

Course-Section: SPAN 101 0101
 Title ELEMENTARY SPANISH I
 Instructor: PEREZ-REYNA, MA
 Enrollment: 32
 Questionnaires: 26

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 1571
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	2	4	11	5	4	3.19	1597/1674	3.66	4.23	4.27	4.07	3.19	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	4	8	8	5	3.46	1515/1674	3.69	4.26	4.23	4.16	3.46	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	2	0	6	12	6	3.77	1169/1423	4.07	4.36	4.27	4.16	3.77	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	2	0	9	10	4	3.56	1427/1609	3.82	4.23	4.22	4.05	3.56	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	13	6	4	3	0	1.88	1580/1585	3.28	4.04	3.96	3.88	1.88	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	7	4	6	7	2	2.73	1494/1535	3.49	4.08	4.08	3.89	2.73	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	3	4	2	7	10	3.65	1381/1651	3.66	4.20	4.18	4.10	3.65	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	16	9	4.36	1339/1673	4.48	4.65	4.69	4.67	4.36	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	1	0	4	10	5	1	3.15	1510/1656	3.67	4.06	4.07	3.96	3.15	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	1	4	7	10	3	3.40	1499/1586	4.04	4.43	4.43	4.37	3.40	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	2	3	20	4.72	1002/1585	4.71	4.72	4.69	4.60	4.72	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	3	2	11	7	2	3.12	1492/1582	3.48	4.30	4.26	4.17	3.12	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	3	3	5	8	6	3.44	1388/1575	3.83	4.32	4.27	4.17	3.44	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	5	5	1	3	5	5	3.21	1174/1380	3.28	3.94	3.94	3.78	3.21	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	3	2	6	7	3	3.24	1291/1520	3.73	4.14	4.01	3.76	3.24	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	1	4	3	5	8	3.71	1233/1515	4.30	4.37	4.24	3.97	3.71	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	2	5	5	9	4.00	1050/1511	4.18	4.37	4.27	4.00	4.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	5	1	2	1	5	6	6	3.65	680/ 994	4.00	3.97	3.94	3.73	3.65	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	1	0.00-0.99 0	A 5	Required for Majors	17
28-55	4	1.00-1.99 0	B 15		Graduate 1
56-83	4	2.00-2.99 3	C 2	General	1
84-150	8	3.00-3.49 7	D 0		Under-grad 25
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00 6	F 0	Electives	2
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	6
			? 1		

Course-Section: SPAN 101 0201
 Title ELEMENTARY SPANISH I
 Instructor: MORENILLA, LAUR
 Enrollment: 30
 Questionnaires: 19

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 1572
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	5	5	5	4	3.42	1538/1674	3.66	4.23	4.27	4.07	3.42	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	2	9	3	4	3.37	1550/1674	3.69	4.26	4.23	4.16	3.37	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	3	3	6	7	3.89	1111/1423	4.07	4.36	4.27	4.16	3.89	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	3	4	7	4	3.53	1443/1609	3.82	4.23	4.22	4.05	3.53	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	7	4	7	4.00	769/1585	3.28	4.04	3.96	3.88	4.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	3	6	4	6	3.68	1196/1535	3.49	4.08	4.08	3.89	3.68	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	2	3	6	2	6	3.37	1496/1651	3.66	4.20	4.18	4.10	3.37	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	15	3	4.17	1484/1673	4.48	4.65	4.69	4.67	4.17	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	1	1	7	4	2	3.33	1444/1656	3.67	4.06	4.07	3.96	3.33	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	2	8	8	4.33	1074/1586	4.04	4.43	4.43	4.37	4.33	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	7	11	4.61	1130/1585	4.71	4.72	4.69	4.60	4.61	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	1	6	2	5	4	3.28	1468/1582	3.48	4.30	4.26	4.17	3.28	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	4	4	5	4	3.39	1408/1575	3.83	4.32	4.27	4.17	3.39	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	3	1	5	3	3	1	2.85	1276/1380	3.28	3.94	3.94	3.78	2.85	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	4	2	4	4	3.57	1141/1520	3.73	4.14	4.01	3.76	3.57	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	0	2	4	8	4.43	733/1515	4.30	4.37	4.24	3.97	4.43	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	1	0	4	4	4	3.77	1216/1511	4.18	4.37	4.27	4.00	3.77	
4. Were special techniques successful	5	1	0	1	2	7	3	3.92	549/ 994	4.00	3.97	3.94	3.73	3.92	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	18	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 265	****	4.06	4.23	3.97	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 278	****	4.21	4.19	3.97	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 260	****	4.43	4.46	4.41	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 259	****	4.21	4.33	4.19	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	18	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 233	****	4.36	4.20	4.00	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	0	A	8	Required for Majors	11	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	B	5						
56-83	6	2.00-2.99	6	C	4	General	2	Under-grad	19	Non-major	6
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	5	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	6				
				?	0						

Course-Section: SPAN 101 0301
 Title ELEMENTARY SPANISH I
 Instructor: OSKOZ, ANA
 Enrollment: 28
 Questionnaires: 23

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 1573
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	0	1	1	9	11	4.36	817/1674	3.66	4.23	4.27	4.07	4.36	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	3	11	8	4.23	968/1674	3.69	4.26	4.23	4.16	4.23	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	1	0	7	14	4.55	528/1423	4.07	4.36	4.27	4.16	4.55	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	1	2	7	12	4.36	701/1609	3.82	4.23	4.22	4.05	4.36	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	1	1	1	5	5	9	3.95	838/1585	3.28	4.04	3.96	3.88	3.95	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	1	0	2	2	10	7	4.05	853/1535	3.49	4.08	4.08	3.89	4.05	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	1	0	2	6	4	9	3.95	1162/1651	3.66	4.20	4.18	4.10	3.95	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	1	0	21	4.91	706/1673	4.48	4.65	4.69	4.67	4.91	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	8	0	0	0	0	7	8	4.53	359/1656	3.67	4.06	4.07	3.96	4.53	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	1	10	9	4.40	1004/1586	4.04	4.43	4.43	4.37	4.40	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	0	4	16	4.80	811/1585	4.71	4.72	4.69	4.60	4.80	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	0	1	4	7	7	4.05	1104/1582	3.48	4.30	4.26	4.17	4.05	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	1	5	14	4.65	509/1575	3.83	4.32	4.27	4.17	4.65	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	1	2	0	5	4	7	3.78	887/1380	3.28	3.94	3.94	3.78	3.78	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	1	0	5	7	4.38	529/1520	3.73	4.14	4.01	3.76	4.38	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	10	0	0	1	0	0	12	4.77	372/1515	4.30	4.37	4.24	3.97	4.77	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	10	0	0	0	0	3	10	4.77	402/1511	4.18	4.37	4.27	4.00	4.77	
4. Were special techniques successful	10	1	0	1	2	0	9	4.42	278/ 994	4.00	3.97	3.94	3.73	4.42	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	22	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 265	****	4.06	4.23	3.97	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	22	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 278	****	4.21	4.19	3.97	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	22	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 260	****	4.43	4.46	4.41	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 259	****	4.21	4.33	4.19	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 233	****	4.36	4.20	4.00	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	22	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 103	****	4.39	4.41	4.33	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 101	****	4.33	4.48	4.18	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	22	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 95	****	4.15	4.31	3.99	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	22	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 99	****	4.36	4.39	4.10	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 97	****	3.76	4.14	3.69	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 76	****	3.36	3.98	3.32	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	22	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 77	****	3.65	3.93	3.42	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 53	****	4.19	4.45	4.34	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	22	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 48	****	3.86	4.12	4.00	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 49	****	3.74	4.27	4.30	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	22	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 61	****	4.03	4.09	3.87	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	22	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 52	****	4.21	4.26	3.91	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 50	****	4.23	4.44	4.39	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	22	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 35	****	4.22	4.36	3.92	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	22	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 31	****	4.25	4.34	3.88	****	

Course-Section: SPAN 101 0301
 Title ELEMENTARY SPANISH I
 Instructor: OSKOZ, ANA
 Enrollment: 28
 Questionnaires: 23

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 1573
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	2	Required for Majors	15	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	B	11						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	2	C	2	General	1	Under-grad	23	Non-major	10
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	5	D	2						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	2				
				?	1						

Course-Section: SPAN 102 0101
 Title ELEMENTARY SPANISH II
 Instructor: RIBEYRO, CLAUDI (Instr. A)
 Enrollment: 26
 Questionnaires: 22

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 1574
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	2	2	10	8	4.09	1123/1674	4.07	4.23	4.27	4.07	4.09	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	11	8	4.18	1009/1674	4.11	4.26	4.23	4.16	4.18	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	4	8	9	4.14	936/1423	4.17	4.36	4.27	4.16	4.14	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	6	6	9	4.14	985/1609	4.08	4.23	4.22	4.05	4.14	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	4	2	3	3	6	4	3.39	1306/1585	3.51	4.04	3.96	3.88	3.39	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	3	5	6	7	3.68	1196/1535	3.74	4.08	4.08	3.89	3.68	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	3	1	6	11	4.05	1070/1651	3.98	4.20	4.18	4.10	4.05	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	9	13	4.59	1141/1673	4.77	4.65	4.69	4.67	4.59	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	11	1	0	0	0	7	3	4.30	655/1656	3.99	4.06	4.07	3.96	4.21	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	9	0	0	0	1	2	10	4.69	618/1586	4.29	4.43	4.43	4.37	4.29	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	9	0	0	0	1	1	11	4.77	896/1585	4.79	4.72	4.69	4.60	4.72	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	9	0	0	0	1	3	9	4.62	510/1582	4.16	4.30	4.26	4.17	4.59	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	0	3	10	4.77	343/1575	4.32	4.32	4.27	4.17	4.66	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	9	1	2	1	2	3	4	3.50	1036/1380	3.42	3.94	3.94	3.78	3.39	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	1	7	9	4.47	431/1520	4.12	4.14	4.01	3.76	4.47	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	1	0	0	3	13	4.59	560/1515	4.62	4.37	4.24	3.97	4.59	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	0	1	2	14	4.76	402/1511	4.30	4.37	4.27	4.00	4.76	
4. Were special techniques successful	5	2	0	1	4	3	7	4.07	456/ 994	4.02	3.97	3.94	3.73	4.07	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 265	****	4.06	4.23	3.97	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 278	****	4.21	4.19	3.97	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 260	****	4.43	4.46	4.41	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 259	****	4.21	4.33	4.19	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 233	****	4.36	4.20	4.00	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 103	****	4.39	4.41	4.33	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 101	****	4.33	4.48	4.18	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 95	****	4.15	4.31	3.99	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 99	****	4.36	4.39	4.10	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 97	****	3.76	4.14	3.69	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 76	****	3.36	3.98	3.32	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 77	****	3.65	3.93	3.42	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 53	****	4.19	4.45	4.34	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 48	****	3.86	4.12	4.00	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 49	****	3.74	4.27	4.30	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 61	****	4.03	4.09	3.87	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 52	****	4.21	4.26	3.91	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 50	****	4.23	4.44	4.39	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 35	****	4.22	4.36	3.92	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 31	****	4.25	4.34	3.88	****	

Course-Section: SPAN 102 0101
 Title ELEMENTARY SPANISH II
 Instructor: RIBEYRO, CLAUDI (Instr. A)
 Enrollment: 26
 Questionnaires: 22

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 1574
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	4	0.00-0.99	0	A	3	Required for Majors	13	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	B	8						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	7	C	11	General	4	Under-grad	22	Non-major	10
84-150	6	3.00-3.49	4	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	5				
				?	0						

Course-Section: SPAN 102 0101
 Title ELEMENTARY SPANISH II
 Instructor: (Instr. B)
 Enrollment: 26
 Questionnaires: 22

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 1575
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	2	2	10	8	4.09	1123/1674	4.07	4.23	4.27	4.07	4.09	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	11	8	4.18	1009/1674	4.11	4.26	4.23	4.16	4.18	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	4	8	9	4.14	936/1423	4.17	4.36	4.27	4.16	4.14	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	6	6	9	4.14	985/1609	4.08	4.23	4.22	4.05	4.14	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	4	2	3	3	6	4	3.39	1306/1585	3.51	4.04	3.96	3.88	3.39	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	3	5	6	7	3.68	1196/1535	3.74	4.08	4.08	3.89	3.68	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	3	1	6	11	4.05	1070/1651	3.98	4.20	4.18	4.10	4.05	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	9	13	4.59	1141/1673	4.77	4.65	4.69	4.67	4.59	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	14	0	0	0	3	1	4	4.13	871/1656	3.99	4.06	4.07	3.96	4.21	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	13	0	0	0	2	6	1	3.89	1376/1586	4.29	4.43	4.43	4.37	4.29	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	13	0	0	0	0	3	6	4.67	1071/1585	4.79	4.72	4.69	4.60	4.72	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	13	0	0	0	1	2	6	4.56	578/1582	4.16	4.30	4.26	4.17	4.59	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	1	2	6	4.56	635/1575	4.32	4.32	4.27	4.17	4.66	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	13	2	1	1	1	3	1	3.29	1149/1380	3.42	3.94	3.94	3.78	3.39	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	1	7	9	4.47	431/1520	4.12	4.14	4.01	3.76	4.47	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	1	0	0	3	13	4.59	560/1515	4.62	4.37	4.24	3.97	4.59	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	0	1	2	14	4.76	402/1511	4.30	4.37	4.27	4.00	4.76	
4. Were special techniques successful	5	2	0	1	4	3	7	4.07	456/ 994	4.02	3.97	3.94	3.73	4.07	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 265	****	4.06	4.23	3.97	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 278	****	4.21	4.19	3.97	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 260	****	4.43	4.46	4.41	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 259	****	4.21	4.33	4.19	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 233	****	4.36	4.20	4.00	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 103	****	4.39	4.41	4.33	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 101	****	4.33	4.48	4.18	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 95	****	4.15	4.31	3.99	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 99	****	4.36	4.39	4.10	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 97	****	3.76	4.14	3.69	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 76	****	3.36	3.98	3.32	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 77	****	3.65	3.93	3.42	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 53	****	4.19	4.45	4.34	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 48	****	3.86	4.12	4.00	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 49	****	3.74	4.27	4.30	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 61	****	4.03	4.09	3.87	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 52	****	4.21	4.26	3.91	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 50	****	4.23	4.44	4.39	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 35	****	4.22	4.36	3.92	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 31	****	4.25	4.34	3.88	****	

Course-Section: SPAN 102 0101
 Title ELEMENTARY SPANISH II
 Instructor: (Instr. B)
 Enrollment: 26
 Questionnaires: 22

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 1575
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	4	0.00-0.99	0	A	3	Required for Majors	13	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	B	8						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	7	C	11	General	4	Under-grad	22	Non-major	10
84-150	6	3.00-3.49	4	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	5				
				?	0						

Course-Section: SPAN 102 0201
 Title ELEMENTARY SPANISH II
 Instructor: STAFF
 Enrollment: 23
 Questionnaires: 18

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 1576
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	1	2	6	9	4.28	928/1674	4.07	4.23	4.27	4.07	4.28	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	7	9	4.39	763/1674	4.11	4.26	4.23	4.16	4.39	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	3	6	8	4.29	811/1423	4.17	4.36	4.27	4.16	4.29	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	5	10	4.39	673/1609	4.08	4.23	4.22	4.05	4.39	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	3	1	0	4	8	2	3.67	1121/1585	3.51	4.04	3.96	3.88	3.67	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	4	8	5	3.89	1039/1535	3.74	4.08	4.08	3.89	3.89	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	11	6	4.28	843/1651	3.98	4.20	4.18	4.10	4.28	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	7	11	4.61	1124/1673	4.77	4.65	4.69	4.67	4.61	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	3	9	5	4.12	882/1656	3.99	4.06	4.07	3.96	4.12	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	9	8	4.39	1024/1586	4.29	4.43	4.43	4.37	4.39	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	17	4.94	340/1585	4.79	4.72	4.69	4.60	4.94	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	2	6	10	4.44	719/1582	4.16	4.30	4.26	4.17	4.44	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	10	8	4.44	768/1575	4.32	4.32	4.27	4.17	4.44	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	2	0	0	3	10	3	4.00	666/1380	3.42	3.94	3.94	3.78	4.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	1	1	1	3	6	4.00	810/1520	4.12	4.14	4.01	3.76	4.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	0	0	2	10	4.83	289/1515	4.62	4.37	4.24	3.97	4.83	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	1	0	0	3	8	4.42	740/1511	4.30	4.37	4.27	4.00	4.42	
4. Were special techniques successful	6	3	0	0	2	3	4	4.22	374/ 994	4.02	3.97	3.94	3.73	4.22	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	A 8	Required for Majors	9
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	B 6		Graduate 0
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	C 3	General	18
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	D 1		Non-major 3
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	1
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	5
			? 0		

Course-Section: SPAN 102 0301
 Title ELEMENTARY SPANISH II
 Instructor: VAL, ADRIANA
 Enrollment: 31
 Questionnaires: 17

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 1577
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	2	0	0	0	4	2	9	4.33	854/1674	4.07	4.23	4.27	4.07	4.33	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	0	1	2	5	7	4.20	1001/1674	4.11	4.26	4.23	4.16	4.20	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	0	0	0	1	7	7	4.40	697/1423	4.17	4.36	4.27	4.16	4.40	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	0	1	1	0	7	6	4.07	1055/1609	4.08	4.23	4.22	4.05	4.07	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	2	1	1	3	5	3	3.62	1156/1585	3.51	4.04	3.96	3.88	3.62	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	2	3	4	6	3.93	976/1535	3.74	4.08	4.08	3.89	3.93	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	1	3	3	8	4.20	934/1651	3.98	4.20	4.18	4.10	4.20	
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	0	15	5.00	1/1673	4.77	4.65	4.69	4.67	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	4	5	5	4.07	912/1656	3.99	4.06	4.07	3.96	4.07	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	1	6	8	4.47	916/1586	4.29	4.43	4.43	4.37	4.47	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	1	14	4.93	397/1585	4.79	4.72	4.69	4.60	4.93	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	1	0	3	4	7	4.07	1099/1582	4.16	4.30	4.26	4.17	4.07	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	1	0	5	8	4.20	1010/1575	4.32	4.32	4.27	4.17	4.20	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	0	3	1	3	3	5	3.40	1094/1380	3.42	3.94	3.94	3.78	3.40	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	1	2	7	4.60	338/1520	4.12	4.14	4.01	3.76	4.60	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	0	0	1	0	9	4.80	325/1515	4.62	4.37	4.24	3.97	4.80	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	0	0	1	2	7	4.60	563/1511	4.30	4.37	4.27	4.00	4.60	
4. Were special techniques successful	7	0	0	1	1	3	5	4.20	390/ 994	4.02	3.97	3.94	3.73	4.20	
Laboratory															
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 278	****	4.21	4.19	3.97	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 260	****	4.43	4.46	4.41	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 103	****	4.39	4.41	4.33	****	
Self Paced															
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 50	****	4.23	4.44	4.39	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 35	****	4.22	4.36	3.92	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	4	Required for Majors	11	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	8						
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	3	C	2	General	1	Under-grad	17	Non-major	5
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	4	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	1						
				I	0	Other	3				
				?	0						

Course-Section: SPAN 102 0401
 Title ELEMENTARY SPANISH II
 Instructor: PETERSON, MARYA
 Enrollment: 28
 Questionnaires: 14

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 1578
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	2	4	4	4	3.71	1424/1674	4.07	4.23	4.27	4.07	3.71	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	7	4	4.00	1146/1674	4.11	4.26	4.23	4.16	4.00	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	1	1	4	7	4.07	974/1423	4.17	4.36	4.27	4.16	4.07	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	1	2	7	3	3.92	1198/1609	4.08	4.23	4.22	4.05	3.92	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	3	4	5	1	3.31	1344/1585	3.51	4.04	3.96	3.88	3.31	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	5	5	3	3.71	1177/1535	3.74	4.08	4.08	3.89	3.71	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	4	5	4	3.86	1258/1651	3.98	4.20	4.18	4.10	3.86	
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/1673	4.77	4.65	4.69	4.67	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	1	3	5	1	3.60	1330/1656	3.99	4.06	4.07	3.96	3.60	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	1	2	4	6	4.15	1217/1586	4.29	4.43	4.43	4.37	4.15	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	2	11	4.85	713/1585	4.79	4.72	4.69	4.60	4.85	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	2	3	2	6	3.92	1199/1582	4.16	4.30	4.26	4.17	3.92	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	2	4	6	4.15	1050/1575	4.32	4.32	4.27	4.17	4.15	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	3	1	2	2	2	2	3.22	1170/1380	3.42	3.94	3.94	3.78	3.22	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	4	4	4.50	397/1520	4.12	4.14	4.01	3.76	4.50	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	242/1515	4.62	4.37	4.24	3.97	4.88	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	0	0	0	4	4	4.50	642/1511	4.30	4.37	4.27	4.00	4.50	
4. Were special techniques successful	6	3	0	1	1	2	1	3.60	699/ 994	4.02	3.97	3.94	3.73	3.60	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	12	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 265	****	4.06	4.23	3.97	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	12	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 278	****	4.21	4.19	3.97	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	12	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 260	****	4.43	4.46	4.41	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	12	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 259	****	4.21	4.33	4.19	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	12	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 233	****	4.36	4.20	4.00	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	13	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 103	****	4.39	4.41	4.33	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	12	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 101	****	4.33	4.48	4.18	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	12	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 95	****	4.15	4.31	3.99	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	12	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 99	****	4.36	4.39	4.10	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	12	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 97	****	3.76	4.14	3.69	****	
Field Work															
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 53	****	4.19	4.45	4.34	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 48	****	3.86	4.12	4.00	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 61	****	4.03	4.09	3.87	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 52	****	4.21	4.26	3.91	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 50	****	4.23	4.44	4.39	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 35	****	4.22	4.36	3.92	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 31	****	4.25	4.34	3.88	****	

Course-Section: SPAN 102 0401
 Title ELEMENTARY SPANISH II
 Instructor: PETERSON, MARYA
 Enrollment: 28
 Questionnaires: 14

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 1578
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: SPAN 102 0501
 Title ELEMENTARY SPANISH II
 Instructor: COLOMBO, LAURA
 Enrollment: 18
 Questionnaires: 17

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 1579
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	2	5	10	4.47	655/1674	4.07	4.23	4.27	4.07	4.47	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	8	7	4.29	882/1674	4.11	4.26	4.23	4.16	4.29	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	6	8	4.24	861/1423	4.17	4.36	4.27	4.16	4.24	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	1	0	3	5	7	4.06	1055/1609	4.08	4.23	4.22	4.05	4.06	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	2	4	5	5	3.65	1135/1585	3.51	4.04	3.96	3.88	3.65	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	2	1	2	1	6	5	3.80	1110/1535	3.74	4.08	4.08	3.89	3.80	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	2	1	5	8	4.00	1097/1651	3.98	4.20	4.18	4.10	4.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	17	5.00	1/1673	4.77	4.65	4.69	4.67	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	1	0	0	1	6	4	4.27	693/1656	3.99	4.06	4.07	3.96	4.27	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	1	4	11	4.63	723/1586	4.29	4.43	4.43	4.37	4.63	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	3	13	4.81	786/1585	4.79	4.72	4.69	4.60	4.81	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	4	4	8	4.25	935/1582	4.16	4.30	4.26	4.17	4.25	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	2	5	9	4.44	780/1575	4.32	4.32	4.27	4.17	4.44	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	3	1	1	3	4	4	3.69	944/1380	3.42	3.94	3.94	3.78	3.69	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	1	6	3	4.20	700/1520	4.12	4.14	4.01	3.76	4.20	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	0	0	1	2	7	4.60	543/1515	4.62	4.37	4.24	3.97	4.60	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	0	0	3	5	2	3.90	1139/1511	4.30	4.37	4.27	4.00	3.90	
4. Were special techniques successful	8	0	0	0	1	4	4	4.33	322/ 994	4.02	3.97	3.94	3.73	4.33	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: SPAN 102 0601
 Title ELEMENTARY SPANISH II
 Instructor: DE LOS RIOS, CA
 Enrollment: 21
 Questionnaires: 16

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 1580
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	1	0	1	6	8	4.25	954/1674	4.07	4.23	4.27	4.07	4.25	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	6	8	4.31	856/1674	4.11	4.26	4.23	4.16	4.31	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	8	7	4.47	623/1423	4.17	4.36	4.27	4.16	4.47	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	5	9	4.44	598/1609	4.08	4.23	4.22	4.05	4.44	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	2	1	0	2	5	5	4.00	769/1585	3.51	4.04	3.96	3.88	4.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	2	8	5	4.20	737/1535	3.74	4.08	4.08	3.89	4.20	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	1	1	6	7	4.27	855/1651	3.98	4.20	4.18	4.10	4.27	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	2	14	4.88	760/1673	4.77	4.65	4.69	4.67	4.88	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	1	0	6	7	4.36	588/1656	3.99	4.06	4.07	3.96	4.36	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	2	3	10	4.53	826/1586	4.29	4.43	4.43	4.37	4.53	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	3	12	4.80	811/1585	4.79	4.72	4.69	4.60	4.80	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	1	0	0	5	9	4.40	777/1582	4.16	4.30	4.26	4.17	4.40	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	0	0	3	11	4.53	658/1575	4.32	4.32	4.27	4.17	4.53	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	3	0	0	3	6	3	4.00	666/1380	3.42	3.94	3.94	3.78	4.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	1	0	3	1	6	4.00	810/1520	4.12	4.14	4.01	3.76	4.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1515	4.62	4.37	4.24	3.97	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	0	3	2	6	4.27	875/1511	4.30	4.37	4.27	4.00	4.27	
4. Were special techniques successful	5	0	1	0	2	3	5	4.00	474/ 994	4.02	3.97	3.94	3.73	4.00	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	A 6	Required for Majors	13
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	B 9		Graduate 0
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	C 0	General	0
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad 16
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	2
			? 1		

Course-Section: SPAN 102 0701
 Title ELEMENTARY SPANISH II
 Instructor: COLOMBO, LAURA
 Enrollment: 28
 Questionnaires: 12

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 1581
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	2	5	5	4.25	954/1674	4.07	4.23	4.27	4.07	4.25	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	3	6	4.25	931/1674	4.11	4.26	4.23	4.16	4.25	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	5	5	4.17	915/1423	4.17	4.36	4.27	4.16	4.17	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	5	5	4.25	852/1609	4.08	4.23	4.22	4.05	4.25	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	1	3	3	3	3.80	1006/1585	3.51	4.04	3.96	3.88	3.80	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	2	2	4	4	3.83	1083/1535	3.74	4.08	4.08	3.89	3.83	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	3	1	2	6	3.92	1214/1651	3.98	4.20	4.18	4.10	3.92	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	5	7	4.58	1148/1673	4.77	4.65	4.69	4.67	4.58	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	2	3	6	4.36	575/1656	3.99	4.06	4.07	3.96	4.36	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	1	0	3	8	4.50	858/1586	4.29	4.43	4.43	4.37	4.50	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	510/1585	4.79	4.72	4.69	4.60	4.92	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	1	0	1	2	8	4.33	850/1582	4.16	4.30	4.26	4.17	4.33	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	1	10	4.75	359/1575	4.32	4.32	4.27	4.17	4.75	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	3	0	2	2	2	3	3.67	962/1380	3.42	3.94	3.94	3.78	3.67	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	2	4	5	4.08	783/1520	4.12	4.14	4.01	3.76	4.08	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	4	8	4.67	483/1515	4.62	4.37	4.24	3.97	4.67	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	1	7	4	4.25	896/1511	4.30	4.37	4.27	4.00	4.25	
4. Were special techniques successful	0	2	0	0	1	4	5	4.40	287/ 994	4.02	3.97	3.94	3.73	4.40	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	11	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 265	****	4.06	4.23	3.97	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	11	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 278	****	4.21	4.19	3.97	****	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: SPAN 102 0801
 Title ELEMENTARY SPANISH II
 Instructor: PETERSON, MARYA
 Enrollment: 27
 Questionnaires: 9

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 1582
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	3	4	0	2	3.11	1613/1674	4.07	4.23	4.27	4.07	3.11	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	0	5	2	1	3.22	1580/1674	4.11	4.26	4.23	4.16	3.22	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	5	1	3.67	1214/1423	4.17	4.36	4.27	4.16	3.67	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	2	1	3	2	3.33	1500/1609	4.08	4.23	4.22	4.05	3.33	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	3	1	1	1	2	2.75	1517/1585	3.51	4.04	3.96	3.88	2.75	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	3	0	2	3	1	2.89	1473/1535	3.74	4.08	4.08	3.89	2.89	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	3	1	1	3	3.22	1532/1651	3.98	4.20	4.18	4.10	3.22	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	3	6	4.67	1072/1673	4.77	4.65	4.69	4.67	4.67	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	1	1	1	4	1	0	2.71	1605/1656	3.99	4.06	4.07	3.96	2.71	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	1	1	3	2	2	3.33	1510/1586	4.29	4.43	4.43	4.37	3.33	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	1	0	2	6	4.44	1275/1585	4.79	4.72	4.69	4.60	4.44	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	2	1	3	2	1	2.89	1532/1582	4.16	4.30	4.26	4.17	2.89	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	1	2	3	1	3.00	1487/1575	4.32	4.32	4.27	4.17	3.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	1	5	1	0	1	1	2.00	1359/1380	3.42	3.94	3.94	3.78	2.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	2	1	3	1	1	2.75	1434/1520	4.12	4.14	4.01	3.76	2.75	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	1	0	3	1	3	3.63	1267/1515	4.62	4.37	4.24	3.97	3.63	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	1	2	1	2	2	3.25	1371/1511	4.30	4.37	4.27	4.00	3.25	
4. Were special techniques successful	1	1	1	1	2	1	2	3.29	827/ 994	4.02	3.97	3.94	3.73	3.29	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 4	Required for Majors	7
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	B 2		Graduate
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	C 3	General	0
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	D 0		9
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		
			I 0		
			? 0	Other	1

- Means there are not enough responses to be significant

Course-Section: SPAN 103 0101
 Title INT REV ELEM SPANISH
 Instructor: MORENILLA, LAUR
 Enrollment: 22
 Questionnaires: 16

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 1583
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	1	2	6	3	4	3.44	1534/1674	4.00	4.23	4.27	4.07	3.44	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	3	3	7	3	3.63	1441/1674	4.25	4.26	4.23	4.16	3.63	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	6	7	3	3.81	1150/1423	4.27	4.36	4.27	4.16	3.81	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	2	4	5	5	3.81	1278/1609	4.33	4.23	4.22	4.05	3.81	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	2	1	7	4	3.93	879/1585	4.25	4.04	3.96	3.88	3.93	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	1	5	5	4	3.63	1229/1535	4.07	4.08	4.08	3.89	3.63	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	3	3	1	9	4.00	1097/1651	4.30	4.20	4.18	4.10	4.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	1	0	0	0	10	5	4.33	1361/1673	4.67	4.65	4.69	4.67	4.33	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	1	5	6	1	3.54	1362/1656	4.19	4.06	4.07	3.96	3.54	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	1	4	7	4	3.88	1379/1586	4.41	4.43	4.43	4.37	3.88	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	6	10	4.63	1118/1585	4.81	4.72	4.69	4.60	4.63	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	2	2	4	4	3	3.27	1470/1582	4.04	4.30	4.26	4.17	3.27	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	4	5	5	3.93	1192/1575	4.44	4.32	4.27	4.17	3.93	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	2	4	3	4	0	2	2.46	1329/1380	3.12	3.94	3.94	3.78	2.46	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	3	4	2	3.89	936/1520	4.29	4.14	4.01	3.76	3.89	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	0	0	0	3	6	4.67	483/1515	4.80	4.37	4.24	3.97	4.67	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	0	0	2	3	4	4.22	927/1511	4.61	4.37	4.27	4.00	4.22	
4. Were special techniques successful	7	1	0	1	3	2	2	3.63	691/ 994	4.17	3.97	3.94	3.73	3.63	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: SPAN 103 0201
 Title INT REV ELEM SPANISH
 Instructor: SCHELL, ANTHONY
 Enrollment: 25
 Questionnaires: 25

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 1584
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	2	7	16	4.56	533/1674	4.00	4.23	4.27	4.07	4.56	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	22	4.88	153/1674	4.25	4.26	4.23	4.16	4.88	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	0	4	20	4.72	310/1423	4.27	4.36	4.27	4.16	4.72	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	2	22	4.84	152/1609	4.33	4.23	4.22	4.05	4.84	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	1	8	14	4.57	289/1585	4.25	4.04	3.96	3.88	4.57	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	4	4	17	4.52	355/1535	4.07	4.08	4.08	3.89	4.52	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	0	0	6	18	4.60	393/1651	4.30	4.20	4.18	4.10	4.60	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	25	5.00	1/1673	4.67	4.65	4.69	4.67	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	0	0	3	17	4.85	127/1656	4.19	4.06	4.07	3.96	4.85	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	0	0	0	1	20	4.95	107/1586	4.41	4.43	4.43	4.37	4.95	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	0	0	22	5.00	1/1585	4.81	4.72	4.69	4.60	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	1	2	19	4.82	236/1582	4.04	4.30	4.26	4.17	4.82	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	1	21	4.95	86/1575	4.44	4.32	4.27	4.17	4.95	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	0	0	4	5	5	8	3.77	887/1380	3.12	3.94	3.94	3.78	3.77	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	1	3	12	4.69	281/1520	4.29	4.14	4.01	3.76	4.69	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	9	0	0	0	0	1	15	4.94	145/1515	4.80	4.37	4.24	3.97	4.94	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	10	0	0	0	0	0	15	5.00	1/1511	4.61	4.37	4.27	4.00	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	10	1	0	0	1	2	11	4.71	131/ 994	4.17	3.97	3.94	3.73	4.71	
Laboratory															
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	24	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 278	****	4.21	4.19	3.97	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	24	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 259	****	4.21	4.33	4.19	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	24	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 233	****	4.36	4.20	4.00	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	24	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 103	****	4.39	4.41	4.33	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	24	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 101	****	4.33	4.48	4.18	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	24	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 95	****	4.15	4.31	3.99	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	24	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 99	****	4.36	4.39	4.10	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	24	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 97	****	3.76	4.14	3.69	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	24	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 76	****	3.36	3.98	3.32	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	24	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 77	****	3.65	3.93	3.42	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	24	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 53	****	4.19	4.45	4.34	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	23	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 48	****	3.86	4.12	4.00	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	24	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 49	****	3.74	4.27	4.30	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	24	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 61	****	4.03	4.09	3.87	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	23	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 52	****	4.21	4.26	3.91	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	23	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 50	****	4.23	4.44	4.39	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	23	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 35	****	4.22	4.36	3.92	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	23	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 31	****	4.25	4.34	3.88	****	

Course-Section: SPAN 103 0201
 Title INT REV ELEM SPANISH
 Instructor: SCHELL, ANTHONY
 Enrollment: 25
 Questionnaires: 25

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 1584
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	15	Required for Majors	19	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B	3						
56-83	6	2.00-2.99	7	C	5	General	1	Under-grad	25	Non-major	3
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	6	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	5				
				?	0						

Course-Section: SPAN 201 0101
 Title INTERMEDIATE SPANISH I
 Instructor: STOLLEMCALISTER
 Enrollment: 21
 Questionnaires: 14

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 1585
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	5	5	4	3.93	1296/1674	4.24	4.23	4.27	4.32	3.93	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	5	8	4.50	578/1674	4.28	4.26	4.23	4.26	4.50	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	6	6	4.29	819/1423	4.36	4.36	4.27	4.36	4.29	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	6	6	4.29	812/1609	4.25	4.23	4.22	4.23	4.29	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	5	5	3	3.64	1135/1585	3.74	4.04	3.96	3.91	3.64	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	2	7	4	4.00	870/1535	3.99	4.08	4.08	4.03	4.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	2	6	6	4.29	832/1651	4.30	4.20	4.18	4.20	4.29	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	7	7	4.50	1203/1673	4.67	4.65	4.69	4.67	4.50	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	2	7	3	4.08	906/1656	4.15	4.06	4.07	4.10	4.08	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	1	4	6	4.45	931/1586	4.35	4.43	4.43	4.48	4.45	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	1	4	6	4.45	1267/1585	4.63	4.72	4.69	4.76	4.45	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	0	0	2	3	5	4.30	882/1582	4.20	4.30	4.26	4.35	4.30	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	1	2	8	4.64	537/1575	4.39	4.32	4.27	4.39	4.64	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	1	0	2	3	3	2	3.50	1036/1380	3.51	3.94	3.94	4.03	3.50	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	1	3	4	3	3.82	979/1520	4.22	4.14	4.01	4.03	3.82	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	1	5	5	4.36	798/1515	4.65	4.37	4.24	4.28	4.36	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	1	4	6	4.45	696/1511	4.47	4.37	4.27	4.28	4.45	
4. Were special techniques successful	3	0	0	0	2	7	2	4.00	474/ 994	4.26	3.97	3.94	3.98	4.00	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 2	Required for Majors	10
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	B 6	Graduate	0
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	C 4	General	0
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	D 0	Under-grad	14
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	
			I 0	Other	2
			? 1		

Course-Section: SPAN 201 0201
 Title INTERMEDIATE SPANISH I
 Instructor: STOLLEMCALISTER
 Enrollment: 22
 Questionnaires: 12

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 1586
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	2	5	5	4.25	954/1674	4.24	4.23	4.27	4.32	4.25	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	2	8	4.50	578/1674	4.28	4.26	4.23	4.26	4.50	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	3	8	4.58	482/1423	4.36	4.36	4.27	4.36	4.58	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	5	6	4.42	629/1609	4.25	4.23	4.22	4.23	4.42	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	1	0	3	5	2	3.64	1142/1585	3.74	4.04	3.96	3.91	3.64	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	1	1	4	5	4.18	747/1535	3.99	4.08	4.08	4.03	4.18	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	0	3	8	4.50	524/1651	4.30	4.20	4.18	4.20	4.50	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	635/1673	4.67	4.65	4.69	4.67	4.92	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	1	4	6	4.45	451/1656	4.15	4.06	4.07	4.10	4.45	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	3	8	4.73	560/1586	4.35	4.43	4.43	4.48	4.73	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	2	9	4.82	786/1585	4.63	4.72	4.69	4.76	4.82	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	4	7	4.64	481/1582	4.20	4.30	4.26	4.35	4.64	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	3	7	4.55	646/1575	4.39	4.32	4.27	4.39	4.55	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	1	5	3	2	3.55	1020/1380	3.51	3.94	3.94	4.03	3.55	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	1	2	7	4.60	338/1520	4.22	4.14	4.01	4.03	4.60	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	325/1515	4.65	4.37	4.24	4.28	4.80	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	266/1511	4.47	4.37	4.27	4.28	4.89	
4. Were special techniques successful	3	1	0	0	0	4	4	4.50	205/ 994	4.26	3.97	3.94	3.98	4.50	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 4	Required for Majors	10
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	B 7		Graduate 0
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	C 0	General	0
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad 12
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	2
			? 0		

Course-Section: SPAN 201 0301
 Title INTERMEDIATE SPANISH I
 Instructor: MESSICK, ROSALI
 Enrollment: 21
 Questionnaires: 16

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 1587
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	3	1	9	3	3.75	1407/1674	4.24	4.23	4.27	4.32	3.75	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	3	9	3	3.88	1291/1674	4.28	4.26	4.23	4.26	3.88	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	2	6	8	8	4.38	728/1423	4.36	4.36	4.27	4.36	4.38	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	7	6	4.13	1007/1609	4.25	4.23	4.22	4.23	4.13	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	1	3	8	2	3.44	1274/1585	3.74	4.04	3.96	3.91	3.44	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	4	8	3	3.75	1147/1535	3.99	4.08	4.08	4.03	3.75	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	2	2	4	8	4.13	1009/1651	4.30	4.20	4.18	4.20	4.13	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	13	3	4.19	1470/1673	4.67	4.65	4.69	4.67	4.19	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	0	3	3	5	4.18	805/1656	4.15	4.06	4.07	4.10	4.18	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	3	8	4	4.07	1270/1586	4.35	4.43	4.43	4.48	4.07	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	1	14	4.93	397/1585	4.63	4.72	4.69	4.76	4.93	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	1	10	4	4.20	998/1582	4.20	4.30	4.26	4.35	4.20	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	4	4	7	4.20	1010/1575	4.39	4.32	4.27	4.39	4.20	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	1	2	0	7	2	3	3.29	1149/1380	3.51	3.94	3.94	4.03	3.29	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	810/1520	4.22	4.14	4.01	4.03	4.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	12	0	0	1	0	0	3	4.25	898/1515	4.65	4.37	4.24	4.28	4.25	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	12	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1511	4.47	4.37	4.27	4.28	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	12	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	360/ 994	4.26	3.97	3.94	3.98	4.25	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors				
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	A 6	Required for Majors	11	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	B 3						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	C 7	General	2	Under-grad	16	Non-major	2
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	D 0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
			P 0						
			I 0	Other	3				
			? 0						

Course-Section: SPAN 201 0401
 Title INTERMEDIATE SPANISH I
 Instructor: DEANGULO, SANTI
 Enrollment: 21
 Questionnaires: 17

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 1588
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	2	4	11	4.53	582/1674	4.24	4.23	4.27	4.32	4.53	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	5	10	4.41	721/1674	4.28	4.26	4.23	4.26	4.41	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	2	13	4.65	404/1423	4.36	4.36	4.27	4.36	4.65	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	3	13	4.71	272/1609	4.25	4.23	4.22	4.23	4.71	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	1	5	10	4.41	404/1585	3.74	4.04	3.96	3.91	4.41	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	5	10	4.47	413/1535	3.99	4.08	4.08	4.03	4.47	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	2	4	10	4.35	741/1651	4.30	4.20	4.18	4.20	4.35	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	16	4.94	424/1673	4.67	4.65	4.69	4.67	4.94	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	1	5	7	4.46	437/1656	4.15	4.06	4.07	4.10	4.46	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	0	4	10	4.71	581/1586	4.35	4.43	4.43	4.48	4.71	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	0	1	13	4.93	453/1585	4.63	4.72	4.69	4.76	4.93	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	1	0	5	8	4.43	748/1582	4.20	4.30	4.26	4.35	4.43	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	1	2	11	4.71	423/1575	4.39	4.32	4.27	4.39	4.71	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	1	2	1	4	2	4	3.38	1103/1380	3.51	3.94	3.94	4.03	3.38	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	2	2	5	4.33	572/1520	4.22	4.14	4.01	4.03	4.33	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	0	0	1	0	9	4.80	325/1515	4.65	4.37	4.24	4.28	4.80	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	0	0	2	3	5	4.30	845/1511	4.47	4.37	4.27	4.28	4.30	
4. Were special techniques successful	7	1	0	0	2	3	4	4.22	374/ 994	4.26	3.97	3.94	3.98	4.22	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	A 6	Required for Majors	13
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	B 9		Graduate 0
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	C 1	General	0
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad 17
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	6
			? 1		

Course-Section: SPAN 201 0501
 Title INTERMEDIATE SPANISH I
 Instructor: GLYNN, DOUGLAS
 Enrollment: 18
 Questionnaires: 15

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 1589
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	2	13	4.87	186/1674	4.24	4.23	4.27	4.32	4.87	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	14	4.93	96/1674	4.28	4.26	4.23	4.26	4.93	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	4	11	4.73	286/1423	4.36	4.36	4.27	4.36	4.73	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	4	11	4.73	242/1609	4.25	4.23	4.22	4.23	4.73	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	3	0	0	1	4	7	4.50	326/1585	3.74	4.04	3.96	3.91	4.50	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	3	10	4.53	346/1535	3.99	4.08	4.08	4.03	4.53	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	2	13	4.87	139/1651	4.30	4.20	4.18	4.20	4.87	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	11	4	4.27	1412/1673	4.67	4.65	4.69	4.67	4.27	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	1	6	7	4.43	493/1656	4.15	4.06	4.07	4.10	4.43	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	15	5.00	1/1586	4.35	4.43	4.43	4.48	5.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	15	5.00	1/1585	4.63	4.72	4.69	4.76	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	2	13	4.87	189/1582	4.20	4.30	4.26	4.35	4.87	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	14	4.93	120/1575	4.39	4.32	4.27	4.39	4.93	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	1	2	0	1	3	8	4.07	635/1380	3.51	3.94	3.94	4.03	4.07	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	1	1	9	4.73	251/1520	4.22	4.14	4.01	4.03	4.73	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1515	4.65	4.37	4.24	4.28	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	244/1511	4.47	4.37	4.27	4.28	4.91	
4. Were special techniques successful	4	0	0	0	1	0	10	4.82	93/ 994	4.26	3.97	3.94	3.98	4.82	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	A 6	Required for Majors	12
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	B 4		Graduate 0
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	C 4	General	0
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad 15
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	3
			? 1		

Course-Section: SPAN 201 0601
 Title INTERMEDIATE SPANISH I
 Instructor: MESSICK, ROSALI
 Enrollment: 24
 Questionnaires: 17

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 1590
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	2	7	8	4.35	829/1674	4.24	4.23	4.27	4.32	4.35	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	2	0	4	5	6	3.76	1364/1674	4.28	4.26	4.23	4.26	3.76	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	1	1	4	10	4.24	861/1423	4.36	4.36	4.27	4.36	4.24	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	5	2	10	4.29	799/1609	4.25	4.23	4.22	4.23	4.29	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	2	1	2	5	5	3.67	1121/1585	3.74	4.04	3.96	3.91	3.67	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	2	4	7	4	3.76	1140/1535	3.99	4.08	4.08	4.03	3.76	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	8	3	6	3.88	1240/1651	4.30	4.20	4.18	4.20	3.88	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	13	3	4.19	1470/1673	4.67	4.65	4.69	4.67	4.19	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	5	4	4	3.92	1090/1656	4.15	4.06	4.07	4.10	3.92	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	1	2	6	8	4.24	1160/1586	4.35	4.43	4.43	4.48	4.24	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	17	5.00	1/1585	4.63	4.72	4.69	4.76	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	1	4	4	8	4.12	1070/1582	4.20	4.30	4.26	4.35	4.12	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	2	0	5	10	4.35	867/1575	4.39	4.32	4.27	4.39	4.35	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	2	2	0	5	5	3	3.47	1059/1380	3.51	3.94	3.94	4.03	3.47	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	1	0	3	1	5	3.90	924/1520	4.22	4.14	4.01	4.03	3.90	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	207/1515	4.65	4.37	4.24	4.28	4.90	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	244/1511	4.47	4.37	4.27	4.28	4.90	
4. Were special techniques successful	7	2	0	0	1	1	6	4.63	160/ 994	4.26	3.97	3.94	3.98	4.63	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors				
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	A 7	Required for Majors	11	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	B 6						
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	C 2	General	0	Under-grad	17	Non-major	1
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	D 0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 1	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
			P 0						
			I 0	Other	3				
			? 0						

Course-Section: SPAN 201 0701
 Title INTERMEDIATE SPANISH I
 Instructor: GLYNN, DOUGLAS
 Enrollment: 12
 Questionnaires: 12

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 1591
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	133/1674	4.24	4.23	4.27	4.32	4.92	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	10	4.83	191/1674	4.28	4.26	4.23	4.26	4.83	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	10	4.83	181/1423	4.36	4.36	4.27	4.36	4.83	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	4	8	4.67	312/1609	4.25	4.23	4.22	4.23	4.67	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	0	2	9	4.58	277/1585	3.74	4.04	3.96	3.91	4.58	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	2	9	4.67	238/1535	3.99	4.08	4.08	4.03	4.67	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	104/1651	4.30	4.20	4.18	4.20	4.92	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	1	0	10	1	3.92	1618/1673	4.67	4.65	4.69	4.67	3.92	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	149/1656	4.15	4.06	4.07	4.10	4.80	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	3	8	4.73	560/1586	4.35	4.43	4.43	4.48	4.73	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	567/1585	4.63	4.72	4.69	4.76	4.91	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	152/1582	4.20	4.30	4.26	4.35	4.91	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	171/1575	4.39	4.32	4.27	4.39	4.91	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	2	0	0	1	4	4	4.33	426/1380	3.51	3.94	3.94	4.03	4.33	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1520	4.22	4.14	4.01	4.03	5.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	266/1515	4.65	4.37	4.24	4.28	4.86	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1511	4.47	4.37	4.27	4.28	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	6	1	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	167/ 994	4.26	3.97	3.94	3.98	4.60	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 103	****	4.39	4.41	4.07	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 101	****	4.33	4.48	4.45	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 95	****	4.15	4.31	4.33	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 99	****	4.36	4.39	4.22	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 97	****	3.76	4.14	4.63	****	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: SPAN 201 0801
 Title INTERMEDIATE SPANISH I
 Instructor: NASH, LYLE
 Enrollment: 24
 Questionnaires: 18

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 1592
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	1	0	8	9	4.39	792/1674	4.24	4.23	4.27	4.32	4.39	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	6	10	4.39	763/1674	4.28	4.26	4.23	4.26	4.39	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	6	9	4.33	771/1423	4.36	4.36	4.27	4.36	4.33	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	6	9	4.33	743/1609	4.25	4.23	4.22	4.23	4.33	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	2	1	4	4	5	3.56	1187/1585	3.74	4.04	3.96	3.91	3.56	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	4	6	7	4.06	849/1535	3.99	4.08	4.08	4.03	4.06	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	0	1	3	5	8	4.18	956/1651	4.30	4.20	4.18	4.20	4.18	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	1	0	17	4.89	742/1673	4.67	4.65	4.69	4.67	4.89	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	0	7	7	4.50	381/1656	4.15	4.06	4.07	4.10	4.50	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	2	2	14	4.67	663/1586	4.35	4.43	4.43	4.48	4.67	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	4	14	4.78	874/1585	4.63	4.72	4.69	4.76	4.78	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	1	2	4	11	4.39	798/1582	4.20	4.30	4.26	4.35	4.39	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	1	3	13	4.56	635/1575	4.39	4.32	4.27	4.39	4.56	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	3	1	2	3	3	6	3.73	916/1380	3.51	3.94	3.94	4.03	3.73	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	2	1	7	4.50	397/1520	4.22	4.14	4.01	4.03	4.50	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	207/1515	4.65	4.37	4.24	4.28	4.90	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	358/1511	4.47	4.37	4.27	4.28	4.80	
4. Were special techniques successful	8	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	95/ 994	4.26	3.97	3.94	3.98	4.80	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	A 5	Required for Majors	11
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	B 6		Graduate 0
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	C 4	General	1
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad 18
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	1
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	5
			? 1		

Course-Section: SPAN 201 0901
 Title INTERMEDIATE SPANISH I
 Instructor: POBLANO, MARTHA
 Enrollment: 19
 Questionnaires: 13

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 1593
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	0	0	1	3	8	4.58	509/1674	4.24	4.23	4.27	4.32	4.58	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	2	9	4.67	379/1674	4.28	4.26	4.23	4.26	4.67	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	1	0	3	1	7	4.08	968/1423	4.36	4.36	4.27	4.36	4.08	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	2	4	6	4.33	743/1609	4.25	4.23	4.22	4.23	4.33	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	1	2	2	3	1	3	3.09	1424/1585	3.74	4.04	3.96	3.91	3.09	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	1	0	0	3	4	4	4.09	832/1535	3.99	4.08	4.08	4.03	4.09	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	104/1651	4.30	4.20	4.18	4.20	4.92	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/1673	4.67	4.65	4.69	4.67	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	0	0	3	5	4.63	292/1656	4.15	4.06	4.07	4.10	4.63	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	0	3	8	4.73	560/1586	4.35	4.43	4.43	4.48	4.73	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1585	4.63	4.72	4.69	4.76	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	0	4	7	4.64	481/1582	4.20	4.30	4.26	4.35	4.64	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	1	2	8	4.64	537/1575	4.39	4.32	4.27	4.39	4.64	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	2	0	0	1	3	4	4.38	399/1380	3.51	3.94	3.94	4.03	4.38	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	1	0	6	4.71	259/1520	4.22	4.14	4.01	4.03	4.71	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	0	1	0	6	4.71	432/1515	4.65	4.37	4.24	4.28	4.71	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	0	0	1	0	6	4.71	458/1511	4.47	4.37	4.27	4.28	4.71	
4. Were special techniques successful	6	0	0	0	1	0	6	4.71	131/ 994	4.26	3.97	3.94	3.98	4.71	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: SPAN 201 1001
 Title INTERMEDIATE SPANISH I
 Instructor: MITCHELL, BETTY
 Enrollment: 18
 Questionnaires: 15

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 1594
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	2	6	3	4	3.60	1480/1674	4.24	4.23	4.27	4.32	3.60	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	3	7	4	3.93	1233/1674	4.28	4.26	4.23	4.26	3.93	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	4	5	5	3.93	1079/1423	4.36	4.36	4.27	4.36	3.93	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	1	5	3	5	3.86	1254/1609	4.25	4.23	4.22	4.23	3.86	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	3	2	4	3	2	2.93	1480/1585	3.74	4.04	3.96	3.91	2.93	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	3	2	6	2	3.20	1406/1535	3.99	4.08	4.08	4.03	3.20	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	5	4	5	3.87	1252/1651	4.30	4.20	4.18	4.20	3.87	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	1	0	0	14	4.80	887/1673	4.67	4.65	4.69	4.67	4.80	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	0	0	1	7	1	0	3.00	1540/1656	4.15	4.06	4.07	4.10	3.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	1	2	6	5	4.07	1265/1586	4.35	4.43	4.43	4.48	4.07	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	6	5	4	3.87	1513/1585	4.63	4.72	4.69	4.76	3.87	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	1	8	4	2	3.47	1420/1582	4.20	4.30	4.26	4.35	3.47	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	1	5	2	5	3.64	1336/1575	4.39	4.32	4.27	4.39	3.64	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	2	2	2	3	3	1	2.91	1270/1380	3.51	3.94	3.94	4.03	2.91	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	1	1	4	3	3	3.50	1169/1520	4.22	4.14	4.01	4.03	3.50	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	3	3	6	4.25	898/1515	4.65	4.37	4.24	4.28	4.25	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	1	0	8	2	1	3.17	1391/1511	4.47	4.37	4.27	4.28	3.17	
4. Were special techniques successful	3	3	1	1	5	1	1	3.00	881/ 994	4.26	3.97	3.94	3.98	3.00	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	13	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 265	****	4.06	4.23	4.34	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	13	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/ 278	****	4.21	4.19	4.36	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	13	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 260	****	4.43	4.46	4.51	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	13	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 259	****	4.21	4.33	4.42	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	13	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/ 233	****	4.36	4.20	4.48	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	13	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 103	****	4.39	4.41	4.07	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	13	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/ 101	****	4.33	4.48	4.45	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	13	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 95	****	4.15	4.31	4.33	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 99	****	4.36	4.39	4.22	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	13	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 97	****	3.76	4.14	4.63	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/ 76	****	3.36	3.98	3.97	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	13	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/ 77	****	3.65	3.93	4.20	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	13	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 53	****	4.19	4.45	4.50	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	13	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 48	****	3.86	4.12	4.50	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	13	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 49	****	3.74	4.27	4.82	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 61	****	4.03	4.09	4.23	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	13	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/ 52	****	4.21	4.26	4.53	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	13	0	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	****/ 50	****	4.23	4.44	4.42	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	13	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 35	****	4.22	4.36	4.63	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	13	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 31	****	4.25	4.34	4.50	****	

Course-Section: SPAN 201 1001
 Title INTERMEDIATE SPANISH I
 Instructor: MITCHELL, BETTY
 Enrollment: 18
 Questionnaires: 15

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 1594
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: SPAN 201 1101
 Title INTERMEDIATE SPANISH I
 Instructor: DEANGULO, SANTI
 Enrollment: 23
 Questionnaires: 20

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 1595
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	11	8	4.35	829/1674	4.24	4.23	4.27	4.32	4.35	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	0	8	11	4.45	673/1674	4.28	4.26	4.23	4.26	4.45	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	5	15	4.75	262/1423	4.36	4.36	4.27	4.36	4.75	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	9	9	4.35	715/1609	4.25	4.23	4.22	4.23	4.35	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	4	0	1	3	6	6	4.06	728/1585	3.74	4.04	3.96	3.91	4.06	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	2	2	8	7	3.90	1022/1535	3.99	4.08	4.08	4.03	3.90	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	3	8	9	4.30	809/1651	4.30	4.20	4.18	4.20	4.30	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	19	4.95	424/1673	4.67	4.65	4.69	4.67	4.95	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	3	6	7	4.25	719/1656	4.15	4.06	4.07	4.10	4.25	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	0	1	3	7	5	4.00	1300/1586	4.35	4.43	4.43	4.48	4.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	0	0	3	13	4.81	786/1585	4.63	4.72	4.69	4.76	4.81	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	0	0	4	7	5	4.06	1099/1582	4.20	4.30	4.26	4.35	4.06	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	1	2	4	9	4.31	905/1575	4.39	4.32	4.27	4.39	4.31	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	2	1	1	6	4	2	3.36	1118/1380	3.51	3.94	3.94	4.03	3.36	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	1	1	0	3	8	4.23	663/1520	4.22	4.14	4.01	4.03	4.23	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	0	0	0	1	12	4.92	165/1515	4.65	4.37	4.24	4.28	4.92	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	0	1	0	6	6	4.31	845/1511	4.47	4.37	4.27	4.28	4.31	
4. Were special techniques successful	7	0	0	1	4	3	5	3.92	549/ 994	4.26	3.97	3.94	3.98	3.92	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99 0	A 6	Required for Majors 13	Graduate 0 Major 0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99 0	B 13		
56-83	2	2.00-2.99 2	C 0	General 0	Under-grad 20 Non-major 1
84-150	7	3.00-3.49 3	D 0		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 5	F 0	Electives 0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 8	
			? 0		

Course-Section: SPAN 201 1201
 Title INTERMEDIATE SPANISH I
 Instructor: MITCHELL, BETTY
 Enrollment: 21
 Questionnaires: 15

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 1596
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	1	6	2	1	5	3.20	1595/1674	4.24	4.23	4.27	4.32	3.20	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	2	5	3	2	3	2.93	1625/1674	4.28	4.26	4.23	4.26	2.93	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	2	3	3	2	5	3.33	1316/1423	4.36	4.36	4.27	4.36	3.33	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	4	4	2	2	3	2.73	1593/1609	4.25	4.23	4.22	4.23	2.73	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	3	3	3	2	1	3	2.83	1502/1585	3.74	4.04	3.96	3.91	2.83	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	3	4	4	1	3	2.80	1487/1535	3.99	4.08	4.08	4.03	2.80	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	2	9	1	3	3.33	1504/1651	4.30	4.20	4.18	4.20	3.33	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	2	13	4.87	778/1673	4.67	4.65	4.69	4.67	4.87	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	4	3	4	0	3	2.64	1612/1656	4.15	4.06	4.07	4.10	2.64	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	5	2	4	0	3	2.57	1570/1586	4.35	4.43	4.43	4.48	2.57	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	4	2	4	1	3	2.79	1579/1585	4.63	4.72	4.69	4.76	2.79	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	6	1	3	2	2	2.50	1564/1582	4.20	4.30	4.26	4.35	2.50	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	2	5	1	3	3	3.00	1487/1575	4.39	4.32	4.27	4.39	3.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	2	6	2	0	1	2	2.18	1352/1380	3.51	3.94	3.94	4.03	2.18	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	4	2	3	1	4	2.93	1402/1520	4.22	4.14	4.01	4.03	2.93	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	1	1	4	3	5	3.71	1233/1515	4.65	4.37	4.24	4.28	3.71	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	2	1	6	1	4	3.29	1363/1511	4.47	4.37	4.27	4.28	3.29	
4. Were special techniques successful	1	5	2	1	2	0	4	3.33	811/ 994	4.26	3.97	3.94	3.98	3.33	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	14	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 265	****	4.06	4.23	4.34	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	14	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 278	****	4.21	4.19	4.36	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	14	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 260	****	4.43	4.46	4.51	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	14	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 259	****	4.21	4.33	4.42	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	14	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 233	****	4.36	4.20	4.48	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	6	Required for Majors	9	Graduate	1	Major	0
28-55	6	1.00-1.99	2	B	3						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	0	C	4	General	1	Under-grad	14	Non-major	4
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	2	D	1						
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00	7	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	6				
				?	1						

Course-Section: SPAN 201 1301
 Title INTERMEDIATE SPANISH I
 Instructor: OSKOZ, ANA
 Enrollment: 19
 Questionnaires: 16

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 1597
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	1	0	2	5	8	4.19	1036/1674	4.24	4.23	4.27	4.32	4.19	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	4	5	7	4.19	1009/1674	4.28	4.26	4.23	4.26	4.19	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	4	11	4.63	431/1423	4.36	4.36	4.27	4.36	4.63	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	6	8	4.38	687/1609	4.25	4.23	4.22	4.23	4.38	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	3	0	1	4	3	5	3.92	879/1585	3.74	4.04	3.96	3.91	3.92	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	1	2	4	8	4.27	655/1535	3.99	4.08	4.08	4.03	4.27	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	2	4	9	4.31	795/1651	4.30	4.20	4.18	4.20	4.31	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	16	5.00	1/1673	4.67	4.65	4.69	4.67	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	0	1	4	6	4.45	451/1656	4.15	4.06	4.07	4.10	4.45	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	1	0	0	4	10	4.47	916/1586	4.35	4.43	4.43	4.48	4.47	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	15	4.94	397/1585	4.63	4.72	4.69	4.76	4.94	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	1	5	3	7	4.00	1129/1582	4.20	4.30	4.26	4.35	4.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	3	4	9	4.38	847/1575	4.39	4.32	4.27	4.39	4.38	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	2	1	2	4	4	3	3.43	1082/1380	3.51	3.94	3.94	4.03	3.43	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	2	3	7	4.42	500/1520	4.22	4.14	4.01	4.03	4.42	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	0	0	2	9	4.82	313/1515	4.65	4.37	4.24	4.28	4.82	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	0	1	2	8	4.64	535/1511	4.47	4.37	4.27	4.28	4.64	
4. Were special techniques successful	6	2	0	1	1	1	5	4.25	360/ 994	4.26	3.97	3.94	3.98	4.25	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: SPAN 201 1401
 Title INTERMEDIATE SPANISH I
 Instructor: NASH, LYLE
 Enrollment: 21
 Questionnaires: 19

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 1598
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	2	6	11	4.47	655/1674	4.24	4.23	4.27	4.32	4.47	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	4	13	4.58	495/1674	4.28	4.26	4.23	4.26	4.58	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	10	7	4.26	836/1423	4.36	4.36	4.27	4.36	4.26	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	2	7	8	4.35	715/1609	4.25	4.23	4.22	4.23	4.35	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	3	8	7	4.11	702/1585	3.74	4.04	3.96	3.91	4.11	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	1	3	7	7	4.11	817/1535	3.99	4.08	4.08	4.03	4.11	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	3	7	9	4.32	795/1651	4.30	4.20	4.18	4.20	4.32	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	19	5.00	1/1673	4.67	4.65	4.69	4.67	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	3	6	7	4.25	719/1656	4.15	4.06	4.07	4.10	4.25	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	1	1	5	12	4.47	901/1586	4.35	4.43	4.43	4.48	4.47	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	2	4	13	4.58	1166/1585	4.63	4.72	4.69	4.76	4.58	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	2	10	7	4.26	924/1582	4.20	4.30	4.26	4.35	4.26	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	4	14	4.68	467/1575	4.39	4.32	4.27	4.39	4.68	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	3	1	2	3	5	3	3.50	1036/1380	3.51	3.94	3.94	4.03	3.50	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	1	0	1	2	9	4.38	529/1520	4.22	4.14	4.01	4.03	4.38	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	0	0	3	10	4.77	372/1515	4.65	4.37	4.24	4.28	4.77	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	0	1	2	3	7	4.23	917/1511	4.47	4.37	4.27	4.28	4.23	
4. Were special techniques successful	6	4	0	0	1	1	7	4.67	148/ 994	4.26	3.97	3.94	3.98	4.67	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	2	A	4	Required for Majors	12	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	0	B	8						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	5	C	5	General	1	Under-grad	19	Non-major	6
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	0	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	6				
				?	1						

Course-Section: SPAN 201H 0101
 Title INTERM SPAN I - HONORS
 Instructor: OSKOZ, ANA
 Enrollment: 5
 Questionnaires: 4

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 1599
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	1	1	0	2	3.75	1407/1674	3.75	4.23	4.27	4.32	3.75	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	1	4.25	931/1674	4.25	4.26	4.23	4.26	4.25	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	575/1423	4.50	4.36	4.27	4.36	4.50	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	2	0	3.25	1517/1609	3.25	4.23	4.22	4.23	3.25	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	2	0	0	0	0	1.00	1583/1585	1.00	4.04	3.96	3.91	1.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	2	0	3.50	1295/1535	3.50	4.08	4.08	4.03	3.50	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	1097/1651	4.00	4.20	4.18	4.20	4.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1673	5.00	4.65	4.69	4.67	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	2	2	0	3.50	1377/1656	3.50	4.06	4.07	4.10	3.50	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	1074/1586	4.33	4.43	4.43	4.48	4.33	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	1354/1585	4.33	4.72	4.69	4.76	4.33	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	1	2	0	3.67	1348/1582	3.67	4.30	4.26	4.35	3.67	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	2	1	0	3.33	1423/1575	3.33	4.32	4.27	4.39	3.33	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	1	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	1217/1380	3.00	3.94	3.94	4.03	3.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	1169/1520	3.50	4.14	4.01	4.03	3.50	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	629/1515	4.50	4.37	4.24	4.28	4.50	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	1050/1511	4.00	4.37	4.27	4.28	4.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	2	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	881/ 994	3.00	3.97	3.94	3.98	3.00	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: SPAN 202 0101
 Title INTERMEDIATE SPANISH I
 Instructor: VAL, ADRIANA
 Enrollment: 21
 Questionnaires: 11

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 1600
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	3	3	5	4.18	1036/1674	4.13	4.23	4.27	4.32	4.18	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	3	2	5	4.00	1146/1674	4.04	4.26	4.23	4.26	4.00	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	8	4.73	298/1423	4.67	4.36	4.27	4.36	4.73	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	4	7	4.64	343/1609	4.59	4.23	4.22	4.23	4.64	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	3	3	4	3.91	907/1585	4.07	4.04	3.96	3.91	3.91	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	0	6	4	4.18	747/1535	4.21	4.08	4.08	4.03	4.18	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	1	1	3	5	3.91	1228/1651	3.65	4.20	4.18	4.20	3.91	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1673	4.54	4.65	4.69	4.67	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	2	6	2	4.00	955/1656	4.05	4.06	4.07	4.10	4.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	1	0	2	8	4.55	816/1586	4.59	4.43	4.43	4.48	4.55	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	3	8	4.73	981/1585	4.86	4.72	4.69	4.76	4.73	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	4	3	4	4.00	1129/1582	4.21	4.30	4.26	4.35	4.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	2	8	4.64	537/1575	4.53	4.32	4.27	4.39	4.64	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	2	4	5	4.27	472/1380	4.32	3.94	3.94	4.03	4.27	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	3	1	5	4.22	673/1520	4.54	4.14	4.01	4.03	4.22	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	1	1	0	7	4.44	707/1515	4.72	4.37	4.24	4.28	4.44	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	1	1	7	4.67	507/1511	4.83	4.37	4.27	4.28	4.67	
4. Were special techniques successful	2	2	0	0	1	3	3	4.29	346/ 994	4.64	3.97	3.94	3.98	4.29	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: SPAN 202 0201
 Title INTERMEDIATE SPANISH I
 Instructor: MESSICK, ROSALI
 Enrollment: 23
 Questionnaires: 13

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 1601
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	1	1	7	4	4.08	1139/1674	4.13	4.23	4.27	4.32	4.08	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	7	4	4.08	1097/1674	4.04	4.26	4.23	4.26	4.08	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	3	9	4.62	445/1423	4.67	4.36	4.27	4.36	4.62	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	2	9	4.54	455/1609	4.59	4.23	4.22	4.23	4.54	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	2	1	2	8	4.23	575/1585	4.07	4.04	3.96	3.91	4.23	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	3	4	6	4.23	691/1535	4.21	4.08	4.08	4.03	4.23	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	2	1	2	6	2	3.38	1490/1651	3.65	4.20	4.18	4.20	3.38	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	12	1	4.08	1537/1673	4.54	4.65	4.69	4.67	4.08	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	1	0	7	3	4.09	900/1656	4.05	4.06	4.07	4.10	4.09	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	0	4	7	4.64	708/1586	4.59	4.43	4.43	4.48	4.64	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/1585	4.86	4.72	4.69	4.76	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	1	5	6	4.42	762/1582	4.21	4.30	4.26	4.35	4.42	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	5	6	4.42	806/1575	4.53	4.32	4.27	4.39	4.42	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	0	0	0	2	3	6	4.36	406/1380	4.32	3.94	3.94	4.03	4.36	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	162/1520	4.54	4.14	4.01	4.03	4.86	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1515	4.72	4.37	4.24	4.28	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1511	4.83	4.37	4.27	4.28	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	6	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/ 994	4.64	3.97	3.94	3.98	5.00	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: SPAN 202H 0201
 Title INTERMED SPAN II HONR
 Instructor: MESSICK, ROSALI
 Enrollment: 1
 Questionnaires: 1

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 1602
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1674	5.00	4.23	4.27	4.32	5.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1146/1674	4.00	4.26	4.23	4.26	4.00	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1423	5.00	4.36	4.27	4.36	5.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1609	5.00	4.23	4.22	4.23	5.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	769/1585	4.00	4.04	3.96	3.91	4.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1535	5.00	4.08	4.08	4.03	5.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1651	5.00	4.20	4.18	4.20	5.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1673	5.00	4.65	4.69	4.67	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1656	5.00	4.06	4.07	4.10	5.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1300/1586	4.00	4.43	4.43	4.48	4.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1585	5.00	4.72	4.69	4.76	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1582	5.00	4.30	4.26	4.35	5.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1575	5.00	4.32	4.27	4.39	5.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	666/1380	4.00	3.94	3.94	4.03	4.00	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: SPAN 301 0101
 Title ADVANCED SPANISH I
 Instructor: AREVALO GUERRERO
 Enrollment: 24
 Questionnaires: 22

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 1603
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	5	8	9	4.18	1036/1674	4.26	4.23	4.27	4.26	4.18	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	3	7	11	4.27	906/1674	3.92	4.26	4.23	4.21	4.27	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	6	13	4.41	697/1423	4.35	4.36	4.27	4.27	4.41	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	5	5	12	4.32	771/1609	4.31	4.23	4.22	4.27	4.32	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	5	4	12	4.23	584/1585	4.24	4.04	3.96	3.95	4.23	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	5	15	4.59	292/1535	4.30	4.08	4.08	4.15	4.59	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	3	1	6	3	9	3.64	1390/1651	3.51	4.20	4.18	4.16	3.64	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	21	5.00	1/1673	4.36	4.65	4.69	4.68	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	3	9	6	4.17	827/1656	4.23	4.06	4.07	4.07	4.17	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	1	1	6	14	4.50	858/1586	4.15	4.43	4.43	4.42	4.50	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	3	18	4.77	874/1585	4.73	4.72	4.69	4.66	4.77	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	2	3	4	13	4.27	914/1582	4.06	4.30	4.26	4.26	4.27	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	3	7	11	4.27	940/1575	4.28	4.32	4.27	4.25	4.27	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	3	1	0	6	2	10	4.05	644/1380	3.13	3.94	3.94	4.01	4.05	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	1	2	5	7	4.20	700/1520	4.00	4.14	4.01	4.09	4.20	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	1	0	3	3	7	4.07	1002/1515	4.35	4.37	4.24	4.32	4.07	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	0	1	0	1	12	4.71	458/1511	4.71	4.37	4.27	4.34	4.71	
4. Were special techniques successful	8	1	0	0	3	5	5	4.15	414/ 994	4.01	3.97	3.94	3.96	4.15	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	3	0.00-0.99 1	A 12	Required for Majors	3
28-55	5	1.00-1.99 0	B 5		Graduate 0
56-83	2	2.00-2.99 1	C 2	General	22
84-150	3	3.00-3.49 3	D 0		Non-major 3
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 8	F 0	Electives	1
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	13
			? 0		

Course-Section: SPAN 301 0201
 Title ADVANCED SPANISH I
 Instructor: SLOANE, ROBERT
 Enrollment: 10
 Questionnaires: 8

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 1604
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	2	4	2	4.00	1196/1674	4.26	4.23	4.27	4.26	4.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	1	1	3	2	3.50	1499/1674	3.92	4.26	4.23	4.21	3.50	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	1	5	4.25	845/1423	4.35	4.36	4.27	4.27	4.25	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	1	5	4.38	687/1609	4.31	4.23	4.22	4.27	4.38	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	1	5	4.38	442/1585	4.24	4.04	3.96	3.95	4.38	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	3	0	4	3.88	1048/1535	4.30	4.08	4.08	4.15	3.88	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	1	2	4	0	3.13	1551/1651	3.51	4.20	4.18	4.16	3.13	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	5	3	0	3.38	1655/1673	4.36	4.65	4.69	4.68	3.38	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	2	2	4	4.25	719/1656	4.23	4.06	4.07	4.07	4.25	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	1	0	1	5	1	3.63	1454/1586	4.15	4.43	4.43	4.42	3.63	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	1	6	4.63	1118/1585	4.73	4.72	4.69	4.66	4.63	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	1	0	2	2	2	3.57	1381/1582	4.06	4.30	4.26	4.26	3.57	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	1	2	4	4.13	1080/1575	4.28	4.32	4.27	4.25	4.13	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	4	2	0	0	1	0	2.00	1359/1380	3.13	3.94	3.94	4.01	2.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	0	2	1	3	3.71	1059/1520	4.00	4.14	4.01	4.09	3.71	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	2	1	4	4.29	873/1515	4.35	4.37	4.24	4.32	4.29	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	1	0	6	4.71	458/1511	4.71	4.37	4.27	4.34	4.71	
4. Were special techniques successful	1	0	0	1	1	2	3	4.00	474/ 994	4.01	3.97	3.94	3.96	4.00	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	A 5	Required for Majors	3
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	B 1		Graduate
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	C 1	General	0
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		
			I 1	Other	4
			? 0		

- Means there are not enough responses to be significant

Course-Section: SPAN 301 0301
 Title ADVANCED SPANISH I
 Instructor: AREVALO GUERRERO
 Enrollment: 16
 Questionnaires: 10

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 1605
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sept
	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	6	4.60	485/1674	4.26	4.23	4.27	4.26	4.60	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	4	3	4.00	1146/1674	3.92	4.26	4.23	4.21	4.00	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	2	2	6	4	4.40	697/1423	4.35	4.36	4.27	4.27	4.40	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	1	0	4	4	4.22	892/1609	4.31	4.23	4.22	4.27	4.22	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	1	3	4	4.11	692/1585	4.24	4.04	3.96	3.95	4.11	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	5	4	4.44	454/1535	4.30	4.08	4.08	4.15	4.44	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	5	1	3	3.78	1310/1651	3.51	4.20	4.18	4.16	3.78	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	3	7	4.70	1040/1673	4.36	4.65	4.69	4.68	4.70	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	0	5	2	4.29	680/1656	4.23	4.06	4.07	4.07	4.29	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	1	4	4	4.33	1074/1586	4.15	4.43	4.43	4.42	4.33	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	874/1585	4.73	4.72	4.69	4.66	4.78	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	1	4	4	4.33	850/1582	4.06	4.30	4.26	4.26	4.33	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	3	5	4.44	768/1575	4.28	4.32	4.27	4.25	4.44	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	2	1	1	2	3	3.33	1127/1380	3.13	3.94	3.94	4.01	3.33	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	2	2	5	4.10	777/1520	4.00	4.14	4.01	4.09	4.10	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	3	7	4.70	453/1515	4.35	4.37	4.24	4.32	4.70	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	3	7	4.70	479/1511	4.71	4.37	4.27	4.34	4.70	
4. Were special techniques successful	0	1	1	0	1	4	3	3.89	577/ 994	4.01	3.97	3.94	3.96	3.89	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	6	2	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 265	****	4.06	4.23	4.26	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	6	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	41/ 278	4.75	4.21	4.19	4.24	4.75	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	6	1	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	175/ 260	4.33	4.43	4.46	4.49	4.33	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	6	2	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 259	****	4.21	4.33	4.33	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	6	2	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 233	****	4.36	4.20	4.18	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	6	2	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 103	****	4.39	4.41	4.10	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	6	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	46/ 101	4.75	4.33	4.48	4.30	4.75	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	43/ 95	4.50	4.15	4.31	3.91	4.50	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	49/ 99	4.50	4.36	4.39	4.29	4.50	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	7	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	44/ 97	4.33	3.76	4.14	3.48	4.33	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	1	1	0	2	3.75	46/ 76	3.75	3.36	3.98	4.03	3.75	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	6	0	0	1	0	0	3	4.25	30/ 77	4.25	3.65	3.93	3.70	4.25	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	6	1	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	41/ 53	4.00	4.19	4.45	3.87	4.00	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	6	1	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	13/ 48	4.67	3.86	4.12	3.67	4.67	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	6	2	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 49	****	3.74	4.27	3.27	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	1	0	1	2	4.00	29/ 61	4.00	4.03	4.09	3.20	4.00	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	6	0	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	29/ 52	4.00	4.21	4.26	3.50	4.00	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	6	0	0	0	2	0	2	4.00	36/ 50	4.00	4.23	4.44	3.82	4.00	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	6	1	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	18/ 35	4.67	4.22	4.36	3.29	4.67	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	6	1	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	15/ 31	4.67	4.25	4.34	4.29	4.67	

Course-Section: SPAN 301 0301
 Title ADVANCED SPANISH I
 Instructor: AREVALO GUERRERO
 Enrollment: 16
 Questionnaires: 10

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 1605
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: SPAN 302 0101
 Title ADVANCED SPANISH II
 Instructor: SCHNEIDER, JUDI
 Enrollment: 5
 Questionnaires: 4

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 1606
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1674	4.68	4.23	4.27	4.26	5.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1674	4.93	4.26	4.23	4.21	5.00	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	262/1423	4.80	4.36	4.27	4.27	4.75	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	490/1609	4.75	4.23	4.22	4.27	4.50	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1585	4.89	4.04	3.96	3.95	5.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	169/1535	4.59	4.08	4.08	4.15	4.75	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	231/1651	4.80	4.20	4.18	4.16	4.75	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	958/1673	4.63	4.65	4.69	4.68	4.75	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	955/1656	4.25	4.06	4.07	4.07	4.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1586	4.93	4.43	4.43	4.42	5.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1585	4.93	4.72	4.69	4.66	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1582	4.89	4.30	4.26	4.26	5.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1575	4.82	4.32	4.27	4.25	5.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	1	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1380	4.81	3.94	3.94	4.01	5.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1520	4.89	4.14	4.01	4.09	5.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	483/1515	4.78	4.37	4.24	4.32	4.67	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	507/1511	4.83	4.37	4.27	4.34	4.67	
4. Were special techniques successful	1	0	0	1	0	1	1	3.67	676/ 994	4.00	3.97	3.94	3.96	3.67	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 0	Required for Majors	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	B 3		Graduate
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	C 0	General	0
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	4
			P 0		
			I 0		
			? 0		
					Other
					3

- Means there are not enough responses to be significant

Course-Section: SPAN 302 0201
 Title ADVANCED SPANISH II
 Instructor: STOLLE-MCALLIST
 Enrollment: 17
 Questionnaires: 14

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 1607
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	2	5	7	4.36	829/1674	4.68	4.23	4.27	4.26	4.36	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	12	4.86	176/1674	4.93	4.26	4.23	4.21	4.86	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	12	4.86	167/1423	4.80	4.36	4.27	4.27	4.86	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	0	13	5.00	1/1609	4.75	4.23	4.22	4.27	5.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	1	12	4.79	148/1585	4.89	4.04	3.96	3.95	4.79	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	4	8	4.43	481/1535	4.59	4.08	4.08	4.15	4.43	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	0	13	4.86	145/1651	4.80	4.20	4.18	4.16	4.86	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	7	7	4.50	1203/1673	4.63	4.65	4.69	4.68	4.50	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	1	0	0	1	3	6	4.50	381/1656	4.25	4.06	4.07	4.07	4.50	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	0	13	4.86	301/1586	4.93	4.43	4.43	4.42	4.86	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	0	13	4.86	689/1585	4.93	4.72	4.69	4.66	4.86	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	1	12	4.79	272/1582	4.89	4.30	4.26	4.26	4.79	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	1	11	4.64	523/1575	4.82	4.32	4.27	4.25	4.64	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	1	0	0	2	1	10	4.62	234/1380	4.81	3.94	3.94	4.01	4.62	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	213/1520	4.89	4.14	4.01	4.09	4.78	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	230/1515	4.78	4.37	4.24	4.32	4.89	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1511	4.83	4.37	4.27	4.34	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	5	0	0	0	1	4	4	4.33	322/ 994	4.00	3.97	3.94	3.96	4.33	
Self Paced															
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	13	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 52	****	4.21	4.26	3.50	****	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: SPAN 307 0101
 Title ESPANA Y SUS CULTURAS
 Instructor: SLOANE, ROBERT
 Enrollment: 23
 Questionnaires: 21

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 1608
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sept
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	2	7	12	4.48	655/1674	4.48	4.23	4.27	4.26	4.48	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	12	6	4.10	1083/1674	4.10	4.26	4.23	4.21	4.10	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	3	15	4.57	493/1423	4.57	4.36	4.27	4.27	4.57	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	2	6	12	4.50	490/1609	4.50	4.23	4.22	4.27	4.50	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	4	6	11	4.33	482/1585	4.33	4.04	3.96	3.95	4.33	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	4	9	8	4.19	737/1535	4.19	4.08	4.08	4.15	4.19	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	0	3	4	6	7	3.85	1258/1651	3.85	4.20	4.18	4.16	3.85	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	10	11	0	3.52	1652/1673	3.52	4.65	4.69	4.68	3.52	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	9	11	4.55	345/1656	4.55	4.06	4.07	4.07	4.55	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	2	2	10	7	4.05	1280/1586	4.05	4.43	4.43	4.42	4.05	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	21	5.00	1/1585	5.00	4.72	4.69	4.66	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	3	8	10	4.33	850/1582	4.33	4.30	4.26	4.26	4.33	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	7	13	4.57	612/1575	4.57	4.32	4.27	4.25	4.57	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	3	0	4	5	9	3.81	866/1380	3.81	3.94	3.94	4.01	3.81	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	1	0	4	2	9	4.13	760/1520	4.13	4.14	4.01	4.09	4.13	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	0	2	4	10	4.50	629/1515	4.50	4.37	4.24	4.32	4.50	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	0	1	2	13	4.75	414/1511	4.75	4.37	4.27	4.34	4.75	
4. Were special techniques successful	5	0	0	0	4	11	1	3.81	609/ 994	3.81	3.97	3.94	3.96	3.81	
Laboratory															
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	20	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 278	****	4.21	4.19	4.24	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	19	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 103	****	4.39	4.41	4.10	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	19	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 101	****	4.33	4.48	4.30	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 95	****	4.15	4.31	3.91	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 99	****	4.36	4.39	4.29	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	19	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 97	****	3.76	4.14	3.48	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	20	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 76	****	3.36	3.98	4.03	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 77	****	3.65	3.93	3.70	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 53	****	4.19	4.45	3.87	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	20	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 48	****	3.86	4.12	3.67	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	20	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 49	****	3.74	4.27	3.27	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	20	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 61	****	4.03	4.09	3.20	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 52	****	4.21	4.26	3.50	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	20	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 50	****	4.23	4.44	3.82	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	20	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 35	****	4.22	4.36	3.29	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	20	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 31	****	4.25	4.34	4.29	****	

Course-Section: SPAN 307 0101
 Title ESPANA Y SUS CULTURAS
 Instructor: SLOANE, ROBERT
 Enrollment: 23
 Questionnaires: 21

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 1608
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	A	9	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	B	7						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	3	C	1	General	0	Under-grad	21	Non-major	2
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	8	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	18				
				?	3						

Course-Section: SPAN 308 0101
 Title LATINOAMERICA Y SUS CU
 Instructor: POGGIO, SARA
 Enrollment: 19
 Questionnaires: 15

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 1609
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	2	0	0	2	3	4	4	3.77	1402/1674	3.77	4.23	4.27	4.26	3.77	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	2	1	7	1	2	3.00	1608/1674	3.00	4.26	4.23	4.21	3.00	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	0	1	1	4	2	5	3.69	1197/1423	3.69	4.36	4.27	4.27	3.69	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	0	2	1	2	5	3	3.46	1464/1609	3.46	4.23	4.22	4.27	3.46	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	1	6	6	4.38	432/1585	4.38	4.04	3.96	3.95	4.38	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	3	4	5	1	3.31	1366/1535	3.31	4.08	4.08	4.15	3.31	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	1	2	6	4	0	3.00	1562/1651	3.00	4.20	4.18	4.16	3.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	13	0	4.00	1566/1673	4.00	4.65	4.69	4.68	4.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	1	2	2	5	1	1	2.73	1604/1656	2.73	4.06	4.07	4.07	2.73	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	1	4	3	3	2	3.08	1534/1586	3.08	4.43	4.43	4.42	3.08	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	1	2	3	7	4.23	1406/1585	4.23	4.72	4.69	4.66	4.23	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	1	2	4	6	0	3.15	1487/1582	3.15	4.30	4.26	4.26	3.15	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	2	1	3	6	1	3.23	1450/1575	3.23	4.32	4.27	4.25	3.23	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	6	1	4	0	1	1	2.57	1314/1380	2.57	3.94	3.94	4.01	2.57	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	2	3	2	1	3.25	1284/1520	3.25	4.14	4.01	4.09	3.25	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	0	1	0	3	4	4.25	898/1515	4.25	4.37	4.24	4.32	4.25	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	0	0	2	2	4	4.25	896/1511	4.25	4.37	4.27	4.34	4.25	
4. Were special techniques successful	7	1	0	1	2	3	1	3.57	708/ 994	3.57	3.97	3.94	3.96	3.57	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 9	Required for Majors	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	B 2		Graduate 0
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	C 0	General	0
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad 15
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	11
			? 1		

Course-Section: SPAN 311 0101
 Title INTRO TO SPANISH LIT
 Instructor: SINNIGEN, JOHN
 Enrollment: 21
 Questionnaires: 15

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 1610
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	1	1	5	8	4.33	854/1674	4.33	4.23	4.27	4.26	4.33	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	0	2	9	3	3.87	1298/1674	3.87	4.26	4.23	4.21	3.87	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	4	11	4.73	286/1423	4.73	4.36	4.27	4.27	4.73	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	6	9	4.60	374/1609	4.60	4.23	4.22	4.27	4.60	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	4	10	4.71	191/1585	4.71	4.04	3.96	3.95	4.71	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	1	0	0	1	5	7	4.46	427/1535	4.46	4.08	4.08	4.15	4.46	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	1	2	4	6	3.93	1201/1651	3.93	4.20	4.18	4.16	3.93	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	7	7	4.50	1203/1673	4.50	4.65	4.69	4.68	4.50	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	1	1	10	3	4.00	955/1656	4.00	4.06	4.07	4.07	4.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	5	9	4.53	826/1586	4.53	4.43	4.43	4.42	4.53	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	15	5.00	1/1585	5.00	4.72	4.69	4.66	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	1	2	5	7	4.20	998/1582	4.20	4.30	4.26	4.26	4.20	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	7	7	4.40	819/1575	4.40	4.32	4.27	4.25	4.40	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	1	0	3	5	6	4.00	666/1380	4.00	3.94	3.94	4.01	4.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	3	2	7	4.33	572/1520	4.33	4.14	4.01	4.09	4.33	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	0	3	2	6	4.27	881/1515	4.27	4.37	4.24	4.32	4.27	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	0	3	5	3	4.00	1050/1511	4.00	4.37	4.27	4.34	4.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	4	0	0	1	7	1	2	3.36	799/ 994	3.36	3.97	3.94	3.96	3.36	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 5	Required for Majors	1
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	B 6		Graduate
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	C 1	General	0
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	15
			P 0		Non-major
			I 0		1
			? 1		
				Other	11

- Means there are not enough responses to be significant

Course-Section: SPAN 312 0101
 Title INTRO TO LATIN AMER LI
 Instructor: BELL, ALAN S
 Enrollment: 17
 Questionnaires: 15

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 1611
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	2	0	8	5	4.07	1147/1674	4.07	4.23	4.27	4.26	4.07	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	1	0	3	3	7	4.07	1097/1674	4.07	4.26	4.23	4.21	4.07	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	1	0	1	5	7	4.21	878/1423	4.21	4.36	4.27	4.27	4.21	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	1	0	1	2	10	4.43	614/1609	4.43	4.23	4.22	4.27	4.43	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	0	0	1	12	4.64	238/1585	4.64	4.04	3.96	3.95	4.64	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	0	1	5	7	4.21	715/1535	4.21	4.08	4.08	4.15	4.21	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	1	5	2	6	3.93	1201/1651	3.93	4.20	4.18	4.16	3.93	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	11	3	4.21	1449/1673	4.21	4.65	4.69	4.68	4.21	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	1	0	8	3	4.08	906/1656	4.08	4.06	4.07	4.07	4.08	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	1	1	1	2	8	4.15	1217/1586	4.15	4.43	4.43	4.42	4.15	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	1	1	2	9	4.46	1258/1585	4.46	4.72	4.69	4.66	4.46	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	1	0	3	1	7	4.08	1089/1582	4.08	4.30	4.26	4.26	4.08	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	2	0	1	2	7	4.00	1138/1575	4.00	4.32	4.27	4.25	4.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	1	1	0	0	6	5	4.17	567/1380	4.17	3.94	3.94	4.01	4.17	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	1	1	1	8	4.45	454/1520	4.45	4.14	4.01	4.09	4.45	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	0	1	0	10	4.82	313/1515	4.82	4.37	4.24	4.32	4.82	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	0	3	1	7	4.36	788/1511	4.36	4.37	4.27	4.34	4.36	
4. Were special techniques successful	4	1	0	0	2	3	5	4.30	337/ 994	4.30	3.97	3.94	3.96	4.30	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: SPAN 421 0101
 Title STUDIES IN HISPANIC LI
 Instructor: BELL, ALAN S
 Enrollment: 12
 Questionnaires: 11

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 1612
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	2	9	4.82	233/1674	4.82	4.23	4.27	4.42	4.82	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	8	4.73	303/1674	4.73	4.26	4.23	4.31	4.73	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	4	7	4.64	417/1423	4.64	4.36	4.27	4.34	4.64	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	2	7	4.45	567/1609	4.45	4.23	4.22	4.30	4.45	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1585	5.00	4.04	3.96	4.01	5.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	3	8	4.73	192/1535	4.73	4.08	4.08	4.18	4.73	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	1	2	7	4.36	727/1651	4.36	4.20	4.18	4.23	4.36	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1673	5.00	4.65	4.69	4.67	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	1	0	0	2	5	3	4.10	894/1656	4.10	4.06	4.07	4.19	4.10	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	4	7	4.64	708/1586	4.64	4.43	4.43	4.46	4.64	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	567/1585	4.91	4.72	4.69	4.76	4.91	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	3	8	4.73	353/1582	4.73	4.30	4.26	4.31	4.73	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	4	7	4.64	537/1575	4.64	4.32	4.27	4.35	4.64	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	114/1380	4.80	3.94	3.94	4.04	4.80	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	1	8	4.70	274/1520	4.70	4.14	4.01	4.18	4.70	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	207/1515	4.90	4.37	4.24	4.40	4.90	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	1	2	7	4.60	563/1511	4.60	4.37	4.27	4.45	4.60	
4. Were special techniques successful	1	1	0	0	0	4	5	4.56	186/ 994	4.56	3.97	3.94	4.19	4.56	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: SPAN 472 0101
 Title TOPICS IN LATN AMER CI
 Instructor: POGGIO, SARA (Instr. A)
 Enrollment: 13
 Questionnaires: 7

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 1613
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	195/1674	4.86	4.23	4.27	4.42	4.86	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	3	2	3.86	1305/1674	3.86	4.26	4.23	4.31	3.86	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1423	5.00	4.36	4.27	4.34	5.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	3	3	4.29	812/1609	4.29	4.23	4.22	4.30	4.29	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	111/1585	4.86	4.04	3.96	4.01	4.86	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	2	4	4.43	481/1535	4.43	4.08	4.08	4.18	4.43	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	1	0	2	3	3.71	1352/1651	3.71	4.20	4.18	4.23	3.71	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1673	5.00	4.65	4.69	4.67	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	1	1	0	2	3.75	1237/1656	3.88	4.06	4.07	4.19	3.88	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	1	1	0	3	2	3.57	1466/1586	3.57	4.43	4.43	4.46	3.57	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	0	6	4.71	1002/1585	4.71	4.72	4.69	4.76	4.71	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	3	3	4.29	903/1582	4.29	4.30	4.26	4.31	4.29	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	2	4	4.43	793/1575	4.43	4.32	4.27	4.35	4.43	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	2	0	0	2	0	2	4.00	666/1380	4.00	3.94	3.94	4.04	4.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	173/1520	4.83	4.14	4.01	4.18	4.83	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1515	5.00	4.37	4.24	4.40	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	323/1511	4.83	4.37	4.27	4.45	4.83	
4. Were special techniques successful	1	3	1	0	0	1	1	3.33	811/ 994	3.33	3.97	3.94	4.19	3.33	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 103	****	4.39	4.41	4.42	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	6	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 101	****	4.33	4.48	4.65	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 95	****	4.15	4.31	4.60	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 99	****	4.36	4.39	4.57	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	6	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 97	****	3.76	4.14	4.46	****	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: SPAN 472 0101
 Title TOPICS IN LATN AMER CI
 Instructor: (Instr. B)
 Enrollment: 13
 Questionnaires: 7

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 1614
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	195/1674	4.86	4.23	4.27	4.42	4.86	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	3	2	3.86	1305/1674	3.86	4.26	4.23	4.31	3.86	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1423	5.00	4.36	4.27	4.34	5.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	3	3	4.29	812/1609	4.29	4.23	4.22	4.30	4.29	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	111/1585	4.86	4.04	3.96	4.01	4.86	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	2	4	4.43	481/1535	4.43	4.08	4.08	4.18	4.43	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	1	0	2	3	3.71	1352/1651	3.71	4.20	4.18	4.23	3.71	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1673	5.00	4.65	4.69	4.67	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	955/1656	3.88	4.06	4.07	4.19	3.88	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	173/1520	4.83	4.14	4.01	4.18	4.83	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1515	5.00	4.37	4.24	4.40	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	323/1511	4.83	4.37	4.27	4.45	4.83	
4. Were special techniques successful	1	3	1	0	0	1	1	3.33	811/ 994	3.33	3.97	3.94	4.19	3.33	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 103	****	4.39	4.41	4.42	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	6	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 101	****	4.33	4.48	4.65	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 95	****	4.15	4.31	4.60	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 99	****	4.36	4.39	4.57	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	6	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 97	****	3.76	4.14	4.46	****	

Frequency Distribution

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