Title ELEMENTARY SPANISH I

NOGUEIRA, BRUNO

Instructor:

Enrollment: 30 Questionnaires: 26

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2007

Page 1407 JUN 26, 2007 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

			Fre	quer	ncies	5		Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	4	21	4.77	305/1522	3.92	4.36	4.30	4.14	4.77
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	0	1	6	18	4.54	511/1522	3.75	4.33	4.26	4.18	4.54
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	5	18	4.58	456/1285	3.69	4.45	4.30	4.22	4.58
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	3	4	18	4.60	378/1476	3.83	4.33	4.22	4.09	4.60
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	1	0	6	5	12	4.13	680/1412	3.35	4.26	4.06	4.01	4.13
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	2	3	3	17	4.40	434/1381	3.45	4.19	4.08	3.93	4.40
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	1	3	3	18	4.38	650/1500	3.71	4.14	4.18	4.16	4.38
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	1	0	0	0	13	12		1096/1517	4.70	4.56	4.65	4.62	4.48
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	9	0	0	0	2	6	9	4.41	493/1497	3.74	4.21	4.11	4.02	4.41
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	2	3	20	4.72	532/1440	3.94	4.45	4.45	4.40	4.72
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	25	5.00	1/1448	4.75	4.79	4.71	4.63	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	4	2	19	4.60	478/1436	3.89	4.79	4.71	4.24	4.60
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	4	20	4.76	338/1432		4.47	4.29	4.23	4.76
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	4	3	2	3	4	6	3.44	933/1221		3.91	3.93		3.44
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	4	3	2	3	4	О	3.44	933/1221	3.31	3.91	3.93	3.80	3.44
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	10	0	1	1	3	4	7	3.94	792/1280	3.90	4.28	4.10	3.92	3.94
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	10	0	0	1	1	0	14	4.69	451/1277	4.22	4.60	4.34	4.13	4.69
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	11	0	0	0	0	1	14	4.93	156/1269	4.07	4.47	4.31	4.04	4.93
4. Were special techniques successful	10	3	0	1	2	3	7	4.23	341/ 854	3.88	4.16	4.02	3.87	4.23
- 1														
Laboratory	0.4	-1	0	1	0	^	0	0 00	**** / O1E			1 26	4 21	****
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	24	1	0	1	0	0	0		****/ 215	****	****	4.36	4.31	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	24	0	0	0	2	0	0		****/ 228	****	4.50	4.35	4.33	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	24	1	0	0	1	0	0		****/ 217	****	4.50	4.51	4.51	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	24	1 1	0	0	1 1	0	0		****/ 216			4.42	4.41	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	24	Т	0	0	Τ	0	0	3.00	****/ 205	****	5.00	4.23	4.28	* * * *
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	24	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 79	****	5.00	4.58	4.13	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	24	1	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 77	****	5.00	4.52	4.03	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	24	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 65	****	5.00	4.49	3.85	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	24	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 78	****	4.83	4.45	3.88	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	24	1	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 80	****	4.83	4.11	3.79	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	24	0	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/ 47	****	3.60	4.41	3.90	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	24	0	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/ 45	****	4.00	4.30	3.90	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	24	0	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/ 39	****	3.00	4.40	3.90	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	24	1	0	0	1	0	0		****/ 35	****	3.00	4.40	4.00	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	24	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 34		2.75	4.31	4.11	****
3. Did conferences help you carry out freid activities	24		U	U	1	U	U	3.00	/ 34		2.75	4.30	4.11	
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	24	0	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/ 37	****	4.33	4.63	4.53	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	24	0	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/ 23	****	****	4.41	4.19	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	24	1	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 33	****	****	4.69	4.57	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	24	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 22	****	****	4.54	4.31	***
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	24	1	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 18	****	****	4.49	4.11	****

Title ELEMENTARY SPANISH I

Instructor:

NOGUEIRA, BRUNO

Enrollment: 30
Questionnaires: 26

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2007

Page 1407 JUN 26, 2007 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits	Earned	Cum. GPA		Expecte	d Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	А	13	Required for Majors	12	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	0	В	4						
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	5	C	4	General	3	Under-grad	26	Non-major	26
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	2	D	1						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	2	#### - Means	there	are not enough	ı
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	7				
				?	1						

Course-Section: SPAN 101 0201 University of Maryland Title ELEMENTARY SPANISH I

Baltimore County Spring 2007

Instructor: NASH, LYLE

Enrollment: 32 Questionnaires: 20

Page 1408 JUN 26, 2007 Job IRBR3029

Student Cours	e Evaluation	Questionnaire
---------------	--------------	---------------

Questions								Fre	-	ncie	5			tructor		e Dept			Sect
General 1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course 2 0 1 1 8 3 5 3.56 1383/1522 3.92 4.36 4.30 4.14 3.29 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals 3 0 3 0 6 5 3 3.29 1429/1522 3.75 4.33 4.26 4.18 3.29 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals 2 0 2 4 5 5 2 3.06 1244/1285 3.69 4.45 4.30 4.22 3.06 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals 2 0 1 3 8 5 1 3.11 1408/1476 3.83 4.33 4.22 4.09 3.11 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 2 2 2 2 9 3 1 1 2.38 1393/1412 3.35 4.26 4.06 4.01 2.38 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 2 1 4 7 1 1 2.47 1353/1381 3.45 4.19 4.08 3.93 2.47 7. Was the grading system clearly explained 3 0 6 2 2 4 0 5 2.76 1457/1500 3.71 4.14 4.18 4.16 2.76 8. How many times was class cancelled 3 0 0 0 0 5 12 4.71 891/1517 4.70 4.55 4.65 4.62 4.71 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 5 0 2 1 4 3 5 3.53 1265/1497 3.74 4.21 4.11 4.02 3.53 2. Did the instructor's lectures well prepared 3 0 2 1 6 2 6 3.53 1356/1440 3.94 4.45 4.45 4.40 3.53 2. Did the instructor's lectures well prepared 3 0 2 1 6 2 6 3.53 1356/1440 3.94 4.45 4.49 4.03 3.53 2. Did the instructor's lectures well prepared 3 0 2 1 6 6 2 6 3.53 1356/1440 3.94 4.45 4.49 4.03 3.53 2. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 2 0 2 3 2 6 5 3.50 1270/1432 4.03 4.97 4.71 4.63 4.69 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 3 0 1 0 8 4 4 3.59 1265/1436 3.89 4.39 4.29 4.24 3.59 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 2 0 2 3 2 6 5 3.50 1270/1432 4.03 4.97 4.72 4.29 4.23 3.50 3. Did the instructor encourage do participate 8 0 0 0 3 4 5 4.17 867/1277 4.22 4.60 4.34 4.13 4.17 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 9 0 0 1 3 3 3 4 3.91 960/1269 4.07 4.47 4.31 4.04 3.91 4. Were special techniques successful 8 2 2 2 2 3 3.08 772/854 3.88 4.16 4.02 3.87 3.08 Frequency Distribution Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades Reasons Type Majors 14 Graduate 0 Majors 00-27 1 0.00-0.99 1 A 4 4 8 Required for Majors 14			Question				NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals 3 0 3 0 6 5 5 3 3.29 1429/1522 3.75 4.33 4.26 4.18 3.29 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals 2 0 2 4 5 5 5 2 3.06 1244/1285 3.69 4.45 4.30 4.22 3.06 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals 2 0 1 3 8 5 1 3.11 1408/1476 3.83 4.32 4.22 4.09 3.11 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 2 2 2 2 9 3 1 1 2.38 1393/1412 3.35 4.26 4.06 4.01 2.38 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 2 1 4 4 7 1 1 2.38 1393/1412 3.35 4.26 4.06 4.01 2.38 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 3 0 6 2 4 0 5 2.76 1457/1500 3.71 4.14 4.18 4.16 2.76 8. How many times was class cancelled 3 0 0 0 0 5 12 4.71 891/1517 4.70 4.56 4.65 4.62 4.71 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 5 0 2 1 4 3 5 3.53 1265/1497 3.74 4.21 4.11 4.02 3.53 2. Did the instructor's lectures well prepared 3 0 2 1 6 2 6 3.53 1356/1440 3.94 4.45 4.45 4.40 3.53 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 4 0 0 0 1 3 12 4.69 977/1448 4.75 4.79 4.71 4.63 4.69 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 2 0 2 3 2 6 5 3.50 1270/1432 4.03 4.47 4.29 4.23 3.50 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 2 0 2 3 2 6 5 3.50 1270/1432 4.03 4.47 4.29 4.23 3.50 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 4 1 2 3 4 3 3 3.13 1045/1221 3.31 3.91 3.93 3.86 3.13 Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 9 0 0 1 3 3 4 5 4.17 867/1277 4.22 4.60 4.34 4.13 4.17 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 9 0 0 1 3 3 4 5 4.17 867/1277 4.22 4.60 4.34 4.13 4.17 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 9 0 0 1 3 3 4 5 4.17 867/1277 4.22 4.60 4.34 4.13 4.17 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 9 0 0 1 3 3 4 3.91 960/1269 4.07 4.47 4.31 4.04 3.91 4.09 4.00 4.00 4.00 4.00 4.00 4.00 4.00			Genera																
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals 3 0 3 0 6 5 5 3 3.29 1429/1522 3.75 4.33 4.26 4.18 3.29 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals 2 0 2 4 5 5 5 2 3.06 1244/1285 3.69 4.45 4.30 4.22 3.06 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals 2 0 1 3 8 5 1 3.11 1408/1476 3.83 4.23 4.22 4.09 3.11 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 2 1 2 2 2 9 3 1 1 2.38 1393/1412 3.35 4.26 4.06 4.01 2.38 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 2 1 4 4 7 7 1 1 2.47 1353/1381 3.45 4.19 4.08 3.93 2.47 7. Was the grading system clearly explained 3 0 6 2 2 4 0 5 5 2.76 1457/1500 3.71 4.14 4.18 4.16 2.76 8. How many times was class cancelled 3 0 0 0 0 0 5 12 471 891/1517 4.70 4.56 4.65 4.62 4.71 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 5 0 2 1 4 3 5 3.53 1265/1497 3.74 4.21 4.11 4.02 3.53	1. Did yo	u gain ne	ew insights,ski	lls fro	om this course	2	0	1	1	8	3	5	3.56	1383/1522	3.92	4.36	4.30	4.14	3.56
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals 2 0 1 3 8 5 1 3.11 1408/1476 3.83 4.33 4.22 4.09 3.11 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 2 2 2 9 9 3 1 1 2.38 1393/1412 3.35 4.26 4.06 4.01 2.38 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 2 1 4 4 7 1 1 2.47 1353/1381 3.45 4.19 4.08 3.93 2.47 7. Was the grading system clearly explained 3 0 6 2 4 0 5 2.76 1457/1500 3.71 4.14 4.18 4.16 2.76 8. How many times was class cancelled 3 0 0 0 0 0 5 12 4.71 891/1517 4.70 4.56 4.65 4.62 4.71 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 5 0 2 1 4 3 5 3.53 1265/1497 3.74 4.21 4.11 4.02 3.53 2. Did the instructor's lectures well prepared 3 0 2 1 6 2 6 3.53 1356/1440 3.94 4.45 4.45 4.40 3.53 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 4 0 0 0 1 3 12 4.69 977/1448 4.75 4.79 4.71 4.63 4.69 4.00 did the lectures contribute to what you learned 2 0 2 3 2 6 5 3.50 1270/1432 4.03 4.47 4.29 4.23 3.50 3. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 2 0 2 3 2 6 5 3.50 1270/1432 4.03 4.47 4.29 4.23 3.50 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 4 1 2 3 4 3 3 3.13 1045/1221 3.31 3.91 3.93 3.86 3.13 Discussion Discussion Discussion Discussion Discussion Discussion Discussion Discussion Prequency Distribution Frequency Distribution Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades Reasons Type Majors Prequency Distribution	_	_	-			3	0	3	0	6	5	3	3.29	1429/1522	3.75	4.33	4.26	4.18	3.29
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 2 2 2 2 9 3 1 1 2.38 1393/1412 3.35 4.26 4.06 4.01 2.38 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 2 1 4 4 7 1 1 2.47 1353/1381 3.45 4.19 4.08 3.93 2.47 7. Was the grading system clearly explained 3 0 6 2 4 0 5 2.76 1457/1500 3.71 4.14 4.18 4.16 2.76 8. How many times was class cancelled 3 0 0 0 0 0 5 12 4.71 891/1517 4.70 4.56 4.65 4.62 4.71 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 5 0 2 1 4 3 5 3.53 1265/1497 3.74 4.21 4.11 4.02 3.53 Lecture 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 3 0 2 1 6 2 6 3.53 1356/1440 3.94 4.45 4.45 4.40 3.53 2.01 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 4 0 0 0 0 1 3 12 4.69 977/1448 4.75 4.79 4.71 4.63 4.69 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 3 0 1 0 8 4 4 3.59 1265/1436 3.89 4.39 4.29 4.24 3.59 4.01 the lectures contribute to what you learned 2 0 2 3 2 6 5 3.50 1270/1432 4.03 4.47 4.29 4.23 3.50 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 4 1 2 3 3 4 3 3 3.13 1045/1221 3.31 3.91 3.93 3.86 3.13 Discussion 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 8 0 1 1 3 3 6 1 3.42 1076/1280 3.90 4.28 4.10 3.92 3.42 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 8 0 0 0 3 4 5 4.17 867/1277 4.22 4.60 4.34 4.13 4.17 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 9 0 0 1 3 3 4 3.91 960/1269 4.07 4.47 4.31 4.04 3.91 4. Were special techniques successful 8 0 2 1 5 2 2 3.08 772/854 3.88 4.16 4.02 3.87 3.08 Frequency Distribution Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades Reasons Type Majors 0 0 0 2.7 1 0.00-0.99 1 A 4 Required for Majors 14 Graduate 0 Major 0	3. Did th	e exam qu	uestions reflec	t the	expected goals	2	0	2	4	5	5	2	3.06	1244/1285	3.69	4.45	4.30	4.22	3.06
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 2 1 4 4 7 1 1 2.47 1353/1381 3.45 4.19 4.08 3.93 2.47 7. Was the grading system clearly explained 3 0 6 2 4 0 5 2.76 1457/1500 3.71 4.14 4.18 4.16 2.76 8. How many times was class cancelled 3 0 0 0 0 5 12 4.71 891/1517 4.70 4.56 4.65 4.62 4.71 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 5 0 2 1 4 3 5 3.53 1265/1497 3.74 4.21 4.11 4.02 3.53 Lecture 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 3 0 2 1 6 2 6 3.53 1356/1440 3.94 4.45 4.45 4.49 3.53 2.01 d the instructor seem interested in the subject 4 0 0 0 1 3 12 4.69 977/1448 4.75 4.79 4.71 4.63 4.69 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 3 0 1 0 8 4 4 3.59 1265/1436 3.89 4.39 4.29 4.24 3.59 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 2 0 2 3 2 6 5 3.50 1270/1432 4.03 4.47 4.29 4.23 3.50 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 4 1 2 3 4 3 3 3.13 1045/1221 3.31 3.91 3.93 3.86 3.13 Discussion 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 8 0 1 1 3 3 6 1 3.42 1076/1280 3.90 4.28 4.10 3.92 3.42 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 8 0 0 0 0 3 4 5 4.17 867/1277 4.22 4.60 4.34 4.13 4.17 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 9 0 0 1 3 3 4 3.91 960/1269 4.07 4.47 4.31 4.04 3.91 4.04 3.91 4.05 4.05 4.05 4.05 4.05 4.05 4.05 4.05	4. Did ot	her evalu	uations reflect	the ex	xpected goals	2	0	1	3	8	5	1	3.11	1408/1476	3.83	4.33	4.22	4.09	3.11
7. Was the grading system clearly explained 3 0 6 2 4 0 5 2.76 1457/1500 3.71 4.14 4.18 4.16 2.76 8. How many times was class cancelled 3 0 0 0 0 5 12 4.71 891/1517 4.70 4.56 4.65 4.62 4.71 9.10 4.10 4.10 4.10 4.10 4.10 4.10 4.10 4	5. Did as	signed re	eadings contrib	oute to	what you learned	2	2	2	9	3	1	1	2.38	1393/1412	3.35	4.26	4.06	4.01	2.38
8. How many times was class cancelled 3 0 0 0 0 5 12 4.71 891/1517 4.70 4.56 4.65 4.62 4.71 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 5 0 2 1 4 3 5 3.53 1265/1497 3.74 4.21 4.11 4.02 3.53 Lecture 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 3 0 2 1 6 2 6 3.53 1356/1440 3.94 4.45 4.45 4.40 3.53 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 4 0 0 0 1 3 12 4.69 977/1448 4.75 4.79 4.71 4.63 4.69 4.69 4.69 4.69 4.69 4.69 4.69 4.69	6. Did wr	itten ass	signments contr	ribute 1	to what you learned	2	1	4	4	7	1	1	2.47	1353/1381	3.45	4.19	4.08	3.93	2.47
Lecture Lecture Lecture Lecture Le	7. Was th	e grading	g system clearl	y expla	ained	3	0	6	2	4	0	5	2.76	1457/1500	3.71	4.14	4.18	4.16	2.76
Lecture 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 3. O 2 1 6 2 6 3.53 1356/1440 3.94 4.45 4.45 4.40 3.53 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 4. O 0 0 1 3 12 4.69 977/1448 4.75 4.79 4.71 4.63 4.69 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 3. O 1 0 8 4 4 3.59 1265/1436 3.89 4.39 4.29 4.24 3.59 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 2. O 2 3 2 6 5 3.50 1270/1432 4.03 4.47 4.29 4.23 3.50 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 4. 1 2 3 4 3 3 3.13 1045/1221 3.31 3.91 3.93 3.86 3.13 Discussion 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 3. O 0 0 3 4 5 4.17 867/1277 4.22 4.60 4.34 4.13 4.17 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 4. Were special techniques successful 4. Were special techniques successful 5. Reasons 6. Type 7. Majors 7. Did Credits Earned 8. O 0 0 1 3 3 3 4 3.91 960/1269 4.07 4.47 4.31 4.04 3.91 8. O 2 1 5 2 2 3.08 772/854 3.88 4.16 4.02 3.87 3.08 8. O 2 1 5 2 2 3.08 772/854 3.88 4.16 4.02 3.87 3.08	8. How max	ny times	was class cand	celled		3	0	0	0	0	5	12	4.71	891/1517	4.70	4.56	4.65	4.62	4.71
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 3 0 2 1 6 2 6 3.53 1356/1440 3.94 4.45 4.45 4.40 3.53 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 4 0 0 0 0 1 3 12 4.69 977/1448 4.75 4.79 4.71 4.63 4.69 3.80 4.39 4.29 4.24 3.59 1265/1436 3.89 4.39 4.29 4.24 3.59 1265/1436 3.89 4.39 4.29 4.24 3.59 1265/1436 3.89 4.39 4.29 4.24 3.59 1265/1436 3.89 4.39 4.29 4.24 3.50 1270/1432 4.03 4.47 4.29 4.23 4.20 4.20 4.20 4.20 4.20 4.20 4.20 4.20	9. How wo	uld you g	grade the overa	all tead	ching effectiveness	5	0	2	1	4	3	5	3.53	1265/1497	3.74	4.21	4.11	4.02	3.53
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 4 0 0 0 0 1 3 12 4.69 977/1448 4.75 4.79 4.71 4.63 4.69 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 3 0 1 0 8 4 4 3.59 1265/1436 3.89 4.39 4.29 4.24 3.59 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 2 0 2 3 2 6 5 3.50 1270/1432 4.03 4.47 4.29 4.23 3.50 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 4 1 2 3 4 3 3 3.13 1045/1221 3.31 3.91 3.93 3.86 3.13 Discussion			Lectur	re															
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 4 0 0 0 0 1 3 12 4.69 977/1448 4.75 4.79 4.71 4.63 4.69 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 3 0 1 0 8 4 4 3.59 1265/1436 3.89 4.39 4.29 4.24 3.59 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 2 0 2 3 2 6 5 3.50 1270/1432 4.03 4.47 4.29 4.23 3.50 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 4 1 2 3 4 3 3 3.13 1045/1221 3.31 3.91 3.93 3.86 3.13 Discussion	1. Were t	he instru	prepared	3	0	2	1	6	2	6	3.53	1356/1440	3.94	4.45	4.45	4.40	3.53		
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 2 0 2 3 2 6 5 3.50 1270/1432 4.03 4.47 4.29 4.23 3.50 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 4 1 2 3 4 3 3 3.13 1045/1221 3.31 3.91 3.93 3.86 3.13 Discussion 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 8 0 1 1 3 6 1 3.42 1076/1280 3.90 4.28 4.10 3.92 3.42 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 8 0 0 0 3 4 5 4.17 867/1277 4.22 4.60 4.34 4.13 4.17 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 9 0 0 1 3 3 4 3.91 960/1269 4.07 4.47 4.31 4.04 3.91 4. Were special techniques successful 8 0 2 1 5 2 2 3.08 772/854 3.88 4.16 4.02 3.87 3.08 Frequency Distribution Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades Reasons Type Majors O0-27 1 0.00-0.99 1 A 4 Required for Majors 14 Graduate 0 Major 0								0	0	1	3	12	4.69	977/1448	4.75	4.79	4.71	4.63	4.69
Discussion 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 8 0 1 1 3 6 1 3.42 1076/1280 3.90 4.28 4.10 3.92 3.42 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 8 0 0 0 3 4 5 4.17 867/1277 4.22 4.60 4.34 4.13 4.17 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 9 0 0 1 3 3 4 3.91 960/1269 4.07 4.47 4.31 4.04 3.91 4. Were special techniques successful 8 0 2 1 5 2 2 3.08 772/854 3.88 4.16 4.02 3.87 3.08 Frequency Distribution Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades Reasons Type Majors 0	3. Was le	cture mat	terial presente	ed and	explained clearly	3	0	1	0	8	4	4	3.59	1265/1436	3.89	4.39	4.29	4.24	3.59
Discussion 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 8 0 1 1 3 6 1 3.42 1076/1280 3.90 4.28 4.10 3.92 3.42 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 8 0 0 0 3 4 5 4.17 867/1277 4.22 4.60 4.34 4.13 4.17 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 9 0 0 1 3 3 4 3.91 960/1269 4.07 4.47 4.31 4.04 3.91 4. Were special techniques successful 8 0 2 1 5 2 2 3.08 772/854 3.88 4.16 4.02 3.87 3.08 Frequency Distribution Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades Reasons Type Majors 00-27 1 0.00-0.99 1 A 4 Required for Majors 14 Graduate 0 Major 0	4. Did th	e lecture	es contribute t	o what	you learned	2	0	2	3	2	6	5	3.50	1270/1432	4.03	4.47	4.29	4.23	3.50
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 8 0 1 1 3 6 1 3.42 1076/1280 3.90 4.28 4.10 3.92 3.42 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 8 0 0 0 3 4 5 4.17 867/1277 4.22 4.60 4.34 4.13 4.17 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 9 0 0 1 3 3 4 3.91 960/1269 4.07 4.47 4.31 4.04 3.91 4. Were special techniques successful 8 0 2 1 5 2 2 3.08 772/854 3.88 4.16 4.02 3.87 3.08 Frequency Distribution Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades Reasons Type Majors 00-27 1 0.00-0.99 1 A 4 Required for Majors 14 Graduate 0 Major 0	5. Did au	diovisual	l techniques en	hance y	your understanding	4	1	2	3	4	3	3	3.13	1045/1221	3.31	3.91	3.93	3.86	3.13
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 8 0 0 0 0 3 4 5 4.17 867/1277 4.22 4.60 4.34 4.13 4.17 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 9 0 0 1 3 3 4 3.91 960/1269 4.07 4.47 4.31 4.04 3.91 4. Were special techniques successful 8 0 2 1 5 2 2 3.08 772/854 3.88 4.16 4.02 3.87 3.08 Frequency Distribution Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades Reasons Type Majors 00-27 1 0.00-0.99 1 A 4 Required for Majors 14 Graduate 0 Major 0			Discus	ssion															
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 8 0 0 0 0 3 4 5 4.17 867/1277 4.22 4.60 4.34 4.13 4.17 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 9 0 0 1 3 3 4 3.91 960/1269 4.07 4.47 4.31 4.04 3.91 4.06 4.07 4.47 4.31 4.04 3.91 8 0 2 1 5 2 2 3.08 772/854 3.88 4.16 4.02 3.87 3.08 Frequency Distribution Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades Reasons Type Majors 10 0-27 1 0.00-0.99 1 A 4 Required for Majors 14 Graduate 0 Major 0	1. Did cl	ass discu			what you learned	8	0	1	1	3	6	1	3.42	1076/1280	3.90	4.28	4.10	3.92	3.42
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 9 0 0 1 3 3 4 3.91 960/1269 4.07 4.47 4.31 4.04 3.91 4.04 Were special techniques successful 8 0 2 1 5 2 2 3.08 772/854 3.88 4.16 4.02 3.87 3.08 Frequency Distribution Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades Reasons Type Majors 00-27 1 0.00-0.99 1 A 4 Required for Majors 14 Graduate 0 Major 0						8	0	0	0	3	4	5					4.34	4.13	4.17
4. Were special techniques successful 8 0 2 1 5 2 2 3.08 772/854 3.88 4.16 4.02 3.87 3.08 Frequency Distribution Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades Reasons Type Majors 00-27 1 0.00-0.99 1 A 4 Required for Majors 14 Graduate 0 Major 0						9	0	0	1	3	3	4	3.91	960/1269	4.07	4.47	4.31	4.04	3.91
Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades Reasons Type Majors 00-27 1 0.00-0.99 1 A 4 Required for Majors 14 Graduate 0 Major 0			_		-	8	0	2	1	5	2	2	3.08	772/ 854	3.88	4.16	4.02	3.87	3.08
00-27 1 0.00-0.99 1 A 4 Required for Majors 14 Graduate 0 Major 0		Fre							utio	n									
00-27 1 0.00-0.99 1 A 4 Required for Majors 14 Graduate 0 Major 0																			
1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1	Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grade								Rea	ason	3			Ту	pe			Majors	3
28-55 2 1.00-1.99 0 B 5	00-27		Red	quir	ed f	or Ma	ajor	s 1	4	Graduat	 е	0	Majo	r •	0				
FC 02																			

Credits 1	Earned	Cum. GPA		Expected	d Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	1	A	4	Required for Majors	14	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	В	5						
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	3	C	7	General	0	Under-grad	20	Non-major	20
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	4	D	1						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	n
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	4				
				?	1						

Title ELEMENTARY SPANISH I

Instructor: GRANENAGIMENO,

Enrollment: 28
Questionnaires: 13

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2007 Page 1409 JUN 26, 2007 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

			Fre	eauer	ncies			Inst	tructor	Course	Dept.	UMBC	Level	Sect
Ouestions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank		_		Mean	
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	4	4	3	2	3.23	1467/1522	3.92	4.36	4.30	4.14	3.23
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	5	1	4	3	3.38	1408/1522	3.75	4.33	4.26	4.18	3.38
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	2	4	1	3	3	3.08	1242/1285	3.69	4.45	4.30	4.22	3.08
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	2	4	4	2	3.50	1324/1476	3.83	4.33	4.22	4.09	3.50
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	4	2	3	2	3.08	1320/1412	3.35	4.26	4.06	4.01	3.08
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	3	1	3	4	1	2.92	1313/1381	3.45	4.19	4.08	3.93	2.92
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	4	1	3	3	3.25	1396/1500	3.71	4.14	4.18	4.16	3.25
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	1	0	1	10	4.67	932/1517	4.70	4.56	4.65	4.62	4.67
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	3	0	2	5	1	3.09	1410/1497		4.21	4.11	4.02	3.09
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	1	3	3	3	2	3.17	1400/1440	3.94	4.45	4.45	4.40	3.17
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	1	4	7	4.50	1157/1448	4.75	4.79	4.71	4.63	4.50
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	2	2	5	0	3	3.00	1378/1436	3.89	4.39	4.29	4.24	3.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	3	3	2	4	3.58	1248/1432	4.03	4.47	4.29	4.23	3.58
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	4	1	2	3	2	2.83	1117/1221	3.31	3.91	3.93	3.86	2.83
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	2	0	5	2	3.78	894/1280	3.90	4.28	4.10	3.92	3.78
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	2	2	1	4	3.78	1059/1277	4.22	4.60	4.34	4.13	3.78
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	2	2	1	1	3	3.11	1203/1269	4.07	4.47	4.31	4.04	3.11
4. Were special techniques successful	4	1	0	3	0	2	3	3.63	643/ 854	3.88	4.16	4.02	3.87	3.63
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	11	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/ 215	****	****	4.36	4.31	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	11	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/ 228	****	4.50	4.35	4.33	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	11	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/ 217	****	4.50	4.51	4.51	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	11	0	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/ 216	****	****	4.42	4.41	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	11	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 205	****	5.00	4.23	4.28	****
Seminar		_	_	_	_	_								
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	11	0	1	1	0	0	0		****/ 79	****	5.00	4.58	4.13	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	12	0	0	0	1	0	0		****/ 77	****	5.00	4.52	4.03	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	1	0	0	0		****/ 65	****	5.00	4.49	3.85	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	1	0	0		****/ 78	****	4.83	4.45	3.88	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	12	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 80	****	4.83	4.11	3.79	****
mi al di manda														
Field Work	10	0	0	0	1	0	0	2 00	4444/ 17		2 60	4 41	2 00	****
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	1	0	0		****/ 47	****	3.60	4.41	3.90	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	12	0	0	0	1	0	0		****/ 45	****	4.00	4.30	3.90	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	12	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 39	****	3.00	4.40	3.99	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	12	0	0	0	1	0	0		****/ 35	****	3.00	4.31	4.00	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 34	****	2.75	4.30	4.11	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	1	1	0	3 EU	****/ 37	****	4.33	4.63	4.53	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	11	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 23	****	4.33	4.63	4.53	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	11	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 33	****	****	4.41	4.19	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	11	0	1	0	0	1	0		****/ 22	****	****	4.54	4.31	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	11	1	0	0	0	0	-		****/ 18	****	****	4.49	4.31	****
J. Were there enough proctors for all the students	ΤŢ		U	U	U	U	Τ.	5.00	/ 10			4.49	4.11	

Title ELEMENTARY SPANISH I

Instructor: GRANENAGIMENO,

Enrollment: 28
Questionnaires: 13

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2007 Page 1409 JUN 26, 2007 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits E	Earned	Cum. GPA		Expected	Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	 А	2	Required for Majors	11	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	6						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	1	C	4	General	0	Under-grad	13	Non-major	13
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means	there	are not enough	n
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	1				
				?	0						

Title ELEMENTARY SPANISH I

Instructor: GRANENAGIMENO,

Enrollment: 34
Questionnaires: 26

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2007

Page 1410 JUN 26, 2007 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

			Fre	equer	ncie	s		Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General	_	0	0	^	_	11	11	4 10	1042/1500	2 00	1 26	4 20	4 1 4	4 10
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	2	0		ΤŢ	11		1043/1522		4.36	4.30		4.12
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	4	5	6	10 12	4.04	1262/1522	3.75 3.69	4.33	4.26	4.18	3.77
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	-	0	2	1	2			921/1285		4.45	4.30		4.04
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0 2	3	3 0	4	9	13 11	4.12	945/1476	3.83	4.33	4.22	4.09	4.12
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	∠ 1	3	0	6 5	3		3.83	956/1412	3.35	4.26	4.06	4.01	3.83
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	Τ	U T	1	3	/	10	4.00	806/1381	3.45	4.19	4.08	3.93	4.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	T	0	5	16 24	4.44	571/1500 195/1517	3.71 4.70	4.14 4.56	4.18	4.16 4.62	4.44
8. How many times was class cancelled	J	0	0	1	6	10		4.96	, -			4.65		4.96
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	U	U	Τ	ь	10	6	3.91	1020/1497	3.74	4.21	4.11	4.02	3.91
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	1	0	3	7	15	4.35	976/1440	3.94	4.45	4.45	4.40	4.35
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	5	21	4.81	765/1448	4.75	4.79	4.71	4.63	4.81
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	1	4	5	16	4.38	741/1436	3.89	4.39	4.29	4.24	4.38
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	1	3	6	15	4.27	877/1432	4.03	4.47	4.29	4.23	4.27
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	1	1	3	4	7	9	3.83	739/1221	3.31	3.91	3.93	3.86	3.83
5. Did dddiovibddi ceeimiqdeb eimanee year anderbeanding	_	_	_	3	-	,		3.03	75571221	3.31	3.71	3.75	3.00	3.03
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	3	4	12	4.47	416/1280	3.90	4.28	4.10	3.92	4.47
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	0	1	3	5	10	4.26	796/1277	4.22	4.60	4.34	4.13	4.26
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	1	2	1	1	14	4.32	735/1269	4.07	4.47	4.31	4.04	4.32
4. Were special techniques successful	7	2	0	1	0	4	12	4.59	171/ 854	3.88	4.16	4.02	3.87	4.59
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	25	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 79	****	5.00	4.58	4.13	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	25	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 77	****	5.00	4.52	4.03	****

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	 А	7	Required for Majors	13	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	0	В	6						
56-83	5	2.00-2.99	4	C	7	General	1	Under-grad	26	Non-major	26
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	4	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	6	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	n
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	5				
				?	0						

Course-Section: SPAN 102 0101 University of Maryland Title ELEMENTARY SPANISH II Baltimore County

PETERSON, MARY

Instructor:

Baltimore County Spring 2007 Page 1411

JUN 26, 2007

Job IRBR3029

Enrollment: 30
Questionnaires: 12
Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

? 0

								-	ncie	S		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
		Question	S		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		Genera	1															
1 Did vo	u gain n	ew insights,ski		m this course	0	0	0	1	5	4	2	3 58	1372/1522	4.01	4.36	4.30	4.14	3.58
		ctor make clear			0	0	0	1	5	2	4		1267/1522		4.33	4.26	4.18	3.75
		uestions reflec		_	0	0	0	2	2	6	_		1123/1285		4.45	4.30	4.22	3.67
	_	uations reflect		_	0	1	0	2	5	3			1376/1476		4.33	4.22	4.09	3.27
				what you learned	0	1	1	3	5	0			1351/1412		4.26	4.06	4.01	2.91
	_	_		o what you learned	0	1	3	2	1	4	1		1329/1381		4.19	4.08	3.93	2.82
		g system clearl		-	0	0	0	3	1	4	4		1183/1500		4.14	4.18	4.16	3.75
		was class cand			1	0	0	0	1	10	0		1450/1517		4.56	4.65	4.62	3.91
	-			hing effectiveness	2	0	0	2	5	3	0	3.10	1410/1497	3.96	4.21	4.11	4.02	3.10
	-	3																
		Lectur	e															
1. Were t	he instr	uctor's lecture	s well	prepared	1	0	1	2	5	2	1	3.00	1404/1440	4.14	4.45	4.45	4.40	3.00
2. Did th	e instru	n the subject	1	0	0	1	1	3	6	4.27	1293/1448	4.61	4.79	4.71	4.63	4.27		
3. Was le	cture ma	xplained clearly	1	0	0	3	1	6	1	3.45	1298/1436	4.06	4.39	4.29	4.24	3.45		
4. Did th	e lectur	es contribute t	o what	you learned	1	0	1	2	3	3	2	3.27	1332/1432	4.15	4.47	4.29	4.23	3.27
5. Did au	diovisua	l techniques en	hance y	our understanding	2	2	1	2	2	3	0	2.88	1111/1221	3.26	3.91	3.93	3.86	2.88
		Discus																
				what you learned	6	0	2	1	0	3	0		1250/1280			4.10		
				d to participate	6	0	0	2	0	2			1094/1277			4.34		3.67
				d open discussion	6	0	1	2	0	1			1194/1269			4.31	4.04	
4. Were s	pecial t	echniques succe	ssful		6	1	0	3	0	1	1	3.00	779/ 854	4.06	4.16	4.02	3.87	3.00
				Frequ	iency	, Dist	trib	utio	n									
Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	ason	s			Ty	pe			Majors	.
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	0	A 2	Required for Maj							4	Graduat	e	0	Majo	r	0
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	в 7	_													
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	2	C 2	General							2	Under-g	rad 1	.2	Non-	major	12
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	2	D 1														
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F 0	Electives							0	#### -				_	jh
				P 0									respons	es to b	e sign	nifican	ıt	
				I 0		Other						5						

Course-Section: SPAN 102 0201 University of Maryland Title ELEMENTARY SPANISH II Baltimore County

SIMORANGKIR, MO

Instructor: SIMORA Enrollment: 22

Questionnaires: 13

Spring 2007
Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Page 1412 JUN 26, 2007 Job IRBR3029

			Fr	equei	ncies	3		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	2	6	5	4.23	919/1522	4.01	4.36	4.30	4.14	4.23
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	1	10	4.62	419/1522	4.10	4.33	4.26	4.18	4.62
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	2	1	9	4.58	446/1285	4.19	4.45	4.30	4.22	4.58
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	4	7	4.38	650/1476	4.08	4.33	4.22	4.09	4.38
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	4	3	5	4.08	709/1412	3.86	4.26	4.06	4.01	4.08
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	1	0	0	3	6	2	3.91	938/1381	3.89	4.19	4.08	3.93	3.91
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	2	3	7	4.42	615/1500	4.06	4.14	4.18	4.16	4.42
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	8	4	4.33	1217/1517	4.46	4.56	4.65	4.62	4.33
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	1	0	4	7	4.42	493/1497	3.96	4.21	4.11	4.02	4.42
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	2	10	4.69	565/1440	4.14	4.45	4.45	4.40	4.69
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	2	10	4.69	965/1448	4.61	4.79	4.71	4.63	4.69
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	2	4	7	4.38	741/1436	4.06	4.39	4.29	4.24	4.38
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	3	9	4.62	514/1432	4.15	4.47	4.29	4.23	4.62
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	2	2	1	3	1	4	3.36	971/1221	3.26	3.91	3.93	3.86	3.36
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	390/1280	3.88	4.28	4.10	3.92	4.50
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	0	0	1	0	5	4.67	470/1277	4.30	4.60	4.34	4.13	4.67
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	0	0	0	3	3	4.50	586/1269	4.00	4.47	4.31	4.04	4.50
4. Were special techniques successful	7	0	0	0	0	3	3	4.50	194/ 854	4.06	4.16	4.02	3.87	4.50
Frequ	lency	Dis	trib	ution	n									
Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades				Rea	asons	3			Туј	pe			Majors	;
00-27 0 0.00-0.99 0 A 3		 Red	 quir	ed fo	or Ma	 ajor		 7	Graduate	 e	0	 Majo		0

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

Course-Section: SPAN 102 0301 Title ELEMENTARY SPANISH II

Instructor: MORENILLA, LAUR

Enrollment: 21 Questionnaires: 15 University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2007

Page 1413 JUN 26, 2007 Job IRBR3029

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

Ougstions							Fre	eque	ncies	3		Ins	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
		Questions	3		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		General	 I															
1. Did v	ou gain n	ew insights,skil		om this course	0	0	0	3	2	2	8	4.00	1122/1522	4.01	4.36	4.30	4.14	4.00
		ctor make clear			0	0	1	2	2	5			1276/1522		4.33	4.26		3.73
		uestions reflect			0	0	1	0		6			904/1285			4.30	4.22	
	_	uations reflect		_	1	1	0	0	4	5			1009/1476			4.22	4.09	
				what you learned	0	1	1	3		3			1278/1412			4.06	4.01	
	_	_		to what you learned	0	0	0	0	10	3			1170/1381			4.08	3.93	
		g system clearly		-	0	0	0	1	4	3			956/1500			4.18	4.16	4.07
		was class cance			0	0	0	0	0				341/1517			4.65	4.62	4.93
	-			ching effectiveness	1	0	1	2	4	7			1382/1497					
1 Were	the instr	Lecture uctor's lectures	-	nrenared	2	0	1	1	1	5	5	3 92	1238/1440	A 1A	4 45	4.45	4 40	3.92
		n the subject	2	0	0	0	2	2			1131/1448		4.79	4.71	4.63			
		3	2	•	1	1					1275/1436		4.39	4.29		3.54		
	 Was lecture material presented and explained clearly Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 							0	6				1239/1432			4.29	4.23	
				our understanding	2 4	0 1	1 0	4	3	1			1053/1221					
1 Did a	logg digg	Discuss		what you learned	7	0	0	0	2	4	2	4 00	718/1280	3.88	1 20	4.10	3.92	4 00
				ed to participate	7	0	0	2	0	3			1024/1277				4.13	
				nd open discussion	7	-	1	2		2			1174/1269				4.13	
		echniques succes		id open discussion	7	1	0	0	1	_			240/ 854					
	-	-																
0		Laborat	-				_			_								
2. Were	you provi	ded with adequat	te back	ground information	14	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 228	****	4.50	4.35	4.33	****
		Frequ	ency	/ Dist	rib	utio	n											
Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grad								Re	asons	3			Ту	ne			Majors	ł.
Barned Cum. OIA Expected Glade										- 								
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A 2		Red	quir	ed f	or Ma	ajor	s 1	.0	Graduat	е	0	Majo	or	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	в 4														
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	3	C 7		Ger	nera.	1				1	Under-g	rad 1	5	Non-	-major	15
84-150	6	3.00-3.49	4	D 0														

Credits I	Earned	Cum. GPA		Expected	Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	2	Required for Majors	10	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	4						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	3	C	7	General	1	Under-grad	15	Non-major	15
84-150	6	3.00-3.49	4	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means	there	e are not enough	a
				P	1			responses to	be si	ignificant	
				I	0	Other	2	_			
				?	0						

Course-Section: SPAN 102 0401 University of Maryland Title ELEMENTARY SPANISH II

Baltimore County Spring 2007

Instructor: PETERSON, MARY

Enrollment: 28 Questionnaires: 12 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Page 1414

JUN 26, 2007

Job IRBR3029

						_	ncies	3		Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect		
		Question	S		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		 Genera	1															
1. Did vo	ou gain ne	ew insights,ski	_	m this course	1	0	0	0	4	2	5	4.09	1060/1522	4.01	4.36	4.30	4.14	4.09
		ctor make clear			1	0	0	1	4	2	4		1238/1522		4.33	4.26	4.18	3.82
		uestions reflec			1	0	0	3	2	1	5		1101/1285	4.19	4.45	4.30	4.22	3.73
		uations reflect			1	1	1	1	3	3	2	3.40	1349/1476	4.08	4.33	4.22	4.09	3.40
				what you learned	1	0	1	1	3	3	3	3.55	1143/1412	3.86	4.26	4.06	4.01	3.55
				o what you learned	1	1	0	1	3	3	3	3.80	1016/1381	3.89	4.19	4.08	3.93	3.80
7. Was th	ne gradin	g system clearl	y expla	ined	1	0	0	2	3	2	4	3.73	1204/1500	4.06	4.14	4.18	4.16	3.73
8. How ma	any times	was class canc	elled		1	0	0	0	1	8	2	4.09	1358/1517	4.46	4.56	4.65	4.62	4.09
9. How wo	ould you	grade the overa	ll teac	hing effectiveness	2	0	1	1	2	4	2	3.50	1277/1497	3.96	4.21	4.11	4.02	3.50
		Lectur	e															
1. Were t	the instr	uctor's lecture		prepared	2	0	2	1	1	2	4	3.50	1359/1440	4.14	4.45	4.45	4.40	3.50
		ctor seem inter			2	0	0	0	1	3			1157/1448	4.61		4.71	4.63	4.50
			2		2	1		3			1315/1436		4.39	4.29	4.24	3.40		
	 Was lecture material presented and explained clearly Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 						1	2	1	0			1224/1432		4.47	4.29	4.23	3.67
				our understanding	3	6	1	0	1	1			1148/1221					2.67
		Discus	sion															
1 Did cl	lagg dige			what you learned	4	0	1	0	3	3	1	3 38	1091/1280	3.88	4.28	4 10	3.92	3.38
				d to participate	4	-	1	0	2	1			1024/1277	4.30	4.60	4.34	4.13	3.88
				d open discussion	4	0	0	1	4	1	2		1117/1269	4.00	4.47	4.31		3.50
		echniques succe		a open arrouprem	4	1	0	0	2	4	1		547/ 854		4.16	4.02		3.86
				Frequ	ency	7 Dist	trib	ut i oi	n									
		Cum. GPA		_	2													
Credits E	Expected Grades				Rea	asons	5			Ту	pe 			Majors	:			
00-27 1 0.00-0.99 0 A 2						Red	quir	ed f	or Ma	jors		6	Graduat	e	0	Majo	or	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	в 5														
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	2	C 3		Ger	nera	1				0	Under-g	rad 1	2	Non-	-major	12
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	3	D 0														
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0		Ele	ecti	ves				0	#### -	Means t	here a	re not	enoug	ιh	
				P 0									respons	es to b	e sign	ificar	ıt	
				I 0		Otl	her					3						

0

I ?

Title ELEMENTARY SPANISH II

Instructor: SIMORANGKIR, MO

Enrollment: 22
Questionnaires: 15

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2007 Page 1415 JUN 26, 2007 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

		Questions		NR	. N	ΙA	Fre	equei 2	ncie: 3	s 4	5	Ins Mean	tructor Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean		Level Mean	Sec Mea
		 General																
. Did von a	gain ne		s from this course	0		0	0	1	3	4	7	4.13	1022/1522	4.01	4.36	4.30	4.14	4.1
	-	-	he expected goals	0		0	0	1	3	5	6		1048/1522		4.33	4.26	4.18	4.0
			the expected goals	1		0	0	0	2	8			849/1285		4.45	4.30	4.22	4.1
	_		he expected goals	0		0	0	0	1	6			535/1476		4.33	4.22	4.09	4.4
			e to what you learned	0		4	0	1	2	1			547/1412		4.26	4.06	4.01	
			ute to what you learne			2	0	0	3	2			458/1381		4.19	4.08	3.93	
		system clearly	_	0		0	0	1	3	5	6	4.07	956/1500	4.06	4.14	4.18	4.16	4.0
. How many	times	was class cancel	led	0		0	0	0	0	10	5	4.33	1217/1517	4.46	4.56	4.65	4.62	4.3
. How would	d you g	rade the overall	teaching effectivenes	ss 2		1	0	1	1	4	6	4.25	654/1497	3.96	4.21	4.11	4.02	4.2
		Lecture																
. Were the	instru	ctor's lectures	well prepared	3		0	0	0	2	2	8	4.50	798/1440	4.14	4.45	4.45	4.40	4.5
			ted in the subject	3		0	0	0	1	0			683/1448		4.79	4.71	4.63	4.8
. Was lectu	ire mat	erial presented	and explained clearly	3		0	0	1	1	2	8	4.42	708/1436	4.06	4.39	4.29	4.24	4.
			what you learned	3		0	0	2	1	1	8	4.25	884/1432	4.15	4.47	4.29	4.23	4.
. Did audio	ovisual	techniques enha	nce your understanding	y 3		6	1	2	1	0	2	3.00	1064/1221	3.26	3.91	3.93	3.86	3.
		Discussi																
			e to what you learned	7		0	0	0	3	0		4.25	,		4.28		3.92	4.
			uraged to participate	7		0	0	0	0	2		4.75			4.60		4.13	4.
			ir and open discussion			0	0	0	1	2			586/1269				4.04	
. Were spec	cial te	chniques success	ful	7		0	0	1	1	1	5	4.25	330/ 854	4.06	4.16	4.02	3.87	4.
. Were you	provid	Laborato ed with adequate	ry background informatio	on 14		0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 228	****	4.50	4.35	4.33	**:
		Seminar																
Did prese	antatio		what you learned	14		0	0	0	1	0	0	3 00	****/ 78	****	4.83	4.45	3.88	**:
		or grading made		14		0	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 80		4.83		3.79	**:
		Field Wo	rk															
. Did field	d exper		to what you learned	14		0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 47	****	3.60	4.41	3.90	***
	_		evaluation criteria	14		0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 45	****	4.00	4.30	3.90	* * *
		Self Pa	ced															
. Did self-	-paced	system contribut	e to what you learned	14		0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 37	****	4.33	4.63	4.53	**
			Fre	equenc	уD	Dist	ribu	ation	n									
redits Earn	es				Rea	ason	s			Ту	pe			Majors	3			
00-27	4	0.00-0.99	0 A 2			Req	uire	ed fo	or Ma	 ajor	s 1	.0	 Graduat	 e	0	Majo	 or	
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0 в 6			_				-						,		
56-83 2 2.00-2.99 3 C 5						Gen	eral	_				2	Under-g	rad 1	L5	Non-	-major	1
84-150 1 3.00-3.49 1 D 1 Grad. 0 3.50-4.00 4 F 0																		
Grad.			Ele	ctiv	res				0	#### -	Means t	here a	are not	enoug	gh			
	P 0												respons	es to k	oe sign	nificar	ıt	
	I 0											1						

Title ELEMENTARY SPANISH II

Instructor: RIBEYRO, CLAUDI

Enrollment: 20
Questionnaires: 14

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2007 Page 1416 JUN 26, 2007 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions General 1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course 1 0 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals 1 0 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals 1 0 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals 2 0 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 1 1 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 1 0 7. Was the grading system clearly explained 1 0 8. How many times was class cancelled 1 0 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 4 1 Lecture 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 2 0 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 2 0 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 2		2	3 	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean		
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course 1 0 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals 1 0 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals 1 0 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals 2 0 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 1 1 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 1 0 7. Was the grading system clearly explained 1 0 8. How many times was class cancelled 1 0 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 4 1 Lecture 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 2 0 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 2	1								rican	Mean	Mean	Mean
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course 1 0 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals 1 0 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals 1 0 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals 2 0 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 1 1 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 1 0 7. Was the grading system clearly explained 1 0 8. How many times was class cancelled 1 0 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 4 1 Lecture 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 2 0 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 2	1											
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals 1 0 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals 1 0 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals 2 0 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 1 1 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 1 0 7. Was the grading system clearly explained 1 0 8. How many times was class cancelled 1 0 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 4 1 Lecture 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 2 0 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 2		1	4	4	3	3 54	1390/1522	4.01	4.36	4.30	4.14	3.54
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals 1 0 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals 2 0 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 1 1 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 1 0 7. Was the grading system clearly explained 1 0 8. How many times was class cancelled 1 0 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 4 1 Lecture 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 2 0 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 2	0	1	2	6	4		1080/1522	4.10	4.33	4.26	4.18	4.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals 2 0 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 1 1 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 1 0 7. Was the grading system clearly explained 1 0 8. How many times was class cancelled 1 0 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 4 1 Lecture 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 2 0 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 2	-	2	1	3	6		1049/1285	4.19	4.45	4.30	4.22	3.85
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 1 1 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 1 0 7. Was the grading system clearly explained 1 0 8. How many times was class cancelled 1 0 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 4 1 Lecture 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 2 0 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 2 0	_	0	2	5	5	4.25	792/1476	4.08	4.33	4.22	4.09	4.25
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 1 0 7. Was the grading system clearly explained 1 0 8. How many times was class cancelled 1 0 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 4 1 Lecture 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 2 0 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 2 0	•	2	1	2	6	3.83		3.86	4.26	4.06	4.01	3.83
7. Was the grading system clearly explained 1 0 8. How many times was class cancelled 1 0 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 4 1 Lecture 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 2 0 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 2 0	_	0	4	2	7		623/1381	3.89	4.19	4.08	3.93	4.23
8. How many times was class cancelled 1 0 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 4 1 Lecture 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 2 0 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 2 0	-	1	1	5	5		1068/1500	4.06	4.14	4.18		3.92
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 4 1 Lecture 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 2 0 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 2 0	0	0	2	10			1437/1517	4.46	4.56	4.65	4.62	
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 2 0 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 2 0	. 0	0	1	2			348/1497		4.21	4.11	4.02	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 2 0												
	0	0	1	5	6	4.42	917/1440	4.14	4.45	4.45	4.40	4.42
2 Mag logtum material progented and emplained glocals: 2 0	0	0	1	3	8	4.58	1089/1448	4.61	4.79	4.71	4.63	4.58
3. Was recture material presented and explained creatly 2 0	0	1	0	3	8	4.50	601/1436	4.06	4.39	4.29	4.24	4.50
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 2 0	0	0	1	4	7	4.50	632/1432	4.15	4.47	4.29	4.23	4.50
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 2 2	2	0	4	2	2	3.20	1028/1221	3.26	3.91	3.93	3.86	3.20
Discussion												
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 2 0	0	0	2	5	5	4.25	585/1280	3.88	4.28	4.10	3.92	4.25
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 2 0	0	0	2	3	7	4.42	682/1277	4.30	4.60	4.34	4.13	4.42
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 2 0	0	1	2	1	8	4.33	721/1269	4.00	4.47	4.31	4.04	4.33
4. Were special techniques successful 2 1	. 0	1	3	2	5	4.00	426/ 854	4.06	4.16	4.02	3.87	4.00
Self Paced												
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 13 0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 37	****	4.33	4.63	4.53	****
Frequency Dis	stribu	ıtion										
Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades												

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors	
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	 А	4	Required for Majors	5	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	4						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	2	C	2	General	2	Under-grad	14	Non-major	13
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	a
				P	1			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	3				
				?	0						

Course-Section: SPAN 102 0801 Title

ELEMENTARY SPANISH II COLOMBO, LAURA

Instructor: Enrollment:

26

Questionnaires: 17

Spring 2007 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

University of Maryland

Baltimore County

Page 1417 JUN 26, 2007 Job IRBR3029

			Fre	equer	ncies	5		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	0	0	1	5	10	4.56	537/1522	4.01	4.36	4.30	4.14	4.56
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	2	5	9	4.44	654/1522	4.10	4.33	4.26	4.18	4.44
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	3	13	4.81	220/1285	4.19	4.45	4.30	4.22	4.81
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	3	12	4.69	295/1476	4.08	4.33	4.22	4.09	4.69
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	1	0	0	1	5	9	4.53	322/1412	3.86	4.26	4.06	4.01	4.53
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	1	1	0	2	5	7	4.13	723/1381	3.89	4.19	4.08	3.93	4.13
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	2	6	8	4.38	660/1500	4.06	4.14	4.18	4.16	4.38
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	4	12	4.75	802/1517	4.46	4.56	4.65	4.62	4.75
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	1	0	0	1	6	6	4.38	525/1497	3.96	4.21	4.11	4.02	4.38
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	1	4	11	4.63	656/1440	4.14	4.45	4.45	4.40	4.63
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	1	2	13	4.75	859/1448	4.61	4.79	4.71	4.63	4.75
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	2	4	10	4.50	601/1436	4.06	4.39	4.29	4.24	4.50
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	2	2	12	4.63	502/1432	4.15	4.47	4.29	4.23	4.63
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	3	1	0	4	3	4	3.75	786/1221	3.26	3.91	3.93	3.86	3.75
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	4	3	4	4.00	718/1280	3.88	4.28	4.10	3.92	4.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	1	0	2	1	7	4.18	855/1277	4.30	4.60	4.34	4.13	4.18
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	0	0	2	3	6	4.36	699/1269	4.00	4.47	4.31	4.04	4.36
4. Were special techniques successful	6	0	0	0	3	4	4	4.09	414/ 854	4.06	4.16	4.02	3.87	4.09

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	 2	0.00-0.99	0	A	 6	Required for Majors	11	Graduate	1	Major	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	В	3						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	4	С	5	General	0	Under-grad	16	Non-major	17
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	n
				Р	0			responses to	be sig	nificant	
				I	0	Other	5	-	_		
					0						

Course-Section: SPAN 102 0901 Title

ELEMENTARY SPANISH II

Instructor: MORENILLA, LAUR

Enrollment: 18 Questionnaires: 10 University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2007

Page 1418 JUN 26, 2007 Job IRBR3029

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

				Fre	eque	ncies	3		Inst	cructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
	General														
1	. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	1	0	2	4	3	3.80	1269/1522	4.01	4.36	4.30	4.14	3.80
	. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	0	1	4	4	4.00	1080/1522	4.10	4.33	4.26	4.18	4.00
3	. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	4	4	4.10	882/1285	4.19	4.45	4.30	4.22	4.10
4	. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	3	4	4.10	956/1476	4.08	4.33	4.22	4.09	4.10
5	. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	4	3	3	3.90	892/1412	3.86	4.26	4.06	4.01	3.90
6	. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	3	2	5	4.20	663/1381	3.89	4.19	4.08	3.93	4.20
7	. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	0	1	2	6	4.20	839/1500	4.06	4.14	4.18	4.16	4.20
8	. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	487/1517	4.46	4.56	4.65	4.62	4.90
9	. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	1	5	2	4.13	807/1497	3.96	4.21	4.11	4.02	4.13
	Lecture														
1	. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	2	2	_	4 20	1007/1440	1 11	4.45	4.45	4.40	4.30
	. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	2	7		1007/1440		4.45	4.45	4.40	4.60
	. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	2	5	7		1072/1448		4.79	4.71	4.03	4.10
	. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	٥	0	0	0	1	4	5	4.40	758/1432		4.47	4.29		4.40
	. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	1	1	2	0	2	4	3.67			3.91			3.67
3	. Did dadiovibual teemingues emance your understanding	J	_	_	_	J	_	-	3.07	032/1221	3.20	3.71	3.75	3.00	3.07
	Discussion														
1	. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	2	0	3	3	3.56	1009/1280	3.88	4.28	4.10	3.92	3.56
2	. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	2	1	6	4.44	652/1277	4.30	4.60	4.34	4.13	4.44
3	. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	2	0	0	1	6	4.00	875/1269	4.00	4.47	4.31	4.04	4.00
4	4. Were special techniques successful		0	0	0	1	4	4	4.33	287/ 854	4.06	4.16	4.02	3.87	4.33
	Laboratory														
2	Laboratory 2. Were you provided with adequate background information		0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 228	****	4.50	4.35	4.33	****
	1 3														

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	d Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	1	A	2	Required for Majors	6	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	В	5						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	2	C	1	General	0	Under-grad	10	Non-major	10
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	n
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	3	-			
				2	0						

Course-Section: SPAN 102 1001 Title

ELEMENTARY SPANISH II

Instructor: COLOMBO, LAURA

Enrollment: 24 Questionnaires: 18 University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2007

Page 1419 JUN 26, 2007 Job IRBR3029

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

			Frequencies				Instructor		Course Dept				Sect	
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	1	3	7	7	4.11	1043/1522	4.01	4.36	4.30	4.14	4.11
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	5	11	4.50	545/1522	4.10	4.33	4.26	4.18	4.50
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	5	13	4.72	308/1285	4.19	4.45	4.30	4.22	4.72
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	0	3	5	9	4.17	892/1476	4.08	4.33	4.22	4.09	4.17
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	4	4	10	4.33	493/1412	3.86	4.26	4.06	4.01	4.33
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	1	2	1	4	9	4.06	779/1381	3.89	4.19	4.08	3.93	4.06
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	0	5	3	9	4.06	961/1500	4.06	4.14	4.18	4.16	4.06
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	18	5.00	1/1517	4.46	4.56	4.65	4.62	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	2	9	4	4.13	794/1497	3.96	4.21	4.11	4.02	4.13
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	2	8	7	4.29	1015/1440	4.14	4.45	4.45	4.40	4.29
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	4	13	4.76	840/1448	4.61	4.79	4.71	4.63	4.76
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	4	5	8	4.24	896/1436	4.06	4.39	4.29	4.24	4.24
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	2	6	9	4.41	745/1432	4.15	4.47	4.29	4.23	4.41
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	2	0	1	5	5	3	3.71	808/1221	3.26	3.91	3.93	3.86	3.71
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	1	0	6	7	4.36	515/1280	3.88	4.28	4.10	3.92	4.36
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	0	0	2	12	4.86	272/1277	4.30	4.60	4.34	4.13	4.86
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	0	2	5	7	4.36	707/1269	4.00	4.47	4.31	4.04	4.36
4. Were special techniques successful	4	1	0	0	3	6	4	4.08	416/ 854	4.06	4.16	4.02	3.87	4.08

Credits Earned Cum. GPA				Expected	d Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors		
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	 А	5	Required for Majors	14	Graduate	0	Major	0	
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	В	6							
56-83	5	2.00-2.99	3	C	6	General	1	Under-grad	18	Non-major	18	
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	1	D	0							
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means	there	are not enough	ı	
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant		
				I	0	Other	4	-		-		
				2	1							

Title INT REV ELEM SPANISH

Instructor: RICHARDS, F

Enrollment: 23

Questionnaires: 20

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2007

Page 1420 JUN 26, 2007 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Fre	equei 2	ncie 3	s 4	5	Inst Mean	ructor Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean		Level Mean	Sect Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	2	0	5	8	5		1321/1522			4.30	4.14	3.70
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	2	1	9	./		1135/1522	3.98	4.33	4.26	4.18	3.95
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	2	1	1	6	9	4.00	938/1285	4.09	4.45	4.30	4.22	4.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1 1	0 2	2	3 3	6 6	8	4.05	982/1476	4.12	4.33	4.22	4.09	4.05 3.47
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	3 1	3 6	ь 5	5		1183/1412 1130/1381	3.44	4.26 4.19	4.06 4.08	4.01	3.47
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	3	3	5 7	6		1219/1500	4.10		4.18	4.16	3.70
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	18	2		1355/1517			4.16	4.10	4.10
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	1	0	6	5			1140/1497		4.21			3.76
7. now would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	U	_	U	U	J	J	3.70	1140/140/	3.00	7.21	7.11	4.02	3.70
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	3	1	5	7	3	3.32	1388/1440	3.70	4.45	4.45	4.40	3.32
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	1	1	1	4	12	4.32	1279/1448	4.57	4.79	4.71	4.63	4.32
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	1	0	4	4	10	4.16	965/1436	4.03	4.39	4.29	4.24	4.16
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	0	1	5	12	4.42	732/1432	4.17	4.47	4.29	4.23	4.42
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	2	2	2	3	3	6	3.56	875/1221	3.51	3.91	3.93	3.86	3.56
Discussion	0	0	-	2	0	0	_	2 50	006/1000	2 50	4 00	4 10	2 00	2 50
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	1	3	2	0	6	3.58	996/1280		4.28	4.10	3.92	3.58
 Were all students actively encouraged to participate Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 	8 8	0	0 1	0	3 1	0 1	9	4.50	594/1277 662/1269	4.45 4.29	4.60 4.47	4.34	4.13	4.50 4.42
4. Were special techniques successful	8	0 1	2	0	1	0	8	4.42	414/ 854			4.31	4.04	4.42
4. Were special techniques successiul	0	1	۷	U	Т	U	0	4.09	414/ 054	4.05	4.10	4.02	3.07	4.09
Laboratory														
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	19	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 228	****	4.50	4.35	4.33	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	19	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 217	****	4.50	4.51	4.51	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	19	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 216	****	****	4.42	4.41	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 205	****	5.00	4.23	4.28	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5 00	****/ 79	****	5.00	4.58	4.13	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 77	****	5.00	4.52	4.03	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 65	****	5.00	4.49	3.85	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 78	****	4.83	4.45	3.88	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	19	0	1	0	0	0	0		****/ 80	****		4.11	3.79	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 47	****	3.60	4.41	3.90	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	19	0	1	0	0	0	0		****/ 45	****	4.00	4.30	3.90	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	19	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	,	****	3.00	4.40	3.99	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	19	0	1	0	0	0	0	⊥.00	****/ 35	****	3.00	4.31	4.00	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	19	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 37	****	4.33	4.63	4.53	****

Title INT REV ELEM SPANISH

Instructor: RICHARDS, F

Enrollment: 23
Questionnaires: 20

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2007 Page 1420 JUN 26, 2007 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits I	Earned	Cum. GPA		Expected	Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	 6	Required for Majors	10	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	В	8						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	3	C	4	General	3	Under-grad	20	Non-major	19
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	3	D	1						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means	there	are not enough	a
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	6				
				?	0						

Course-Section: SPAN 103 0201 University of Maryland INT REV ELEM SPANISH Baltimore County Instructor: MORENILLA, LAUR

Title

Enrollment:

21

JUN 26, 2007 Spring 2007 Job IRBR3029

Page 1421

Ouestionnaires:	17	Student	Course	Evaluation	Ouestionnaire
-----------------	----	---------	--------	------------	---------------

								_	ncies	3	_		tructor	Course	_			
		Question	S		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		Genera	1															
1. Did vo	u gain ne	ew insights,ski		om this course	1	0	0	1	3	7	5	4.00	1122/1522	3.85	4.36	4.30	4.14	4.00
		ctor make clear			1	0	1	0	2	8	5		1080/1522		4.33	4.26	4.18	4.00
		uestions reflec			1	0	0	1	2	6	7				4.45	4.30	4.22	4.19
	_	uations reflect		_	1	0	0	0	4	5	7		871/1476		4.33	4.22	4.09	4.19
				what you learned	1	1	4	0	2	4	5	3.40	1225/1412	3.44	4.26	4.06	4.01	3.40
6. Did wr	itten as:	signments contr	ibute t	o what you learned	1	0	1	3	2	4	6	3.69	1086/1381	3.64	4.19	4.08	3.93	3.69
7. Was th	e gradin	g system clearl	y expla	ained	1	0	0	0	2	4	10	4.50	483/1500	4.10	4.14	4.18	4.16	4.50
8. How ma	ny times	was class cand	elled		1	0	0	0	0	0	16	5.00	1/1517	4.55	4.56	4.65	4.62	5.00
9. How wo	uld you	grade the overa	.ll teac	ching effectiveness	3	0	1	0	6	6	1	3.43	1315/1497	3.60	4.21	4.11	4.02	3.43
		Lectur																
1 Were t	he instr	actor's lecture	_	prepared	5	0	0	2	1	3	6	4 08	1155/1440	3 70	4.45	4 45	4.40	4.08
		ctor seem inter			6	0	0	0	0	2	9		737/1448		4.79	4.71	4.63	4.82
				explained clearly	6	0	0		3	3	Δ		1158/1436		4.39	4.29	4.24	3.91
		es contribute t			6	0	1	0	3	2			1126/1432		4.47	4.29	4.23	3.91
				our understanding	6	0	2	1	3	0			927/1221					3.45
				_														
		Discus																
				what you learned	11	-	0	0	2	2	2		718/1280		4.28	4.10		
		_	_	ed to participate	12	0	0	0		1	3				4.60	4.34		4.40
		_		nd open discussion	11	0	0	0	1	-	2		,			4.31		
4. Were s	pecial to	echniques succe	sstul		11	1	0	0	2	1	2	4.00	426/ 854	4.05	4.16	4.02	3.87	4.00
				Frequ	ıency	Dis	trib	utio:	n									
Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Re	asons	5			Ту	pe			Majors	5
00-27	1		0												0			
00-27 28-55	1 2	0.00-0.99 1.00-1.99	0	A 3 B 6		Ke	4uir	ea I	or Ma	ıjor	s I	. 4	Graduat	е	U	Majo)T	0
28-55 56-83	0	2.00-2.99	1	В 6 С 5		Cos	nera	1				0	Under-g	rad 1	.7	Mos	major	17
84-150	6	3.00-3.49	5	D 0		Gel	iera.	т.				U	onder-9	ıau 1	. /	MOI1-	·iiia JOI	Ι/
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	Б 0 F 0		רם.	ecti	170C				1	#### -	Meane +	hara a	re not	enous	rh
Grau.	U	3.30-4.00	T	P 0		11.1	CCLI	v C D				_	respons				_	1++
				I 0		O+1	ner					2	TCCCOID	-2 CO L	.c brgn	cai		

Course-Section: SPAN 201 0101 Title

INTERMEDIATE SPANISH I

Instructor: RAMIREZ, W

Enrollment: 16 Questionnaires: 14 University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2007

Page 1422 JUN 26, 2007 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

	Frequencies						Instructor		Course Dept		ot UMBC Level		Sect	
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	6	2	6	4.00	1122/1522	4.46	4.36	4.30	4.34	4.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	1	4	5	3	3.57	1335/1522	4.47	4.33	4.26	4.29	3.57
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	6	6	4.21	794/1285	4.41	4.45	4.30	4.36	4.21
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	7	4	4.00	1009/1476	4.45	4.33	4.22	4.20	4.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	1	1	7	3	4.00	760/1412	3.88	4.26	4.06	4.00	4.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	2	8	3	3.93	911/1381	4.24	4.19	4.08	3.97	3.93
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	3	2	5	4	3.71	1211/1500	4.37	4.14	4.18	4.20	3.71
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	13	4.93	389/1517	4.58	4.56	4.65	4.63	4.93
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	1	0	4	4	2	3.55	1261/1497	4.34	4.21	4.11	4.11	3.55
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	1	0	1	8	4	4.00	1186/1440	4.51	4.45	4.45	4.42	4.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	1	0	2	11	4.64	1024/1448	4.85	4.79	4.71	4.78	4.64
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	4	4	4	2	3.29	1346/1436	4.39	4.39	4.29	4.29	3.29
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	3	5	2	4	3.50	1270/1432	4.48	4.47	4.29	4.31	3.50
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	2	0	5	1	3	2	3.18	1033/1221	3.78	3.91	3.93	4.02	3.18
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	1	0	4	1	2	3.38	1091/1280	4.20	4.28	4.10	4.08	3.38
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	0	4	2	2		1066/1277	4.66	4.60	4.34	4.33	3.75
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	0	0	4	2	2		1030/1269	4.54	4.47	4.31	4.33	3.75
4. Were special techniques successful	6	1	0	0	3	2	2	3.86	547/ 854	4.57	4.16	4.02	4.00	3.86

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	l Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	А	6	Required for Majors	9	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	В	6						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	2	C	0	General	1	Under-grad	14	Non-major	14
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	h
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	3	-			
				2	Λ						

Course-Section: SPAN 201 0201 Title

INTERMEDIATE SPANISH I

Instructor: RICHARDS, F

Enrollment: 16 Questionnaires: 14 University of Maryland Page 1423 Baltimore County JUN 26, 2007 Spring 2007 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

			Fre	equer	ncie	S		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	Λ	5	Λ	9	4.29	869/1522	4 46	4.36	4 30	4.34	4.29
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	1	10	4.43	670/1522		4.33	4.26	4.29	4.43
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	Ū	3	2	9	4.43	626/1285		4.45	4.30	4.36	4.43
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	3	2	8	4.21	838/1476	4.45	4.33	4.22	4.20	4.21
• •	-	1	0		5	2	6 6	4.21	715/1412		4.33	4.22	4.20	4.21
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	2	2	7	4.08	556/1381		4.26	4.08	3.97	4.08
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	3	3	9		600/1500		4.19	4.08	4.20	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	Ŭ	0	0	0	3 0	10	9 4	4.43	1251/1517	4.37				4.43
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	•	0	0	10	-			4.58	4.56	4.65	4.63	4.29
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	Τ	0	Τ	3	2	4	3.90	1034/1497	4.34	4.21	4.11	4.11	3.90
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	1	2	5	5	4.08	1159/1440	4.51	4.45	4.45	4.42	4.08
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	3	0	10	4.54	1131/1448	4.85	4.79	4.71	4.78	4.54
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	3	4	6	4.23	896/1436	4.39	4.39	4.29	4.29	4.23
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	3	2	8	4.38			4.47	4.29	4.31	4.38
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	2	1	2	1	4	2	3.40	956/1221		3.91	3.93	4.02	3.40
	_	_	_	_	_	_	_							
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	9	0	1	0	1	0	3	3.80	874/1280	4.20	4.28	4.10	4.08	3.80
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	10	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	375/1277	4.66	4.60	4.34	4.33	4.75
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	10	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	381/1269	4.54	4.47	4.31	4.33	4.75
4. Were special techniques successful	10	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/ 854		4.16	4.02	4.00	5.00
1. Hore Special committees successful		J	•	J	•		-	3.00	1, 001	1.57	1.10	1.02	1.00	3.00

Credits Ea	Credits Earned Cu			Expected	l Grades	Reasons		Type	Majors		
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	 А	4	Required for Majors	10	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	В	6						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	0	C	2	General	0	Under-grad	14	Non-major	14
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	5	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	1	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	n
				Р	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	2	_		-	
				2	0						

Course-Section: SPAN 201 0301 University of Maryland Title INTERMEDIATE SPANISH I Baltimore County

INTERMEDIATE SPANISH I Baltimore County RICHARDS, F Spring 2007

Instructor: RICHARDS, F

Enrollment: 22
Questionnaires: 19

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Page 1424

JUN 26, 2007

Job IRBR3029

General	Mean 4.50 4.83
******	4.83
	4.83
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course 1 0 0 0 1 7 10 4.50 605/1522 4.46 4.36 4.30 4.34 4	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals 1 0 0 1 2 6 9 4.28 752/1285 4.41 4.45 4.30 4.36 4	4.28
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals 1 0 0 0 2 4 12 4.56 425/1476 4.45 4.33 4.22 4.20 4	4.56
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 2 5 3 1 2 0 6 3.42 1219/1412 3.88 4.26 4.06 4.00 3	3.42
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 2 0 0 1 2 4 10 4.35 495/1381 4.24 4.19 4.08 3.97 4	4.35
7. Was the grading system clearly explained 2 0 0 0 2 3 12 4.59 406/1500 4.37 4.14 4.18 4.20 4	4.59
8. How many times was class cancelled 2 0 0 0 12 5 4.29 1246/1517 4.58 4.56 4.65 4.63 4	4.29
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 5 0 0 0 0 9 5 4.36 554/1497 4.34 4.21 4.11 4.11 4	4.36
Lecture	
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 3 0 0 1 1 5 9 4.38 953/1440 4.51 4.45 4.45 4.42 4	4.38
	4.94
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 3 0 0 0 0 6 10 4.63 457/1436 4.39 4.39 4.29 4.29 4	4.63
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 3 0 0 0 1 6 9 4.50 632/1432 4.48 4.47 4.29 4.31 4	4.50
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 4 5 0 0 5 3 2 3.70 $814/1221$ 3.78 3.91 3.93 4.02 3	3.70
Discussion	
	3.83
	4.83
	4.83
	4.60

Credits	Earned	Cum. GPA		Expected	Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	А	9	Required for Majors	16	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	В	6						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	4	C	3	General	0	Under-grad	19	Non-major	19
84-150	7	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	8	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	n
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	2	-			
				?	0						

Title INTERMEDIATE SPANISH I

Instructor: OSKOZ, ANA

Enrollment: 25
Questionnaires: 19

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2007

Page 1425 JUN 26, 2007 Job IRBR3029

	Frequencies					Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect		
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	2	1	0	6	10	4.11	1054/1522	4.46	4.36	4.30	4.34	4.11
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	1	0	6	11	4.32	811/1522	4.47	4.33	4.26	4.29	4.32
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	1	0	3	9	5	3.94	991/1285	4.41	4.45	4.30	4.36	3.94
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	2	0	1	10	6	3.95	1079/1476	4.45	4.33	4.22	4.20	3.95
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	3	4	9	2	3.56	1138/1412	3.88	4.26	4.06	4.00	3.56
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	1	0	13	4	3.95	885/1381	4.24	4.19	4.08	3.97	3.95
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	2	1	5	2	9	3.79	1161/1500	4.37	4.14	4.18	4.20	3.79
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	18	5.00	1/1517	4.58	4.56	4.65	4.63	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	1	0	0	8	8	4.29	612/1497	4.34	4.21	4.11	4.11	4.29
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	1	0	0	2	14	4.65	630/1440	4.51	4.45	4.45	4.42	4.65
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	1	1	15	4.82	710/1448	4.85	4.79	4.71	4.78	4.82
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	1	0	2	6	8	4.18	949/1436	4.39	4.39	4.29	4.29	4.18
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	1	2	3	11	4.41	745/1432	4.48	4.47	4.29	4.31	4.41
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	3	0	2	4	4	4	3.71	808/1221	3.78	3.91	3.93	4.02	3.71
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	1	3	4	4	3.92	814/1280	4.20	4.28	4.10	4.08	3.92
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	0	1	1	3	7	4.33	743/1277	4.66	4.60	4.34	4.33	4.33
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	0	0	2	5	5	4.25	777/1269	4.54	4.47	4.31	4.33	4.25
4. Were special techniques successful	7	0	1	0	1	5	5	4.08	415/ 854	4.57	4.16	4.02	4.00	4.08
1. Were apecial econniques adecessial	,	J	_	J		J	J	1.00	113/ 034	1.57	1.10	1.02	1.00	1.00

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expecte	ed Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	А	4	Required for Majors	6	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	В	10						
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	3	C	4	General	1	Under-grad	19	Non-major	19
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	5	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	n
				P	0			responses to	be si	qnificant	
				I	0	Other	7	-		_	
				2	0						

Course-Section: SPAN 201 0501 University of Maryland Title INTERMEDIATE SPANISH I

Baltimore County Spring 2007

Page 1426

JUN 26, 2007

Job IRBR3029

Instructor: STRICKLING, LAU Enrollment: 27 Questionnaires: 18

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

					Fre	equei	ncies			Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect		
		Questions	3		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		General	 1															
1. Did voi	u gain ne	ew insights,skil	=	m this course	0	0	0	0	1	3	14	4.72	365/1522	4.46	4.36	4.30	4.34	4.72
		ctor make clear			0	0	0	0	0	1		4.94	77/1522	4.47		4.26		4.94
		uestions reflect			0	0	0	0	0	4		4.78	258/1285	4.41		4.30		4.78
		ations reflect			0	0	0	0	0	2			135/1476	4.45		4.22		4.89
				what you learned	1	0	2	3	3	3			1183/1412	3.88	4.26	4.06		3.47
	_	_		what you learned	0	0	0	0	5	5	8	4.17		4.24	4.19	4.08		4.17
		g system clearly		-	0	0	0	0	1	4	13	4.67	312/1500	4.37	4.14	4.18	4.20	4.67
		was class cance			0	0	0	0	0	1	17	4.94	292/1517	4.58	4.56	4.65	4.63	4.94
	_			ning effectiveness	2	1	0	0	0	2	13	4.87	121/1497	4.34	4.21	4.11	4.11	4.87
		Lecture	_															
1 Ware th	he instru	actor's lectures		arenared	1	0	0	0	0	2	15	4.88	224/1440	4 51	4.45	4.45	4.42	4.88
					1	0	0	0	0	0	17	5.00	1/1448	4.85	4.79	4.71	4.78	5.00
	 Did the instructor seem interested in the subject Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 						0	0	0	-	15	4.88	141/1436	4.39	4.39	4.29	4.29	4.88
	4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned						0	0	0	2	15	4.88	187/1432	4.48	4.47	4.29		4.88
	4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding						1	0	1	4		4.33	408/1221				4.02	
J. Dia aa	aiovibaai	r ccciniiques cin	lance y	Jar understanding	1	2	_	O	_	1	,	1.55	100/1221	3.70	3.71	3.75	1.02	1.55
		Discuss	sion															
1. Did cla	ass discu	ussions contribu	ate to	what you learned	6	0	0	0	3	1	8	4.42	468/1280	4.20	4.28	4.10	4.08	4.42
2. Were a	ll studer	nts actively end	courage	d to participate	6	0	0	0	1	1	10	4.75	375/1277	4.66	4.60	4.34	4.33	4.75
3. Did the	e instruc	ctor encourage f	fair an	d open discussion	6	0	0	0	1	2	9	4.67	461/1269	4.54	4.47	4.31	4.33	4.67
4. Were sp	pecial te	echniques succes	ssful		6	2	0	0	0	3	7	4.70	129/ 854	4.57	4.16	4.02	4.00	4.70
				Frequ	iency	Dist	ribu	ıtioı	n									
																	_	
Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grade								Rea	asons				Туј	pe 			Majors	
00-27	00-27 0 0.00-0.99 0 A 13					Red	quire	ed fo	or Ma	jor	s 1	0	Graduate	е	0	Majo	r	0
28-55																		
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	4	C 0		Ger	nera:	L				0	Under-g	rad 1	.8	Non-	major	18
84-150																		
Grad. 0 3.50-4.00 3 F 0					Ele	ectiv	res				0	#### - 1				_	h	
P 0												response	es to b	e sign	ifican	ıt		
	I 0				Oth	ner					7							
? 0																		

Course-Section: SPAN 201 0601 University
Title INTERMEDIATE SPANISH I Baltimo:

Instructor: MESSICK, ROSALI

Enrollment: 26
Questionnaires: 23

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2007

Page 1427 JUN 26, 2007 Job IRBR3029

Student	Course	Eval	.uatio	n Ques	tionna	aire
---------	--------	------	--------	--------	--------	------

Questions				Fre	equer	ncie	s		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course 0 0 0 0 0 0 9 14 4.61 492/1522 4.46 4.36 4.30 4.34 4.61 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals 0 0 0 0 2 10 11 4.39 714/1522 4.47 4.33 4.26 4.29 4.39 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals 0 0 0 0 3 9 11 4.35 698/1285 4.41 4.45 4.30 4.36 4.35 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals 0 0 0 0 2 6 15 4.57 416/1476 4.45 4.33 4.22 4.20 4.57 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0 3 0 2 4 9 5 3.85 932/1412 3.88 4.26 4.06 4.00 3.85 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 2 0 0 0 0 3 11 7 4.19 663/1381 4.24 4.19 4.08 3.97 4.19 7. Was the grading system clearly explained 0 0 0 0 1 2 6 14 4.43 585/1500 4.37 4.14 4.18 4.20 4.43 8. How many times was class cancelled 2 0 0 0 0 0 2 1 5.00 1/1517 4.58 4.56 4.65 4.63 5.00 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 3 0 1 0 1 8 10 4.30 602/1497 4.34 4.21 4.11 4.11 4.30	Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals 0 0 0 0 2 10 11 4.39 714/1522 4.47 4.33 4.26 4.29 4.39 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals 0 0 0 0 3 9 11 4.35 698/1285 4.41 4.45 4.30 4.36 4.35 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals 0 0 0 0 2 6 15 4.57 416/1476 4.45 4.33 4.22 4.20 4.35 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0 3 0 2 4 9 5 3.85 932/1412 3.88 4.26 4.06 4.00 3.85 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 2 0 0 0 3 11 7 4.19 663/1381 4.24 4.19 4.08 3.97 4.19 7. Was the grading system clearly explained 0 0 0 1 2 6 14 4.43 585/1500 4.37 4.14 4.18 4.20 4.43 8. How many times was class cancelled 2 0 0 0 0 0 1 2 6 14 4.43 585/1500 4.37 4.14 4.18 4.20 4.43 8. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 3 0 1 0 1 8 10 4.30 602/1497 4.34 4.21 4.11 4.11 4.30 Lecture 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 0 0 0 0 1 9 13 4.52 774/1440 4.51 4.45 4.45 4.42 4.52 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 1 0 0 0 1 1 20 4.86 602/1448 4.85 4.79 4.71 4.78 4.86 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0 0 0 0 4 8 11 4.30 825/1436 4.39 4.39 4.29 4.29 4.30 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 1 0 0 0 2 6 14 4.55 590/1432 4.48 4.47 4.29 4.31 4.55 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 1 3 0 2 6 3 8 3.89 701/1221 3.78 3.91 3.93 4.02 3.89	General														
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals 0 0 0 0 3 9 11 4.35 698/1285 4.41 4.45 4.30 4.36 4.35 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals 0 0 0 0 0 2 6 15 4.57 416/1476 4.45 4.33 4.22 4.20 4.57 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0 3 0 2 4 9 5 3.85 932/1412 3.88 4.26 4.06 4.00 3.85 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 2 0 0 0 3 11 7 4.19 663/1381 4.24 4.19 4.08 3.97 4.19 7. Was the grading system clearly explained 0 0 0 0 1 2 6 14 4.43 585/1500 4.37 4.14 4.18 4.20 4.43 8. How many times was class cancelled 2 0 0 0 0 0 1 2 6 14 4.43 585/1500 4.37 4.14 4.18 4.20 4.43 8. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 3 0 1 0 1 8 10 4.30 602/1497 4.34 4.21 4.11 4.11 4.30 Lecture 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 0 0 0 0 1 9 13 4.52 774/1440 4.51 4.45 4.45 4.42 4.52 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 1 0 0 0 0 1 1 2 0 4.86 602/1448 4.85 4.79 4.71 4.78 4.86 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0 0 0 0 0 4 8 11 4.30 825/1436 4.39 4.39 4.29 4.29 4.30 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 1 0 0 0 2 6 14 4.55 590/1432 4.48 4.47 4.29 4.31 4.55 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 1 3 0 2 6 3 8 3.89 701/1221 3.78 3.91 3.93 4.02 3.89	1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	9	14	4.61	492/1522	4.46	4.36	4.30	4.34	4.61
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals 0 0 0 0 0 2 6 15 4.57 416/1476 4.45 4.33 4.22 4.20 4.57 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0 3 0 2 4 9 5 3.85 932/1412 3.88 4.26 4.06 4.00 3.85 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 2 0 0 0 3 11 7 4.19 663/1381 4.24 4.19 4.08 3.97 4.19 7. Was the grading system clearly explained 0 0 0 0 1 2 6 14 4.43 585/1500 4.37 4.14 4.18 4.20 4.43 8. How many times was class cancelled 2 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 2 5.00 1/1517 4.58 4.56 4.65 4.63 5.00 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 3 0 1 0 1 8 10 4.30 602/1497 4.34 4.21 4.11 4.11 4.30 8. How the instructor's lectures well prepared 0 0 0 0 1 9 13 4.52 774/1440 4.51 4.45 4.45 4.42 4.52 9. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 1 0 0 0 1 1 2 0 4.86 602/1448 4.85 4.79 4.71 4.78 4.86 9. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0 0 0 0 0 2 6 14 4.55 590/1432 4.48 4.47 4.29 4.31 4.55 9. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 1 3 0 2 6 3 8 3.89 701/1221 3.78 3.91 3.93 4.02 3.89	2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	10	11	4.39	714/1522	4.47	4.33	4.26	4.29	4.39
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0 3 0 2 4 9 5 3.85 932/1412 3.88 4.26 4.06 4.00 3.85 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 2 0 0 0 3 11 7 4.19 663/1381 4.24 4.19 4.08 3.97 4.19 7. Was the grading system clearly explained 0 0 0 1 2 6 14 4.43 585/1500 4.37 4.14 4.18 4.20 4.43 8. How many times was class cancelled 2 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 1 5.00 1/1517 4.58 4.56 4.65 4.63 5.00 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 3 0 1 0 1 8 10 4.30 602/1497 4.34 4.21 4.11 4.11 4.30 Lecture 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 0 0 0 0 1 9 13 4.52 774/1440 4.51 4.45 4.45 4.42 4.52 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 1 0 0 0 1 1 20 4.86 602/1448 4.85 4.79 4.71 4.78 4.86 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0 0 0 0 4 8 11 4.30 825/1436 4.39 4.39 4.29 4.29 4.30 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 1 0 0 0 2 6 14 4.55 590/1432 4.48 4.47 4.29 4.31 4.55 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 1 3 0 2 6 3 8 3.89 701/1221 3.78 3.91 3.93 4.02 3.89	3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	9	11	4.35	698/1285	4.41	4.45	4.30	4.36	4.35
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 2 0 0 0 3 11 7 4.19 663/1381 4.24 4.19 4.08 3.97 4.19 7. Was the grading system clearly explained 0 0 0 1 2 6 14 4.43 585/1500 4.37 4.14 4.18 4.20 4.43 8. How many times was class cancelled 2 0 0 0 0 0 21 5.00 1/1517 4.58 4.56 4.65 4.63 5.00 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 3 0 1 0 1 8 10 4.30 602/1497 4.34 4.21 4.11 4.11 4.30 Lecture 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 0 0 0 0 1 9 13 4.52 774/1440 4.51 4.45 4.45 4.42 4.52 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 1 0 0 0 1 1 20 4.86 602/1448 4.85 4.79 4.71 4.78 4.86 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0 0 0 0 4 8 11 4.30 825/1436 4.39 4.39 4.29 4.29 4.30 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 1 0 0 0 2 6 14 4.55 590/1432 4.48 4.47 4.29 4.31 4.55 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 1 3 0 2 6 3 8 3.89 701/1221 3.78 3.91 3.93 4.02 3.89 Discussion	4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	6	15	4.57	416/1476	4.45	4.33	4.22	4.20	4.57
7. Was the grading system clearly explained 0 0 0 1 2 6 14 4.43 585/1500 4.37 4.14 4.18 4.20 4.43 8. How many times was class cancelled 2 0 0 0 0 0 0 21 5.00 1/1517 4.58 4.56 4.65 4.63 5.00 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 3 0 1 0 1 8 10 4.30 602/1497 4.34 4.21 4.11 4.11 4.30 Lecture 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 0 0 0 0 1 9 13 4.52 774/1440 4.51 4.45 4.45 4.42 4.52 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 1 0 0 0 1 1 20 4.86 602/1448 4.85 4.79 4.71 4.78 4.86 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0 0 0 0 4 8 11 4.30 825/1436 4.39 4.39 4.29 4.29 4.30 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 1 0 0 0 2 6 14 4.55 590/1432 4.48 4.47 4.29 4.31 4.55 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 1 3 0 2 6 3 8 3.89 701/1221 3.78 3.91 3.93 4.02 3.89	5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	3	0	2	4	9	5	3.85	932/1412	3.88	4.26	4.06	4.00	3.85
8. How many times was class cancelled 2 0 0 0 0 0 21 5.00 1/1517 4.58 4.56 4.65 4.63 5.00 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 3 0 1 0 1 8 10 4.30 602/1497 4.34 4.21 4.11 4.11 4.30 Lecture 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 0 0 0 0 1 9 13 4.52 774/1440 4.51 4.45 4.45 4.42 4.52 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 1 0 0 0 1 1 20 4.86 602/1448 4.85 4.79 4.71 4.78 4.86 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0 0 0 0 4 8 11 4.30 825/1436 4.39 4.39 4.29 4.30 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 1 0 0 0 2 6 14 4.55 590/1432 4.48 4.47 4.29 4.31 4.55 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 1 3 0 2 6 3 8 3.89 701/1221 3.78 3.91 3.93 4.02 3.89 Discussion	6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	3	11	7	4.19	663/1381	4.24	4.19	4.08	3.97	4.19
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 3 0 1 0 1 8 10 4.30 602/1497 4.34 4.21 4.11 4.11 4.30 Lecture 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 0 0 0 0 1 9 13 4.52 774/1440 4.51 4.45 4.45 4.42 4.52 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 1 0 0 0 1 1 20 4.86 602/1448 4.85 4.79 4.71 4.78 4.86 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0 0 0 0 4 8 11 4.30 825/1436 4.39 4.39 4.29 4.29 4.30 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 1 0 0 0 2 6 14 4.55 590/1432 4.48 4.47 4.29 4.31 4.55 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 1 3 0 2 6 3 8 3.89 701/1221 3.78 3.91 3.93 4.02 3.89 Discussion	7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	2	6	14	4.43	585/1500	4.37	4.14	4.18	4.20	4.43
Lecture 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding Discussion Lecture 0 0 0 1 9 13 4.52 774/1440 4.51 4.45 4.45 4.42 4.52 4. August 1 20 4.86 602/1448 4.85 4.79 4.71 4.78 4.86 4. But 1 4.30 825/1436 4.39 4.39 4.29 4.29 4.30 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 1 0 0 0 0 2 6 14 4.55 590/1432 4.48 4.47 4.29 4.31 4.55 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding Discussion	8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	0	21	5.00	1/1517	4.58	4.56	4.65	4.63	5.00
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 0 0 0 0 1 9 13 4.52 774/1440 4.51 4.45 4.45 4.42 4.52 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 1 0 0 0 1 1 20 4.86 602/1448 4.85 4.79 4.71 4.78 4.86 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0 0 0 0 0 4 8 11 4.30 825/1436 4.39 4.39 4.29 4.29 4.30 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 1 0 0 0 0 2 6 14 4.55 590/1432 4.48 4.47 4.29 4.31 4.55 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 1 3 0 2 6 3 8 3.89 701/1221 3.78 3.91 3.93 4.02 3.89	9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	1	0	1	8	10	4.30	602/1497	4.34	4.21	4.11	4.11	4.30
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 1 0 0 0 1 1 20 4.86 602/1448 4.85 4.79 4.71 4.78 4.86 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0 0 0 0 4 8 11 4.30 825/1436 4.39 4.39 4.29 4.29 4.30 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 1 0 0 0 0 2 6 14 4.55 590/1432 4.48 4.47 4.29 4.31 4.55 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 1 3 0 2 6 3 8 3.89 701/1221 3.78 3.91 3.93 4.02 3.89 Discussion	Lecture														
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0 0 0 0 4 8 11 4.30 825/1436 4.39 4.39 4.29 4.29 4.30 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 1 0 0 0 0 2 6 14 4.55 590/1432 4.48 4.47 4.29 4.31 4.55 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 1 3 0 2 6 3 8 3.89 701/1221 3.78 3.91 3.93 4.02 3.89 Discussion	1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	9	13	4.52	774/1440	4.51	4.45	4.45	4.42	4.52
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 1 0 0 0 2 6 14 4.55 590/1432 4.48 4.47 4.29 4.31 4.55 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 1 3 0 2 6 3 8 3.89 701/1221 3.78 3.91 3.93 4.02 3.89 Discussion	2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	1	1	20	4.86	602/1448	4.85	4.79	4.71	4.78	4.86
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 1 3 0 2 6 3 8 3.89 701/1221 3.78 3.91 3.93 4.02 3.89 Discussion	3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	4	8	11	4.30	825/1436	4.39	4.39	4.29	4.29	4.30
Discussion	4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	2	6	14	4.55	590/1432	4.48	4.47	4.29	4.31	4.55
	5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	3	0	2	6	3	8	3.89	701/1221	3.78	3.91	3.93	4.02	3.89
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 10 0 0 0 3 3 7 4.31 553/1280 4.20 4.28 4.10 4.08 4.31	Discussion														
	1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	3	3	7	4.31	553/1280	4.20	4.28	4.10	4.08	4.31
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 10 0 0 0 0 4 9 4.69 442/1277 4.66 4.60 4.34 4.33 4.69	-		0	0	0	0	4	9		,				4.33	4.69
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 10 0 0 0 0 5 8 4.62 501/1269 4.54 4.47 4.31 4.33 4.62		10	0	0	0	0	5	8	4.62	501/1269	4.54	4.47		4.33	4.62
4. Were special techniques successful 10 1 0 0 2 3 7 4.42 246/854 4.57 4.16 4.02 4.00 4.42	-		1	0	0	2	3	7	4.42		4.57	4.16	4.02	4.00	4.42

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expecte	d Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	 А	7	Required for Majors	20	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	В	12						
56-83	5	2.00-2.99	4	C	2	General	0	Under-grad	23	Non-major	23
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	5	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	1	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	ı
				P	0			responses to	be sig	nificant	
				I	0	Other	5	-			
				2	0						

Course-Section: SPAN 201 0701
Title INTERMEDIATE SPANISH I

INTERMEDIATE SPANISH I Baltimore County GLYNN, DOUGLAS Spring 2007

Instructor: GLYNN, DOUGLAS

Enrollment: 24
Questionnaires: 18

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

University of Maryland

Page 1428 JUN 26, 2007 Job IRBR3029

	Frequencies			Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect				
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	2	3	13	4.61	482/1522	4.46	4.36	4.30	4.34	4.61
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	6	12	4.67	358/1522	4.47	4.33	4.26	4.29	4.67
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	2	2	13	4.65	386/1285	4.41	4.45	4.30	4.36	4.65
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	3	14	4.72	255/1476	4.45	4.33	4.22	4.20	4.72
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	5	0	1	2	4	6	4.15	655/1412	3.88	4.26	4.06	4.00	4.15
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	5	12	4.61	240/1381	4.24	4.19	4.08	3.97	4.61
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	6	11	4.56	435/1500	4.37	4.14	4.18	4.20	4.56
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	15	3	4.17	1319/1517	4.58	4.56	4.65	4.63	4.17
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	1	1	2	5	8	4.06	865/1497	4.34	4.21	4.11	4.11	4.06
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	2	2	11	4.47	837/1440	4.51	4.45	4.45	4.42	4.47
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	17	5.00	1/1448	4.85	4.79	4.71	4.78	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	1	5	11	4.59	502/1436	4.39	4.39	4.71	4.29	4.59
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	2	5	10	4.47	669/1432	4.48	4.47	4.29	4.31	4.47
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	11	1	1	1	2	1		1038/1221	3.78	3.91	3.93	4.02	3.17
5. 21d dddioviddai ceennigaeb ennance your anderbeanding	_		_	_	_	_	_	3.1.	1030, 1221	3.70	3.71	3.75	1.02	3.1.
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	170/1280	4.20	4.28	4.10	4.08	4.83
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	12	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1277	4.66	4.60	4.34	4.33	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	12	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	299/1269	4.54	4.47	4.31	4.33	4.83
4. Were special techniques successful	12	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/ 854	4.57	4.16	4.02	4.00	5.00
Frequ	iency	Dis	trib	ution	n									

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	 А	6	Required for Majors	14	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	В	8						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	6	C	1	General	0	Under-grad	18	Non-major	18
84-150	6	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means	there	are not enough	h
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	2	_			
				2	1						

Title INTERMEDIATE SPANISH I

Instructor: GLYNN, DOUGLAS

Enrollment: 22

Questionnaires: 19

Spring 2007 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

University of Maryland

Baltimore County

Page 1429 JUN 26, 2007 Job IRBR3029

			Fre	equei	ncie	s		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	1	18	4.95	106/1522	4.46	4.36	4.30	4.34	4.95
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	17	4.89	135/1522	4.47	4.33	4.26	4.29	4.89
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	16	4.84	196/1285	4.41	4.45	4.30	4.36	4.84
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	1	17	4.94	75/1476	4.45	4.33	4.22	4.20	4.94
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	4	6	8	4.22	594/1412	3.88	4.26	4.06	4.00	4.22
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	3	15	4.74	162/1381	4.24	4.19	4.08	3.97	4.74
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	2	2	15	4.68	287/1500	4.37	4.14	4.18	4.20	4.68
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	10	9	4.47	1104/1517	4.58	4.56	4.65	4.63	4.47
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	1	0	0	0	5	10	4.67	264/1497	4.34	4.21	4.11	4.11	4.67
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared		0	0	0	0	1	16	4.94	115/1440	4.51	4.45	4.45	4.42	4.94
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	0	17	5.00	1/1448	4.85	4.79	4.71	4.78	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	1	0	2	14	4.71	373/1436	4.39	4.39	4.29	4.29	4.71
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	1	0	16	4.88	187/1432	4.48	4.47	4.29	4.31	4.88
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	10	1	0	1	1	4	4.00	606/1221		3.91	3.93	4.02	4.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.80	184/1280	4.20	4.28	4.10	4.08	4.80
-	-	0	0	0	0		8	4.80	228/1277	4.20	4.28	4.10	4.08	4.80
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	0	0	1	0	9	4.80	332/1269	4.54	4.60	4.34	4.33	4.80
4. Were special techniques successful	9	0	0	0	2	0	9	4.80	166/ 854		4.47	4.31	4.33	4.80
4. Were special techniques successful	9	U	U	U	4	U	0	4.60	100/ 054	4.57	4.10	4.02	4.00	4.00
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	18	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 215	****	****	4.36	4.62	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	18	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 228	****	4.50	4.35	4.56	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 217	****	4.50	4.51	4.57	****

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

Course-Section: SPAN 201 0901 University of Maryland Title INTERMEDIATE SPANISH I Baltimore County

Baltimore County Spring 2007

Instructor: STRICKLING, LAU
Enrollment: 29

Ouestionnaires: 19

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Page 1430

JUN 26, 2007

Job IRBR3029

4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals 3 0 0 0 1 1 1 4 4.81 1/2/14/6 4.45 4.33 4.22 4.20 4.81 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 3 1 0 1 2 4 8 4.27 557/1412 3.88 4.26 4.06 4.00 4.27 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 3 0 0 0 1 5 10 4.56 280/1381 4.24 4.19 4.08 3.97 4.56 7. Was the grading system clearly explained 2 0 0 0 0 2 15 4.88 119/1500 4.37 4.14 4.18 4.20 4.88 8. How many times was class cancelled 3 0 0 0 0 1 15 4.94 341/1517 4.58 4.56 4.65 4.63 4.94

8. How many times was class cancelled 3 0 0 0 0 1 15 4.94 341/1517 4.58 4.56 4.65 4.63 4.94 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 4 0 0 0 0 15 5.00 1/1497 4.34 4.21 4.11 4.11 5.00

Lecture 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 4 0 0 0 0 1 14 4.93 134/1440 4.51 4.45 4.45 4.42 4.93 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 4 0 0 0 0 0 15 5.00 1/1448 4.85 4.79 4.71 4.78 5.00 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 4 0 0 0 0 0 15 5.00 1/1436 4.39 4.39 4.29 4.29 5.00 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 1/1432 4.48 4.47 4.29 4.31 5.00 4 0 0 0 0 0 15 5.00

4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 4 0 0 0 0 0 15 5.00 1/1432 4.48 4.47 4.29 4.31 5.00 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 4 1 0 0 0 4 10 4.71 144/1221 3.78 3.91 3.93 4.02 4.71

Discussion 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 8 0 0 0 0 2 9 4.82 179/1280 4.20 4.28 4.10 4.08 4.82 1 10 4.91 228/1277 4.66 4.60 4.34 4.33 4.91 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 8 0 0 0 0 8 0 0

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expecte	d Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors	
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	 А	12	Required for Majors	13	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	4						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	1	C	1	General	0	Under-grad	19	Non-major	19
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	ı
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	4				
				?	0						

Course-Section: SPAN 201 1001 Title

University of Maryland INTERMEDIATE SPANISH I Baltimore County Spring 2007

Instructor: RAMIREZ, W

Enrollment: 25 Questionnaires: 19

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Page 1431 JUN 26, 2007 Job IRBR3029

		1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1			Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect			
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	0	0	3	3	12	4.50	605/1522	4.46	4.36	4.30	4.34	4.50
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	7	10	4.50	545/1522	4.47	4.33	4.26	4.29	4.50
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	0	3	5	10	4.21	794/1285	4.41	4.45	4.30	4.36	4.21
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	4	12	4.42	597/1476	4.45	4.33	4.22	4.20	4.42
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	1	3	3	11	4.33	493/1412	3.88	4.26	4.06	4.00	4.33
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	4	4	11	4.37	482/1381	4.24	4.19	4.08	3.97	4.37
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	3	3	12	4.37	670/1500	4.37	4.14	4.18	4.20	4.37
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	5	14	4.74	837/1517	4.58	4.56	4.65	4.63	4.74
$9.\ \mbox{How would}$ you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	1	5	11	4.59	326/1497	4.34	4.21	4.11	4.11	4.59
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	0	5	12	4.71	552/1440	4.51	4.45	4.45	4.42	4.71
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	0	17	5.00	1/1448	4.85	4.79	4.71	4.78	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	3	6	8	4.29	835/1436	4.39	4.39	4.29	4.29	4.29
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	7	10	4.59	548/1432	4.48	4.47	4.29	4.31	4.59
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	9	0	1	1	0	6	4.38	380/1221	3.78	3.91	3.93	4.02	4.38
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	343/1280	4.20	4.28	4.10	4.08	4.5
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	12	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	272/1277	4.66	4.60	4.34	4.33	4.86
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	12	0	0	0	1	1	5	4.57	532/1269	4.54	4.47	4.31	4.33	4.5
4. Were special techniques successful	12	1	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	84/ 854	4.57	4.16	4.02	4.00	4.83
Frequ	ıency	Dis	trib	utio	n									
Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades				Rea	asons	3			Ty	pe			Majors	;
00-27 4 0.00-0.99 1 A 11		 Red	 guir	ed f	or Ma	 ajor	s 1	3	Graduat	 e	0	 Majo		0

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expecte	d Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	4	0.00-0.99	1	 А	11	Required for Majors	13	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	0	В	7						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	1	C	0	General	1	Under-grad	19	Non-major	19
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	5	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	h
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	5	-			
				2	Λ						

Course-Section: SPAN 201 1101 University of Maryland Title INTERMEDIATE SPANISH I

Baltimore County Spring 2007

Instructor: DEANGULO, SANTI Enrollment: 21

Questionnaires: 18

Page 1432 JUN 26, 2007 Job IRBR3029

Student	Course	Evaluation	Quest:	ionnaire
---------	--------	------------	--------	----------

	Frequencies					Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect		
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	Ο	Ο	1	5	4	8	4 06	1088/1522	4 46	4 36	4 30	4.34	4.06
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	0	4	6	7		1080/1522		4.33	4.26	4.29	4.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	2	2	5	9	4.17	833/1285	4.41	4.45	4.30	4.36	4.17
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	11	4	4.06	982/1476		4.33	4.22	4.20	4.06
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	5	1	1	2	5	4		1005/1412		4.26	4.06	4.00	3.77
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	1	1	1	2	7	5	3.88	961/1381	4.24	4.19	4.08	3.97	3.88
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	2	2	8	6	4.00	988/1500	4.37	4.14	4.18	4.20	4.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	15	3	4.17	1319/1517	4.58	4.56	4.65	4.63	4.17
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	3	6	5	4.14	782/1497		4.21		4.11	4.14
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	1	0	0	9	8	4.28	1031/1440	4.51	4.45	4.45	4.42	4.28
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	1	16	4.83	683/1448	4.85	4.79	4.71	4.78	4.83
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	3	8	7	4.22	906/1436	4.39	4.39	4.29	4.29	4.22
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	2	3	6	7	4.00	1036/1432	4.48	4.47	4.29	4.31	4.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	8	1	0	1	3	2	3.71	808/1221	3.78	3.91	3.93	4.02	3.71
Discussion														
	11	0	^	0	2	2	1	2 71	024/1000	4 00	4 00	4 10	4 00	2 71
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	3	3	Τ.	3.71	934/1280		4.28	4.10	4.08	3.71
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	11	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	421/1277	4.66	4.60	4.34	4.33	4.71
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	11	0	0	0	Ţ	3	3	4.29	756/1269	4.54	4.47	4.31	4.33	4.29
4. Were special techniques successful	11	Τ	0	0	Ü	3	3	4.50	194/ 854	4.57	4.16	4.02	4.00	4.50
To a control of the c	D	2 1												

Credits	Earned	Cum. GPA		Expected	d Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	7	Required for Majors	12	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	5						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	2	C	4	General	1	Under-grad	18	Non-major	18
84-150	6	3.00-3.49	5	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	n
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	4				
				?	1						

Course-Section: SPAN 201 1201 University of Maryland Title INTERMEDIATE SPANISH I Baltimore County

DEANGULO, SANTI

Instructor:

Baltimore County Spring 2007 Page 1433

JUN 26, 2007

Job IRBR3029

Enrollment:	20			
Questionnaires:	18	Student Cour	se Evaluation	Questionnaire

							Fre	equer		s		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
		Question	S		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		 Genera	1															
1. Did	d vou gain i	new insights,ski	_	m this course	0	0	0	1	1	7	9	4.33	814/1522	4.46	4.36	4.30	4.34	4.33
	1 0	uctor make clear			0	0	0	1	2	8	7	4.17	965/1522	4.47	4.33	4.26	4.29	4.17
		questions reflec			0	0	0	1	1	5	11	4.44	602/1285	4.41	4.45	4.30	4.36	4.44
		luations reflect		_	0	0	0	3	0	4	11	4.28	769/1476		4.33	4.22	4.20	4.28
				what you learned	0	4	1	2	3	5	3	3.50	1165/1412		4.26	4.06	4.00	3.50
				o what you learned	0	0	1	2	1	8	6	3.89	953/1381	4.24	4.19	4.08	3.97	3.89
		ng system clearl			0	0	0	1	2	6	9	4.28	760/1500	4.37	4.14	4.18	4.20	4.28
		s was class canc			0	0	0	0	2	14	2	4.00	1389/1517	4.58	4.56	4.65	4.63	4.00
9. How	would you	grade the overa	ll tead	hing effectiveness	2	0	0	1	0	7	8	4.38	534/1497	4.34	4.21	4.11	4.11	4.38
1. Wer	re the inst	prepared	0	0	0	0	3	7	8	4.28	1031/1440	4.51	4.45	4.45	4.42	4.28		
2. Did	. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject						0	0	1	5	12	4.61	1060/1448	4.85	4.79	4.71	4.78	4.61
3. Was	s lecture ma	xplained clearly	0	0	0	0	3	5	10	4.39	741/1436	4.39	4.39	4.29	4.29	4.39		
4. Did	d the lectu	res contribute t	o what	you learned	0	0	0	0	1	5	12	4.61	514/1432	4.48	4.47	4.29	4.31	4.61
5. Did	d audiovisua	al techniques en	hance y	our understanding	0	9	2	0	3	2	2	3.22	1021/1221	3.78	3.91	3.93	4.02	3.22
		Discus																
				what you learned	13	0	0	0	1	3	1		718/1280			4.10	4.08	4.00
				d to participate	13	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	692/1277	4.66	4.60	4.34	4.33	4.40
				d open discussion	13	0	0		1	2		4.20	816/1269		4.47	4.31	4.33	4.20
4. Wer	re special	techniques succe	ssful		13	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	252/ 854	4.57	4.16	4.02	4.00	4.40
				Frequ	ency	Dist	tribu	ıtior	1									
Credit	s Earned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	ason	s			Туј	pe			Majors	
00-27	7 2	0.00-0.99	0	A 2		Rec	 quire	ad fo	or Ma	 aior	 g 1	0	Graduat	 _	0	Majo		0
28-55							-1 ()		-	or adda c	-	-		_	ŭ
	56-83 3 2.00-2.99 2 C 3						neral	L				1	Under-g	rad 1	.8	Non-	major	18
84-15		3.00-3.49	7	D 0		001		-				_	5301 9.		-	-1011		_0
Grad.		3.50-4.00	3	F 0		Ele	ectiv	res				0	#### - 1	Means t	here a	re not	enouo	h
	.	2.22 2.00	-	P 0								-	respons				_	
	I 0					Ot.h	ner					7			3			
? 0																		

Course-Section: SPAN 202 0101 University of Maryland Title INTERMEDIATE SPANISH I

Baltimore County Spring 2007

Page 1434

JUN 26, 2007

Job IRBR3029

Instructor: MESSICK, ROSALI Enrollment: 23 Questionnaires: 16

4. Were special techniques successful

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

	Frequencies					Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect		
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	3	12	4.69	414/1522	4.42	4.36	4.30	4.34	4.69
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	3	12	4.69	334/1522	4.23	4.33	4.26	4.29	4.69
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	3	12	4.69	347/1285	4.69	4.45	4.30	4.36	4.69
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	4	12	4.75	226/1476	4.38	4.33	4.22	4.20	4.75
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	2	5	8	4.25	566/1412	4.24	4.26	4.06	4.00	4.25
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	1	5	9	4.38	470/1381	4.23	4.19	4.08	3.97	4.38
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	2	6	7	4.19	850/1500	3.82	4.14	4.18	4.20	4.19
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	16	5.00	1/1517	4.96	4.56	4.65	4.63	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	1	5	8	4.50	385/1497	4.15	4.21	4.11	4.11	4.50
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	1	4	9	4.57	716/1440	4.58	4.45	4.45	4.42	4.57
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	1	14	4.93	346/1448	4.84	4.79	4.71	4.78	4.93
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	0	7	7	4.50	601/1436	4.42	4.39	4.29	4.29	4.50
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	1	1	12	4.60	527/1432	4.34	4.47	4.29	4.31	4.60
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	2	0	4	3	3	2	3.25	1011/1221	3.50	3.91	3.93	4.02	3.25
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned			0	0	2	1	3	4.17	644/1280	4.25	4.28	4.10	4.08	4.17
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate			0	0	1	0	5	4.67	470/1277	4.71	4.60	4.34	4.33	4.67
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	10 10	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	299/1269	4.75	4.47	4.31		4.83

Frequency Distribution

10 0 0 1 0 1 4 4.33 287/854 4.17 4.16 4.02 4.00 4.33

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expecte	d Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors	
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	А	9	Required for Majors	4	Graduate	0	Major	2
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	В	4						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	3	C	2	General	2	Under-grad	16	Non-major	14
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	4	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	2	#### - Means	there	are not enough	ı
				P	0			responses to	be sig	nificant	
				I	0	Other	7	-			
				?	0						

Course-Section: SPAN 202 0201 University of Maryland Title

INTERMEDIATE SPANISH I

Instructor: VAL, ADRIANA

Enrollment: 16 Questionnaires: 13

Baltimore County Spring 2007

Page 1435 JUN 26, 2007 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

		Frequencies					Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect	
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	1	2	4	6	4.15	1001/1522	4.42	4.36	4.30	4.34	4.15
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	0	5	2	5	3.77	1262/1522	4.23	4.33	4.26	4.29	3.77
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	12	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1285	4.69	4.45	4.30	4.36	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	5	3	5	4.00	1009/1476	4.38	4.33	4.22	4.20	4.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	6	5	4.23	585/1412	4.24	4.26	4.06	4.00	4.23
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	4	4	5	4.08	768/1381	4.23	4.19	4.08	3.97	4.08
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	3	3	1	5	3.46	1321/1500	3.82	4.14	4.18	4.20	3.46
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	12	4.92	389/1517	4.96	4.56	4.65	4.63	4.92
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	8	0	0	0	2	2	1	3.80	1113/1497	4.15	4.21	4.11	4.11	3.80
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	1	3	8	4.58	705/1440	4.58	4.45	4.45	4.42	4.58
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	1	1	10	4.75	859/1448	4.84	4.79	4.71	4.78	4.75
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	2	4	6	4.33	793/1436	4.42	4.39	4.29	4.29	4.33
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	2	4	5	4.08	1000/1432	4.34	4.47	4.29	4.31	4.08
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	1	1	2	4	4	3.75	786/1221	3.50	3.91	3.93	4.02	3.75
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	0	0	4	7	4.33	530/1280	4.25	4.28	4.10	4.08	4.33
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate		0	0	0	0	3	9	4.75	375/1277	4.71	4.60	4.34	4.33	4.75
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1 1	0	0	0	1	2	9	4.67	461/1269	4.75	4.47	4.31	4.33	4.67
4. Were special techniques successful	1	0	1	1	0	5	5	4.00	426/ 854	4.17	4.16	4.02	4.00	4.00

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	d Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	А	3	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	2
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	0	В	5						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	1	C	1	General	2	Under-grad	13	Non-major	11
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means	there	are not enough	n
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	6	_			
				?	4						

Course-Section: SPAN 202H 0101 University of Maryland Baltimore County INTERMED SPAN II HONR

Title Instructor: MESSICK, ROSALI Spring 2007

Enrollment:	2		
Questionnaires:	1	Student Course Evalu	uation Questionnaire

			Fre	eque	ncies	3		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1522	5.00	4.36	4.30	4.34	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1522	5.00	4.33	4.26	4.29	5.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1285	5.00	4.45	4.30	4.36	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1476	5.00	4.33	4.22	4.20	5.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1412	5.00	4.26	4.06	4.00	5.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1381	5.00	4.19	4.08	3.97	5.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	988/1500	4.00	4.14	4.18	4.20	4.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1517	5.00	4.56	4.65	4.63	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1497	5.00	4.21	4.11	4.11	5.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1440	5.00	4.45	4.45	4.42	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1448	5.00	4.79	4.71	4.78	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1436	5.00	4.39	4.29	4.29	5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1432	5.00	4.47	4.29	4.31	5.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	606/1221	4.00	3.91	3.93	4.02	4.00
Frequ	ency	Dist	ribu	utio	n									

Page 1436

JUN 26, 2007

Job IRBR3029

Credits Earned Cum. GPA		Expected	Grades	Reasons		Type	Majors				
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	1	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	В	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	0	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	ı
				P	0			responses to	be sig	nificant	
				I	0	Other	0	_			
				2	Λ						

Course-Section: SPAN 301 0101 University of Maryland ADVANCED SPANISH I Baltimore County AREVALOGUERRERO

?

0

Title

Instructor:

Enrollment:

Questionnaires: 11

15

Spring 2007

Page 1437

JUN 26, 2007

Job IRBR3029

Student	Course	Evaluation	Ouestionnair	^_

							Fre	equei	ncies	3		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
		Question	3		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		Genera	 1															
1. Did vo	u gain ne	ew insights,ski	_	m this course	0	0	0	0	2	1	8	4.55	559/1522	3.92	4.36	4.30	4.34	4.55
		ctor make clear			0	0	0	0	3	2	6	4.27	854/1522	3.91	4.33	4.26	4.25	4.27
		estions reflec			0	0	0	0	1	1	9	4.73	308/1285	4.55	4.45	4.30	4.30	4.73
4. Did ot	her evalu	ations reflect	the ex	pected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1476	4.55	4.33	4.22	4.26	5.00
5. Did as	signed re	adings contrib	ute to	what you learned	0	0	1	0	3	3	4	3.82	964/1412	4.06	4.26	4.06	4.03	3.82
6. Did wr	itten ass	signments contr	ibute t	o what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	9	4.82	114/1381	4.36	4.19	4.08	4.13	4.82
7. Was th	e grading	system clearly	y expla	ined	0	0	0	0	1	4	6	4.45	556/1500	3.68	4.14	4.18	4.13	4.45
8. How man	ny times	was class cance	elled		0	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1517	4.00	4.56	4.65	4.62	5.00
				hing effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	7	4	4.36	544/1497	4.07	4.21	4.11	4.13	4.36
		Lectur	e															
1. Were t	he instru	ctor's lecture	s well	prepared	0	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	192/1440	4.10	4.45	4.45	4.46	4.91
2. Did th	e instruc	ctor seem inter	ested i	n the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1448	4.80	4.79	4.71	4.71	5.00
3. Was le	cture mat	erial presente	d and e	xplained clearly	1	0	0	0	1	2	7	4.60	478/1436	4.00	4.39	4.29	4.30	4.60
4. Did th	e lecture	es contribute to	o what	you learned	0	0	0	0	0	4	7	4.64	490/1432	3.97	4.47	4.29	4.29	4.64
5. Did au	diovisual	techniques en	nance y	our understanding	0	1	0	0	3	4	3	4.00	606/1221	3.40	3.91	3.93	3.94	4.00
		Discus	sion															
1. Did cl	ass discu	ssions contrib	ute to	what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1280	4.71	4.28	4.10	4.14	5.00
				d to participate	5	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	290/1277	4.70	4.60	4.34	4.38	4.83
				d open discussion	5	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1269	4.79	4.47	4.31	4.39	5.00
4. Were s	pecial te	echniques succe	ssful	-	5	0	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	194/ 854	4.42	4.16	4.02	4.00	4.50
				Frequ	ıency	, Dis	trib	ution	n									
Coodity D		Come CDA		Towns at ad Grander				Da		_			m				M	
Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				ке:	asons	3 			Ту]	pe 			Majors	;
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	A 6		Re	quir	ed fo	or Ma	ajor	s	1	Graduat	е	0	Majo	or	3
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	в 4														
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	0	C 0		Ge	nera	l				5	Under-g	rad 1	.1	Non-	major	8
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	1	D 0														
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	7	F 0		El	ecti	ves				1	#### - 1				_	ıh
				P 0									respons	es to b	e sign	nificar	ıt	
				I 0		Ot1	her					5						

Baltimore County

Course-Section: SPAN 301 0201

16

ADVANCED SPANISH I

SLOANE, ROBERT

Title

Instructor:

Enrollment:

Questionnaires: 11

University of Maryland Page 1438 JUN 26, 2007 Spring 2007 Job IRBR3029

5

	_			
Ctudant	('Ollred	Evaluation	()IIAGEIAN	naira

		Ouestion	a		NTD	NA	Fre	equer 2	ncies 3	s 4	5	Ins Mean	tructor Rank	Course	Dept Mean		Level Mean	Sect Mean
		Question	.s 		INIX.	NA				-1		Mean	Kalik	Mean	Mean	меан	Mean	Mean
		Genera	1															
1. Did y	you gain ne	ew insights,ski	lls fro	m this course	1	0	0	2	4	3	1	3.30	1456/1522	3.92	4.36	4.30	4.34	3.30
		ctor make clear			0	0	0	1	5	3	2	3.55	1348/1522	3.91	4.33	4.26	4.25	3.55
		uestions reflec			0	0	0	1	1	2	7	4.36	682/1285	4.55	4.45	4.30	4.30	4.36
4. Did c	other eval	uations reflect	the ex	pected goals	0	0	0	1	2	3	5	4.09	961/1476	4.55	4.33	4.22	4.26	4.09
5. Did a	assigned re	eadings contrib	ute to	what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	5	4	4.30	520/1412	4.06	4.26	4.06	4.03	4.30
6. Did w	written as:	signments contr	ibute t	o what you learned	0	0	0	1	2	5	3	3.91	938/1381	4.36	4.19	4.08	4.13	3.91
7. Was t	the grading	g system clearl	y expla	ined	0	0	2	1	6	0	2	2.91	1449/1500	3.68	4.14	4.18	4.13	2.91
8. How m	many times	was class cand	elled		1	0	0	2	7	0	1	3.00	1506/1517	4.00	4.56	4.65	4.62	3.00
9. How w	would you	grade the overa	ll teac	hing effectiveness	2	0	0	0	4	3	2	3.78	1133/1497	4.07	4.21	4.11	4.13	3.78
		Lectur	е															
1. Were	the instr	uctor's lecture	s well	prepared	1	0	0	3	2	4	1	3.30	1390/1440	4.10	4.45	4.45	4.46	3.30
2. Did t	the instru	ctor seem inter	ested i	n the subject	1	0	0	0	1	2	7	4.60	1072/1448	4.80	4.79	4.71	4.71	4.60
3. Was l	lecture mat	terial presente	d and e	xplained clearly	1	0	0		3	4	1	3.40	1315/1436	4.00	4.39	4.29	4.30	3.40
4. Did t	the lecture	es contribute t	o what	you learned	1	0	1	1	3	4	1	3.30	1327/1432	3.97	4.47	4.29	4.29	3.30
5. Did a	audiovisua	l techniques en	hance y	our understanding	1	5	1	1	2	0	1	2.80	1121/1221	3.40	3.91	3.93	3.94	2.80
		Discus																
				what you learned	4	0	0	0	1	2	4	4.43	459/1280			4.10	4.14	4.43
		-	_	d to participate	4	0	0	0	1	1	5		547/1277		4.60	4.34	4.38	4.57
				d open discussion	4	0	0	0	1	1	5	4.57	532/1269		4.47	4.31	4.39	4.57
4. Were	special to	echniques succe	ssful		4	1	0	0	1	2	3	4.33	287/ 854	4.42	4.16	4.02	4.00	4.33
				Frequ	ency	Dist	trib	ution	1									
Credits	Earned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	asons	5			Ту	pe			Majors	5
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	A 7					 эх Мэ	ajors	. – – –	0	 Graduat		1	Majo	·	1
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B 1		Kec	Jutt	Eu I) I I I C	ב שוטו ב	•	U	Graduat	C	_	Maje) <u>T</u>	Τ.
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	0	C 0		Ger	nera:	1				2	Under-q	rad 1	.0	Non-	major	10
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	2	D 0		001	u.	-				_	onacr 9		. •	1,011		-0
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00	3	F 0		Ele	ectiv	zes.				1	#### - :	Means t	here a	re not	enone	ιh
orua.	-	3.30 1.00	3	P 0								_	respons				_	,
				1 0									TCDPOILD		5191			

Other

I

?

0

0

Course-Section: SPAN 302 0101 University of Maryland Title ADVANCED SPANISH II Instructor: SLOANE, ROBERT

Baltimore County Spring 2007

Enrollment: 16 Questionnaires: 14

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Page 1439

JUN 26, 2007

Job IRBR3029

					Fr	eque	ncies	3		Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect		
		Question	s		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		 Genera	1															
1. Did yo	ou gain ne	ew insights,ski	lls fro	m this course	0	0	0	0	2	5	7	4.36	791/1522	4.46	4.36	4.30	4.34	4.36
		ctor make clear			0	0	0	1	2	6	5	4.07	1042/1522	4.04	4.33	4.26	4.25	4.07
3. Did th	ne exam qu	uestions reflec	t the e	expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	4	10	4.71	318/1285	4.36	4.45	4.30	4.30	4.71
4. Did ot	her evalu	uations reflect	the ex	pected goals	0	0	0	1	1	3	9	4.43	597/1476	4.36	4.33	4.22	4.26	4.43
5. Did as	ssigned re	eadings contrib	ute to	what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	3	11	4.79	149/1412	4.68	4.26	4.06	4.03	4.79
6. Did wr	ritten ass	signments contr	ibute t	o what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	12	4.86	102/1381	4.64	4.19	4.08	4.13	4.86
7. Was th	ne grading	g system clearl	y expla	ined	0	0	1	4	2	3	4	3.36	1372/1500	3.61	4.14	4.18	4.13	3.36
8. How ma	any times	was class canc	elled		1	0	0	1	8	4	0	3.23	1500/1517	3.62	4.56	4.65	4.62	3.23
9. How wo	ould you	grade the overa	ll tead	hing effectiveness	3	0	0	0	2	5	4	4.18	731/1497	4.39	4.21	4.11	4.13	4.18
		Lectur	е															
1. Were t	the instru	uctor's lecture	s well	prepared	1	0	0	1	2	6	4	4.00	1186/1440	4.25	4.45	4.45	4.46	4.00
2. Did th	ne instru	ctor seem inter	ested i	n the subject	1	0	0	0	1	0	12	4.85	656/1448	4.84	4.79	4.71	4.71	4.85
3. Was le	ecture mat	terial presente	d and e	explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	6	7	4.54	564/1436	4.52	4.39	4.29	4.30	4.54
4. Did th	ne lecture	es contribute t	o what	you learned	1	0	0	0	1	5	7	4.46	682/1432	4.48	4.47	4.29	4.29	4.46
5. Did au	udiovisua	l techniques en	hance y	our understanding	1	8	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	99/1221	4.23	3.91	3.93	3.94	4.80
		Discus	sion															
1. Did cl	lass discu	ussions contrib	ute to	what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	207/1280	4.39	4.28	4.10	4.14	4.78
2. Were a	all studer	nts actively en	courage	d to participate	5	0	0	0	1	1	7	4.67	470/1277	4.75	4.60	4.34	4.38	4.67
3. Did th	ne instru	ctor encourage	fair ar	d open discussion	5	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	244/1269	4.94	4.47	4.31	4.39	4.89
4. Were s	special te	echniques succe	ssful		5	0	0	0	2	3	4	4.22	347/ 854	3.86	4.16	4.02	4.00	4.22
				Frequ	ency	Dist	trib	utio	n									
Credits E	Earned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	asons	3			Туј	pe			Majors	;
														- 				
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A 5		Red	quir	ed f	or Ma	ajor	s	0	Graduat	е	0	Majo	or	4
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	0	в 7														
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	1	C 1		Gei	nera	1				4	Under-g	rad 1	.4	Non-	-major	10
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	3	D 0														
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	8	F 0		Ele	ecti	ves				1	#### - 1				_	ŗh
				P 0									respons	es to b	e sign	ificar	ıt	
				_								_						

Other

9

0

0

I ? Course-Section: SPAN 302 0201 Title

ADVANCED SPANISH II NASH, LYLE

Instructor: Enrollment:

18 Questionnaires: 7 University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2007

Page 1440 JUN 26, 2007 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

	Frequencies							Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	1	5	4.57	525/1522	4.46	4.36	4.30	4.34	4.57
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	3	2	4.00	1080/1522	4.04	4.33	4.26	4.25	4.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	2	3	4.00	938/1285	4.36	4.45	4.30	4.30	4.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	3	3	4.29	758/1476	4.36	4.33	4.22	4.26	4.29
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	299/1412	4.68	4.26	4.06	4.03	4.57
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	2	4	4.43	413/1381	4.64	4.19	4.08	4.13	4.43
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	4	0	3		1117/1500	3.61	4.14	4.18	4.13	3.86
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	7	0	4.00	1389/1517	3.62	4.56	4.65	4.62	4.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	312/1497	4.39	4.21	4.11	4.13	4.60
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	3	3	4.50	798/1440	4.25	4.45	4.45	4.46	4.50
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	683/1448	4.84	4.79	4.71	4.71	4.83
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	3	3	4.50	601/1436	4.52	4.39	4.29	4.30	4.50
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	632/1432	4.48	4.47	4.29	4.29	4.50
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	3	0	0	2	0	1	3.67	832/1221	4.23	3.91	3.93	3.94	3.67
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	0	1	0	4	4.00	718/1280	4.39	4.28	4.10	4.14	4.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	290/1277	4.75	4.60	4.34	4.38	4.83
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1269	4.94	4.47	4.31	4.39	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	1	4	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	673/ 854	3.86	4.16	4.02	4.00	3.50

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

Course-Section: SPAN 304 0101

Title SPAN: FOR HERITAGE SPEA

Instructor: SCHWARTZ, ANA-M

Enrollment: 14

Questionnaires: 13

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2007

Page 1441 JUN 26, 2007 Job IRBR3029

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

Questions	NR	NA	Fre	equer 2	ncies 3	4	5	Inst Mean	ructor Rank	Course Mean	_	UMBC Mean		Sect Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	0	0	0	3	9	4.75	320/1522	4.75	4.36	4.30	4.34	4.75
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	11	4.85	171/1522	4.85	4.33	4.26	4.25	4.85
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	12	4.92	120/1285	4.92	4.45	4.30	4.30	4.92
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	0	3	8	4.73	255/1476	4.73	4.33	4.22	4.26	4.73
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	3	10	4.77	161/1412	4.77	4.26	4.06	4.03	4.77
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	4	9	4.69	187/1381	4.69	4.19	4.08	4.13	4.69
 Was the grading system clearly explained 	0	0	0	1	2	2	8	4.31	731/1500	4.31	4.14	4.18	4.13	4.31
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0		5.00	1/1517			4.65		5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	0	6	5	4.45	445/1497	4.45	4.21	4.11	4.13	4.45
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	1	12	4.92	153/1440	4.92	4.45	4.45	4.46	4.92
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	13	5.00	1/1448	5.00	4.79	4.71	4.71	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	2	11	4.85	179/1436	4.85	4.39	4.29	4.30	4.85
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	11	4.85	240/1432	4.85	4.47	4.29	4.29	4.85
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	4	3	1	0	0	4	3.13	1048/1221	3.13	3.91	3.93	3.94	3.13
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	2	10	4.83	170/1280	4.83	4.28	4.10	4.14	4.83
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	205/1277	4.92	4.60	4.34	4.38	4.92
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/1269	5.00	4.47	4.31	4.39	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	1	0	0	0	3	2	7	4.33	287/ 854	4.33	4.16	4.02	4.00	4.33
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	11	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 215	****	****	4.36	4.21	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 228	****	4.50	4.35	4.29	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	12	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 217	****	4.50	4.51	4.45	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	12	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 216	****	****	4.42	4.35	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 205	****	5.00	4.23	4.26	***
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	11	1	0	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 79	****	5.00	4.58	4.53	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 77	****	5.00	4.52	4.30	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 65	****	5.00	4.49	4.33	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 78	****	4.83	4.45	4.34	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	12	0	0	U	U	0	1	5.00	****/ 80	****	4.83	4.11	3.33	* * * *
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	11	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 47	****	3.60	4.41	4.56	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	12	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 45	****	4.00	4.30	4.39	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	12	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 39	****	3.00	4.40	4.68	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	12	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 35	****	3.00	4.31	4.26	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 34	****	2.75	4.30	4.12	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 37	****	4.33	4.63	5.00	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 23	****	****	4.41	****	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	12	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 33	****	****	4.69	4.75	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 22	****	****	4.54	****	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 18	****	****	4.49	****	****

Course-Section: SPAN 304 0101

Title SPAN: FOR HERITAGE SPEA

Instructor: SCH

SCHWARTZ, ANA-M

Enrollment: 14
Questionnaires: 13

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2007 Page 1441 JUN 26, 2007 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

Course-Section: SPAN 307 0101

Title ESPANA Y SUS CULTURAS

Instructor: SINNIGEN, JOHN

Enrollment: 18
Questionnaires: 11

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

University of Maryland

Baltimore County

Spring 2007

Page 1442 JUN 26, 2007 Job IRBR3029

		Frequencies						Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	3	7	4.55	559/1522	4.55	4.36	4.30	4.34	4.55
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	5	4	4.18	945/1522	4.18	4.33	4.26	4.25	4.18
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	3	7	4.55	488/1285	4.55	4.45	4.30	4.30	4.55
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	3	7	4.55	435/1476	4.55	4.33	4.22	4.26	4.55
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	9	4.82	133/1412	4.82	4.26	4.06	4.03	4.82
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	1	3	6	4.27	585/1381	4.27	4.19	4.08	4.13	4.27
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	1	2	2	5	4.10	935/1500	4.10	4.14	4.18	4.13	4.10
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	4	6	4.60	994/1517	4.60	4.56	4.65	4.62	4.60
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	5	3	0	3.38	1334/1497	3.38	4.21	4.11	4.13	3.38
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	4	7	4.64	643/1440	4.64	4.45	4.45	4.46	4.64
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	494/1448	4.91	4.79	4.71	4.71	4.91
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	5	6	4.55	551/1436	4.55	4.39	4.29	4.30	4.55
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	5	5	4.36	793/1432		4.47	4.29	4.29	4.36
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	1	2	0	8	4.36	387/1221	4.36	3.91	3.93	3.94	4.36
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	1	4	4	4.33	530/1280	4.33	4.28	4.10	4.14	4.33
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	0	5	4	4.44	652/1277	4.44	4.60	4.34	4.38	4.44
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	1	5	3	4.22	798/1269	4.22	4.47	4.31	4.39	4.22
4. Were special techniques successful	2	0	0	0	2	1	6	4.44	228/ 854	4.44	4.16	4.02	4.00	4.44
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 79	****	5.00	4.58	4.53	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 77	****	5.00	4.52	4.30	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 65	****	5.00	4.49	4.33	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 78	****	4.83	4.45	4.34	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 80	****	4.83	4.11	3.33	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	0.00	****/ 47	****	3.60	4.41	4.56	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 45	****	4.00	4.30	4.39	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 39	****	3.00	4.40	4.68	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 34	****	2.75	4.30	4.12	****
Self Paced								= 0-						
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 33	****	****	4.69	4.75	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 22	****	****	4.54	****	****

Credits	Earned	Cum. GPA		Expected	Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	 А	5	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	3
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	В	3						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	С	1	General	0	Under-grad	11	Non-major	8
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	6	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	
				P	0			responses to	be sig	mificant	
				I	0	Other	10				
				?	1						

Course-Section: SPAN 308 0101

Title LATINOAMERICA Y SUS CU

Instructor: POGGIO, SARA

Enrollment: 21
Questionnaires: 11

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2007

Page 1443 JUN 26, 2007 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

					Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect			
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	3	7	4.55	559/1522	4.55	4.36	4.30	4.34	4.55
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	4	6	4.45	623/1522	4.45	4.33	4.26	4.25	4.45
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	5	5	4.36	682/1285	4.36	4.45	4.30	4.30	4.36
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	0	6	4	4.18	871/1476	4.18	4.33	4.22	4.26	4.18
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	6	5	4.45	384/1412	4.45	4.26	4.06	4.03	4.45
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	1	5	4	4.30	556/1381	4.30	4.19	4.08	4.13	4.30
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	0	3	7	4.45	556/1500	4.45	4.14	4.18	4.13	4.45
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	1	0	0	3	6	1	3.80	1467/1517	3.80	4.56	4.65	4.62	3.80
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	1	0	0	2	4	1	3.86	1073/1497	3.86	4.21	4.11	4.13	3.86
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	1	4	4	4.33	984/1440	4.33	4.45	4.45	4.46	4.33
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	1	1	7	4.67	1001/1448	4.67	4.79	4.71	4.71	4.67
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	1	5	3	4.22	906/1436	4.22	4.39	4.29	4.30	4.22
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	1	4	4	4.33	820/1432	4.33	4.47	4.29	4.29	4.33
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	0	0	1	2	3	3	3.89	707/1221	3.89	3.91	3.93	3.94	3.89
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	222/1280	4.75	4.28	4.10	4.14	4.75
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	375/1277	4.75	4.60	4.34	4.38	4.75
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1269	5.00	4.47	4.31	4.39	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	7	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	106/ 854	4.75	4.16	4.02	4.00	4.75
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 47	****	3.60	4.41	4.56	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	10	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 45	****	4.00	4.30	4.39	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	10	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 39	****	3.00	4.40	4.68	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 35	****	3.00	4.31	4.26	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 34	****	2.75	4.30	4.12	****

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	l Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	 А	7	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	1	Major	7
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	0						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	0	С	1	General	2	Under-grad	10	Non-major	4
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	2	#### - Means	there	are not enough	
				P	0	Electives		responses to	be sig	nificant	
				I	0	Other	4	_	_		
				2	1						

Course-Section: SPAN 311 0101 Univ

Title INTRO TO SPANISH Instructor: SLOANE, ROBERT

Enrollment: 23
Questionnaires: 21

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2007 Page 1444 JUN 26, 2007 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

	Questions					NA	Fre	eque:	ncies 3	4	5	Inst Mean	tructor Rank		e Dept Mean		Level Mean	Sect Mean
		Genera	1															
1. Did yo	ou gain ne	w insights,ski	lls fro	m this course	1	0	0	1	2	5	12	4.40	733/1522	4.40	4.36	4.30	4.34	4.40
2. Did th	ne instruc	tor make clear	the ex	pected goals	1	0	0	0	3	9	8	4.25	874/1522	4.25	4.33	4.26	4.25	4.25
3. Did th	ne exam qu	estions reflec	t the e	xpected goals	1	0	0	0	0	8	12	4.60	425/1285	4.60	4.45	4.30	4.30	4.60
4. Did ot	her evalu	ations reflect	the ex	pected goals	1	0	0	0	3	9	8	4.25	792/1476	4.25	4.33	4.22	4.26	4.25
5. Did as	ssigned re	adings contrib	ute to	what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	5	14	4.74	179/1412	4.74	4.26	4.06	4.03	4.74
6. Did wr	ritten ass	ignments contr	ibute t	o what you learned	2	0	0	0	2	7	10	4.42	413/1381	4.42	4.19	4.08	4.13	4.42
7. Was th	ne grading	system clearl	y expla	ined	2	0	0	2	3	6	8	4.05	961/1500	4.05	4.14	4.18	4.13	4.05
8. How ma	any times	was class canc	elled		3	0	1	0	8	6	3	3.56	1488/1517	3.56	4.56	4.65	4.62	3.56
9. How wo	ould you g	rade the overa	ll teac	hing effectiveness	4	0	0	1	1	3	12	4.53	370/1497	4.53	4.21	4.11	4.13	4.53
		Lectur	е															
1. Were t	the instru	ctor's lecture	s well ;	prepared	3	0	0	1	2	8	7	4.17	1112/1440	4.17	4.45	4.45	4.46	4.17
2. Did th	ne instruc	tor seem inter	ested i	n the subject	3	0	0	0	0	2	16	4.89	548/1448	4.89	4.79	4.71	4.71	4.89
3. Was le	ecture mat	erial presente	d and e	xplained clearly	3	0	0	0	0	9	9	4.50	601/1436	4.50	4.39	4.29	4.30	4.50
4. Did th	ne lecture	s contribute t	o what	you learned	4	0	1	0	1	3	12	4.47	669/1432	4.47	4.47	4.29	4.29	4.47
5. Did au	udiovisual	techniques en	hance y	our understanding	3	12	1	0	2	2	1	3.33	983/1221	3.33	3.91	3.93	3.94	3.33
		Discus	sion															
1. Did cl	id class discussions contribute to what you learn				6	0	0	0	1	2	12	4.73	237/1280	4.73	4.28	4.10	4.14	4.73
2. Were a	ere all students actively encouraged to participa				6	0	0	0	0	2	13	4.87	263/1277	4.87	4.60	4.34	4.38	4.87
3. Did th	d the instructor encourage fair and open discussi				6	0	0	0	0	2	13	4.87	266/1269	4.87	4.47	4.31	4.39	4.87
4. Were s	id the instructor encourage fair and open discussi ere special techniques successful					2	0	0	1	6	6	4.38	262/ 854	4.38	4.16	4.02	4.00	4.38
		Labora	tory															
1. Did th	ne lab inc	rease understa	nding o	f the material	19	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 215	****	****	4.36	4.21	***
2. Were y	ou provid	ed with adequa	te back	ground information	19	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 228	****	4.50	4.35	4.29	***
3. Were n	necessary	materials avai	lable f	or lab activities	19	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 217	****	4.50	4.51	4.45	****
4. Did th	ne lab ins	tructor provid	e assis	tance	19	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 216	****	****	4.42	4.35	****
5. Were r	requiremen	ts for lab rep	orts cl	early specified	19	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 205	****	5.00	4.23	4.26	****
		Semina	r															
1. Were a	assigned t	opics relevant	to the	announced theme	20	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 79	****	5.00	4.58	4.53	****
2. Was th	ne instruc	tor available	for ind	ividual attention	20	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 77	****	5.00	4.52	4.30	****
3. Did re	esearch pr	ojects contrib	ute to	what you learned	19	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 65	****	5.00	4.49	4.33	****
4. Did pr	resentatio	ns contribute	to what	you learned	19	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 78	****	4.83	4.45	4.34	****
5. Were c	criteria f	or grading mad	e clear		19	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 80	****	4.83	4.11	3.33	****
	F				iency	Dist	trib	utio	n									
Credits E	Earned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	asons	3			Ту	pe			Majors	;
00-27																		
00-27 28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	A 12 B 3		кес	quire	eu I	or Ma	ıjor	B	0	Graduat	e	0	Majo	Σ	8
28-55 56-83	4	2.00-2.99	1	C 0	General						1	IIndon ~	rad 1	21	Non	madam	13	
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	3	D 0	General					_	Under-g	ıau 2	5 T	14011-	-major	13		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F 0	Floativos					0	#### -	Meane +	-horo -	re not	enous	rh		
Grau.	U	3.30-4.00	7	P 0		Electives					U	respons				_	111	
				I 0		Othor					1	4	respons	co LU L	e sigi	ıııcal	10	
				1 0		Other						7						

?

0

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

Baltimore County Spring 2007

Instructor: SCHNEIDER, JUDI Enrollment: 19

4. Were special techniques successful

Questionnaires: 15

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Page 1445

JUN 26, 2007

Job IRBR3029

	Frequencies							Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	3	3	9	4.40	733/1522	4.40	4.36	4.30	4.34	4.40
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	8	6	4.33	787/1522	4.33	4.33	4.26	4.25	4.33
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	6	8	4.47	578/1285	4.47	4.45	4.30	4.30	4.47
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	0	0	4	10	4.47	535/1476	4.47	4.33	4.22	4.26	4.47
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	2	3	9	4.33	493/1412	4.33	4.26	4.06	4.03	4.33
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	3	4	7	4.07	774/1381	4.07	4.19	4.08	4.13	4.07
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	3	5	6	4.07	956/1500	4.07	4.14	4.18	4.13	4.07
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	4	8	3	3.93	1431/1517	3.93	4.56	4.65	4.62	3.93
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	1	3	6	4	3.93	1006/1497	3.93	4.21	4.11	4.13	3.93
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	1	1	5	8	4.33	984/1440	4.33	4.45	4.45	4.46	4.33
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	4	11	4.73	897/1448	4.73	4.79	4.71	4.71	4.73
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	1	3	4	7	4.13	980/1436	4.13	4.39	4.29	4.30	4.13
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	0	6	8	4.33	820/1432	4.33	4.47	4.29	4.29	4.33
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	1	1	2	4	5	1	3.23	1018/1221	3.23	3.91	3.93	3.94	3.23
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	4	6	4.60	324/1280	4.60	4.28	4.10	4.14	4.60
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	317/1277	4.80	4.60	4.34	4.38	4.80
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	332/1269	4.80	4.47	4.31	4.39	4.80

Frequency Distribution

5 1 0 0 1 3 5 4.44 228/ 854 4.44 4.16 4.02 4.00 4.44

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	d Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	9	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	9
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	В	4						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	1	C	0	General	1	Under-grad	15	Non-major	6
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	7	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	L
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	12	_			
				?	0						

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2007

Page 1446

JUN 26, 2007

Job IRBR3029

responses to be significant

Questionnaires: 6 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

P

I

0

Course-Section: SPAN 331 0101

STRUCT SPAN

7

WESTPHAL, GERMA

Title

Instructor:

Enrollment:

					Frequencies NR NA 1 2 3 4					Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect		
		Questions	5		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank		Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		General	 L															
1. Did you	ı gain ne	ew insights,skil	lls fro	om this course	0	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	433/1522	4.67	4.36	4.30	4.34	4.67
		ctor make clear			0	0	0	0	0	5	1	4.17	965/1522	4.17	4.33	4.26	4.25	4.17
		uestions reflect		_	0	5	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1285	****	4.45	4.30	4.30	****
4. Did oth	ner evalı	uations reflect	the ex	spected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	316/1476	4.67	4.33	4.22	4.26	4.67
				what you learned	0	0	0	1	1	2	2	3.83	948/1412	3.83	4.26	4.06	4.03	3.83
6. Did wri	ltten ass	signments contri	bute t	to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	331/1381	4.50	4.19	4.08	4.13	4.50
7. Was the	grading	g system clearly	/ expla	ined	0	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	312/1500	4.67	4.14	4.18	4.13	4.67
8. How man	ny times	was class cance	elled		0	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	645/1517	4.83	4.56	4.65	4.62	4.83
9. How wou	9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectivenes						0	0	1	1	4	4.50	385/1497	4.50	4.21	4.11	4.13	4.50
	Lecture																	
1. Were th	l. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared						0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1440	5.00	4.45	4.45	4.46	5.00
		ctor seem intere			0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1448	5.00	4.79	4.71	4.71	5.00
3. Was led	cture mat	terial presented	and e	explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1436	5.00	4.39	4.29	4.30	5.00
4. Did the	e lecture	es contribute to	what	you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1432	5.00	4.47	4.29	4.29	5.00
		Discuss	sion															
1. Did cla	ass discu	ussions contribu	ite to	what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1280	5.00	4.28	4.10	4.14	5.00
2. Were al	ll studer	nts actively end	courage	ed to participate	1	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	317/1277	4.80	4.60	4.34	4.38	4.80
3. Did the	e instru	ctor encourage f	air ar	nd open discussion	2	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	777/1269	4.25	4.47	4.31	4.39	4.25
4. Were sp	pecial te	echniques succes	ssful		1	4	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 854	****	4.16	4.02	4.00	****
				Frequ	ency	Dis	trib	utio	n									
Credits Ea	Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grade							Rea	asons	3			Ту	pe			Majors	5
00-27 0 0.00-0.99 0 A 6																		
00-27 28-55		1.00-0.99	0	A 6 B 0		ке	quir	ea I	or Ma	ijors	5	0	Graduat	е	0	Majo)r.	5
28-55 56-83	1		0	B 0 C 0	Conoral							2	IIndox ==	~~d	6	Mon	mo i o	1
84-150	1	2.00-2.99 3.00-3.49	0	D 0		General			z onder-		Under-g	LaU	6	NON-	-major	1		
84-150 Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	0 5	D 0 F 0		Electives				0	#### - Me		- Means there are not end		enoug	jh		

Other

4

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

Baltimore County Spring 2007

Page 1447

JUN 26, 2007

Job IRBR3029

Instructor: BELL, ALAN S

Enrollment: 7 Questionnaires: 6

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

			Fre	equer	ncies	3		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect		
	Questions		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
	General															
1. Did you gain new	insights, skills fro	om this course	0	0	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	605/1522	4.50	4.36	4.30	4.42	4.50
1 5	or make clear the ex		0	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	179/1522	4.83	4.33	4.26	4.34	4.83
	estions reflect the e		0	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	366/1285	4.67	4.45	4.30	4.42	4.67
_	tions reflect the ex		0	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	162/1476	4.83	4.33	4.22	4.31	4.83
5. Did assigned rea	dings contribute to	what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	1	3	4.17	646/1412	4.17	4.26	4.06	4.11	4.17
6. Did written assi	gnments contribute t	to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	0	5	4.67	207/1381	4.67	4.19	4.08	4.21	4.67
7. Was the grading	system clearly expla	ained	0	0	0	1	0	2	3	4.17	871/1500	4.17	4.14	4.18	4.25	4.17
8. How many times w	as class cancelled		0	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	932/1517	4.67	4.56	4.65	4.71	4.67
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness				0	0	1	0	3	1	3.80	1113/1497	3.80	4.21	4.11	4.21	3.80
Lecture																
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared				0	0	0	0	3	3	4.50	798/1440	4.50	4.45	4.45	4.52	4.50
	or seem interested		0	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	683/1448	4.83	4.79	4.71	4.75	4.83
3. Was lecture mate	erial presented and e	explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	415/1436	4.67	4.39	4.29	4.32	4.67
4. Did the lectures	contribute to what	you learned	0	0	0	0	1	2	3	4.33	820/1432	4.33	4.47	4.29	4.34	4.33
5. Did audiovisual	techniques enhance y	our understanding	0	0	0	0	0	3	3	4.50	279/1221	4.50	3.91	3.93	4.04	4.50
	Discussion															
1. Did class discus	ssions contribute to	what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	286/1280	4.67	4.28	4.10	4.28	4.67
	s actively encourage	-	3	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	470/1277	4.67	4.60	4.34	4.50	4.67
	or encourage fair ar		3	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	721/1269	4.33	4.47	4.31	4.49	4.33
4. Were special techniques successful				0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	426/ 854	4.00	4.16	4.02	4.31	4.00
Freq				Dis	trib	ution	n									
•																
Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades						Rea	asons	3			Туј	pe			Majors	

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

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

Spring 2007

Instructor: SINNIGEN, JOHN Enrollment: 10 Questionn

JUN 26, 2007 Job IRBR3029

Page 1448

nnaires:	10	Student	Course	Evaluation	Questionnaire
		50000110	004100	_, ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~	2 accountant

			Fre	equei	ncies	5		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	246/1522	4.80	4.36	4.30	4.42	4.80
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals		0	0	0	1	4	5	4.40	702/1522		4.33	4.26	4.34	4.40
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	6	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	938/1285		4.45	4.30	4.42	4.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	178/1476		4.33	4.22	4.31	4.80
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1412		4.26	4.06	4.11	5.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	92/1381		4.19	4.08	4.21	4.89
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	1	3	5	4.44	571/1500	4.44	4.14	4.18	4.25	4.44
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1517	5.00	4.56	4.65	4.71	5.00
·														
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	6	3	4.33	573/1497	4.33	4.21	4.11	4.21	4.33
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	224/1440	4.89	4.45	4.45	4.52	4.89
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1448	5.00	4.79	4.71	4.75	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	141/1436	4.89	4.39	4.29	4.32	4.89
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	3	5	4.63	502/1432	4.63	4.47	4.29	4.34	4.63
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	144/1221	4.71	3.91	3.93	4.04	4.71
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1280		4.28	4.10	4.28	5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1277	5.00	4.60	4.34	4.50	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1269		4.47	4.31	4.49	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	6	0	0	0	0	3	1	4.25	330/ 854	4.25	4.16	4.02	4.31	4.25

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	d Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	4	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	5
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	4						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	С	0	General	1	Under-grad	10	Non-major	5
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	2	D	0			_		-	
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there a	are not enough	
				P	0			responses to	be sign	nificant	
				I	0	Other	7	-			
				2	^						

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

Title SINNIGEN, JOHN Spring 2007 Instructor:

	,	~ ~
Enrollment:	4	

Questionnaires: 1

Ctudant	('Ollred	Evaluation	Ollection	marra

Page 1449

JUN 26, 2007

Job IRBR3029

			Fr	eque	ncie	S		Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5 	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1122/1522	4.00	4.36	4.30	4.42	4.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals		0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1522	5.00	4.33	4.26	4.34	5.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	938/1285	4.00	4.45	4.30	4.42	4.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1009/1476	4.00	4.33	4.22	4.31	4.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1412	5.00	4.26	4.06	4.11	5.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	806/1381	4.00	4.19	4.08	4.21	4.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained			0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1500	5.00	4.14	4.18	4.25	5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1517	5.00	4.56	4.65	4.71	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	898/1497	4.00	4.21	4.11	4.21	4.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1440	5.00	4.45	4.45	4.52	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1448	5.00	4.79	4.71	4.75	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly		0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1056/1436	4.00	4.39	4.29	4.32	4.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1432	5.00	4.47	4.29	4.34	5.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding		0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	606/1221	4.00	3.91	3.93	4.04	4.00

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

Course-Section: SPAN 472 0101 Title

TOPICS IN LATN AMER CI

Instructor: MEDINA, ADRIANA

Enrollment: 19 Questionnaires: 17

Spring 2007 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

University of Maryland

Baltimore County

Page 1450 JUN 26, 2007 Job IRBR3029

			Frequencies					Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General	0	0	1	0	0	4	1.0	4 52	E00/1E00	4 52	1 26	4 20	4 40	4 52
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	Ţ	0	0	4	12	4.53	582/1522			4.30	4.42	4.53
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	5	10 10	4.41	686/1522 690/1285		4.33	4.26	4.34	4.41
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	-	Τ	5		4.35	,		4.45	4.30	4.42	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	U T	0 3	0	, 5	9	4.35	682/1476		4.33	4.22	4.31	4.35
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	3	1	_	8 7	4.06	728/1412		4.26	4.06	4.11	4.06
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	4 2	5 6		4.00	806/1381		4.19	4.08	4.21 4.25	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	U T	0	0	9	8	4.18	860/1500		4.14	4.18 4.65		4.18 4.82
8. How many times was class cancelled	4	0	0	1	1	3 4	14 7	4.82	668/1517			4.05		
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	U	U	Τ	1	4	/	4.31	602/1497	4.31	4.21	4.11	4.21	4.31
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	1	1	3	11	4.50	798/1440	4.50	4.45	4.45	4.52	4.50
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	1	0	2	13	4.69	977/1448		4.79	4.71	4.75	4.69
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	2	2	1		4.27	865/1436		4.39	4.29	4.73	4.27
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	1	0	3	11	4.38	784/1432		4.47	4.29	4.34	4.38
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	3	0	0	3	3	5	4.18	508/1221				4.04	
5. Did addiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	3	U	U	3	3	5	4.10	500/1221	4.10	3.91	3.93	4.04	4.10
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	1	0	0	2	11	4.57	343/1280	4.57	4.28	4.10	4.28	4.57
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	1	1	0		11	4.43			4.60	4.34	4.50	4.43
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	1			4.79	351/1269		4.47		4.49	4.79
4. Were special techniques successful	4	1	1	0	1	2	8	4.33	287/ 854		4.16	4.02	4.31	4.33
<u>.</u>									, ,					
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 79	****	5.00	4.58	4.67	***
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 77	****	5.00	4.52	4.60	***
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned		0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 65	****	5.00	4.49	4.65	***
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 78	****	4.83	4.45	4.58	***
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	16	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 80	****	4.83	4.11	4.14	****
Freq	encv	n Dist	rib	ut i o	n									
riequ	спсу	יבים		46101										
Goodita Romaid Goodin				ъ.									34-2	

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expecte	ed Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	5	0.00-0.99	0	 А	11	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	1	Major	5
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	3						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	1	C	1	General	4	Under-grad	16	Non-major	12
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00	7	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means	there	are not enough	h
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	8	-		_	
				2	Ο						

Course-Section: SPAN 621 0101 University of Maryland Title STUDIES IN HISPANIC LI Baltimore County Instructor: SINNIGEN, JOHN

Page 1451 JUN 26, 2007 Spring 2007 Job IRBR3029

Enrollment:	4	
Questionnaires:	4	Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

						Frequencies						Inst	Instructor		Course Dept		UMBC Level	
Questions			NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean		
General																		
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course					0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	320/1522	4.75	4.36	4.30	4.45	4.75
	2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals					0	0	1	0	1	2		1080/1522		4.33	4.26	4.29	4.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals						2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1285	5.00	4.45	4.30	4.31	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals						0	0	1	0	1	2		1009/1476		4.33	4.22	4.31	4.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned					0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1412		4.26	4.06	4.25	5.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned					0	0	1	0	0	0	3	4.00	806/1381		4.19	4.08	4.25	4.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained					0	0	0	1	0	0	3	4.25	780/1500	4.25	4.14	4.18	4.22	4.25
8. How many times was class cancelled					1	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1517	5.00	4.56	4.65	4.73	5.00
9. How	9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness					0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1497	5.00	4.21	4.11	4.21	5.00
Lecture					0	0	0	0	•	•		F 00	1 /1 4 4 0	F 00	4 45	4 45	4 40	F 00
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared					0	0	0	0	0	0		5.00	1/1440		4.45	4.45	4.48	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject					0 T	0	0	0	0	0		5.00	1/1448		4.79	4.71	4.80	5.00
	3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly					0	0	0	0	0		5.00	1/1436		4.39	4.29	4.37	5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned					0	0	0	0	0	1		4.75	350/1432		4.47		4.33	4.75
5. Did	5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding			0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	124/1221	4.75	3.91	3.93	3.83	4.75	
	Discussion																	
1. Did	1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned					0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	222/1280	4.75	4.28	4.10	4.24	4.75
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate					0	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	594/1277	4.50	4.60	4.34	4.52	4.50
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion					0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	381/1269		4.47	4.31	4.51	4.75
4. Were special techniques successful			0	0	0	0	0	2		4.50	194/ 854		4.16	4.02		4.50		
•																		
Frequency Distribution																		
Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades					Reasons							Туре			Majors			
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A 2		Required for Majors					0	Graduat	 e	1	Majo	 r	0	
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В 2		110	1011	-	01 110	.,			Gradad	_	_	11000		ŭ
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C 0	General					3	Under-g	rad	3	Non-	-major	4		
84-150		3.00-3.49	0	D 0	SCHOLAL						-	2		-		5	-	
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00	2	F 0		Ele	Electives				0	#### - Means there are not enough						
	P 0										responses to be significant					•		
				I O		Other				0	- 3							
				? 0														