

Course Section: SPAN 101 0101  
 Title ELEMENTARY SPANISH I  
 Instructor: NASH, LYLE  
 Enrollment: 27  
 Questionnaires: 9

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 1570  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 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	1	2	3	2	3.44	1507/1669	3.98	4.33	4.23	4.02	3.44	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	0	2	4	2	3.67	1387/1666	4.16	4.28	4.19	4.11	3.67	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	1	1	0	3	3	3.75	1135/1421	4.01	4.36	4.24	4.11	3.75	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	1	1	5	1	3.44	1403/1617	3.87	4.27	4.15	3.99	3.44	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	1	1	2	4	3.78	1045/1555	3.96	4.17	4.00	3.92	3.78	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	1	0	2	5	4.00	895/1543	4.02	4.19	4.06	3.86	4.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	2	2	1	3	3.33	1474/1647	3.93	4.18	4.12	4.06	3.33	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	1	0	8	0	3.78	1611/1668	4.34	4.60	4.67	4.62	3.78	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	1	0	5	2	1	3.22	1464/1605	3.76	4.13	4.07	3.96	3.22	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	1	0	1	4	2	3.75	1324/1514	4.19	4.39	4.39	4.32	3.75	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	1	0	1	6	4.50	1193/1551	4.78	4.72	4.66	4.55	4.50	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	1	0	2	4	1	3.50	1330/1503	3.97	4.31	4.24	4.17	3.50	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	0	0	3	4	4.13	1010/1506	4.30	4.40	4.26	4.17	4.13	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	1	1	1	1	3	1	3.29	1048/1311	3.54	3.78	3.85	3.68	3.29	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	1	0	1	1	1	3.25	1265/1490	4.07	4.26	4.05	3.85	3.25	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	1	0	0	3	4.25	880/1502	4.63	4.54	4.26	4.06	4.25	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	1	0	1	0	2	3.50	1279/1489	3.86	4.43	4.29	4.07	3.50	
4. Were special techniques successful	5	0	0	0	2	2	0	3.50	759/1006	3.69	4.14	4.00	3.81	3.50	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	8	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 226	****	****	4.20	3.98	****	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course Section: SPAN 101 0201  
 Title ELEMENTARY SPANISH I  
 Instructor: NASH, LYLE  
 Enrollment: 32  
 Questionnaires: 22

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 1571  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 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	1	3	7	9	4.20	988/1669	3.98	4.33	4.23	4.02	4.20	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	0	0	5	5	10	4.25	881/1666	4.16	4.28	4.19	4.11	4.25	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	3	0	0	1	2	8	8	4.21	847/1421	4.01	4.36	4.24	4.11	4.21	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	0	1	1	3	7	8	4.00	1029/1617	3.87	4.27	4.15	3.99	4.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	2	5	5	8	3.95	856/1555	3.96	4.17	4.00	3.92	3.95	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	2	2	8	7	3.90	1019/1543	4.02	4.19	4.06	3.86	3.90	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	1	2	5	4	8	3.80	1250/1647	3.93	4.18	4.12	4.06	3.80	
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	15	5	4.25	1382/1668	4.34	4.60	4.67	4.62	4.25	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	8	1	0	1	3	6	3	3.85	1140/1605	3.76	4.13	4.07	3.96	3.85	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	0	1	3	4	10	4.28	1070/1514	4.19	4.39	4.39	4.32	4.28	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	0	1	1	16	4.83	705/1551	4.78	4.72	4.66	4.55	4.83	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	0	2	3	4	9	4.11	1005/1503	3.97	4.31	4.24	4.17	4.11	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	2	2	2	12	4.33	838/1506	4.30	4.40	4.26	4.17	4.33	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	1	0	0	5	5	7	4.12	531/1311	3.54	3.78	3.85	3.68	4.12	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	2	2	7	4.45	501/1490	4.07	4.26	4.05	3.85	4.45	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	11	0	0	0	1	1	9	4.73	427/1502	4.63	4.54	4.26	4.06	4.73	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	11	0	1	2	2	0	6	3.73	1204/1489	3.86	4.43	4.29	4.07	3.73	
4. Were special techniques successful	11	1	0	1	3	2	4	3.90	607/1006	3.69	4.14	4.00	3.81	3.90	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	21	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 226	****	****	4.20	3.98	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	21	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 233	****	****	4.19	4.09	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	21	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 225	****	****	4.50	4.42	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	21	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 223	****	****	4.35	4.19	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	21	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 206	****	****	4.15	4.01	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	1	A	7	Required for Majors	8	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B	4						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	2	C	6	General	3	Under-grad	22	Non-major	22
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	6	D	1						
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	7				
				?	0						

Course Section: SPAN 101 0301  
 Title ELEMENTARY SPANISH I  
 Instructor: GRANENAGIMENO,  
 Enrollment: 24  
 Questionnaires: 16

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 1572  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 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	1	2	3	8	4.29	876/1669	3.98	4.33	4.23	4.02	4.29	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	1	0	1	0	12	4.57	472/1666	4.16	4.28	4.19	4.11	4.57	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	3	0	0	2	0	6	5	4.08	943/1421	4.01	4.36	4.24	4.11	4.08	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	1	0	1	3	2	7	4.15	911/1617	3.87	4.27	4.15	3.99	4.15	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	3	0	1	1	0	4	7	4.15	655/1555	3.96	4.17	4.00	3.92	4.15	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	3	1	0	1	2	3	6	4.17	759/1543	4.02	4.19	4.06	3.86	4.17	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	0	2	1	11	4.64	324/1647	3.93	4.18	4.12	4.06	4.64	
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	0	14	5.00	1/1668	4.34	4.60	4.67	4.62	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	0	0	0	2	4	4	4.20	759/1605	3.76	4.13	4.07	3.96	4.20	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	1	0	3	9	4.54	763/1514	4.19	4.39	4.39	4.32	4.54	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	0	14	5.00	1/1551	4.78	4.72	4.66	4.55	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	1	2	3	8	4.29	852/1503	3.97	4.31	4.24	4.17	4.29	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	1	1	3	9	4.43	744/1506	4.30	4.40	4.26	4.17	4.43	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	0	2	3	3	2	4	3.21	1069/1311	3.54	3.78	3.85	3.68	3.21	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	1	0	3	8	4.50	445/1490	4.07	4.26	4.05	3.85	4.50	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	213/1502	4.63	4.54	4.26	4.06	4.92	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	1	2	0	8	4.36	837/1489	3.86	4.43	4.29	4.07	4.36	
4. Were special techniques successful	5	2	1	0	3	2	3	3.67	694/1006	3.69	4.14	4.00	3.81	3.67	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	A 6	Required for Majors	7
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	B 2		Graduate 0
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	C 2	General	2
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	D 0		16
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		
			I 0	Other	2
			? 0		

#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant

Course Section: SPAN 102 0101  
 Title ELEMENTARY SPANISH II  
 Instructor: NOGUEIRA, BRUNO  
 Enrollment: 24  
 Questionnaires: 19

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 1573  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 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	2	6	8	4.00	1173/1669	3.60	4.33	4.23	4.02	4.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	3	3	12	4.37	740/1666	3.62	4.28	4.19	4.11	4.37	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	2	2	8	6	3.84	1095/1421	3.39	4.36	4.24	4.11	3.84	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	0	4	5	9	4.11	970/1617	3.62	4.27	4.15	3.99	4.11	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	2	6	3	6	3.76	1054/1555	3.19	4.17	4.00	3.92	3.76	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	1	2	6	8	3.89	1027/1543	3.36	4.19	4.06	3.86	3.89	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	2	2	5	10	4.21	907/1647	3.76	4.18	4.12	4.06	4.21	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	4	15	4.79	926/1668	4.28	4.60	4.67	4.62	4.79	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	2	7	7	4.31	617/1605	3.57	4.13	4.07	3.96	4.31	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	1	0	7	9	4.41	939/1514	3.88	4.39	4.39	4.32	4.41	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	5	12	4.71	973/1551	4.40	4.72	4.66	4.55	4.71	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	0	7	10	4.59	482/1503	3.75	4.31	4.24	4.17	4.59	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	2	4	11	4.53	623/1506	3.80	4.40	4.26	4.17	4.53	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	3	3	2	3	2	3	3.00	1115/1311	2.98	3.78	3.85	3.68	3.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	3	2	4	4.11	800/1490	3.76	4.26	4.05	3.85	4.11	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	10	0	0	1	0	1	7	4.56	586/1502	4.10	4.54	4.26	4.06	4.56	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	10	0	0	0	1	4	4	4.33	865/1489	4.02	4.43	4.29	4.07	4.33	
4. Were special techniques successful	10	2	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	159/1006	4.09	4.14	4.00	3.81	4.71	
Laboratory															
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	17	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 233	****	****	4.19	4.09	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 4	Required for Majors	12
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	B 8		Graduate 0
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	C 4	General	0
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad 19
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
			? 1		

Course Section: SPAN 102 0201  
 Title ELEMENTARY SPANISH II  
 Instructor: NOGUEIRA, BRUNO  
 Enrollment: 26  
 Questionnaires: 18

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 1574  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 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	2	8	7	4.29	864/1669	3.60	4.33	4.23	4.02	4.29	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	2	1	3	12	4.39	715/1666	3.62	4.28	4.19	4.11	4.39	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	2	6	5	4	3.50	1222/1421	3.39	4.36	4.24	4.11	3.50	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	1	4	3	9	4.18	887/1617	3.62	4.27	4.15	3.99	4.18	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	1	0	2	3	3	7	4.00	773/1555	3.19	4.17	4.00	3.92	4.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	0	3	6	6	4.00	895/1543	3.36	4.19	4.06	3.86	4.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	0	3	4	9	4.38	697/1647	3.76	4.18	4.12	4.06	4.38	
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	1	11	4	4.19	1425/1668	4.28	4.60	4.67	4.62	4.19	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	1	1	0	2	8	5	4.00	918/1605	3.57	4.13	4.07	3.96	4.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	2	5	10	4.47	845/1514	3.88	4.39	4.39	4.32	4.47	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	0	16	5.00	1/1551	4.40	4.72	4.66	4.55	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	4	3	10	4.35	777/1503	3.75	4.31	4.24	4.17	4.35	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	2	3	11	4.41	757/1506	3.80	4.40	4.26	4.17	4.41	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	4	2	1	3	4	3	3.38	1004/1311	2.98	3.78	3.85	3.68	3.38	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	3	2	7	4.33	622/1490	3.76	4.26	4.05	3.85	4.33	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	0	0	3	9	4.75	393/1502	4.10	4.54	4.26	4.06	4.75	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	252/1489	4.02	4.43	4.29	4.07	4.92	
4. Were special techniques successful	6	1	0	0	1	3	7	4.55	220/1006	4.09	4.14	4.00	3.81	4.55	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 226	****	****	4.20	3.98	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 233	****	****	4.19	4.09	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 225	****	****	4.50	4.42	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 223	****	****	4.35	4.19	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 206	****	****	4.15	4.01	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 112	****	4.00	4.38	4.04	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 97	****	3.00	4.36	4.19	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 92	****	3.50	4.22	3.79	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 105	****	4.00	4.20	3.94	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 98	****	4.00	3.95	3.90	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 58	****	4.33	4.22	4.00	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 52	****	4.00	4.06	3.81	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 39	****	5.00	4.39	4.30	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 40	****	4.00	3.97	4.00	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 30	****	5.00	4.33	4.30	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 55	****	4.42	4.34	4.17	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 42	****	****	4.31	4.08	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 46	****	4.33	4.45	4.26	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 33	****	****	4.25	4.25	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 29	****	5.00	4.34	4.22	****	

Course Section: SPAN 102 0201  
 Title ELEMENTARY SPANISH II  
 Instructor: NOGUEIRA, BRUNO  
 Enrollment: 26  
 Questionnaires: 18

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 1574  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	4	0.00-0.99	1	A	4	Required for Majors	12	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B	6						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	3	C	6	General	2	Under-grad	18	Non-major	18
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	5	D	1						
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	3				
				?	1						

Course Section: SPAN 102 0301  
 Title ELEMENTARY SPANISH II  
 Instructor: SIMORANGKIR, MO  
 Enrollment: 25  
 Questionnaires: 19

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 1575  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 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	1	1	6	8	2	3.50	1480/1669	3.60	4.33	4.23	4.02	3.50	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	2	3	5	6	2	3.17	1556/1666	3.62	4.28	4.19	4.11	3.17	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	0	2	3	3	7	2	3.24	1312/1421	3.39	4.36	4.24	4.11	3.24	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	0	0	3	2	10	2	3.65	1312/1617	3.62	4.27	4.15	3.99	3.65	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	1	2	4	3	6	2	3.12	1410/1555	3.19	4.17	4.00	3.92	3.12	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	1	1	3	2	8	3	3.53	1253/1543	3.36	4.19	4.06	3.86	3.53	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	3	0	8	6	3.83	1223/1647	3.76	4.18	4.12	4.06	3.83	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	6	12	4.67	1068/1668	4.28	4.60	4.67	4.62	4.67	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	0	2	2	4	5	0	2.92	1521/1605	3.57	4.13	4.07	3.96	2.92	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	1	2	5	5	3	3.44	1401/1514	3.88	4.39	4.39	4.32	3.44	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	1	1	4	10	4.44	1246/1551	4.40	4.72	4.66	4.55	4.44	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	1	1	4	7	3	3.63	1293/1503	3.75	4.31	4.24	4.17	3.63	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	3	4	5	2	3.43	1341/1506	3.80	4.40	4.26	4.17	3.43	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	3	2	2	4	4	1	3.00	1115/1311	2.98	3.78	3.85	3.68	3.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	3	2	1	3.67	1088/1490	3.76	4.26	4.05	3.85	3.67	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	13	0	0	1	2	1	2	3.67	1253/1502	4.10	4.54	4.26	4.06	3.67	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	13	0	0	0	2	3	1	3.83	1155/1489	4.02	4.43	4.29	4.07	3.83	
4. Were special techniques successful	13	0	0	1	2	1	2	3.67	694/1006	4.09	4.14	4.00	3.81	3.67	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	18	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 226	****	****	4.20	3.98	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	18	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 233	****	****	4.19	4.09	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	18	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 225	****	****	4.50	4.42	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	18	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 223	****	****	4.35	4.19	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	18	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 206	****	****	4.15	4.01	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	18	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 112	****	4.00	4.38	4.04	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	18	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 97	****	3.00	4.36	4.19	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 92	****	3.50	4.22	3.79	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 105	****	4.00	4.20	3.94	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	18	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 98	****	4.00	3.95	3.90	****	
Field Work															
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	18	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 52	****	4.00	4.06	3.81	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	18	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 39	****	5.00	4.39	4.30	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	18	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 40	****	4.00	3.97	4.00	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	18	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 30	****	5.00	4.33	4.30	****	
Self Paced															
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	18	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 42	****	****	4.31	4.08	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	18	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 46	****	4.33	4.45	4.26	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	18	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 33	****	****	4.25	4.25	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	18	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 29	****	5.00	4.34	4.22	****	

Course Section: SPAN 102 0301  
 Title ELEMENTARY SPANISH II  
 Instructor: SIMORANGKIR, MO  
 Enrollment: 25  
 Questionnaires: 19

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 1575  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 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	2	Required for Majors	8	Graduate	1	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	5						
56-83	6	2.00-2.99	5	C	7	General	3	Under-grad	18	Non-major	19
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	2	D	1						
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00	6	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	2						
				I	0	Other	6				
				?	1						



Course Section: SPAN 102 0401  
 Title ELEMENTARY SPANISH II  
 Instructor: RIBEYRO, CLAUDI  
 Enrollment: 25  
 Questionnaires: 19

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 1576  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 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	2	3	6	4	4	3.26	1560/1669	3.60	4.33	4.23	4.02	3.26	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	5	5	3	6	3.53	1459/1666	3.62	4.28	4.19	4.11	3.53	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	3	3	4	5	4	3.21	1316/1421	3.39	4.36	4.24	4.11	3.21	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	2	4	4	4	5	3.32	1455/1617	3.62	4.27	4.15	3.99	3.32	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	5	3	5	3	3	2.79	1485/1555	3.19	4.17	4.00	3.92	2.79	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	1	3	8	4	2	3.17	1372/1543	3.36	4.19	4.06	3.86	3.17	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	1	1	3	4	6	3	3.41	1435/1647	3.76	4.18	4.12	4.06	3.41	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	1	15	3	4.11	1477/1668	4.28	4.60	4.67	4.62	4.11	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	4	9	3	3.94	1039/1605	3.57	4.13	4.07	3.96	3.94	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	1	1	7	9	4.33	1022/1514	3.88	4.39	4.39	4.32	4.33	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	1	3	6	9	4.21	1354/1551	4.40	4.72	4.66	4.55	4.21	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	1	7	5	5	3.78	1225/1503	3.75	4.31	4.24	4.17	3.78	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	3	1	10	5	3.89	1179/1506	3.80	4.40	4.26	4.17	3.89	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	1	5	1	1	6	4	3.18	1081/1311	2.98	3.78	3.85	3.68	3.18	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	2	1	2	2	4	3.45	1184/1490	3.76	4.26	4.05	3.85	3.45	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	9	0	0	1	1	5	3	4.00	1013/1502	4.10	4.54	4.26	4.06	4.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	10	0	1	3	0	2	3	3.33	1341/1489	4.02	4.43	4.29	4.07	3.33	
4. Were special techniques successful	9	2	0	0	2	6	0	3.75	657/1006	4.09	4.14	4.00	3.81	3.75	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	18	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 226	****	****	4.20	3.98	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	18	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 233	****	****	4.19	4.09	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	17	1	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 225	****	****	4.50	4.42	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	18	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 223	****	****	4.35	4.19	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	18	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 206	****	****	4.15	4.01	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	18	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 112	****	4.00	4.38	4.04	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	18	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 97	****	3.00	4.36	4.19	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 92	****	3.50	4.22	3.79	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 105	****	4.00	4.20	3.94	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 98	****	4.00	3.95	3.90	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 58	****	4.33	4.22	4.00	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	18	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 52	****	4.00	4.06	3.81	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	18	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 39	****	5.00	4.39	4.30	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	18	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 40	****	4.00	3.97	4.00	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	18	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 30	****	5.00	4.33	4.30	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 55	****	4.42	4.34	4.17	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	18	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 42	****	****	4.31	4.08	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	18	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 46	****	4.33	4.45	4.26	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	18	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 33	****	****	4.25	4.25	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 29	****	5.00	4.34	4.22	****	

Course Section: SPAN 102 0401  
 Title ELEMENTARY SPANISH II  
 Instructor: RIBEYRO, CLAUDI  
 Enrollment: 25  
 Questionnaires: 19

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 1576  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	0	A	2	Required for Majors	10	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	1	B	9						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	3	C	4	General	1	Under-grad	19	Non-major	19
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	8	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	1						
				I	0	Other	5				
				?	0						

Course Section: SPAN 102 0501  
 Title ELEMENTARY SPANISH II  
 Instructor: PETERSON, MARY  
 Enrollment: 24  
 Questionnaires: 15

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 1577  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 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	1	2	5	4	2	3.29	1555/1669	3.60	4.33	4.23	4.02	3.29	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	4	6	2	2	3.14	1561/1666	3.62	4.28	4.19	4.11	3.14	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	2	3	5	4	0	2.79	1387/1421	3.39	4.36	4.24	4.11	2.79	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	1	5	5	2	1	2.79	1571/1617	3.62	4.27	4.15	3.99	2.79	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	1	2	5	4	0	2	2.62	1512/1555	3.19	4.17	4.00	3.92	2.62	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	4	6	1	2	2.93	1451/1543	3.36	4.19	4.06	3.86	2.93	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	2	7	1	4	3.50	1393/1647	3.76	4.18	4.12	4.06	3.50	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	1	0	13	4.86	807/1668	4.28	4.60	4.67	4.62	4.86	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	2	8	1	1	3.08	1497/1605	3.57	4.13	4.07	3.96	3.08	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	6	0	0	2	4	1	2	3.33	1418/1514	3.88	4.39	4.39	4.32	3.33	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	6	0	0	0	4	1	4	4.00	1404/1551	4.40	4.72	4.66	4.55	4.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	6	0	1	0	4	3	1	3.33	1380/1503	3.75	4.31	4.24	4.17	3.33	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	6	0	1	1	3	2	2	3.33	1361/1506	3.80	4.40	4.26	4.17	3.33	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	7	1	1	1	3	1	1	3.00	1115/1311	2.98	3.78	3.85	3.68	3.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	11	0	1	0	1	0	2	3.50	1154/1490	3.76	4.26	4.05	3.85	3.50	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	11	0	0	1	0	2	1	3.75	1208/1502	4.10	4.54	4.26	4.06	3.75	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	11	0	1	0	0	0	3	4.00	1038/1489	4.02	4.43	4.29	4.07	4.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	11	0	0	1	0	1	2	4.00	479/1006	4.09	4.14	4.00	3.81	4.00	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 226	****	****	4.20	3.98	****	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course Section: SPAN 102 0601  
 Title: ELEMENTARY SPANISH II  
 Instructor: SIMORANGKIR, MO  
 Enrollment: 24  
 Questionnaires: 18

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 1578  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 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	1	2	7	6	1	3.24	1568/1669	3.60	4.33	4.23	4.02	3.24	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	1	5	6	3	2	3.00	1578/1666	3.62	4.28	4.19	4.11	3.00	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	4	1	6	4	2	2.94	1372/1421	3.39	4.36	4.24	4.11	2.94	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	2	1	5	7	2	3.35	1442/1617	3.62	4.27	4.15	3.99	3.35	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	3	1	1	2	5	5	1	3.21	1378/1555	3.19	4.17	4.00	3.92	3.21	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	0	3	0	7	4	2	3.13	1386/1543	3.36	4.19	4.06	3.86	3.13	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	2	2	3	6	3	3.38	1454/1647	3.76	4.18	4.12	4.06	3.38	
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	7	9	0	3.56	1636/1668	4.28	4.60	4.67	4.62	3.56	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	8	0	2	1	3	4	0	2.90	1526/1605	3.57	4.13	4.07	3.96	2.90	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	3	2	4	3	4	3.19	1440/1514	3.88	4.39	4.39	4.32	3.19	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	1	1	2	5	7	4.00	1404/1551	4.40	4.72	4.66	4.55	4.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	3	1	5	5	2	3.13	1413/1503	3.75	4.31	4.24	4.17	3.13	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	2	1	7	2	3	3.20	1384/1506	3.80	4.40	4.26	4.17	3.20	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	3	5	4	1	1	2	2.31	1257/1311	2.98	3.78	3.85	3.68	2.31	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	2	1	2	3	2	3.20	1288/1490	3.76	4.26	4.05	3.85	3.20	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	2	0	1	3	4	3.70	1237/1502	4.10	4.54	4.26	4.06	3.70	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	1	0	3	2	4	3.80	1168/1489	4.02	4.43	4.29	4.07	3.80	
4. Were special techniques successful	8	3	0	1	1	1	4	4.14	436/1006	4.09	4.14	4.00	3.81	4.14	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	17	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 226	****	****	4.20	3.98	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	17	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 233	****	****	4.19	4.09	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	17	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 225	****	****	4.50	4.42	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	17	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 223	****	****	4.35	4.19	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	17	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 206	****	****	4.15	4.01	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	A 1	Required for Majors	10
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	B 7		Graduate 0
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	C 7	General	1
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	D 1		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	3
			? 0		

Course Section: SPAN 102 0701  
 Title ELEMENTARY SPANISH II  
 Instructor: DEANGULO, SANTI  
 Enrollment: 25  
 Questionnaires: 18

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 1579  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 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	6	8	3	3.67	1409/1669	3.60	4.33	4.23	4.02	3.67	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	1	0	4	8	4	3.82	1295/1666	3.62	4.28	4.19	4.11	3.82	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	6	9	2	3.67	1166/1421	3.39	4.36	4.24	4.11	3.67	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	0	3	8	4	4.07	993/1617	3.62	4.27	4.15	3.99	4.07	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	3	1	6	6	1	3.06	1420/1555	3.19	4.17	4.00	3.92	3.06	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	2	1	3	6	4	2	3.19	1365/1543	3.36	4.19	4.06	3.86	3.19	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	1	3	8	5	3.83	1223/1647	3.76	4.18	4.12	4.06	3.83	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	16	1	4.06	1503/1668	4.28	4.60	4.67	4.62	4.06	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	1	1	6	8	1	3.41	1395/1605	3.57	4.13	4.07	3.96	3.41	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	2	0	1	9	3	3.73	1330/1514	3.88	4.39	4.39	4.32	3.73	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	1	5	9	4.53	1168/1551	4.40	4.72	4.66	4.55	4.53	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	1	2	5	5	2	3.33	1380/1503	3.75	4.31	4.24	4.17	3.33	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	1	1	1	8	4	3.87	1194/1506	3.80	4.40	4.26	4.17	3.87	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	3	5	1	2	3	1	2.50	1227/1311	2.98	3.78	3.85	3.68	2.50	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	1	0	1	7	3	3.92	945/1490	3.76	4.26	4.05	3.85	3.92	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	0	1	7	4	4.25	880/1502	4.10	4.54	4.26	4.06	4.25	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	1	0	1	7	3	3.92	1116/1489	4.02	4.43	4.29	4.07	3.92	
4. Were special techniques successful	6	1	1	0	3	4	3	3.73	666/1006	4.09	4.14	4.00	3.81	3.73	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	1	0.00-0.99 0	A 4	Required for Majors 9	Graduate 0 Major 0
28-55	2	1.00-1.99 0	B 6		
56-83	3	2.00-2.99 5	C 5	General 2	Under-grad 18 Non-major 18
84-150	4	3.00-3.49 4	D 2		
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 6	
			? 0		

Course Section: SPAN 102 0801  
 Title ELEMENTARY SPANISH II  
 Instructor: RIBEYRO, CLAUDI  
 Enrollment: 23  
 Questionnaires: 20

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 1580  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 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	2	1	7	2	7	3.58	1449/1669	3.60	4.33	4.23	4.02	3.58	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	1	8	8	2	3.58	1442/1666	3.62	4.28	4.19	4.11	3.58	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	3	2	9	6	3.90	1061/1421	3.39	4.36	4.24	4.11	3.90	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	2	9	6	3	3.50	1372/1617	3.62	4.27	4.15	3.99	3.50	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	3	0	5	7	2	1	2.93	1457/1555	3.19	4.17	4.00	3.92	2.93	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	1	1	5	5	4	2	3.06	1401/1543	3.36	4.19	4.06	3.86	3.06	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	2	2	3	7	5	3.58	1365/1647	3.76	4.18	4.12	4.06	3.58	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	1	0	16	2	4.00	1530/1668	4.28	4.60	4.67	4.62	4.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	2	0	0	4	8	4	4.00	918/1605	3.57	4.13	4.07	3.96	4.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	6	4	8	4.11	1166/1514	3.88	4.39	4.39	4.32	4.11	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	5	2	11	4.33	1304/1551	4.40	4.72	4.66	4.55	4.33	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	3	5	2	8	3.83	1197/1503	3.75	4.31	4.24	4.17	3.83	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	2	4	5	6	3.72	1254/1506	3.80	4.40	4.26	4.17	3.72	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	0	2	1	6	4	5	3.50	939/1311	2.98	3.78	3.85	3.68	3.50	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	2	2	3	5	3.92	945/1490	3.76	4.26	4.05	3.85	3.92	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	0	1	2	4	6	4.15	944/1502	4.10	4.54	4.26	4.06	4.15	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	0	2	1	5	5	4.00	1038/1489	4.02	4.43	4.29	4.07	4.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	7	3	0	2	0	2	6	4.20	407/1006	4.09	4.14	4.00	3.81	4.20	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	18	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/ 226	****	****	4.20	3.98	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	18	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/ 233	****	****	4.19	4.09	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	18	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/ 225	****	****	4.50	4.42	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	18	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 223	****	****	4.35	4.19	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	18	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 206	****	****	4.15	4.01	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	18	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 112	****	4.00	4.38	4.04	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	18	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 97	****	3.00	4.36	4.19	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	18	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 92	****	3.50	4.22	3.79	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	18	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 105	****	4.00	4.20	3.94	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	18	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/ 98	****	4.00	3.95	3.90	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/ 58	****	4.33	4.22	4.00	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	18	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/ 52	****	4.00	4.06	3.81	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	18	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 39	****	5.00	4.39	4.30	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	18	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 40	****	4.00	3.97	4.00	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	18	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 30	****	5.00	4.33	4.30	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	1	0	1	1	3.67	****/ 55	****	4.42	4.34	4.17	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	17	0	1	0	0	1	1	3.33	****/ 42	****	****	4.31	4.08	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	17	1	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 46	****	4.33	4.45	4.26	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	17	0	0	0	1	2	0	3.67	****/ 33	****	****	4.25	4.25	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	17	0	0	0	0	3	0	4.00	****/ 29	****	5.00	4.34	4.22	****	

Course Section: SPAN 102 0801  
 Title ELEMENTARY SPANISH II  
 Instructor: RIBEYRO, CLAUDI  
 Enrollment: 23  
 Questionnaires: 20

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 1580  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	4	0.00-0.99	1	A	2	Required for Majors	8	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	9						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	1	C	6	General	3	Under-grad	20	Non-major	20
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	3				
				?	0						

Course Section: SPAN 103 0101  
 Title INT REV ELEM SPANISH  
 Instructor: NASH, LYLE  
 Enrollment: 20  
 Questionnaires: 13

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 1581  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 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	5	5	4.08	1124/1669	3.56	4.33	4.23	4.02	4.08	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	4	5	4	4.00	1094/1666	3.50	4.28	4.19	4.11	4.00	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	3	7	2	3.77	1131/1421	3.46	4.36	4.24	4.11	3.77	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	1	0	3	6	2	3.67	1301/1617	3.65	4.27	4.15	3.99	3.67	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	4	6	2	3.69	1111/1555	3.26	4.17	4.00	3.92	3.69	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	1	5	2	4	3.54	1249/1543	3.50	4.19	4.06	3.86	3.54	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	4	8	1	3.77	1270/1647	3.69	4.18	4.12	4.06	3.77	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	9	4	4.31	1353/1668	4.77	4.60	4.67	4.62	4.31	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	1	0	0	0	8	2	4.20	759/1605	3.33	4.13	4.07	3.96	4.20	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	2	4	7	4.38	974/1514	3.90	4.39	4.39	4.32	4.38	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	12	4.92	409/1551	4.43	4.72	4.66	4.55	4.92	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	4	8	4.54	528/1503	3.68	4.31	4.24	4.17	4.54	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	4	8	4.54	613/1506	3.72	4.40	4.26	4.17	4.54	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	3	0	2	2	3	3	3.70	818/1311	3.04	3.78	3.85	3.68	3.70	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	4	1	1	3.50	1154/1490	3.26	4.26	4.05	3.85	3.50	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1502	4.39	4.54	4.26	4.06	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	684/1489	3.88	4.43	4.29	4.07	4.50	
4. Were special techniques successful	7	1	0	2	1	1	1	3.20	891/1006	3.43	4.14	4.00	3.81	3.20	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 55	****	4.42	4.34	4.17	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	12	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 42	****	****	4.31	4.08	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	12	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 46	****	4.33	4.45	4.26	****	

Frequency Distribution

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



Course Section: SPAN 103 0201  
 Title INT REV ELEM SPANISH  
 Instructor: MORENILLA, LAUR  
 Enrollment: 24  
 Questionnaires: 18

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 1582  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 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	4	1	8	2	3	2.94	1608/1669	3.56	4.33	4.23	4.02	2.94	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	4	2	5	4	3	3.00	1578/1666	3.50	4.28	4.19	4.11	3.00	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	2	4	6	4	2	3.00	1357/1421	3.46	4.36	4.24	4.11	3.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	1	1	1	6	6	2	3.44	1409/1617	3.65	4.27	4.15	3.99	3.44	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	3	1	6	4	1	1	2.62	1512/1555	3.26	4.17	4.00	3.92	2.62	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	2	8	3	2	3.33	1322/1543	3.50	4.19	4.06	3.86	3.33	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	3	0	2	1	2	6	4	3.60	1353/1647	3.69	4.18	4.12	4.06	3.60	
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	0	0	0	0	0	15	5.00	1/1668	4.77	4.60	4.67	4.62	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	1	8	6	3	0	2.61	1554/1605	3.33	4.13	4.07	3.96	2.61	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	2	1	6	6	3	3.39	1410/1514	3.90	4.39	4.39	4.32	3.39	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	1	1	9	7	4.22	1350/1551	4.43	4.72	4.66	4.55	4.22	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	3	4	6	2	3	2.89	1438/1503	3.68	4.31	4.24	4.17	2.89	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	4	2	3	4	5	3.22	1380/1506	3.72	4.40	4.26	4.17	3.22	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	5	3	1	5	1	2	2.83	1178/1311	3.04	3.78	3.85	3.68	2.83	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	10	0	2	2	3	1	0	2.38	1450/1490	3.26	4.26	4.05	3.85	2.38	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	10	0	0	1	0	6	1	3.88	1135/1502	4.39	4.54	4.26	4.06	3.88	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	10	0	0	2	3	2	1	3.25	1361/1489	3.88	4.43	4.29	4.07	3.25	
4. Were special techniques successful	10	0	2	1	1	3	1	3.00	923/1006	3.43	4.14	4.00	3.81	3.00	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99 0	A 4	Required for Majors 10	Graduate 0 Major 0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99 0	B 8		
56-83	4	2.00-2.99 4	C 6	General 1	Under-grad 18 Non-major 18
84-150	5	3.00-3.49 1	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 103 0301  
 Title INT REV ELEM SPANISH  
 Instructor: MORENILLA, LAUR  
 Enrollment: 23  
 Questionnaires: 15

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 1583  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 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	6	3	3.67	1409/1669	3.56	4.33	4.23	4.02	3.67	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	1	1	5	4	3	3.50	1466/1666	3.50	4.28	4.19	4.11	3.50	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	0	1	2	2	4	4	3.62	1185/1421	3.46	4.36	4.24	4.11	3.62	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	1	1	3	3	6	3.86	1196/1617	3.65	4.27	4.15	3.99	3.86	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	1	1	2	4	2	4	3.46	1257/1555	3.26	4.17	4.00	3.92	3.46	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	1	5	2	5	3.64	1205/1543	3.50	4.19	4.06	3.86	3.64	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	2	2	4	5	3.71	1295/1647	3.69	4.18	4.12	4.06	3.71	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	14	5.00	1/1668	4.77	4.60	4.67	4.62	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	2	5	4	0	3.18	1475/1605	3.33	4.13	4.07	3.96	3.18	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	2	3	2	6	3.92	1255/1514	3.90	4.39	4.39	4.32	3.92	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	4	3	6	4.15	1374/1551	4.43	4.72	4.66	4.55	4.15	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	1	2	3	2	5	3.62	1297/1503	3.68	4.31	4.24	4.17	3.62	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	3	2	4	3	3.38	1351/1506	3.72	4.40	4.26	4.17	3.38	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	0	3	1	6	2	0	2.58	1215/1311	3.04	3.78	3.85	3.68	2.58	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	1	0	2	3	4	3.90	956/1490	3.26	4.26	4.05	3.85	3.90	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	1	1	2	6	4.30	846/1502	4.39	4.54	4.26	4.06	4.30	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	1	3	2	4	3.90	1125/1489	3.88	4.43	4.29	4.07	3.90	
4. Were special techniques successful	5	0	0	2	0	3	5	4.10	459/1006	3.43	4.14	4.00	3.81	4.10	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course Section: SPAN 201 0101  
 Title INTERMEDIATE SPANISH I  
 Instructor: GLYNN, DOUGLAS  
 Enrollment: 17  
 Questionnaires: 15

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 1584  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 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	4	10	4.60	478/1669	4.37	4.33	4.23	4.34	4.60	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	4	11	4.73	268/1666	4.44	4.28	4.19	4.29	4.73	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	0	1	1	12	4.53	529/1421	4.32	4.36	4.24	4.35	4.53	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	4	11	4.73	242/1617	4.35	4.27	4.15	4.24	4.73	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	1	0	1	2	10	4.43	418/1555	3.85	4.17	4.00	3.96	4.43	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	1	0	0	3	10	4.50	390/1543	4.20	4.19	4.06	4.10	4.50	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	0	0	2	12	4.60	367/1647	4.33	4.18	4.12	4.19	4.60	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	3	10	2	3.93	1574/1668	4.55	4.60	4.67	4.59	3.93	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	1	0	0	5	9	4.40	499/1605	4.36	4.13	4.07	4.15	4.40	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	2	5	8	4.40	955/1514	4.47	4.39	4.39	4.39	4.40	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	15	5.00	1/1551	4.73	4.72	4.66	4.72	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	2	2	11	4.60	464/1503	4.37	4.31	4.24	4.29	4.60	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	2	12	4.73	380/1506	4.43	4.40	4.26	4.33	4.73	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	1	2	0	2	3	7	3.93	676/1311	3.76	3.78	3.85	3.96	3.93	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	1	0	0	3	8	4.42	546/1490	4.37	4.26	4.05	4.11	4.42	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	1	0	0	1	10	4.58	558/1502	4.65	4.54	4.26	4.31	4.58	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	1	1	10	4.75	434/1489	4.53	4.43	4.29	4.36	4.75	
4. Were special techniques successful	3	1	0	0	2	2	7	4.45	271/1006	4.41	4.14	4.00	3.99	4.45	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 5	Required for Majors	8
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	B 8		Graduate 0
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	C 2	General	2
84-150	2	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	5
			? 0		

Course Section: SPAN 201 0201  
 Title INTERMEDIATE SPANISH I  
 Instructor: STRICKLING, LAU  
 Enrollment: 18  
 Questionnaires: 14

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 1585  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 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	5	9	4.64	419/1669	4.37	4.33	4.23	4.34	4.64	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	13	4.93	82/1666	4.44	4.28	4.19	4.29	4.93	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	2	11	4.71	331/1421	4.32	4.36	4.24	4.35	4.71	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	11	4.79	184/1617	4.35	4.27	4.15	4.24	4.79	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	1	3	4	5	4.00	773/1555	3.85	4.17	4.00	3.96	4.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	3	3	8	4.36	562/1543	4.20	4.19	4.06	4.10	4.36	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	0	14	5.00	1/1647	4.33	4.18	4.12	4.19	5.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	4	10	4.71	1017/1668	4.55	4.60	4.67	4.59	4.71	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	99/1605	4.36	4.13	4.07	4.15	4.91	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	3	11	4.79	392/1514	4.47	4.39	4.39	4.39	4.79	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	14	5.00	1/1551	4.73	4.72	4.66	4.72	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	2	12	4.86	173/1503	4.37	4.31	4.24	4.29	4.86	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	13	4.93	131/1506	4.43	4.40	4.26	4.33	4.93	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	2	0	0	3	2	7	4.33	389/1311	3.76	3.78	3.85	3.96	4.33	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	162/1490	4.37	4.26	4.05	4.11	4.88	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1502	4.65	4.54	4.26	4.31	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	434/1489	4.53	4.43	4.29	4.36	4.75	
4. Were special techniques successful	6	1	0	0	1	2	4	4.43	292/1006	4.41	4.14	4.00	3.99	4.43	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	13	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 58	****	4.33	4.22	4.20	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	13	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 55	****	4.42	4.34	4.67	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors				
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	A 11	Required for Majors 12	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	6	1.00-1.99	0	B 3					
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	2	C 0	General	0	Under-grad	14	Non-major 14
84-150	2	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	4			
				? 0					

Course Section: SPAN 201 0301  
 Title INTERMEDIATE SPANISH I  
 Instructor: MESSICK, ROSALI  
 Enrollment: 19  
 Questionnaires: 14

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 1586  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 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	1	11	4.64	419/1669	4.37	4.33	4.23	4.34	4.64	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	11	4.79	206/1666	4.44	4.28	4.19	4.29	4.79	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	14	5.00	1/1421	4.32	4.36	4.24	4.35	5.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	13	4.93	91/1617	4.35	4.27	4.15	4.24	4.93	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	1	0	0	2	3	7	4.42	428/1555	3.85	4.17	4.00	3.96	4.42	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	6	8	4.57	325/1543	4.20	4.19	4.06	4.10	4.57	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	0	2	11	4.85	145/1647	4.33	4.18	4.12	4.19	4.85	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	14	5.00	1/1668	4.55	4.60	4.67	4.59	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	0	3	9	4.75	170/1605	4.36	4.13	4.07	4.15	4.75	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	1	5	7	4.46	861/1514	4.47	4.39	4.39	4.39	4.46	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	13	5.00	1/1551	4.73	4.72	4.66	4.72	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	5	8	4.62	451/1503	4.37	4.31	4.24	4.29	4.62	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	1	12	4.92	131/1506	4.43	4.40	4.26	4.33	4.92	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	1	2	1	0	3	5	3.73	807/1311	3.76	3.78	3.85	3.96	3.73	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	2	2	6	4.40	558/1490	4.37	4.26	4.05	4.11	4.40	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1502	4.65	4.54	4.26	4.31	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1489	4.53	4.43	4.29	4.36	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	4	0	0	0	1	3	6	4.50	235/1006	4.41	4.14	4.00	3.99	4.50	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 226	****	****	4.20	4.42	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 233	****	****	4.19	4.36	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 225	****	****	4.50	4.74	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 223	****	****	4.35	4.71	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 206	****	****	4.15	4.59	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 112	****	4.00	4.38	4.59	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 97	****	3.00	4.36	4.60	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 92	****	3.50	4.22	4.50	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 105	****	4.00	4.20	4.63	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 98	****	4.00	3.95	4.20	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 58	****	4.33	4.22	4.20	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 52	****	4.00	4.06	5.00	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 39	****	5.00	4.39	5.00	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 40	****	4.00	3.97	5.00	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 30	****	5.00	4.33	5.00	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 55	****	4.42	4.34	4.67	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 42	****	****	4.31	5.00	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 46	****	4.33	4.45	5.00	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 33	****	****	4.25	5.00	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 29	****	5.00	4.34	5.00	****	

Course Section: SPAN 201 0301  
 Title INTERMEDIATE SPANISH I  
 Instructor: MESSICK, ROSALI  
 Enrollment: 19  
 Questionnaires: 14

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 1586  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 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	11	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	6						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	2	C	2	General	0	Under-grad	14	Non-major	14
84-150	4	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	3				
				?	0						

Course Section: SPAN 201 0401  
 Title INTERMEDIATE SPANISH I  
 Instructor: LEE, JUSTIN D  
 Enrollment: 25  
 Questionnaires: 18

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 1587  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 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	2	15	4.78	244/1669	4.37	4.33	4.23	4.34	4.78	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	15	4.83	157/1666	4.44	4.28	4.19	4.29	4.83	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	3	13	4.61	453/1421	4.32	4.36	4.24	4.35	4.61	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	3	14	4.82	151/1617	4.35	4.27	4.15	4.24	4.82	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	3	1	1	1	4	7	4.07	728/1555	3.85	4.17	4.00	3.96	4.07	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	1	0	0	2	2	11	4.60	298/1543	4.20	4.19	4.06	4.10	4.60	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	1	1	2	13	4.59	389/1647	4.33	4.18	4.12	4.19	4.59	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	13	4	4.24	1394/1668	4.55	4.60	4.67	4.59	4.24	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	1	0	0	0	2	12	4.86	119/1605	4.36	4.13	4.07	4.15	4.86	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	2	1	14	4.71	522/1514	4.47	4.39	4.39	4.39	4.71	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	2	15	4.88	567/1551	4.73	4.72	4.66	4.72	4.88	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	1	2	14	4.76	266/1503	4.37	4.31	4.24	4.29	4.76	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	0	1	15	4.76	340/1506	4.43	4.40	4.26	4.33	4.76	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	5	1	1	2	3	4	3.73	807/1311	3.76	3.78	3.85	3.96	3.73	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	1	0	0	7	4.63	372/1490	4.37	4.26	4.05	4.11	4.63	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	10	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	393/1502	4.65	4.54	4.26	4.31	4.75	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	10	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	309/1489	4.53	4.43	4.29	4.36	4.88	
4. Were special techniques successful	10	2	0	0	1	5	0	3.83	632/1006	4.41	4.14	4.00	3.99	3.83	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	A 9	Required for Majors	12
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	B 6		Graduate 0
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	C 2	General	1
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad 18
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 201 0501  
 Title INTERMEDIATE SPANISH I  
 Instructor: OSKOZ, ANA  
 Enrollment: 15  
 Questionnaires: 10

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 1588  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 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	8	4.80	207/1669	4.37	4.33	4.23	4.34	4.80	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	181/1666	4.44	4.28	4.19	4.29	4.80	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	4	6	4.60	466/1421	4.32	4.36	4.24	4.35	4.60	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	161/1617	4.35	4.27	4.15	4.24	4.80	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	1	0	1	3	4	4.00	773/1555	3.85	4.17	4.00	3.96	4.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	5	5	4.50	390/1543	4.20	4.19	4.06	4.10	4.50	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	167/1647	4.33	4.18	4.12	4.19	4.80	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1668	4.55	4.60	4.67	4.59	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	194/1605	4.36	4.13	4.07	4.15	4.71	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	223/1514	4.47	4.39	4.39	4.39	4.89	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	594/1551	4.73	4.72	4.66	4.72	4.88	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	277/1503	4.37	4.31	4.24	4.29	4.75	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	200/1506	4.43	4.40	4.26	4.33	4.88	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	2	0	0	0	4	2	4.33	389/1311	3.76	3.78	3.85	3.96	4.33	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	177/1490	4.37	4.26	4.05	4.11	4.86	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1502	4.65	4.54	4.26	4.31	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1489	4.53	4.43	4.29	4.36	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	3	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	159/1006	4.41	4.14	4.00	3.99	4.71	

Frequency Distribution

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



Course Section: SPAN 201 0601  
 Title INTERMEDIATE SPANISH I  
 Instructor: GLYNN, DOUGLAS  
 Enrollment: 21  
 Questionnaires: 20

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 1589  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 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	3	17	4.85	167/1669	4.37	4.33	4.23	4.34	4.85	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	19	4.95	62/1666	4.44	4.28	4.19	4.29	4.95	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	19	4.95	91/1421	4.32	4.36	4.24	4.35	4.95	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	18	4.90	114/1617	4.35	4.27	4.15	4.24	4.90	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	1	0	3	1	13	4.39	453/1555	3.85	4.17	4.00	3.96	4.39	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	18	4.90	104/1543	4.20	4.19	4.06	4.10	4.90	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	0	20	5.00	1/1647	4.33	4.18	4.12	4.19	5.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	13	7	4.35	1313/1668	4.55	4.60	4.67	4.59	4.35	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	0	5	12	4.71	201/1605	4.36	4.13	4.07	4.15	4.71	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	0	2	16	4.89	223/1514	4.47	4.39	4.39	4.39	4.89	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	0	18	5.00	1/1551	4.73	4.72	4.66	4.72	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	0	2	16	4.89	144/1503	4.37	4.31	4.24	4.29	4.89	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	3	15	4.83	249/1506	4.43	4.40	4.26	4.33	4.83	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	4	1	0	2	2	9	4.29	426/1311	3.76	3.78	3.85	3.96	4.29	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	2	14	4.88	162/1490	4.37	4.26	4.05	4.11	4.88	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	0	0	0	16	5.00	1/1502	4.65	4.54	4.26	4.31	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	0	0	1	15	4.94	196/1489	4.53	4.43	4.29	4.36	4.94	
4. Were special techniques successful	4	0	0	0	0	3	13	4.81	120/1006	4.41	4.14	4.00	3.99	4.81	
Field Work															
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	19	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 52	****	4.00	4.06	5.00	****	
Self Paced															
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	19	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 42	****	****	4.31	5.00	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors				
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	A 4	Required for Majors 11	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B 12					
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	2	C 3	General 2	Under-grad	20	Non-major	20
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	1	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 3				
				? 0					

Course Section: SPAN 201 0701  
 Title INTERMEDIATE SPANISH I  
 Instructor: MESSICK, ROSALI  
 Enrollment: 17  
 Questionnaires: 13

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 1590  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 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	1	10	4.75	269/1669	4.37	4.33	4.23	4.34	4.75	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	2	9	4.67	359/1666	4.44	4.28	4.19	4.29	4.67	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	0	0	1	0	3	7	4.45	620/1421	4.32	4.36	4.24	4.35	4.45	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	0	0	2	0	2	7	4.27	780/1617	4.35	4.27	4.15	4.24	4.27	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	0	1	5	5	4.08	721/1555	3.85	4.17	4.00	3.96	4.08	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	0	1	3	7	4.25	659/1543	4.20	4.19	4.06	4.10	4.25	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	0	2	2	7	4.17	948/1647	4.33	4.18	4.12	4.19	4.17	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	4	8	4.67	1068/1668	4.55	4.60	4.67	4.59	4.67	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	170/1605	4.36	4.13	4.07	4.15	4.75	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	1	2	7	4.60	679/1514	4.47	4.39	4.39	4.39	4.60	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	512/1551	4.73	4.72	4.66	4.72	4.90	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	0	3	7	4.70	347/1503	4.37	4.31	4.24	4.29	4.70	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	286/1506	4.43	4.40	4.26	4.33	4.80	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	1	0	0	2	3	3	4.13	525/1311	3.76	3.78	3.85	3.96	4.13	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	242/1490	4.37	4.26	4.05	4.11	4.78	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1502	4.65	4.54	4.26	4.31	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1489	4.53	4.43	4.29	4.36	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	4	0	0	0	1	2	6	4.56	217/1006	4.41	4.14	4.00	3.99	4.56	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course Section: SPAN 201 0801  
 Title INTERMEDIATE SPANISH I  
 Instructor: DEANGULO, SANTI  
 Enrollment: 17  
 Questionnaires: 13

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 1591  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 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	6	4.23	938/1669	4.37	4.33	4.23	4.34	4.23	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	0	5	7	4.38	715/1666	4.44	4.28	4.19	4.29	4.38	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	10	4.77	267/1421	4.32	4.36	4.24	4.35	4.77	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	4	8	4.54	465/1617	4.35	4.27	4.15	4.24	4.54	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	1	3	1	6	4.09	715/1555	3.85	4.17	4.00	3.96	4.09	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	3	4	6	4.23	680/1543	4.20	4.19	4.06	4.10	4.23	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	2	1	3	7	4.15	955/1647	4.33	4.18	4.12	4.19	4.15	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	9	4	4.31	1353/1668	4.55	4.60	4.67	4.59	4.31	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	0	7	4	4.36	551/1605	4.36	4.13	4.07	4.15	4.36	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	1	0	1	5	6	4.15	1142/1514	4.47	4.39	4.39	4.39	4.15	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	6	6	4.38	1279/1551	4.73	4.72	4.66	4.72	4.38	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	8	4	4.23	896/1503	4.37	4.31	4.24	4.29	4.23	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	3	8	4.46	693/1506	4.43	4.40	4.26	4.33	4.46	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	5	1	1	0	4	2	3.63	875/1311	3.76	3.78	3.85	3.96	3.63	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	1	0	4	4	4.22	718/1490	4.37	4.26	4.05	4.11	4.22	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	0	1	1	7	4.67	486/1502	4.65	4.54	4.26	4.31	4.67	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	1	0	4	4	4.22	936/1489	4.53	4.43	4.29	4.36	4.22	
4. Were special techniques successful	4	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1006	4.41	4.14	4.00	3.99	5.00	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 6	Required for Majors	9
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	B 6		Graduate 0
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	C 1	General	0
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad 13
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 0901  
 Title INTERMEDIATE SPANISH I  
 Instructor: DEANGULO, SANTI  
 Enrollment: 21  
 Questionnaires: 17

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 1592  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 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	7	4	5	3.76	1367/1669	4.37	4.33	4.23	4.34	3.76	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	2	5	4	6	3.82	1295/1666	4.44	4.28	4.19	4.29	3.82	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	6	5	5	3.82	1106/1421	4.32	4.36	4.24	4.35	3.82	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	1	3	7	5	4.00	1029/1617	4.35	4.27	4.15	4.24	4.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	4	4	2	2	3	2	2.77	1488/1555	3.85	4.17	4.00	3.96	2.77	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	3	4	6	4	3.65	1205/1543	4.20	4.19	4.06	4.10	3.65	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	5	5	6	3.94	1113/1647	4.33	4.18	4.12	4.19	3.94	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	14	3	4.18	1431/1668	4.55	4.60	4.67	4.59	4.18	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	1	5	6	2	3.64	1286/1605	4.36	4.13	4.07	4.15	3.64	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	6	4	5	3.93	1248/1514	4.47	4.39	4.39	4.39	3.93	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	3	5	6	4.21	1354/1551	4.73	4.72	4.66	4.72	4.21	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	2	5	5	2	3.50	1330/1503	4.37	4.31	4.24	4.29	3.50	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	2	1	4	4	3	3.36	1357/1506	4.43	4.40	4.26	4.33	3.36	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	7	2	2	0	2	1	2.71	1203/1311	3.76	3.78	3.85	3.96	2.71	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	1	1	3	4	4	3.69	1073/1490	4.37	4.26	4.05	4.11	3.69	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	1	2	2	8	4.31	846/1502	4.65	4.54	4.26	4.31	4.31	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	0	6	3	4	3.85	1150/1489	4.53	4.43	4.29	4.36	3.85	
4. Were special techniques successful	5	1	0	0	2	4	5	4.27	372/1006	4.41	4.14	4.00	3.99	4.27	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 226	****	****	4.20	4.42	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 233	****	****	4.19	4.36	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 225	****	****	4.50	4.74	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 206	****	****	4.15	4.59	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	16	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 58	****	4.33	4.22	4.20	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	16	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 52	****	4.00	4.06	5.00	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	16	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 55	****	4.42	4.34	4.67	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors		
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A 4	Required for Majors 12	Graduate 0	Major 0
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B 1			
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	2	C 11	General 1	Under-grad 17	Non-major 17
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	2	D 0			
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F 0	Electives 0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	
				P 0			
				I 0	Other 4		
				? 0			

Course Section: SPAN 201 1001  
 Title INTERMEDIATE SPANISH I  
 Instructor: RICHARDS, F  
 Enrollment: 17  
 Questionnaires: 13

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 1593  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 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	3	4	3	2	1	2.54	1644/1669	4.37	4.33	4.23	4.34	2.54	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	3	4	5	0	1	2.38	1643/1666	4.44	4.28	4.19	4.29	2.38	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	3	4	3	2	1	2.54	1405/1421	4.32	4.36	4.24	4.35	2.54	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	3	5	4	1	0	2.23	1607/1617	4.35	4.27	4.15	4.24	2.23	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	3	3	3	4	0	0	2.10	1544/1555	3.85	4.17	4.00	3.96	2.10	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	3	4	3	3	0	2.46	1518/1543	4.20	4.19	4.06	4.10	2.46	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	6	2	3	0	2	2.23	1609/1647	4.33	4.18	4.12	4.19	2.23	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	12	4.92	570/1668	4.55	4.60	4.67	4.59	4.92	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	4	3	3	0	0	1.90	1595/1605	4.36	4.13	4.07	4.15	1.90	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	3	4	6	0	0	2.23	1496/1514	4.47	4.39	4.39	4.39	2.23	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	1	3	3	5	1	3.15	1520/1551	4.73	4.72	4.66	4.72	3.15	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	5	4	2	1	0	1.92	1497/1503	4.37	4.31	4.24	4.29	1.92	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	3	3	4	2	0	2.42	1468/1506	4.43	4.40	4.26	4.33	2.42	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	4	2	2	3	1	0	2.38	1248/1311	3.76	3.78	3.85	3.96	2.38	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	3	2	2	3	0	2.50	1431/1490	4.37	4.26	4.05	4.11	2.50	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	3	1	3	2	2	2.91	1424/1502	4.65	4.54	4.26	4.31	2.91	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	2	3	3	1	2	2.82	1433/1489	4.53	4.43	4.29	4.36	2.82	
4. Were special techniques successful	2	3	1	1	3	1	2	3.25	873/1006	4.41	4.14	4.00	3.99	3.25	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	12	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 226	****	****	4.20	4.42	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	12	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 233	****	****	4.19	4.36	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	12	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 225	****	****	4.50	4.74	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	7	Required for Majors	9	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	2						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	2	C	2	General	0	Under-grad	13	Non-major	13
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	0	D	1						
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	2				
				?	0						

Course Section: SPAN 201 1101  
 Title INTERMEDIATE SPANISH I  
 Instructor: COLOMBO, LAURA  
 Enrollment: 16  
 Questionnaires: 13

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 1594  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 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	5	8	4.62	463/1669	4.37	4.33	4.23	4.34	4.62	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	10	4.77	231/1666	4.44	4.28	4.19	4.29	4.77	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	2	1	5	4	3.69	1155/1421	4.32	4.36	4.24	4.35	3.69	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	4	4	5	4.08	987/1617	4.35	4.27	4.15	4.24	4.08	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	2	1	2	6	0	3.09	1414/1555	3.85	4.17	4.00	3.96	3.09	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	4	3	5	3.92	994/1543	4.20	4.19	4.06	4.10	3.92	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	0	0	3	9	4.46	549/1647	4.33	4.18	4.12	4.19	4.46	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	10	2	4.17	1438/1668	4.55	4.60	4.67	4.59	4.17	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	0	4	7	4.64	268/1605	4.36	4.13	4.07	4.15	4.64	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	189/1514	4.47	4.39	4.39	4.39	4.90	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1551	4.73	4.72	4.66	4.72	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	0	3	7	4.70	347/1503	4.37	4.31	4.24	4.29	4.70	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	1	3	6	4.50	642/1506	4.43	4.40	4.26	4.33	4.50	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	1	0	1	2	3	3	3.89	712/1311	3.76	3.78	3.85	3.96	3.89	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	1	2	4	4.43	535/1490	4.37	4.26	4.05	4.11	4.43	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	0	2	0	5	4.43	729/1502	4.65	4.54	4.26	4.31	4.43	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	478/1489	4.53	4.43	4.29	4.36	4.71	
4. Were special techniques successful	6	1	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	178/1006	4.41	4.14	4.00	3.99	4.67	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	12	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 226	****	****	4.20	4.42	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	12	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 233	****	****	4.19	4.36	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	12	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 225	****	****	4.50	4.74	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	12	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 223	****	****	4.35	4.71	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	12	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 206	****	****	4.15	4.59	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	12	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 112	****	4.00	4.38	4.59	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	12	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 97	****	3.00	4.36	4.60	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 92	****	3.50	4.22	4.50	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 105	****	4.00	4.20	4.63	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	12	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 98	****	4.00	3.95	4.20	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 58	****	4.33	4.22	4.20	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	12	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 52	****	4.00	4.06	5.00	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	12	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 39	****	5.00	4.39	5.00	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 40	****	4.00	3.97	5.00	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	12	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 30	****	5.00	4.33	5.00	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 55	****	4.42	4.34	4.67	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 42	****	****	4.31	5.00	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	12	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 46	****	4.33	4.45	5.00	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	12	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 33	****	****	4.25	5.00	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	12	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 29	****	5.00	4.34	5.00	****	

Course Section: SPAN 201 1101  
 Title INTERMEDIATE SPANISH I  
 Instructor: COLOMBO, LAURA  
 Enrollment: 16  
 Questionnaires: 13

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 1594  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 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	3	Required for Majors	9	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	8						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	1	C	1	General	1	Under-grad	13	Non-major	13
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	4	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	3				
				?	0						

Course Section: SPAN 201 1201  
 Title INTERMEDIATE SPANISH I  
 Instructor: RAMIREZ, W  
 Enrollment: 19  
 Questionnaires: 18

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 1595  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 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	4	5	8	4.11	1090/1669	4.37	4.33	4.23	4.34	4.11	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	9	6	4.11	1028/1666	4.44	4.28	4.19	4.29	4.11	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	9	7	4.22	839/1421	4.32	4.36	4.24	4.35	4.22	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	3	5	9	4.22	831/1617	4.35	4.27	4.15	4.24	4.22	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	1	0	3	3	9	4.19	622/1555	3.85	4.17	4.00	3.96	4.19	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	1	4	5	7	3.89	1035/1543	4.20	4.19	4.06	4.10	3.89	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	2	6	2	8	3.89	1178/1647	4.33	4.18	4.12	4.19	3.89	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	17	4.94	428/1668	4.55	4.60	4.67	4.59	4.94	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	0	10	4	4.29	654/1605	4.36	4.13	4.07	4.15	4.29	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	4	14	4.78	408/1514	4.47	4.39	4.39	4.39	4.78	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	2	16	4.89	567/1551	4.73	4.72	4.66	4.72	4.89	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	1	4	6	7	4.06	1040/1503	4.37	4.31	4.24	4.29	4.06	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	2	1	3	12	4.39	789/1506	4.43	4.40	4.26	4.33	4.39	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	6	2	1	4	3	2	3.17	1084/1311	3.76	3.78	3.85	3.96	3.17	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	0	2	5	8	4.19	749/1490	4.37	4.26	4.05	4.11	4.19	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	0	2	14	4.88	266/1502	4.65	4.54	4.26	4.31	4.88	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	1	0	0	3	12	4.56	631/1489	4.53	4.43	4.29	4.36	4.56	
4. Were special techniques successful	2	0	0	1	1	5	9	4.38	322/1006	4.41	4.14	4.00	3.99	4.38	
Field Work															
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	17	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 30	****	5.00	4.33	5.00	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	A 4	Required for Majors	10
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	B 3		Graduate 0
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	C 7	General	18
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	D 0		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	7
			? 1		



Course Section: SPAN 201 1301  
 Title INTERMEDIATE SPANISH I  
 Instructor: OSKOZ, ANA  
 Enrollment: 12  
 Questionnaires: 9

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 1596  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 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	1	2	0	5	4.13	1077/1669	4.37	4.33	4.23	4.34	4.13	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	3	4	4.38	727/1666	4.44	4.28	4.19	4.29	4.38	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	1	0	5	2	4.00	969/1421	4.32	4.36	4.24	4.35	4.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	1	2	1	4	4.00	1029/1617	4.35	4.27	4.15	4.24	4.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	1	1	0	0	2	4	4.14	665/1555	3.85	4.17	4.00	3.96	4.14	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	1	2	4	4.43	490/1543	4.20	4.19	4.06	4.10	4.43	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	1	1	0	5	4.29	828/1647	4.33	4.18	4.12	4.19	4.29	
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1668	4.55	4.60	4.67	4.59	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	1	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/1605	4.36	4.13	4.07	4.15	****	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	308/1514	4.47	4.39	4.39	4.39	4.83	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1551	4.73	4.72	4.66	4.72	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	0	3	3	4.50	556/1503	4.37	4.31	4.24	4.29	4.50	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	1	2	3	4.33	838/1506	4.43	4.40	4.26	4.33	4.33	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	1	0	0	2	0	2	4.00	587/1311	3.76	3.78	3.85	3.96	4.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	558/1490	4.37	4.26	4.05	4.11	4.40	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	336/1502	4.65	4.54	4.26	4.31	4.80	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	1	0	1	3	4.20	953/1489	4.53	4.43	4.29	4.36	4.20	
4. Were special techniques successful	4	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	307/1006	4.41	4.14	4.00	3.99	4.40	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors				
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 1	Required for Majors	5	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	B 3						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	C 3	General	0	Under-grad	9	Non-major	9
84-150	2	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	4				
			? 0						

Course Section: SPAN 201 1401  
 Title INTERMEDIATE SPANISH I  
 Instructor: COLOMBO, LAURA  
 Enrollment: 20  
 Questionnaires: 18

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 1597  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 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	4	5	9	4.28	889/1669	4.37	4.33	4.23	4.34	4.28	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	8	8	4.33	777/1666	4.44	4.28	4.19	4.29	4.33	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	2	3	2	11	4.22	839/1421	4.32	4.36	4.24	4.35	4.22	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	2	1	4	11	4.33	717/1617	4.35	4.27	4.15	4.24	4.33	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	3	6	3	5	3.44	1272/1555	3.85	4.17	4.00	3.96	3.44	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	1	1	4	3	8	3.94	969/1543	4.20	4.19	4.06	4.10	3.94	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	4	2	11	4.28	839/1647	4.33	4.18	4.12	4.19	4.28	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	1	0	17	0	3.89	1596/1668	4.55	4.60	4.67	4.59	3.89	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	7	0	0	0	2	4	5	4.27	666/1605	4.36	4.13	4.07	4.15	4.27	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	1	1	4	12	4.50	799/1514	4.47	4.39	4.39	4.39	4.50	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	2	2	14	4.67	1028/1551	4.73	4.72	4.66	4.72	4.67	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	2	4	10	4.50	556/1503	4.37	4.31	4.24	4.29	4.50	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	1	1	4	10	4.44	731/1506	4.43	4.40	4.26	4.33	4.44	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	2	0	2	2	3	6	4.00	587/1311	3.76	3.78	3.85	3.96	4.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	2	3	7	4.42	546/1490	4.37	4.26	4.05	4.11	4.42	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	0	3	0	9	4.50	632/1502	4.65	4.54	4.26	4.31	4.50	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	0	0	3	2	7	4.33	865/1489	4.53	4.43	4.29	4.36	4.33	
4. Were special techniques successful	6	0	0	3	0	3	6	4.00	479/1006	4.41	4.14	4.00	3.99	4.00	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	A 7	Required for Majors	14
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	B 5		Graduate 0
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	C 3	General	2
84-150	4	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	0
			? 0		

Course Section: SPAN 201 1501  
 Title INTERMEDIATE SPANISH I  
 Instructor: RAMIREZ, W  
 Enrollment: 16  
 Questionnaires: 12

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 1598  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 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	10	4.83	183/1669	4.37	4.33	4.23	4.34	4.83	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	2	9	4.67	359/1666	4.44	4.28	4.19	4.29	4.67	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	2	9	4.67	392/1421	4.32	4.36	4.24	4.35	4.67	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	0	10	4.67	323/1617	4.35	4.27	4.15	4.24	4.67	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	2	8	4.50	340/1555	3.85	4.17	4.00	3.96	4.50	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	1	10	4.75	180/1543	4.20	4.19	4.06	4.10	4.75	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	2	0	10	4.67	302/1647	4.33	4.18	4.12	4.19	4.67	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/1668	4.55	4.60	4.67	4.59	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	1	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	127/1605	4.36	4.13	4.07	4.15	4.83	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	170/1514	4.47	4.39	4.39	4.39	4.92	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	460/1551	4.73	4.72	4.66	4.72	4.92	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	113/1503	4.37	4.31	4.24	4.29	4.92	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	3	9	4.75	353/1506	4.43	4.40	4.26	4.33	4.75	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	1	0	2	0	2	6	4.20	483/1311	3.76	3.78	3.85	3.96	4.20	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	141/1490	4.37	4.26	4.05	4.11	4.90	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1502	4.65	4.54	4.26	4.31	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1489	4.53	4.43	4.29	4.36	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	2	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	98/1006	4.41	4.14	4.00	3.99	4.90	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 226	****	****	4.20	4.42	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 233	****	****	4.19	4.36	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 225	****	****	4.50	4.74	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 223	****	****	4.35	4.71	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 206	****	****	4.15	4.59	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	10	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 112	****	4.00	4.38	4.59	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 97	****	3.00	4.36	4.60	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 92	****	3.50	4.22	4.50	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 105	****	4.00	4.20	4.63	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 98	****	4.00	3.95	4.20	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 58	****	4.33	4.22	4.20	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 52	****	4.00	4.06	5.00	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 39	****	5.00	4.39	5.00	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 40	****	4.00	3.97	5.00	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 30	****	5.00	4.33	5.00	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 55	****	4.42	4.34	4.67	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 42	****	****	4.31	5.00	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 46	****	4.33	4.45	5.00	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 33	****	****	4.25	5.00	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 29	****	5.00	4.34	5.00	****	

Course Section: SPAN 201 1501  
 Title INTERMEDIATE SPANISH I  
 Instructor: RAMIREZ, W  
 Enrollment: 16  
 Questionnaires: 12

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 1598  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 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	7	Required for Majors	5	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B	3						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	2	C	2	General	0	Under-grad	12	Non-major	11
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	7				
				?	0						

Course Section: SPAN 201H 0101  
 Title INTERM SPAN I - HONORS  
 Instructor: OSKOZ, ANA  
 Enrollment: 3  
 Questionnaires: 2

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 1599  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 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	1	0	3.50	1480/1669	3.50	4.33	4.23	4.34	3.50	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	1094/1666	4.00	4.28	4.19	4.29	4.00	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	557/1421	4.50	4.36	4.24	4.35	4.50	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	1372/1617	3.50	4.27	4.15	4.24	3.50	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	1427/1555	3.00	4.17	4.00	3.96	3.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	895/1543	4.00	4.19	4.06	4.10	4.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	1043/1647	4.00	4.18	4.12	4.19	4.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1668	5.00	4.60	4.67	4.59	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	918/1605	4.00	4.13	4.07	4.15	4.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	1199/1514	4.00	4.39	4.39	4.39	4.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1551	5.00	4.72	4.66	4.72	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	1066/1503	4.00	4.31	4.24	4.29	4.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	1319/1506	3.50	4.40	4.26	4.33	3.50	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	1269/1311	2.00	3.78	3.85	3.96	2.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	1328/1490	3.00	4.26	4.05	4.11	3.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1502	5.00	4.54	4.26	4.31	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1038/1489	4.00	4.43	4.29	4.36	4.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	479/1006	4.00	4.14	4.00	3.99	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	1
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	B 0		Graduate
56-83	0	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	0
			P 0		
			I 0		
			? 0		
					2
					0
					2
					0
					0
					1
					0

#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant

Course Section: SPAN 202 0101  
 Title INTERMEDIATE SPANISH I  
 Instructor: VAL, ADRIANA  
 Enrollment: 18  
 Questionnaires: 14

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 1600  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 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	6	8	4.57	511/1669	4.57	4.33	4.23	4.34	4.57	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	5	7	4.46	605/1666	4.37	4.28	4.19	4.29	4.46	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	11	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/1421	4.86	4.36	4.24	4.35	****	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	12	4.86	137/1617	4.89	4.27	4.15	4.24	4.86	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	0	4	9	4.50	340/1555	4.50	4.17	4.00	3.96	4.50	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	13	4.93	83/1543	4.75	4.19	4.06	4.10	4.93	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	8	6	4.43	617/1647	4.39	4.18	4.12	4.19	4.43	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	13	4.93	570/1668	4.96	4.60	4.67	4.59	4.93	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	0	7	5	4.42	486/1605	4.36	4.13	4.07	4.15	4.42	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	1	0	1	1	11	4.50	799/1514	4.50	4.39	4.39	4.39	4.50	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	13	4.93	409/1551	4.96	4.72	4.66	4.72	4.93	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	5	9	4.64	412/1503	4.46	4.31	4.24	4.29	4.64	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	12	4.86	225/1506	4.61	4.40	4.26	4.33	4.86	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	1	2	11	4.71	163/1311	4.29	3.78	3.85	3.96	4.71	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	3	9	4.75	261/1490	4.81	4.26	4.05	4.11	4.75	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	1	1	10	4.75	393/1502	4.65	4.54	4.26	4.31	4.75	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	252/1489	4.96	4.43	4.29	4.36	4.92	
4. Were special techniques successful	2	1	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	98/1006	4.70	4.14	4.00	3.99	4.91	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	3	0.00-0.99 0	A 5	Required for Majors 6	Graduate 2 Major 1
28-55	0	1.00-1.99 0	B 5		
56-83	1	2.00-2.99 3	C 3	General 4	Under-grad 12 Non-major 13
84-150	2	3.00-3.49 1	D 0		
Grad.	2	3.50-4.00 2	F 0	Electives 1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 3	
			? 0		

Course Section: SPAN 202 0201  
 Title INTERMEDIATE SPANISH I  
 Instructor: MESSICK, ROSALI  
 Enrollment: 16  
 Questionnaires: 14

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 1601  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 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	2	10	4.57	511/1669	4.57	4.33	4.23	4.34	4.57	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	4	7	4.29	841/1666	4.37	4.28	4.19	4.29	4.29	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	12	4.86	184/1421	4.86	4.36	4.24	4.35	4.86	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	1	12	4.92	91/1617	4.89	4.27	4.15	4.24	4.92	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	3	9	4.50	340/1555	4.50	4.17	4.00	3.96	4.50	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	0	3	10	4.57	325/1543	4.75	4.19	4.06	4.10	4.57	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	1	4	8	4.36	728/1647	4.39	4.18	4.12	4.19	4.36	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	14	5.00	1/1668	4.96	4.60	4.67	4.59	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	1	0	0	1	5	4	4.30	631/1605	4.36	4.13	4.07	4.15	4.30	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	5	8	4.50	799/1514	4.50	4.39	4.39	4.39	4.50	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	14	5.00	1/1551	4.96	4.72	4.66	4.72	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	1	1	5	7	4.29	852/1503	4.46	4.31	4.24	4.29	4.29	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	5	7	4.36	819/1506	4.61	4.40	4.26	4.33	4.36	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	2	3	4	5	3.86	731/1311	4.29	3.78	3.85	3.96	3.86	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	162/1490	4.81	4.26	4.05	4.11	4.88	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	1	0	1	7	4.56	586/1502	4.65	4.54	4.26	4.31	4.56	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1489	4.96	4.43	4.29	4.36	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	6	0	0	0	0	4	4	4.50	235/1006	4.70	4.14	4.00	3.99	4.50	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors				
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	A 4	Required for Majors	5	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	B 4						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	C 3	General	3	Under-grad	14	Non-major	13
84-150	1	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				
			? 1						

Course Section: SPAN 202H 0201  
 Title INTERMED SPAN II HONR  
 Instructor: MESSICK, ROSALI  
 Enrollment: 3  
 Questionnaires: 3

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 1602  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 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	1	4.33	816/1669	4.33	4.33	4.23	4.34	4.33	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	359/1666	4.67	4.28	4.19	4.29	4.67	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1421	5.00	4.36	4.24	4.35	5.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	323/1617	4.67	4.27	4.15	4.24	4.67	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	773/1555	4.00	4.17	4.00	3.96	4.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	250/1543	4.67	4.19	4.06	4.10	4.67	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	1043/1647	4.00	4.18	4.12	4.19	4.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1668	5.00	4.60	4.67	4.59	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	591/1605	4.33	4.13	4.07	4.15	4.33	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	1022/1514	4.33	4.39	4.39	4.39	4.33	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1551	5.00	4.72	4.66	4.72	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	386/1503	4.67	4.31	4.24	4.29	4.67	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	471/1506	4.67	4.40	4.26	4.33	4.67	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	587/1311	4.00	3.78	3.85	3.96	4.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	849/1490	4.00	4.26	4.05	4.11	4.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1502	5.00	4.54	4.26	4.31	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1489	5.00	4.43	4.29	4.36	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	2	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	479/1006	4.00	4.14	4.00	3.99	4.00	

Frequency Distribution

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



Course Section: SPAN 301 0101  
 Title ADVANCED SPANISH I  
 Instructor: AREVALO GUERRERO  
 Enrollment: 17  
 Questionnaires: 16

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 1603  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 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	6	10	4.63	448/1669	4.51	4.33	4.23	4.28	4.63	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	4	5	7	4.19	966/1666	4.28	4.28	4.19	4.20	4.19	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	6	7	4.25	814/1421	4.41	4.36	4.24	4.25	4.25	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	6	9	4.50	496/1617	4.33	4.27	4.15	4.22	4.50	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	2	0	6	7	4.20	611/1555	4.12	4.17	4.00	4.03	4.20	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	3	13	4.81	138/1543	4.71	4.19	4.06	4.14	4.81	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	7	1	7	3.88	1187/1647	3.94	4.18	4.12	4.14	3.88	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	5	11	4.69	1049/1668	4.47	4.60	4.67	4.68	4.69	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	1	6	8	4.47	423/1605	4.39	4.13	4.07	4.09	4.47	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	2	3	11	4.56	727/1514	4.35	4.39	4.39	4.46	4.56	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	1	14	4.81	760/1551	4.78	4.72	4.66	4.70	4.81	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	6	9	4.50	556/1503	4.41	4.31	4.24	4.28	4.50	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	4	11	4.63	521/1506	4.45	4.40	4.26	4.30	4.63	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	7	1	1	3	1	3	3.44	972/1311	3.50	3.78	3.85	3.97	3.44	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	2	3	7	4.42	546/1490	4.53	4.26	4.05	4.11	4.42	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	1	1	3	7	4.33	818/1502	4.58	4.54	4.26	4.28	4.33	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	0	1	4	7	4.50	684/1489	4.71	4.43	4.29	4.35	4.50	
4. Were special techniques successful	4	3	0	1	0	5	3	4.11	453/1006	4.66	4.14	4.00	4.10	4.11	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	15	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 226	****	****	4.20	4.17	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	15	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 233	****	****	4.19	4.13	****	

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
28-55	2	1.00-1.99 0	B 4		Graduate 0
56-83	4	2.00-2.99 0	C 1	General	6
84-150	2	3.00-3.49 1	D 0		Under-grad 16
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 11	F 0	Electives	2
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	6
			? 1		

Course Section: SPAN 301 0201  
 Title ADVANCED SPANISH I  
 Instructor: SLOANE, ROBERT  
 Enrollment: 14  
 Questionnaires: 9

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 1604  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 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	3	5	4.44	676/1669	4.51	4.33	4.23	4.28	4.44	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	4	4	4.33	777/1666	4.28	4.28	4.19	4.20	4.33	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	2	6	4.56	511/1421	4.41	4.36	4.24	4.25	4.56	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	3	4	4.11	958/1617	4.33	4.27	4.15	4.22	4.11	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	3	1	5	4.22	584/1555	4.12	4.17	4.00	4.03	4.22	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	2	6	4.56	344/1543	4.71	4.19	4.06	4.14	4.56	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	0	0	2	3	3	4.13	977/1647	3.94	4.18	4.12	4.14	4.13	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	9	0	4.00	1530/1668	4.47	4.60	4.67	4.68	4.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	1	0	0	2	1	4	4.29	654/1605	4.39	4.13	4.07	4.09	4.29	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	2	4	3	4.11	1166/1514	4.35	4.39	4.39	4.46	4.11	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	3	6	4.67	1028/1551	4.78	4.72	4.66	4.70	4.67	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	4	4	4.33	800/1503	4.41	4.31	4.24	4.28	4.33	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	4	4	4.33	838/1506	4.45	4.40	4.26	4.30	4.33	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	3	1	0	3	1	1	3.17	1084/1311	3.50	3.78	3.85	3.97	3.17	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	298/1490	4.53	4.26	4.05	4.11	4.71	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	286/1502	4.58	4.54	4.26	4.28	4.86	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1489	4.71	4.43	4.29	4.35	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	2	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	110/1006	4.66	4.14	4.00	4.10	4.86	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 3	Required for Majors	3
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	B 2		Graduate 0
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	C 0	General	9
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	D 0		Non-major 8
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
			? 3		

Course Section: SPAN 301 0301  
 Title ADVANCED SPANISH I  
 Instructor: AREVALO GUERRERO  
 Enrollment: 16  
 Questionnaires: 13

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 1605  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 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	0	3	9	4.46	647/1669	4.51	4.33	4.23	4.28	4.46	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	3	7	4.31	814/1666	4.28	4.28	4.19	4.20	4.31	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	2	3	7	4.42	670/1421	4.41	4.36	4.24	4.25	4.42	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	4	7	4.38	662/1617	4.33	4.27	4.15	4.22	4.38	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	3	5	4	3.92	905/1555	4.12	4.17	4.00	4.03	3.92	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	3	10	4.77	172/1543	4.71	4.19	4.06	4.14	4.77	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	2	3	2	5	3.83	1223/1647	3.94	4.18	4.12	4.14	3.83	
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	3	8	4.73	1004/1668	4.47	4.60	4.67	4.68	4.73	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	1	5	6	4.42	486/1605	4.39	4.13	4.07	4.09	4.42	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	2	4	7	4.38	974/1514	4.35	4.39	4.39	4.46	4.38	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	2	11	4.85	677/1551	4.78	4.72	4.66	4.70	4.85	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	2	4	7	4.38	742/1503	4.41	4.31	4.24	4.28	4.38	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	6	6	4.38	789/1506	4.45	4.40	4.26	4.30	4.38	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	3	0	0	4	2	3	3.89	712/1311	3.50	3.78	3.85	3.97	3.89	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	1	0	3	7	4.45	501/1490	4.53	4.26	4.05	4.11	4.45	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	1	0	0	1	9	4.55	595/1502	4.58	4.54	4.26	4.28	4.55	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	1	2	8	4.64	564/1489	4.71	4.43	4.29	4.35	4.64	
4. Were special techniques successful	2	1	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1006	4.66	4.14	4.00	4.10	5.00	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 112	****	4.00	4.38	4.53	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 97	****	3.00	4.36	4.12	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	10	1	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 92	****	3.50	4.22	4.47	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 105	****	4.00	4.20	4.45	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	12	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 98	****	4.00	3.95	4.15	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	6	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	3
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	2						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	13	Non-major	10
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	0	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	8				
				?	0						

Course Section: SPAN 301H 0201  
 Title  
 Instructor: SLOANE, ROBERT  
 Enrollment: 1  
 Questionnaires: 1

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 1606  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 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	1/1669	5.00	4.33	4.23	4.28	5.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1666	5.00	4.28	4.19	4.20	5.00	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1421	5.00	4.36	4.24	4.25	5.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1617	5.00	4.27	4.15	4.22	5.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1555	5.00	4.17	4.00	4.03	5.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1543	5.00	4.19	4.06	4.14	5.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1647	5.00	4.18	4.12	4.14	5.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1530/1668	4.00	4.60	4.67	4.68	4.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1514	5.00	4.39	4.39	4.46	5.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1551	5.00	4.72	4.66	4.70	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1503	5.00	4.31	4.24	4.28	5.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1506	5.00	4.40	4.26	4.30	5.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1490	5.00	4.26	4.05	4.11	5.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1502	5.00	4.54	4.26	4.28	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1489	5.00	4.43	4.29	4.35	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1006	5.00	4.14	4.00	4.10	5.00	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	1	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	0						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	1	Non-major	1
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	1	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	0				
				?	0						

Course Section: SPAN 302 0101  
 Title ADVANCED SPANISH II  
 Instructor: MIRANDA-ALDACO,  
 Enrollment: 13  
 Questionnaires: 7

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 1607  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 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	3	3	4.29	876/1669	4.31	4.33	4.23	4.28	4.29	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	3	3	4.29	841/1666	4.25	4.28	4.19	4.20	4.29	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	3	2	4.00	969/1421	4.00	4.36	4.24	4.25	4.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	424/1617	4.29	4.27	4.15	4.22	4.57	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	0	1	5	4.43	418/1555	4.49	4.17	4.00	4.03	4.43	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	210/1543	4.52	4.19	4.06	4.14	4.71	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	401/1647	4.12	4.18	4.12	4.14	4.57	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	4	2	4.33	1329/1668	4.17	4.60	4.67	4.68	4.33	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	1	1	4	1	3.71	1241/1605	3.69	4.13	4.07	4.09	3.71	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	360/1514	4.34	4.39	4.39	4.46	4.80	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	788/1551	4.59	4.72	4.66	4.70	4.80	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	277/1503	4.31	4.31	4.24	4.28	4.75	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	909/1506	4.44	4.40	4.26	4.30	4.25	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	1	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	389/1311	4.04	3.78	3.85	3.97	4.33	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	214/1490	4.60	4.26	4.05	4.11	4.80	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1502	4.40	4.54	4.26	4.28	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	596/1489	4.30	4.43	4.29	4.35	4.60	
4. Were special techniques successful	3	1	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	178/1006	4.63	4.14	4.00	4.10	4.67	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	1	0.00-0.99 0	A 5	Required for Majors 2	Graduate 0 Major 6
28-55	0	1.00-1.99 0	B 2		
56-83	0	2.00-2.99 2	C 0	General 0	Under-grad 7 Non-major 1
84-150	2	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 5	
			? 0		

Course Section: SPAN 302 0201  
 Title ADVANCED SPANISH II  
 Instructor: BELL, ALAN S  
 Enrollment: 13  
 Questionnaires: 9

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 1608  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 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	0	6	4.33	816/1669	4.31	4.33	4.23	4.28	4.33	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	2	5	4.22	922/1666	4.25	4.28	4.19	4.20	4.22	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	2	0	3	4	4.00	969/1421	4.00	4.36	4.24	4.25	4.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	2	4	4.00	1029/1617	4.29	4.27	4.15	4.22	4.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	2	6	4.56	301/1555	4.49	4.17	4.00	4.03	4.56	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	2	5	4.33	580/1543	4.52	4.19	4.06	4.14	4.33	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	2	2	2	3	3.67	1321/1647	4.12	4.18	4.12	4.14	3.67	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	9	0	4.00	1530/1668	4.17	4.60	4.67	4.68	4.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	4	4	1	3.67	1274/1605	3.69	4.13	4.07	4.09	3.67	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	4	1	3	3.88	1281/1514	4.34	4.39	4.39	4.46	3.88	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	1	3	4	4.38	1284/1551	4.59	4.72	4.66	4.70	4.38	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	1	3	0	4	3.88	1180/1503	4.31	4.31	4.24	4.28	3.88	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	3	5	4.63	521/1506	4.44	4.40	4.26	4.30	4.63	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	1	1	1	1	4	3.75	791/1311	4.04	3.78	3.85	3.97	3.75	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	558/1490	4.60	4.26	4.05	4.11	4.40	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	2	0	0	3	3.80	1179/1502	4.40	4.54	4.26	4.28	3.80	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	1	1	0	3	4.00	1038/1489	4.30	4.43	4.29	4.35	4.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	4	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	199/1006	4.63	4.14	4.00	4.10	4.60	

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	2	1.00-1.99	B 2		Graduate 1
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	C 2	General	0
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad 8
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	3
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	4
			? 0		

Course Section: SPAN 308 0101  
 Title LATINOAMERICA Y SUS CU  
 Instructor: POGGIO, SARA  
 Enrollment: 23  
 Questionnaires: 20

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 1609  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 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	2	3	2	5	6	3.56	1458/1669	3.56	4.33	4.23	4.28	3.56	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	1	1	8	6	3	3.47	1479/1666	3.47	4.28	4.19	4.20	3.47	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	0	0	0	8	4	6	3.89	1072/1421	3.89	4.36	4.24	4.25	3.89	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	0	0	1	3	10	4	3.94	1112/1617	3.94	4.27	4.15	4.22	3.94	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	0	3	7	7	4.06	741/1555	4.06	4.17	4.00	4.03	4.06	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	3	6	6	3	3.37	1314/1543	3.37	4.19	4.06	4.14	3.37	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	1	1	2	5	5	4	3.53	1385/1647	3.53	4.18	4.12	4.14	3.53	
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	2	7	9	4.39	1289/1668	4.39	4.60	4.67	4.68	4.39	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	2	2	5	9	0	3.17	1480/1605	3.17	4.13	4.07	4.09	3.17	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	3	1	5	4	5	3.39	1410/1514	3.39	4.39	4.39	4.46	3.39	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	3	6	9	4.33	1304/1551	4.33	4.72	4.66	4.70	4.33	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	2	1	5	5	5	3.56	1315/1503	3.56	4.31	4.24	4.28	3.56	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	2	3	5	4	4	3.28	1372/1506	3.28	4.40	4.26	4.30	3.28	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	5	1	2	4	5	1	3.23	1063/1311	3.23	3.78	3.85	3.97	3.23	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	1	0	1	6	4	4.00	849/1490	4.00	4.26	4.05	4.11	4.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	0	1	1	4	6	4.25	880/1502	4.25	4.54	4.26	4.28	4.25	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	0	1	2	3	6	4.17	973/1489	4.17	4.43	4.29	4.35	4.17	
4. Were special techniques successful	8	4	0	0	0	6	2	4.25	381/1006	4.25	4.14	4.00	4.10	4.25	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	19	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 226	****	****	4.20	4.17	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 16	Required for Majors	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	B 0		0
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	C 0	General	0
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	D 0		20
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		
			I 0		
			? 1		
				Other	18

#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant

Course Section: SPAN 311 0101  
 Title INTRO TO SPANISH LIT  
 Instructor: SINNIGEN, JOHN  
 Enrollment: 15  
 Questionnaires: 10

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 1610  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 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	3	6	4.50	590/1669	4.50	4.33	4.23	4.28	4.50	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	3	5	4.30	814/1666	4.30	4.28	4.19	4.20	4.30	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	151/1421	4.90	4.36	4.24	4.25	4.90	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	2	7	4.60	394/1617	4.60	4.27	4.15	4.22	4.60	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	100/1555	4.90	4.17	4.00	4.03	4.90	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	0	2	7	4.40	516/1543	4.40	4.19	4.06	4.14	4.40	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	2	2	6	4.40	651/1647	4.40	4.18	4.12	4.14	4.40	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1668	5.00	4.60	4.67	4.68	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	2	3	4	4.22	725/1605	4.22	4.13	4.07	4.09	4.22	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	3	7	4.70	537/1514	4.70	4.39	4.39	4.46	4.70	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1551	5.00	4.72	4.66	4.70	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	2	2	6	4.40	719/1503	4.40	4.31	4.24	4.28	4.40	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	3	2	5	4.20	958/1506	4.20	4.40	4.26	4.30	4.20	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	1	1	4	4	4.10	538/1311	4.10	3.78	3.85	3.97	4.10	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	1	2	5	4.50	445/1490	4.50	4.26	4.05	4.11	4.50	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	1	2	5	4.50	632/1502	4.50	4.54	4.26	4.28	4.50	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	1	2	5	4.50	684/1489	4.50	4.43	4.29	4.35	4.50	
4. Were special techniques successful	2	0	0	0	0	4	4	4.50	235/1006	4.50	4.14	4.00	4.10	4.50	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 55	****	4.42	4.34	4.03	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 42	****	****	4.31	4.13	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 46	****	4.33	4.45	4.13	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 6	Required for Majors	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	B 3		
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	C 1	General	1
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	D 0	Under-grad	9
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00	F 0		
			P 0		
			I 0		
			? 0		
				Electives	1
				Other	7
				#### - 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: 12  
 Questionnaires: 9

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 1611  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 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	0	7	4.56	534/1669	4.56	4.33	4.23	4.28	4.56	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	3	3	4.00	1094/1666	4.00	4.28	4.19	4.20	4.00	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	1	4	3	4.25	814/1421	4.25	4.36	4.24	4.25	4.25	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	1	2	5	4.50	496/1617	4.50	4.27	4.15	4.22	4.50	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	1	7	4.67	225/1555	4.67	4.17	4.00	4.03	4.67	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	3	1	5	4.22	690/1543	4.22	4.19	4.06	4.14	4.22	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	1	0	0	5	2	3.88	1187/1647	3.88	4.18	4.12	4.14	3.88	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	8	1	4.11	1470/1668	4.11	4.60	4.67	4.68	4.11	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	2	0	2	0	3	3.29	1446/1605	3.29	4.13	4.07	4.09	3.29	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	2	1	5	4.38	984/1514	4.38	4.39	4.39	4.46	4.38	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	594/1551	4.88	4.72	4.66	4.70	4.88	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	1	2	5	4.50	556/1503	4.50	4.31	4.24	4.28	4.50	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	2	1	5	4.38	799/1506	4.38	4.40	4.26	4.30	4.38	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	2	0	0	2	2	2	4.00	587/1311	4.00	3.78	3.85	3.97	4.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	192/1490	4.83	4.26	4.05	4.11	4.83	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	486/1502	4.67	4.54	4.26	4.28	4.67	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	684/1489	4.50	4.43	4.29	4.35	4.50	
4. Were special techniques successful	3	0	0	0	0	3	3	4.50	235/1006	4.50	4.14	4.00	4.10	4.50	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course Section: SPAN 401 0101  
 Title: STUDIES IN SPANISH LAN  
 Instructor: OSKOZ, ANA  
 Enrollment: 15  
 Questionnaires: 12

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 1612  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 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	4	5	2	3.67	1409/1669	3.67	4.33	4.23	4.39	3.67	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	0	0	4	5	1	3.70	1358/1666	3.70	4.28	4.19	4.22	3.70	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	6	0	1	2	3	0	3.33	1292/1421	3.33	4.36	4.24	4.38	3.33	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	2	5	4	4.18	875/1617	4.18	4.27	4.15	4.22	4.18	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	2	0	5	2	2	3.18	1389/1555	3.18	4.17	4.00	4.08	3.18	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	2	5	3	3.91	1019/1543	3.91	4.19	4.06	4.18	3.91	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	1	1	2	7	4.36	713/1647	4.36	4.18	4.12	4.14	4.36	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	8	4	4.33	1329/1668	4.33	4.60	4.67	4.70	4.33	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	1	5	3	4.22	725/1605	4.22	4.13	4.07	4.16	4.22	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	1	0	2	4	3	3.80	1307/1514	3.80	4.39	4.39	4.45	3.80	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	2	2	7	4.45	1231/1551	4.45	4.72	4.66	4.73	4.45	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	3	5	3	4.00	1066/1503	4.00	4.31	4.24	4.27	4.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	2	6	2	3.82	1219/1506	3.82	4.40	4.26	4.29	3.82	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	4	0	2	2	1	2	3.43	983/1311	3.43	3.78	3.85	3.88	3.43	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	2	4	5	4.27	675/1490	4.27	4.26	4.05	4.26	4.27	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	1	1	1	8	4.45	693/1502	4.45	4.54	4.26	4.46	4.45	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	2	0	1	8	4.36	837/1489	4.36	4.43	4.29	4.52	4.36	
4. Were special techniques successful	1	2	0	0	1	6	2	4.11	453/1006	4.11	4.14	4.00	4.21	4.11	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 4	Required for Majors	1
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	B 6		2
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	C 0	General	10
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	D 0		5
Grad.	2	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	1
			P 0		
			I 0		
			? 1	Other	7

#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant

Course Section: SPAN 472 0101  
 Title TOPICS IN LATN AMER CI  
 Instructor: POGGIO, SARA  
 Enrollment: 14  
 Questionnaires: 12

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 1613  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 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	6	4	4.08	1117/1669	4.08	4.33	4.23	4.39	4.08	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	3	4	4	3.92	1220/1666	3.92	4.28	4.19	4.22	3.92	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	5	0	2	2	2	3	4.14	901/1421	4.14	4.36	4.24	4.38	4.14	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	2	7	4.25	801/1617	4.25	4.27	4.15	4.22	4.25	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	0	6	5	4.25	558/1555	4.25	4.17	4.00	4.08	4.25	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	2	4	5	4.27	638/1543	4.27	4.19	4.06	4.18	4.27	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	1	0	1	4	2	3	3.70	1300/1647	3.70	4.18	4.12	4.14	3.70	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	10	1	4.09	1482/1668	4.09	4.60	4.67	4.70	4.09	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	1	0	1	4	4	0	3.33	1428/1605	3.33	4.13	4.07	4.16	3.33	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	2	0	2	3	4	3.64	1360/1514	3.64	4.39	4.39	4.45	3.64	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	2	9	4.82	760/1551	4.82	4.72	4.66	4.73	4.82	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	4	5	2	3.82	1205/1503	3.82	4.31	4.24	4.27	3.82	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	1	1	6	2	3.64	1288/1506	3.64	4.40	4.26	4.29	3.64	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	3	1	1	0	4	1	3.43	983/1311	3.43	3.78	3.85	3.88	3.43	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	2	0	4	5	4.09	812/1490	4.09	4.26	4.05	4.26	4.09	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	1	0	0	2	8	4.45	693/1502	4.45	4.54	4.26	4.46	4.45	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	1	0	1	3	6	4.18	960/1489	4.18	4.43	4.29	4.52	4.18	
4. Were special techniques successful	1	1	0	3	1	4	2	3.50	759/1006	3.50	4.14	4.00	4.21	3.50	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	A 5	Required for Majors	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	B 3		Graduate 2
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	C 0	General	10
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	D 0		Major 7
Grad.	2	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	8
			? 3		