

Course-Section: SPAN 101 0101  
 Title ELEMENTARY SPANISH I  
 Instructor: VESPOINT, ANDRE  
 Enrollment: 30  
 Questionnaires: 24

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2008

Page 1546  
 FEB 11, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	0	1	2	9	11	4.30	912/1649	4.02	4.34	4.28	4.11	4.30	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	9	15	4.63	414/1648	4.04	4.31	4.23	4.16	4.63	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	8	13	4.42	653/1375	4.19	4.42	4.27	4.10	4.42	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	7	16	4.63	362/1595	4.16	4.29	4.20	4.03	4.63	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	1	5	10	6	3.83	996/1533	3.58	4.16	4.04	3.87	3.83	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	2	1	4	15	4.45	451/1512	4.06	4.19	4.10	3.86	4.45	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	4	8	12	4.33	720/1623	3.90	4.08	4.16	4.08	4.33	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	4	20	4.83	782/1646	4.53	4.59	4.69	4.67	4.83	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	7	0	0	0	0	8	9	4.53	356/1621	3.87	4.14	4.06	3.96	4.53	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	4	19	4.75	480/1568	4.17	4.39	4.43	4.39	4.75	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	4	20	4.83	765/1572	4.74	4.79	4.70	4.64	4.83	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	1	5	17	4.70	434/1564	3.96	4.28	4.28	4.20	4.70	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	5	18	4.71	463/1559	4.24	4.43	4.29	4.20	4.71	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	2	1	1	3	9	8	4.00	690/1352	3.59	3.97	3.98	3.86	4.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	0	4	12	4.75	247/1384	4.11	4.28	4.08	3.86	4.75	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	0	1	1	2	12	4.56	570/1382	4.51	4.57	4.29	4.03	4.56	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	0	0	0	1	15	4.94	185/1368	4.48	4.42	4.30	4.01	4.94	
4. Were special techniques successful	8	0	0	1	0	4	11	4.56	183/ 948	4.05	4.10	3.95	3.75	4.56	
Laboratory															
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	22	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 243	****	4.69	4.12	4.08	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	15	2	3	1	2	0	1	2.29	517/ 555	2.02	2.56	4.29	4.14	2.29	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	22	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 88	****	4.39	4.54	4.31	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	22	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 85	****	4.20	4.47	4.30	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	22	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 81	****	4.23	4.43	4.39	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	22	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 92	****	4.32	4.35	4.01	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	18	3	0	1	0	2	0	3.33	****/ 288	****	2.95	3.68	3.54	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	22	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 52	****	5.00	4.06	3.72	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	22	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 48	****	5.00	4.09	3.65	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	22	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 39	****	4.67	4.47	4.36	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	22	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 39	****	4.67	4.38	4.37	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	18	1	1	2	0	1	1	2.80	****/ 312	3.00	2.48	3.68	3.51	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	22	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 53	****	5.00	4.30	4.17	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	22	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.16	4.06	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	22	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 41	****	****	4.43	4.27	****	

Course-Section: SPAN 101 0101  
 Title ELEMENTARY SPANISH I  
 Instructor: VESPOINT, ANDRE  
 Enrollment: 30  
 Questionnaires: 24

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2008

Page 1546  
 FEB 11, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	5	Required for Majors	14	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	10						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	3	C	4	General	1	Under-grad	24	Non-major	24
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	5				
				?	1						

Course-Section: SPAN 101 0201  
 Title ELEMENTARY SPANISH I  
 Instructor: VESPOINT, ANDRE  
 Enrollment: 32  
 Questionnaires: 28

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2008

Page 1547  
 FEB 11, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	2	8	18	4.57	550/1649	4.02	4.34	4.28	4.11	4.57	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	4	22	4.71	300/1648	4.04	4.31	4.23	4.16	4.71	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	7	21	4.75	296/1375	4.19	4.42	4.27	4.10	4.75	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	7	19	4.61	383/1595	4.16	4.29	4.20	4.03	4.61	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	2	6	7	12	4.07	768/1533	3.58	4.16	4.04	3.87	4.07	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	1	0	0	2	7	17	4.58	331/1512	4.06	4.19	4.10	3.86	4.58	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	6	6	15	4.33	720/1623	3.90	4.08	4.16	4.08	4.33	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	12	15	4.56	1148/1646	4.53	4.59	4.69	4.67	4.56	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	1	8	15	4.58	305/1621	3.87	4.14	4.06	3.96	4.58	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	1	3	23	4.81	372/1568	4.17	4.39	4.43	4.39	4.81	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	1	26	4.96	237/1572	4.74	4.79	4.70	4.64	4.96	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	0	7	19	4.73	374/1564	3.96	4.28	4.28	4.20	4.73	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	3	24	4.89	227/1559	4.24	4.43	4.29	4.20	4.89	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	3	0	2	7	5	9	3.91	805/1352	3.59	3.97	3.98	3.86	3.91	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	1	3	4	10	4.28	661/1384	4.11	4.28	4.08	3.86	4.28	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	12	0	0	0	2	2	12	4.63	521/1382	4.51	4.57	4.29	4.03	4.63	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	11	0	0	0	3	2	12	4.53	639/1368	4.48	4.42	4.30	4.01	4.53	
4. Were special techniques successful	11	0	1	0	2	8	6	4.06	420/ 948	4.05	4.10	3.95	3.75	4.06	
Laboratory															
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	27	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 243	****	4.69	4.12	4.08	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	27	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 212	****	5.00	4.40	4.43	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	27	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 209	****	****	4.35	4.38	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	21	1	2	1	2	0	1	2.50	****/ 555	2.02	2.56	4.29	4.14	****	
Seminar															
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	27	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 92	****	4.32	4.35	4.01	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	22	1	1	2	1	0	1	2.60	****/ 288	****	2.95	3.68	3.54	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	27	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 52	****	5.00	4.06	3.72	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	27	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 48	****	5.00	4.09	3.65	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	27	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 39	****	4.67	4.47	4.36	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	27	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 39	****	4.67	4.38	4.37	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	20	1	0	3	1	3	0	3.00	256/ 312	3.00	2.48	3.68	3.51	3.00	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	27	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 53	****	5.00	4.30	4.17	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	27	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.16	4.06	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	27	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 41	****	****	4.43	4.27	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	27	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 24	****	****	4.42	4.24	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	26	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 110	****	4.13	3.99	3.83	****	

Course-Section: SPAN 101 0201  
 Title ELEMENTARY SPANISH I  
 Instructor: VESPOINT, ANDRE  
 Enrollment: 32  
 Questionnaires: 28

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2008

Page 1547  
 FEB 11, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: SPAN 101 0301  
 Title ELEMENTARY SPANISH I  
 Instructor: COYNE, MARIA  
 Enrollment: 31  
 Questionnaires: 20

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2008

Page 1548  
 FEB 11, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	1	2	5	12	4.40	776/1649	4.02	4.34	4.28	4.11	4.40	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	5	12	4.40	702/1648	4.04	4.31	4.23	4.16	4.40	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	11	9	4.45	617/1375	4.19	4.42	4.27	4.10	4.45		
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	9	8	4.20	890/1595	4.16	4.29	4.20	4.03	4.20	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	3	3	3	5	6	3.40	1317/1533	3.58	4.16	4.04	3.87	3.40	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	6	7	7	4.05	859/1512	4.06	4.19	4.10	3.86	4.05	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	2	7	10	4.30	757/1623	3.90	4.08	4.16	4.08	4.30	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	4	16	4.80	833/1646	4.53	4.59	4.69	4.67	4.80	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	1	0	0	2	10	3	4.07	881/1621	3.87	4.14	4.06	3.96	4.07	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	1	4	5	10	4.20	1169/1568	4.17	4.39	4.43	4.39	4.20	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	2	18	4.90	591/1572	4.74	4.79	4.70	4.64	4.90	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	3	9	8	4.25	939/1564	3.96	4.28	4.28	4.20	4.25	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	0	4	15	4.65	524/1559	4.24	4.43	4.29	4.20	4.65	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	1	0	1	5	5	8	4.05	661/1352	3.59	3.97	3.98	3.86	4.05	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	3	3	7	4.31	644/1384	4.11	4.28	4.08	3.86	4.31	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	0	0	1	3	9	4.62	530/1382	4.51	4.57	4.29	4.03	4.62	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	0	0	0	3	10	4.77	415/1368	4.48	4.42	4.30	4.01	4.77	
4. Were special techniques successful	7	2	0	0	3	2	6	4.27	334/ 948	4.05	4.10	3.95	3.75	4.27	
Laboratory															
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	12	0	5	2	0	0	1	1.75	534/ 555	2.02	2.56	4.29	4.14	1.75	
Seminar															
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	16	2	2	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 288	****	2.95	3.68	3.54	****	
Field Work															
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	15	1	4	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 312	3.00	2.48	3.68	3.51	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	8	Required for Majors	10	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B	7						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	2	C	0	General	1	Under-grad	20	Non-major	20
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	6	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	0	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	4				
				?	0						

Course-Section: SPAN 101 0401  
 Title ELEMENTARY SPANISH I  
 Instructor: CURTO, NATALIA  
 Enrollment: 30  
 Questionnaires: 26

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2008

Page 1549  
 FEB 11, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	2	8	8	8	3.85	1319/1649	4.02	4.34	4.28	4.11	3.85	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	5	8	4	8	3.50	1481/1648	4.04	4.31	4.23	4.16	3.50	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	5	12	9	4.15	882/1375	4.19	4.42	4.27	4.10	4.15	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	1	1	4	10	9	4.00	1067/1595	4.16	4.29	4.20	4.03	4.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	2	4	2	5	7	5	3.30	1347/1533	3.58	4.16	4.04	3.87	3.30	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	1	0	1	6	9	8	4.00	883/1512	4.06	4.19	4.10	3.86	4.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	5	3	6	5	7	3.23	1489/1623	3.90	4.08	4.16	4.08	3.23	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	3	21	2	3.96	1568/1646	4.53	4.59	4.69	4.67	3.96	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	1	2	1	8	7	1	3.21	1460/1621	3.87	4.14	4.06	3.96	3.21	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	5	7	4	8	3.63	1435/1568	4.17	4.39	4.43	4.39	3.63	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	1	3	6	14	4.38	1339/1572	4.74	4.79	4.70	4.64	4.38	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	1	3	8	5	7	3.58	1365/1564	3.96	4.28	4.28	4.20	3.58	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	4	5	5	10	3.88	1211/1559	4.24	4.43	4.29	4.20	3.88	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	9	1	0	4	2	8	4.07	655/1352	3.59	3.97	3.98	3.86	4.07	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	1	2	4	5	4.08	767/1384	4.11	4.28	4.08	3.86	4.08	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	14	0	0	0	1	4	7	4.50	616/1382	4.51	4.57	4.29	4.03	4.50	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	14	0	0	0	0	4	8	4.67	522/1368	4.48	4.42	4.30	4.01	4.67	
4. Were special techniques successful	14	2	0	0	3	4	3	4.00	431/ 948	4.05	4.10	3.95	3.75	4.00	
Laboratory															
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	23	0	2	0	0	1	0	2.00	****/ 555	2.02	2.56	4.29	4.14	****	
Field Work															
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	23	2	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 312	3.00	2.48	3.68	3.51	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	1	A	10	Required for Majors	12	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	5	1.00-1.99	0	B	11						
56-83	9	2.00-2.99	3	C	2	General	6	Under-grad	26	Non-major	26
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	5	D	1						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	6	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	1						
				I	0	Other	8				
				?	0						

Course-Section: SPAN 101 0501  
 Title ELEMENTARY SPANISH I  
 Instructor: AREVALO GUERRERO  
 Enrollment: 30  
 Questionnaires: 21

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2008

Page 1550  
 FEB 11, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sept
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	3	5	4	7	2	3.00	1603/1649	4.02	4.34	4.28	4.11	3.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	4	3	6	6	2	2.95	1598/1648	4.04	4.31	4.23	4.16	2.95	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	2	5	3	9	2	3.19	1298/1375	4.19	4.42	4.27	4.10	3.19	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	1	3	5	10	1	3.35	1463/1595	4.16	4.29	4.20	4.03	3.35	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	3	2	5	8	3	3.29	1354/1533	3.58	4.16	4.04	3.87	3.29	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	2	4	6	4	4	3.20	1395/1512	4.06	4.19	4.10	3.86	3.20	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	3	2	7	4	5	3.29	1478/1623	3.90	4.08	4.16	4.08	3.29	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	10	11	4.52	1175/1646	4.53	4.59	4.69	4.67	4.52	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	1	2	2	7	5	0	2.94	1525/1621	3.87	4.14	4.06	3.96	2.94	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	3	0	5	9	3	3.45	1470/1568	4.17	4.39	4.43	4.39	3.45	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	7	12	4.63	1108/1572	4.74	4.79	4.70	4.64	4.63	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	6	4	3	7	0	2.55	1544/1564	3.96	4.28	4.28	4.20	2.55	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	4	1	7	5	3	3.10	1468/1559	4.24	4.43	4.29	4.20	3.10	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	6	7	1	4	1	0	1.92	1342/1352	3.59	3.97	3.98	3.86	1.92	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	7	3	6	3	3.15	1228/1384	4.11	4.28	4.08	3.86	3.15	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	1	1	1	6	11	4.25	831/1382	4.51	4.57	4.29	4.03	4.25	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	3	2	3	6	6	3.50	1181/1368	4.48	4.42	4.30	4.01	3.50	
4. Were special techniques successful	1	2	2	1	6	7	2	3.33	776/ 948	4.05	4.10	3.95	3.75	3.33	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	17	2	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	****/ 221	****	4.38	4.16	4.05	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	18	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/ 243	****	4.69	4.12	4.08	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	18	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/ 212	****	5.00	4.40	4.43	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	18	0	0	0	2	0	1	3.67	****/ 209	****	****	4.35	4.38	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	17	0	0	1	0	0	3	4.25	****/ 555	2.02	2.56	4.29	4.14	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	19	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 88	****	4.39	4.54	4.31	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	19	0	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	****/ 85	****	4.20	4.47	4.30	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/ 81	****	4.23	4.43	4.39	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/ 92	****	4.32	4.35	4.01	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	18	0	0	2	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 288	****	2.95	3.68	3.54	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 52	****	5.00	4.06	3.72	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	19	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 48	****	5.00	4.09	3.65	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	19	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 39	****	4.67	4.47	4.36	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	19	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 39	****	4.67	4.38	4.37	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	16	1	0	3	0	1	0	2.50	****/ 312	3.00	2.48	3.68	3.51	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 53	****	5.00	4.30	4.17	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	19	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.16	4.06	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	19	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/ 41	****	****	4.43	4.27	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	19	1	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 24	****	****	4.42	4.24	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	19	1	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 110	****	4.13	3.99	3.83	****	

Course-Section: SPAN 101 0501  
 Title ELEMENTARY SPANISH I  
 Instructor: AREVALO GUERRERO  
 Enrollment: 30  
 Questionnaires: 21

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2008

Page 1550  
 FEB 11, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	3	Required for Majors	11	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	5						
56-83	5	2.00-2.99	2	C	7	General	0	Under-grad	21	Non-major	21
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	2	D	2						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	7				
				?	2						

Course-Section: SPAN 102 0101  
 Title ELEMENTARY SPANISH II  
 Instructor: BURGOS, FELIX A  
 Enrollment: 21  
 Questionnaires: 14

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2008

Page 1551  
 FEB 11, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	7	7	4.50	644/1649	4.10	4.34	4.28	4.11	4.50	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	5	7	4.36	770/1648	4.04	4.31	4.23	4.16	4.36	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	4	10	4.71	347/1375	4.04	4.42	4.27	4.10	4.71	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	6	7	4.54	462/1595	4.06	4.29	4.20	4.03	4.54	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	3	5	6	4.21	663/1533	3.80	4.16	4.04	3.87	4.21	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	6	7	4.43	493/1512	4.00	4.19	4.10	3.86	4.43	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	2	4	8	4.43	608/1623	4.04	4.08	4.16	4.08	4.43	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	4	10	4.71	977/1646	4.71	4.59	4.69	4.67	4.71	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	1	3	6	4.50	374/1621	3.94	4.14	4.06	3.96	4.50	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	6	8	4.57	767/1568	4.21	4.39	4.43	4.39	4.57	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	3	11	4.79	876/1572	4.66	4.79	4.70	4.64	4.79	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	5	8	4.50	651/1564	4.03	4.28	4.28	4.20	4.50	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	5	9	4.64	536/1559	4.24	4.43	4.29	4.20	4.64	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	0	0	5	8	4.62	240/1352	3.84	3.97	3.98	3.86	4.62	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	1	2	7	4.60	376/1384	4.16	4.28	4.08	3.86	4.60	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	0	4	7	4.64	511/1382	4.51	4.57	4.29	4.03	4.64	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	0	0	4	6	4.60	579/1368	4.31	4.42	4.30	4.01	4.60	
4. Were special techniques successful	5	1	0	0	0	5	3	4.38	293/ 948	3.98	4.10	3.95	3.75	4.38	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	9	3	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 221	****	4.38	4.16	4.05	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	10	0	1	0	0	1	2	3.75	188/ 243	3.75	4.69	4.12	4.08	3.75	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	10	3	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 212	****	5.00	4.40	4.43	****	
Seminar															
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	11	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 288	1.86	2.95	3.68	3.54	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/ 52	****	5.00	4.06	3.72	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	11	0	0	1	0	0	2	4.00	****/ 48	****	5.00	4.09	3.65	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	10	1	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 39	****	4.67	4.47	4.36	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	11	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 39	****	4.67	4.38	4.37	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	11	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 312	2.80	2.48	3.68	3.51	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 53	****	5.00	4.30	4.17	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	11	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.16	4.06	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	11	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 41	****	****	4.43	4.27	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	11	2	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 24	****	****	4.42	4.24	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 2	Required for Majors 7
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B 8	
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	2	C 1	General 0
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	1	D 0	Under-grad 14
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F 0	Non-major 14
Electives 0					
#### - Means there are not enough					

P	0			responses to be significant
I	0	Other	3	
?	0			

Course-Section: SPAN 102 0201  
 Title ELEMENTARY SPANISH II  
 Instructor: SHORKEY, CATALI  
 Enrollment: 28  
 Questionnaires: 17

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2008

Page 1552  
 FEB 11, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	0	1	3	5	7	4.13	1096/1649	4.10	4.34	4.28	4.11	4.13	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	4	6	6	4.13	1043/1648	4.04	4.31	4.23	4.16	4.13	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	2	3	4	7	4.00	950/1375	4.04	4.42	4.27	4.10	4.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	5	2	9	4.25	818/1595	4.06	4.29	4.20	4.03	4.25	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	1	6	3	5	3.63	1166/1533	3.80	4.16	4.04	3.87	3.63	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	2	4	1	9	4.06	854/1512	4.00	4.19	4.10	3.86	4.06	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	0	5	4	6	3.88	1198/1623	4.04	4.08	4.16	4.08	3.88	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	16	5.00	1/1646	4.71	4.59	4.69	4.67	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	7	0	0	0	2	6	2	4.00	914/1621	3.94	4.14	4.06	3.96	4.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	1	4	10	4.60	731/1568	4.21	4.39	4.43	4.39	4.60	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	1	1	13	4.80	840/1572	4.66	4.79	4.70	4.64	4.80	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	4	4	7	4.20	1001/1564	4.03	4.28	4.28	4.20	4.20	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	1	5	9	4.53	662/1559	4.24	4.43	4.29	4.20	4.53	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	0	1	0	2	4	8	4.20	556/1352	3.84	3.97	3.98	3.86	4.20	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	2	4	5	4.27	661/1384	4.16	4.28	4.08	3.86	4.27	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	0	1	0	10	4.82	332/1382	4.51	4.57	4.29	4.03	4.82	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	0	0	2	2	7	4.45	703/1368	4.31	4.42	4.30	4.01	4.45	
4. Were special techniques successful	6	1	0	0	1	2	7	4.60	170/ 948	3.98	4.10	3.95	3.75	4.60	
Laboratory															
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	15	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/ 555	1.33	2.56	4.29	4.14	****	
Seminar															
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	15	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 288	1.86	2.95	3.68	3.54	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	16	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 52	****	5.00	4.06	3.72	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	11	1	0	3	0	2	0	2.80	267/ 312	2.80	2.48	3.68	3.51	2.80	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 53	****	5.00	4.30	4.17	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	2	Required for Majors	11	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B	8						
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	2	C	2	General	0	Under-grad	17	Non-major	17
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	2	D	1						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	6	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	4				
				?	0						

Course-Section: SPAN 102 0401  
 Title ELEMENTARY SPANISH II  
 Instructor: KING, ROBIN R  
 Enrollment: 24  
 Questionnaires: 20

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2008

Page 1553  
 FEB 11, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sept
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	1	3	4	12	4.35	844/1649	4.10	4.34	4.28	4.11	4.35	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	2	3	6	9	4.10	1065/1648	4.04	4.31	4.23	4.16	4.10	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	2	3	7	7	3.85	1060/1375	4.04	4.42	4.27	4.10	3.85	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	1	2	7	9	4.10	1010/1595	4.06	4.29	4.20	4.03	4.10	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	7	5	7	3.85	966/1533	3.80	4.16	4.04	3.87	3.85	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	3	2	7	2	6	3.30	1356/1512	4.00	4.19	4.10	3.86	3.30	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	2	4	1	12	4.21	861/1623	4.04	4.08	4.16	4.08	4.21	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	19	4.95	398/1646	4.71	4.59	4.69	4.67	4.95	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	10	1	0	0	6	0	3	3.67	1261/1621	3.94	4.14	4.06	3.96	3.67	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	1	0	3	5	10	4.21	1153/1568	4.21	4.39	4.43	4.39	4.21	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	1	2	16	4.79	876/1572	4.66	4.79	4.70	4.64	4.79	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	1	1	2	7	8	4.05	1105/1564	4.03	4.28	4.28	4.20	4.05	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	1	4	5	8	3.95	1166/1559	4.24	4.43	4.29	4.20	3.95	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	2	1	4	4	4	4	3.35	1122/1352	3.84	3.97	3.98	3.86	3.35	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	7	1	6	3.93	867/1384	4.16	4.28	4.08	3.86	3.93	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	1	1	2	10	4.50	616/1382	4.51	4.57	4.29	4.03	4.50	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	0	1	3	2	7	4.15	896/1368	4.31	4.42	4.30	4.01	4.15	
4. Were special techniques successful	6	0	0	2	3	3	6	3.93	512/ 948	3.98	4.10	3.95	3.75	3.93	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	18	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 221	****	4.38	4.16	4.05	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	18	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 243	3.75	4.69	4.12	4.08	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	18	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 212	****	5.00	4.40	4.43	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	18	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 209	****	****	4.35	4.38	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	15	1	0	2	1	0	1	3.00	****/ 555	1.33	2.56	4.29	4.14	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	18	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 88	****	4.39	4.54	4.31	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	18	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 85	****	4.20	4.47	4.30	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	18	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 81	****	4.23	4.43	4.39	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 92	****	4.32	4.35	4.01	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	12	1	3	1	0	1	2	2.71	248/ 288	1.86	2.95	3.68	3.54	2.71	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 52	****	5.00	4.06	3.72	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	18	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 48	****	5.00	4.09	3.65	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	18	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 39	****	4.67	4.47	4.36	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	18	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 39	****	4.67	4.38	4.37	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	15	1	1	2	0	0	1	2.50	****/ 312	2.80	2.48	3.68	3.51	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 53	****	5.00	4.30	4.17	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	18	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.16	4.06	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	18	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 41	****	****	4.43	4.27	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	18	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 24	****	****	4.42	4.24	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	18	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 110	****	4.13	3.99	3.83	****	

Course-Section: SPAN 102 0401  
 Title ELEMENTARY SPANISH II  
 Instructor: KING, ROBIN R  
 Enrollment: 24  
 Questionnaires: 20

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2008

Page 1553  
 FEB 11, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	1	A	11	Required for Majors	12	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	2						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	3	C	4	General	1	Under-grad	20	Non-major	20
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	4				
				?	0						

Course-Section: SPAN 102 0501  
 Title ELEMENTARY SPANISH II  
 Instructor: QUIROGA, MARIA  
 Enrollment: 28  
 Questionnaires: 23

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2008

Page 1554  
 FEB 11, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	1	0	3	14	5	3.96	1227/1649	4.10	4.34	4.28	4.11	3.96	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	4	10	8	4.09	1076/1648	4.04	4.31	4.23	4.16	4.09	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	4	3	9	6	3.65	1153/1375	4.04	4.42	4.27	4.10	3.65	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	3	0	1	1	5	6	7	3.85	1231/1595	4.06	4.29	4.20	4.03	3.85	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	1	3	9	8	4.14	718/1533	3.80	4.16	4.04	3.87	4.14	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	1	6	5	10	3.96	952/1512	4.00	4.19	4.10	3.86	3.96	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	2	6	7	6	3.68	1308/1623	4.04	4.08	4.16	4.08	3.68	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	23	5.00	1/1646	4.71	4.59	4.69	4.67	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	1	0	0	3	8	5	4.13	835/1621	3.94	4.14	4.06	3.96	4.13	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	2	2	6	10	4.20	1169/1568	4.21	4.39	4.43	4.39	4.20	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	1	0	1	19	4.81	840/1572	4.66	4.79	4.70	4.64	4.81	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	4	1	5	10	4.05	1105/1564	4.03	4.28	4.28	4.20	4.05	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	1	0	2	7	10	4.25	966/1559	4.24	4.43	4.29	4.20	4.25	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	1	1	0	6	5	6	3.83	860/1352	3.84	3.97	3.98	3.86	3.83	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	12	0	1	0	1	4	5	4.09	764/1384	4.16	4.28	4.08	3.86	4.09	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	12	0	1	0	1	1	8	4.36	749/1382	4.51	4.57	4.29	4.03	4.36	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	12	0	1	0	1	3	6	4.18	881/1368	4.31	4.42	4.30	4.01	4.18	
4. Were special techniques successful	12	3	1	0	2	1	4	3.88	546/ 948	3.98	4.10	3.95	3.75	3.88	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	22	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 221	****	4.38	4.16	4.05	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	22	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 243	3.75	4.69	4.12	4.08	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 212	****	5.00	4.40	4.43	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	22	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 209	****	****	4.35	4.38	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	19	0	1	1	0	1	1	3.00	****/ 555	1.33	2.56	4.29	4.14	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 88	****	4.39	4.54	4.31	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	22	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 85	****	4.20	4.47	4.30	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 81	****	4.23	4.43	4.39	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	22	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 92	****	4.32	4.35	4.01	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	20	0	1	1	0	1	0	2.33	****/ 288	1.86	2.95	3.68	3.54	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 52	****	5.00	4.06	3.72	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 48	****	5.00	4.09	3.65	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	22	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 39	****	4.67	4.47	4.36	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	22	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 39	****	4.67	4.38	4.37	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	20	0	2	0	0	1	0	2.00	****/ 312	2.80	2.48	3.68	3.51	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 53	****	5.00	4.30	4.17	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	22	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.16	4.06	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	22	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 41	****	****	4.43	4.27	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 24	****	****	4.42	4.24	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	21	0	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/ 110	****	4.13	3.99	3.83	****	

Course-Section: SPAN 102 0501  
 Title ELEMENTARY SPANISH II  
 Instructor: QUIROGA, MARIA  
 Enrollment: 28  
 Questionnaires: 23

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2008

Page 1554  
 FEB 11, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	7	Required for Majors	13	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	7						
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	1	C	4	General	1	Under-grad	23	Non-major	23
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	3				
				?	0						

Course-Section: SPAN 102 0601  
 Title ELEMENTARY SPANISH II  
 Instructor: QUIROGA, MARIA  
 Enrollment: 25  
 Questionnaires: 19

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2008

Page 1555  
 FEB 11, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	2	9	8	4.32	898/1649	4.10	4.34	4.28	4.11	4.32	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	0	1	6	11	4.37	756/1648	4.04	4.31	4.23	4.16	4.37	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	2	0	6	10	4.33	733/1375	4.04	4.42	4.27	4.10	4.33	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	6	4	8	4.11	996/1595	4.06	4.29	4.20	4.03	4.11	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	2	3	8	6	3.95	875/1533	3.80	4.16	4.04	3.87	3.95	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	3	6	8	4.17	782/1512	4.00	4.19	4.10	3.86	4.17	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	4	5	9	4.16	926/1623	4.04	4.08	4.16	4.08	4.16	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	18	4.95	398/1646	4.71	4.59	4.69	4.67	4.95	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	0	1	10	3	4.14	812/1621	3.94	4.14	4.06	3.96	4.14	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	1	6	11	4.56	791/1568	4.21	4.39	4.43	4.39	4.56	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	1	17	4.94	355/1572	4.66	4.79	4.70	4.64	4.94	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	1	1	3	4	9	4.06	1105/1564	4.03	4.28	4.28	4.20	4.06	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	0	0	5	12	4.50	695/1559	4.24	4.43	4.29	4.20	4.50	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	3	0	0	1	8	5	4.29	495/1352	3.84	3.97	3.98	3.86	4.29	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	1	5	4	4.30	644/1384	4.16	4.28	4.08	3.86	4.30	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	9	0	0	0	1	3	6	4.50	616/1382	4.51	4.57	4.29	4.03	4.50	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	0	0	2	4	4	4.20	876/1368	4.31	4.42	4.30	4.01	4.20	
4. Were special techniques successful	9	1	0	0	1	5	3	4.22	353/ 948	3.98	4.10	3.95	3.75	4.22	
Laboratory															
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	17	0	2	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 555	1.33	2.56	4.29	4.14	****	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: SPAN 102 0701  
 Title ELEMENTARY SPANISH II  
 Instructor: NASH, LYLE  
 Enrollment: 25  
 Questionnaires: 19

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2008

Page 1556  
 FEB 11, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	2	1	8	8	4.16	1067/1649	4.10	4.34	4.28	4.11	4.16	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	3	1	3	4	8	3.68	1395/1648	4.04	4.31	4.23	4.16	3.68	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	0	5	6	7	3.95	1000/1375	4.04	4.42	4.27	4.10	3.95	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	1	4	9	4	3.74	1295/1595	4.06	4.29	4.20	4.03	3.74	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	1	4	2	7	4	3.50	1249/1533	3.80	4.16	4.04	3.87	3.50	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	4	8	6	4.00	883/1512	4.00	4.19	4.10	3.86	4.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	3	3	6	7	3.89	1186/1623	4.04	4.08	4.16	4.08	3.89	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	1	0	0	1	14	3	4.11	1498/1646	4.71	4.59	4.69	4.67	4.11	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	1	1	10	2	3.93	1030/1621	3.94	4.14	4.06	3.96	3.93	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	1	5	7	4	3.82	1377/1568	4.21	4.39	4.43	4.39	3.82	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	2	5	10	4.47	1265/1572	4.66	4.79	4.70	4.64	4.47	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	1	4	6	6	4.00	1127/1564	4.03	4.28	4.28	4.20	4.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	1	0	4	11	4.35	881/1559	4.24	4.43	4.29	4.20	4.35	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	2	1	0	6	6	2	3.53	1034/1352	3.84	3.97	3.98	3.86	3.53	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	3	2	3	4.00	795/1384	4.16	4.28	4.08	3.86	4.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	11	0	0	0	0	3	5	4.63	521/1382	4.51	4.57	4.29	4.03	4.63	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	11	0	0	0	1	1	6	4.63	560/1368	4.31	4.42	4.30	4.01	4.63	
4. Were special techniques successful	11	0	0	1	1	3	3	4.00	431/ 948	3.98	4.10	3.95	3.75	4.00	
Laboratory															
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	18	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 555	1.33	2.56	4.29	4.14	****	
Seminar															
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	17	0	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/ 288	1.86	2.95	3.68	3.54	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	1	Required for Majors	10	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	7						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	3	C	3	General	1	Under-grad	19	Non-major	19
84-150	6	3.00-3.49	3	D	1						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	2				
				?	1						

Course-Section: SPAN 102 0801  
 Title ELEMENTARY SPANISH II  
 Instructor: NASH, LYLE  
 Enrollment: 21  
 Questionnaires: 12

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2008

Page 1557  
 FEB 11, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	2	2	4	1	3	3.08	1595/1649	4.10	4.34	4.28	4.11	3.08	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	2	1	4	2	3	3.25	1563/1648	4.04	4.31	4.23	4.16	3.25	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	2	0	4	2	4	3.50	1208/1375	4.04	4.42	4.27	4.10	3.50	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	2	0	3	2	4	3.55	1387/1595	4.06	4.29	4.20	4.03	3.55	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	3	0	3	3	3	3.25	1366/1533	3.80	4.16	4.04	3.87	3.25	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	1	0	3	3	4	3.82	1082/1512	4.00	4.19	4.10	3.86	3.82	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	2	0	1	3	6	3.92	1164/1623	4.04	4.08	4.16	4.08	3.92	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	11	1	4.08	1513/1646	4.71	4.59	4.69	4.67	4.08	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	3	0	2	5	2	3.25	1451/1621	3.94	4.14	4.06	3.96	3.25	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	2	1	3	4	2	3.25	1496/1568	4.21	4.39	4.43	4.39	3.25	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	2	0	3	0	7	3.83	1506/1572	4.66	4.79	4.70	4.64	3.83	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	2	0	5	1	4	3.42	1423/1564	4.03	4.28	4.28	4.20	3.42	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	2	2	2	4	3.33	1424/1559	4.24	4.43	4.29	4.20	3.33	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	2	1	2	2	2	2	3.22	1170/1352	3.84	3.97	3.98	3.86	3.22	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	2	0	1	2	3	3.50	1081/1384	4.16	4.28	4.08	3.86	3.50	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	1	1	0	0	6	4.13	911/1382	4.51	4.57	4.29	4.03	4.13	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	1	3	0	4	3.88	1043/1368	4.31	4.42	4.30	4.01	3.88	
4. Were special techniques successful	4	3	2	0	2	0	1	2.60	905/ 948	3.98	4.10	3.95	3.75	2.60	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	10	1	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 221	****	4.38	4.16	4.05	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	11	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 243	3.75	4.69	4.12	4.08	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	11	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 212	****	5.00	4.40	4.43	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	11	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 209	****	****	4.35	4.38	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	9	0	2	1	0	0	0	1.33	550/ 555	1.33	2.56	4.29	4.14	1.33	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	10	1	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 88	****	4.39	4.54	4.31	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	11	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 85	****	4.20	4.47	4.30	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	11	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 81	****	4.23	4.43	4.39	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	11	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 92	****	4.32	4.35	4.01	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	8	1	3	0	0	0	0	1.00	283/ 288	1.86	2.95	3.68	3.54	1.00	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	11	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 52	****	5.00	4.06	3.72	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	11	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 48	****	5.00	4.09	3.65	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	11	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 39	****	4.67	4.47	4.36	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	11	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 39	****	4.67	4.38	4.37	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	10	1	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 312	2.80	2.48	3.68	3.51	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	11	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 53	****	5.00	4.30	4.17	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	11	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.16	4.06	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 24	****	****	4.42	4.24	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	10	0	2	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 110	****	4.13	3.99	3.83	****	

Course-Section: SPAN 102 0801  
 Title ELEMENTARY SPANISH II  
 Instructor: NASH, LYLE  
 Enrollment: 21  
 Questionnaires: 12

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2008

Page 1557  
 FEB 11, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: SPAN 102 0901  
 Title ELEMENTARY SPANISH II  
 Instructor: OSKOZ, ANA  
 Enrollment: 29  
 Questionnaires: 21

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2008

Page 1558  
 FEB 11, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	0	0	4	6	10	4.30	912/1649	4.10	4.34	4.28	4.11	4.30	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	4	5	12	4.38	729/1648	4.04	4.31	4.23	4.16	4.38	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	1	1	6	12	4.29	780/1375	4.04	4.42	4.27	4.10	4.29	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	2	1	6	12	4.33	722/1595	4.06	4.29	4.20	4.03	4.33	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	5	0	1	5	4	5	3.87	955/1533	3.80	4.16	4.04	3.87	3.87	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	2	1	8	10	4.24	711/1512	4.00	4.19	4.10	3.86	4.24	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	4	6	10	4.19	883/1623	4.04	4.08	4.16	4.08	4.19	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	1	0	0	20	4.86	748/1646	4.71	4.59	4.69	4.67	4.86	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	1	2	13	2	3.89	1078/1621	3.94	4.14	4.06	3.96	3.89	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	2	7	12	4.48	891/1568	4.21	4.39	4.43	4.39	4.48	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	1	19	4.86	715/1572	4.66	4.79	4.70	4.64	4.86	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	1	5	9	6	3.95	1173/1564	4.03	4.28	4.28	4.20	3.95	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	5	3	13	4.38	851/1559	4.24	4.43	4.29	4.20	4.38	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	3	2	0	6	3	6	3.65	981/1352	3.84	3.97	3.98	3.86	3.65	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	2	3	11	4.56	400/1384	4.16	4.28	4.08	3.86	4.56	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	1	1	3	12	4.53	600/1382	4.51	4.57	4.29	4.03	4.53	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	1	2	3	10	4.38	771/1368	4.31	4.42	4.30	4.01	4.38	
4. Were special techniques successful	4	1	1	1	2	1	11	4.25	342/ 948	3.98	4.10	3.95	3.75	4.25	
Laboratory															
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	20	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 555	1.33	2.56	4.29	4.14	****	
Seminar															
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	19	0	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	****/ 288	1.86	2.95	3.68	3.54	****	
Field Work															
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	19	1	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 312	2.80	2.48	3.68	3.51	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	A	3	Required for Majors	12	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	9						
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	3	C	7	General	0	Under-grad	21	Non-major	20
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	8				
				?	0						

Course-Section: SPAN 103 0101  
 Title INT REV ELEM SPANISH  
 Instructor: NASH, LYLE  
 Enrollment: 19  
 Questionnaires: 19

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2008

Page 1559  
 FEB 11, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	5	10	4	3.95	1236/1649	4.05	4.34	4.28	4.11	3.95	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	2	6	4	7	3.84	1279/1648	3.89	4.31	4.23	4.16	3.84	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	2	6	5	6	3.79	1097/1375	3.64	4.42	4.27	4.10	3.79	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	3	4	5	7	3.84	1236/1595	3.81	4.29	4.20	4.03	3.84	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	3	2	3	4	6	1	3.06	1430/1533	3.42	4.16	4.04	3.87	3.06	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	3	1	1	3	7	4	3.75	1119/1512	3.53	4.19	4.10	3.86	3.75	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	4	7	4	3	3.21	1493/1623	3.57	4.08	4.16	4.08	3.21	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	12	7	4.37	1317/1646	4.51	4.59	4.69	4.67	4.37	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	1	5	8	3	3.76	1184/1621	3.77	4.14	4.06	3.96	3.76	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	1	4	6	6	4.00	1279/1568	4.07	4.39	4.43	4.39	4.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	1	16	4.94	355/1572	4.79	4.79	4.70	4.64	4.94	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	1	3	6	7	4.12	1073/1564	4.02	4.28	4.28	4.20	4.12	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	2	6	9	4.41	818/1559	4.24	4.43	4.29	4.20	4.41	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	6	1	2	4	2	2	3.18	1183/1352	3.14	3.97	3.98	3.86	3.18	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	2	1	0	3.33	****/1384	4.00	4.28	4.08	3.86	****	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	16	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/1382	4.00	4.57	4.29	4.03	****	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	16	0	0	0	2	1	0	3.33	****/1368	4.14	4.42	4.30	4.01	****	
4. Were special techniques successful	17	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 948	3.71	4.10	3.95	3.75	****	
Laboratory															
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	18	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 555	****	2.56	4.29	4.14	****	
Seminar															
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	18	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 288	****	2.95	3.68	3.54	****	
Field Work															
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	18	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 312	****	2.48	3.68	3.51	****	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: SPAN 103 0201  
 Title INT REV ELEM SPANISH  
 Instructor: AREVALO GUERRERO  
 Enrollment: 20  
 Questionnaires: 14

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2008

Page 1560  
 FEB 11, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	2	8	4	4.14	1076/1649	4.05	4.34	4.28	4.11	4.14	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	8	3	3.93	1208/1648	3.89	4.31	4.23	4.16	3.93	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	2	3	5	3	3.50	1208/1375	3.64	4.42	4.27	4.10	3.50	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	0	4	5	4	3.79	1270/1595	3.81	4.29	4.20	4.03	3.79	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	2	5	1	6	3.79	1036/1533	3.42	4.16	4.04	3.87	3.79	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	1	3	3	3	3	3.31	1356/1512	3.53	4.19	4.10	3.86	3.31	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	0	4	3	6	3.93	1149/1623	3.57	4.08	4.16	4.08	3.93	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	1	0	0	1	12	4.64	1059/1646	4.51	4.59	4.69	4.67	4.64	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	1	0	1	5	2	3.78	1175/1621	3.77	4.14	4.06	3.96	3.78	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	2	1	4	7	4.14	1205/1568	4.07	4.39	4.43	4.39	4.14	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	1	0	2	11	4.64	1096/1572	4.79	4.79	4.70	4.64	4.64	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	3	1	4	6	3.93	1200/1564	4.02	4.28	4.28	4.20	3.93	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	1	2	2	8	4.07	1088/1559	4.24	4.43	4.29	4.20	4.07	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	3	2	1	4	0	3	3.10	1207/1352	3.14	3.97	3.98	3.86	3.10	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	2	0	1	4	4.00	795/1384	4.00	4.28	4.08	3.86	4.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	0	1	1	2	3	4.00	946/1382	4.00	4.57	4.29	4.03	4.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	0	1	1	1	4	4.14	900/1368	4.14	4.42	4.30	4.01	4.14	
4. Were special techniques successful	7	0	1	1	1	0	4	3.71	619/ 948	3.71	4.10	3.95	3.75	3.71	
Laboratory															
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	12	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/ 555	****	2.56	4.29	4.14	****	
Seminar															
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	13	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 288	****	2.95	3.68	3.54	****	
Field Work															
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	10	1	0	1	0	2	0	3.33	****/ 312	****	2.48	3.68	3.51	****	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: SPAN 201 0101  
 Title INTERMEDIATE SPANISH I  
 Instructor: MESSICK, ROSALI  
 Enrollment: 24  
 Questionnaires: 19

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2008

Page 1561  
 FEB 11, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	3	3	2	5	6	3.42	1518/1649	4.30	4.34	4.28	4.29	3.42	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	3	3	5	7	3.74	1361/1648	4.33	4.31	4.23	4.25	3.74	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	1	3	8	6	3.89	1039/1375	4.50	4.42	4.27	4.37	3.89	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	1	2	2	7	6	3.83	1242/1595	4.41	4.29	4.20	4.22	3.83	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	5	1	3	4	4	3.06	1432/1533	3.79	4.16	4.04	4.04	3.06	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	3	5	4	5	3.37	1334/1512	4.06	4.19	4.10	4.14	3.37	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	5	1	2	2	8	3.39	1442/1623	4.26	4.08	4.16	4.21	3.39	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	13	6	4.32	1356/1646	4.62	4.59	4.69	4.63	4.32	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	0	0	0	4	7	2	3.85	1114/1621	4.21	4.14	4.06	4.01	3.85	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	4	1	2	6	3	3.19	1502/1568	4.28	4.39	4.43	4.39	3.19	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	1	0	0	4	11	4.50	1241/1572	4.79	4.79	4.70	4.73	4.50	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	3	2	2	6	3	3.25	1460/1564	4.23	4.28	4.28	4.27	3.25	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	3	1	4	1	7	3.50	1370/1559	4.39	4.43	4.29	4.33	3.50	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	5	2	1	2	3	2	3.20	1177/1352	3.95	3.97	3.98	4.07	3.20	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	9	0	1	1	5	2	1	3.10	1248/1384	4.15	4.28	4.08	3.99	3.10	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	9	0	0	0	0	3	7	4.70	455/1382	4.70	4.57	4.29	4.19	4.70	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	0	0	0	4	6	4.60	579/1368	4.56	4.42	4.30	4.21	4.60	
4. Were special techniques successful	9	1	0	1	4	1	3	3.67	645/ 948	4.28	4.10	3.95	3.89	3.67	
Seminar															
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	17	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 288	2.75	2.95	3.68	3.65	****	
Field Work															
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	18	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 312	1.81	2.48	3.68	3.59	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	4	Required for Majors	11	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	6	1.00-1.99	0	B	6						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	2	C	6	General	2	Under-grad	19	Non-major	19
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	3	D	1						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	1						
				I	0	Other	3				
				?	0						

Course-Section: SPAN 201 0201  
 Title INTERMEDIATE SPANISH I  
 Instructor: SHORKEY, CATALI  
 Enrollment: 23  
 Questionnaires: 19

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2008

Page 1562  
 FEB 11, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	1	0	1	6	11	4.37	830/1649	4.30	4.34	4.28	4.29	4.37	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	6	10	4.32	825/1648	4.33	4.31	4.23	4.25	4.32	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	7	12	4.63	432/1375	4.50	4.42	4.27	4.37	4.63	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	5	13	4.63	352/1595	4.41	4.29	4.20	4.22	4.63	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	3	0	5	4	6	3.56	1214/1533	3.79	4.16	4.04	4.04	3.56	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	2	2	6	8	4.11	826/1512	4.06	4.19	4.10	4.14	4.11	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	1	4	13	4.67	321/1623	4.26	4.08	4.16	4.21	4.67	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	18	5.00	1/1646	4.62	4.59	4.69	4.63	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	2	8	8	4.33	595/1621	4.21	4.14	4.06	4.01	4.33	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	1	3	6	9	4.21	1153/1568	4.28	4.39	4.43	4.39	4.21	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	2	16	4.79	876/1572	4.79	4.79	4.70	4.73	4.79	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	1	2	7	9	4.26	929/1564	4.23	4.28	4.28	4.27	4.26	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	3	3	12	4.37	871/1559	4.39	4.43	4.29	4.33	4.37	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	1	1	1	6	4	6	3.72	935/1352	3.95	3.97	3.98	4.07	3.72	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	3	2	3	4.00	795/1384	4.15	4.28	4.08	3.99	4.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	11	0	0	0	1	3	4	4.38	740/1382	4.70	4.57	4.29	4.19	4.38	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	11	0	0	0	1	2	5	4.50	654/1368	4.56	4.42	4.30	4.21	4.50	
4. Were special techniques successful	12	1	0	0	1	3	2	4.17	380/ 948	4.28	4.10	3.95	3.89	4.17	
Seminar															
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	17	0	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/ 288	2.75	2.95	3.68	3.65	****	
Field Work															
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	17	0	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/ 312	1.81	2.48	3.68	3.59	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	1	A	8	Required for Majors	14	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B	9						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	2	C	2	General	1	Under-grad	19	Non-major	19
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	6	F	0	Electives	2	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	2				
				?	0						

Course-Section: SPAN 201 0301  
 Title INTERMEDIATE SPANISH I  
 Instructor: MESSICK, ROSALI  
 Enrollment: 23  
 Questionnaires: 17

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2008

Page 1563  
 FEB 11, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	5	2	2	4	3	2.88	1622/1649	4.30	4.34	4.28	4.29	2.88	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	6	2	3	2	3	2.63	1628/1648	4.33	4.31	4.23	4.25	2.63	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	4	4	0	2	6	3.13	1315/1375	4.50	4.42	4.27	4.37	3.13	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	2	3	3	4	4	3.31	1478/1595	4.41	4.29	4.20	4.22	3.31	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	3	3	0	3	4	3	3.31	1347/1533	3.79	4.16	4.04	4.04	3.31	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	4	3	1	5	3	3.00	1428/1512	4.06	4.19	4.10	4.14	3.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	4	3	4	2	3	2.81	1569/1623	4.26	4.08	4.16	4.21	2.81	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	9	7	4.44	1258/1646	4.62	4.59	4.69	4.63	4.44	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	2	2	2	2	5	0	2.91	1535/1621	4.21	4.14	4.06	4.01	2.91	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	6	1	5	2	1	2.40	1558/1568	4.28	4.39	4.43	4.39	2.40	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	1	1	4	10	4.44	1297/1572	4.79	4.79	4.70	4.73	4.44	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	4	4	5	2	1	2.50	1547/1564	4.23	4.28	4.28	4.27	2.50	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	4	2	3	4	3	3.00	1479/1559	4.39	4.43	4.29	4.33	3.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	4	4	1	2	1	3	2.82	1268/1352	3.95	3.97	3.98	4.07	2.82	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	1	2	4	2	1	3.00	1254/1384	4.15	4.28	4.08	3.99	3.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	0	0	2	3	5	4.30	799/1382	4.70	4.57	4.29	4.19	4.30	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	0	3	1	1	5	3.80	1071/1368	4.56	4.42	4.30	4.21	3.80	
4. Were special techniques successful	7	0	1	1	2	1	5	3.80	578/ 948	4.28	4.10	3.95	3.89	3.80	
Laboratory															
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	12	0	3	0	2	0	0	1.80	532/ 555	1.53	2.56	4.29	4.33	1.80	
Seminar															
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	13	2	2	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 288	2.75	2.95	3.68	3.65	****	
Field Work															
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	11	0	5	0	1	0	0	1.33	307/ 312	1.81	2.48	3.68	3.59	1.33	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	1	A	4	Required for Majors	9	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B	7						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	1	C	4	General	0	Under-grad	17	Non-major	17
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	4	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	6				
				?	1						

Course-Section: SPAN 201 0401  
 Title INTERMEDIATE SPANISH I  
 Instructor: SHORKEY, CATALI  
 Enrollment: 20  
 Questionnaires: 16

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2008

Page 1564  
 FEB 11, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	4	11	4.63	484/1649	4.30	4.34	4.28	4.29	4.63	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	14	4.88	168/1648	4.33	4.31	4.23	4.25	4.88	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	2	13	4.75	296/1375	4.50	4.42	4.27	4.37	4.75	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	1	3	11	4.67	321/1595	4.41	4.29	4.20	4.22	4.67	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	1	1	2	5	6	3.93	885/1533	3.79	4.16	4.04	4.04	3.93	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	2	3	10	4.53	359/1512	4.06	4.19	4.10	4.14	4.53	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	6	9	4.50	502/1623	4.26	4.08	4.16	4.21	4.50	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	16	5.00	1/1646	4.62	4.59	4.69	4.63	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	1	3	11	4.67	234/1621	4.21	4.14	4.06	4.01	4.67	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	0	4	10	4.71	554/1568	4.28	4.39	4.43	4.39	4.71	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	1	13	4.93	473/1572	4.79	4.79	4.70	4.73	4.93	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	0	4	10	4.71	406/1564	4.23	4.28	4.28	4.27	4.71	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	3	11	4.79	347/1559	4.39	4.43	4.29	4.33	4.79	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	0	0	0	2	4	8	4.43	379/1352	3.95	3.97	3.98	4.07	4.43	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1384	4.15	4.28	4.08	3.99	5.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	11	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1382	4.70	4.57	4.29	4.19	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	11	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1368	4.56	4.42	4.30	4.21	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	11	1	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/ 948	4.28	4.10	3.95	3.89	5.00	
Laboratory															
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	15	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 555	1.53	2.56	4.29	4.33	****	
Seminar															
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	14	0	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/ 288	2.75	2.95	3.68	3.65	****	
Field Work															
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	14	0	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	****/ 312	1.81	2.48	3.68	3.59	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	5	Required for Majors	11	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B	7						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	3	C	3	General	0	Under-grad	16	Non-major	16
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	4				
				?	0						

Course-Section: SPAN 201 0501  
 Title INTERMEDIATE SPANISH I  
 Instructor: COYNE, MARIA  
 Enrollment: 24  
 Questionnaires: 20

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2008

Page 1565  
 FEB 11, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor Mean	Instructor Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5								
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	5	14	4.65	446/1649	4.30	4.34	4.28	4.29	4.65	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	5	14	4.74	281/1648	4.33	4.31	4.23	4.25	4.74	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	19	4.95	100/1375	4.50	4.42	4.27	4.37	4.95	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	17	4.85	162/1595	4.41	4.29	4.20	4.22	4.85	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	1	0	1	3	13	4.50	366/1533	3.79	4.16	4.04	4.04	4.50	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	5	13	4.55	345/1512	4.06	4.19	4.10	4.14	4.55	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	6	14	4.70	284/1623	4.26	4.08	4.16	4.21	4.70	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	8	12	4.60	1103/1646	4.62	4.59	4.69	4.63	4.60	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	1	1	0	1	5	8	4.27	676/1621	4.21	4.14	4.06	4.01	4.27	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	2	4	13	4.58	767/1568	4.28	4.39	4.43	4.39	4.58	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	2	17	4.89	615/1572	4.79	4.79	4.70	4.73	4.89	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	1	3	15	4.74	374/1564	4.23	4.28	4.28	4.27	4.74	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	4	15	4.79	347/1559	4.39	4.43	4.29	4.33	4.79	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	0	0	0	2	5	11	4.50	303/1352	3.95	3.97	3.98	4.07	4.50	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/1384	4.15	4.28	4.08	3.99	5.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	0	0	0	2	10	4.83	312/1382	4.70	4.57	4.29	4.19	4.83	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	237/1368	4.56	4.42	4.30	4.21	4.92	
4. Were special techniques successful	8	0	0	0	1	3	8	4.58	176/ 948	4.28	4.10	3.95	3.89	4.58	
Laboratory															
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	18	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/ 555	1.53	2.56	4.29	4.33	****	
Seminar															
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	15	4	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 288	2.75	2.95	3.68	3.65	****	
Field Work															
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	12	1	2	2	2	1	0	2.29	288/ 312	1.81	2.48	3.68	3.59	2.29	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	3	Required for Majors	11	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	12						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	4	C	3	General	1	Under-grad	20	Non-major	20
84-150	6	3.00-3.49	4	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	4				
				?	0						

Course-Section: SPAN 201 0601  
 Title INTERMEDIATE SPANISH I  
 Instructor: NASH, LYLE  
 Enrollment: 15  
 Questionnaires: 15

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2008

Page 1566  
 FEB 11, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	2	6	7	4.33	871/1649	4.30	4.34	4.28	4.29	4.33	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	8	6	4.33	797/1648	4.33	4.31	4.23	4.25	4.33	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	6	6	4.13	895/1375	4.50	4.42	4.27	4.37	4.13	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	3	9	4.40	636/1595	4.41	4.29	4.20	4.22	4.40	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	1	1	1	3	7	1	3.46	1276/1533	3.79	4.16	4.04	4.04	3.46	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	2	0	4	6	2	3.43	1309/1512	4.06	4.19	4.10	4.14	3.43	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	1	2	6	5	4.07	994/1623	4.26	4.08	4.16	4.21	4.07	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	14	5.00	1/1646	4.62	4.59	4.69	4.63	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	1	7	4	4.25	687/1621	4.21	4.14	4.06	4.01	4.25	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	0	5	7	4.58	755/1568	4.28	4.39	4.43	4.39	4.58	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/1572	4.79	4.79	4.70	4.73	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	1	0	6	5	4.25	939/1564	4.23	4.28	4.28	4.27	4.25	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	5	7	4.58	607/1559	4.39	4.43	4.29	4.33	4.58	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	5	1	1	2	1	2	3.29	1149/1352	3.95	3.97	3.98	4.07	3.29	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/1384	4.15	4.28	4.08	3.99	****	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	12	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/1382	4.70	4.57	4.29	4.19	****	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	12	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/1368	4.56	4.42	4.30	4.21	****	
4. Were special techniques successful	12	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 948	4.28	4.10	3.95	3.89	****	
Field Work															
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	14	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 312	1.81	2.48	3.68	3.59	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 3	Required for Majors	10
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	B 8		Graduate 0
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	C 3	General	0
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad 15
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	5
			? 0		

Course-Section: SPAN 201 0801  
 Title INTERMEDIATE SPANISH I  
 Instructor: STRICKLING, LAU  
 Enrollment: 21  
 Questionnaires: 17

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2008

Page 1567  
 FEB 11, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	2	0	0	0	0	1	14	4.93	130/1649	4.30	4.34	4.28	4.29	4.93
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	0	0	1	3	11	4.67	362/1648	4.33	4.31	4.23	4.25	4.67
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	0	0	0	0	2	13	4.87	192/1375	4.50	4.42	4.27	4.37	4.87
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	0	0	0	1	2	12	4.73	254/1595	4.41	4.29	4.20	4.22	4.73
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	0	2	6	6	4.07	774/1533	3.79	4.16	4.04	4.04	4.07
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	2	2	12	4.63	294/1512	4.06	4.19	4.10	4.14	4.63
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	0	0	3	12	4.80	169/1623	4.26	4.08	4.16	4.21	4.80
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	1	14	4.93	465/1646	4.62	4.59	4.69	4.63	4.93
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	8	0	0	0	0	4	5	4.56	331/1621	4.21	4.14	4.06	4.01	4.56
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	0	1	13	4.93	196/1568	4.28	4.39	4.43	4.39	4.93
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	0	0	14	5.00	1/1572	4.79	4.79	4.70	4.73	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	0	2	12	4.86	216/1564	4.23	4.28	4.28	4.27	4.86
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	1	13	4.93	164/1559	4.39	4.43	4.29	4.33	4.93
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	1	0	0	2	4	7	4.38	415/1352	3.95	3.97	3.98	4.07	4.38
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	0	3	7	4.70	302/1384	4.15	4.28	4.08	3.99	4.70
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1382	4.70	4.57	4.29	4.19	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	0	0	2	0	8	4.60	579/1368	4.56	4.42	4.30	4.21	4.60
4. Were special techniques successful	7	1	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	93/ 948	4.28	4.10	3.95	3.89	4.89
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 221	****	4.38	4.16	4.45	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 243	****	4.69	4.12	4.47	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	13	0	2	1	1	0	0	1.75	****/ 555	1.53	2.56	4.29	4.33	****
Seminar														
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	12	2	2	0	0	1	0	2.00	****/ 288	2.75	2.95	3.68	3.65	****
Field Work														
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	13	1	1	2	0	0	0	1.67	****/ 312	1.81	2.48	3.68	3.59	****

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: SPAN 201 0901  
 Title INTERMEDIATE SPANISH I  
 Instructor: COLOMBO, LAURA  
 Enrollment: 19  
 Questionnaires: 16

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2008

Page 1568  
 FEB 11, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	2	1	1	6	6	3.81	1343/1649	4.30	4.34	4.28	4.29	3.81	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	0	4	5	6	3.94	1197/1648	4.33	4.31	4.23	4.25	3.94	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	6	8	4.31	753/1375	4.50	4.42	4.27	4.37	4.31	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	5	4	6	4.07	1032/1595	4.41	4.29	4.20	4.22	4.07	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	3	1	3	2	7	3.56	1207/1533	3.79	4.16	4.04	4.04	3.56	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	1	5	3	5	3.50	1266/1512	4.06	4.19	4.10	4.14	3.50	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	3	5	7	4.13	957/1623	4.26	4.08	4.16	4.21	4.13	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	15	1	4.06	1521/1646	4.62	4.59	4.69	4.63	4.06	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	1	2	6	4	4.00	914/1621	4.21	4.14	4.06	4.01	4.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	4	3	7	4.21	1153/1568	4.28	4.39	4.43	4.39	4.21	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	4	10	4.71	1003/1572	4.79	4.79	4.70	4.73	4.71	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	2	3	4	5	3.86	1246/1564	4.23	4.28	4.28	4.27	3.86	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	0	2	4	7	4.14	1045/1559	4.39	4.43	4.29	4.33	4.14	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	1	0	0	3	5	4	4.08	644/1352	3.95	3.97	3.98	4.07	4.08	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	3	1	2	3.83	921/1384	4.15	4.28	4.08	3.99	3.83	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	10	0	0	0	1	0	5	4.67	483/1382	4.70	4.57	4.29	4.19	4.67	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	10	0	0	0	1	2	3	4.33	796/1368	4.56	4.42	4.30	4.21	4.33	
4. Were special techniques successful	10	0	0	1	1	2	2	3.83	564/ 948	4.28	4.10	3.95	3.89	3.83	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	14	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 221	****	4.38	4.16	4.45	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	14	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 243	****	4.69	4.12	4.47	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	14	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 212	****	5.00	4.40	4.62	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	14	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 209	****	****	4.35	4.64	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	14	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 555	1.53	2.56	4.29	4.33	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	14	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 88	****	4.39	4.54	3.75	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	14	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/ 85	****	4.20	4.47	3.33	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	14	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 81	****	4.23	4.43	3.67	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/ 92	****	4.32	4.35	5.00	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	12	0	1	1	1	0	1	2.75	246/ 288	2.75	2.95	3.68	3.65	2.75	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 52	****	5.00	4.06	3.93	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	14	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/ 48	****	5.00	4.09	4.05	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	14	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 39	****	4.67	4.47	4.49	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	14	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 39	****	4.67	4.38	3.66	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	14	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 312	1.81	2.48	3.68	3.59	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 53	****	5.00	4.30	4.07	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	14	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.16	1.50	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	14	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 41	****	****	4.43	3.50	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	14	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 24	****	****	4.42	2.00	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	14	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 110	****	4.13	3.99	3.72	****	

Course-Section: SPAN 201 0901  
 Title INTERMEDIATE SPANISH I  
 Instructor: COLOMBO, LAURA  
 Enrollment: 19  
 Questionnaires: 16

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2008

Page 1568  
 FEB 11, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	6	Required for Majors	10	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	4						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	1	C	3	General	1	Under-grad	16	Non-major	16
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	7	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	2				
				?	1						

Course-Section: SPAN 201 1001  
 Title INTERMEDIATE SPANISH I  
 Instructor: COLOMBO, LAURA  
 Enrollment: 16  
 Questionnaires: 11

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2008

Page 1569  
 FEB 11, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	2	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	203/1649	4.30	4.34	4.28	4.29	4.89	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	244/1648	4.33	4.31	4.23	4.25	4.78	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	271/1375	4.50	4.42	4.27	4.37	4.78	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	1	0	0	1	1	6	4.63	362/1595	4.41	4.29	4.20	4.22	4.63	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	1	0	0	1	1	6	4.63	272/1533	3.79	4.16	4.04	4.04	4.63	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	1	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	194/1512	4.06	4.19	4.10	4.14	4.75	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	0	0	3	6	4.67	321/1623	4.26	4.08	4.16	4.21	4.67	
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	7	2	4.22	1419/1646	4.62	4.59	4.69	4.63	4.22	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	0	3	5	4.63	270/1621	4.21	4.14	4.06	4.01	4.63	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	480/1568	4.28	4.39	4.43	4.39	4.75	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	931/1572	4.79	4.79	4.70	4.73	4.75	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	342/1564	4.23	4.28	4.28	4.27	4.75	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	390/1559	4.39	4.43	4.29	4.33	4.75	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	2	0	1	1	2	2	3.83	860/1352	3.95	3.97	3.98	4.07	3.83	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1384	4.15	4.28	4.08	3.99	****	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	9	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1382	4.70	4.57	4.29	4.19	****	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/1368	4.56	4.42	4.30	4.21	****	
4. Were special techniques successful	9	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 948	4.28	4.10	3.95	3.89	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99 0	A 2	Required for Majors 5	Graduate 0 Major 1
28-55	0	1.00-1.99 1	B 4		
56-83	0	2.00-2.99 0	C 2	General 0	Under-grad 11 Non-major 10
84-150	4	3.00-3.49 3	D 0		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 1	F 0	Electives 0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 2	
			? 0		

Course-Section: SPAN 201 1101  
 Title INTERMEDIATE SPANISH I  
 Instructor: STRICKLING, LAU  
 Enrollment: 26  
 Questionnaires: 21

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2008

Page 1570  
 FEB 11, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor Mean	Instructor Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5							
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	1	0	2	2	16	4.52	617/1649	4.30	4.34	4.28	4.29	4.52
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	3	16	4.67	362/1648	4.33	4.31	4.23	4.25	4.67
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	20	4.95	83/1375	4.50	4.42	4.27	4.37	4.95	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	4	17	4.81	192/1595	4.41	4.29	4.20	4.22	4.81
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	3	4	4	3	5	3.16	1404/1533	3.79	4.16	4.04	4.04	3.16
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	5	9	7	4.10	839/1512	4.06	4.19	4.10	4.14	4.10
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	1	3	16	4.75	220/1623	4.26	4.08	4.16	4.21	4.75
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	21	5.00	1/1646	4.62	4.59	4.69	4.63	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	2	6	11	4.47	415/1621	4.21	4.14	4.06	4.01	4.47
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	2	4	14	4.60	731/1568	4.28	4.39	4.43	4.39	4.60
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	1	2	17	4.80	840/1572	4.79	4.79	4.70	4.73	4.80
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	1	2	7	9	4.26	929/1564	4.23	4.28	4.28	4.27	4.26
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	2	3	14	4.50	695/1559	4.39	4.43	4.29	4.33	4.50
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	2	0	0	4	7	6	4.12	624/1352	3.95	3.97	3.98	4.07	4.12
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	2	3	1	3.83	921/1384	4.15	4.28	4.08	3.99	3.83
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	15	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	312/1382	4.70	4.57	4.29	4.19	4.83
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	15	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	522/1368	4.56	4.42	4.30	4.21	4.67
4. Were special techniques successful	14	1	0	0	2	1	3	4.17	380/ 948	4.28	4.10	3.95	3.89	4.17
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	20	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 53	****	5.00	4.30	4.07	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	20	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.16	1.50	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	20	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 41	****	****	4.43	3.50	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	20	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 24	****	****	4.42	2.00	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	20	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 110	****	4.13	3.99	3.72	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	10	Required for Majors	13	Graduate	0	Major	2
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	5						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	2	C	2	General	0	Under-grad	21	Non-major	19
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	7	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	2				
				?	1						

Course-Section: SPAN 201 1201  
 Title INTERMEDIATE SPANISH I  
 Instructor: COYNE, MARIA  
 Enrollment: 24  
 Questionnaires: 20

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2008

Page 1571  
 FEB 11, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	3	16	4.75	328/1649	4.30	4.34	4.28	4.29	4.75	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	17	4.85	182/1648	4.33	4.31	4.23	4.25	4.85	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	19	4.95	100/1375	4.50	4.42	4.27	4.37	4.95	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	1	17	4.75	236/1595	4.41	4.29	4.20	4.22	4.75	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	5	1	13	4.42	454/1533	3.79	4.16	4.04	4.04	4.42	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	4	14	4.60	310/1512	4.06	4.19	4.10	4.14	4.60	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	2	4	14	4.60	395/1623	4.26	4.08	4.16	4.21	4.60	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	10	10	4.50	1193/1646	4.62	4.59	4.69	4.63	4.50	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	1	0	0	3	3	7	4.31	632/1621	4.21	4.14	4.06	4.01	4.31	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	1	3	15	4.74	517/1568	4.28	4.39	4.43	4.39	4.74	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	1	18	4.95	355/1572	4.79	4.79	4.70	4.73	4.95	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	1	0	18	4.89	178/1564	4.23	4.28	4.28	4.27	4.89	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	1	17	4.84	272/1559	4.39	4.43	4.29	4.33	4.84	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	1	0	0	4	14	4.58	263/1352	3.95	3.97	3.98	4.07	4.58	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	1	1	1	11	4.57	394/1384	4.15	4.28	4.08	3.99	4.57	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	0	1	2	11	4.71	435/1382	4.70	4.57	4.29	4.19	4.71	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	0	0	1	0	13	4.86	316/1368	4.56	4.42	4.30	4.21	4.86	
4. Were special techniques successful	6	3	0	0	2	3	6	4.36	297/ 948	4.28	4.10	3.95	3.89	4.36	
Laboratory															
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	18	0	2	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 555	1.53	2.56	4.29	4.33	****	
Seminar															
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	15	1	3	0	0	1	0	1.75	****/ 288	2.75	2.95	3.68	3.65	****	
Field Work															
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	17	0	1	1	0	1	0	2.33	****/ 312	1.81	2.48	3.68	3.59	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 5	Required for Majors	14
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	B 10		
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	C 1	General	0
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	D 0	Under-grad	20
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0		
			P 0		
			I 0		
			? 0		
				Electives	0
				Other	3
				#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	

Course-Section: SPAN 201 1301  
 Title INTERMEDIATE SPANISH I  
 Instructor: COYNE, MARIA  
 Enrollment: 27  
 Questionnaires: 16

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2008

Page 1572  
 FEB 11, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor Mean	Instructor Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5								
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	1	0	1	4	10	4.38	816/1649	4.30	4.34	4.28	4.29	4.38	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	0	0	5	10	4.44	658/1648	4.33	4.31	4.23	4.25	4.44	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	5	11	4.69	380/1375	4.50	4.42	4.27	4.37	4.69	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	1	2	5	7	4.20	890/1595	4.41	4.29	4.20	4.22	4.20	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	2	2	5	6	3.81	1006/1533	3.79	4.16	4.04	4.04	3.81	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	0	2	4	8	4.20	755/1512	4.06	4.19	4.10	4.14	4.20	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	2	2	1	10	4.06	999/1623	4.26	4.08	4.16	4.21	4.06	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	10	6	4.38	1310/1646	4.62	4.59	4.69	4.63	4.38	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	1	1	4	6	4.25	687/1621	4.21	4.14	4.06	4.01	4.25	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	1	0	0	5	9	4.40	983/1568	4.28	4.39	4.43	4.39	4.40	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	1	2	12	4.73	967/1572	4.79	4.79	4.70	4.73	4.73	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	1	0	0	4	10	4.47	702/1564	4.23	4.28	4.28	4.27	4.47	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	2	3	10	4.53	662/1559	4.39	4.43	4.29	4.33	4.53	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	0	1	0	0	4	9	4.43	379/1352	3.95	3.97	3.98	4.07	4.43	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	0	4	4	4.50	437/1384	4.15	4.28	4.08	3.99	4.50	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	0	0	0	3	5	4.63	521/1382	4.70	4.57	4.29	4.19	4.63	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	0	0	0	5	3	4.38	771/1368	4.56	4.42	4.30	4.21	4.38	
4. Were special techniques successful	8	2	0	0	1	2	3	4.33	310/ 948	4.28	4.10	3.95	3.89	4.33	
Laboratory															
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	12	0	3	1	0	0	0	1.25	552/ 555	1.53	2.56	4.29	4.33	1.25	
Seminar															
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	13	1	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 288	2.75	2.95	3.68	3.65	****	
Field Work															
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	14	1	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 312	1.81	2.48	3.68	3.59	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	4	Required for Majors	10	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	4						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	2	C	2	General	0	Under-grad	16	Non-major	16
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	2				
				?	1						

Course-Section: SPAN 201H 0101  
 Title INTERM SPAN I - HONORS  
 Instructor: COLOMBO, LAURA  
 Enrollment: 5  
 Questionnaires: 5

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2008

Page 1573  
 FEB 11, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	776/1649	4.40	4.34	4.28	4.29	4.40
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	702/1648	4.40	4.31	4.23	4.25	4.40
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	233/1375	4.80	4.42	4.27	4.37	4.80
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	636/1595	4.40	4.29	4.20	4.22	4.40
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	476/1533	4.40	4.16	4.04	4.04	4.40
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	1	1	2	3.80	1089/1512	3.80	4.19	4.10	4.14	3.80
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	395/1623	4.60	4.08	4.16	4.21	4.60
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	4	1	4.20	1440/1646	4.20	4.59	4.69	4.63	4.20
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	754/1621	4.20	4.14	4.06	4.01	4.20
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	3	2	4.40	983/1568	4.40	4.39	4.43	4.39	4.40
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	840/1572	4.80	4.79	4.70	4.73	4.80
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	1001/1564	4.20	4.28	4.28	4.27	4.20
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	586/1559	4.60	4.43	4.29	4.33	4.60
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	2	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	457/1352	4.33	3.97	3.98	4.07	4.33

Frequency Distribution

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

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

Course-Section: SPAN 202 0101  
 Title INTERMEDIATE SPANISH I  
 Instructor: VAL, ADRIANA  
 Enrollment: 16  
 Questionnaires: 10

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2008

Page 1574  
 FEB 11, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	1	0	2	5	2	3.70	1402/1649	3.70	4.34	4.28	4.29	3.70
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	3	5	4.20	966/1648	4.20	4.31	4.23	4.25	4.20
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	6	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	806/1375	4.25	4.42	4.27	4.37	4.25
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	3	5	4.20	890/1595	4.20	4.29	4.20	4.22	4.20
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	1	0	1	3	4	4.00	815/1533	4.00	4.16	4.04	4.04	4.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	0	3	6	4.30	627/1512	4.30	4.19	4.10	4.14	4.30
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	5	4	4.30	757/1623	4.30	4.08	4.16	4.21	4.30
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1646	5.00	4.59	4.69	4.63	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	1	0	2	0	2	3.40	1405/1621	3.40	4.14	4.06	4.01	3.40
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	1	0	0	4	5	4.20	1169/1568	4.20	4.39	4.43	4.39	4.20
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	3	6	4.50	1241/1572	4.50	4.79	4.70	4.73	4.50
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	1	0	2	4	3	3.80	1273/1564	3.80	4.28	4.28	4.27	3.80
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	1	2	4	2	3.50	1370/1559	3.50	4.43	4.29	4.33	3.50
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	1	0	4	5	4.30	482/1352	4.30	3.97	3.98	4.07	4.30
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	1	2	2	3	3.88	901/1384	3.88	4.28	4.08	3.99	3.88
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	394/1382	4.75	4.57	4.29	4.19	4.75
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	426/1368	4.75	4.42	4.30	4.21	4.75
4. Were special techniques successful	3	0	0	0	1	2	4	4.43	265/ 948	4.43	4.10	3.95	3.89	4.43
Laboratory														
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	9	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 555	****	2.56	4.29	4.33	****

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: SPAN 301 0101  
 Title ADVANCED SPANISH I  
 Instructor: STOLLE-MCALLIST  
 Enrollment: 19  
 Questionnaires: 13

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2008

Page 1575  
 FEB 11, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	6	6	4.38	803/1649	4.17	4.34	4.28	4.27	4.38	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	3	9	4.62	427/1648	3.82	4.31	4.23	4.18	4.62	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	149/1375	3.92	4.42	4.27	4.22	4.92	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	12	4.92	106/1595	4.02	4.29	4.20	4.21	4.92	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	5	7	4.46	410/1533	3.95	4.16	4.04	4.05	4.46	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	5	8	4.62	302/1512	4.03	4.19	4.10	4.11	4.62	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	3	9	4.62	382/1623	3.81	4.08	4.16	4.08	4.62	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	8	5	4.38	1302/1646	4.35	4.59	4.69	4.67	4.38	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	1	0	0	1	4	5	4.40	511/1621	3.93	4.14	4.06	4.02	4.40	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	2	11	4.85	330/1568	4.18	4.39	4.43	4.39	4.85	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	2	11	4.85	740/1572	4.70	4.79	4.70	4.64	4.85	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	1	11	4.77	326/1564	4.10	4.28	4.28	4.25	4.77	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	3	9	4.62	573/1559	4.23	4.43	4.29	4.23	4.62	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	1	0	1	1	5	5	4.17	582/1352	4.08	3.97	3.98	3.97	4.17	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	1	4	5	4.40	541/1384	4.04	4.28	4.08	4.11	4.40	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	243/1382	4.56	4.57	4.29	4.37	4.90	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1368	4.59	4.42	4.30	4.39	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	3	1	0	0	1	3	5	4.44	249/ 948	3.54	4.10	3.95	4.00	4.44	
Laboratory															
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	11	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 555	****	2.56	4.29	4.22	****	
Seminar															
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	12	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 288	****	2.95	3.68	3.58	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	4	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	3
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	0	B	6						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	4	Under-grad	13	Non-major	10
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	1						
				I	0	Other	7				
				?	0						

Course-Section: SPAN 301 0201  
 Title ADVANCED SPANISH I  
 Instructor: NASH, LYLE  
 Enrollment: 20  
 Questionnaires: 16

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2008

Page 1576  
 FEB 11, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	1	0	2	5	7	4.13	1086/1649	4.17	4.34	4.28	4.27	4.13	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	6	2	3	0	4	2.60	1630/1648	3.82	4.31	4.23	4.18	2.60	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	0	6	2	3	1	2	2.36	1369/1375	3.92	4.42	4.27	4.22	2.36	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	1	3	1	3	5	2	3.14	1516/1595	4.02	4.29	4.20	4.21	3.14	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	3	1	4	6	3.73	1084/1533	3.95	4.16	4.04	4.05	3.73	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	2	1	5	2	5	3.47	1287/1512	4.03	4.19	4.10	4.11	3.47	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	4	3	3	3	2	2.73	1582/1623	3.81	4.08	4.16	4.08	2.73	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	15	0	4.00	1544/1646	4.35	4.59	4.69	4.67	4.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	8	0	1	0	2	4	1	3.50	1345/1621	3.93	4.14	4.06	4.02	3.50	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	6	0	1	0	4	2	3	3.60	1440/1568	4.18	4.39	4.43	4.39	3.60	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	1	1	2	8	4.42	1313/1572	4.70	4.79	4.70	4.64	4.42	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	5	0	0	2	6	1	2	3.27	1455/1564	4.10	4.28	4.28	4.25	3.27	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	5	0	2	0	2	2	5	3.73	1295/1559	4.23	4.43	4.29	4.23	3.73	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	10	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/1352	4.08	3.97	3.98	3.97	****	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	3	1	1	3	3.50	1081/1384	4.04	4.28	4.08	4.11	3.50	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	0	1	2	1	4	4.00	946/1382	4.56	4.57	4.29	4.37	4.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	0	0	4	0	4	4.00	948/1368	4.59	4.42	4.30	4.39	4.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	9	1	3	1	0	2	0	2.17	933/ 948	3.54	4.10	3.95	4.00	2.17	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	4	0.00-0.99 0	A 5	Required for Majors 1	Graduate 0 Major 3
28-55	2	1.00-1.99 0	B 2		
56-83	1	2.00-2.99 0	C 5	General 2	Under-grad 16 Non-major 13
84-150	0	3.00-3.49 2	D 0		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 4	F 0	Electives 3	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 8	
			? 3		

Course-Section: SPAN 301 0301  
 Title ADVANCED SPANISH I  
 Instructor: MEDINA, ADRIANA  
 Enrollment: 15  
 Questionnaires: 12

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2008

Page 1577  
 FEB 11, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	1	1	1	3	6	4.00	1183/1649	4.17	4.34	4.28	4.27	4.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	5	5	4.25	897/1648	3.82	4.31	4.23	4.18	4.25	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	2	2	8	4.50	546/1375	3.92	4.42	4.27	4.22	4.50		
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	5	4	4.00	1067/1595	4.02	4.29	4.20	4.21	4.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	2	1	4	4	3.67	1139/1533	3.95	4.16	4.04	4.05	3.67	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	1	7	3	4.00	883/1512	4.03	4.19	4.10	4.11	4.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	2	4	5	4.08	989/1623	3.81	4.08	4.16	4.08	4.08	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	1	2	9	4.67	1037/1646	4.35	4.59	4.69	4.67	4.67	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	1	2	4	3	3.90	1060/1621	3.93	4.14	4.06	4.02	3.90	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	1	2	4	5	4.08	1243/1568	4.18	4.39	4.43	4.39	4.08	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	2	10	4.83	765/1572	4.70	4.79	4.70	4.64	4.83	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	1	1	4	6	4.25	939/1564	4.10	4.28	4.28	4.25	4.25	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	1	3	7	4.33	901/1559	4.23	4.43	4.29	4.23	4.33	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	1	0	0	3	5	3	4.00	690/1352	4.08	3.97	3.98	3.97	4.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	1	1	2	5	4.22	691/1384	4.04	4.28	4.08	4.11	4.22	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	373/1382	4.56	4.57	4.29	4.37	4.78	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	403/1368	4.59	4.42	4.30	4.39	4.78	
4. Were special techniques successful	3	0	0	0	2	5	2	4.00	431/ 948	3.54	4.10	3.95	4.00	4.00	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	4	0.00-0.99 0	A 5	Required for Majors 1	Graduate 0 Major 3
28-55	2	1.00-1.99 0	B 6		
56-83	1	2.00-2.99 1	C 0	General 1	Under-grad 12 Non-major 9
84-150	1	3.00-3.49 1	D 0		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 5	F 0	Electives 0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 9	
			? 1		

Course-Section: SPAN 302 0101  
 Title ADVANCED SPANISH II  
 Instructor: SCHNEIDER, JUDI  
 Enrollment: 12  
 Questionnaires: 9

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2008

Page 1578  
 FEB 11, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	0	0	0	4	4	4.50	644/1649	4.40	4.34	4.28	4.27	4.50
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	2	2	4	4.25	897/1648	4.32	4.31	4.23	4.18	4.25
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	1	6	4.63	443/1375	4.53	4.42	4.27	4.22	4.63
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	4	3	4.25	818/1595	4.40	4.29	4.20	4.21	4.25
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	2	1	5	4.38	505/1533	4.54	4.16	4.04	4.05	4.38
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	2	5	4.50	380/1512	4.30	4.19	4.10	4.11	4.50
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	0	1	2	4	4.00	1029/1623	4.00	4.08	4.16	4.08	4.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	6	2	4.25	1398/1646	4.63	4.59	4.69	4.67	4.25
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	2	1	4	4.29	654/1621	3.87	4.14	4.06	4.02	4.29
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	2	4	2	4.00	1279/1568	3.88	4.39	4.43	4.39	4.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	665/1572	4.81	4.79	4.70	4.64	4.88
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	2	2	4	4.25	939/1564	3.88	4.28	4.28	4.25	4.25
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	4	4	4.50	695/1559	4.58	4.43	4.29	4.23	4.50
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	0	1	1	6	4.63	234/1352	3.81	3.97	3.98	3.97	4.63
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	1	2	4	4.43	520/1384	4.71	4.28	4.08	4.11	4.43
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	1	0	6	4.71	435/1382	4.54	4.57	4.29	4.37	4.71
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	1	2	4	4.43	732/1368	4.34	4.42	4.30	4.39	4.43
4. Were special techniques successful	2	0	0	1	0	2	4	4.29	330/ 948	4.31	4.10	3.95	4.00	4.29

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	3	0.00-0.99 1	A 1	Required for Majors 1	Graduate 0 Major 2
28-55	0	1.00-1.99 0	B 5		
56-83	1	2.00-2.99 0	C 1	General 2	Under-grad 9 Non-major 7
84-150	0	3.00-3.49 1	D 0		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 0	F 0	Electives 1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 2	
			? 0		

Course-Section: SPAN 302 0201  
 Title ADVANCED SPANISH II  
 Instructor: BELL, ALAN S  
 Enrollment: 13  
 Questionnaires: 10

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2008

Page 1579  
 FEB 11, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	2	3	5	4.30	912/1649	4.40	4.34	4.28	4.27	4.30	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	4	5	4.40	702/1648	4.32	4.31	4.23	4.18	4.40	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	1	0	2	6	4.44	617/1375	4.53	4.42	4.27	4.22	4.44	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	4	5	4.56	440/1595	4.40	4.29	4.20	4.21	4.56	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	1	8	4.70	217/1533	4.54	4.16	4.04	4.05	4.70	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	1	3	5	4.10	835/1512	4.30	4.19	4.10	4.11	4.10	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	1	2	2	4	4.00	1029/1623	4.00	4.08	4.16	4.08	4.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1646	4.63	4.59	4.69	4.67	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	1	4	3	1	3.44	1381/1621	3.87	4.14	4.06	4.02	3.44	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	6	0	1	0	0	1	2	3.75	1401/1568	3.88	4.39	4.43	4.39	3.75	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	6	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	931/1572	4.81	4.79	4.70	4.64	4.75	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	6	0	1	0	0	2	1	3.50	1388/1564	3.88	4.28	4.28	4.25	3.50	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	6	1	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	512/1559	4.58	4.43	4.29	4.23	4.67	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	5	2	0	1	1	1	0	3.00	1219/1352	3.81	3.97	3.98	3.97	3.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1384	4.71	4.28	4.08	4.11	5.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	2	1	5	4.38	740/1382	4.54	4.57	4.29	4.37	4.38	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	3	0	5	4.25	844/1368	4.34	4.42	4.30	4.39	4.25	
4. Were special techniques successful	2	2	0	0	1	2	3	4.33	310/ 948	4.31	4.10	3.95	4.00	4.33	
Laboratory															
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	8	0	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/ 555	****	2.56	4.29	4.22	****	
Seminar															
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	8	1	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 288	****	2.95	3.68	3.58	****	
Field Work															
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	7	0	0	2	0	1	0	2.67	275/ 312	2.67	2.48	3.68	3.60	2.67	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 4	Required for Majors	0 Graduate
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	B 3		
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	C 1	General	0 Under-grad 10
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	D 0		Non-major
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	1
			P 0		
			I 0		
			? 1	Other	8

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

Course-Section: SPAN 305 0101  
 Title SPAN FOR HERITAGE SPAN  
 Instructor: SCHWARTZ, ANA-M  
 Enrollment: 6  
 Questionnaires: 6

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2008

Page 1580  
 FEB 11, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	247/1649	4.83	4.34	4.28	4.27	4.83	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	195/1648	4.83	4.31	4.23	4.18	4.83	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1375	5.00	4.42	4.27	4.22	5.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	174/1595	4.83	4.29	4.20	4.21	4.83	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	3	3	4.50	366/1533	4.50	4.16	4.04	4.05	4.50	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	142/1512	4.83	4.19	4.10	4.11	4.83	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	3	1	2	3.83	1222/1623	3.83	4.08	4.16	4.08	3.83	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	782/1646	4.83	4.59	4.69	4.67	4.83	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	165/1621	4.75	4.14	4.06	4.02	4.75	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	344/1568	4.83	4.39	4.43	4.39	4.83	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1572	5.00	4.79	4.70	4.64	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	234/1564	4.83	4.28	4.28	4.25	4.83	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	284/1559	4.83	4.43	4.29	4.23	4.83	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	1	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1352	5.00	3.97	3.98	3.97	5.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	201/1384	4.80	4.28	4.08	4.11	4.80	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	342/1382	4.80	4.57	4.29	4.37	4.80	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	369/1368	4.80	4.42	4.30	4.39	4.80	
4. Were special techniques successful	1	1	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	122/ 948	4.75	4.10	3.95	4.00	4.75	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 221	****	4.38	4.16	4.07	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 243	****	4.69	4.12	3.89	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 212	****	5.00	4.40	4.21	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 209	****	****	4.35	4.12	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 555	****	2.56	4.29	4.22	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 88	****	4.39	4.54	4.63	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 85	****	4.20	4.47	4.55	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 81	****	4.23	4.43	4.30	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 92	****	4.32	4.35	4.46	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 288	****	2.95	3.68	3.58	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 52	****	5.00	4.06	3.59	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 48	****	5.00	4.09	4.21	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 39	****	4.67	4.47	4.43	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 39	****	4.67	4.38	4.32	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 312	****	2.48	3.68	3.60	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 53	****	5.00	4.30	4.32	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.16	4.44	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 41	****	****	4.43	5.00	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 24	****	****	4.42	5.00	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 110	****	4.13	3.99	4.05	****	

Course-Section: SPAN 305 0101  
 Title SPAN FOR HERITAGE SPAN  
 Instructor: SCHWARTZ, ANA-M  
 Enrollment: 6  
 Questionnaires: 6

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2008

Page 1580  
 FEB 11, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: SPAN 307 0101  
 Title ESPANA Y SUS CULTURAS  
 Instructor: SLOANE, ROBERT  
 Enrollment: 21  
 Questionnaires: 18

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2008

Page 1581  
 FEB 11, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor Mean	Instructor Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5								
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	2	16	4.89	203/1649	4.89	4.34	4.28	4.27	4.89	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	2	14	4.67	362/1648	4.67	4.31	4.23	4.18	4.67	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	17	4.94	100/1375	4.94	4.42	4.27	4.22	4.22	4.94	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	3	2	11	4.50	497/1595	4.50	4.29	4.20	4.21	4.50	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	5	13	4.72	198/1533	4.72	4.16	4.04	4.05	4.72	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	4	12	4.65	279/1512	4.65	4.19	4.10	4.11	4.65	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	2	3	12	4.59	416/1623	4.59	4.08	4.16	4.08	4.59	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	16	1	4.06	1525/1646	4.06	4.59	4.69	4.67	4.06	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	0	0	2	11	4.85	117/1621	4.85	4.14	4.06	4.02	4.85	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	1	0	4	12	4.59	755/1568	4.59	4.39	4.43	4.39	4.59	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	17	5.00	1/1572	5.00	4.79	4.70	4.64	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	1	1	14	4.81	253/1564	4.81	4.28	4.28	4.25	4.81	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	17	5.00	1/1559	5.00	4.43	4.29	4.23	5.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	0	1	4	12	4.65	221/1352	4.65	3.97	3.98	3.97	4.65	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	150/1384	4.91	4.28	4.08	4.11	4.91	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1382	5.00	4.57	4.29	4.37	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1368	5.00	4.42	4.30	4.39	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	7	0	1	0	0	2	8	4.45	242/ 948	4.45	4.10	3.95	4.00	4.45	
Laboratory															
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	17	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 555	****	2.56	4.29	4.22	****	
Seminar															
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	16	1	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 288	****	2.95	3.68	3.58	****	
Field Work															
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	15	0	2	0	0	1	0	2.00	****/ 312	****	2.48	3.68	3.60	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	13	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	7
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B	4						
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	2	C	1	General	2	Under-grad	18	Non-major	11
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	6	F	0	Electives	2	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	16				
				?	0						

Course-Section: SPAN 308 0101  
 Title LATINOAMERICA Y SUS CU  
 Instructor: POGGIO, SARA  
 Enrollment: 11  
 Questionnaires: 7

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2008

Page 1582  
 FEB 11, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1649	5.00	4.34	4.28	4.27	5.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	3	3	4.29	862/1648	4.29	4.31	4.23	4.18	4.29	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	3	3	4.29	780/1375	4.29	4.42	4.27	4.22	4.29	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	1	4	1	4.00	1067/1595	4.00	4.29	4.20	4.21	4.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1533	5.00	4.16	4.04	4.05	5.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	2	3	4.14	799/1512	4.14	4.19	4.10	4.11	4.14	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	3	3	4.29	780/1623	4.29	4.08	4.16	4.08	4.29	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	1	3	3	4.29	1377/1646	4.29	4.59	4.69	4.67	4.29	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	2	2	1	3.80	1151/1621	3.80	4.14	4.06	4.02	3.80	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	387/1568	4.80	4.39	4.43	4.39	4.80	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	840/1572	4.80	4.79	4.70	4.64	4.80	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	780/1564	4.40	4.28	4.28	4.25	4.40	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	586/1559	4.60	4.43	4.29	4.23	4.60	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	0	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	556/1352	4.20	3.97	3.98	3.97	4.20	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1384	5.00	4.28	4.08	4.11	5.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1382	5.00	4.57	4.29	4.37	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1368	5.00	4.42	4.30	4.39	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	2	2	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	431/ 948	4.00	4.10	3.95	4.00	4.00	
Laboratory															
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	6	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 555	****	2.56	4.29	4.22	****	
Field Work															
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	4	1	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	256/ 312	3.00	2.48	3.68	3.60	3.00	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: SPAN 311 0101  
 Title INTRO TO SPANISH LIT  
 Instructor: SINNIGEN, JOHN  
 Enrollment: 4  
 Questionnaires: 3

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2008

Page 1583  
 FEB 11, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1649	5.00	4.34	4.28	4.27	5.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1648	5.00	4.31	4.23	4.18	5.00	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1375	5.00	4.42	4.27	4.22	5.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1595	5.00	4.29	4.20	4.21	5.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1533	5.00	4.16	4.04	4.05	5.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1512	5.00	4.19	4.10	4.11	5.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1623	5.00	4.08	4.16	4.08	5.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	1037/1646	4.67	4.59	4.69	4.67	4.67	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1621	5.00	4.14	4.06	4.02	5.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1568	5.00	4.39	4.43	4.39	5.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1572	5.00	4.79	4.70	4.64	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1564	5.00	4.28	4.28	4.25	5.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1559	5.00	4.43	4.29	4.23	5.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1352	5.00	3.97	3.98	3.97	5.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1384	5.00	4.28	4.08	4.11	5.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1382	5.00	4.57	4.29	4.37	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1368	5.00	4.42	4.30	4.39	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 948	5.00	4.10	3.95	4.00	5.00	
Laboratory															
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	2	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	522/ 555	2.00	2.56	4.29	4.22	2.00	
Field Work															
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	2	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	308/ 312	1.00	2.48	3.68	3.60	1.00	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: SPAN 312 0101  
 Title INTRO TO LATIN AMER LI  
 Instructor: BELL, ALAN S  
 Enrollment: 6  
 Questionnaires: 6

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2008

Page 1584  
 FEB 11, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	2	0	4	4.33	871/1649	4.33	4.34	4.28	4.27	4.33	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	2	1	2	4.00	1124/1648	4.00	4.31	4.23	4.18	4.00	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	0	4	4.33	733/1375	4.33	4.42	4.27	4.22	4.33	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	1	3	4.17	930/1595	4.17	4.29	4.20	4.21	4.17	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	0	5	4.67	241/1533	4.67	4.16	4.04	4.05	4.67	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	3	3	4.50	380/1512	4.50	4.19	4.10	4.11	4.50	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	0	2	1	2	3.50	1387/1623	3.50	4.08	4.16	4.08	3.50	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	782/1646	4.83	4.59	4.69	4.67	4.83	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	2	1	1	3.75	1192/1621	3.75	4.14	4.06	4.02	3.75	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	3	3	4.50	852/1568	4.50	4.39	4.43	4.39	4.50	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1572	5.00	4.79	4.70	4.64	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	651/1564	4.50	4.28	4.28	4.25	4.50	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	695/1559	4.50	4.43	4.29	4.23	4.50	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	1	0	0	5	4.50	303/1352	4.50	3.97	3.98	3.97	4.50	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	201/1384	4.80	4.28	4.08	4.11	4.80	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	540/1382	4.60	4.57	4.29	4.37	4.60	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	2	0	2	1	3.40	1206/1368	3.40	4.42	4.30	4.39	3.40	
4. Were special techniques successful	1	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	104/ 948	4.80	4.10	3.95	4.00	4.80	
Self Paced															
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	5	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 110	****	4.13	3.99	4.05	****	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: SPAN 401 0101  
 Title STUDIES IN SPANISH LAN  
 Instructor: OSKOZ, ANA  
 Enrollment: 11  
 Questionnaires: 9

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2008

Page 1585  
 FEB 11, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	2	2	5	4.33	871/1649	4.33	4.34	4.28	4.50	4.33	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	4	3	4.11	1054/1648	4.11	4.31	4.23	4.36	4.11	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	6	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	401/1375	4.67	4.42	4.27	4.48	4.67	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	6	2	4.11	996/1595	4.11	4.29	4.20	4.36	4.11	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	1	2	2	3	3.56	1214/1533	3.56	4.16	4.04	4.14	3.56	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	0	4	4	4.22	723/1512	4.22	4.19	4.10	4.26	4.22	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	4	2	2	1	3.00	1533/1623	3.00	4.08	4.16	4.27	3.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	5	4	4.44	1249/1646	4.44	4.59	4.69	4.71	4.44	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	1	0	2	4	1	3.50	1345/1621	3.50	4.14	4.06	4.24	3.50	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	2	3	4	4.22	1145/1568	4.22	4.39	4.43	4.54	4.22	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	640/1572	4.89	4.79	4.70	4.79	4.89	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	1	2	3	3	3.89	1229/1564	3.89	4.28	4.28	4.40	3.89	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	3	3	3	4.00	1121/1559	4.00	4.43	4.29	4.41	4.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	3	0	3	2	0	1	2.83	1266/1352	2.83	3.97	3.98	4.07	2.83	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	3	4	4.38	571/1384	4.38	4.28	4.08	4.35	4.38	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	1	1	6	4.63	521/1382	4.63	4.57	4.29	4.56	4.63	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	1	1	6	4.63	560/1368	4.63	4.42	4.30	4.58	4.63	
4. Were special techniques successful	1	0	0	0	3	3	2	3.88	546/ 948	3.88	4.10	3.95	4.31	3.88	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: SPAN 421 0101  
 Title STUDIES IN HISPANIC LI  
 Instructor: SLOANE, ROBERT  
 Enrollment: 15  
 Questionnaires: 12

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2008

Page 1586  
 FEB 11, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	1	10	4.75	328/1649	4.75	4.34	4.28	4.50	4.75	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	2	8	4.50	556/1648	4.50	4.31	4.23	4.36	4.50	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	166/1375	4.90	4.42	4.27	4.48	4.90	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	2	9	4.67	321/1595	4.67	4.29	4.20	4.36	4.67	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	106/1533	4.91	4.16	4.04	4.14	4.91	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	2	9	4.82	151/1512	4.82	4.19	4.10	4.26	4.82	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	1	1	4	5	3.92	1164/1623	3.92	4.08	4.16	4.27	3.92	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	597/1646	4.92	4.59	4.69	4.71	4.92	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	1	0	0	1	2	5	4.50	374/1621	4.50	4.14	4.06	4.24	4.50	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	1	1	9	4.73	535/1568	4.73	4.39	4.43	4.54	4.73	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	532/1572	4.92	4.79	4.70	4.79	4.92	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	1	10	4.75	342/1564	4.75	4.28	4.28	4.40	4.75	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	1	10	4.75	390/1559	4.75	4.43	4.29	4.41	4.75	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	3	3	6	4.25	515/1352	4.25	3.97	3.98	4.07	4.25	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	3	8	4.73	275/1384	4.73	4.28	4.08	4.35	4.73	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	0	2	9	4.82	332/1382	4.82	4.57	4.29	4.56	4.82	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	1	0	10	4.82	358/1368	4.82	4.42	4.30	4.58	4.82	
4. Were special techniques successful	1	0	0	0	0	3	8	4.73	133/ 948	4.73	4.10	3.95	4.31	4.73	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99 0	A 10	Required for Majors 0	Graduate 1 Major 6
28-55	0	1.00-1.99 0	B 1		
56-83	0	2.00-2.99 1	C 0	General 1	Under-grad 11 Non-major 6
84-150	5	3.00-3.49 3	D 0		
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00 4	F 0	Electives 0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 11	
			? 0		

Course-Section: SPAN 472 0101  
 Title TOPICS IN LATN AMER CI  
 Instructor: STOLLE-MCALLIST  
 Enrollment: 17  
 Questionnaires: 12

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2008

Page 1587  
 FEB 11, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	2	10	4.83	247/1649	4.83	4.34	4.28	4.50	4.83	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	0	3	8	4.50	556/1648	4.50	4.31	4.23	4.36	4.50	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	5	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	199/1375	4.86	4.42	4.27	4.48	4.86	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	0	3	8	4.50	497/1595	4.50	4.29	4.20	4.36	4.50	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	1	1	9	4.50	366/1533	4.50	4.16	4.04	4.14	4.50	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	10	4.83	142/1512	4.83	4.19	4.10	4.26	4.83	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	0	3	8	4.50	502/1623	4.50	4.08	4.16	4.27	4.50	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	7	5	4.42	1277/1646	4.42	4.59	4.69	4.71	4.42	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	152/1621	4.78	4.14	4.06	4.24	4.78	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	1	1	9	4.73	535/1568	4.73	4.39	4.43	4.54	4.73	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1572	5.00	4.79	4.70	4.79	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	1	1	9	4.73	390/1564	4.73	4.28	4.28	4.40	4.73	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	1	9	4.73	434/1559	4.73	4.43	4.29	4.41	4.73	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1352	5.00	3.97	3.98	4.07	5.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	4	8	4.67	326/1384	4.67	4.28	4.08	4.35	4.67	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	1	1	10	4.75	394/1382	4.75	4.57	4.29	4.56	4.75	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	2	10	4.83	337/1368	4.83	4.42	4.30	4.58	4.83	
4. Were special techniques successful	0	2	0	0	1	4	5	4.40	281/ 948	4.40	4.10	3.95	4.31	4.40	
Laboratory															
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	11	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 555	****	2.56	4.29	4.41	****	
Seminar															
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	10	0	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/ 288	****	2.95	3.68	3.71	****	
Self Paced															
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	11	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 110	****	4.13	3.99	4.22	****	

Frequency Distribution

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