

Course-Section: SPAN 101 0101
 Title ELEMENTARY SPANISH I
 Instructor: NOGUEIRA, BRUNO
 Enrollment: 30
 Questionnaires: 26

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 1407
 JUN 26, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	4	21	4.77	305/1522	3.92	4.36	4.30	4.14	4.77	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	0	1	6	18	4.54	511/1522	3.75	4.33	4.26	4.18	4.54	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	5	18	4.58	456/1285	3.69	4.45	4.30	4.22	4.58	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	3	4	18	4.60	378/1476	3.83	4.33	4.22	4.09	4.60	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	1	0	6	5	12	4.13	680/1412	3.35	4.26	4.06	4.01	4.13	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	2	3	3	17	4.40	434/1381	3.45	4.19	4.08	3.93	4.40	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	1	3	3	18	4.38	650/1500	3.71	4.14	4.18	4.16	4.38	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	1	0	0	0	13	12	4.48	1096/1517	4.70	4.56	4.65	4.62	4.48	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	9	0	0	0	2	6	9	4.41	493/1497	3.74	4.21	4.11	4.02	4.41	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	2	3	20	4.72	532/1440	3.94	4.45	4.45	4.40	4.72	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	25	5.00	1/1448	4.75	4.79	4.71	4.63	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	4	2	19	4.60	478/1436	3.89	4.39	4.29	4.24	4.60	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	4	20	4.76	338/1432	4.03	4.47	4.29	4.23	4.76	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	4	3	2	3	4	6	3.44	933/1221	3.31	3.91	3.93	3.86	3.44	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	10	0	1	1	3	4	7	3.94	792/1280	3.90	4.28	4.10	3.92	3.94	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	10	0	0	1	1	0	14	4.69	451/1277	4.22	4.60	4.34	4.13	4.69	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	11	0	0	0	0	1	14	4.93	156/1269	4.07	4.47	4.31	4.04	4.93	
4. Were special techniques successful	10	3	0	1	2	3	7	4.23	341/ 854	3.88	4.16	4.02	3.87	4.23	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	24	1	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 215	****	****	4.36	4.31	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	24	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/ 228	****	4.50	4.35	4.33	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	24	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 217	****	4.50	4.51	4.51	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	24	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 216	****	****	4.42	4.41	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	24	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 205	****	5.00	4.23	4.28	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	24	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 79	****	5.00	4.58	4.13	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	24	1	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 77	****	5.00	4.52	4.03	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	24	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 65	****	5.00	4.49	3.85	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	24	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 78	****	4.83	4.45	3.88	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	24	1	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 80	****	4.83	4.11	3.79	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	24	0	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/ 47	****	3.60	4.41	3.90	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	24	0	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/ 45	****	4.00	4.30	3.90	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	24	0	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/ 39	****	3.00	4.40	3.99	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	24	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 35	****	3.00	4.31	4.00	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	24	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 34	****	2.75	4.30	4.11	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	24	0	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/ 37	****	4.33	4.63	4.53	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	24	0	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/ 23	****	****	4.41	4.19	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	24	1	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 33	****	****	4.69	4.57	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	24	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 22	****	****	4.54	4.31	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	24	1	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 18	****	****	4.49	4.11	****	

Course-Section: SPAN 101 0101
 Title ELEMENTARY SPANISH I
 Instructor: NOGUEIRA, BRUNO
 Enrollment: 30
 Questionnaires: 26

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 1407
 JUN 26, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: SPAN 101 0201
 Title ELEMENTARY SPANISH I
 Instructor: NASH, LYLE
 Enrollment: 32
 Questionnaires: 20

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 1408
 JUN 26, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	2	0	1	1	8	3	5	3.56	1383/1522	3.92	4.36	4.30	4.14	3.56	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	3	0	3	0	6	5	3	3.29	1429/1522	3.75	4.33	4.26	4.18	3.29	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	0	2	4	5	5	2	3.06	1244/1285	3.69	4.45	4.30	4.22	3.06	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	0	1	3	8	5	1	3.11	1408/1476	3.83	4.33	4.22	4.09	3.11	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	2	2	9	3	1	1	2.38	1393/1412	3.35	4.26	4.06	4.01	2.38	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	1	4	4	7	1	1	2.47	1353/1381	3.45	4.19	4.08	3.93	2.47	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	3	0	6	2	4	0	5	2.76	1457/1500	3.71	4.14	4.18	4.16	2.76	
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	0	0	0	0	5	12	4.71	891/1517	4.70	4.56	4.65	4.62	4.71	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	2	1	4	3	5	3.53	1265/1497	3.74	4.21	4.11	4.02	3.53	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	2	1	6	2	6	3.53	1356/1440	3.94	4.45	4.45	4.40	3.53	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	0	1	3	12	4.69	977/1448	4.75	4.79	4.71	4.63	4.69	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	1	0	8	4	4	3.59	1265/1436	3.89	4.39	4.29	4.24	3.59	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	2	3	2	6	5	3.50	1270/1432	4.03	4.47	4.29	4.23	3.50	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	1	2	3	4	3	3	3.13	1045/1221	3.31	3.91	3.93	3.86	3.13	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	1	1	3	6	1	3.42	1076/1280	3.90	4.28	4.10	3.92	3.42	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	0	0	3	4	5	4.17	867/1277	4.22	4.60	4.34	4.13	4.17	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	0	1	3	3	4	3.91	960/1269	4.07	4.47	4.31	4.04	3.91	
4. Were special techniques successful	8	0	2	1	5	2	2	3.08	772/ 854	3.88	4.16	4.02	3.87	3.08	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: SPAN 101 0301
 Title ELEMENTARY SPANISH I
 Instructor: GRANENAGIMENO,
 Enrollment: 28
 Questionnaires: 13

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 1409
 JUN 26, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	4	4	3	2	3.23	1467/1522	3.92	4.36	4.30	4.14	3.23	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	5	1	4	3	3.38	1408/1522	3.75	4.33	4.26	4.18	3.38	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	2	4	1	3	3	3.08	1242/1285	3.69	4.45	4.30	4.22	3.08	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	2	4	4	2	3.50	1324/1476	3.83	4.33	4.22	4.09	3.50	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	4	2	3	2	3.08	1320/1412	3.35	4.26	4.06	4.01	3.08	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	3	1	3	4	1	2.92	1313/1381	3.45	4.19	4.08	3.93	2.92	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	4	1	3	3	3.25	1396/1500	3.71	4.14	4.18	4.16	3.25	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	1	0	1	10	4.67	932/1517	4.70	4.56	4.65	4.62	4.67	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	3	0	2	5	1	3.09	1410/1497	3.74	4.21	4.11	4.02	3.09	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	1	3	3	3	2	3.17	1400/1440	3.94	4.45	4.45	4.40	3.17	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	1	4	7	4.50	1157/1448	4.75	4.79	4.71	4.63	4.50	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	2	2	5	0	3	3.00	1378/1436	3.89	4.39	4.29	4.24	3.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	3	3	2	4	3.58	1248/1432	4.03	4.47	4.29	4.23	3.58	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	4	1	2	3	2	2.83	1117/1221	3.31	3.91	3.93	3.86	2.83	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	2	0	5	2	3.78	894/1280	3.90	4.28	4.10	3.92	3.78	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	2	2	1	4	3.78	1059/1277	4.22	4.60	4.34	4.13	3.78	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	2	2	1	1	3	3.11	1203/1269	4.07	4.47	4.31	4.04	3.11	
4. Were special techniques successful	4	1	0	3	0	2	3	3.63	643/ 854	3.88	4.16	4.02	3.87	3.63	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	11	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/ 215	****	****	4.36	4.31	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	11	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/ 228	****	4.50	4.35	4.33	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	11	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/ 217	****	4.50	4.51	4.51	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	11	0	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/ 216	****	****	4.42	4.41	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	11	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 205	****	5.00	4.23	4.28	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	11	0	1	1	0	0	0	1.50	****/ 79	****	5.00	4.58	4.13	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	12	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 77	****	5.00	4.52	4.03	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 65	****	5.00	4.49	3.85	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 78	****	4.83	4.45	3.88	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	12	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 80	****	4.83	4.11	3.79	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 47	****	3.60	4.41	3.90	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	12	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 45	****	4.00	4.30	3.90	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	12	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 39	****	3.00	4.40	3.99	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	12	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 35	****	3.00	4.31	4.00	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 34	****	2.75	4.30	4.11	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 37	****	4.33	4.63	4.53	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	11	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 23	****	****	4.41	4.19	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	11	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 33	****	****	4.69	4.57	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	11	0	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/ 22	****	****	4.54	4.31	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	11	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 18	****	****	4.49	4.11	****	

Course-Section: SPAN 101 0301
 Title ELEMENTARY SPANISH I
 Instructor: GRANENAGIMENO,
 Enrollment: 28
 Questionnaires: 13

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 1409
 JUN 26, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: SPAN 101 0401
 Title ELEMENTARY SPANISH I
 Instructor: GRANENAGIMENO,
 Enrollment: 34
 Questionnaires: 26

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 1410
 JUN 26, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	2	0	2	11	11	4.12	1043/1522	3.92	4.36	4.30	4.14	4.12	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	4	5	6	10	3.77	1262/1522	3.75	4.33	4.26	4.18	3.77	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	2	7	5	12	4.04	921/1285	3.69	4.45	4.30	4.22	4.04	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	3	4	6	13	4.12	945/1476	3.83	4.33	4.22	4.09	4.12	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	2	3	0	6	3	11	3.83	956/1412	3.35	4.26	4.06	4.01	3.83	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	1	1	1	5	7	10	4.00	806/1381	3.45	4.19	4.08	3.93	4.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	1	3	5	16	4.44	571/1500	3.71	4.14	4.18	4.16	4.44	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	1	24	4.96	195/1517	4.70	4.56	4.65	4.62	4.96	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	1	6	10	6	3.91	1020/1497	3.74	4.21	4.11	4.02	3.91	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	1	0	3	7	15	4.35	976/1440	3.94	4.45	4.45	4.40	4.35	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	5	21	4.81	765/1448	4.75	4.79	4.71	4.63	4.81	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	1	4	5	16	4.38	741/1436	3.89	4.39	4.29	4.24	4.38	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	1	3	6	15	4.27	877/1432	4.03	4.47	4.29	4.23	4.27	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	1	1	3	4	7	9	3.83	739/1221	3.31	3.91	3.93	3.86	3.83	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	3	4	12	4.47	416/1280	3.90	4.28	4.10	3.92	4.47	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	0	1	3	5	10	4.26	796/1277	4.22	4.60	4.34	4.13	4.26	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	1	2	1	1	14	4.32	735/1269	4.07	4.47	4.31	4.04	4.32	
4. Were special techniques successful	7	2	0	1	0	4	12	4.59	171/ 854	3.88	4.16	4.02	3.87	4.59	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	25	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 79	****	5.00	4.58	4.13	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	25	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 77	****	5.00	4.52	4.03	****	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: SPAN 102 0101
 Title ELEMENTARY SPANISH II
 Instructor: PETERSON, MARY
 Enrollment: 30
 Questionnaires: 12

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 1411
 JUN 26, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	1	5	4	2	3.58	1372/1522	4.01	4.36	4.30	4.14	3.58	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	5	2	4	3.75	1267/1522	4.10	4.33	4.26	4.18	3.75	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	2	2	6	2	3.67	1123/1285	4.19	4.45	4.30	4.22	3.67	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	2	5	3	1	3.27	1376/1476	4.08	4.33	4.22	4.09	3.27	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	1	3	5	0	2	2.91	1351/1412	3.86	4.26	4.06	4.01	2.91	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	3	2	1	4	1	2.82	1329/1381	3.89	4.19	4.08	3.93	2.82	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	3	1	4	4	3.75	1183/1500	4.06	4.14	4.18	4.16	3.75	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	1	10	0	3.91	1450/1517	4.46	4.56	4.65	4.62	3.91	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	2	5	3	0	3.10	1410/1497	3.96	4.21	4.11	4.02	3.10	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	1	2	5	2	1	3.00	1404/1440	4.14	4.45	4.45	4.40	3.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	1	1	3	6	4.27	1293/1448	4.61	4.79	4.71	4.63	4.27	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	3	1	6	1	3.45	1298/1436	4.06	4.39	4.29	4.24	3.45	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	2	3	3	2	3.27	1332/1432	4.15	4.47	4.29	4.23	3.27	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	2	1	2	2	3	0	2.88	1111/1221	3.26	3.91	3.93	3.86	2.88	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	2	1	0	3	0	2.67	1250/1280	3.88	4.28	4.10	3.92	2.67	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	2	0	2	2	3.67	1094/1277	4.30	4.60	4.34	4.13	3.67	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	1	2	0	1	2	3.17	1194/1269	4.00	4.47	4.31	4.04	3.17	
4. Were special techniques successful	6	1	0	3	0	1	1	3.00	779/ 854	4.06	4.16	4.02	3.87	3.00	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: SPAN 102 0201
 Title ELEMENTARY SPANISH II
 Instructor: SIMORANGKIR, MO
 Enrollment: 22
 Questionnaires: 13

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 1412
 JUN 26, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	2	6	5	4.23	919/1522	4.01	4.36	4.30	4.14	4.23	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	1	10	4.62	419/1522	4.10	4.33	4.26	4.18	4.62	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	2	1	9	4.58	446/1285	4.19	4.45	4.30	4.22	4.58	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	4	7	4.38	650/1476	4.08	4.33	4.22	4.09	4.38	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	4	3	5	4.08	709/1412	3.86	4.26	4.06	4.01	4.08	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	1	0	0	3	6	2	3.91	938/1381	3.89	4.19	4.08	3.93	3.91	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	2	3	7	4.42	615/1500	4.06	4.14	4.18	4.16	4.42	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	8	4	4.33	1217/1517	4.46	4.56	4.65	4.62	4.33	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	1	0	4	7	4.42	493/1497	3.96	4.21	4.11	4.02	4.42	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	2	10	4.69	565/1440	4.14	4.45	4.45	4.40	4.69	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	2	10	4.69	965/1448	4.61	4.79	4.71	4.63	4.69	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	2	4	7	4.38	741/1436	4.06	4.39	4.29	4.24	4.38	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	3	9	4.62	514/1432	4.15	4.47	4.29	4.23	4.62	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	2	2	1	3	1	4	3.36	971/1221	3.26	3.91	3.93	3.86	3.36	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	390/1280	3.88	4.28	4.10	3.92	4.50	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	0	0	1	0	5	4.67	470/1277	4.30	4.60	4.34	4.13	4.67	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	0	0	0	3	3	4.50	586/1269	4.00	4.47	4.31	4.04	4.50	
4. Were special techniques successful	7	0	0	0	0	3	3	4.50	194/ 854	4.06	4.16	4.02	3.87	4.50	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: SPAN 102 0301
 Title ELEMENTARY SPANISH II
 Instructor: MORENILLA, LAUR
 Enrollment: 21
 Questionnaires: 15

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 1413
 JUN 26, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	3	2	2	8	4.00	1122/1522	4.01	4.36	4.30	4.14	4.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	2	2	5	5	3.73	1276/1522	4.10	4.33	4.26	4.18	3.73	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	0	2	6	6	4.07	904/1285	4.19	4.45	4.30	4.22	4.07	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	1	0	0	4	5	4	4.00	1009/1476	4.08	4.33	4.22	4.09	4.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	1	3	4	3	3	3.29	1278/1412	3.86	4.26	4.06	4.01	3.29	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	10	3	2	3.47	1170/1381	3.89	4.19	4.08	3.93	3.47	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	4	3	7	4.07	956/1500	4.06	4.14	4.18	4.16	4.07	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	14	4.93	341/1517	4.46	4.56	4.65	4.62	4.93	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	1	2	4	7	0	3.21	1382/1497	3.96	4.21	4.11	4.02	3.21	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	1	1	1	5	5	3.92	1238/1440	4.14	4.45	4.45	4.40	3.92	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	2	2	9	4.54	1131/1448	4.61	4.79	4.71	4.63	4.54	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	1	1	4	4	3	3.54	1275/1436	4.06	4.39	4.29	4.24	3.54	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	0	6	2	4	3.62	1239/1432	4.15	4.47	4.29	4.23	3.62	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	1	0	4	3	1	2	3.10	1053/1221	3.26	3.91	3.93	3.86	3.10	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	2	4	2	4.00	718/1280	3.88	4.28	4.10	3.92	4.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	0	2	0	3	3	3.88	1024/1277	4.30	4.60	4.34	4.13	3.88	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	1	2	1	2	2	3.25	1174/1269	4.00	4.47	4.31	4.04	3.25	
4. Were special techniques successful	7	1	0	0	1	2	4	4.43	240/ 854	4.06	4.16	4.02	3.87	4.43	
Laboratory															
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	14	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 228	****	4.50	4.35	4.33	****	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: SPAN 102 0401
 Title ELEMENTARY SPANISH II
 Instructor: PETERSON, MARY
 Enrollment: 28
 Questionnaires: 12

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 1414
 JUN 26, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	0	0	4	2	5	4.09	1060/1522	4.01	4.36	4.30	4.14	4.09	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	1	4	2	4	3.82	1238/1522	4.10	4.33	4.26	4.18	3.82	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	3	2	1	5	3.73	1101/1285	4.19	4.45	4.30	4.22	3.73	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	1	1	1	3	3	2	3.40	1349/1476	4.08	4.33	4.22	4.09	3.40	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	1	3	3	3	3.55	1143/1412	3.86	4.26	4.06	4.01	3.55	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	1	0	1	3	3	3	3.80	1016/1381	3.89	4.19	4.08	3.93	3.80	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	2	3	2	4	3.73	1204/1500	4.06	4.14	4.18	4.16	3.73	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	1	8	2	4.09	1358/1517	4.46	4.56	4.65	4.62	4.09	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	1	1	2	4	2	3.50	1277/1497	3.96	4.21	4.11	4.02	3.50	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	2	1	1	2	4	3.50	1359/1440	4.14	4.45	4.45	4.40	3.50	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	1	3	6	4.50	1157/1448	4.61	4.79	4.71	4.63	4.50	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	2	1	1	3	3	3.40	1315/1436	4.06	4.39	4.29	4.24	3.40	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	1	2	1	0	5	3.67	1224/1432	4.15	4.47	4.29	4.23	3.67	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	6	1	0	1	1	0	2.67	1148/1221	3.26	3.91	3.93	3.86	2.67	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	1	0	3	3	1	3.38	1091/1280	3.88	4.28	4.10	3.92	3.38	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	1	0	2	1	4	3.88	1024/1277	4.30	4.60	4.34	4.13	3.88	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	1	4	1	2	3.50	1117/1269	4.00	4.47	4.31	4.04	3.50	
4. Were special techniques successful	4	1	0	0	2	4	1	3.86	547/ 854	4.06	4.16	4.02	3.87	3.86	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: SPAN 102 0601
 Title ELEMENTARY SPANISH II
 Instructor: SIMORANGKIR, MO
 Enrollment: 22
 Questionnaires: 15

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 1415
 JUN 26, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	1	3	4	7	4.13	1022/1522	4.01	4.36	4.30	4.14	4.13	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	3	5	6	4.07	1048/1522	4.10	4.33	4.26	4.18	4.07	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	2	8	4	4.14	849/1285	4.19	4.45	4.30	4.22	4.14	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	6	8	4.47	535/1476	4.08	4.33	4.22	4.09	4.47	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	4	0	1	2	1	7	4.27	547/1412	3.86	4.26	4.06	4.01	4.27	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	0	3	2	8	4.38	458/1381	3.89	4.19	4.08	3.93	4.38	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	3	5	6	4.07	956/1500	4.06	4.14	4.18	4.16	4.07	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	10	5	4.33	1217/1517	4.46	4.56	4.65	4.62	4.33	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	1	0	1	1	4	6	4.25	654/1497	3.96	4.21	4.11	4.02	4.25	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	2	2	8	4.50	798/1440	4.14	4.45	4.45	4.40	4.50	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	1	0	11	4.83	683/1448	4.61	4.79	4.71	4.63	4.83	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	1	1	2	8	4.42	708/1436	4.06	4.39	4.29	4.24	4.42	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	2	1	1	8	4.25	884/1432	4.15	4.47	4.29	4.23	4.25	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	6	1	2	1	0	2	3.00	1064/1221	3.26	3.91	3.93	3.86	3.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	3	0	5	4.25	585/1280	3.88	4.28	4.10	3.92	4.25	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	375/1277	4.30	4.60	4.34	4.13	4.75	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	0	0	1	2	5	4.50	586/1269	4.00	4.47	4.31	4.04	4.50	
4. Were special techniques successful	7	0	0	1	1	1	5	4.25	330/ 854	4.06	4.16	4.02	3.87	4.25	
Laboratory															
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	14	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 228	****	4.50	4.35	4.33	****	
Seminar															
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 78	****	4.83	4.45	3.88	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	14	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 80	****	4.83	4.11	3.79	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 47	****	3.60	4.41	3.90	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	14	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 45	****	4.00	4.30	3.90	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 37	****	4.33	4.63	4.53	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	4	0.00-0.99	0	A 2	Required for Majors 10
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B 6	
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	3	C 5	General 2
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	1	D 1	Under-grad 15
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F 0	Non-major 15
				P 0	
				I 0	
				? 0	
					Electives 0
					Other 1

- Means there are not enough responses to be significant

Course-Section: SPAN 102 0701
 Title ELEMENTARY SPANISH II
 Instructor: RIBEYRO, CLAUDI
 Enrollment: 20
 Questionnaires: 14

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 1416
 JUN 26, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	1	1	4	4	3	3.54	1390/1522	4.01	4.36	4.30	4.14	3.54	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	1	2	6	4	4.00	1080/1522	4.10	4.33	4.26	4.18	4.00	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	1	2	1	3	6	3.85	1049/1285	4.19	4.45	4.30	4.22	3.85	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	0	0	0	2	5	5	4.25	792/1476	4.08	4.33	4.22	4.09	4.25	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	1	1	2	1	2	6	3.83	948/1412	3.86	4.26	4.06	4.01	3.83	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	4	2	7	4.23	623/1381	3.89	4.19	4.08	3.93	4.23	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	1	1	5	5	3.92	1068/1500	4.06	4.14	4.18	4.16	3.92	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	2	10	1	3.92	1437/1517	4.46	4.56	4.65	4.62	3.92	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	1	0	0	1	2	6	4.56	348/1497	3.96	4.21	4.11	4.02	4.56	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	1	5	6	4.42	917/1440	4.14	4.45	4.45	4.40	4.42	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	1	3	8	4.58	1089/1448	4.61	4.79	4.71	4.63	4.58	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	1	0	3	8	4.50	601/1436	4.06	4.39	4.29	4.24	4.50	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	1	4	7	4.50	632/1432	4.15	4.47	4.29	4.23	4.50	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	2	2	0	4	2	2	3.20	1028/1221	3.26	3.91	3.93	3.86	3.20	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	2	5	5	4.25	585/1280	3.88	4.28	4.10	3.92	4.25	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	2	3	7	4.42	682/1277	4.30	4.60	4.34	4.13	4.42	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	1	2	1	8	4.33	721/1269	4.00	4.47	4.31	4.04	4.33	
4. Were special techniques successful	2	1	0	1	3	2	5	4.00	426/ 854	4.06	4.16	4.02	3.87	4.00	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 37	****	4.33	4.63	4.53	****	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: SPAN 102 0801
 Title ELEMENTARY SPANISH II
 Instructor: COLOMBO, LAURA
 Enrollment: 26
 Questionnaires: 17

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 1417
 JUN 26, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: SPAN 102 0901
 Title ELEMENTARY SPANISH II
 Instructor: MORENILLA, LAUR
 Enrollment: 18
 Questionnaires: 10

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 1418
 JUN 26, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	1	0	2	4	3	3.80	1269/1522	4.01	4.36	4.30	4.14	3.80	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	0	1	4	4	4.00	1080/1522	4.10	4.33	4.26	4.18	4.00	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	4	4	4.10	882/1285	4.19	4.45	4.30	4.22	4.10	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	3	4	4.10	956/1476	4.08	4.33	4.22	4.09	4.10	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	4	3	3	3.90	892/1412	3.86	4.26	4.06	4.01	3.90	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	3	2	5	4.20	663/1381	3.89	4.19	4.08	3.93	4.20	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	0	1	2	6	4.20	839/1500	4.06	4.14	4.18	4.16	4.20	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	487/1517	4.46	4.56	4.65	4.62	4.90	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	1	5	2	4.13	807/1497	3.96	4.21	4.11	4.02	4.13	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	2	3	5	4.30	1007/1440	4.14	4.45	4.45	4.40	4.30	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	2	7	4.60	1072/1448	4.61	4.79	4.71	4.63	4.60	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	2	5	3	4.10	1003/1436	4.06	4.39	4.29	4.24	4.10	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	4	5	4.40	758/1432	4.15	4.47	4.29	4.23	4.40	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	1	1	2	0	2	4	3.67	832/1221	3.26	3.91	3.93	3.86	3.67	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	2	0	3	3	3.56	1009/1280	3.88	4.28	4.10	3.92	3.56	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	2	1	6	4.44	652/1277	4.30	4.60	4.34	4.13	4.44	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	2	0	0	1	6	4.00	875/1269	4.00	4.47	4.31	4.04	4.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	1	0	0	0	1	4	4	4.33	287/ 854	4.06	4.16	4.02	3.87	4.33	
Laboratory															
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	9	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 228	****	4.50	4.35	4.33	****	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: SPAN 102 1001
 Title ELEMENTARY SPANISH II
 Instructor: COLOMBO, LAURA
 Enrollment: 24
 Questionnaires: 18

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 1419
 JUN 26, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

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

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: SPAN 103 0101
 Title INT REV ELEM SPANISH
 Instructor: RICHARDS, F
 Enrollment: 23
 Questionnaires: 20

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 1420
 JUN 26, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	2	0	5	8	5	3.70	1321/1522	3.85	4.36	4.30	4.14	3.70	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	2	1	9	7	3.95	1135/1522	3.98	4.33	4.26	4.18	3.95	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	2	1	1	6	9	4.00	938/1285	4.09	4.45	4.30	4.22	4.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	2	3	6	8	4.05	982/1476	4.12	4.33	4.22	4.09	4.05	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	2	3	3	6	5	3.47	1183/1412	3.44	4.26	4.06	4.01	3.47	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	1	6	5	6	3.60	1130/1381	3.64	4.19	4.08	3.93	3.60	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	3	3	7	6	3.70	1219/1500	4.10	4.14	4.18	4.16	3.70	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	18	2	4.10	1355/1517	4.55	4.56	4.65	4.62	4.10	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	1	0	6	5	5	3.76	1140/1497	3.60	4.21	4.11	4.02	3.76	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	3	1	5	7	3	3.32	1388/1440	3.70	4.45	4.45	4.40	3.32	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	1	1	1	4	12	4.32	1279/1448	4.57	4.79	4.71	4.63	4.32	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	1	0	4	4	10	4.16	965/1436	4.03	4.39	4.29	4.24	4.16	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	0	1	5	12	4.42	732/1432	4.17	4.47	4.29	4.23	4.42	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	2	2	2	3	3	6	3.56	875/1221	3.51	3.91	3.93	3.86	3.56	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	1	3	2	0	6	3.58	996/1280	3.79	4.28	4.10	3.92	3.58	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	0	0	3	0	9	4.50	594/1277	4.45	4.60	4.34	4.13	4.50	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	1	0	1	1	9	4.42	662/1269	4.29	4.47	4.31	4.04	4.42	
4. Were special techniques successful	8	1	2	0	1	0	8	4.09	414/ 854	4.05	4.16	4.02	3.87	4.09	
Laboratory															
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	19	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 228	****	4.50	4.35	4.33	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	19	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 217	****	4.50	4.51	4.51	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	19	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 216	****	****	4.42	4.41	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 205	****	5.00	4.23	4.28	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 79	****	5.00	4.58	4.13	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 77	****	5.00	4.52	4.03	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 65	****	5.00	4.49	3.85	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 78	****	4.83	4.45	3.88	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	19	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 80	****	4.83	4.11	3.79	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 47	****	3.60	4.41	3.90	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	19	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 45	****	4.00	4.30	3.90	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	19	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 39	****	3.00	4.40	3.99	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	19	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 35	****	3.00	4.31	4.00	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	19	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 37	****	4.33	4.63	4.53	****	

Course-Section: SPAN 103 0101
 Title INT REV ELEM SPANISH
 Instructor: RICHARDS, F
 Enrollment: 23
 Questionnaires: 20

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 1420
 JUN 26, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: SPAN 103 0201
 Title INT REV ELEM SPANISH
 Instructor: MORENILLA, LAUR
 Enrollment: 21
 Questionnaires: 17

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 1421
 JUN 26, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	0	1	3	7	5	4.00	1122/1522	3.85	4.36	4.30	4.14	4.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	1	0	2	8	5	4.00	1080/1522	3.98	4.33	4.26	4.18	4.00	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	1	2	6	7	4.19	817/1285	4.09	4.45	4.30	4.22	4.19	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	4	5	7	4.19	871/1476	4.12	4.33	4.22	4.09	4.19	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	1	4	0	2	4	5	3.40	1225/1412	3.44	4.26	4.06	4.01	3.40	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	3	2	4	6	3.69	1086/1381	3.64	4.19	4.08	3.93	3.69	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	2	4	10	4.50	483/1500	4.10	4.14	4.18	4.16	4.50	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	16	5.00	1/1517	4.55	4.56	4.65	4.62	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	1	0	6	6	1	3.43	1315/1497	3.60	4.21	4.11	4.02	3.43	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	5	0	0	2	1	3	6	4.08	1155/1440	3.70	4.45	4.45	4.40	4.08	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	6	0	0	0	0	2	9	4.82	737/1448	4.57	4.79	4.71	4.63	4.82	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	6	0	0	1	3	3	4	3.91	1158/1436	4.03	4.39	4.29	4.24	3.91	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	6	0	1	0	3	2	5	3.91	1126/1432	4.17	4.47	4.29	4.23	3.91	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	6	0	2	1	3	0	5	3.45	927/1221	3.51	3.91	3.93	3.86	3.45	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	2	2	2	4.00	718/1280	3.79	4.28	4.10	3.92	4.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	12	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	692/1277	4.45	4.60	4.34	4.13	4.40	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	11	0	0	0	1	3	2	4.17	828/1269	4.29	4.47	4.31	4.04	4.17	
4. Were special techniques successful	11	1	0	0	2	1	2	4.00	426/ 854	4.05	4.16	4.02	3.87	4.00	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	3	Required for Majors	12	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B	6						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	1	C	5	General	0	Under-grad	17	Non-major	17
84-150	6	3.00-3.49	5	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	2				
				?	1						

Course-Section: SPAN 201 0101
 Title INTERMEDIATE SPANISH I
 Instructor: RAMIREZ, W
 Enrollment: 16
 Questionnaires: 14

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 1422
 JUN 26, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

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

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: SPAN 201 0201
 Title INTERMEDIATE SPANISH I
 Instructor: RICHARDS, F
 Enrollment: 16
 Questionnaires: 14

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 1423
 JUN 26, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	5	0	9	4.29	869/1522	4.46	4.36	4.30	4.34	4.29	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	1	10	4.43	670/1522	4.47	4.33	4.26	4.29	4.43	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	2	9	4.43	626/1285	4.41	4.45	4.30	4.36	4.43	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	3	2	8	4.21	838/1476	4.45	4.33	4.22	4.20	4.21	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	5	2	6	4.08	715/1412	3.88	4.26	4.06	4.00	4.08	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	3	3	7	4.31	556/1381	4.24	4.19	4.08	3.97	4.31	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	3	2	9	4.43	600/1500	4.37	4.14	4.18	4.20	4.43	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	10	4	4.29	1251/1517	4.58	4.56	4.65	4.63	4.29	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	1	0	1	3	2	4	3.90	1034/1497	4.34	4.21	4.11	4.11	3.90	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	1	2	5	5	4.08	1159/1440	4.51	4.45	4.45	4.42	4.08	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	3	0	10	4.54	1131/1448	4.85	4.79	4.71	4.78	4.54	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	3	4	6	4.23	896/1436	4.39	4.39	4.29	4.29	4.23	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	3	2	8	4.38	775/1432	4.48	4.47	4.29	4.31	4.38	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	2	1	2	1	4	2	3.40	956/1221	3.78	3.91	3.93	4.02	3.40	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	9	0	1	0	1	0	3	3.80	874/1280	4.20	4.28	4.10	4.08	3.80	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	10	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	375/1277	4.66	4.60	4.34	4.33	4.75	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	10	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	381/1269	4.54	4.47	4.31	4.33	4.75	
4. Were special techniques successful	10	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/ 854	4.57	4.16	4.02	4.00	5.00	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	A	4	Required for Majors	10	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	6						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	0	C	2	General	0	Under-grad	14	Non-major	14
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	5	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	1	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	2				
				?	0						

Course-Section: SPAN 201 0301
 Title INTERMEDIATE SPANISH I
 Instructor: RICHARDS, F
 Enrollment: 22
 Questionnaires: 19

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 1424
 JUN 26, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	0	0	1	7	10	4.50	605/1522	4.46	4.36	4.30	4.34	4.50	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	3	15	4.83	179/1522	4.47	4.33	4.26	4.29	4.83	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	1	2	6	9	4.28	752/1285	4.41	4.45	4.30	4.36	4.28	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	2	4	12	4.56	425/1476	4.45	4.33	4.22	4.20	4.56	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	5	3	1	2	0	6	3.42	1219/1412	3.88	4.26	4.06	4.00	3.42	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	1	2	4	10	4.35	495/1381	4.24	4.19	4.08	3.97	4.35	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	0	2	3	12	4.59	406/1500	4.37	4.14	4.18	4.20	4.59	
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	12	5	4.29	1246/1517	4.58	4.56	4.65	4.63	4.29	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	0	0	9	5	4.36	554/1497	4.34	4.21	4.11	4.11	4.36	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	1	1	5	9	4.38	953/1440	4.51	4.45	4.45	4.42	4.38	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	0	1	15	4.94	346/1448	4.85	4.79	4.71	4.78	4.94	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	0	6	10	4.63	457/1436	4.39	4.39	4.29	4.29	4.63	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	1	6	9	4.50	632/1432	4.48	4.47	4.29	4.31	4.50	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	5	0	0	5	3	2	3.70	814/1221	3.78	3.91	3.93	4.02	3.70	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	1	1	2	2	3.83	859/1280	4.20	4.28	4.10	4.08	3.83	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	13	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	290/1277	4.66	4.60	4.34	4.33	4.83	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	13	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	299/1269	4.54	4.47	4.31	4.33	4.83	
4. Were special techniques successful	13	1	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	166/ 854	4.57	4.16	4.02	4.00	4.60	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: SPAN 201 0401
 Title INTERMEDIATE SPANISH I
 Instructor: OSKOZ, ANA
 Enrollment: 25
 Questionnaires: 19

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 1425
 JUN 26, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

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

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	4	Required for Majors	6	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	B	10						
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	3	C	4	General	1	Under-grad	19	Non-major	19
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	5	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	7				
				?	0						

Course-Section: SPAN 201 0501
 Title INTERMEDIATE SPANISH I
 Instructor: STRICKLING, LAU
 Enrollment: 27
 Questionnaires: 18

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 1426
 JUN 26, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	3	14	4.72	365/1522	4.46	4.36	4.30	4.34	4.72	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	17	4.94	77/1522	4.47	4.33	4.26	4.29	4.94	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	4	14	4.78	258/1285	4.41	4.45	4.30	4.36	4.78	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	16	4.89	135/1476	4.45	4.33	4.22	4.20	4.89	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	2	3	3	3	6	3.47	1183/1412	3.88	4.26	4.06	4.00	3.47	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	5	5	8	4.17	693/1381	4.24	4.19	4.08	3.97	4.17	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	4	13	4.67	312/1500	4.37	4.14	4.18	4.20	4.67	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	17	4.94	292/1517	4.58	4.56	4.65	4.63	4.94	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	1	0	0	0	2	13	4.87	121/1497	4.34	4.21	4.11	4.11	4.87	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	2	15	4.88	224/1440	4.51	4.45	4.45	4.42	4.88	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	17	5.00	1/1448	4.85	4.79	4.71	4.78	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	2	15	4.88	141/1436	4.39	4.39	4.29	4.29	4.88	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	2	15	4.88	187/1432	4.48	4.47	4.29	4.31	4.88	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	2	1	0	1	4	9	4.33	408/1221	3.78	3.91	3.93	4.02	4.33	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	3	1	8	4.42	468/1280	4.20	4.28	4.10	4.08	4.42	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	0	1	1	10	4.75	375/1277	4.66	4.60	4.34	4.33	4.75	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	0	0	1	2	9	4.67	461/1269	4.54	4.47	4.31	4.33	4.67	
4. Were special techniques successful	6	2	0	0	0	3	7	4.70	129/ 854	4.57	4.16	4.02	4.00	4.70	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99 0	A 13	Required for Majors 10	Graduate 0 Major 0
28-55	3	1.00-1.99 0	B 5		
56-83	4	2.00-2.99 4	C 0	General 0	Under-grad 18 Non-major 18
84-150	8	3.00-3.49 9	D 0		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 3	F 0	Electives 0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 7	
			? 0		

Course-Section: SPAN 201 0601
 Title INTERMEDIATE SPANISH I
 Instructor: MESSICK, ROSALI
 Enrollment: 26
 Questionnaires: 23

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 1427
 JUN 26, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

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

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 7	Required for Majors	20
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	B 12	Graduate	0
56-83	5	2.00-2.99	C 2	General	0
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	D 0	Under-grad	23
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 1	Electives	0
			P 0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	
			I 0	Other	5
			? 0		

Course-Section: SPAN 201 0701
 Title INTERMEDIATE SPANISH I
 Instructor: GLYNN, DOUGLAS
 Enrollment: 24
 Questionnaires: 18

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 1428
 JUN 26, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

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

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	A 6	Required for Majors	14
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	B 8		Graduate 0
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	C 1	General	0
84-150	6	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad 18
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	1
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	2
			? 1		

Course-Section: SPAN 201 0801
 Title INTERMEDIATE SPANISH I
 Instructor: GLYNN, DOUGLAS
 Enrollment: 22
 Questionnaires: 19

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 1429
 JUN 26, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	1	18	4.95	106/1522	4.46	4.36	4.30	4.34	4.95	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	17	4.89	135/1522	4.47	4.33	4.26	4.29	4.89	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	16	4.84	196/1285	4.41	4.45	4.30	4.36	4.84	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	1	17	4.94	75/1476	4.45	4.33	4.22	4.20	4.94	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	4	6	8	4.22	594/1412	3.88	4.26	4.06	4.00	4.22	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	3	15	4.74	162/1381	4.24	4.19	4.08	3.97	4.74	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	2	2	15	4.68	287/1500	4.37	4.14	4.18	4.20	4.68	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	10	9	4.47	1104/1517	4.58	4.56	4.65	4.63	4.47	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	1	0	0	0	5	10	4.67	264/1497	4.34	4.21	4.11	4.11	4.67	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	0	1	16	4.94	115/1440	4.51	4.45	4.45	4.42	4.94	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	0	17	5.00	1/1448	4.85	4.79	4.71	4.78	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	1	0	2	14	4.71	373/1436	4.39	4.39	4.29	4.29	4.71	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	1	0	16	4.88	187/1432	4.48	4.47	4.29	4.31	4.88	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	10	1	0	1	1	4	4.00	606/1221	3.78	3.91	3.93	4.02	4.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	184/1280	4.20	4.28	4.10	4.08	4.80	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	9	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	228/1277	4.66	4.60	4.34	4.33	4.90	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	0	0	1	0	9	4.80	332/1269	4.54	4.47	4.31	4.33	4.80	
4. Were special techniques successful	9	0	0	0	2	0	8	4.60	166/ 854	4.57	4.16	4.02	4.00	4.60	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 215	****	****	4.36	4.62	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 228	****	4.50	4.35	4.56	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 217	****	4.50	4.51	4.57	****	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: SPAN 201 0901
 Title INTERMEDIATE SPANISH I
 Instructor: STRICKLING, LAU
 Enrollment: 29
 Questionnaires: 19

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 1430
 JUN 26, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	2	0	0	0	0	3	14	4.82	232/1522	4.46	4.36	4.30	4.34	4.82	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	0	0	0	1	16	4.94	77/1522	4.47	4.33	4.26	4.29	4.94	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	0	0	0	0	6	11	4.65	386/1285	4.41	4.45	4.30	4.36	4.65	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	3	0	0	0	1	1	14	4.81	172/1476	4.45	4.33	4.22	4.20	4.81	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	3	1	0	1	2	4	8	4.27	557/1412	3.88	4.26	4.06	4.00	4.27	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	1	5	10	4.56	280/1381	4.24	4.19	4.08	3.97	4.56	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	0	0	2	15	4.88	119/1500	4.37	4.14	4.18	4.20	4.88	
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	0	0	0	0	1	15	4.94	341/1517	4.58	4.56	4.65	4.63	4.94	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	0	0	15	5.00	1/1497	4.34	4.21	4.11	4.11	5.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	0	0	0	1	14	4.93	134/1440	4.51	4.45	4.45	4.42	4.93	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	0	0	0	15	5.00	1/1448	4.85	4.79	4.71	4.78	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	0	0	0	0	15	5.00	1/1436	4.39	4.39	4.29	4.29	5.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	0	15	5.00	1/1432	4.48	4.47	4.29	4.31	5.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	1	0	0	0	4	10	4.71	144/1221	3.78	3.91	3.93	4.02	4.71	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	0	2	9	4.82	179/1280	4.20	4.28	4.10	4.08	4.82	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	228/1277	4.66	4.60	4.34	4.33	4.91	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	223/1269	4.54	4.47	4.31	4.33	4.91	
4. Were special techniques successful	8	1	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	88/ 854	4.57	4.16	4.02	4.00	4.80	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	2	0.00-0.99 0	A 12	Required for Majors 13	Graduate 0 Major 0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99 0	B 4		
56-83	1	2.00-2.99 1	C 1	General 0	Under-grad 19 Non-major 19
84-150	3	3.00-3.49 2	D 0		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 4	F 0	Electives 0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 4	
			? 0		

Course-Section: SPAN 201 1001
 Title INTERMEDIATE SPANISH I
 Instructor: RAMIREZ, W
 Enrollment: 25
 Questionnaires: 19

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 1431
 JUN 26, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	0	0	3	3	12	4.50	605/1522	4.46	4.36	4.30	4.34	4.50	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	7	10	4.50	545/1522	4.47	4.33	4.26	4.29	4.50	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	0	3	5	10	4.21	794/1285	4.41	4.45	4.30	4.36	4.21	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	4	12	4.42	597/1476	4.45	4.33	4.22	4.20	4.42	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	1	3	3	11	4.33	493/1412	3.88	4.26	4.06	4.00	4.33	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	4	4	11	4.37	482/1381	4.24	4.19	4.08	3.97	4.37	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	3	3	12	4.37	670/1500	4.37	4.14	4.18	4.20	4.37	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	5	14	4.74	837/1517	4.58	4.56	4.65	4.63	4.74	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	1	5	11	4.59	326/1497	4.34	4.21	4.11	4.11	4.59	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	0	5	12	4.71	552/1440	4.51	4.45	4.45	4.42	4.71	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	0	17	5.00	1/1448	4.85	4.79	4.71	4.78	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	3	6	8	4.29	835/1436	4.39	4.39	4.29	4.29	4.29	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	7	10	4.59	548/1432	4.48	4.47	4.29	4.31	4.59	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	9	0	1	1	0	6	4.38	380/1221	3.78	3.91	3.93	4.02	4.38	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	343/1280	4.20	4.28	4.10	4.08	4.57	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	12	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	272/1277	4.66	4.60	4.34	4.33	4.86	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	12	0	0	0	1	1	5	4.57	532/1269	4.54	4.47	4.31	4.33	4.57	
4. Were special techniques successful	12	1	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	84/ 854	4.57	4.16	4.02	4.00	4.83	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	4	0.00-0.99 1	A 11	Required for Majors 13	Graduate 0 Major 0
28-55	4	1.00-1.99 0	B 7		
56-83	1	2.00-2.99 1	C 0	General 1	Under-grad 19 Non-major 19
84-150	5	3.00-3.49 5	D 0		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 3	F 0	Electives 0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 5	
			? 0		

Course-Section: SPAN 201 1101
 Title INTERMEDIATE SPANISH I
 Instructor: DEANGULO, SANTI
 Enrollment: 21
 Questionnaires: 18

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 1432
 JUN 26, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	1	5	4	8	4.06	1088/1522	4.46	4.36	4.30	4.34	4.06	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	0	4	6	7	4.00	1080/1522	4.47	4.33	4.26	4.29	4.00	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	2	2	5	9	4.17	833/1285	4.41	4.45	4.30	4.36	4.17	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	11	4	4.06	982/1476	4.45	4.33	4.22	4.20	4.06	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	5	1	1	2	5	4	3.77	1005/1412	3.88	4.26	4.06	4.00	3.77	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	1	1	1	2	7	5	3.88	961/1381	4.24	4.19	4.08	3.97	3.88	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	2	2	8	6	4.00	988/1500	4.37	4.14	4.18	4.20	4.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	15	3	4.17	1319/1517	4.58	4.56	4.65	4.63	4.17	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	3	6	5	4.14	782/1497	4.34	4.21	4.11	4.11	4.14	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	1	0	0	9	8	4.28	1031/1440	4.51	4.45	4.45	4.42	4.28	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	1	16	4.83	683/1448	4.85	4.79	4.71	4.78	4.83	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	3	8	7	4.22	906/1436	4.39	4.39	4.29	4.29	4.22	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	2	3	6	7	4.00	1036/1432	4.48	4.47	4.29	4.31	4.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	8	1	0	1	3	2	3.71	808/1221	3.78	3.91	3.93	4.02	3.71	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	3	3	1	3.71	934/1280	4.20	4.28	4.10	4.08	3.71	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	11	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	421/1277	4.66	4.60	4.34	4.33	4.71	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	11	0	0	0	1	3	3	4.29	756/1269	4.54	4.47	4.31	4.33	4.29	
4. Were special techniques successful	11	1	0	0	0	3	3	4.50	194/ 854	4.57	4.16	4.02	4.00	4.50	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: SPAN 201 1201
 Title INTERMEDIATE SPANISH I
 Instructor: DEANGULO, SANTI
 Enrollment: 20
 Questionnaires: 18

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 1433
 JUN 26, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	1	1	7	9	4.33	814/1522	4.46	4.36	4.30	4.34	4.33	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	8	7	4.17	965/1522	4.47	4.33	4.26	4.29	4.17	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	5	11	4.44	602/1285	4.41	4.45	4.30	4.36	4.44	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	3	0	4	11	4.28	769/1476	4.45	4.33	4.22	4.20	4.28	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	4	1	2	3	5	3	3.50	1165/1412	3.88	4.26	4.06	4.00	3.50	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	2	1	8	6	3.89	953/1381	4.24	4.19	4.08	3.97	3.89	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	2	6	9	4.28	760/1500	4.37	4.14	4.18	4.20	4.28	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	2	14	2	4.00	1389/1517	4.58	4.56	4.65	4.63	4.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	1	0	7	8	4.38	534/1497	4.34	4.21	4.11	4.11	4.38	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	3	7	8	4.28	1031/1440	4.51	4.45	4.45	4.42	4.28	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	5	12	4.61	1060/1448	4.85	4.79	4.71	4.78	4.61	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	3	5	10	4.39	741/1436	4.39	4.39	4.29	4.29	4.39	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	5	12	4.61	514/1432	4.48	4.47	4.29	4.31	4.61	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	9	2	0	3	2	2	3.22	1021/1221	3.78	3.91	3.93	4.02	3.22	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	1	3	1	4.00	718/1280	4.20	4.28	4.10	4.08	4.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	13	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	692/1277	4.66	4.60	4.34	4.33	4.40	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	13	0	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	816/1269	4.54	4.47	4.31	4.33	4.20	
4. Were special techniques successful	13	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	252/ 854	4.57	4.16	4.02	4.00	4.40	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	A 2	Required for Majors	10
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	B 11		Graduate 0
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	C 3	General	18
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	D 0		Non-major 18
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	7
			? 0		

Course-Section: SPAN 202 0101
 Title INTERMEDIATE SPANISH I
 Instructor: MESSICK, ROSALI
 Enrollment: 23
 Questionnaires: 16

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 1434
 JUN 26, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	3	12	4.69	414/1522	4.42	4.36	4.30	4.34	4.69	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	3	12	4.69	334/1522	4.23	4.33	4.26	4.29	4.69	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	3	12	4.69	347/1285	4.69	4.45	4.30	4.36	4.69	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	4	12	4.75	226/1476	4.38	4.33	4.22	4.20	4.75	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	2	5	8	4.25	566/1412	4.24	4.26	4.06	4.00	4.25	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	1	5	9	4.38	470/1381	4.23	4.19	4.08	3.97	4.38	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	2	6	7	4.19	850/1500	3.82	4.14	4.18	4.20	4.19	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	16	5.00	1/1517	4.96	4.56	4.65	4.63	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	1	5	8	4.50	385/1497	4.15	4.21	4.11	4.11	4.50	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	1	4	9	4.57	716/1440	4.58	4.45	4.45	4.42	4.57	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	1	14	4.93	346/1448	4.84	4.79	4.71	4.78	4.93	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	0	7	7	4.50	601/1436	4.42	4.39	4.29	4.29	4.50	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	1	1	12	4.60	527/1432	4.34	4.47	4.29	4.31	4.60	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	2	0	4	3	3	2	3.25	1011/1221	3.50	3.91	3.93	4.02	3.25	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	2	1	3	4.17	644/1280	4.25	4.28	4.10	4.08	4.17	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	10	0	0	0	1	0	5	4.67	470/1277	4.71	4.60	4.34	4.33	4.67	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	10	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	299/1269	4.75	4.47	4.31	4.33	4.83	
4. Were special techniques successful	10	0	0	1	0	1	4	4.33	287/ 854	4.17	4.16	4.02	4.00	4.33	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	A 9	Required for Majors	4
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	B 4		Graduate 0
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	C 2	General	2
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad 16
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	2
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	7
			? 0		

Course-Section: SPAN 202 0201
 Title INTERMEDIATE SPANISH I
 Instructor: VAL, ADRIANA
 Enrollment: 16
 Questionnaires: 13

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 1435
 JUN 26, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: SPAN 202H 0101
 Title INTERMED SPAN II HONR
 Instructor: MESSICK, ROSALI
 Enrollment: 2
 Questionnaires: 1

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 1436
 JUN 26, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

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

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: SPAN 301 0101
 Title ADVANCED SPANISH I
 Instructor: AREVALO GUERRERO
 Enrollment: 15
 Questionnaires: 11

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 1437
 JUN 26, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	2	1	8	4.55	559/1522	3.92	4.36	4.30	4.34	4.55	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	2	6	4.27	854/1522	3.91	4.33	4.26	4.25	4.27	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	1	9	4.73	308/1285	4.55	4.45	4.30	4.30	4.73	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1476	4.55	4.33	4.22	4.26	5.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	3	3	4	3.82	964/1412	4.06	4.26	4.06	4.03	3.82	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	9	4.82	114/1381	4.36	4.19	4.08	4.13	4.82	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	4	6	4.45	556/1500	3.68	4.14	4.18	4.13	4.45	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1517	4.00	4.56	4.65	4.62	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	7	4	4.36	544/1497	4.07	4.21	4.11	4.13	4.36	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	192/1440	4.10	4.45	4.45	4.46	4.91	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1448	4.80	4.79	4.71	4.71	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	1	2	7	4.60	478/1436	4.00	4.39	4.29	4.30	4.60	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	4	7	4.64	490/1432	3.97	4.47	4.29	4.29	4.64	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	1	0	0	3	4	3	4.00	606/1221	3.40	3.91	3.93	3.94	4.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1280	4.71	4.28	4.10	4.14	5.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	290/1277	4.70	4.60	4.34	4.38	4.83	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1269	4.79	4.47	4.31	4.39	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	5	0	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	194/ 854	4.42	4.16	4.02	4.00	4.50	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	2	0.00-0.99 0	A 6	Required for Majors	1 Graduate 0 Major 3
28-55	2	1.00-1.99 0	B 4		
56-83	1	2.00-2.99 0	C 0	General	5 Under-grad 11 Non-major 8
84-150	2	3.00-3.49 1	D 0		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 7	F 0	Electives	1 #### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 0		
			I 0	Other	5
			? 0		

Course-Section: SPAN 301 0201
 Title ADVANCED SPANISH I
 Instructor: SLOANE, ROBERT
 Enrollment: 16
 Questionnaires: 11

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 1438
 JUN 26, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	0	2	4	3	1	3.30	1456/1522	3.92	4.36	4.30	4.34	3.30	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	5	3	2	3.55	1348/1522	3.91	4.33	4.26	4.25	3.55	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	2	7	4.36	682/1285	4.55	4.45	4.30	4.30	4.36	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	3	5	4.09	961/1476	4.55	4.33	4.22	4.26	4.09	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	5	4	4.30	520/1412	4.06	4.26	4.06	4.03	4.30	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	2	5	3	3.91	938/1381	4.36	4.19	4.08	4.13	3.91	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	2	1	6	0	2	2.91	1449/1500	3.68	4.14	4.18	4.13	2.91	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	2	7	0	1	3.00	1506/1517	4.00	4.56	4.65	4.62	3.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	4	3	2	3.78	1133/1497	4.07	4.21	4.11	4.13	3.78	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	3	2	4	1	3.30	1390/1440	4.10	4.45	4.45	4.46	3.30	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	1	2	7	4.60	1072/1448	4.80	4.79	4.71	4.71	4.60	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	2	3	4	1	3.40	1315/1436	4.00	4.39	4.29	4.30	3.40	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	1	3	4	1	3.30	1327/1432	3.97	4.47	4.29	4.29	3.30	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	5	1	1	2	0	1	2.80	1121/1221	3.40	3.91	3.93	3.94	2.80	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	1	2	4	4.43	459/1280	4.71	4.28	4.10	4.14	4.43	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	0	1	1	5	4.57	547/1277	4.70	4.60	4.34	4.38	4.57	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	0	1	1	5	4.57	532/1269	4.79	4.47	4.31	4.39	4.57	
4. Were special techniques successful	4	1	0	0	1	2	3	4.33	287/ 854	4.42	4.16	4.02	4.00	4.33	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: SPAN 302 0101
 Title ADVANCED SPANISH II
 Instructor: SLOANE, ROBERT
 Enrollment: 16
 Questionnaires: 14

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 1439
 JUN 26, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	2	5	7	4.36	791/1522	4.46	4.36	4.30	4.34	4.36	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	6	5	4.07	1042/1522	4.04	4.33	4.26	4.25	4.07	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	4	10	4.71	318/1285	4.36	4.45	4.30	4.30	4.71	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	3	9	4.43	597/1476	4.36	4.33	4.22	4.26	4.43	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	3	11	4.79	149/1412	4.68	4.26	4.06	4.03	4.79	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	12	4.86	102/1381	4.64	4.19	4.08	4.13	4.86	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	4	2	3	4	3.36	1372/1500	3.61	4.14	4.18	4.13	3.36	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	1	8	4	0	3.23	1500/1517	3.62	4.56	4.65	4.62	3.23	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	2	5	4	4.18	731/1497	4.39	4.21	4.11	4.13	4.18	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	1	2	6	4	4.00	1186/1440	4.25	4.45	4.45	4.46	4.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	1	0	12	4.85	656/1448	4.84	4.79	4.71	4.71	4.85	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	6	7	4.54	564/1436	4.52	4.39	4.29	4.30	4.54	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	5	7	4.46	682/1432	4.48	4.47	4.29	4.29	4.46	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	8	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	99/1221	4.23	3.91	3.93	3.94	4.80	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	207/1280	4.39	4.28	4.10	4.14	4.78	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	0	1	1	7	4.67	470/1277	4.75	4.60	4.34	4.38	4.67	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	244/1269	4.94	4.47	4.31	4.39	4.89	
4. Were special techniques successful	5	0	0	0	2	3	4	4.22	347/ 854	3.86	4.16	4.02	4.00	4.22	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	5	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	4
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	0	B	7						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	1	C	1	General	4	Under-grad	14	Non-major	10
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	8	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	9				
				?	0						

Course-Section: SPAN 302 0201
 Title ADVANCED SPANISH II
 Instructor: NASH, LYLE
 Enrollment: 18
 Questionnaires: 7

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 1440
 JUN 26, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

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

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: SPAN 304 0101
 Title SPAN:FOR HERITAGE SPEA
 Instructor: SCHWARTZ, ANA-M
 Enrollment: 14
 Questionnaires: 13

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 1441
 JUN 26, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	0	0	0	3	9	4.75	320/1522	4.75	4.36	4.30	4.34	4.75	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	11	4.85	171/1522	4.85	4.33	4.26	4.25	4.85	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	12	4.92	120/1285	4.92	4.45	4.30	4.30	4.92	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	0	3	8	4.73	255/1476	4.73	4.33	4.22	4.26	4.73	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	3	10	4.77	161/1412	4.77	4.26	4.06	4.03	4.77	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	4	9	4.69	187/1381	4.69	4.19	4.08	4.13	4.69	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	2	2	8	4.31	731/1500	4.31	4.14	4.18	4.13	4.31	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	13	5.00	1/1517	5.00	4.56	4.65	4.62	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	0	6	5	4.45	445/1497	4.45	4.21	4.11	4.13	4.45	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	1	12	4.92	153/1440	4.92	4.45	4.45	4.46	4.92	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	13	5.00	1/1448	5.00	4.79	4.71	4.71	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	2	11	4.85	179/1436	4.85	4.39	4.29	4.30	4.85	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	11	4.85	240/1432	4.85	4.47	4.29	4.29	4.85	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	4	3	1	0	0	4	3.13	1048/1221	3.13	3.91	3.93	3.94	3.13	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	2	10	4.83	170/1280	4.83	4.28	4.10	4.14	4.83	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	205/1277	4.92	4.60	4.34	4.38	4.92	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/1269	5.00	4.47	4.31	4.39	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	1	0	0	0	3	2	7	4.33	287/ 854	4.33	4.16	4.02	4.00	4.33	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	11	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 215	****	****	4.36	4.21	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 228	****	4.50	4.35	4.29	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 217	****	4.50	4.51	4.45	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 216	****	****	4.42	4.35	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 205	****	5.00	4.23	4.26	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	11	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 79	****	5.00	4.58	4.53	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 77	****	5.00	4.52	4.30	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 65	****	5.00	4.49	4.33	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 78	****	4.83	4.45	4.34	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 80	****	4.83	4.11	3.33	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	11	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 47	****	3.60	4.41	4.56	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 45	****	4.00	4.30	4.39	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 39	****	3.00	4.40	4.68	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 35	****	3.00	4.31	4.26	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 34	****	2.75	4.30	4.12	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 37	****	4.33	4.63	5.00	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 23	****	****	4.41	****	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 33	****	****	4.69	4.75	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 22	****	****	4.54	****	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 18	****	****	4.49	****	****	

Course-Section: SPAN 304 0101
 Title SPAN:FOR HERITAGE SPEA
 Instructor: SCHWARTZ, ANA-M
 Enrollment: 14
 Questionnaires: 13

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 1441
 JUN 26, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: SPAN 307 0101
 Title ESPANA Y SUS CULTURAS
 Instructor: SINNIGEN, JOHN
 Enrollment: 18
 Questionnaires: 11

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 1442
 JUN 26, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: SPAN 308 0101
 Title LATINOAMERICA Y SUS CU
 Instructor: POGGIO, SARA
 Enrollment: 21
 Questionnaires: 11

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 1443
 JUN 26, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

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

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: SPAN 311 0101
 Title INTRO TO SPANISH LIT
 Instructor: SLOANE, ROBERT
 Enrollment: 23
 Questionnaires: 21

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 1444
 JUN 26, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	0	1	2	5	12	4.40	733/1522	4.40	4.36	4.30	4.34	4.40	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	3	9	8	4.25	874/1522	4.25	4.33	4.26	4.25	4.25	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	8	12	4.60	425/1285	4.60	4.45	4.30	4.30	4.60	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	3	9	8	4.25	792/1476	4.25	4.33	4.22	4.26	4.25	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	5	14	4.74	179/1412	4.74	4.26	4.06	4.03	4.74	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	2	7	10	4.42	413/1381	4.42	4.19	4.08	4.13	4.42	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	2	3	6	8	4.05	961/1500	4.05	4.14	4.18	4.13	4.05	
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	0	1	0	8	6	3	3.56	1488/1517	3.56	4.56	4.65	4.62	3.56	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	1	1	3	12	4.53	370/1497	4.53	4.21	4.11	4.13	4.53	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	1	2	8	7	4.17	1112/1440	4.17	4.45	4.45	4.46	4.17	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	0	2	16	4.89	548/1448	4.89	4.79	4.71	4.71	4.89	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	0	9	9	4.50	601/1436	4.50	4.39	4.29	4.30	4.50	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	1	0	1	3	12	4.47	669/1432	4.47	4.47	4.29	4.29	4.47	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	12	1	0	2	2	1	3.33	983/1221	3.33	3.91	3.93	3.94	3.33	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	1	2	12	4.73	237/1280	4.73	4.28	4.10	4.14	4.73	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	0	0	2	13	4.87	263/1277	4.87	4.60	4.34	4.38	4.87	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	0	0	0	2	13	4.87	266/1269	4.87	4.47	4.31	4.39	4.87	
4. Were special techniques successful	6	2	0	0	1	6	6	4.38	262/ 854	4.38	4.16	4.02	4.00	4.38	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	19	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 215	****	****	4.36	4.21	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	19	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 228	****	4.50	4.35	4.29	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	19	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 217	****	4.50	4.51	4.45	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	19	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 216	****	****	4.42	4.35	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	19	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 205	****	5.00	4.23	4.26	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	20	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 79	****	5.00	4.58	4.53	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	20	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 77	****	5.00	4.52	4.30	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 65	****	5.00	4.49	4.33	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 78	****	4.83	4.45	4.34	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	19	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 80	****	4.83	4.11	3.33	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors		
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	1	A 12	Required for Majors 0	Graduate 0	Major 8
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B 3			
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	1	C 0	General 1	Under-grad 21	Non-major 13
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	3	D 0			
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F 0	Electives 0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	
				P 0			
				I 0	Other 14		
				? 0			

Course-Section: SPAN 312 0101
 Title INTRO TO LATIN AMER LI
 Instructor: SCHNEIDER, JUDI
 Enrollment: 19
 Questionnaires: 15

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 1445
 JUN 26, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	3	3	9	4.40	733/1522	4.40	4.36	4.30	4.34	4.40	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	8	6	4.33	787/1522	4.33	4.33	4.26	4.25	4.33	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	6	8	4.47	578/1285	4.47	4.45	4.30	4.30	4.47	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	0	0	4	10	4.47	535/1476	4.47	4.33	4.22	4.26	4.47	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	2	3	9	4.33	493/1412	4.33	4.26	4.06	4.03	4.33	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	3	4	7	4.07	774/1381	4.07	4.19	4.08	4.13	4.07	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	3	5	6	4.07	956/1500	4.07	4.14	4.18	4.13	4.07	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	4	8	3	3.93	1431/1517	3.93	4.56	4.65	4.62	3.93	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	1	3	6	4	3.93	1006/1497	3.93	4.21	4.11	4.13	3.93	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	1	1	5	8	4.33	984/1440	4.33	4.45	4.45	4.46	4.33	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	4	11	4.73	897/1448	4.73	4.79	4.71	4.71	4.73	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	1	3	4	7	4.13	980/1436	4.13	4.39	4.29	4.30	4.13	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	0	6	8	4.33	820/1432	4.33	4.47	4.29	4.29	4.33	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	1	1	2	4	5	1	3.23	1018/1221	3.23	3.91	3.93	3.94	3.23	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	4	6	4.60	324/1280	4.60	4.28	4.10	4.14	4.60	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	317/1277	4.80	4.60	4.34	4.38	4.80	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	332/1269	4.80	4.47	4.31	4.39	4.80	
4. Were special techniques successful	5	1	0	0	1	3	5	4.44	228/ 854	4.44	4.16	4.02	4.00	4.44	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	A 9	Required for Majors	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	B 4		Graduate 0
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	C 0	General	1
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad 15
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	12
			? 0		

Course-Section: SPAN 331 0101
 Title STRUCT SPAN
 Instructor: WESTPHAL, GERMA
 Enrollment: 7
 Questionnaires: 6

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 1446
 JUN 26, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	433/1522	4.67	4.36	4.30	4.34	4.67	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	5	1	4.17	965/1522	4.17	4.33	4.26	4.25	4.17	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	5	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1285	****	4.45	4.30	4.30	****	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	316/1476	4.67	4.33	4.22	4.26	4.67	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	1	2	2	3.83	948/1412	3.83	4.26	4.06	4.03	3.83	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	331/1381	4.50	4.19	4.08	4.13	4.50	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	312/1500	4.67	4.14	4.18	4.13	4.67	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	645/1517	4.83	4.56	4.65	4.62	4.83	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	385/1497	4.50	4.21	4.11	4.13	4.50	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1440	5.00	4.45	4.45	4.46	5.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1448	5.00	4.79	4.71	4.71	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1436	5.00	4.39	4.29	4.30	5.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1432	5.00	4.47	4.29	4.29	5.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1280	5.00	4.28	4.10	4.14	5.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	317/1277	4.80	4.60	4.34	4.38	4.80	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	777/1269	4.25	4.47	4.31	4.39	4.25	
4. Were special techniques successful	1	4	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 854	****	4.16	4.02	4.00	****	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: SPAN 401 0101
 Title STUDIES IN SPANISH LAN
 Instructor: BELL, ALAN S
 Enrollment: 7
 Questionnaires: 6

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 1447
 JUN 26, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	605/1522	4.50	4.36	4.30	4.42	4.50	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	179/1522	4.83	4.33	4.26	4.34	4.83	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	366/1285	4.67	4.45	4.30	4.42	4.67	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	162/1476	4.83	4.33	4.22	4.31	4.83	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	1	3	4.17	646/1412	4.17	4.26	4.06	4.11	4.17	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	0	5	4.67	207/1381	4.67	4.19	4.08	4.21	4.67	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	0	2	3	4.17	871/1500	4.17	4.14	4.18	4.25	4.17	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	932/1517	4.67	4.56	4.65	4.71	4.67	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	1	0	3	1	3.80	1113/1497	3.80	4.21	4.11	4.21	3.80	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	3	3	4.50	798/1440	4.50	4.45	4.45	4.52	4.50	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	683/1448	4.83	4.79	4.71	4.75	4.83	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	415/1436	4.67	4.39	4.29	4.32	4.67	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	2	3	4.33	820/1432	4.33	4.47	4.29	4.34	4.33	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	0	3	3	4.50	279/1221	4.50	3.91	3.93	4.04	4.50	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	286/1280	4.67	4.28	4.10	4.28	4.67	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	470/1277	4.67	4.60	4.34	4.50	4.67	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	721/1269	4.33	4.47	4.31	4.49	4.33	
4. Were special techniques successful	3	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	426/ 854	4.00	4.16	4.02	4.31	4.00	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: SPAN 421 0101
 Title STUDIES IN HISPANIC LI
 Instructor: SINNIGEN, JOHN
 Enrollment: 10
 Questionnaires: 10

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 1448
 JUN 26, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

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

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: SPAN 421H 0101
 Title: STUDIES IN HISPANIC LI
 Instructor: SINNIGEN, JOHN
 Enrollment: 4
 Questionnaires: 1

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 1449
 JUN 26, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1122/1522	4.00	4.36	4.30	4.42	4.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1522	5.00	4.33	4.26	4.34	5.00	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	938/1285	4.00	4.45	4.30	4.42	4.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1009/1476	4.00	4.33	4.22	4.31	4.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1412	5.00	4.26	4.06	4.11	5.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	806/1381	4.00	4.19	4.08	4.21	4.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1500	5.00	4.14	4.18	4.25	5.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1517	5.00	4.56	4.65	4.71	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	898/1497	4.00	4.21	4.11	4.21	4.00	

Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1440	5.00	4.45	4.45	4.52	5.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1448	5.00	4.79	4.71	4.75	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1056/1436	4.00	4.39	4.29	4.32	4.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1432	5.00	4.47	4.29	4.34	5.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	606/1221	4.00	3.91	3.93	4.04	4.00	

Frequency Distribution

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

- Means there are not enough responses to be significant

Course-Section: SPAN 472 0101
 Title TOPICS IN LATN AMER CI
 Instructor: MEDINA, ADRIANA
 Enrollment: 19
 Questionnaires: 17

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 1450
 JUN 26, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	1	0	0	4	12	4.53	582/1522	4.53	4.36	4.30	4.42	4.53	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	5	10	4.41	686/1522	4.41	4.33	4.26	4.34	4.41	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	0	1	5	10	4.35	690/1285	4.35	4.45	4.30	4.42	4.35	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	0	0	7	9	4.35	682/1476	4.35	4.33	4.22	4.31	4.35	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	3	1	5	8	4.06	728/1412	4.06	4.26	4.06	4.11	4.06	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	4	5	7	4.00	806/1381	4.00	4.19	4.08	4.21	4.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	0	2	6	8	4.18	860/1500	4.18	4.14	4.18	4.25	4.18	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	3	14	4.82	668/1517	4.82	4.56	4.65	4.71	4.82	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	1	1	4	7	4.31	602/1497	4.31	4.21	4.11	4.21	4.31	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	1	1	3	11	4.50	798/1440	4.50	4.45	4.45	4.52	4.50	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	1	0	2	13	4.69	977/1448	4.69	4.79	4.71	4.75	4.69	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	2	2	1	10	4.27	865/1436	4.27	4.39	4.29	4.32	4.27	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	1	0	3	11	4.38	784/1432	4.38	4.47	4.29	4.34	4.38	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	3	0	0	3	3	5	4.18	508/1221	4.18	3.91	3.93	4.04	4.18	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	1	0	0	2	11	4.57	343/1280	4.57	4.28	4.10	4.28	4.57	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	1	1	0	1	11	4.43	672/1277	4.43	4.60	4.34	4.50	4.43	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	1	1	12	4.79	351/1269	4.79	4.47	4.31	4.49	4.79	
4. Were special techniques successful	4	1	1	0	1	2	8	4.33	287/ 854	4.33	4.16	4.02	4.31	4.33	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 79	****	5.00	4.58	4.67	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 77	****	5.00	4.52	4.60	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 65	****	5.00	4.49	4.65	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 78	****	4.83	4.45	4.58	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	16	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 80	****	4.83	4.11	4.14	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	5	0.00-0.99	0	A 11	Required for Majors 0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B 3	Graduate 1
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	1	C 1	General 4
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	1	D 0	Under-grad 16
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00	7	F 0	Non-major 12
				P 0	
				I 0	
				? 0	
					Electives 1
					Other 8

- Means there are not enough responses to be significant

Course-Section: SPAN 621 0101
 Title STUDIES IN HISPANIC LI
 Instructor: SINNIGEN, JOHN
 Enrollment: 4
 Questionnaires: 4

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 1451
 JUN 26, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	320/1522	4.75	4.36	4.30	4.45	4.75	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	0	1	2	4.00	1080/1522	4.00	4.33	4.26	4.29	4.00	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1285	5.00	4.45	4.30	4.31	5.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	0	1	2	4.00	1009/1476	4.00	4.33	4.22	4.31	4.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1412	5.00	4.26	4.06	4.25	5.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	0	0	3	4.00	806/1381	4.00	4.19	4.08	4.25	4.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	0	0	3	4.25	780/1500	4.25	4.14	4.18	4.22	4.25	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1517	5.00	4.56	4.65	4.73	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1497	5.00	4.21	4.11	4.21	5.00	

Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1440	5.00	4.45	4.45	4.48	5.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1448	5.00	4.79	4.71	4.80	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1436	5.00	4.39	4.29	4.37	5.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	350/1432	4.75	4.47	4.29	4.33	4.75	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	124/1221	4.75	3.91	3.93	3.83	4.75	

Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	222/1280	4.75	4.28	4.10	4.24	4.75	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	594/1277	4.50	4.60	4.34	4.52	4.50	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	381/1269	4.75	4.47	4.31	4.51	4.75	
4. Were special techniques successful	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	194/ 854	4.50	4.16	4.02	4.08	4.50	

Frequency Distribution

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