Course-Section: SPAN 101 1 University of Maryland Title Elementary Spanish I Messick, Rosalie

Instructor:

Baltimore County Fall 2009

Page 1414

MAR 22, 2010

Job IRBR3029

responses to be significant

Enrollment: Questionnaires: 17 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Ρ

I ?

0

0

2

						Fre	equei	ncie	s		Inst	ructor	Course	. Dept.	UMBC.	Level	Sect	
		Questions	3		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank		Mean		Mean	
		General																
1. Did you	ı gain ne	w insights,skil	ls fro	om this course	2	0	0	2	3	3	7	4.00	1114/1509	4.47	4.42	4.31	4.18	4.00
2. Did the	instruc	ctor make clear	the ex	spected goals	2	0	3	2	4	1	5	3.20	1441/1509	4.34	4.39	4.26	4.25	3.20
3. Did the	e exam qu	estions reflect	the e	expected goals	2	0	1	1	2	4	7	4.00	924/1287	4.50	4.48	4.30	4.24	4.00
4. Did oth	ner evalu	ations reflect	the ex	spected goals	2	1	1	3	1	3	6	3.71	1212/1459	4.31	4.32	4.22	4.11	3.71
5. Did ass	signed re	adings contribu	ite to	what you learned	2	0	1	1	2	5	6	3.93	897/1406	4.21	4.19	4.09	4.02	3.93
6. Did wri	tten ass	signments contri	.bute t	o what you learned	2	0	1	3	2	3	6	3.67	1107/1384	3.96	4.17	4.11	3.98	3.67
7. Was the	grading	system clearly	expla	ined	2	0	3	3	4	2	3	2.93	1419/1489	3.93	4.07	4.17	4.20	2.93
8. How man	y times	was class cance	elled		2	0	0	0	0	10	5	4.33	1205/1506	4.70	4.55	4.67	4.66	4.33
9. How wou	ıld you g	grade the overal	l tead	ching effectiveness	4	0	1	2	4	4	2	3.31	1323/1463	4.22	4.16	4.09	4.02	3.31
		Lecture																
1 Wara th	Were the instructor's lectures well prepared						2	2	6	1	2	2 07	1403/1438	4.32	4.48	4.46	4.44	3.07
							0	0	1	1	12	4.79	828/1421	4.89	4.75	4.73	4.66	4.79
	Did the instructor seem interested in the subject Was lecture material presented and explained clear						2	1	4	4	7 2		1317/1411	4.38	4.39	4.31	4.27	3.36
		es contribute to			3	0	2	1	5	2	2		1317/1411	4.38	4.45	4.31	4.27	3.29
				your understanding		10	0	1	2	1	0		****/1236		3.92		3.87	****
5. Did add	IIOVISUAI	ceciniiques em	iance y	our understanding	3	10	U	_	4		U	3.00	71230	4.00	3.94	4.00	3.07	
		Discuss	sion															
1. Did cla	ıss discu	ssions contribu	ite to	what you learned	12	0	0	0	2	3	0	3.60	1011/1260	4.45	4.32	4.14	3.95	3.60
				ed to participate	12	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	665/1255	4.53	4.53	4.33	4.15	4.40
				nd open discussion	12	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	721/1258	4.67	4.46	4.38	4.18	4.40
4. Were sp	ecial te	chniques succes	sful		12	0	1	1	0	1	2	3.40	738/ 873	4.25	4.14	4.03	3.89	3.40
				Frequ	ency	/ Dist	ribu	ution	ı									
Constitute De		G GDA		Towns of Conden				D -					m				26	
credits Ea	Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Gra							кеа	ason	S 			Ту]	pe 			Majors	
00-27	00-27 2 0.00-0.99 0 A 7						quire	ed fo	or M	ajor	s	3	Graduat	е	0	Majo	or	0
28-55	28-55 4 1.00-1.99 0 B 1																	
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	4	C 5		Ger	nera:	l			1	1	Under-g	rad 1	.7	Non-	major	17
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	3	D 0														
Grad.	F 0		Ele	ectiv	ves				0	#### - 1	Means t	here a	re not	enoug	h			

Other

1

Course-Section: SPAN 101 2 University of Maryland Title Elementary Spanish I Baltimore County

Messick,Rosalie

Instructor:

Baltimore County Fall 2009

Frequencies

Instructor

Page 1415

MAR 22, 2010

Job IRBR3029

Course Dept UMBC Level Sect

Enrollment: 31
Questionnaires: 21 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

		Question		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
		Genera	 1															
1. Did yo	ou gain n	ew insights,ski	lls fro	m this course	0	0	1	1	1	7	11	4.24	901/1509	4.47	4.42	4.31	4.18	4.24
2. Did th	he instru	ctor make clear	the ex	pected goals	0	0	1	2	3	9	6	3.81	1228/1509	4.34	4.39	4.26	4.25	3.81
	_	uestions reflec		1 3	0	0	0	2	3	6	10	4.14	857/1287	4.50	4.48	4.30		4.14
		uations reflect			0	0	0	2	5	6	8		1033/1459	4.31		4.22	4.11	
				what you learned	0	2	0	1	3	7	8	4.16	693/1406	4.21	4.19	4.09	4.02	4.16
		_		o what you learned	0	0	0	3	4	8			1017/1384		4.17	4.11	3.98	3.81
		g system clearl		ined	0	0	2	5	5	5			1383/1489		4.07	4.17	4.20	3.19
		was class canc			0	0	0	0	0	10			1054/1506		4.55			4.52
9. How wo	ould you	grade the overa	ll teac	hing effectiveness	5	0	2	0	4	7	3	3.56	1220/1463	4.22	4.16	4.09	4.02	3.56
		Lectur	е															
1. Were t	the instr	uctor's lecture	s well	prepared	1	0	1	2	4	7	6	3.75	1315/1438	4.32	4.48	4.46	4.44	3.75
2. Did th	he instru	ctor seem inter	ested i	n the subject	1	0	0	0	0	3	17	4.85	665/1421	4.89	4.75	4.73	4.66	4.85
3. Was le	as lecture material presented and explained clear					0	1		2	7	8	3.95	1098/1411	4.38	4.39	4.31	4.27	3.95
4. Did th	oid the lectures contribute to what you learned					0	1	1	3	6	9	4.05	1024/1405	4.38	4.45	4.32	4.27	4.05
5. Did a	Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understandi					10	4	0	1	3	1	2.67	1188/1236	4.00	3.92	4.00	3.87	2.67
		Discus	sion															
1. Did c	lass disc	ussions contrib	ute to	what you learned	12	0	0	1	2	4	2	3.78	924/1260	4.45	4.32	4.14	3.95	3.78
2. Were a	all stude:	nts actively en	courage	d to participate	12	0	0	1	1	1	6	4.33	723/1255	4.53	4.53	4.33	4.15	4.33
3. Did th	he instru	ctor encourage	fair an	d open discussion	12	0	0	0	1	2	6	4.56	584/1258	4.67	4.46	4.38	4.18	4.56
4. Were s	special t	echniques succe	ssful	-	12	0	0	0	3	3	3	4.00	442/ 873	4.25	4.14	4.03	3.89	4.00
				Frequ	iency	/ Dis	trib	atio	n									
				•	_													
Credits I	Earned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	ason	s			Тур	oe .			Majors	3
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	A 4		Re	quir	ed f	or M	 ajor	 s	5	Graduate	· · · · · · ·	0	Majo	 or	2
28-55							_			-						_		
56-83						Ge	nera:	1			1	.1	Under-gr	rad 2	21	Non-	-major	19
84-150																		
Grad.	Frad. 0 3.50-4.00 2 F 0						ecti	ves				3	#### - N	Means t	here a	re not	enoug	jh
	P 0												response	es to b	e sign	nifican	nt	
				I 0		Ot1	her					0						
	? 0																	

Carmody, Sean P

University of Maryland Elementary Spanish I

Baltimore County

Fall 2009

Enrollment: 33 Questionnaires: 27

Title

Instructor:

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Page 1416 MAR 22, 2010 Job IRBR3029

Questions	NR	NA	Fre	equer 2	ncies 3	s 4	5	Inst Mean	ructor Rank	Course Mean	_	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	0	0	1	10	15	4.54	563/1509	4.47	4.42	4.31	4.18	4.54
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	3	9	14	4.42	667/1509	4.34	4.39	4.26	4.25	4.42
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	4	5	17	4.50	519/1287	4.50	4.48	4.30	4.24	4.50
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	3	0	0	1	7	15	4.61	346/1459	4.31	4.32	4.22	4.11	4.61
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	2	0	1	3	7	12	4.30	527/1406	4.21	4.19	4.09	4.02	4.30
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	1	5	9	10	4.12	734/1384	3.96	4.17	4.11	3.98	4.12
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	3	5	4	3	10	3.48	1311/1489	3.93	4.07	4.17	4.20	3.48
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	5	20	4.80	782/1506	4.70	4.55	4.67	4.66	4.80
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	1	0	0	3	11	6	4.15	738/1463	4.22	4.16	4.09	4.02	4.15
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	2	3	19	4.71	531/1438	4.32	4.48	4.46	4.44	4.71
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	1	1	22	4.88	614/1421	4.89	4.75	4.73	4.66	4.88
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	1	7	16	4.63	469/1411	4.38	4.39	4.31	4.27	4.63
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	2	5	17	4.63	513/1405	4.38	4.45	4.32	4.27	4.63
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	0	0	1	4	8	11	4.21	528/1236	4.00	3.92	4.00	3.87	4.21
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	0	4	13	4.76	237/1260	4.45	4.32	4.14	3.95	4.76
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	10	0	0	0	1	6	10	4.53	561/1255	4.53	4.53	4.33	4.15	4.53
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	10	0	0	0	2	4	11	4.53	605/1258	4.67	4.46	4.38	4.18	4.53
4. Were special techniques successful	10	4	0	0	2	2	9	4.54	199/ 873	4.25	4.14	4.03	3.89	4.54
Laboratory														
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	26	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 198	****	****	4.22	4.14	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	25	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 89	****	5.00	4.49	4.31	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	25	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 92	****	4.93	4.54	4.16	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	25	1	0	0	1	0	0	0.00	****/ 92	****	4.93	4.38	4.21	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	25	1	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 93	****	4.86	4.06	3.92	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	25	0	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.39	3.75	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	25	0	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.41	4.29	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	25	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 47	****	****	4.51	4.53	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	25	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 47	****	****	4.18	4.26	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	25	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 44	****	****	4.32	4.12	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	24	0	1	0	2	0	0	2.55	****/ 49	****	****	4.26	4.28	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	24	1	0	0	2	0	0	0.00	****/ 41	****	****	4.14	4.13	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	24	0	0	0	3	0	0	3.00	****/ 46	****	****	4.31	4.52	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	24	1	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 37	****	****	4.05	4.47	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	24	1	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 30	****	***	4.27	4.21	****

Title Elementary Spanish I

Instructor: Carmody, Sean P

Enrollment: 33
Questionnaires: 27

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2009 Page 1416 MAR 22, 2010 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits E	Carned	Cum. GPA		Expecte	d Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	 А	7	Required for Majors	5	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	1	В	11						
56-83	5	2.00-2.99	7	C	5	General	17	Under-grad	27	Non-major	27
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	0	D	1						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	2	#### - Means	there	are not enough	n
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	0	-		_	
				?	0						

Course-Section: SPAN 101 4 University of Maryland Title Elementary Spanish I

DeLutis-Eichenb

Instructor:

Baltimore County Fall 2009

Page 1417

MAR 22, 2010

Job IRBR3029

responses to be significant

Enrollment: 32 Questionnaires: 16 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Ρ

I ?

0

0

0

			NR	NA	Fre	equer 2	ncies 3	4	5	Inst Mean	ructor Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean		Level Mean			
		General																
1. Did you	ı gain ne	w insights,skil	ls from	n this course	0	0	0	0	2	1	13	4.69	386/1509	4.47	4.42	4.31	4.18	4.69
2. Did the	e instruc	tor make clear	the exp	pected goals	0	0	0	0	1	1	14	4.81	192/1509	4.34	4.39	4.26	4.25	4.81
3. Did the	e exam qu	estions reflect	the ex	spected goals	0	0	0	1	0	1	14	4.75	261/1287	4.50	4.48	4.30	4.24	4.75
4. Did oth	ner evalu	ations reflect	the exp	pected goals	0	0	0	2	0	3	11	4.44	569/1459	4.31	4.32	4.22	4.11	4.44
5. Did ass	signed re	adings contribu	ite to v	what you learned	1	0	0	0	4	3	8	4.27	575/1406	4.21	4.19	4.09	4.02	4.27
6. Did wri	itten ass	ignments contri	bute to	what you learned	1	0	1	2	1	4	7	3.93	899/1384	3.96	4.17	4.11	3.98	3.93
7. Was the	e grading	system clearly	expla:	ined	1	0	0	1	0	3	11	4.60	341/1489	3.93	4.07	4.17	4.20	4.60
8. How man	ny times	was class cance	elled		0	0	0	1	0	0	15	4.81	762/1506	4.70	4.55	4.67	4.66	4.81
9. How wor	ıld you g	rade the overal	l teacl	ning effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	3	12	4.80	118/1463	4.22	4.16	4.09	4.02	4.80
		Lecture																
1. Were th			2 2	0	0	0	1	0	13	4.86	291/1438	4.32	4.48	4.46	4.44	4.86		
	2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject							0	1	0	13	4.86	665/1421	4.89	4.75	4.73	4.66	4.86
		-		xplained clearly	3	0	0	0	1	2	10	4.69	376/1411	4.38	4.39	4.31	4.27	4.69
		s contribute to	-		3	0	0	1	1	0	11	4.62	526/1405	4.38	4.45	4.32	4.27	4.62
5. Did aud	diovisual	techniques enh	ance yo	our understanding	2	0	1	0	0	1	12	4.64	187/1236	4.00	3.92	4.00	3.87	4.64
		Discuss																
				what you learned	10	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	187/1260	4.45	4.32	4.14	3.95	4.83
				d to participate	10	0	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	575/1255	4.53	4.53	4.33	4.15	4.50
				d open discussion	10	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1258	4.67	4.46	4.38	4.18	5.00
4. Were sp	pecial te	chniques succes	stul		10	Τ	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	261/ 873	4.25	4.14	4.03	3.89	4.40
				From	ionai	, Dist	rib	ıtior	,									
				FIEdo	<i>lency</i>	DISC	.1.100	10101	1									
Credits Ea	arned	Expected Grades				Rea	asons	5			Туј	pe			Majors	<b>;</b>		
00-27	00-27 1 0.00-0.99 0 A 10							ed fo	or Ma	jor	s	4	Graduate	 e	0	Majo	 r	0
28-55										-						3 -		
56-83								L			1	.0	Under-g	rad 1	6	Non-	major	16
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	0	D 0									3				-	
Grad.								<i>r</i> es				2	#### - 1	Means t	here a	re not	enoug	ŗh

Other

0

II. DEMN IOI D

Title Elementary Spanish I

Instructor: Strickling, Laur

Enrollment: 30
Questionnaires: 27

#### University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2009

Page 1418 MAR 22, 2010 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions						NA	Fr	equei 2	ncies 3	4	5	Inst Mean	tructor Rank	Course Mean	e Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
		 Genera	.1															
1. Did you	u gain new	insights, ski	lls fro	m this course	0	0	0	0	1	5	21	4.74	315/150	9 4.47	4.42	4.31	4.18	4.74
2. Did the	e instructo	or make clear	the exp	pected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	24	4.89	133/150	4.34	4.39	4.26	4.25	4.89
3. Did the	e exam que	stions reflec	t the e	xpected goals	1	0	0	0	0	5	21	4.81	208/128	7 4.50	4.48	4.30	4.24	4.81
4. Did otl	her evaluat	tions reflect	the exp	pected goals	2	1	0	0	1	8	15	4.58	367/145	4.31	4.32	4.22	4.11	4.58
5. Did as	signed read	dings contrib	ute to	what you learned	1	2	0	2	2	8	12	4.25	587/140	4.21	4.19	4.09	4.02	4.25
6. Did wr	itten assig	gnments contr	ibute to	o what you learned	1	5	1	3	4	2	11	3.90	939/138	3.96	4.17	4.11	3.98	3.90
		system clearl		ined	3	0	0	0	3	3	18	4.63	319/148	3.93	4.07	4.17	4.20	4.63
	-	as class canc			2	0	0	0	0	3	22	4.88	622/150	4.70	4.55	4.67	4.66	4.88
9. How wor	uld you gra	ade the overa	ll teac	ning effectiveness	6	0	0	0	0	6	15	4.71	177/146	3 4.22	4.16	4.09	4.02	4.71
		Lectur	e															
1. Were th	he instruct	tor's lecture	s well ;	prepared	1	0	0	0	3	2	21	4.69	545/143	3 4.32	4.48	4.46	4.44	4.69
2. Did the	e instructo	or seem inter	ested i	n the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	26	5.00	1/142	4.89	4.75	4.73	4.66	5.00
3. Was le	cture mate	rial presente	d and e	xplained clearly	1	0	0	0	1	3	22	4.81	243/141	4.38	4.39	4.31	4.27	4.81
4. Did the	e lectures	contribute t	o what	you learned	2	0	0	0	1	3	21	4.80	285/140	4.38	4.45	4.32	4.27	4.80
5. Did au	diovisual t	techniques en	hance y	our understanding	2	6	1	1	4	3	10	4.05	640/123	4.00	3.92	4.00	3.87	4.05
		Discus	sion															
1. Did cla	Did class discussions contribute to what you learn						0	0	0	3	11	4.79	223/126	4.45	4.32	4.14	3.95	4.79
2. Were a	Were all students actively encouraged to participat					0	0	0	1	4	8	4.54	554/125	4.53	4.53	4.33	4.15	4.54
3. Did the	Were all students actively encouraged to participat Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussi					0	0	0	1	2	10	4.69	486/125	3 4.67	4.46	4.38	4.18	4.69
4. Were s	pecial tech	hniques succe	ssful		14	0	0	0	2	5	6	4.31	306/ 87	3 4.25	4.14	4.03	3.89	4.31
		Labora	tory															
1. Did the	e lab incre	ease understa	nding o	f the material	26	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 18	1 ****	****	4.16	4.06	****
		Semina	r															
1. Were as	ssigned to	pics relevant	to the	announced theme	26	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 8	****	5.00	4.49	4.31	****
2. Was the	e instructo	or available	for ind	ividual attention	26	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 9:	****	4.93	4.54	4.16	****
5. Were c	riteria fo	r grading mad	e clear		26	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 9	****	4.86	4.06	3.92	****
		Self	Paced															
1. Did se	lf-paced sy	ystem contrib	ute to	what you learned	26	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 4	****	****	4.26	4.28	****
3. Were yo	our contact	ts with the i	nstruct	or helpful	26	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 4	5 ****	****	4.31	4.52	****
				Frequ	iency	Dis	trib	utio	n									
Crodita E	amad	Expected Grades				Do	asons				T.	<b>m</b> .0			Majawa			
	Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Gra								asons					/pe 			Majors	· 
00-27							quir	ed f	or Ma	jor	s	4	Gradua	e	0	Majo	or	0
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	В 6		_		,			_	_		,	2.5			0.7
56-83						Gei	nera	Τ			1	.7	Under-	grad 2	27	Non-	-major	27
84-150																		
Grad.							ecti <sup>,</sup>	ves				2		Means t			_	ın
				P 0		O. 1	h					0	respon	ses to b	be sign	nıııcar	1C	
				I 0 ? 1		Utl	her					0						
				? I														

University of Maryland Baltimore County

Title Elementary Spanish I

Instructor: Strickling, Laur

Enrollment: 33
Questionnaires: 29

Fall 2009

Page 1419 MAR 22, 2010 Job IRBR3029

### Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

				Fre	mier	ncies			Tnet	ructor	Course	Dent	TIMBC	Level	Sect
	Ouestions	NR	NΔ	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	19	4.59	505/1509	4.47	4.42	4.31	4.18	4.59
2.	Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	1	27	4.90	124/1509	4.34	4.39	4.26	4.25	4.90
3.	Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	6	23	4.79	218/1287	4.50	4.48	4.30	4.24	4.79
4.	Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	3	7	18	4.54	421/1459	4.31	4.32	4.22	4.11	4.54
	Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	1	1	0	2	9	15	4.37	470/1406	4.21	4.19	4.09	4.02	4.37
6.	Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	3	0	1	4	7	14	4.31	570/1384	3.96	4.17	4.11	3.98	4.31
7.	Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	7	22	4.76	192/1489	3.93	4.07	4.17	4.20	4.76
8.	How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	4	25	4.86	662/1506	4.70	4.55	4.67	4.66	4.86
9.	How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	8	0	0	0	0	5	16	4.76	144/1463	4.22	4.16	4.09	4.02	4.76
	Lecture														
1.	Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	3	25	4.83	334/1438	4.32	4.48	4.46	4.44	4.83
2.	Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	28	5.00	1/1421	4.89	4.75	4.73	4.66	5.00
	Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	4	25	4.86	180/1411	4.38	4.39	4.31	4.27	4.86
4.	Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	3	26	4.90	183/1405	4.38	4.45	4.32	4.27	4.90
5.	Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	2	2	1	1	2	20	4.42	338/1236	4.00	3.92	4.00	3.87	4.42
_	Discussion		•	•	•	•	_			00/4050		4 00			4 0=
	Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	0	1	18	4.95	82/1260	4.45	4.32	4.14	3.95	4.95
	Were all students actively encouraged to participate	10	0	0	0	0	2	17	4.89	213/1255	4.53	4.53	4.33	4.15	4.89
	Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	10	0	0	0	0	3	16	4.84	312/1258	4.67	4.46	4.38	4.18	4.84
4.	Were special techniques successful	10	1	0	0	0	3	15	4.83	87/ 873	4.25	4.14	4.03	3.89	4.83
	Laboratowy														
-1	Laboratory	26	1	-1	0	1	^	^	0 00	<b>4444</b> / 104	****	****	1 10	1 00	****
	Did the lab increase understanding of the material	26	1	1	0	1	0	0		****/ 184	****	****	4.16	4.06	****
	Were you provided with adequate background information	26	0	0	1	-	0	2		****/ 198	****	****	4.22	4.14	****
	Were necessary materials available for lab activities	26 26	2 1	0 1	0	0	0	1		****/ 184 ****/ 177	****	****	4.48 4.36	4.48	****
	Did the lab instructor provide assistance Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	26 26	2	0	0	1	0	0		****/ 165	****	****	4.36	4.29	****
5.	were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	20	۷	U	U	1	U	U	3.00	/ 165			4.10	4.15	
	Seminar														
1.	Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	27	1	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 89	****	5.00	4.49	4.31	****
	Was the instructor available for individual attention	27	1	1	0	0	0	0		****/ 92	****	4.93	4.54	4.16	****
	Did research projects contribute to what you learned	26	2	1	0	0	0	0		****/ 90	****	4.62	4.50	4.21	****
	Did presentations contribute to what you learned	26	0	0	0	0	0	3		****/ 92	****	4.93	4.38	4.21	****
	Were criteria for grading made clear	26	0	0	0	0	0	3		****/ 93	****	4.86	4.06	3.92	****
	and the state of t									,					
	Field Work														
1.	Did field experience contribute to what you learned	27	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.39	3.75	***
2.	Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	27	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.41	4.29	***
3.	Was the instructor available for consultation	27	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 47	****	****	4.51	4.53	***
4.	To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	27	1	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 47	****	****	4.18	4.26	***
5.	Did conferences help you carry out field activities	27	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 44	****	****	4.32	4.12	****
	Self Paced														
	Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	27	0	0	0	0	0	2	3.00	****/ 49	****	****	4.26	4.28	****
	Did study questions make clear the expected goal	27	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 41	****	****	4.14	4.13	****
	Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	27	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 46	****	****	4.31	4.52	****
	Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	27	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 37	****	****	4.05	4.47	****
5.	Were there enough proctors for all the students	27	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 30	***	****	4.27	4.21	***

Title Elementary Spanish I

Instructor: Strickling, Laur

Enrollment: 33
Questionnaires: 29

### University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2009

Page 1419 MAR 22, 2010 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	d Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	16	Required for Majors	11	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	В	7						
56-83	8	2.00-2.99	2	C	2	General	11	Under-grad	29	Non-major	29
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	2	#### - Means	there	are not enough	n
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	2	_			
				?	0						

AN 102 1 University of Maryland

Elementary Spanish II Baltimore County

Burgos, Felix A Fall 200

Enrollment: 28
Questionnaires: 25

Title

Instructor:

Fall 2009

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Page 1420 MAR 22, 2010 Job IRBR3029

	M	272		equer		S	-		ructor	Course	_			
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	2	0	1	1	4	7	10	4 04	1086/1509	4.28	4.42	4.31	4.18	4.04
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	1	0	2	á	11	4.26	849/1509	4.38	4.39	4.26	4.25	4.26
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	3	0	0	0	1	5	16	4.68	337/1287	4.57	4.48	4.30	4.24	4.68
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	3	0	0	0	1	7	14	4.59	356/1459	4.46	4.32	4.22	4.11	4.59
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	3	3	1	4	5	7		1140/1406	3.85	4.19	4.09	4.02	3.60
		0	0	1	2	_	-							4.23
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	3	0	-			10	9	4.23	649/1384	4.17	4.17	4.11	3.98	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	•	0	1	7	8	7		1094/1489	4.00	4.07	4.17	4.20	3.91
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	23	0		1383/1506		4.55	4.67		4.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	3	13	6	4.14	762/1463	4.10	4.16	4.09	4.02	4.14
Lecture														
<ol> <li>Were the instructor's lectures well prepared</li> </ol>	3	0	0	1	5	4	12		1094/1438	4.42	4.48	4.46	4.44	4.23
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	0	2	20	4.91	537/1421	4.81	4.75	4.73	4.66	4.91
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	1	2	10	9	4.23	911/1411	4.41	4.39	4.31	4.27	4.23
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	1	1	3	17	4.64	499/1405	4.46	4.45	4.32	4.27	4.64
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	2	1	1	5	6	6	3.79	835/1236	3.60	3.92	4.00	3.87	3.79
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	10	0	1	0	1	8	5	4.07	725/1260	4.17	4.32	4.14	3.95	4.07
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	10	0	0	0	0	1	14	4.93	143/1255	4.61	4.53	4.33	4.15	4.93
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	10	0	0	0	1	5	9	4.53	598/1258		4.46			4.53
4. Were special techniques successful	10	0	0	1	1	2	11	4.53	199/ 873	4.41		4.03	3.89	
4. Were special techniques successful	10	U	U	1	Т	۷	ТТ	4.53	199/ 0/3	4.41	4.14	4.03	3.09	4.55
Laboratory														
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	24	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 198	****	****	4.22	4.14	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	23	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 89	****	5.00	4.49	4.31	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	24	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 92	****	4.93	4.54	4.16	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	23	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 92	****	4.93	4.38	4.21	***
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	23	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 93	****	4.86	4.06	3.92	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	24	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.39	3.75	****
		0	0	0	0	0	1		,	****	****		4.29	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	24				0		_		,	****	****	4.41		****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	24	0	0	0		1	0	1.00	,			4.51	4.53	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	24	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 47	****	****	4.18	4.26	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	24	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 49	****	****	4.26	4.28	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	24	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 41	****	****	4.14	4.13	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	24	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 46	****	****	4.31	4.52	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	24	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 37	****	****	4.05	4.47	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	24	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.27	4.21	***

Title Elementary Spanish II

Instructor: Burgos, Felix A

Enrollment: 28
Questionnaires: 25

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2009 Page 1420 MAR 22, 2010 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits E	Earned	Cum. GPA		Expected	Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	 А	9	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	5	1.00-1.99	0	В	7						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	3	C	6	General	21	Under-grad	25	Non-major	25
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	ı
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	0	_	_		
				?	1						

Elementary Spanish II

Title Instructor: Burgos, Felix A

Enrollment: 32 Questionnaires: 19

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2009

Page 1421 MAR 22, 2010 Job IRBR3029

#### Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Fre	eque:	ncie 3	s 4	5	Inst Mean	ructor Rank	Course Mean	_	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
General		0	0	0	2	•	_	4 1 1	006/1500	4 00	4 40	4 21	4 10	4 15
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	0	0	3	9	6		976/1509	4.28		4.31	4.18	4.17
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	1	3 2	5	7 11	4.11	1002/1509	4.38	4.39	4.26	4.25 4.24	4.11 4.50
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	1	2	5 6	9	4.28	519/1287 748/1459	4.57 4.46	4.48	4.30 4.22	4.24	4.28
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	3	2	3	0	4	5	2		1295/1406	3.85	4.19	4.22	4.11	3.21
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	2	11	5	4.17	701/1384		4.17	4.11	3.98	4.17
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	1	2	4	10	4.17	854/1489	4.00	4.17	4.17	4.20	4.17
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	14	4		1280/1506		4.55	4.67	4.66	4.22
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	9	0	0	0	2	6	2	4.00	853/1463		4.16	4.09	4.02	4.00
Lecture	_	•	_		_	_			505/4400	4 40	4 40			
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	1	5	10	4.56	725/1438	4.42	4.48	4.46	4.44	4.56
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	1	2	14	4.76	863/1421	4.81	4.75	4.73	4.66	4.76
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	1	5	10	4.56	544/1411	4.41	4.39	4.31	4.27	4.56
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2 5	0 1	0	0 1	1	8 8	8	4.41	745/1405	4.46	4.45	4.32	4.27	4.41
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	5	Т	U	Т	Т	8	3	4.00	664/1236	3.60	3.92	4.00	3.87	4.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	0	5	6	4.55	389/1260	4.17	4.32	4.14	3.95	4.55
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	0	0	1	1	9	4.73	379/1255	4.61	4.53	4.33	4.15	4.73
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	0	0	0	2	9	4.82	350/1258	4.46	4.46	4.38	4.18	4.82
4. Were special techniques successful	8	0	0	0	1	3	7	4.55	196/ 873	4.41	4.14	4.03	3.89	4.55
Laboratory														
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	1 Ω	0	0	0	1	0	0	3 00	****/ 198	****	****	4.22	4.14	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	10	U	U	U		U	U	3.00	/ 198			4.22	4.14	
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	18	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 89	****	5.00	4.49	4.31	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	18	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 92	****	4.93	4.54	4.16	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 90	****	4.62	4.50	4.21	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 92	****	4.93	4.38	4.21	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 93	****	4.86	4.06	3.92	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.39	3.75	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	18	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 48	****	****	4.41	4.29	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	18	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 47	****	****	4.51	4.53	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	18	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 47	****	****	4.18	4.26	****
Self Paced	1.0	0	0	0	1	0	0	2 00	++++/ 40	****	****	1 20	4 00	****
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	18 18	0	0	0	1	0	0 1		****/ 49 ****/ 41	****	****	4.26 4.14	4.28	****
	18 18	0	0	0	1	0	U T		****/ 41 ****/ 46	****	****	4.14	4.13 4.52	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	ТΩ	U	U	U	Т	U	U	3.00	46			4.31	4.54	
Frequ	iency	Dis	trib	utio	n									

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors	
00-27	 1	0.00-0.99	0	A	 6	Required for Majors	4	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	В	8						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	2	C	0	General	8	Under-grad	19	Non-major	19
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means	there	are not enough	n

I

Course-Section: SPAN 102 3 University of Maryland Page 1422 Title Baltimore County MAR 22, 2010

Elementary Spanish II

Instructor: Curto,Natalia

Enrollment: 28 Questionnaires: 23

#### Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Job IRBR3029

Fall 2009

	Frequencies							Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	2	0	0	0	1	4	16	4.71	351/1509	4.28	4.42	4.31	4.18	4.71
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	0	0	0	7	14	4.67	356/1509	4.38	4.39	4.26	4.25	4.67
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	2	19	4.82	199/1287	4.57	4.48	4.30	4.24	4.82
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	3	1	18	4.68	258/1459	4.46	4.32	4.22	4.11	4.68
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	3	7	11	4.27	563/1406	3.85	4.19	4.09	4.02	4.27
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	2	1	5	14	4.41	440/1384	4.17	4.17	4.11	3.98	4.41
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	0	4	10	7	4.00	986/1489	4.00	4.07	4.17	4.20	4.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	1	21	4.95	292/1506	4.62	4.55	4.67	4.66	4.95
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	1	4	6	7	4.06	826/1463	4.10	4.16	4.09	4.02	4.06
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	2	6	14	4.55	750/1438	4.42	4.48	4.46	4.44	4.55
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	22	5.00	1/1421	4.81	4.75	4.73	4.66	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	1	0	4	17	4.68	389/1411	4.41	4.39	4.31	4.27	4.68
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	2	2	18	4.73	381/1405	4.46	4.45	4.32	4.27	4.73
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	13	3	1	0	1	3	3.00	1131/1236	3.60	3.92	4.00	3.87	3.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	2	1	4	8	4.20	666/1260	4.17	4.32	4.14	3.95	4.20
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	0	0	1	1	13	4.80	287/1255	4.61	4.53	4.33	4.15	4.80
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	0	0	1	3	11	4.67	507/1258	4.46	4.46	4.38	4.18	4.67
4. Were special techniques successful	8	2	0	1	0	3	9	4.54	199/ 873	4.41	4.14	4.03	3.89	4.54

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expecte	ed Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	 А	2	Required for Majors	5	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	0	В	11						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	3	C	5	General	14	Under-grad	23	Non-major	23
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	7	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means	there	are not enough	n
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	0						

Title

University of Maryland Baltimore County

Elementary Spanish II

Instructor: Quiroga,Maria I

Enrollment:

Fall 2009

Page 1423 MAR 22, 2010 Job IRBR3029

Questionnaires:	23	Student	Course	Evaluation	Questionnaire

			Fre	quer	ncie	e e		Tnet	ructor	Course	Dent	UMBC	T.evel	Sect
Ouestions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
׫«»»»			<del>-</del>											
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	0	0	4	10	8	4.18	953/1509	4.28	4.42	4.31	4.18	4.18
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	2	5	15	4.59	435/1509	4.38	4.39	4.26	4.25	4.59
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	1	0	5	16	4.64	392/1287	4.57	4.48	4.30	4.24	4.64
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	9	13	4.59	356/1459	4.46	4.32	4.22	4.11	4.59
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	1	0	0	6	7	8	4.10	746/1406	3.85	4.19	4.09	4.02	4.10
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	3	8	11	4.36	492/1384	4.17	4.17	4.11	3.98	4.36
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	1	5	4	12	4.23	791/1489	4.00	4.07	4.17	4.20	4.23
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	1	20	4.95	292/1506	4.62	4.55	4.67	4.66	4.95
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	0	0	0	1	10	6	4.29	588/1463	4.10	4.16	4.09	4.02	4.29
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	1	6	14	4.62	660/1438	4.42	4.48	4.46	4.44	4.62
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	0	1	19	4.95	322/1421	4.81	4.75	4.73	4.66	4.95
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	3	5		4.45	689/1411	4.41	4.39	4.31	4.27	4.45
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	1	9	10	4.45	708/1405	4.46	4.45	4.32	4.27	4.45
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	1	1	1	3	7	7	3.95	730/1236	3.60	3.92	4.00	3.87	3.95
Discussion					_	_								
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	2	7	8	4.35	543/1260	4.17	4.32	4.14	3.95	4.35
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	0	2	3	12	4.59	519/1255	4.61	4.53	4.33	4.15	4.59
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	1	0	4	3	8	4.06	913/1258	4.46	4.46	4.38	4.18	4.06
4. Were special techniques successful	7	0	1	1	1	4	9	4.19	372/ 873	4.41	4.14	4.03	3.89	4.19
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	20	2	0	0	1	0	0	2 00	****/ 184	****	****	4.16	4.06	****
<u> </u>	20 21	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 198	****	****	4.16	4.06	****
<ol> <li>Were you provided with adequate background information</li> <li>Were necessary materials available for lab activities</li> </ol>	21	1	0	0	1	0	0		****/ 184	****	****	4.22	4.14	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	21	1	0	0	1	0	0		****/ 177	****	****	4.46	4.40	***
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	21	1	0	0	1	0	0		****/ 165	****	****	4.18	4.29	****
J. Were requirements for tab reports creatry specified	21	_	U	U		U	U	3.00	/ 103			1.10	1.13	
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	20	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/ 89	****	5.00	4.49	4.31	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	21	0	0	0	1	0	1		****/ 92	****	4.93	4.54	4.16	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	21	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 90	****	4.62	4.50	4.21	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	21	0	0	0	1	0	1		****/ 92	****	4.93	4.38	4.21	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	21	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 93	****	4.86	4.06	3.92	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	21	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.39	3.75	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	22	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.41	4.29	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	22	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 47	****	****	4.51	4.53	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	22	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 47	****	****	4.18	4.26	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	22	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 44	****	****	4.32	4.12	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	21	0	0	0	1	0	1		****/ 49	****	****	4.26	4.28	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	21	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 41	****	****	4.14	4.13	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	21	0	0	0	1	0	1	1.00	****/ 46	****	****	4.31	4.52	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	21	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 37	****	****	4.05	4.47	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	21	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.27	4.21	***

Title Elementary Spanish II

Instructor: Quiroga, Maria I

Enrollment: 29
Questionnaires: 23

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2009 Page 1423 MAR 22, 2010 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expecte	d Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	1	 А	2	Required for Majors	7	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	В	14						
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	2	C	3	General	10	Under-grad	23	Non-major	23
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	n
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	1	_			
				?	0						

Course-Section: SPAN 102 5 University of Maryland
Title Elementary Spanish II Baltimore County

Title Elementary Spanish II
Instructor: Quiroga, Maria I

Instructor: Quir Enrollment: 30 Questionnaires: 23 Fall 2009

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Page 1424

MAR 22, 2010

Job IRBR3029

	Frequencies						Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect	
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	1	1	2	7	11	4.18	953/1509	4.28	4.42	4.31	4.18	4.18
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	0	0	4	7	10	4.29	828/1509	4.38	4.39	4.26	4.25	4.29
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	2	4	6	10	4.09	886/1287	4.57	4.48	4.30	4.24	4.09
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	1	0	0	4	5	12	4.38	638/1459	4.46	4.32	4.22	4.11	4.38
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	3	6	4	9	3.86	964/1406	3.85	4.19	4.09	4.02	3.86
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	3	3	7	9	4.00	807/1384	4.17	4.17	4.11	3.98	4.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	2	2	4	3	11	3.86	1134/1489	4.00	4.07	4.17	4.20	3.86
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	1	1	2	18	4.68	925/1506	4.62	4.55	4.67	4.66	4.68
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	1	1	0	6	9	2	3.61	1200/1463	4.10	4.16	4.09	4.02	3.61
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	4	7	10	4.29	1047/1438	4.42	4.48	4.46	4.44	4.29
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	2	8	11	4.43	1206/1421	4.81	4.75	4.73	4.66	4.43
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	1	4	8	8	4.10	1005/1411	4.41	4.39	4.31	4.27	4.10
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	2	4	4	10	3.95	1089/1405	4.46	4.45	4.32	4.27	3.95
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	5	0	0	1	3	6	8	4.17	563/1236	3.60	3.92	4.00	3.87	4.17
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	2	1	5	2	3.70	964/1260	4.17	4.32	4.14	3.95	3.70
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	13	0	0	0	2	3	5	4.30	749/1255	4.61	4.53	4.33	4.15	4.30
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	13	0	0	0	0	5	5	4.50	620/1258	4.46	4.46	4.38	4.18	4.50
4. Were special techniques successful	13	0	0	0	1	4	5	4.40	261/ 873		4.14	4.03	3.89	4.40
i. Were special techniques successivi	13	U	J	U	_	4	5	4.40	201/ 0/3	4.41	4.14	Ŧ.U3	3.03	1.40
Frem	iencv	Dist	-rih	ıt i or	า									

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors	
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	0	 А	8	Required for Majors	3	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	В	4						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	1	C	2	General	9	Under-grad	23	Non-major	23
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	n
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	0	_			
				?	0						

Elementary Spanish II Quiroga,Maria I Title

Instructor:

Enrollment: Questionnaires: 22

#### University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2009

Page 1425 MAR 22, 2010 Job IRBR3029

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

			Frequencies				Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect	
Questions	NR	NA	1	_	3	4	5	Mean	Rank		Mean			Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	1	0	2	9	10		911/1509	4.28	4.42	4.31	4.18	4.23
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	1	3	9	8		1086/1509	4.38	4.39	4.26	4.25	4.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	2	2	4	13	4.33	708/1287	4.57	4.48	4.30	4.24	4.33
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	1	3	5	12	4.18	843/1459	4.46	4.32	4.22	4.11	4.18
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	2	3	8	8	3.91	934/1406	3.85	4.19	4.09	4.02	3.91
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	2	3	11	4		1149/1384	4.17	4.17	4.11	3.98	3.59
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	2	3	5	5	7		1287/1489	4.00	4.07	4.17	4.20	3.55
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	22	5.00	1/1506	4.62	4.55	4.67	4.66	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	1	1	1	3	7	6	3.89	998/1463	4.10	4.16	4.09	4.02	3.89
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	1	3	3	6	8	3.81	1297/1438	4.42	4.48	4.46	4.44	3.81
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	1	0	0	1	19	4.76	863/1421	4.81	4.75	4.73	4.66	4.76
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	1	1	4	3	12	4.14	/	4.41	4.39	4.31	4.27	4.14
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	2	1	1	6	11	4.10	1005/1405	4.46	4.45	4.32	4.27	4.10
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	0	3	3	6	2	6		1078/1236	3.60	3.92	4.00	3.87	3.25
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	2	2	1	7	4.08	718/1260	4.17	4.32	4.14	3.95	4.08
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	10	0	0	1	1	2	8	4.42	656/1255	4.61	4.53	4.33	4.15	4.42
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	10	0	0	1	2	2	7	4.25	818/1258	4.46	4.46	4.38	4.18	4.25
4. Were special techniques successful	10	0	1	0	3	2	6	4.00	442/ 873	4.41	4.14	4.03	3.89	4.00
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	21	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 184	****	****	4.16	4.06	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	21	0	0	1	0	0	0		****/ 198	****	****	4.22	4.14	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	21	0	1	0	0	0	0		****/ 184	****	****	4.48	4.48	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	21	0	1	0	0	0	0		****/ 177	****	****	4.36	4.29	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	21	0	0	1	0	0	0		****/ 165	****	****	4.18	4.15	****
									,					
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	21	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 89	****	5.00	4.49	4.31	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	21	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 92	****	4.93	4.54	4.16	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	21	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 90	****	4.62	4.50	4.21	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	21	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 92	****	4.93	4.38	4.21	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	21	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 93	****	4.86	4.06	3.92	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	21	0	0	0	1	0	0	2 00	****/ 48	****	****	4.39	3.75	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	21	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.39	4.29	****
2. Did you creatly understand your evaluation criteria	41	U		U	U	U	U	1.00	/ 40			4.41	4.43	

Credits	Earned	Cum. GPA		Expected	Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	1	A	6	Required for Majors	5	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	В	3						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	2	C	4	General	10	Under-grad	22	Non-major	22
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	4	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	e are not enough	ı
				P	0			responses to	be si	ignificant	
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	2						

Course-Section: SPAN 102 7 University of Maryland Title Elementary Spanish II

Baltimore County Fall 2009

Page 1426

MAR 22, 2010

Job IRBR3029

Enrollment: Questionnaires: 21 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Instructor:

Curto, Natalia

		Question	tions			NA	Fre 1	equer 2	ncie 3	s 4	5	Ins Mean	tructor Rank		e Dept Mean	-	Level Mean	Sect Mean
		Genera	1															
1. Did you	u gain ne	w insights,ski	_	om this course	0	0	0	2	2	5	12	4.29	852/1509	9 4.28	4.42	4.31	4.18	4.29
		tor make clear			0	0	0	0	2	6	13	4.52	519/1509	9 4.38	4.39	4.26	4.25	4.52
3. Did the	e exam qu	estions reflec	t the e	expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	2	17	4.67	359/1287	7 4.57	4.48	4.30	4.24	4.67
		ations reflect			0	0	0	0	2	6	13	4.52	- ,		4.32	4.22	4.11	4.52
				what you learned	2	1	0	1	4	7	6	4.00	813/1406	3.85	4.19	4.09	4.02	4.00
				to what you learned	1	0	0	0	5	3	12	4.35	,		4.17	4.11	3.98	4.35
		system clearl		ined	2	0	0	2	2	10	5		1058/1489		4.07	4.17	4.20	3.95
	-	was class canc			1	0	0	0	0	17	3		1320/1506		4.55	4.67	4.66	4.15
9. How wor	uld you g	rade the overa	ll tead	ching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	1	13	4	4.17	726/1463	3 4.10	4.16	4.09	4.02	4.17
		Lectur	е															
1. Were th	he instru	ctor's lecture	s well	prepared	2	0	0	0	2	5	12	4.53	775/1438	3 4.42	4.48	4.46	4.44	4.53
2. Did the	e instruc	tor seem inter	ested i	n the subject	3	0	0	0	1	2	15	4.78	846/1421	1 4.81	4.75	4.73	4.66	4.78
3. Was led	cture mat	erial presente	d and e	explained clearly	3	0	0	1	2	5	10	4.33	810/1411	1 4.41	4.39	4.31	4.27	4.33
		s contribute t			3	0	0	0	2	4	12	4.56	587/1405	5 4.46	4.45	4.32	4.27	4.56
5. Did aud	diovisual	techniques en	hance y	our understanding	3	6	1	1	2	5	3	3.67	904/1236	3.60	3.92	4.00	3.87	3.67
1 Did al:	Discussion Oid class discussions contribute to what you learn						0	0	4	4	7	4.20	666/1260	0 4.17	4.32	4.14	3.95	4.20
				ed to participate	6 6	0	0	0	2	5	8	4.40	665/125		4.53	4.33	4.15	4.40
				nd open discussion	6	0	0	0	2	4	9	4.47	660/1258		4.46	4.38	4.18	4.47
		chniques succe		a open arbeabbion	6	0	0	0	4	2	9	4.33	292/ 873			4.03	3.89	4.33
	-	-																
		Semina																
				announced theme	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	,		5.00	4.49	4.31	****
				lividual attention	20	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	,	_	4.93	4.54	4.16	****
	_	-		what you learned	20	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	,		4.62	4.50	4.21	****
		ns contribute			20	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 92		4.93	4.38	4.21	****
5. Were c	riteria f	or grading mad	e clear		20	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 93	3 ****	4.86	4.06	3.92	***
				Frequ	iency	Dist	cribu	utior	n									
Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades				Rea	ason	s			Ty	уре			Majors		
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 4		Red	quire	ed fo	or M	ajor	s	4	Graduat	te	0	Majo	r	0
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	В 6		~					_	-	1		0.1			0.1
56-83						Gei	nera!	L			1	.1	Under-	grad :	21	Non-	major	21
84-150						m 7						1	шшшш	Manne	- h			la.
Grad.	rad. 0 3.50-4.00 3 F 0					E⊥€	ectiv	/es				1		Means				11
						0+1	ner					2	respons	ses to 1	be sign	ıııcan	L	
	I 0					Oti	ier.					4						
				; I														

Curto,Natalia

University of Maryland

Elementary Spanish II Baltimore County

Fall 2009

Enrollment: 29
Questionnaires: 25

Title

Instructor:

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Page 1427 MAR 22, 2010 Job IRBR3029

			Frequencies				Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect	
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank		Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General 1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	2	11	12	4.40	724/1509	4.28	4.42	4.31	4.18	4.40
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	7	17	4.64	378/1509	4.38	4.39	4.26	4.25	4.64
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	4	21	4.84	175/1287	4.57	4.48	4.30	4.24	4.84
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	2	9	13	4.46	536/1459	4.46	4.32	4.22	4.11	4.46
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	2	2	4	6	10	3.83	986/1406	3.85	4.19	4.09	4.02	3.83
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	6	6	12	4.25	619/1384	4.17	4.17	4.11	3.98	4.25
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	3	10	11	4.33	674/1489	4.00	4.07	4.17	4.20	4.33
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	0	23	5.00	1/1506	4.62	4.55	4.67	4.66	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	1	6	14	4.62	241/1463	4.10	4.16	4.09	4.02	4.62
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	0	0	0	4	17	4.81	363/1438	4.42	4.48	4.46	4.44	4.81
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	0	0	2	19	4.90	537/1421	4.81	4.75	4.73	4.66	4.90
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	0	0	0	5	16	4.76	291/1411	4.41	4.39	4.31	4.27	4.76
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	1	0	0	0	3	17	4.85	228/1405	4.46	4.45	4.32	4.27	4.85
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	6	8	2	2	2	4	1	3.00	1131/1236	3.60	3.92	4.00	3.87	3.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	1	1	4	5	4.18	671/1260	4.17	4.32	4.14	3.95	4.18
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	14	0	0	0	1	1	9	4.73	379/1255	4.61	4.53	4.33	4.15	4.73
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	15	0	0	0	2	2	6	4.40	721/1258	4.46	4.46	4.38	4.18	4.40
4. Were special techniques successful	15	2	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	114/ 873	4.41	4.14	4.03	3.89	4.75
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	24	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 184	****	****	4.16	4.06	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	24	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 198	****	****	4.22	4.14	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	24	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 184	****	****	4.48	4.48	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	24	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 177	****	****	4.36	4.29	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	24	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 165	****	****	4.18	4.15	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	24	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 89	****	5.00	4.49	4.31	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	24	0	0	0	1	0	0		****/ 92	****	4.93	4.54	4.16	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	24	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 90	****	4.62	4.50	4.21	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	24	0	0	0	0	1	0	1.00	****/ 92	****	4.93	4.38	4.21	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	24	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 93	****	4.86	4.06	3.92	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	24	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.39	3.75	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	24	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 48	****	****	4.41	4.29	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	24	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 47	****	****	4.51	4.53	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	24	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 47	****	****	4.18	4.26	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	24	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 44	****	****	4.32	4.12	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	24	0	0	1	0	0	0		****/ 49	****	****	4.26	4.28	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	24	0	0	1	0	0	0		****/ 41	****	****	4.14	4.13	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	24	0	0	1	0	0	0		****/ 46	****	****	4.31	4.52	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	24	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 37	****	****	4.05	4.47	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	24	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.27	4.21	***

Title Elementary Spanish II

Instructor: Curto, Natalia
Fnrollment: 29

Enrollment: 29
Questionnaires: 25

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2009 Page 1427 MAR 22, 2010 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expecte	d Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	 А	9	Required for Majors	6	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	В	10						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	2	C	1	General	12	Under-grad	25	Non-major	25
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	8	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	n
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	0	-		_	
				?	1						

University of Maryland

Int Rev Elem Spanish Baltimore County

Carmody, Sean P

Enrollment: 26 Questionnaires: 21

Title

Instructor:

Fall 2009

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Page 1428 MAR 22, 2010 Job IRBR3029

			Fre	equer	ncies	5		Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank		Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	1	2	7	11	4.33	800/1509	4.13	4.42	4.31	4.18	4.33
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	7	12	4.43	667/1509	4.26	4.39	4.26	4.25	4.43
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	10	9	4.33	708/1287	4.31	4.48	4.30	4.24	4.33
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	1	3	5	11	4.30	715/1459	4.16	4.32	4.22	4.11	4.30
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	3	1	2	6	5	4		1178/1406		4.19	4.09	4.02	3.50
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	1	5	8	5		1138/1384	3.83	4.17	4.11	3.98	3.62
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	2	3	5	10	4.00	986/1489	4.23	4.07	4.17	4.20	4.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	3	18	4.86	682/1506	4.71	4.55	4.67	4.66	4.86
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	3	7	7	4.24	648/1463	4.04	4.16	4.09	4.02	4.24
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	6	14	4.62	660/1438	4.46	4.48	4.46	4.44	4.62
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	2	19	4.90	537/1421	4.77	4.75	4.73	4.66	4.90
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	1	0	10	10	4.38	758/1411	4.32	4.39	4.31	4.27	4.38
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	4	16	4.71	393/1405	4.50	4.45	4.32	4.27	4.71
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	5	1	2	6	3	4	3.44	1016/1236	3.67	3.92	4.00	3.87	3.44
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	1	1	4	8	4.36	543/1260	4.31	4.32	4.14	3.95	4.36
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	0	0	6	9	4.60	505/1255	4.39	4.53	4.33	4.15	4.60
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	0	0	0	6	9	4.60	549/1258	4.44	4.46	4.38	4.18	4.60
4. Were special techniques successful	6	4	0	1	1	5	4	4.09	419/ 873	3.98	4.14	4.03	3.89	4.09
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 184	****	****	4.16	4.06	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 198	****	****	4.22	4.14	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 184	****	****	4.48	4.48	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	20	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 177	****	****	4.36	4.29	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 165	****	****	4.18	4.15	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 89	****	5.00	4.49	4.31	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 92	****	4.93	4.54	4.16	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 90	****	4.62	4.50	4.21	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 92	****	4.93	4.38	4.21	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	20	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 93	****	4.86	4.06	3.92	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.39	3.75	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.41	4.29	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 47	****	****	4.51	4.53	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 47	****	****	4.18	4.26	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 44	****	****	4.32	4.12	***
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 49	****	****	4.26	4.28	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 41	****	****	4.14	4.13	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 46	****	****	4.31	4.52	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 37	****	****	4.05	4.47	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	20	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 30	***	****	4.27	4.21	****

Title Int Rev Elem Spanish

Instructor: Carmody, Sean P

Enrollment: 26
Questionnaires: 21

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2009 Page 1428 MAR 22, 2010 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	1	A	9	Required for Majors	4	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	В	6						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	0	C	4	General	13	Under-grad	21	Non-major	21
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means	there	are not enough	ı
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	1	_		_	
				?	1						

Course-Section: SPAN 103 2 University of Maryland Page 1429 Title Baltimore County MAR 22, 2010 Int Rev Elem Spanish

Instructor: King,Robin R

Enrollment: 25 Questionnaires: 19

Fall 2009 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire Job IRBR3029

		Ouestion	g		MD	NA	Fre	_	ncie	s 1	5	Inst Mean	tructor Rank		_		Level Mean	
		Quescion				11/27												
		Genera	1															
1. Did you	ı gain ne	w insights,ski	lls fro	m this course	1	0	0	1	4	7	6	4.00	1114/1509	4.13	4.42	4.31	4.18	4.00
2. Did the	e instruc	ctor make clear	the ex	pected goals	1	0	0	0	6	4	8	4.11	1002/1509	4.26	4.39	4.26	4.25	4.11
3. Did the	e exam qu	estions reflec	t the e	xpected goals	2	0	0	1	2	4	10	4.35	688/1287	4.31	4.48	4.30	4.24	4.35
4. Did oth	ner evalu	ations reflect	the ex	pected goals	1	1	0	2	3	6	6	3.94	1044/1459	4.16	4.32	4.22	4.11	3.94
5. Did ass	signed re	eadings contrib	ute to	what you learned	1	2	0	4	3	6	3	3.50	1178/1406	3.79	4.19	4.09	4.02	3.50
6. Did wri	itten ass	signments contr	ibute t	o what you learned	1	1	1	1	4	6	5	3.76	1043/1384	3.83	4.17	4.11	3.98	3.76
7. Was the	e grading	g system clearl	y expla	ined	1	0	0	0	3	6	9	4.33	674/1489	4.23	4.07	4.17	4.20	4.33
8. How man	ny times	was class canc	elled		1	0	0	0	0	13	5	4.28	1243/1506	4.71	4.55	4.67	4.66	4.28
9. How wou	ıld you g	grade the overa	ll teac	hing effectiveness	4	0	0	0	2	8	5	4.20	690/1463	4.04	4.16	4.09	4.02	4.20
		Lectur																
1. Were th	ne instru	ctor's lecture	s well	prepared	2	0	0	0	3	6	8	4.29	1039/1438	4.46	4.48	4.46	4.44	4.29
		ctor seem inter			2	0	0	0	1	1	15	4.82	742/1421	4.77	4.75	4.73	4.66	4.82
				xplained clearly	2	0	0	1	2	5	9	4.29	849/1411	4.32	4.39	4.31	4.27	4.29
					2	0	0	0	2	3	12	4.59	558/1405	4.50	4.45	4.32	4.27	4.59
	Did the lectures contribute to what you learned Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understand				2	3	2	1	2	6	3	3.50	984/1236	3.67	3.92	4.00	3.87	3.50
		Discus	aion															
1 Did cla	aga diga			what you learned	12	0	0	0	1	2	4	4.43	487/1260	4.31	4.32	4.14	3.95	4.43
				d to participate	12	0	0	0	1	1	5	4.57	526/1255		4.53	4.33	4.15	4.57
				d open discussion	12	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	299/1258		4.46	4.38	4.18	4.86
		echniques succe		a open arbeabbion	12	0	0	0	2	2	3	4.14	394/ 873			4.03	3.89	4.14
-	•	-																
				Frequ	iency	Dis	tribu	ıtioı	n									
Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	ason	s			Ту	pe			Majors	5
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	1	 А б		Re	 quire	ed fo	or M	 ajor	 s	3	Graduat	 e	0	Majo	 r	0
28-55	5	1.00-1.99	0	В 9			-			3 -								
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	2	C 1		Ge	nera:	L			1	.2	Under-g	rad 1	.9	Non-	major	19
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	2	D 0													-	
Grad.						El	ectiv	res				1	#### - 1	Means t	here a	re not	enoug	jh
				P 0									respons	es to b	e sign	ifican	ıt	
				I 0		Ot1	her					0	-					
				? 0														

Garcia,Tareixa

University of Maryland

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Int Rev Elem Spanish Baltimore County

Enrollment: 25 Questionnaires: 17

Title

Instructor:

Fall 2009

Page 1430 MAR 22, 2010 Job IRBR3029

			Fre	equer	ncies			Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank		Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	1	3	7	6	4.06	1079/1509	4.13	4.42	4.31	4.18	4.06
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	0	2	5	9	4.24	880/1509	4.26	4.39	4.26	4.25	4.24
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	6	8	4.24	795/1287	4.31	4.48	4.30	4.24	4.24
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	0	1	7	8	4.24	792/1459	4.16	4.32	4.22	4.11	4.24
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	1	2	3	10	4.38	470/1406	3.79	4.19	4.09	4.02	4.38
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	1	1	6	8	4.12	742/1384	3.83	4.17	4.11	3.98	4.12
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	2	0	5	10	4.35	652/1489	4.23	4.07	4.17	4.20	4.35
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	17	5.00	1/1506	4.71	4.55	4.67	4.66	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	1	1	0	3	7	2	3.69	1148/1463	4.04	4.16	4.09	4.02	3.69
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	1	0	6	10	4.47	839/1438	4.46	4.48	4.46	4.44	4.47
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	1	1	2	13	4.59	1099/1421	4.77	4.75	4.73	4.66	4.59
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	1	2	5	9	4.29	849/1411	4.32	4.39	4.31	4.27	4.29
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	0	2	5	8	4.19	947/1405	4.50	4.45	4.32	4.27	4.19
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	2	0	2	4	9	4.06	640/1236	3.67	3.92	4.00	3.87	4.06
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	1	2	5	6	4.14	691/1260	4.31	4.32	4.14	3.95	4.14
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	3	2	1	8	4.00	904/1255	4.39	4.53	4.33	4.15	4.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	1	0	5	2	6		1033/1258	4.44	4.46	4.38	4.18	3.86
4. Were special techniques successful	3	0	2	0	3	4	5	3.71	630/ 873	3.98	4.14	4.03	3.89	3.71
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	13	1	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 184	****	****	4.16	4.06	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	13	0	1	0	0	1	2	3.75	****/ 198	****	****	4.22	4.14	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	12	2	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 184	****	****	4.48	4.48	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	12	1	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	****/ 177	****	****	4.36	4.29	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	12	2	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 165	****	****	4.18	4.15	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	13	1	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 89	****	5.00	4.49	4.31	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	13	1	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 92	****	4.93	4.54	4.16	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	13	1	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 90	****	4.62	4.50	4.21	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	13	1	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 92	****	4.93	4.38	4.21	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	13	1	U	U	U	1	2	4.6/	****/ 93	****	4.86	4.06	3.92	***
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 48	****	****	4.39	3.75	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	15	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 48	****	****	4.41	4.29	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	15	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 47	****	****	4.51	4.53	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	15	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 47	****	****	4.18	4.26	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	15	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 44	****	****	4.32	4.12	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 49	****	****	4.26	4.28	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	15	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 41	****	****	4.14	4.13	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	15	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 46	****	****	4.31	4.52	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	15	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 37	****	****	4.05	4.47	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	15	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.27	4.21	****

Title Int Rev Elem Spanish

Instructor: Garcia, Tareixa

Enrollment: 25
Questionnaires: 17

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2009 Page 1430 MAR 22, 2010 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	1	 А	8	Required for Majors	4	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	В	7						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	3	C	1	General	9	Under-grad	17	Non-major	17
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	n
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	0	-			
				?	0						

Course-Section: SPAN 201 1 University of Maryland Page 1431 Title Intermediate Spanish I Baltimore County MAR 22, 2010

Morales, Daniel Instructor:

Enrollment: 23 Questionnaires: 16

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Job IRBR3029

Fall 2009

		Ouestion	æ		NIP	NA	Fre	equei 2		s 4	5	Inst Mean	ructor Rank	Course	Dept Mean			
		Quescion																
		Genera	1															
1. Did you	ı gain ne	w insights,ski	lls fro	m this course	0	0	1	1	4	4	6	3.81	1280/1509	4.09	4.42	4.31	4.34	3.81
2. Did the	e instruc	ctor make clear	the ex	pected goals	0	0	0	1	8	2	5	3.69	1298/1509	4.29	4.39	4.26	4.32	3.69
3. Did the	e exam qu	estions reflec	t the e	xpected goals	0	0	0	0	4	5	7	4.19	832/1287	4.42	4.48	4.30	4.35	4.19
4. Did oth	ner evalu	ations reflect	the ex	pected goals	0	1	0	3	1	6	5	3.87	1119/1459	4.31	4.32	4.22	4.30	3.87
5. Did ass	signed re	adings contrib	ute to	what you learned	1	3	1	3	3	2	3	3.25	1283/1406	3.75	4.19	4.09	4.09	3.25
6. Did wri	itten ass	signments contr	ibute t	o what you learned	1	0	1	2	3	6	3	3.53	1177/1384	4.10	4.17	4.11	4.09	3.53
7. Was the	e grading	system clearl	y expla	ined	1	1	2	1	3	1	7	3.71	1214/1489	4.19	4.07	4.17	4.19	3.71
	-	was class canc			1	0	0	2	3	10			1483/1506		4.55	4.67		3.53
9. How wou	ıld you g	grade the overa	ll teac	hing effectiveness	3	0	0	1	6	4	2	3.54	1230/1463	4.04	4.16	4.09	4.08	3.54
		Lectur	_															
					0	0	0	4	2	6			1353/1438				4.48	3.63
					0	0	0	0	4	4	8		1292/1421	4.70	4.75	4.73	4.76	4.25
	Were the instructor's lectures well prepared Did the instructor seem interested in the subject Was lecture material presented and explained clea Did the lectures contribute to what you learned				0	0	0	1	4	6			1116/1411	4.26	4.39	4.31	4.37	3.94
	Did the instructor seem interested in the subject Was lecture material presented and explained clea Did the lectures contribute to what you learned				0	0	0	1	-				1019/1405		4.45	4.32	4.39	4.06
5. Did aud	Was lecture material presented and explained clea			our understanding	0	1	2	3	3	7	0	3.00	1131/1236	3.56	3.92	4.00	4.11	3.00
		- ·																
1 543		Discus			13	0	0	0	1	-1	-	4 00	++++ /1060	4 10	4 20	1 1 1	4 10	****
				what you learned d to participate	13	0	0	0	1	0	7		****/1260 ****/1255				4.19 4.37	****
				d to participate d open discussion	13	0	0	0	0	0			****/1258		4.53	4.33	4.37	****
		chniques succe		a open arscussion	13	2	0	0	1	0	0		****/ 873				4.44	****
4. Were SF	peciai te	ciniiques succe	SSLUI		13	2	U	U		U	U	3.00	/ 6/3	4.12	4.14	4.03	4.04	
				Frequ	iency	Dist	crib	utio	n									
Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	ason	s			ТУ	pe			Majors	}
00-27								 ed f	 วะ M	 ajors	. – – – !	2	Graduat		1	Majo	 r	0
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	В 4		1000	1011		J_ 11	~ J U L	•	-	SI adda c	_	_	.10.50	-	Ü
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	4	C 1		Ger	nera	1				8	Under-g	rad 1	.5	Non-	major	16
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	2	D 0									5				3	
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00	1	F 0		Ele	ecti	ves				1	#### - 1	Means t	here a	re not	enoug	ıh
				P 0									respons				_	
				I 0		Oth	ner					2	_		_			

? 0

Course-Section: SPAN 201 10 University of Maryland Title MAR 22, 2010 Intermediate Spanish I Baltimore County

Colombo,Laura M

Instructor:

Enrollment: 25 Questionnaires: 23

Fall 2009 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire Page 1432

Job IRBR3029

		Question	ıs		NR	NA	Fre	_	ncies 3	4	5	Inst Mean	ructor Rank		Dept Mean		Level Mean	Sect Mean
		Genera																
1 Did vo	nı gain ne	ew insights,ski		om this course	0	0	0	1	0	7	15	4.57	528/1509	4.09	4.42	4.31	4.34	4.57
		ctor make clear			0	0	0	0	1	3	19	4.78	223/1509	4.29	4.39	4.26	4.32	4.78
		estions reflec			0	0	0	0	0	3	20	4.87	159/1287	4.42	4.48	4.30	4.35	4.87
	_	ations reflect		1 3	0	0	0	0	0	5	18	4.78	164/1459	4.31	4.32	4.22	4.30	4.78
				what you learned	0	4	2	0	1	4	12	4.26	575/1406	3.75	4.19	4.09	4.09	4.26
				o what you learned	0	1	0	0	2	8	12	4.45	394/1384	4.10	4.17	4.11	4.09	4.45
7. Was th	ne gradino	g system clear]	y expla	ined	0	0	0	0	0	5	18	4.78	167/1489	4.19	4.07	4.17	4.19	4.78
8. How ma	any times	was class cand	elled		0	0	0	0	0	6	17	4.74	870/1506	4.62	4.55	4.67	4.61	4.74
9. How wo	How would you grade the overall teaching effective			hing effectiveness	7	0	0	0	0	8	8	4.50	325/1463	4.04	4.16	4.09	4.08	4.50
		Lectur	re															
		actor's lecture			2	0	0	0	0	4	17	4.81	363/1438	4.32	4.48	4.46	4.48	4.81
2. Did th	ne instruc	ctor seem inter	rested i	n the subject	2	0	0	0	0	2	19	4.90	537/1421	4.70	4.75	4.73	4.76	4.90
3. Was le	ecture mat	erial presente	ed and e	explained clearly	2	0	0	0	0	5	16	4.76	291/1411	4.26	4.39	4.31	4.37	4.76
4. Did th	ne lecture	es contribute t	o what	you learned	2	0	0	0	0	2	19	4.90	172/1405	4.33	4.45	4.32	4.39	4.90
5. Did au	udiovisual	l techniques er	hance y	our understanding	3	1	0	0	2	3	14	4.63	193/1236	3.56	3.92	4.00	4.11	4.63
		Discus	ssion															
				what you learned	13	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	209/1260	4.18	4.32	4.14	4.19	4.80
2. Were a	all studer	nts actively er	ncourage	ed to participate	13	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1255	4.51	4.53	4.33	4.37	5.00
				d open discussion	13	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	363/1258	4.35	4.46	4.38	4.44	4.80
4. Were s	special te	echniques succe	essful		13	0	0	0	1	1	8	4.70	139/ 873	4.12	4.14	4.03	4.04	4.70
				Frequ	ıency	Dis	trib	ution	1									
Credits E	Earned	Cum. GPA	7	Expected Grades				Rea	asons				Ty	pe			Majors	;
00-27	 1	0.00-0.99	0	 A 8		Red	auire	ed fo	or Ma	ior	 s	3	Graduat	 e	0	Majo	 or	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B 10						,		-		-	-	) ~		-
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	1	C 2		Gei	nera:	1			1	.4	Under-g	rad 2	13	Non-	major	23
84-150																	3 -	
Grad.						Ele	ecti	ves				2	#### - 1	Means t	here a	re not	enou	ıh
				P 0									respons				_	
				I O		Ot1	her					0	-					
				2 0														

0

Intermediate Spanish I

Title King,Robin R Instructor:

Enrollment: 25 Questionnaires: 20

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2009 MAR 22, 2010 Job IRBR3029

Page 1433

Student	Course	Eva.	luation	Question	naire
---------	--------	------	---------	----------	-------

		Question	s		NR	NA	Fr 1	_	ncies 3	4	5	Ins Mean	tructor Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean		Level Mean	Sect Mean
		Genera	 1															
1. Did yo	ou gain ne	ew insights,ski		om this course	2	0	1	1	5	6	5	3.72	1314/1509	4.09	4.42	4.31	4.34	3.72
2. Did th	ne instru	ctor make clear	the ex	xpected goals	2	0	0	1	2	9	6	4.11	1002/1509	4.29	4.39	4.26	4.32	4.11
3. Did th	ne exam qu	uestions reflec	t the e	expected goals	2	0	0	0	2	8	8	4.33	708/1287	4.42	4.48	4.30	4.35	4.33
4. Did ot	her eval	uations reflect	the ex	xpected goals	2	0	0	0	4	5	9	4.28	748/1459	4.31	4.32	4.22	4.30	4.28
5. Did as	signed re	eadings contrib	ute to	what you learned	2	2	0	2	2	6	6	4.00	813/1406	3.75	4.19	4.09	4.09	4.00
6. Did wr	ritten as:	signments contr	ibute t	to what you learned	2	0	1	0	2	8	7	4.11	742/1384	4.10	4.17	4.11	4.09	4.11
		g system clearl		ained	2	0	0	1	1	5	11	4.44	541/1489	4.19	4.07	4.17	4.19	4.44
		was class cand			2	0	0	0	0	0	18	5.00	1/1506	4.62	4.55	4.67	4.61	5.00
9. How wo	ould you	grade the overa	ll tead	ching effectiveness	8	0	0	0	2	7	3	4.08	809/1463	4.04	4.16	4.09	4.08	4.08
		Lectur	е															
1. Were t	he instr	uctor's lecture	s well	prepared	4	0	0	1	3	4	8	4.19	1122/1438	4.32	4.48	4.46	4.48	4.19
2. Did th	ne instru	ctor seem inter	ested :	in the subject	4	0	0	0	0	2	14	4.88	614/1421	4.70	4.75	4.73	4.76	4.88
3. Was le	cture mat	terial presente	d and	explained clearly	4	0	1	1	3	2	9	4.06	1020/1411	4.26	4.39	4.31	4.37	4.06
4. Did th	ne lecture	es contribute t	o what	you learned	4	0	1	0	2	3	10	4.31	848/1405	4.33	4.45	4.32	4.39	4.31
5. Did au	id audiovisual techniques enhance your understan					2	5	2	0	3	5	3.07	1122/1236	3.56	3.92	4.00	4.11	3.07
		Discus	sion															
1. Did cl	ass disc	ussions contrib	ute to	what you learned	8	0	2	1	2	2	5	3.58	1017/1260	4.18	4.32	4.14	4.19	3.58
2. Were a	all stude	nts actively en	courage	ed to participate	8	0	2	0	1	3	6	3.92	983/1255	4.51	4.53	4.33	4.37	3.92
				nd open discussion	7	0	1	0	4	2	6	3.92	996/1258	4.35	4.46	4.38	4.44	3.92
		echniques succe		•	7	1	0	1	2	5	4	4.00	442/ 873	4.12	4.14	4.03	4.04	4.00
		Labora	tory															
2. Were y	ou provi	ded with adequa	te bacl	ground information	19	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 198	****	****	4.22	4.51	****
		Semina	r															
4. Did pr	resentatio	ons contribute	to what	you learned	19	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 92	****	4.93	4.38	4.00	****
5. Were c	riteria :	for grading mad	e clear		19	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 93	****	4.86	4.06	2.88	****
		Field	Work															
1. Did fi	eld expe	rience contribu	te to v	what you learned	19	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.39	4.79	***
				Frequ	ıency	Dis	trib	utio	n									
Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades				Rea	asons	:			Т√	рe			Majors	<b>:</b>	
												- 						
00-27 28-55	2	0.00-0.99	0	A 4		Re	quir	ed f	or Ma	jor	S	3	Graduat	e	0	Majo	or	0
26-33 56-83				C 3		Car	nera	1			1	1	Under-c	rad 1	20	Non-	-major	20
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	3	D 0		Ge.	c.a	_			_	_	onder - g	12 44 2		11011-	a JUI	20
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F 0		<u>ت</u> ا.	ecti	WAG.				0	#### -	Meane +	here :	are not	enous	rh
JI aa.	J	3.30-4.00	ی	P 0		15.1.1	CCLI	v C D				5	respons					,
				I 0		O+1	her					0	T CBPOILS	CD LO L	, bigi	cai		
				5 0		U L	TICI					J						
				: U														

Title Intermediate Spanish I

Arevalo-Guerrer Instructor:

Enrollment: 23 Questionnaires: 22

# University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2009

Page 1434 MAR 22, 2010 Job IRBR3029

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

			Fre	anier	ncies			Tnst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Ouestions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
~ 														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	3	6	13	4.45	661/1509	4.09	4.42	4.31	4.34	4.45
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	7	12	4.41	699/1509	4.29	4.39	4.26	4.32	4.41
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	3	2	16	4.50	519/1287	4.42	4.48	4.30	4.35	4.50
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	7	13	4.50	454/1459	4.31	4.32	4.22	4.30	4.50
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	3	7	11	4.27	563/1406	3.75	4.19	4.09	4.09	4.27
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	3	17	4.68	208/1384	4.10	4.17	4.11	4.09	4.68
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	7	3	12	4.23	791/1489	4.19	4.07	4.17	4.19	4.23
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	2	20	4.91	583/1506	4.62	4.55	4.67	4.61	4.91
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	1	8	9	4.44	410/1463	4.04	4.16	4.09	4.08	4.44
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	1	5	14	4.65	603/1438	4.32	4.48	4.46	4.48	4.65
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	1	2	17	4.80	794/1421	4.70	4.75	4.73	4.76	4.80
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	1	1	3	15	4.60	496/1411	4.26	4.39	4.31	4.37	4.60
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	1	1	1	17	4.70	419/1405	4.33	4.45	4.32	4.39	4.70
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	4	0	0	3	4	9	4.38	383/1236	3.56	3.92	4.00	4.11	4.38
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	0	5	9	4.64	323/1260	4.18	4.32	4.14	4.19	4.64
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	0	0	0	2	12	4.86	246/1255	4.51	4.53	4.33	4.37	4.86
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	0	0	2	2	10	4.57	570/1258	4.35	4.46	4.38	4.44	4.57
4. Were special techniques successful	8	0	0	0	1	5	8	4.50	209/ 873		4.14	4.03		4.50
T albania banna														
Laboratory	20	1	^	0	0	^	1	F 00	<b>4444/10</b> 1	****	****	1 10	4 54	****
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	20	1	0	0	-	0	1		****/ 184 ****/ 198	****	****	4.16	4.54	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information 3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	21 21	0	0 0	0	0	0	_	5.00	****/ 184	****	****	4.22 4.48	4.51 4.62	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	21	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 177	****	****	4.46	4.65	***
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	21	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 165	****	****	4.18	4.56	****
Seminar				•								4 40		
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 89	****	5.00	4.49	5.00	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 92	****	4.93	4.54	****	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	21	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 90		4.62	4.50		****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	21 21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 92 ****/ 93	****	4.93	4.38	4.00	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	21	U	U	U	U	U	Τ	5.00	****/ 93		4.86	4.06	2.88	
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.39	4.79	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.41	4.50	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 47	****	****	4.51	4.83	***
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	21	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 47	****	****	4.18	4.56	***
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 44	****	****	4.32	4.67	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 49	****	****	4.26	4.33	***
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 41	****	****	4.14	****	***
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 46	****	****	4.31	4.00	***
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 37	****	****	4.05	****	***
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.27	****	****

Title Intermediate Spanish I

Instructor: Arevalo-Guerrer

Enrollment: 23
Questionnaires: 22

University of Maryland
Baltimore County
Fall 2009

Page 1434 MAR 22, 2010 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits E	Earned	Cum. GPA		Expected	Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	 А	3	Required for Majors	4	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	В	9						
56-83	5	2.00-2.99	3	C	5	General	15	Under-grad	22	Non-major	22
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	4	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	6	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	ı
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	1	_			
				?	1						

Course-Section: SPAN 201 13 University of Maryland

Title Intermediate Spanish I Baltimore County Fall 2009

Instructor:	Arevalo-Guerrer	Fall 2009
Enrollment:	25	
Questionnaires:	20	Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

			Fre	equei	ncie	s		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank		Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	2	3	6	9	4.10	1044/1509	4.09	4.42	4.31	4.34	4.10
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	3	7	9	4.20	922/1509	4.29	4.39	4.26	4.32	4.20
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	0	4	6	9	4.10	882/1287	4.42	4.48	4.30	4.35	4.10
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	3	10	6	4.05	945/1459	4.31	4.32	4.22	4.30	4.05
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	1	1	7	5	5	3.63	1122/1406	3.75	4.19	4.09	4.09	3.63
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	3	5	11	4.25	619/1384	4.10	4.17	4.11	4.09	4.25
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	2	2	8	7	3.90	1106/1489	4.19	4.07	4.17	4.19	3.90
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	1	0	1	1	17	4.65	949/1506	4.62	4.55	4.67	4.61	4.65
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	1	0	0	2	11	2	4.00	853/1463	4.04	4.16	4.09	4.08	4.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	1	0	1	5	13	4.45	878/1438	4.32	4.48	4.46	4.48	4.45
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	2	3	15	4.65	1026/1421	4.70	4.75	4.73	4.76	4.65
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	1	3	9	7	4.10	1000/1411	4.26	4.39	4.31	4.37	4.10
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	1	1	7	10	4.20	940/1405	4.33	4.45	4.32	4.39	4.20
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	4	1	1	5	4	5	3.69	893/1236	3.56	3.92	4.00	4.11	3.69
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	9	0	1	0	1	2	7	4.27	605/1260	4.18	4.32	4.14	4.19	4.27
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	9	0	1	0	1	4	5	4.09	877/1255	4.51	4.53	4.33	4.37	4.09
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	1	0	1	3	6	4.18	856/1258	4.35	4.46	4.38	4.44	4.18
4. Were special techniques successful	9	1	0	0	1	2	7	4.60	178/ 873	4.12	4.14	4.03	4.04	4.60

Page 1435

MAR 22, 2010

Job IRBR3029

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expecte	ed Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	 А	3	Required for Majors	4	Graduate	0	Major	2
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	1	В	11						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	3	C	2	General	10	Under-grad	20	Non-major	18
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means	there	are not enough	n
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	1	-			
				?	0						

Course-Section: SPAN 201 14 University of Maryland
Title Intermediate Spanish I Baltimore County

Intermediate Spanish I Baltimore County
Arevalo-Guerrer Fall 2009

Enrollment: 21 Ouestionnaires: 17

Instructor:

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Page 1436

MAR 22, 2010

Job IRBR3029

			Fre	aner	ncies	3		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	_	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	2	2	7	6		1114/1509	4.09	4.42	4.31	4.34	4.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	0	2	7	7		1002/1509	4.29	4.39	4.26	4.32	4.12
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	7	9	4.47	554/1287	4.42	4.48	4.30	4.35	4.47
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	6	11	4.65	302/1459	4.31	4.32	4.22	4.30	4.65
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	1	5	5	4	3.80	1009/1406	3.75	4.19	4.09	4.09	3.80
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	4	8	5	4.06	779/1384	4.10	4.17	4.11	4.09	4.06
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	1	1	6	8	4.12	906/1489	4.19	4.07	4.17	4.19	4.12
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	17	5.00	1/1506	4.62	4.55	4.67	4.61	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	2	8	3	4.08	815/1463	4.04	4.16	4.09	4.08	4.08
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	1	Λ	0	_	11	4.47	839/1438	4.32	4.48	4.46	4.48	4.47
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	1	0	0	1	15	4.71	968/1421	4.70	4.75	4.73	4.76	4.71
<u> </u>			1	1	2	7	12						4.37	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	Τ	Ţ	∠ 1	7	0		1107/1411	4.26	4.39	4.31		3.94
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	0	1	7	,		1047/1405	4.33	4.45	4.32	4.39	4.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	5	3	0	4	3	2	3.08	1119/1236	3.56	3.92	4.00	4.11	3.08
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	2	0	0	6	4	3.83	896/1260	4.18	4.32	4.14	4.19	3.83
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	0	1	1	10	4.75	344/1255	4.51	4.53	4.33	4.37	4.75
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	1	0	0	1	10	4.58	563/1258	4.35	4.46	4.38	4.44	4.58
4. Were special techniques successful	5	0	0	1	0	4	7	4.42	255/ 873	4.12	4.14	4.03	4.04	4.42

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA	-	Expected	Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	 А	8	Required for Majors	3	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	0	В	5						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	3	C	4	General	12	Under-grad	17	Non-major	17
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	h
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	0	_			
				?	0						

Course-Section: SPAN 201 2 University of Maryland Title Intermediate Spanish I Baltimore County MAR 22, 2010

Instructor: Richards,France

Enrollment: 26 Questionnaires: 20

# Fall 2009 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Page 1437

Job IRBR3029

beadene course svardaction gaestionnaire														
			Fre	equer	ncie	s		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	2	0	4	6	7	3.84	1258/1509	4.09	4.42	4.31	4.34	3.84
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	2	1	5	8	4	3.55	1351/1509	4.29	4.39	4.26	4.32	3.55
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	2	0	3	8	6	3.84	1053/1287	4.42	4.48	4.30	4.35	3.84
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	1	4	10	4	3.75	1192/1459	4.31	4.32	4.22	4.30	3.75
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	3	7	7	2	3.30	1267/1406	3.75	4.19	4.09	4.09	3.30
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	1	5	6	7	3.85	978/1384	4.10	4.17	4.11	4.09	3.85
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	3	4	9	3	3.50	1303/1489	4.19	4.07	4.17	4.19	3.50
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	14	6	4.30	1222/1506	4.62	4.55	4.67	4.61	4.30
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	3	6	7	2	3.44	1273/1463	4.04	4.16	4.09	4.08	3.44
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	2	1	7	6	3	3.37	1385/1438	4.32	4.48	4.46	4.48	3.37
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	1	0	3	5	11		1292/1421		4.75	4.73	4.76	4.25
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	2	1	6	7	3		1302/1411		4.39	4.31	4.37	3.42
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	3	1	1	10	5		1223/1405		4.45	4.32	4.39	3.65
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	4	5	3	6	1		1181/1236					2.74
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	10	0	1	0	3	1	2	2 (0	1011/1260	4.18	4.32	4.14	4.19	3.60
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	10	0	1	1	3	4			1011/1260		4.53	4.14	4.19	3.80
· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	10	0	1	0	4	3	5 2		1143/1258		4.53	4.33		3.50
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 4. Were special techniques successful	10	0	1	4	1	1	3		792/ 873			4.03		3.10
T. WEIE SPECIAL LECHNIQUES SUCCESSIUL	ΤŪ	U	Т	4	Т	Τ	3	3.10	194/ 6/3	4.12	4.14	4.03	4.04	3.10
Frequ	lency	Dist	cribu	ution	ı									

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	l Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	 А	6	Required for Majors	4	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	В	8						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	2	C	3	General	12	Under-grad	20	Non-major	20
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	h
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	0	_			
				?	0						

University of Maryland Baltimore County

Intermediate Spanish I

Instructor: Enrollment:

Questionnaires: 20

Title

Richards,France 24

Fall 2009

Page 1438 MAR 22, 2010 Job IRBR3029

### Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Fro	equer 2	ncies 3	4	5	Ins Mean	tructor Rank	Course Mean	_	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
General  1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course  2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals  3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals  4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals  5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned  6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned  7. Was the grading system clearly explained  8. How many times was class cancelled  9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness  Lecture	0 0 0 0 1 1 1 1 5	0 0 0 1 0 1 0 0	1 1 1 1 1 1 1 0	1 0 1 0 1 0 0 0	4 5 1 2 4 5 1 0 4	6 3 4 6 7 5 8 5	8 11 13 10 6 7 12 11 4	4.15 4.35 4.26 3.84 3.94 4.42 4.58	759/1459 979/1406 886/1384	4.29 4.42 4.31 3.75 4.10 4.19 4.62	4.42 4.39 4.48 4.32 4.19 4.17 4.07 4.55 4.16	4.31 4.26 4.30 4.22 4.09 4.11 4.17 4.67 4.09	4.34 4.32 4.35 4.30 4.09 4.09 4.19 4.61 4.08	3.95 4.15 4.35 4.26 3.84 3.94 4.42 4.58 3.67
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2 1 2 2 1	0 0 0 0 4	1 1 1 1	0 0 0 0	2 0 2 0 4	5 6 6 6 3	10 12 9 11 6		708/1405	4.70 4.26 4.33	4.48 4.75 4.39 4.45 3.92	4.46 4.73 4.31 4.32 4.00	4.48 4.76 4.37 4.39 4.11	4.28 4.47 4.22 4.44 3.80
Discussion  1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned  2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate  3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion  4. Were special techniques successful	8 8 9 8	0 0 0 2	2 1 1 0	0 0 0	2 2 1 3	3 2 3 1	5 7 6 6	3.75 4.17 4.18 4.30	839/1255	4.51 4.35	4.32 4.53 4.46 4.14	4.14 4.33 4.38 4.03	4.19 4.37 4.44 4.04	3.75 4.17 4.18 4.30
Laboratory 2. Were you provided with adequate background information	19	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 198	***	****	4.22	4.51	***
Field Work  1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned  2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	19 19	0	1	0	0	0	0		****/ 48 ****/ 48	**** ****	**** ***	4.39 4.41	4.79 4.50	**** ****
Self Paced  1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	19	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 49	****	****	4.26	4.33	***
Frequence Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades	ıency	Dist	trib		n asons				Ту	pe			Majors	
00-27 0 0.00-0.99 0 A 11 28-55 2 1.00-1.99 0 B 6 56-83 4 2.00-2.99 5 C 0			quir		or Ma	 jor		4	Graduat Under-q		0	Majo	r major	0 20
84-150 3 3.00-3.49 3 D 0 Grad. 0 3.50-4.00 3 F 0 P 0 I 0 ? 0		Ele	ecti <sup>.</sup> her					0	#### - respons	Means t	here a	re not	enoug	

Course-Section: SPAN 201 4 University of Maryland Page 1439 Title MAR 22, 2010 Intermediate Spanish I Baltimore County

Instructor: Curto,Natalia

Enrollment: 23 Ouestionnaires: 23

56-83

Grad.

84-150

0

1

2.00-2.99

3.00-3.49

3.50-4.00

2

3

C

D

F

Ρ

I

4

0

0

0

0

0

## Fall 2009 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Job IRBR3029

Non-major 23

	Out at the same								equer	ncies	S		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
		Questions	5			NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		General	 L																
1. Did vo	u gain n	ew insights,skil		m this course	2	0	0	0	0	5	8	10	4.22	921/1509	4.09	4.42	4.31	4.34	4.22
		ctor make clear				0	0	0	0	1	4	18	4.74	278/1509	4.29	4.39	4.26	4.32	4.74
		uestions reflect		-	3	0	0	0	0	2	4	17	4.65	370/1287	4.42	4.48	4.30	4.35	4.65
4. Did ot	her eval	uations reflect	the ex	pected goals		0	1	0	2	1	7	12	4.32	705/1459	4.31	4.32	4.22	4.30	4.32
5. Did as	signed r	eadings contribu	ite to	what you lear	rned	0	4	2	3	6	5	3	3.21	1295/1406	3.75	4.19	4.09	4.09	3.21
6. Did wr	itten as	signments contri	ibute t	o what you le	earned	0	0	0	1	4	6	12	4.26	609/1384	4.10	4.17	4.11	4.09	4.26
7. Was the	e gradin	g system clearly	z expla	ined		0	0	0	3	3	6	11	4.09	930/1489	4.19	4.07	4.17	4.19	4.09
8. How man	ny times	was class cance	elled			0	0	0	0	0	1	22	4.96	292/1506	4.62	4.55	4.67	4.61	4.96
9. How wo	uld you	grade the overal	ll teac	hing effectiv	reness	2	0	0	0	3	8	10	4.33	545/1463	4.04	4.16	4.09	4.08	4.33
		Lecture	9																
1. Were t	. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared							0	0	0	5	18	4.78	396/1438	4.32	4.48	4.46	4.48	4.78
	. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject						0	0	0	0	1	22	4.96	269/1421	4.70	4.75	4.73	4.76	4.96
3. Was le	cture ma	terial presented	d and e	xplained clea	arly	2	0	0	0	0	7	14	4.67	416/1411	4.26	4.39	4.31	4.37	4.67
4. Did the	e lectur	es contribute to	what	you learned	-	1	0	0	0	0	4	18	4.82	273/1405	4.33	4.45	4.32	4.39	4.82
5. Did au	diovisua	l techniques enh	nance y	our understar	nding	0	16	2	0	3	1	1	2.86	1169/1236	3.56	3.92	4.00	4.11	2.86
		Discuss	sion																
1. Did cla	ass disc	ussions contribu	ite to	what you lear	ned	13	0	1	0	1	3	5	4.10	712/1260	4.18	4.32	4.14	4.19	4.10
		nts actively end		-		13	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	287/1255	4.51	4.53	4.33	4.37	4.80
		_	_			14	0	1	0	0	3	5	4.22	834/1258	4.35	4.46	4.38	4.44	4.22
	<ol> <li>Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion</li> <li>Were special techniques successful</li> </ol>						2	1	0	2	3	1	3.43	731/ 873	4.12	4.14	4.03	4.04	3.43
	$\operatorname{ ext{Fr}} olimits$							ribu	ation	n									
Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades									Rea	asons	S			Туј	pe			Majors	}
00-27	00-27 1 0.00-0.99 0 A 8						Red	quire	ed fo	or Ma	ajor	s	8	Graduat	e	0	Majo	or	0
28-55	6	1.00-1.99	0	В 9	)														

General

Other

Electives

12

0

1

Under-grad 23

#### - Means there are not enough

responses to be significant

Course-Section: SPAN 201 5 University of Maryland Page 1440 Title Intermediate Spanish I Baltimore County MAR 22, 2010

Instructor: King,Robin R

Enrollment: 24 Questionnaires: 18

Fall 2009 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Job IRBR3029

			Fre	equer	cie	s		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	8	5	5	3.83	1265/1509	4.09	4.42	4.31	4.34	3.83
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	5	11	4.50	543/1509	4.29	4.39	4.26	4.32	4.50
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	5	10	4.39	658/1287	4.42	4.48	4.30	4.35	4.39
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	2	3	6	7	4.00	979/1459	4.31	4.32	4.22	4.30	4.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	4	1	2	4	5	2	3.36	1252/1406	3.75	4.19	4.09	4.09	3.36
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	2	3	6	6	3.78	1036/1384	4.10	4.17	4.11	4.09	3.78
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	2	6	10	4.44	541/1489	4.19	4.07	4.17	4.19	4.44
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	3	15	4.83	722/1506	4.62	4.55	4.67	4.61	4.83
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	1	0	0	2	10	3	4.07	820/1463	4.04	4.16	4.09	4.08	4.07
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	1	6	10	4.53	775/1438	4.32	4.48	4.46	4.48	4.53
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	4	13	4.76	863/1421	4.70	4.75	4.73	4.76	4.76
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	2	7	8	4.35	789/1411	4.26	4.39	4.31	4.37	4.35
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	1	3	3	9	4.06	1024/1405	4.33	4.45	4.32	4.39	4.06
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	1	0	2	5	4	5	3.75	853/1236	3.56	3.92	4.00	4.11	3.75
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	1	0	7	5	4.23	637/1260		4.32	4.14	4.19	4.23
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	0	0	4	9	4.69	412/1255	4.51	4.53	4.33	4.37	4.69
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	2	0	4	7	4.23	829/1258	4.35	4.46	4.38	4.44	4.23
4. Were special techniques successful	5	1	Τ	Τ	4	2	4	3.58	677/ 873	4.12	4.14	4.03	4.04	3.58

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	l Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	 А	6	Required for Majors	4	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	В	9						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	1	C	2	General	9	Under-grad	18	Non-major	18
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means	there	are not enough	h
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	1	_			
				?	0						

Course-Section: SPAN 201 6

AN 201 6 University

Intermediate Spanish I

Instructor: Gomez-Rubio, Mar

Enrollment: 22 Questionnaires: 16

Title

### University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2009

Page 1441 MAR 22, 2010 Job IRBR3029

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

			Fre	mier	cies			Tnet	ructor	Course	Dent	UMBC	T.evel	Sect
Ouestions	NR	NΔ	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
׫«»«»»			<del>-</del>											
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	1	1	2	4	8	4.06	1072/1509	4.09	4.42	4.31	4.34	4.06
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	0	1	6	8	4.25	859/1509	4.29	4.39	4.26	4.32	4.25
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	6	9	4.50	519/1287	4.42	4.48	4.30	4.35	4.50
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	1	1	6	7	4.27	759/1459	4.31	4.32	4.22	4.30	4.27
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	1	5	5	3	3.71	1074/1406	3.75	4.19	4.09	4.09	3.71
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	5	3	8	4.19	685/1384	4.10	4.17	4.11	4.09	4.19
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	3	4	3	4	3.40	1343/1489	4.19	4.07	4.17	4.19	3.40
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	1	9	5	4.27	1251/1506	4.62	4.55	4.67	4.61	4.27
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	1	3	9	2	3.80	1060/1463	4.04	4.16	4.09	4.08	3.80
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	2	3	6	2	3.62	1355/1438	4.32	4.48	4.46	4.48	3.62
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	0	1	1	10	4.75	881/1421	4.70	4.75	4.73	4.76	4.75
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	0	0	2	6	4	4.17	957/1411	4.26	4.39	4.31	4.37	4.17
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	3	5	4	4.08	1010/1405	4.33	4.45	4.32	4.39	4.08
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	1	0	1	7	1	2	3.36	1045/1236	3.56	3.92	4.00	4.11	3.36
Discussion		_					_							
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	2	0	3	4.20	666/1260	4.18	4.32	4.14	4.19	4.20
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	11	0	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	505/1255	4.51	4.53	4.33	4.37	4.60
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	11	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	721/1258	4.35	4.46	4.38	4.44	4.40
4. Were special techniques successful	11	2	0	1	2	0	0	2.67	****/ 873	4.12	4.14	4.03	4.04	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	1 =	0	0	0	1	0	0	2 00	****/ 184	****	****	4.16	1 = 1	****
<u> </u>	15 15	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 198	****	****	4.16	4.54 4.51	****
<ol> <li>Were you provided with adequate background information</li> <li>Were necessary materials available for lab activities</li> </ol>	15	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 184	****	****	4.22	4.62	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	15	0	0	0	1	0	0		****/ 177	****	****	4.46	4.65	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	15	0	0	0	1	0	0		****/ 165	****	****	4.18	4.56	****
J. Were requirements for tab reports creatry specified	13	O	U	U		U	U	3.00	/ 103			1.10	1.50	
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	15	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 89	****	5.00	4.49	5.00	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	15	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 92	****	4.93	4.54	****	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 90	****	4.62	4.50	****	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 92	****	4.93	4.38	4.00	***
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	15	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 93	****	4.86	4.06	2.88	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.39	4.79	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	15	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.41	4.50	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	15	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 47	****	****	4.51	4.83	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	15	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 47	****	****	4.18	4.56	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	15	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 44	****	****	4.32	4.67	****
Self Paced		•	•			•	•		,			4 0 5	4 05	
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 49	***	****	4.26	4.33	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	15	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 41	****	****	4.14	****	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	15	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 46	****	****	4.31	4.00	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	15	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 37	****	****	4.05	****	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	15	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 30	* * * *	^ ^ * *	4.27	^ ^ * *	^ ^ * *

Course-Section: SPAN 201 6

Title Intermediate Spanish I

Instructor: Gomez-Rubio, Mar

Enrollment: 22
Questionnaires: 16

University of Maryland
Baltimore County
Fall 2009

Page 1441 MAR 22, 2010 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	 А	9	Required for Majors	7	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	В	5						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	7	Under-grad	16	Non-major	16
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	4	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	n
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	0	-		_	
				?	1						

Course-Section: SPAN 201 7

Intermediate Spanish I

Title Instructor: Gomez-Rubio,Mar

Enrollment: 25 Questionnaires: 15

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2009

Page 1442 MAR 22, 2010 Job IRBR3029

### Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

		Question	s		NR	NA	Fre	equer 2	ncies 3	4	5	Inst Mean	ructor Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
		 Genera																
1 Did vou	ı gəin new	Genera insights,ski	_	m this source	1	0	1	0	1	3	9	4.36	778/1509	4.09	4.42	4.31	4.34	4.36
		or make clear			1	0	0	1	1	2	10	4.50	543/1509		4.39	4.26	4.32	4.50
		estions reflec			1	0	0	0	1	4	9	4.57	453/1287		4.48	4.30	4.35	4.57
		ations reflect			1	1	0	0	2	2	9	4.54	421/1459		4.32	4.22	4.30	4.54
				what you learned	1	2	0	0	2	3	7	4.42	434/1406		4.19	4.09	4.09	4.42
				o what you learned	1	0	3	0	1	3	7	3.79	1030/1384		4.17	4.11	4.09	3.79
		system clearl			1	0	0	2	0	1	11	4.50	458/1489	4.19	4.07	4.17	4.19	4.50
8. How man	ny times w	vas class cand	elled		1	0	1	0	0	6	7	4.29	1236/1506	4.62	4.55	4.67	4.61	4.29
				hing effectiveness	5	2	0	0	0	5	3	4.38	500/1463	4.04	4.16	4.09	4.08	4.38
		Lectur	е															
		ctor's lecture			1	0	1	0	1	3	9	4.36	981/1438		4.48	4.46	4.48	4.36
		or seem inter			1	0	0	0	1	2	11	4.71	950/1421		4.75	4.73	4.76	4.71
				xplained clearly	1	0	0	0	2	2	10	4.57	532/1411		4.39	4.31	4.37	4.57
		s contribute t			1	0	1	0	1	3	9	4.36	808/1405		4.45	4.32	4.39	4.36
5. Did aud	liovisual	techniques en	hance y	our understanding	3	1	0	2	3	0	6	3.91	774/1236	3.56	3.92	4.00	4.11	3.91
		Discus																
1. Did cla	ass discus	ssions contrib	ute to	what you learned	8	0	1	0	0	1	5	4.29	597/1260		4.32	4.14	4.19	4.29
				d to participate	8	0	0	0	1	0	6	4.71	390/1255		4.53	4.33	4.37	4.71
				d open discussion	8	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	299/1258		4.46	4.38	4.44	4.86
4. Were sp	ecial tec	chniques succe	sstul		8	2	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	261/ 873	4.12	4.14	4.03	4.04	4.40
1 5 1 6		Field			1.4	0	-	0	•	•	0	1 00	***** / 40	de de de de		4 20	4 50	
I. Did fie	eld experi	lence contribu	te to w	hat you learned	14	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.39	4.79	***
		Self														4 0 0	4 00	
				what you learned	13	0	0	0	0	0	2	3.00	****/ 49	****	****	4.26	4.33	****
		ons make clea			13	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 41 ****/ 46	****	****	4.14	4 00	****
3. Were yo	our contac	cts with the i	nstruct	or neipiul	13	0	0	U	U	0	2	5.00	****/ 46	****	****	4.31	4.00	***
				Frequ	lency	Dist	ribu	ıtior	1									
Credits Ea	rned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	sons	5			Ту	pe			Majors	}
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 4		Rec	uire	ed fo	or Ma	ior	 s	4	 Graduat	 e	0	 Majo	 or	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В 5			1			-5	_	_		_	-		_	-
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	2	C 4		Ger	neral					4	Under-g	rad 1	.5	Non-	major	15
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	1	D 0									3				3	-
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F 0		Ele	ectiv	res				1	#### -	Means t	here a	re not	enoug	ŗh
				P 0									respons				_	
				I 0		Oth	ner					0	-					
				? 0														

Course-Section: SPAN 201 8 University of Maryland Page 1443 Title Intermediate Spanish I Baltimore County MAR 22, 2010

Instructor: King,Robin R

Enrollment: 24 Questionnaires: 18

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Job IRBR3029

Fall 2009

				Fre	equer	ncies	5		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	N.	ΙA	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	4	7	5	3.88	1228/1509	4.09	4.42	4.31	4.34	3.88
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1		0	0	0	0	7	10	4.59	447/1509	4.29	4.39	4.26	4.32	4.59
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	. 1		0	0	0	2	4	11	4.53	500/1287	4.42	4.48	4.30	4.35	4.53
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1		0	0	0	1	7	9	4.47	503/1459	4.31	4.32	4.22	4.30	4.47
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you lear	ned 1		2	2	0	3	6	4	3.67	1105/1406	3.75	4.19	4.09	4.09	3.67
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you le			0	1	0	3	6	7	4.06	779/1384	4.10	4.17	4.11	4.09	4.06
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1		0	0	1	0	4	12	4.59	364/1489	4.19	4.07	4.17	4.19	4.59
8. How many times was class cancelled	1		0	0	0	0	1	16	4.94	350/1506	4.62	4.55	4.67	4.61	4.94
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effective	reness 4		0	0	0	4	8	2		1021/1463		4.16	4.09	4.08	3.86
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2		0	0	0	1	5	10	4.56	725/1438		4.48	4.46	4.48	4.56
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	. 2		0	0	0	1	1	14	4.81	768/1421	4.70	4.75	4.73	4.76	4.81
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clea	rly 2		0	0	0	3	6	7	4.25	885/1411	4.26	4.39	4.31	4.37	4.25
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3		0	0	1	1	2	11	4.53	605/1405	4.33	4.45	4.32	4.39	4.53
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understan	ding 2		4	1	2	4	4	1	3.17	1099/1236	3.56	3.92	4.00	4.11	3.17
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you lear	med 7		0	Λ	1	1	4	5	4.18	671/1260	4.18	4.32	4.14	4.19	4.18
2. Were all students actively encouraged to particip			0	0	0	2	1	Ω	4.55	547/1255	4.51	4.53	4.33	4.37	4.55
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discus			0	0	0	2	4	5	4.27	807/1258		4.46	4.38	4.44	4.27
4. Were special techniques successful	7		1	2	1	1	3	3	3.40	738/ 873	4.12	4.14	4.03	4.04	3.40
1. Were special ecomiques successful	•		_	_	-	-	,	5	3.10	7307 073	1.12		1.05	1.01	3.10
	Frequenc	y D	istr	ribu	ıtior	ı									
Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected G	rades				Rea	sons	5			Tyr	pe			Majors	

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

Course-Section: SPAN 201 9 University of Maryland Intermediate Spanish I Baltimore County

Title

4. Were special techniques successful

Instructor: Colombo, Laura M Enrollment: Ouestionnaires: 17

Fall 2009 Student Course Evaluation Ouestionnaire

Page 1444 MAR 22, 2010

Job IRBR3029

Frequencies Instructor Course Dept UMBC Level Sect Ouestions NR NA 1 2 3 4 5 Mean Rank Mean Mean Mean Mean General 1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course 0 0 0 1 1 5 10 4.41 711/1509 4.09 4.42 4.31 4.34 4.41 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals 0 0 0 0 1 6 10 4.53 519/1509 4.29 4.39 4.26 4.32 4.53 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals 0 0 0 0 1 6 10 4.53 500/1287 4.42 4.48 4.30 4.35 4.53 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals 0 1 0 0 1 4 11 4.63 324/1459 4.31 4.32 4.22 4.30 4.63 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 2 1 0 3 3 2 6 3.79 1023/1406 3.75 4.19 4.09 4.09 3.79 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 2 0 0 0 1 7 7 4.40 440/1384 4.10 4.17 4.11 4.09 4.40 7. Was the grading system clearly explained 2 0 0 0 0 7 8 4.53 422/1489 4.19 4.07 4.17 4.19 4.53 8. How many times was class cancelled 3 0 0 0 0 4 10 4.71 896/1506 4.62 4.55 4.67 4.61 4.71 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 3 0 0 0 1 6 7 4.43 438/1463 4.04 4.16 4.09 4.08 4.43 Lecture 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 3 0 0 0 0 2 12 4.86 291/1438 4.32 4.48 4.46 4.48 4.86 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 3 0 0 0 0 1 13 4.93 429/1421 4.70 4.75 4.73 4.76 4.93 0 1 5 9 4.53 580/1411 4.26 4.39 4.31 4.37 4.53 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 2 0 0 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 2 0 0 0 1 5 9 4.53 605/1405 4.33 4.45 4.32 4.39 4.53 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 3 1 0 0 2 4 7 4.38 373/1236 3.56 3.92 4.00 4.11 4.38 Discussion 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 10 0 0 1 6 4.86 172/1260 4.18 4.32 4.14 4.19 4.86 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 10 0 0 0 0 2 5 4.71 390/1255 4.51 4.53 4.33 4.37 4.71 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 10 0 0 0 0 1 6 4.86 299/1258 4.35 4.46 4.38 4.44 4.86

#### Frequency Distribution

0 0 0 0 7 5.00 1/873 4.12 4.14 4.03 4.04 5.00

10

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	 А	4	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	0	В	9						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	4	C	2	General	14	Under-grad	17	Non-major	17
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means	there	are not enough	n
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	0	-			
				?	0						

Course-Section: SPAN 202 1

Title Intermediate Spanish I

Instructor: Val, Adriana

Enrollment: 17
Questionnaires: 10

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2009 Page 1445 MAR 22, 2010 Job IRBR3029

#### Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Ouestions	NR	NA	Fr	equei 2	ncies 3	5 4	5	Inst Mean	tructor Rank	Course	Dept Mean		Level Mean	Sect Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	1	0	1	4	3	3.89	1228/1509	3.89	4.42	4.31	4.34	3.89
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	1	1	4	3	4.00	1086/1509	4.00	4.39	4.26	4.32	4.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	7	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1287	****	4.48	4.30	4.35	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	1	0	2	6	4.44	553/1459	4.44	4.32	4.22	4.30	4.44
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	1	1	1	0	0	6	4.13	720/1406	4.13	4.19	4.09	4.09	4.13
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	0	1	1	6	4.22	649/1384	4.22	4.17	4.11	4.09	4.22
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	1	1	1			674/1489	4.33	4.07	4.17	4.19	4.33
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	9	0		1383/1506		4.55	4.67	4.61	4.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	2	0	1	1	2	1	3.60	1207/1463	3.60	4.16	4.09	4.08	3.60
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	1	3	5		878/1438		4.48	4.46	4.48	4.44
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	2	0	7		1123/1421	4.56	4.75	4.73	4.76	4.56
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	1	0	2	2			1153/1411		4.39	4.31		3.89
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	0	1	3			1047/1405	4.00	4.45	4.32	4.39	4.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	1	1	1	6	4.33	421/1236	4.33	3.92	4.00	4.11	4.33
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	0	2	2	4	3.89	876/1260	3.89	4.32	4.14	4.19	3.89
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	2	0	1	6	4.22	803/1255	4.22	4.53	4.33	4.37	4.22
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	1	0	1	7	4.56	584/1258	4.56	4.46	4.38	4.44	4.56
4. Were special techniques successful	1	1	1	1	1	1	4	3.75	610/ 873	3.75	4.14	4.03	4.04	3.75
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	8	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	, -	****	****	4.16	4.54	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	8	0	1	0	0	0	1		****/ 198	****	****	4.22	4.51	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	8	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 184	****	****	4.48	4.62	****
Seminar		_					_							
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	8	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	,	****	5.00	4.49	5.00	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	8	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	, -	****	4.93	4.38	4.00	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	8	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 93	****	4.86	4.06	2.88	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	8	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.39	4.79	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	8	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.41	4.50	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	8	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 47	****	****	4.51	4.83	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	8	1	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 47	****	****	4.18	4.56	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	8	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	,	****	****	4.26	4.33	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	8	1	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 46	****	****	4.31	4.00	****
Frequ	iency	Dist	trib	utio	n									

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

I 0 Other 1 ?

Course-Section: SPAN 301 1 University of Maryland Title Advanced Spanish I

I

0

0

Baltimore County MAR 22, 2010 Fall 2009 Job IRBR3029

0

Page 1446

Instructor: Medina, Adriana (Instr. A) Enrollment: 8

Questionnaires: 7

C+udon+	Courac	Erraluation	Ouestionnaire
Scudent	COULSE	Evaluation	Odescionnarie

								_	ncies		_		ructor	Course	_			
		Question	S		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		Genera	 1															
1. Did vo	ou gain n	ew insights,ski		m this course	0	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	201/1509	4.54	4.42	4.31	4.32	4.86
		ctor make clear			0	0	0	0	1	1	5	4.57	. ,	4.48	4.39	4.26	4.25	4.57
		uestions reflec			0	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71			4.48	4.30	4.33	4.71
		uations reflect			0	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	227/1459	4.57	4.32	4.22	4.26	4.71
				what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	187/1406	4.54	4.19	4.09	4.12	4.71
	_	-		o what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	182/1384	4.42	4.17	4.11	4.15	4.71
7. Was th	e gradin	g system clearl	y expla	ined	0	0	0	1	2	3	1	3.57	1275/1489	3.65	4.07	4.17	4.14	3.57
		was class canc			0	0	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	1014/1506	4.41	4.55	4.67	4.67	4.57
9. How wo	ould you	grade the overa	ll tead	hing effectiveness	1	0	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	325/1463	4.19	4.16	4.09	4.08	4.50
		Lectur	e															
1. Were t	he instr	uctor's lecture	_	prepared	0	0	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	712/1438	4.48	4.48	4.46	4.43	4.57
		ctor seem inter			0	0	0	0	0	0	7		1/1421	4.88	4.75	4.73	4.73	5.00
				explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	3	3	4.50		4.30	4.39	4.31	4.29	4.25
		es contribute t			0	0	0	0	0	2	5		. ,		4.45	4.32		4.71
				our understanding	0	4	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	421/1236					4.33
		Discus	gion															
1. Did cl	ass disc			what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1260	4.77	4.32	4.14	4.22	5.00
				ed to participate	2	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1255		4.53	4.33	4.37	5.00
				d open discussion	2	0	0	0	0	1	4		363/1258		4.46	4.38	4.42	4.80
		echniques succe			2	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	,	4.59				5.00
				Frequ	iency	/ Dist	trib	utio	n									
				-	-													
Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Re	asons	3			Ту	pe 			Majors	; 
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A 3		Red	quir	ed f	or Ma	ajors	3	4	Graduat	е	0	Majo	or	1
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	В 3														
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	0	C 0		Ger	nera	1				1	Under-g	rad	7	Non-	-major	6
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	1	D 0														
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	0	F 0		Ele	ecti	ves				1	#### -				_	jh
				P 0									respons	es to b	e sign	nifican	ıt	

Other

Course-Section: SPAN 301 1 University of Maryland Page 1447 Title Advanced Spanish I Baltimore County MAR 22, 2010

Job IRBR3029

Title Advanced Spanish I Baltimore County
Instructor: (Instr. B) Fall 2009

Enrollment: 8

Questionnaires: 7 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Queberonn	.alleb	,		beadene coe	LIBC	LVal	aacı	011 Q	ucbc.	1011110		•						
							Fr	eque	ncies	3		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
		Question	.s		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		Genera	.1															
1. Did you	u gain n	ew insights,ski	lls fro	m this course	0	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	201/1509	4.54	4.42	4.31	4.32	4.8
2. Did the	e instru	ctor make clear	the ex	pected goals	0	0	0	0	1	1	5	4.57	459/1509	4.48	4.39	4.26	4.25	4.5
3. Did the	e exam q	uestions reflec	t the e	xpected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	304/1287	4.65	4.48	4.30	4.33	4.7
4. Did oth	her eval	uations reflect	the ex	pected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	227/1459	4.57	4.32	4.22	4.26	4.7
5. Did as:	signed r	eadings contrib	ute to	what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	187/1406	4.54	4.19	4.09	4.12	4.7
6. Did wr	itten as	signments contr	ibute t	o what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	182/1384	4.42	4.17	4.11	4.15	4.7
7. Was the	e gradin	g system clearl	y expla	ined	0	0	0	1	2	3	1	3.57	1275/1489	3.65	4.07	4.17	4.14	3.5
8. How man	ny times	was class cand	elled		0	0	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	1014/1506	4.41	4.55	4.67	4.67	4.5
		Lectur	e															
1. Were th	he instr	uctor's lecture	s well	prepared	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1438	4.48	4.48	4.46	4.43	4.5
2. Did the	e instru	ctor seem inter	ested i	n the subject	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1421	4.88	4.75	4.73	4.73	5.0
3. Was le	cture ma	terial presente	d and e	xplained clearly	5	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	1051/1411	4.30	4.39	4.31	4.29	4.2
4. Did the	e lectur	es contribute t	o what	you learned	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1405	4.46	4.45	4.32	4.32	4.7
5. Did au	diovisua	l techniques en	hance y	our understanding	6	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/1236	4.17	3.92	4.00	4.07	4.3
		Discus	sion															
1. Did cla	ass disc	ussions contrib	ute to	what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1260	4.77	4.32	4.14	4.22	5.0
2. Were a	ll stude	nts actively en	courage	d to participate	2	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1255	4.91	4.53	4.33	4.37	5.0
3. Did the	e instru	ctor encourage	fair an	d open discussion	2	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	363/1258	4.81	4.46	4.38	4.42	4.8
4. Were s	pecial t	echniques succe	ssful	_	2	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/ 873	4.59	4.14	4.03	4.08	5.0
				Frequ	iency	/ Dis	trib	utio	n									
Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	asons	5			Ty	pe			Majors	3
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A 3		Re	quir	ed f	or Ma	ajors	3	4	Graduat	e	0	Majo	or	1
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B 3		~		,				-	1	,	-			_
56-83		2.00-2.99		C 0		Ge:	nera	Τ				1	Under-g	rad	7	Non-	-major	6
84-150		3.00-3.49		D 0														
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	0	F 0		El	ecti	ves				1	#### - 1				_	jh
				P 0								_	respons	es to k	e sign	ificar	ıt	
				I 0		Ot:	her					0						

Course-Section: SPAN 301 2 University of Maryland Title Advanced Spanish I Medina, Adriana Instructor:

Baltimore County Fall 2009

Frequencies

Instructor

Page 1448

MAR 22, 2010

Job IRBR3029

Course Dept UMBC Level Sect

Enrollment: 20 Questionnaires: 18 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean			
		Genera	 1															
1. Did you	u gain ne	ew insights,ski	- lls fro	om this course	1	0	0	1	2	5	9	4.29	842/1509	4.54	4.42	4.31	4.32	4.29
		ctor make clear			1	0	2	0	0	5	10	4.24	880/1509	4.48	4.39	4.26	4.25	4.24
		estions reflec			1	0	0	1	2	2	12	4.47	554/1287	4.65	4.48	4.30	4.33	4.47
4. Did oth	her evalī	ations reflect	the ex	pected goals	1	0	0	2	0	7	8	4.24	792/1459	4.57	4.32	4.22	4.26	4.24
5. Did ass	signed re	eadings contrib	ute to	what you learned	1	0	0	1	3	3	10	4.29	539/1406	4.54	4.19	4.09	4.12	4.29
6. Did wr	itten ass	signments contr	ibute t	o what you learned	1	0	1	2	2	4	8	3.94	886/1384	4.42	4.17	4.11	4.15	3.94
7. Was the	e grading	g system clearly	y expla	ined	1	0	3	3	3	4	4	3.18	1386/1489	3.65	4.07	4.17	4.14	3.18
8. How man	ny times	was class canc	elled		1	0	0	0	1	13	3	4.12	1340/1506	4.41	4.55	4.67	4.67	4.12
9. How wor	uld you g	grade the overa	ll teac	hing effectiveness	6	0	0	2	0	5	5	4.08	809/1463	4.19	4.16	4.09	4.08	4.08
		Lectur	<u> </u>															
1 Were th	he instri	actor's lecture		prepared	3	0	0	1	2	4	8	4 27	1063/1438	4.48	4.48	4.46	4.43	4.27
		ctor seem inter			2	0	0	0	1	2	13	4.75	881/1421	4.88	4.75	4.73	4.73	4.75
					3	0	1	0	2	4	8	4.20	936/1411	4.30	4.39	4.31	4.29	4.20
	<ol> <li>Was lecture material presented and explained clearly</li> <li>Did the lectures contribute to what you learned</li> </ol>							0	2	5	8	4.40	758/1405	4.46	4.45	4.32	4.32	4.40
				your understanding	3	0 13	0	0	0	0	2		****/1236	4.17	3.92	4.00	4.07	****
		1		, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,														
		Discus	sion															
1. Did cla	ass discu	ussions contrib	ute to	what you learned	7	0	0	1	0	3	7	4.45	460/1260	4.77	4.32	4.14	4.22	4.45
2. Were a	ll studer	nts actively en	courage	ed to participate	7	0	0	0	0	2	9	4.82	278/1255	4.91	4.53	4.33	4.37	4.82
				d open discussion	7	0	0	0	0	2	9	4.82	350/1258	4.81	4.46	4.38	4.42	4.82
4. Were sp	pecial te	echniques succe	ssful		7	1	0	1	1	3	5	4.20	366/ 873	4.59	4.14	4.03	4.08	4.20
				Freq	uency	, Dis	trib	utio	n									
Credits Ea		Cum. GPA	Demonstrad Consider				Da		_				_			M	_	
	Expected Grades				e	ason	.s 			Тур				Majors	; 			
00-27 4 0.00-0.99 0 A 6						Re	quir	ed f	or M	ajor	s 1	.1	Graduate	2	0	Majo	or	3
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	в б														
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	1	C 1		Ge	nera	1				1	Under-gr	ad 1	.8	Non-	major	15
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	2	D 0														
Grad. 0 3.50-4.00 5 F 0						El	ecti	ves				2	#### - M				_	<sub>J</sub> h
				P 0									response	es to b	e sign	ifican	ıt	
				I 0		Ot	her					2						

Course-Section: SPAN 301 3 Title Advanced Spanish I Instructor: Stolle-McAllist

Questions

Enrollment:

Questionnaires: 19

19

University of Maryland Page 1449 MAR 22, 2010 Baltimore County Fall 2009 Job IRBR3029

Instructor

Rank

Course Dept UMBC Level Sect

Mean Mean Mean Mean

Frequencies

NR NA 1 2 3 4 5 Mean

Ctudont	Comman	Errolustion	Ouestionnaire
Student	Course	Evaluation	Questionnaire

		Genera	1															
1. Did you	u gain n	ew insights,ski	lls fro	m this course	0	0	0	1	3	7	8	4.16	987/1509	4.54	4.42	4.31	4.32	4.16
2. Did the	e instru	ctor make clear	the ex	pected goals	0	0	0	0	2	5	12	4.53	519/1509	4.48	4.39	4.26	4.25	4.53
3. Did the	e exam q	uestions reflec	t the e	expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	4	14	4.68	337/1287	4.65	4.48	4.30	4.33	4.68
4. Did oth	her eval	uations reflect	the ex	pected goals	0	0	0	0	0	7	12	4.63	313/1459	4.57	4.32	4.22	4.26	4.63
5. Did ass	signed r	eadings contrib	ute to	what you learned	0	0	0	0	3	5	11	4.42	423/1406	4.54	4.19	4.09	4.12	4.42
6. Did wr:	itten as	signments contr	ibute t	o what you learned	0	0	1	0	2	5	11	4.32	557/1384	4.42	4.17	4.11	4.15	4.32
7. Was the	e gradin	g system clearl	y expla	ined	0	0	0	0	3	8	8	4.26	749/1489	3.65	4.07	4.17	4.14	4.26
8. How man	ny times	was class canc	elled		0	0	0	0	0	12	7	4.37	1188/1506	4.41	4.55	4.67	4.67	4.37
9. How wor	uld you	grade the overa	ll teac	hing effectiveness	2	1	0	0	3	10	3	4.00	853/1463	4.19	4.16	4.09	4.08	4.00
		Lectur	e															
1. Were th	he instr	uctor's lecture	s well	prepared	1	0	0	0	0	7	11	4.61	660/1438	4.48	4.48	4.46	4.43	4.61
2. Did the	e instru	ctor seem inter	ested i	n the subject	1	0	0	0	0	2	16	4.89	588/1421	4.88	4.75	4.73	4.73	4.89
				explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	9	9	4.50	617/1411	4.30	4.39	4.31	4.29	4.50
		es contribute t		1	0	0	1	2	6	9	4.28	881/1405	4.46	4.45	4.32	4.32	4.28	
5. Did aud	diovisua	l techniques en	hance y	our understanding	1	1	1	1	2	6	7	4.00	664/1236	4.17	3.92	4.00	4.07	4.00
		Discus	sion															
1. Did cla	ass disc			what you learned	8	0	0	0	0	4	7	4.64	330/1260	4.77	4.32	4.14	4.22	4.64
				ed to participate	8		0				10		278/1255	4.91		4.33		
				d open discussion	8		0	0						4.81				
		echniques succe			8	4	0	1	0				394/ 873					
				Frequ	encv	Dis	trib	ut i ou	n									
				11040	cricy	DIS	CIID	ac101										
Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	ason	ıs			Typ	e			Majors	3
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	A 5		Re	quir	ed f	or M	 Major	s	8	Graduate	:	0	Majo	or	5	
28-55	4	в 8																
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	0	C 4		Ger	nera:	1				1	Under-gr	ad 1	.9	Non-	-major	14
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	4	D 0									_				-	
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F 0		El	ecti	ves				6	#### - M	leans t	here a	re not	enoug	jh
				P 0									response	s to b	e sign	ificar	ıt	
			I 0		Ot1	her					2	_		_				
				? 1														

Baltimore County

Course-Section: SPAN 302 1 University of Maryland Page 1450 Title Advanced Spanish II MAR 22, 2010 Instructor: Schneider, Judit Fall 2009 Job IRBR3029

Frequencies

Instructor

Course Dept UMBC Level Sect

Enrollment:	6				
Ouestionnaires:	5	Student	Course	Evaluation	Ouestionnaire

		Question		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
		 Genera	 1															
1. Did you	u gain ne	ew insights,ski	lls fro	m this course	0	0	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	482/1509	3.96	4.42	4.31	4.32	4.60
2. Did the	e instruc	ctor make clear	the ex	pected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1509	4.19	4.39	4.26	4.25	5.00
3. Did the	e exam qı	estions reflec	t the e	xpected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1287	4.53	4.48	4.30	4.33	5.00
4. Did oth	her evalı	uations reflect	the ex	pected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1459	4.23	4.32	4.22	4.26	5.00
5. Did ass	signed re	eadings contrib	ute to	what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	135/1406	4.53	4.19	4.09	4.12	4.80
6. Did wr	itten ass	signments contr	ibute t	o what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1384	4.25	4.17	4.11	4.15	5.00
7. Was the	e grading	g system clearl	y expla	ined	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	151/1489	3.78	4.07	4.17	4.14	4.80
8. How man	ny times	was class canc	elled		0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1506	4.47	4.55	4.67	4.67	5.00
9. How wor	uld you g	grade the overa	ll teac	hing effectiveness	2	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1463	4.08	4.16	4.09	4.08	5.00
		Lectur	e															
1. Were th	he instru	actor's lecture		prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1438	4.17	4.48	4.46	4.43	5.00
		ctor seem inter			0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1421	4.92	4.75	4.73	4.73	5.00
		xplained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	243/1411	4.32	4.39	4.31	4.29	4.80		
		es contribute t			0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1405	4.33	4.45	4.32	4.32	5.00
				our understanding	0	1	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1236	4.62	3.92	4.00	4.07	5.00
		-	-	3														
		Discus	sion															
1. Did cla	ass discu	ussions contrib	ute to	what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1260	3.75	4.32	4.14	4.22	****
2. Were a	ll studer	nts actively en	courage	d to participate	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1255	4.33	4.53	4.33	4.37	****
3. Did the	e instruc	ctor encourage	fair an	d open discussion	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1258	4.75	4.46	4.38	4.42	****
4. Were sp	pecial te	echniques succe	ssful		4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 873	3.91	4.14	4.03	4.08	****
				Frequ	ıency	/ Dis	trib	utio	n									
Credits Ea	awn ad	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Do	ason	~			Пт то				Majors	
crearts E		Cuiii. GPA											Тур	·				·
00-27	A 5		Re	quir	ed f	or Ma	ajors	3	3	Graduate	2	0	Majo	r	3			
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	в 0														
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	0	C 0		Ge:	nera	1				0	Under-gr	ad	5	Non-	major	2
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D 0														
Grad. $0   3.50-4.00   3$ F $0$						El	ecti	ves				1	#### - M				_	jh
P 0													response	s to b	e sign	ifican	ıt	
		I 0 Other										0						

Course-Section: SPAN 302 2

Advanced Spanish II

Title Sloane, Robert A

Instructor:

Enrollment: 19 Questionnaires: 16

#### University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2009

Page 1451 MAR 22, 2010 Job IRBR3029

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

			Fre	equei	ncies	S		Ins	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC:	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	_	3	4	5	Mean			Mean	Mean		Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	2	2	4	5	3		1438/1509	3.96	4.42	4.31	4.32	3.31
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	3	1	3	5	4	3.38	1410/1509	4.19	4.39	4.26	4.25	3.38
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	4	4	7	4.06		4.53	4.48	4.30	4.33	4.06
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	3	5	4	3		1325/1459	4.23	4.32	4.22	4.26	3.47
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	8	6	4.25	587/1406	4.53	4.19	4.09	4.12	4.25
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	2	4	6	3	3.50	1192/1384	4.25	4.17	4.11	4.15	3.50
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	4	4	2	4	2	2.75	1438/1489	3.78	4.07	4.17	4.14	2.75
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	2	13	1	3.94	1428/1506	4.47	4.55	4.67	4.67	3.94
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	2	2	3	4	2	3.15	1367/1463	4.08	4.16	4.09	4.08	3.15
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	2	2	0	6	2	3 33	1388/1438	4.17	4.48	4.46	4.43	3.33
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	0	0	2	10	4.83	716/1421	4.92	4.75	4.73	4.73	4.83
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	0	2	1	6	3		1174/1411	4.32	4.39	4.31	4.29	3.83
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	1	1	3	3	4		1220/1405	4.33	4.45	4.32		3.67
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	0	0	1	2	3	7	4.23	504/1236			4.00		4.23
5. Did didiovibual teelmiques emanee jour understanding	3	Ü	Ü	_	-	3	,	1.23	301/1230	1.02	3.72	1.00	1.07	1.25
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	1	1	3	2	5	3.75	936/1260	3.75	4.32	4.14	4.22	3.75
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	0	2	4	6	4.33	723/1255	4.33	4.53	4.33	4.37	4.33
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	0	1	1	10	4.75	421/1258	4.75	4.46	4.38	4.42	4.75
4. Were special techniques successful	4	1	0	0	4	4	3	3.91	536/ 873	3.91	4.14	4.03	4.08	3.91
Laboratory														
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	15	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 198	****	****	4.22	4.17	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	15	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 184	****	****	4.48	4.52	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	15	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 89	****	5.00	4.49	4.86	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 92	****	4.93	4.54	4.67	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 90	****	4.62	4.50	4.63	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 92	****	4.93	4.38	4.73	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	15	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	,	****	4.86	4.06	3.94	****
									, , ,					
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.39	4.61	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	15	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.41	4.34	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	15	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 47	****	****	4.51	4.62	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	15	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 47	****	****	4.18	4.47	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	15	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 44	****	****	4.32	4.40	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 49	****	****	4.26	5.00	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	15	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 41	****	****	4.14	5.00	****
Were your contacts with the instructor helpful		0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 46	****	****	4.31	5.00	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	15 15	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 37	****	****	4.05	5.00	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	15	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.27	5.00	****
Total Control of the seasons		-	-	J	-	J	Ū		, 30					

Course-Section: SPAN 302 2 Title

Advanced Spanish II

Sloane, Robert A Instructor:

Enrollment: 19 Questionnaires: 16

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2009

Page 1451 MAR 22, 2010 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits	edits Earned Cum. GPA		Expected	Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors		
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	 6	Required for Majors	11	Graduate	0	Major	8
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	0	В	5						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	0	С	0	General	0	Under-grad	16	Non-major	8
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	2	#### - Means	there	are not enough	
				P	0			responses to	be sig	nificant	
				I	0	Other	1	_	_		
				?	4						

Course-Section: SPAN 305 1

Span For Heritage Span

Instructor: Schwartz, Ana M

Enrollment: 11
Questionnaires: 10

Title

#### University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2009

Page 1452 MAR 22, 2010 Job IRBR3029

### Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

			Fre	eaner	ncies			Inst	ructor	Course	Dept.	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	5	5	4.50	598/1509	4.50	4.42	4.31	4.32	4.50
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	116/1509	4.90	4.39	4.26	4.25	4.90
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	208/1287	4.80	4.48	4.30	4.33	4.80
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	146/1459	4.80	4.32	4.22	4.26	4.80
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	135/1406	4.80	4.19	4.09	4.12	4.80
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	2	7	4.60	278/1384	4.60	4.17	4.11	4.15	4.60
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	1	8	4.70	243/1489	4.70	4.07	4.17	4.14	4.70
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	6	4	4.40	1166/1506	4.40	4.55	4.67	4.67	4.40
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	209/1463	4.67	4.16	4.09	4.08	4.67
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	514/1438	4.71	4.48	4.46	4.43	4.71
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	614/1421	4.88	4.75	4.73	4.73	4.88
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	169/1411	4.88	4.39	4.31	4.29	4.88
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	205/1405	4.88	4.45	4.32	4.32	4.88
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	2	0	0	1	3	2	4.17	563/1236	4.17	3.92	4.00	4.07	4.17
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	370/1260	4.57	4.32	4.14	4.22	4.57
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	246/1255	4.86	4.53	4.33	4.37	4.86
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	299/1258	4.86	4.46	4.38	4.42	4.86
4. Were special techniques successful	3	0	0	0	1	1	5	4.57	187/ 873	4.57	4.14	4.03	4.08	4.57
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	9	0	0	0	0	1	0	4 00	****/ 184	****	****	4.16	4.07	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	9	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 198	****	****	4.22	4.17	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	9	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 184	****	****	4.48	4.52	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	9	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 177	****	****	4.36	4.30	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	9	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 165	****	****	4.18	4.11	***
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	9	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 89	****	5.00	4.49	4.86	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	9	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 92	****	4.93	4.54	4.67	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 90	****	4.62	4.50	4.63	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 92	****	4.93	4.38	4.73	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	9	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 93	****	4.86	4.06	3.94	***
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.39	4.61	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	9	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.41	4.34	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	9	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 47	****	****	4.51	4.62	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	9	0	0	0	0	1	0	1.00	****/ 47	****	****	4.18	4.47	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	9	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 44	****	****	4.32	4.40	****
Self Paced	_	_	_	_		_	-							
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 49	****	****	4.26	5.00	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	8	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 41	****	****	4.14	5.00	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	8	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 46		****	4.31	5.00	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	8	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 37	****	****	4.05	5.00	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	8	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.27	5.00	****

Course-Section: SPAN 305 1

Title Span For Heritage Span

Instructor: Schwartz, Ana M

Enrollment: 11
Questionnaires: 10

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2009 Page 1452 MAR 22, 2010 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

Course-Section: SPAN 307 1 University of Maryland Page 1453 Title Espana Y Sus Culturas Baltimore County MAR 22, 2010 Fall 2009

Instructor: Sloane, Robert A

Enrollment: 25 Questionnaires: 17

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Job IRBR3029

	Frequencies I					Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect		
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	1	4	4	8	4.12	1032/1509	4.12	4.42	4.31	4.32	4.12
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	0	4	5	7	4.00	1086/1509	4.00	4.39	4.26	4.25	4.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	0	3	2	11	4.29	747/1287	4.29	4.48	4.30	4.33	4.29
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	2	3	5	5	3.87	1119/1459	3.87	4.32	4.22	4.26	3.87
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	2	4	4	6	3.71	1082/1406	3.71	4.19	4.09	4.12	3.71
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	4	1	2	1	3	6	3.85	985/1384	3.85	4.17	4.11	4.15	3.85
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	1	3	4	3	5	3.50	1303/1489	3.50	4.07	4.17	4.14	3.50
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	4	12	1	3.82	1461/1506	3.82	4.55	4.67	4.67	3.82
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	1	0	4	6	4	3.80	1060/1463	3.80	4.16	4.09	4.08	3.80
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	1	1	5	4	6	3.76	1311/1438	3.76	4.48	4.46	4.43	3.76
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	0	16	4.88	588/1421	4.88	4.75	4.73	4.73	4.88
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	1	0	4	4	8	4.06	1025/1411	4.06	4.39	4.31	4.29	4.06
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	2	3	11	4.35	808/1405	4.35	4.45	4.32	4.32	4.35
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	4	3	10	4.35	402/1236	4.35	3.92	4.00	4.07	4.35
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	1	1	4	3	4.00	746/1260	4.00	4.32	4.14	4.22	4.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	0	0	2	1	6	4.44	629/1255	4.44	4.53	4.33	4.37	4.44
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	0	1	2	1	5	4.11	895/1258	4.11	4.46	4.38	4.42	4.11
4. Were special techniques successful	8	3	1	1	0	2	2	3.50	705/ 873	3.50	4.14	4.03	4.08	3.50

Credits E	Carned	Cum. GPA		Expected	l Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	 А	9	Required for Majors	11	Graduate	0	Major	10
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	В	2						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	2	Under-grad	17	Non-major	7
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	2	#### - Means	there	are not enough	h
				P	0			responses to	be sig	nificant	
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	2						

Course-Section: SPAN 308 1 University of Maryland Page 1454 Title Baltimore County MAR 22, 2010 Latinoamerica Y Sus Cu

Instructor: Poggio,Sara Z

Enrollment: 14 Questionnaires: 12

# Fall 2009 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Job IRBR3029

Questions			NR	NA	Fre	_	ncies 3	4	5	Inst Mean	ructor Rank	Course	Dept Mean			Sect Mean		
			- 															
		Genera	1															
1. Did you	u gain ne	ew insights,ski	lls fro	m this course	0	0	1	0	1	4	6	4.17	976/1509	4.17	4.42	4.31	4.32	4.17
2. Did the	e instruc	ctor make clear	the ex	pected goals	0	0	1	1	2	3	5	3.83	1208/1509	3.83	4.39	4.26	4.25	3.83
3. Did the	e exam qı	uestions reflec	t the e	xpected goals	0	0	1	0	3	1	7	4.08	890/1287	4.08	4.48	4.30	4.33	4.08
4. Did oth	her evalı	uations reflect	the ex	pected goals	0	1	1	1	1	3	5	3.91	1088/1459	3.91	4.32	4.22	4.26	3.91
5. Did ass	signed re	eadings contrib	ute to	what you learned	0	0	1	0	1	6	4	4.00	813/1406	4.00	4.19	4.09	4.12	4.00
6. Did wr	itten ass	signments contr	ibute t	what you learned	0	0	1	0	2	4	5	4.00	807/1384	4.00	4.17	4.11	4.15	4.00
		g system clearl		ined	0	0	2	2	3	2	3	3.17	1388/1489	3.17	4.07	4.17	4.14	3.17
8. How man	ny times	was class canc	elled		0	0	0	0	0	7	5	4.42	1156/1506	4.42	4.55	4.67	4.67	4.42
9. How wor	uld you g	grade the overa	ll teac	ning effectiveness	1	0	1	2	3	4	1	3.18	1359/1463	3.18	4.16	4.09	4.08	3.18
	Lecture																	
1. Were th	he instru	uctor's lecture	s well	orepared	3	0	1	0	4	2	2	3.44	1377/1438	3.44	4.48	4.46	4.43	3.44
		ctor seem inter		-	3	0	0	0	4	2	3	3.89	1369/1421	3.89	4.75	4.73	4.73	3.89
3. Was led	3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly					0	2	1	2	2	2	3.11	1352/1411	3.11	4.39	4.31	4.29	3.11
		es contribute t			3	0	1	1	1	3	3	3.67	1220/1405	3.67	4.45	4.32	4.32	3.67
				our understanding	3	0	2	0	1	3	3	3.56	960/1236	3.56	3.92	4.00	4.07	3.56
		Discus	sion															
1. Did cla	ass discu			what you learned	7	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	505/1260	4.40	4.32	4.14	4.22	4.40
				d to participate	7	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	665/1255	4.40	4.53	4.33	4.37	4.40
				d open discussion	7	0	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	850/1258	4.20	4.46	4.38	4.42	4.20
		echniques succe			7	1	0	0	1	2	1		442/ 873		4.14	4.03	4.08	4.00
				Frequ	ency	7 Dist	trib	ıtio	n									
				11040	.01107	210	0110											
Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	asons	3			Ту	pe			Majors	5
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	A 9		Red	quir	ed f	or Ma	jors	 5	9	Graduat	 e	0	Majo	r	4
28-55																		
56-83	56-83 2 2.00-2.99 0 C 1					Gei	nera:	l				1	Under-g	rad 1	.2	Non-	major	8
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	3	D 0														
Grad. 0 3.50-4.00 3 F 0					Ele	ecti	ves				1	#### - 1	Means t	here a	re not	enoug	gh	
	P 0												respons	es to b	e sign	ifican	ıt	
I O				Otl	her					1	_		_					
? 0																		

Course-Section: SPAN 312 1 University of Maryland Page 1455 Title Intro To Latin Amer Li Baltimore County MAR 22, 2010

Instructor: Bell,Alan S

Enrollment: 13 Questionnaires: 11

# Fall 2009 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Job IRBR3029

			Fre	equer	ncies	3		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	1	1	1	2	6	4.00	1114/1509	4.00	4.42	4.31	4.32	4.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	0	3	3	4		1221/1509	3.82	4.39	4.26	4.25	3.82
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	1	1	3	5		826/1287		4.48	4.30	4.33	4.20
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	1	1	3	5	3.91	1088/1459	3.91	4.32	4.22	4.26	3.91
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	1	3	6	4.27	563/1406	4.27	4.19	4.09	4.12	4.27
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	1	2	3	4	3.73	1069/1384	3.73	4.17	4.11	4.15	3.73
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	2	2	1	5	3.64	1249/1489	3.64	4.07	4.17	4.14	3.64
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	3	8	4.73	883/1506	4.73	4.55	4.67	4.67	4.73
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	2	0	2	3	1	3.13	1375/1463	3.13	4.16	4.09	4.08	3.13
Lecture														
	1	0	0	0	2	2	_	4 20	1032/1438	4.30	4.48	4.46	4.43	4.30
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	∠ 1	3	5 7		1032/1438		4.48	4.46	4.43	4.60
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	7	2	6		738/1411	4.40	4.75	4.73	4.73	4.40
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	2	∠ 1	1	6		1001/1405		4.45	4.31	4.32	4.10
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	2	0	1	2	2	2		853/1236		3.92	4.00	4.07	
3. Did addiovisual techniques enhance your understanding		2	U	_	2	3	4	3.75	053/1230	3.75	3.94	4.00	4.07	3.75
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1260	5.00	4.32	4.14	4.22	5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	321/1255	4.78	4.53	4.33	4.37	4.78
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	1	0	2	0	6	4.11	895/1258	4.11	4.46	4.38	4.42	4.11
4. Were special techniques successful			0	0	0	2	7	4.78	105/ 873	4.78	4.14	4.03	4.08	4.78
From	ona	Dia	- wib	1+ i or	2									

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

Course-Section: SPAN 401 1 University of Maryland Title Studies In Spanish Lan Baltimore County MAR 22, 2010

Sinnigen, John H

Instructor:

Enrollment: 12 Questionnaires: 10

# Fall 2009 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Page 1456

Job IRBR3029

			Fr	eque:	ncie	s		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions		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	5	4.40	724/1509	4.40	4.42	4.31	4.39	4.40
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	3	6	4.50	543/1509	4.50	4.39	4.26	4.26	4.50
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	0	1	8	4.60	426/1287	4.60	4.48	4.30	4.38	4.60
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	0	1	8	4.60	346/1459	4.60	4.32	4.22	4.32	4.60
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	0	2	7	4.40	446/1406	4.40	4.19	4.09	4.11	4.40
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	3	7	4.70	199/1384	4.70	4.17	4.11	4.23	4.70
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	2	7	4.60	341/1489	4.60	4.07	4.17	4.18	4.60
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1506	5.00	4.55	4.67	4.67	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness $% \left( 1\right) =\left( 1\right) \left( 1\right) \left($	2	0	0	0	2	5	1	3.88	1006/1463	3.88	4.16	4.09	4.18	3.88
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	413/1438	4.78	4.48	4.46	4.50	4.78
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	794/1421	4.80	4.75	4.73	4.76	4.8
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	1	8	4.70	376/1411	4.70	4.39	4.31	4.35	4.7
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	1	1	6	4.33	828/1405	4.33	4.45	4.32	4.34	4.3
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	2	0	2	2	4	3.60	936/1236	3.60	3.92	4.00	4.03	3.6
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	1	1	1	3	4.00	746/1260	4.00	4.32	4.14	4.25	4.0
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	2	1	1	2	3.50	1127/1255	3.50	4.53	4.33	4.46	3.5
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	1	1	1	0	3	3.50	1143/1258	3.50	4.46	4.38	4.51	3.5
4. Were special techniques successful	4	0	2	0	2	0	2	3.00	801/ 873	3.00	4.14	4.03	4.26	3.0
Freq	ıency	/ Dis	trib	utio	n									
Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades				Re	ason	S			Ту	pe			Majors	;
00-27 1 0 00-0 99 0 a 5			auir		 or M	 aior	 a 1	n	Graduat		·	 Maio		

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

Course-Section: SPAN 421 1 University of Maryland
Title Studies In Hispanic Li Baltimore County

Baltimore County Fall 2009

Instructor: Schneider, Judit

Enrollment: 13
Questionnaires: 9

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Page 1457

MAR 22, 2010

Job IRBR3029

			Fre	eauei	ncies	3		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank		Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	3	6	4.67	410/1509	4.67	4.42	4.31	4.39	4.67
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	133/1509	4.89	4.39	4.26	4.26	4.89
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	143/1287	4.89	4.48	4.30	4.38	4.89
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	173/1459	4.78	4.32	4.22	4.32	4.78
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1406	5.00	4.19	4.09	4.11	5.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	132/1384	4.78	4.17	4.11	4.23	4.78
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	0	1	7	4.56	399/1489	4.56	4.07	4.17	4.18	4.56
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	820/1506	4.78	4.55	4.67	4.67	4.78
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	1	5	3	4.22	658/1463	4.22	4.16	4.09	4.18	4.22
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	1	2	5	4.50	800/1438	4.50	4.48	4.46	4.50	4.50
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1421	5.00	4.75	4.73	4.76	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	3	5	4.63	469/1411	4.63	4.39	4.31	4.35	4.63
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	345/1405	4.75	4.45	4.32	4.34	4.75
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	1	3	1	3	3.75	853/1236	3.75	3.92	4.00	4.03	3.75
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	Λ	2	1	4.57	370/1260	4.57	4.32	4.14	4.25	4.57
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.86	246/1255	4.86	4.53	4.33	4.46	4.86
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	1	1	5	4.57	570/1258	4.57	4.46	4.38	4.51	4.57
4. Were special techniques successful	2	0	0	0	0	5	2	4.29	317/ 873	4.29	4.14	4.03	4.26	4.29

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

Course-Section: SPAN 472 1

Topics In Latn Amer Ci

Instructor: Stolle-McAllist

Enrollment: 18
Questionnaires: 15

Title

### University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2009

Page 1458 MAR 22, 2010 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions			NID	NA	Fre	_	ncies 3	5 4	_	Inst Mean	ructor Rank	Course	Dept Mean		Level Mean	
	Questions		NK	NA			3	-4 		mean	Rank	Mean	mean	mean	mean	Mean
	General															
1. Did you gain new	insights, skills from t	his course	0	0	0	0	1	4	10	4.60	482/1509	4.60	4.42	4.31	4.39	4.60
	or make clear the exped		0	0	0	2	1	4	8	4.20	922/1509	4.20	4.39	4.26	4.26	4.20
	stions reflect the expe		0	2	0	1	1	2	9	4.46	566/1287	4.46	4.48	4.30	4.38	4.46
_	tions reflect the exped	-	0	0	0	0	3	2	10	4.47	520/1459	4.47	4.32	4.22	4.32	4.47
5. Did assigned read	dings contribute to wha	t you learned	0	0	0	2	1	3	9	4.27	575/1406	4.27	4.19	4.09	4.11	4.27
6. Did written assign	gnments contribute to v	hat you learned	0	1	0	0	3	4	7	4.29	589/1384	4.29	4.17	4.11	4.23	4.29
7. Was the grading s	system clearly explaine	ed	0	0	1	1	2	3	8	4.07	944/1489	4.07	4.07	4.17	4.18	4.07
8. How many times wa	as class cancelled		0	0	0	0	0	2	13	4.87	662/1506	4.87	4.55	4.67	4.67	4.87
9. How would you gra	ade the overall teaching	ng effectiveness	4	0	1	1	1	3	5	3.91	983/1463	3.91	4.16	4.09	4.18	3.91
	Lecture															
	tor's lectures well pre	-	1	0	0	1	0	4	9	4.50	800/1438	4.50	4.48	4.46	4.50	4.50
2. Did the instructor	1	0	0 1	0	0	1	13	4.93	429/1421	4.93	4.75	4.73	4.76	4.93		
	3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly					0	2	2	9	4.29	858/1411	4.29	4.39	4.31	4.35	4.29
	contribute to what you		1	0	0	1	2	2	9	4.36	808/1405	4.36	4.45	4.32		4.36
5. Did audiovisual	cechniques enhance you	understanding	1	0	0	0	4	2	8	4.29	466/1236	4.29	3.92	4.00	4.03	4.29
	Discussion		_			•			_		=0=/4060	4 40	4 00			4 40
	sions contribute to wha	-	5	0	0	0	Τ	4	5	4.40	505/1260	4.40	4.32	4.14	4.25	4.40
	s actively encouraged t		5	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	287/1255	4.80	4.53	4.33	4.46	4.80
	or encourage fair and o	pen discussion	6 5	0	0	0	0	0 4	9	5.00 4.56	1/1258 193/ 873	5.00	4.46	4.38	4.51	5.00 4.56
4. Were special tech	iniques successiui		5	Τ	U	U	U	4	5	4.56	193/ 8/3	4.56	4.14	4.03	4.26	4.56
	Seminar															
1 Were assigned to	pics relevant to the a	nounced theme	12	0	0	0	2	1	Λ	3 33	****/ 89	****	5.00	4.49	4.71	****
	or available for indivi		12	0	0	0	1	0	2		****/ 92	****	4.93	4.54	4.83	****
	jects contribute to wha		12	0	0	1	1	1	0		****/ 90	****	4.62	4.50	4.69	****
	s contribute to what yo	-	12	0	0	0	1	2	0		****/ 92	****	4.93	4.38	4.64	****
-	grading made clear		12	0	1	1	0	1	0	2.33	****/ 93	****	4.86	4.06	4.32	****
	5															
		Freq	uency	Dist	ribu	ution	ı									
Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades				Rea	asons	3			Tyn	oe			Majors	

Credits Earned Cum. GF			Expected	d Grades	Reasons		Type	Majors			
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	1	А	 6	Required for Majors	6	Graduate	3	Major	5
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	4						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	1	Under-grad	12	Non-major	10
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	3	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means	there	are not enoug	h
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	0				
				2	1						