

Course-Section: SPAN 101 1
 Title Elementary Spanish I
 Instructor: Messick,Rosalie
 Enrollment: 27
 Questionnaires: 17

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2009

Page 1414
 MAR 22, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	2	0	0	2	3	3	7	4.00	1114/1509	4.47	4.42	4.31	4.18	4.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	3	2	4	1	5	3.20	1441/1509	4.34	4.39	4.26	4.25	3.20
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	0	1	1	2	4	7	4.00	924/1287	4.50	4.48	4.30	4.24	4.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	1	1	3	1	3	6	3.71	1212/1459	4.31	4.32	4.22	4.11	3.71
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	1	2	5	6	3.93	897/1406	4.21	4.19	4.09	4.02	3.93
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	3	2	3	6	3.67	1107/1384	3.96	4.17	4.11	3.98	3.67
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	3	3	4	2	3	2.93	1419/1489	3.93	4.07	4.17	4.20	2.93
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	10	5	4.33	1205/1506	4.70	4.55	4.67	4.66	4.33
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	1	2	4	4	2	3.31	1323/1463	4.22	4.16	4.09	4.02	3.31
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	2	2	6	1	3	3.07	1403/1438	4.32	4.48	4.46	4.44	3.07
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	1	1	12	4.79	828/1421	4.89	4.75	4.73	4.66	4.79
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	2	1	4	4	3	3.36	1317/1411	4.38	4.39	4.31	4.27	3.36
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	2	1	5	3	3	3.29	1315/1405	4.38	4.45	4.32	4.27	3.29
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	10	0	1	2	1	0	3.00	****/1236	4.00	3.92	4.00	3.87	****
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	2	3	0	3.60	1011/1260	4.45	4.32	4.14	3.95	3.60
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	12	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	665/1255	4.53	4.53	4.33	4.15	4.40
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	12	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	721/1258	4.67	4.46	4.38	4.18	4.40
4. Were special techniques successful	12	0	1	1	0	1	2	3.40	738/ 873	4.25	4.14	4.03	3.89	3.40

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	A	7	Required for Majors	3	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	0	B	1						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	4	C	5	General	11	Under-grad	17	Non-major	17
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	3	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	1				
				?	2						

Course-Section: SPAN 101 2
 Title Elementary Spanish I
 Instructor: Messick,Rosalie
 Enrollment: 31
 Questionnaires: 21

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2009

Page 1415
 MAR 22, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	1	1	1	7	11	4.24	901/1509	4.47	4.42	4.31	4.18	4.24
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	2	3	9	6	3.81	1228/1509	4.34	4.39	4.26	4.25	3.81
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	2	3	6	10	4.14	857/1287	4.50	4.48	4.30	4.24	4.14
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	2	5	6	8	3.95	1033/1459	4.31	4.32	4.22	4.11	3.95
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	1	3	7	8	4.16	693/1406	4.21	4.19	4.09	4.02	4.16
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	3	4	8	6	3.81	1017/1384	3.96	4.17	4.11	3.98	3.81
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	2	5	5	5	4	3.19	1383/1489	3.93	4.07	4.17	4.20	3.19
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	10	11	4.52	1054/1506	4.70	4.55	4.67	4.66	4.52
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	2	0	4	7	3	3.56	1220/1463	4.22	4.16	4.09	4.02	3.56
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	1	2	4	7	6	3.75	1315/1438	4.32	4.48	4.46	4.44	3.75
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	3	17	4.85	665/1421	4.89	4.75	4.73	4.66	4.85
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	1	2	2	7	8	3.95	1098/1411	4.38	4.39	4.31	4.27	3.95
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	1	3	6	9	4.05	1024/1405	4.38	4.45	4.32	4.27	4.05
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	10	4	0	1	3	1	2.67	1188/1236	4.00	3.92	4.00	3.87	2.67
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	1	2	4	2	3.78	924/1260	4.45	4.32	4.14	3.95	3.78
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	12	0	0	1	1	1	6	4.33	723/1255	4.53	4.53	4.33	4.15	4.33
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	12	0	0	0	1	2	6	4.56	584/1258	4.67	4.46	4.38	4.18	4.56
4. Were special techniques successful	12	0	0	0	3	3	3	4.00	442/ 873	4.25	4.14	4.03	3.89	4.00

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors		
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	A 4	Required for Majors 5	Graduate 0	Major 2
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B 12			
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	3	C 4	General 11	Under-grad 21	Non-major 19
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	5	D 0			
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F 0	Electives 3	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	
				P 0			
				I 0	Other 0		
				? 0			

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	0	0	1	10	15	4.54	563/1509	4.47	4.42	4.31	4.18	4.54
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	3	9	14	4.42	667/1509	4.34	4.39	4.26	4.25	4.42
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	4	5	17	4.50	519/1287	4.50	4.48	4.30	4.24	4.50
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	3	0	0	1	7	15	4.61	346/1459	4.31	4.32	4.22	4.11	4.61
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	2	0	1	3	7	12	4.30	527/1406	4.21	4.19	4.09	4.02	4.30
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	1	5	9	10	4.12	734/1384	3.96	4.17	4.11	3.98	4.12
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	3	5	4	3	10	3.48	1311/1489	3.93	4.07	4.17	4.20	3.48
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	5	20	4.80	782/1506	4.70	4.55	4.67	4.66	4.80
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	1	0	0	3	11	6	4.15	738/1463	4.22	4.16	4.09	4.02	4.15
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	2	3	19	4.71	531/1438	4.32	4.48	4.46	4.44	4.71
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	1	1	22	4.88	614/1421	4.89	4.75	4.73	4.66	4.88
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	1	7	16	4.63	469/1411	4.38	4.39	4.31	4.27	4.63
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	2	5	17	4.63	513/1405	4.38	4.45	4.32	4.27	4.63
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	0	0	1	4	8	11	4.21	528/1236	4.00	3.92	4.00	3.87	4.21
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	0	4	13	4.76	237/1260	4.45	4.32	4.14	3.95	4.76
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	10	0	0	0	1	6	10	4.53	561/1255	4.53	4.53	4.33	4.15	4.53
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	10	0	0	0	2	4	11	4.53	605/1258	4.67	4.46	4.38	4.18	4.53
4. Were special techniques successful	10	4	0	0	2	2	9	4.54	199/ 873	4.25	4.14	4.03	3.89	4.54
Laboratory														
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	26	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 198	****	****	4.22	4.14	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	25	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 89	****	5.00	4.49	4.31	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	25	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 92	****	4.93	4.54	4.16	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	25	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 92	****	4.93	4.38	4.21	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	25	1	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 93	****	4.86	4.06	3.92	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	25	0	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.39	3.75	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	25	0	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.41	4.29	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	25	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 47	****	****	4.51	4.53	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	25	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 47	****	****	4.18	4.26	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	25	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 44	****	****	4.32	4.12	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	24	0	1	0	2	0	0	2.33	****/ 49	****	****	4.26	4.28	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	24	1	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/ 41	****	****	4.14	4.13	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	24	0	0	0	3	0	0	3.00	****/ 46	****	****	4.31	4.52	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	24	1	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 37	****	****	4.05	4.47	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	24	1	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.27	4.21	****

Course-Section: SPAN 101 3
 Title Elementary Spanish I
 Instructor: Carmody, Sean P
 Enrollment: 33
 Questionnaires: 27

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2009

Page 1416
 MAR 22, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: SPAN 101 4
 Title Elementary Spanish I
 Instructor: DeLutis-Eichenb
 Enrollment: 32
 Questionnaires: 16

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2009

Page 1417
 MAR 22, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	2	1	13	4.69	386/1509	4.47	4.42	4.31	4.18	4.69
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	1	14	4.81	192/1509	4.34	4.39	4.26	4.25	4.81
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	0	1	14	4.75	261/1287	4.50	4.48	4.30	4.24	4.75
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	2	0	3	11	4.44	569/1459	4.31	4.32	4.22	4.11	4.44
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	4	3	8	4.27	575/1406	4.21	4.19	4.09	4.02	4.27
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	2	1	4	7	3.93	899/1384	3.96	4.17	4.11	3.98	3.93
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	1	0	3	11	4.60	341/1489	3.93	4.07	4.17	4.20	4.60
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	1	0	0	15	4.81	762/1506	4.70	4.55	4.67	4.66	4.81
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	3	12	4.80	118/1463	4.22	4.16	4.09	4.02	4.80
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	1	0	13	4.86	291/1438	4.32	4.48	4.46	4.44	4.86
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	1	0	13	4.86	665/1421	4.89	4.75	4.73	4.66	4.86
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	1	2	10	4.69	376/1411	4.38	4.39	4.31	4.27	4.69
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	1	1	0	11	4.62	526/1405	4.38	4.45	4.32	4.27	4.62
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	0	1	0	0	1	12	4.64	187/1236	4.00	3.92	4.00	3.87	4.64
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	187/1260	4.45	4.32	4.14	3.95	4.83
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	10	0	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	575/1255	4.53	4.53	4.33	4.15	4.50
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	10	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1258	4.67	4.46	4.38	4.18	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	10	1	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	261/ 873	4.25	4.14	4.03	3.89	4.40

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: SPAN 101 5
 Title Elementary Spanish I
 Instructor: Strickling,Laur
 Enrollment: 30
 Questionnaires: 27

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2009

Page 1418
 MAR 22, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	5	21	4.74	315/1509	4.47	4.42	4.31	4.18	4.74
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	24	4.89	133/1509	4.34	4.39	4.26	4.25	4.89
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	5	21	4.81	208/1287	4.50	4.48	4.30	4.24	4.81
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	1	0	0	1	8	15	4.58	367/1459	4.31	4.32	4.22	4.11	4.58
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	2	0	2	2	8	12	4.25	587/1406	4.21	4.19	4.09	4.02	4.25
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	5	1	3	4	2	11	3.90	939/1384	3.96	4.17	4.11	3.98	3.90
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	3	0	0	0	3	3	18	4.63	319/1489	3.93	4.07	4.17	4.20	4.63
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	3	22	4.88	622/1506	4.70	4.55	4.67	4.66	4.88
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	0	0	0	0	6	15	4.71	177/1463	4.22	4.16	4.09	4.02	4.71
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	3	2	21	4.69	545/1438	4.32	4.48	4.46	4.44	4.69
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	26	5.00	1/1421	4.89	4.75	4.73	4.66	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	1	3	22	4.81	243/1411	4.38	4.39	4.31	4.27	4.81
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	1	3	21	4.80	285/1405	4.38	4.45	4.32	4.27	4.80
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	6	1	1	4	3	10	4.05	640/1236	4.00	3.92	4.00	3.87	4.05
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	0	3	11	4.79	223/1260	4.45	4.32	4.14	3.95	4.79
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	14	0	0	0	1	4	8	4.54	554/1255	4.53	4.53	4.33	4.15	4.54
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	14	0	0	0	1	2	10	4.69	486/1258	4.67	4.46	4.38	4.18	4.69
4. Were special techniques successful	14	0	0	0	2	5	6	4.31	306/ 873	4.25	4.14	4.03	3.89	4.31
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	26	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 184	****	****	4.16	4.06	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	26	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 89	****	5.00	4.49	4.31	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	26	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 92	****	4.93	4.54	4.16	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	26	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 93	****	4.86	4.06	3.92	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	26	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 49	****	****	4.26	4.28	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	26	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 46	****	****	4.31	4.52	****

Frequency Distribution

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

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	2	8	19	4.59	505/1509	4.47	4.42	4.31	4.18	4.59
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	1	27	4.90	124/1509	4.34	4.39	4.26	4.25	4.90
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	6	23	4.79	218/1287	4.50	4.48	4.30	4.24	4.79
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	3	7	18	4.54	421/1459	4.31	4.32	4.22	4.11	4.54
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	1	1	0	2	9	15	4.37	470/1406	4.21	4.19	4.09	4.02	4.37
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	3	0	1	4	7	14	4.31	570/1384	3.96	4.17	4.11	3.98	4.31
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	7	22	4.76	192/1489	3.93	4.07	4.17	4.20	4.76
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	4	25	4.86	662/1506	4.70	4.55	4.67	4.66	4.86
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	8	0	0	0	0	5	16	4.76	144/1463	4.22	4.16	4.09	4.02	4.76
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	3	25	4.83	334/1438	4.32	4.48	4.46	4.44	4.83
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	28	5.00	1/1421	4.89	4.75	4.73	4.66	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	4	25	4.86	180/1411	4.38	4.39	4.31	4.27	4.86
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	3	26	4.90	183/1405	4.38	4.45	4.32	4.27	4.90
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	2	2	1	1	2	20	4.42	338/1236	4.00	3.92	4.00	3.87	4.42
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	0	1	18	4.95	82/1260	4.45	4.32	4.14	3.95	4.95
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	10	0	0	0	0	2	17	4.89	213/1255	4.53	4.53	4.33	4.15	4.89
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	10	0	0	0	0	3	16	4.84	312/1258	4.67	4.46	4.38	4.18	4.84
4. Were special techniques successful	10	1	0	0	0	3	15	4.83	87/ 873	4.25	4.14	4.03	3.89	4.83
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	26	1	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/ 184	****	****	4.16	4.06	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	26	0	0	1	0	0	2	4.00	****/ 198	****	****	4.22	4.14	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	26	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 184	****	****	4.48	4.48	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	26	1	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 177	****	****	4.36	4.29	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	26	2	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 165	****	****	4.18	4.15	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	27	1	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 89	****	5.00	4.49	4.31	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	27	1	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 92	****	4.93	4.54	4.16	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	26	2	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 90	****	4.62	4.50	4.21	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	26	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 92	****	4.93	4.38	4.21	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	26	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 93	****	4.86	4.06	3.92	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	27	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.39	3.75	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	27	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.41	4.29	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	27	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 47	****	****	4.51	4.53	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	27	1	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 47	****	****	4.18	4.26	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	27	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 44	****	****	4.32	4.12	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	27	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 49	****	****	4.26	4.28	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	27	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 41	****	****	4.14	4.13	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	27	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 46	****	****	4.31	4.52	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	27	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 37	****	****	4.05	4.47	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	27	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.27	4.21	****

Course-Section: SPAN 101 6
 Title Elementary Spanish I
 Instructor: Strickling,Laur
 Enrollment: 33
 Questionnaires: 29

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2009

Page 1419
 MAR 22, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: SPAN 102 1
 Title Elementary Spanish II
 Instructor: Burgos,Felix A
 Enrollment: 28
 Questionnaires: 25

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2009

Page 1420
 MAR 22, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	2	0	1	1	4	7	10	4.04	1086/1509	4.28	4.42	4.31	4.18	4.04
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	1	0	2	9	11	4.26	849/1509	4.38	4.39	4.26	4.25	4.26
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	3	0	0	0	1	5	16	4.68	337/1287	4.57	4.48	4.30	4.24	4.68
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	3	0	0	0	1	7	14	4.59	356/1459	4.46	4.32	4.22	4.11	4.59
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	3	3	1	4	5	7	3.60	1140/1406	3.85	4.19	4.09	4.02	3.60
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	1	2	10	9	4.23	649/1384	4.17	4.17	4.11	3.98	4.23
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	1	7	8	7	3.91	1094/1489	4.00	4.07	4.17	4.20	3.91
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	23	0	4.00	1383/1506	4.62	4.55	4.67	4.66	4.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	3	13	6	4.14	762/1463	4.10	4.16	4.09	4.02	4.14
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	1	5	4	12	4.23	1094/1438	4.42	4.48	4.46	4.44	4.23
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	0	2	20	4.91	537/1421	4.81	4.75	4.73	4.66	4.91
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	1	2	10	9	4.23	911/1411	4.41	4.39	4.31	4.27	4.23
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	1	1	3	17	4.64	499/1405	4.46	4.45	4.32	4.27	4.64
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	2	1	1	5	6	6	3.79	835/1236	3.60	3.92	4.00	3.87	3.79
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	10	0	1	0	1	8	5	4.07	725/1260	4.17	4.32	4.14	3.95	4.07
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	10	0	0	0	0	1	14	4.93	143/1255	4.61	4.53	4.33	4.15	4.93
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	10	0	0	0	1	5	9	4.53	598/1258	4.46	4.46	4.38	4.18	4.53
4. Were special techniques successful	10	0	0	1	1	2	11	4.53	199/ 873	4.41	4.14	4.03	3.89	4.53
Laboratory														
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	24	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 198	****	****	4.22	4.14	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	23	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 89	****	5.00	4.49	4.31	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	24	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 92	****	4.93	4.54	4.16	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	23	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 92	****	4.93	4.38	4.21	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	23	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 93	****	4.86	4.06	3.92	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	24	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.39	3.75	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	24	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.41	4.29	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	24	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 47	****	****	4.51	4.53	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	24	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 47	****	****	4.18	4.26	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	24	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 49	****	****	4.26	4.28	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	24	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 41	****	****	4.14	4.13	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	24	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 46	****	****	4.31	4.52	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	24	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 37	****	****	4.05	4.47	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	24	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.27	4.21	****

Course-Section: SPAN 102 1
 Title Elementary Spanish II
 Instructor: Burgos, Felix A
 Enrollment: 28
 Questionnaires: 25

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2009

Page 1420
 MAR 22, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	9	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	5	1.00-1.99	0	B	7						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	3	C	6	General	21	Under-grad	25	Non-major	25
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	4	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	1						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean		
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5						Mean	Rank
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	0	0	3	9	6	4.17	976/1509	4.28	4.42	4.31	4.18	4.17
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	1	3	7	7	4.11	1002/1509	4.38	4.39	4.26	4.25	4.11
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	2	5	11	4.50	519/1287	4.57	4.48	4.30	4.24	4.50
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	1	2	6	9	4.28	748/1459	4.46	4.32	4.22	4.11	4.28
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	3	2	3	0	4	5	2	3.21	1295/1406	3.85	4.19	4.09	4.02	3.21
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	2	11	5	4.17	701/1384	4.17	4.17	4.11	3.98	4.17
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	1	2	4	10	4.17	854/1489	4.00	4.07	4.17	4.20	4.17
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	14	4	4.22	1280/1506	4.62	4.55	4.67	4.66	4.22
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	9	0	0	0	2	6	2	4.00	853/1463	4.10	4.16	4.09	4.02	4.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	1	5	10	4.56	725/1438	4.42	4.48	4.46	4.44	4.56
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	1	2	14	4.76	863/1421	4.81	4.75	4.73	4.66	4.76
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	1	5	10	4.56	544/1411	4.41	4.39	4.31	4.27	4.56
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	1	8	8	4.41	745/1405	4.46	4.45	4.32	4.27	4.41
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	5	1	0	1	1	8	3	4.00	664/1236	3.60	3.92	4.00	3.87	4.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	0	5	6	4.55	389/1260	4.17	4.32	4.14	3.95	4.55
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	0	0	1	1	9	4.73	379/1255	4.61	4.53	4.33	4.15	4.73
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	0	0	0	2	9	4.82	350/1258	4.46	4.46	4.38	4.18	4.82
4. Were special techniques successful	8	0	0	0	1	3	7	4.55	196/ 873	4.41	4.14	4.03	3.89	4.55
Laboratory														
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	18	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 198	****	****	4.22	4.14	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	18	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 89	****	5.00	4.49	4.31	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	18	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 92	****	4.93	4.54	4.16	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 90	****	4.62	4.50	4.21	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 92	****	4.93	4.38	4.21	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 93	****	4.86	4.06	3.92	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.39	3.75	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.41	4.29	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	18	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 47	****	****	4.51	4.53	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	18	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 47	****	****	4.18	4.26	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 49	****	****	4.26	4.28	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 41	****	****	4.14	4.13	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	18	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 46	****	****	4.31	4.52	****

Frequency Distribution

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

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

Course-Section: SPAN 102 3
 Title Elementary Spanish II
 Instructor: Curto,Natalia
 Enrollment: 28
 Questionnaires: 23

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2009

Page 1422
 MAR 22, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: SPAN 102 4
 Title Elementary Spanish II
 Instructor: Quiroga, Maria I
 Enrollment: 29
 Questionnaires: 23

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2009

Page 1423
 MAR 22, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	0	0	4	10	8	4.18	953/1509	4.28	4.42	4.31	4.18	4.18
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	2	5	15	4.59	435/1509	4.38	4.39	4.26	4.25	4.59
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	1	0	5	16	4.64	392/1287	4.57	4.48	4.30	4.24	4.64
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	9	13	4.59	356/1459	4.46	4.32	4.22	4.11	4.59
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	1	0	0	6	7	8	4.10	746/1406	3.85	4.19	4.09	4.02	4.10
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	3	8	11	4.36	492/1384	4.17	4.17	4.11	3.98	4.36
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	1	5	4	12	4.23	791/1489	4.00	4.07	4.17	4.20	4.23
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	1	20	4.95	292/1506	4.62	4.55	4.67	4.66	4.95
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	0	0	0	1	10	6	4.29	588/1463	4.10	4.16	4.09	4.02	4.29
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	1	6	14	4.62	660/1438	4.42	4.48	4.46	4.44	4.62
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	0	1	19	4.95	322/1421	4.81	4.75	4.73	4.66	4.95
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	3	5	12	4.45	689/1411	4.41	4.39	4.31	4.27	4.45
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	1	9	10	4.45	708/1405	4.46	4.45	4.32	4.27	4.45
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	1	1	1	3	7	7	3.95	730/1236	3.60	3.92	4.00	3.87	3.95
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	2	7	8	4.35	543/1260	4.17	4.32	4.14	3.95	4.35
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	0	2	3	12	4.59	519/1255	4.61	4.53	4.33	4.15	4.59
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	1	0	4	3	8	4.06	913/1258	4.46	4.46	4.38	4.18	4.06
4. Were special techniques successful	7	0	1	1	1	4	9	4.19	372/ 873	4.41	4.14	4.03	3.89	4.19
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	20	2	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 184	****	****	4.16	4.06	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	21	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 198	****	****	4.22	4.14	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	21	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 184	****	****	4.48	4.48	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	21	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 177	****	****	4.36	4.29	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	21	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 165	****	****	4.18	4.15	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	20	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/ 89	****	5.00	4.49	4.31	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	21	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 92	****	4.93	4.54	4.16	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	21	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 90	****	4.62	4.50	4.21	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	21	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 92	****	4.93	4.38	4.21	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	21	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 93	****	4.86	4.06	3.92	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	21	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.39	3.75	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	22	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.41	4.29	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	22	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 47	****	****	4.51	4.53	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	22	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 47	****	****	4.18	4.26	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	22	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 44	****	****	4.32	4.12	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	21	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 49	****	****	4.26	4.28	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	21	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 41	****	****	4.14	4.13	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	21	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 46	****	****	4.31	4.52	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	21	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 37	****	****	4.05	4.47	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	21	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.27	4.21	****

Course-Section: SPAN 102 4
 Title Elementary Spanish II
 Instructor: Quiroga, Maria I
 Enrollment: 29
 Questionnaires: 23

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2009

Page 1423
 MAR 22, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: SPAN 102 5
 Title Elementary Spanish II
 Instructor: Quiroga, Maria I
 Enrollment: 30
 Questionnaires: 23

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2009

Page 1424
 MAR 22, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

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

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors		
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	0	A 8	Required for Majors 3	Graduate 0	Major 0
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B 4			
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	1	C 2	General 9	Under-grad 23	Non-major 23
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	1	D 0			
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F 0	Electives 0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	
				P 0			
				I 0	Other 0		
				? 0			

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	1	0	2	9	10	4.23	911/1509	4.28	4.42	4.31	4.18	4.23
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	1	3	9	8	4.00	1086/1509	4.38	4.39	4.26	4.25	4.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	2	2	4	13	4.33	708/1287	4.57	4.48	4.30	4.24	4.33
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	1	3	5	12	4.18	843/1459	4.46	4.32	4.22	4.11	4.18
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	2	3	8	8	3.91	934/1406	3.85	4.19	4.09	4.02	3.91
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	2	3	11	4	3.59	1149/1384	4.17	4.17	4.11	3.98	3.59
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	2	3	5	5	7	3.55	1287/1489	4.00	4.07	4.17	4.20	3.55
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	22	5.00	1/1506	4.62	4.55	4.67	4.66	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	1	1	1	3	7	6	3.89	998/1463	4.10	4.16	4.09	4.02	3.89
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	1	3	3	6	8	3.81	1297/1438	4.42	4.48	4.46	4.44	3.81
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	1	0	0	1	19	4.76	863/1421	4.81	4.75	4.73	4.66	4.76
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	1	1	4	3	12	4.14	971/1411	4.41	4.39	4.31	4.27	4.14
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	2	1	1	6	11	4.10	1005/1405	4.46	4.45	4.32	4.27	4.10
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	0	3	3	6	2	6	3.25	1078/1236	3.60	3.92	4.00	3.87	3.25
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	2	2	1	7	4.08	718/1260	4.17	4.32	4.14	3.95	4.08
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	10	0	0	1	1	2	8	4.42	656/1255	4.61	4.53	4.33	4.15	4.42
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	10	0	0	1	2	2	7	4.25	818/1258	4.46	4.46	4.38	4.18	4.25
4. Were special techniques successful	10	0	1	0	3	2	6	4.00	442/ 873	4.41	4.14	4.03	3.89	4.00
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	21	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 184	****	****	4.16	4.06	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	21	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 198	****	****	4.22	4.14	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	21	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 184	****	****	4.48	4.48	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	21	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 177	****	****	4.36	4.29	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	21	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 165	****	****	4.18	4.15	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	21	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 89	****	5.00	4.49	4.31	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	21	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 92	****	4.93	4.54	4.16	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	21	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 90	****	4.62	4.50	4.21	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	21	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 92	****	4.93	4.38	4.21	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	21	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 93	****	4.86	4.06	3.92	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	21	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.39	3.75	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	21	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.41	4.29	****

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: SPAN 102 7
 Title Elementary Spanish II
 Instructor: Curto,Natalia
 Enrollment: 29
 Questionnaires: 21

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2009

Page 1426
 MAR 22, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	2	2	5	12	4.29	852/1509	4.28	4.42	4.31	4.18	4.29
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	6	13	4.52	519/1509	4.38	4.39	4.26	4.25	4.52
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	2	17	4.67	359/1287	4.57	4.48	4.30	4.24	4.67
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	6	13	4.52	432/1459	4.46	4.32	4.22	4.11	4.52
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	1	0	1	4	7	6	4.00	813/1406	3.85	4.19	4.09	4.02	4.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	5	3	12	4.35	505/1384	4.17	4.17	4.11	3.98	4.35
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	2	2	10	5	3.95	1058/1489	4.00	4.07	4.17	4.20	3.95
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	17	3	4.15	1320/1506	4.62	4.55	4.67	4.66	4.15
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	1	13	4	4.17	726/1463	4.10	4.16	4.09	4.02	4.17
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	2	5	12	4.53	775/1438	4.42	4.48	4.46	4.44	4.53
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	1	2	15	4.78	846/1421	4.81	4.75	4.73	4.66	4.78
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	1	2	5	10	4.33	810/1411	4.41	4.39	4.31	4.27	4.33
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	2	4	12	4.56	587/1405	4.46	4.45	4.32	4.27	4.56
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	6	1	1	2	5	3	3.67	904/1236	3.60	3.92	4.00	3.87	3.67
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	4	4	7	4.20	666/1260	4.17	4.32	4.14	3.95	4.20
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	0	2	5	8	4.40	665/1255	4.61	4.53	4.33	4.15	4.40
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	0	0	2	4	9	4.47	660/1258	4.46	4.46	4.38	4.18	4.47
4. Were special techniques successful	6	0	0	0	4	2	9	4.33	292/ 873	4.41	4.14	4.03	3.89	4.33
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 89	****	5.00	4.49	4.31	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	20	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 92	****	4.93	4.54	4.16	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	20	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 90	****	4.62	4.50	4.21	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 92	****	4.93	4.38	4.21	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	20	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 93	****	4.86	4.06	3.92	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors				
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 4	Required for Majors	4	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	B 6						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	C 6	General	11	Under-grad	21	Non-major	21
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	D 0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
			P 0						
			I 0	Other	2				
			? 1						

Course-Section: SPAN 102 8
 Title Elementary Spanish II
 Instructor: Curto,Natalia
 Enrollment: 29
 Questionnaires: 25

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2009

Page 1427
 MAR 22, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	2	11	12	4.40	724/1509	4.28	4.42	4.31	4.18	4.40
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	7	17	4.64	378/1509	4.38	4.39	4.26	4.25	4.64
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	4	21	4.84	175/1287	4.57	4.48	4.30	4.24	4.84
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	2	9	13	4.46	536/1459	4.46	4.32	4.22	4.11	4.46
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	2	2	4	6	10	3.83	986/1406	3.85	4.19	4.09	4.02	3.83
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	6	6	12	4.25	619/1384	4.17	4.17	4.11	3.98	4.25
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	3	10	11	4.33	674/1489	4.00	4.07	4.17	4.20	4.33
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	0	23	5.00	1/1506	4.62	4.55	4.67	4.66	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	1	6	14	4.62	241/1463	4.10	4.16	4.09	4.02	4.62
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	0	0	0	4	17	4.81	363/1438	4.42	4.48	4.46	4.44	4.81
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	0	0	2	19	4.90	537/1421	4.81	4.75	4.73	4.66	4.90
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	0	0	0	5	16	4.76	291/1411	4.41	4.39	4.31	4.27	4.76
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	1	0	0	0	3	17	4.85	228/1405	4.46	4.45	4.32	4.27	4.85
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	6	8	2	2	2	4	1	3.00	1131/1236	3.60	3.92	4.00	3.87	3.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	1	1	4	5	4.18	671/1260	4.17	4.32	4.14	3.95	4.18
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	14	0	0	0	1	1	9	4.73	379/1255	4.61	4.53	4.33	4.15	4.73
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	15	0	0	0	2	2	6	4.40	721/1258	4.46	4.46	4.38	4.18	4.40
4. Were special techniques successful	15	2	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	114/ 873	4.41	4.14	4.03	3.89	4.75
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	24	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 184	****	****	4.16	4.06	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	24	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 198	****	****	4.22	4.14	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	24	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 184	****	****	4.48	4.48	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	24	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 177	****	****	4.36	4.29	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	24	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 165	****	****	4.18	4.15	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	24	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 89	****	5.00	4.49	4.31	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	24	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 92	****	4.93	4.54	4.16	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	24	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 90	****	4.62	4.50	4.21	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	24	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 92	****	4.93	4.38	4.21	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	24	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 93	****	4.86	4.06	3.92	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	24	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.39	3.75	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	24	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.41	4.29	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	24	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 47	****	****	4.51	4.53	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	24	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 47	****	****	4.18	4.26	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	24	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 44	****	****	4.32	4.12	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	24	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 49	****	****	4.26	4.28	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	24	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 41	****	****	4.14	4.13	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	24	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 46	****	****	4.31	4.52	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	24	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 37	****	****	4.05	4.47	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	24	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.27	4.21	****

Course-Section: SPAN 102 8
 Title Elementary Spanish II
 Instructor: Curto,Natalia
 Enrollment: 29
 Questionnaires: 25

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2009

Page 1427
 MAR 22, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: SPAN 103 1
 Title Int Rev Elem Spanish
 Instructor: Carmody, Sean P
 Enrollment: 26
 Questionnaires: 21

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2009

Page 1428
 MAR 22, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	1	2	7	11	4.33	800/1509	4.13	4.42	4.31	4.18	4.33
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	7	12	4.43	667/1509	4.26	4.39	4.26	4.25	4.43
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	2	10	9	4.33	708/1287	4.31	4.48	4.30	4.24	4.33	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	1	3	5	11	4.30	715/1459	4.16	4.32	4.22	4.11	4.30
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	3	1	2	6	5	4	3.50	1178/1406	3.79	4.19	4.09	4.02	3.50
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	1	5	8	5	3.62	1138/1384	3.83	4.17	4.11	3.98	3.62
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	2	3	5	10	4.00	986/1489	4.23	4.07	4.17	4.20	4.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	3	18	4.86	682/1506	4.71	4.55	4.67	4.66	4.86
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	3	7	7	4.24	648/1463	4.04	4.16	4.09	4.02	4.24
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	6	14	4.62	660/1438	4.46	4.48	4.46	4.44	4.62
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	2	19	4.90	537/1421	4.77	4.75	4.73	4.66	4.90
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	1	0	10	10	4.38	758/1411	4.32	4.39	4.31	4.27	4.38
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	4	16	4.71	393/1405	4.50	4.45	4.32	4.27	4.71
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	5	1	2	6	3	4	3.44	1016/1236	3.67	3.92	4.00	3.87	3.44
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	1	1	4	8	4.36	543/1260	4.31	4.32	4.14	3.95	4.36
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	0	0	6	9	4.60	505/1255	4.39	4.53	4.33	4.15	4.60
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	0	0	0	6	9	4.60	549/1258	4.44	4.46	4.38	4.18	4.60
4. Were special techniques successful	6	4	0	1	1	5	4	4.09	419/ 873	3.98	4.14	4.03	3.89	4.09
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 184	****	****	4.16	4.06	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 198	****	****	4.22	4.14	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 184	****	****	4.48	4.48	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	20	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 177	****	****	4.36	4.29	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 165	****	****	4.18	4.15	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 89	****	5.00	4.49	4.31	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 92	****	4.93	4.54	4.16	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 90	****	4.62	4.50	4.21	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 92	****	4.93	4.38	4.21	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	20	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 93	****	4.86	4.06	3.92	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.39	3.75	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.41	4.29	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 47	****	****	4.51	4.53	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 47	****	****	4.18	4.26	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 44	****	****	4.32	4.12	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 49	****	****	4.26	4.28	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 41	****	****	4.14	4.13	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 46	****	****	4.31	4.52	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 37	****	****	4.05	4.47	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	20	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.27	4.21	****

Course-Section: SPAN 103 1
 Title Int Rev Elem Spanish
 Instructor: Carmody, Sean P
 Enrollment: 26
 Questionnaires: 21

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2009

Page 1428
 MAR 22, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: SPAN 103 2
 Title Int Rev Elem Spanish
 Instructor: King,Robin R
 Enrollment: 25
 Questionnaires: 19

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2009

Page 1429
 MAR 22, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	0	1	4	7	6	4.00	1114/1509	4.13	4.42	4.31	4.18	4.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	6	4	8	4.11	1002/1509	4.26	4.39	4.26	4.25	4.11
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	0	0	1	2	4	10	4.35	688/1287	4.31	4.48	4.30	4.24	4.35
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	1	0	2	3	6	6	3.94	1044/1459	4.16	4.32	4.22	4.11	3.94
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	2	0	4	3	6	3	3.50	1178/1406	3.79	4.19	4.09	4.02	3.50
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	1	1	1	4	6	5	3.76	1043/1384	3.83	4.17	4.11	3.98	3.76
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	3	6	9	4.33	674/1489	4.23	4.07	4.17	4.20	4.33
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	13	5	4.28	1243/1506	4.71	4.55	4.67	4.66	4.28
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	2	8	5	4.20	690/1463	4.04	4.16	4.09	4.02	4.20
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	3	6	8	4.29	1039/1438	4.46	4.48	4.46	4.44	4.29
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	1	1	15	4.82	742/1421	4.77	4.75	4.73	4.66	4.82
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	1	2	5	9	4.29	849/1411	4.32	4.39	4.31	4.27	4.29
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	2	3	12	4.59	558/1405	4.50	4.45	4.32	4.27	4.59
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	3	2	1	2	6	3	3.50	984/1236	3.67	3.92	4.00	3.87	3.50
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	1	2	4	4.43	487/1260	4.31	4.32	4.14	3.95	4.43
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	12	0	0	0	1	1	5	4.57	526/1255	4.39	4.53	4.33	4.15	4.57
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	12	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	299/1258	4.44	4.46	4.38	4.18	4.86
4. Were special techniques successful	12	0	0	0	2	2	3	4.14	394/ 873	3.98	4.14	4.03	3.89	4.14

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors		
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	1	A 6	Required for Majors 3	Graduate 0	Major 0
28-55	5	1.00-1.99	0	B 9			
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	2	C 1	General 12	Under-grad 19	Non-major 19
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	2	D 0			
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F 1	Electives 1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	
				P 0			
				I 0	Other 0		
				? 0			

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

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

Course-Section: SPAN 103 3
 Title Int Rev Elem Spanish
 Instructor: Garcia,Tareixa
 Enrollment: 25
 Questionnaires: 17

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2009

Page 1430
 MAR 22, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: SPAN 201 1
 Title Intermediate Spanish I
 Instructor: Morales, Daniel
 Enrollment: 23
 Questionnaires: 16

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2009

Page 1431
 MAR 22, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	1	1	4	4	6	3.81	1280/1509	4.09	4.42	4.31	4.34	3.81
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	8	2	5	3.69	1298/1509	4.29	4.39	4.26	4.32	3.69
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	4	5	7	4.19	832/1287	4.42	4.48	4.30	4.35	4.19
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	3	1	6	5	3.87	1119/1459	4.31	4.32	4.22	4.30	3.87
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	3	1	3	3	2	3	3.25	1283/1406	3.75	4.19	4.09	4.09	3.25
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	2	3	6	3	3.53	1177/1384	4.10	4.17	4.11	4.09	3.53
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	1	2	1	3	1	7	3.71	1214/1489	4.19	4.07	4.17	4.19	3.71
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	2	3	10	0	3.53	1483/1506	4.62	4.55	4.67	4.61	3.53
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	1	6	4	2	3.54	1230/1463	4.04	4.16	4.09	4.08	3.54
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	4	2	6	4	3.63	1353/1438	4.32	4.48	4.46	4.48	3.63
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	4	4	8	4.25	1292/1421	4.70	4.75	4.73	4.76	4.25
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	1	4	6	5	3.94	1116/1411	4.26	4.39	4.31	4.37	3.94
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	4	4	7	4.06	1019/1405	4.33	4.45	4.32	4.39	4.06
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	1	2	3	3	7	0	3.00	1131/1236	3.56	3.92	4.00	4.11	3.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/1260	4.18	4.32	4.14	4.19	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	13	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/1255	4.51	4.53	4.33	4.37	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	13	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/1258	4.35	4.46	4.38	4.44	****
4. Were special techniques successful	13	2	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 873	4.12	4.14	4.03	4.04	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors		
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	1	A 10	Required for Majors 2	Graduate 1	Major 0
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B 4			
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	4	C 1	General 8	Under-grad 15	Non-major 16
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	2	D 0			
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00	1	F 0	Electives 1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	
				P 0			
				I 0	Other 2		
				? 0			

Course-Section: SPAN 201 10
 Title Intermediate Spanish I
 Instructor: Colombo, Laura M
 Enrollment: 25
 Questionnaires: 23

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2009

Page 1432
 MAR 22, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	1	0	7	15	4.57	528/1509	4.09	4.42	4.31	4.34	4.57
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	3	19	4.78	223/1509	4.29	4.39	4.26	4.32	4.78
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	20	4.87	159/1287	4.42	4.48	4.30	4.35	4.87
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	5	18	4.78	164/1459	4.31	4.32	4.22	4.30	4.78
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	4	2	0	1	4	12	4.26	575/1406	3.75	4.19	4.09	4.09	4.26
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	2	8	12	4.45	394/1384	4.10	4.17	4.11	4.09	4.45
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	5	18	4.78	167/1489	4.19	4.07	4.17	4.19	4.78
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	6	17	4.74	870/1506	4.62	4.55	4.67	4.61	4.74
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	7	0	0	0	0	8	8	4.50	325/1463	4.04	4.16	4.09	4.08	4.50
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	0	4	17	4.81	363/1438	4.32	4.48	4.46	4.48	4.81
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	2	19	4.90	537/1421	4.70	4.75	4.73	4.76	4.90
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	0	5	16	4.76	291/1411	4.26	4.39	4.31	4.37	4.76
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	2	19	4.90	172/1405	4.33	4.45	4.32	4.39	4.90
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	1	0	0	2	3	14	4.63	193/1236	3.56	3.92	4.00	4.11	4.63
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	209/1260	4.18	4.32	4.14	4.19	4.80
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	13	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1255	4.51	4.53	4.33	4.37	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	13	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	363/1258	4.35	4.46	4.38	4.44	4.80
4. Were special techniques successful	13	0	0	0	1	1	8	4.70	139/ 873	4.12	4.14	4.03	4.04	4.70

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors		

00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	8	Required for Majors		3	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	10							
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	1	C	2	General		14	Under-grad	23	Non-major	23
84-150	11	3.00-3.49	5	D	0							
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	11	F	0	Electives		2	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0							
				I	0	Other		0				
				?	0							

Course-Section: SPAN 201 11
 Title Intermediate Spanish I
 Instructor: King,Robin R
 Enrollment: 25
 Questionnaires: 20

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2009

Page 1433
 MAR 22, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	2	0	1	1	5	6	5	3.72	1314/1509	4.09	4.42	4.31	4.34	3.72
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	0	1	2	9	6	4.11	1002/1509	4.29	4.39	4.26	4.32	4.11
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	0	0	0	2	8	8	4.33	708/1287	4.42	4.48	4.30	4.35	4.33
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	0	0	0	4	5	9	4.28	748/1459	4.31	4.32	4.22	4.30	4.28
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	2	0	2	2	6	6	4.00	813/1406	3.75	4.19	4.09	4.09	4.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	0	2	8	7	4.11	742/1384	4.10	4.17	4.11	4.09	4.11
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	1	1	5	11	4.44	541/1489	4.19	4.07	4.17	4.19	4.44
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	0	18	5.00	1/1506	4.62	4.55	4.67	4.61	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	8	0	0	0	2	7	3	4.08	809/1463	4.04	4.16	4.09	4.08	4.08
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	0	1	3	4	8	4.19	1122/1438	4.32	4.48	4.46	4.48	4.19
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	0	0	2	14	4.88	614/1421	4.70	4.75	4.73	4.76	4.88
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	1	1	3	2	9	4.06	1020/1411	4.26	4.39	4.31	4.37	4.06
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	1	0	2	3	10	4.31	848/1405	4.33	4.45	4.32	4.39	4.31
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	2	5	2	0	3	5	3.07	1122/1236	3.56	3.92	4.00	4.11	3.07
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	2	1	2	2	5	3.58	1017/1260	4.18	4.32	4.14	4.19	3.58
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	2	0	1	3	6	3.92	983/1255	4.51	4.53	4.33	4.37	3.92
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	1	0	4	2	6	3.92	996/1258	4.35	4.46	4.38	4.44	3.92
4. Were special techniques successful	7	1	0	1	2	5	4	4.00	442/ 873	4.12	4.14	4.03	4.04	4.00
Laboratory														
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	19	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 198	****	****	4.22	4.51	****
Seminar														
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	19	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 92	****	4.93	4.38	4.00	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	19	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 93	****	4.86	4.06	2.88	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	19	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.39	4.79	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors		
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	A 4	Required for Majors 3	Graduate 0	Major 0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B 7			
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	1	C 3	General 11	Under-grad 20	Non-major 20
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	3	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 0		
				? 0			

Course-Section: SPAN 201 12
 Title Intermediate Spanish I
 Instructor: Arevalo-Guerrer
 Enrollment: 23
 Questionnaires: 22

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2009

Page 1434
 MAR 22, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	3	6	13	4.45	661/1509	4.09	4.42	4.31	4.34	4.45
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	7	12	4.41	699/1509	4.29	4.39	4.26	4.32	4.41
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	3	2	16	4.50	519/1287	4.42	4.48	4.30	4.35	4.50
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	7	13	4.50	454/1459	4.31	4.32	4.22	4.30	4.50
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	3	7	11	4.27	563/1406	3.75	4.19	4.09	4.09	4.27
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	3	17	4.68	208/1384	4.10	4.17	4.11	4.09	4.68
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	7	3	12	4.23	791/1489	4.19	4.07	4.17	4.19	4.23
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	2	20	4.91	583/1506	4.62	4.55	4.67	4.61	4.91
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	1	8	9	4.44	410/1463	4.04	4.16	4.09	4.08	4.44
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	1	5	14	4.65	603/1438	4.32	4.48	4.46	4.48	4.65
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	1	2	17	4.80	794/1421	4.70	4.75	4.73	4.76	4.80
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	1	1	3	15	4.60	496/1411	4.26	4.39	4.31	4.37	4.60
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	1	1	1	17	4.70	419/1405	4.33	4.45	4.32	4.39	4.70
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	4	0	0	3	4	9	4.38	383/1236	3.56	3.92	4.00	4.11	4.38
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	0	5	9	4.64	323/1260	4.18	4.32	4.14	4.19	4.64
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	0	0	0	2	12	4.86	246/1255	4.51	4.53	4.33	4.37	4.86
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	0	0	2	2	10	4.57	570/1258	4.35	4.46	4.38	4.44	4.57
4. Were special techniques successful	8	0	0	0	1	5	8	4.50	209/ 873	4.12	4.14	4.03	4.04	4.50
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	20	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 184	****	****	4.16	4.54	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 198	****	****	4.22	4.51	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 184	****	****	4.48	4.62	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 177	****	****	4.36	4.65	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 165	****	****	4.18	4.56	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 89	****	5.00	4.49	5.00	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 92	****	4.93	4.54	****	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 90	****	4.62	4.50	****	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 92	****	4.93	4.38	4.00	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 93	****	4.86	4.06	2.88	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.39	4.79	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.41	4.50	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 47	****	****	4.51	4.83	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 47	****	****	4.18	4.56	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 44	****	****	4.32	4.67	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 49	****	****	4.26	4.33	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 41	****	****	4.14	****	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 46	****	****	4.31	4.00	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 37	****	****	4.05	****	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.27	****	****

Course-Section: SPAN 201 12
 Title Intermediate Spanish I
 Instructor: Arevalo-Guerrer
 Enrollment: 23
 Questionnaires: 22

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2009

Page 1434
 MAR 22, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: SPAN 201 13
 Title Intermediate Spanish I
 Instructor: Arevalo-Guerrer
 Enrollment: 25
 Questionnaires: 20

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2009

Page 1435
 MAR 22, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

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

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: SPAN 201 14
 Title Intermediate Spanish I
 Instructor: Arevalo-Guerrer
 Enrollment: 21
 Questionnaires: 17

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2009

Page 1436
 MAR 22, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

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

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: SPAN 201 2
 Title Intermediate Spanish I
 Instructor: Richards,France
 Enrollment: 26
 Questionnaires: 20

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2009

Page 1437
 MAR 22, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	2	0	4	6	7	3.84	1258/1509	4.09	4.42	4.31	4.34	3.84
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	2	1	5	8	4	3.55	1351/1509	4.29	4.39	4.26	4.32	3.55
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	2	0	3	8	6	3.84	1053/1287	4.42	4.48	4.30	4.35	3.84
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	1	4	10	4	3.75	1192/1459	4.31	4.32	4.22	4.30	3.75
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	3	7	7	2	3.30	1267/1406	3.75	4.19	4.09	4.09	3.30
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	1	5	6	7	3.85	978/1384	4.10	4.17	4.11	4.09	3.85
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	3	4	9	3	3.50	1303/1489	4.19	4.07	4.17	4.19	3.50
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	14	6	4.30	1222/1506	4.62	4.55	4.67	4.61	4.30
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	3	6	7	2	3.44	1273/1463	4.04	4.16	4.09	4.08	3.44
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	2	1	7	6	3	3.37	1385/1438	4.32	4.48	4.46	4.48	3.37
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	1	0	3	5	11	4.25	1292/1421	4.70	4.75	4.73	4.76	4.25
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	2	1	6	7	3	3.42	1302/1411	4.26	4.39	4.31	4.37	3.42
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	3	1	1	10	5	3.65	1223/1405	4.33	4.45	4.32	4.39	3.65
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	4	5	3	6	1	2.74	1181/1236	3.56	3.92	4.00	4.11	2.74
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	10	0	1	0	3	4	2	3.60	1011/1260	4.18	4.32	4.14	4.19	3.60
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	10	0	1	1	2	1	5	3.80	1037/1255	4.51	4.53	4.33	4.37	3.80
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	10	0	1	0	4	3	2	3.50	1143/1258	4.35	4.46	4.38	4.44	3.50
4. Were special techniques successful	10	0	1	4	1	1	3	3.10	792/ 873	4.12	4.14	4.03	4.04	3.10

Frequency Distribution

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

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	1	1	4	6	8	3.95	1164/1509	4.09	4.42	4.31	4.34	3.95
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	0	5	3	11	4.15	962/1509	4.29	4.39	4.26	4.32	4.15
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	1	1	4	13	4.35	688/1287	4.42	4.48	4.30	4.35	4.35
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	1	0	2	6	10	4.26	759/1459	4.31	4.32	4.22	4.30	4.26
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	1	4	7	6	3.84	979/1406	3.75	4.19	4.09	4.09	3.84
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	1	1	0	5	5	7	3.94	886/1384	4.10	4.17	4.11	4.09	3.94
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	0	1	5	12	4.42	569/1489	4.19	4.07	4.17	4.19	4.42
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	8	11	4.58	1014/1506	4.62	4.55	4.67	4.61	4.58
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	1	1	4	5	4	3.67	1168/1463	4.04	4.16	4.09	4.08	3.67
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	1	0	2	5	10	4.28	1055/1438	4.32	4.48	4.46	4.48	4.28
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	1	0	0	6	12	4.47	1178/1421	4.70	4.75	4.73	4.76	4.47
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	1	0	2	6	9	4.22	911/1411	4.26	4.39	4.31	4.37	4.22
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	0	0	6	11	4.44	708/1405	4.33	4.45	4.32	4.39	4.44
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	4	1	1	4	3	6	3.80	824/1236	3.56	3.92	4.00	4.11	3.80
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	2	0	2	3	5	3.75	936/1260	4.18	4.32	4.14	4.19	3.75
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	1	0	2	2	7	4.17	839/1255	4.51	4.53	4.33	4.37	4.17
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	1	0	1	3	6	4.18	856/1258	4.35	4.46	4.38	4.44	4.18
4. Were special techniques successful	8	2	0	0	3	1	6	4.30	306/ 873	4.12	4.14	4.03	4.04	4.30
Laboratory														
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	19	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 198	****	****	4.22	4.51	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	19	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.39	4.79	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	19	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.41	4.50	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	19	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 49	****	****	4.26	4.33	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors		
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 11	Required for Majors 4	Graduate 0	Major 0
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B 6			
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	5	C 0	General 12	Under-grad 20	Non-major 20
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	3	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 1		
				? 0			

Course-Section: SPAN 201 4
 Title Intermediate Spanish I
 Instructor: Curto,Natalia
 Enrollment: 23
 Questionnaires: 23

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2009

Page 1439
 MAR 22, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	5	8	10	4.22	921/1509	4.09	4.42	4.31	4.34	4.22
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	4	18	4.74	278/1509	4.29	4.39	4.26	4.32	4.74
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	4	17	4.65	370/1287	4.42	4.48	4.30	4.35	4.65
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	2	1	7	12	4.32	705/1459	4.31	4.32	4.22	4.30	4.32
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	4	2	3	6	5	3	3.21	1295/1406	3.75	4.19	4.09	4.09	3.21
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	4	6	12	4.26	609/1384	4.10	4.17	4.11	4.09	4.26
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	3	3	6	11	4.09	930/1489	4.19	4.07	4.17	4.19	4.09
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	22	4.96	292/1506	4.62	4.55	4.67	4.61	4.96
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	3	8	10	4.33	545/1463	4.04	4.16	4.09	4.08	4.33
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	5	18	4.78	396/1438	4.32	4.48	4.46	4.48	4.78
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	22	4.96	269/1421	4.70	4.75	4.73	4.76	4.96
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	0	7	14	4.67	416/1411	4.26	4.39	4.31	4.37	4.67
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	4	18	4.82	273/1405	4.33	4.45	4.32	4.39	4.82
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	16	2	0	3	1	1	2.86	1169/1236	3.56	3.92	4.00	4.11	2.86
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	13	0	1	0	1	3	5	4.10	712/1260	4.18	4.32	4.14	4.19	4.10
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	13	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	287/1255	4.51	4.53	4.33	4.37	4.80
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	14	0	1	0	0	3	5	4.22	834/1258	4.35	4.46	4.38	4.44	4.22
4. Were special techniques successful	14	2	1	0	2	3	1	3.43	731/ 873	4.12	4.14	4.03	4.04	3.43

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors		
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A 8	Required for Majors 8	Graduate 0	Major 0
28-55	6	1.00-1.99	0	B 9			
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	2	C 4	General 12	Under-grad 23	Non-major 23
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	3	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 1		
				? 0			

Course-Section: SPAN 201 5
 Title Intermediate Spanish I
 Instructor: King,Robin R
 Enrollment: 24
 Questionnaires: 18

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2009

Page 1440
 MAR 22, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	8	5	5	3.83	1265/1509	4.09	4.42	4.31	4.34	3.83
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	5	11	4.50	543/1509	4.29	4.39	4.26	4.32	4.50
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	5	10	4.39	658/1287	4.42	4.48	4.30	4.35	4.39
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	2	3	6	7	4.00	979/1459	4.31	4.32	4.22	4.30	4.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	4	1	2	4	5	2	3.36	1252/1406	3.75	4.19	4.09	4.09	3.36
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	2	3	6	6	3.78	1036/1384	4.10	4.17	4.11	4.09	3.78
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	2	6	10	4.44	541/1489	4.19	4.07	4.17	4.19	4.44
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	3	15	4.83	722/1506	4.62	4.55	4.67	4.61	4.83
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	1	0	0	2	10	3	4.07	820/1463	4.04	4.16	4.09	4.08	4.07
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	1	6	10	4.53	775/1438	4.32	4.48	4.46	4.48	4.53
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	4	13	4.76	863/1421	4.70	4.75	4.73	4.76	4.76
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	2	7	8	4.35	789/1411	4.26	4.39	4.31	4.37	4.35
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	1	3	3	9	4.06	1024/1405	4.33	4.45	4.32	4.39	4.06
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	1	0	2	5	4	5	3.75	853/1236	3.56	3.92	4.00	4.11	3.75
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	1	0	7	5	4.23	637/1260	4.18	4.32	4.14	4.19	4.23
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	0	0	4	9	4.69	412/1255	4.51	4.53	4.33	4.37	4.69
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	2	0	4	7	4.23	829/1258	4.35	4.46	4.38	4.44	4.23
4. Were special techniques successful	5	1	1	1	4	2	4	3.58	677/ 873	4.12	4.14	4.03	4.04	3.58

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: SPAN 201 6
 Title Intermediate Spanish I
 Instructor: Gomez-Rubio,Mar
 Enrollment: 22
 Questionnaires: 16

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2009

Page 1441
 MAR 22, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	1	1	2	4	8	4.06	1072/1509	4.09	4.42	4.31	4.34	4.06
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	0	1	6	8	4.25	859/1509	4.29	4.39	4.26	4.32	4.25
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	6	9	4.50	519/1287	4.42	4.48	4.30	4.35	4.50
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	1	1	6	7	4.27	759/1459	4.31	4.32	4.22	4.30	4.27
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	1	5	5	3	3.71	1074/1406	3.75	4.19	4.09	4.09	3.71
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	5	3	8	4.19	685/1384	4.10	4.17	4.11	4.09	4.19
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	3	4	3	4	3.40	1343/1489	4.19	4.07	4.17	4.19	3.40
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	1	9	5	4.27	1251/1506	4.62	4.55	4.67	4.61	4.27
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	1	3	9	2	3.80	1060/1463	4.04	4.16	4.09	4.08	3.80
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	2	3	6	2	3.62	1355/1438	4.32	4.48	4.46	4.48	3.62
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	0	1	1	10	4.75	881/1421	4.70	4.75	4.73	4.76	4.75
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	0	0	2	6	4	4.17	957/1411	4.26	4.39	4.31	4.37	4.17
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	3	5	4	4.08	1010/1405	4.33	4.45	4.32	4.39	4.08
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	1	0	1	7	1	2	3.36	1045/1236	3.56	3.92	4.00	4.11	3.36
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	2	0	3	4.20	666/1260	4.18	4.32	4.14	4.19	4.20
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	11	0	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	505/1255	4.51	4.53	4.33	4.37	4.60
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	11	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	721/1258	4.35	4.46	4.38	4.44	4.40
4. Were special techniques successful	11	2	0	1	2	0	0	2.67	****/ 873	4.12	4.14	4.03	4.04	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	15	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 184	****	****	4.16	4.54	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	15	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 198	****	****	4.22	4.51	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	15	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 184	****	****	4.48	4.62	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	15	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 177	****	****	4.36	4.65	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	15	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 165	****	****	4.18	4.56	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	15	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 89	****	5.00	4.49	5.00	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	15	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 92	****	4.93	4.54	****	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 90	****	4.62	4.50	****	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 92	****	4.93	4.38	4.00	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	15	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 93	****	4.86	4.06	2.88	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.39	4.79	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	15	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.41	4.50	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	15	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 47	****	****	4.51	4.83	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	15	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 47	****	****	4.18	4.56	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	15	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 44	****	****	4.32	4.67	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 49	****	****	4.26	4.33	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	15	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 41	****	****	4.14	****	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	15	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 46	****	****	4.31	4.00	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	15	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 37	****	****	4.05	****	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	15	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.27	****	****

Course-Section: SPAN 201 6
 Title Intermediate Spanish I
 Instructor: Gomez-Rubio,Mar
 Enrollment: 22
 Questionnaires: 16

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2009

Page 1441
 MAR 22, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: SPAN 201 7
 Title Intermediate Spanish I
 Instructor: Gomez-Rubio,Mar
 Enrollment: 25
 Questionnaires: 15

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2009

Page 1442
 MAR 22, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	1	0	1	3	9	4.36	778/1509	4.09	4.42	4.31	4.34	4.36
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	1	1	2	10	4.50	543/1509	4.29	4.39	4.26	4.32	4.50
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	4	9	4.57	453/1287	4.42	4.48	4.30	4.35	4.57
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	1	0	0	2	2	9	4.54	421/1459	4.31	4.32	4.22	4.30	4.54
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	2	0	0	2	3	7	4.42	434/1406	3.75	4.19	4.09	4.09	4.42
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	3	0	1	3	7	3.79	1030/1384	4.10	4.17	4.11	4.09	3.79
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	2	0	1	11	4.50	458/1489	4.19	4.07	4.17	4.19	4.50
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	1	0	0	6	7	4.29	1236/1506	4.62	4.55	4.67	4.61	4.29
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	2	0	0	0	5	3	4.38	500/1463	4.04	4.16	4.09	4.08	4.38
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	1	0	1	3	9	4.36	981/1438	4.32	4.48	4.46	4.48	4.36
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	1	2	11	4.71	950/1421	4.70	4.75	4.73	4.76	4.71
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	2	2	10	4.57	532/1411	4.26	4.39	4.31	4.37	4.57
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	0	1	3	9	4.36	808/1405	4.33	4.45	4.32	4.39	4.36
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	1	0	2	3	0	6	3.91	774/1236	3.56	3.92	4.00	4.11	3.91
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	1	0	0	1	5	4.29	597/1260	4.18	4.32	4.14	4.19	4.29
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	0	0	1	0	6	4.71	390/1255	4.51	4.53	4.33	4.37	4.71
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	299/1258	4.35	4.46	4.38	4.44	4.86
4. Were special techniques successful	8	2	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	261/ 873	4.12	4.14	4.03	4.04	4.40
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	14	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.39	4.79	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 49	****	****	4.26	4.33	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	13	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 41	****	****	4.14	****	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	13	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 46	****	****	4.31	4.00	****

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: SPAN 201 8
 Title Intermediate Spanish I
 Instructor: King,Robin R
 Enrollment: 24
 Questionnaires: 18

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2009

Page 1443
 MAR 22, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	1	0	4	7	5	3.88	1228/1509	4.09	4.42	4.31	4.34	3.88
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	7	10	4.59	447/1509	4.29	4.39	4.26	4.32	4.59
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	2	4	11	4.53	500/1287	4.42	4.48	4.30	4.35	4.53
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	7	9	4.47	503/1459	4.31	4.32	4.22	4.30	4.47
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	2	2	0	3	6	4	3.67	1105/1406	3.75	4.19	4.09	4.09	3.67
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	0	3	6	7	4.06	779/1384	4.10	4.17	4.11	4.09	4.06
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	1	0	4	12	4.59	364/1489	4.19	4.07	4.17	4.19	4.59
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	1	16	4.94	350/1506	4.62	4.55	4.67	4.61	4.94
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	4	8	2	3.86	1021/1463	4.04	4.16	4.09	4.08	3.86
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	1	5	10	4.56	725/1438	4.32	4.48	4.46	4.48	4.56
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	1	1	14	4.81	768/1421	4.70	4.75	4.73	4.76	4.81
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	3	6	7	4.25	885/1411	4.26	4.39	4.31	4.37	4.25
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	1	1	2	11	4.53	605/1405	4.33	4.45	4.32	4.39	4.53
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	4	1	2	4	4	1	3.17	1099/1236	3.56	3.92	4.00	4.11	3.17
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	1	1	4	5	4.18	671/1260	4.18	4.32	4.14	4.19	4.18
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	0	0	2	1	8	4.55	547/1255	4.51	4.53	4.33	4.37	4.55
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	0	0	2	4	5	4.27	807/1258	4.35	4.46	4.38	4.44	4.27
4. Were special techniques successful	7	1	2	1	1	3	3	3.40	738/ 873	4.12	4.14	4.03	4.04	3.40

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: SPAN 201 9
 Title Intermediate Spanish I
 Instructor: Colombo, Laura M
 Enrollment: 20
 Questionnaires: 17

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2009

Page 1444
 MAR 22, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	1	1	5	10	4.41	711/1509	4.09	4.42	4.31	4.34	4.41
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	6	10	4.53	519/1509	4.29	4.39	4.26	4.32	4.53
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	6	10	4.53	500/1287	4.42	4.48	4.30	4.35	4.53
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	1	4	11	4.63	324/1459	4.31	4.32	4.22	4.30	4.63
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	1	0	3	3	2	6	3.79	1023/1406	3.75	4.19	4.09	4.09	3.79
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	1	7	7	4.40	440/1384	4.10	4.17	4.11	4.09	4.40
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	0	0	7	8	4.53	422/1489	4.19	4.07	4.17	4.19	4.53
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	0	0	0	0	4	10	4.71	896/1506	4.62	4.55	4.67	4.61	4.71
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	1	6	7	4.43	438/1463	4.04	4.16	4.09	4.08	4.43
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	0	2	12	4.86	291/1438	4.32	4.48	4.46	4.48	4.86
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	0	1	13	4.93	429/1421	4.70	4.75	4.73	4.76	4.93
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	1	5	9	4.53	580/1411	4.26	4.39	4.31	4.37	4.53
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	1	5	9	4.53	605/1405	4.33	4.45	4.32	4.39	4.53
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	1	0	0	2	4	7	4.38	373/1236	3.56	3.92	4.00	4.11	4.38
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	172/1260	4.18	4.32	4.14	4.19	4.86
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	10	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	390/1255	4.51	4.53	4.33	4.37	4.71
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	10	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	299/1258	4.35	4.46	4.38	4.44	4.86
4. Were special techniques successful	10	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/ 873	4.12	4.14	4.03	4.04	5.00

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: SPAN 202 1
 Title Intermediate Spanish I
 Instructor: Val,Adriana
 Enrollment: 17
 Questionnaires: 10

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2009

Page 1445
 MAR 22, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	1	0	1	4	3	3.89	1228/1509	3.89	4.42	4.31	4.34	3.89
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	1	1	4	3	4.00	1086/1509	4.00	4.39	4.26	4.32	4.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	7	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1287	****	4.48	4.30	4.35	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	1	0	2	6	4.44	553/1459	4.44	4.32	4.22	4.30	4.44
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	1	1	1	0	0	6	4.13	720/1406	4.13	4.19	4.09	4.09	4.13
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	0	1	1	6	4.22	649/1384	4.22	4.17	4.11	4.09	4.22
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	1	1	1	6	4.33	674/1489	4.33	4.07	4.17	4.19	4.33
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	9	0	4.00	1383/1506	4.00	4.55	4.67	4.61	4.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	2	0	1	1	2	1	3.60	1207/1463	3.60	4.16	4.09	4.08	3.60
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	1	3	5	4.44	878/1438	4.44	4.48	4.46	4.48	4.44
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	2	0	7	4.56	1123/1421	4.56	4.75	4.73	4.76	4.56
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	1	0	2	2	4	3.89	1153/1411	3.89	4.39	4.31	4.37	3.89
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	0	1	3	4	4.00	1047/1405	4.00	4.45	4.32	4.39	4.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	1	1	1	6	4.33	421/1236	4.33	3.92	4.00	4.11	4.33
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	0	2	2	4	3.89	876/1260	3.89	4.32	4.14	4.19	3.89
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	2	0	1	6	4.22	803/1255	4.22	4.53	4.33	4.37	4.22
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	1	0	1	7	4.56	584/1258	4.56	4.46	4.38	4.44	4.56
4. Were special techniques successful	1	1	1	1	1	1	4	3.75	610/ 873	3.75	4.14	4.03	4.04	3.75
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	8	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 184	****	****	4.16	4.54	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	8	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 198	****	****	4.22	4.51	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	8	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 184	****	****	4.48	4.62	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	8	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 89	****	5.00	4.49	5.00	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	8	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 92	****	4.93	4.38	4.00	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	8	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 93	****	4.86	4.06	2.88	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	8	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.39	4.79	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	8	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.41	4.50	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	8	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 47	****	****	4.51	4.83	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	8	1	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 47	****	****	4.18	4.56	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	8	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 49	****	****	4.26	4.33	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	8	1	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 46	****	****	4.31	4.00	****

Frequency Distribution

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

I	0	Other	1
?	0		

Course-Section: SPAN 301 1
 Title Advanced Spanish I
 Instructor: Medina,Adriana (Instr. A)
 Enrollment: 8
 Questionnaires: 7

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2009

Page 1446
 MAR 22, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	201/1509	4.54	4.42	4.31	4.32	4.86
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	1	5	4.57	459/1509	4.48	4.39	4.26	4.25	4.57
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	304/1287	4.65	4.48	4.30	4.33	4.71
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	227/1459	4.57	4.32	4.22	4.26	4.71
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	187/1406	4.54	4.19	4.09	4.12	4.71
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	182/1384	4.42	4.17	4.11	4.15	4.71
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	2	3	1	3.57	1275/1489	3.65	4.07	4.17	4.14	3.57
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	1014/1506	4.41	4.55	4.67	4.67	4.57
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	325/1463	4.19	4.16	4.09	4.08	4.50
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	712/1438	4.48	4.48	4.46	4.43	4.57
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1421	4.88	4.75	4.73	4.73	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	3	3	4.50	617/1411	4.30	4.39	4.31	4.29	4.25
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	393/1405	4.46	4.45	4.32	4.32	4.71
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	4	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	421/1236	4.17	3.92	4.00	4.07	4.33
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1260	4.77	4.32	4.14	4.22	5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1255	4.91	4.53	4.33	4.37	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	363/1258	4.81	4.46	4.38	4.42	4.80
4. Were special techniques successful	2	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/ 873	4.59	4.14	4.03	4.08	5.00

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: SPAN 301 1
 Title Advanced Spanish I
 Instructor: (Instr. B)
 Enrollment: 8
 Questionnaires: 7

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2009

Page 1447
 MAR 22, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	201/1509	4.54	4.42	4.31	4.32	4.86
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	1	5	4.57	459/1509	4.48	4.39	4.26	4.25	4.57
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	304/1287	4.65	4.48	4.30	4.33	4.71
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	227/1459	4.57	4.32	4.22	4.26	4.71
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	187/1406	4.54	4.19	4.09	4.12	4.71
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	182/1384	4.42	4.17	4.11	4.15	4.71
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	2	3	1	3.57	1275/1489	3.65	4.07	4.17	4.14	3.57
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	1014/1506	4.41	4.55	4.67	4.67	4.57
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1438	4.48	4.48	4.46	4.43	4.57
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1421	4.88	4.75	4.73	4.73	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	5	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	1051/1411	4.30	4.39	4.31	4.29	4.25
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1405	4.46	4.45	4.32	4.32	4.71
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	6	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/1236	4.17	3.92	4.00	4.07	4.33
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1260	4.77	4.32	4.14	4.22	5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1255	4.91	4.53	4.33	4.37	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	363/1258	4.81	4.46	4.38	4.42	4.80
4. Were special techniques successful	2	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/ 873	4.59	4.14	4.03	4.08	5.00

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: SPAN 301 2
 Title Advanced Spanish I
 Instructor: Medina,Adriana
 Enrollment: 20
 Questionnaires: 18

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2009

Page 1448
 MAR 22, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	0	1	2	5	9	4.29	842/1509	4.54	4.42	4.31	4.32	4.29
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	2	0	0	5	10	4.24	880/1509	4.48	4.39	4.26	4.25	4.24
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	1	2	2	12	4.47	554/1287	4.65	4.48	4.30	4.33	4.47
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	2	0	7	8	4.24	792/1459	4.57	4.32	4.22	4.26	4.24
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	3	3	10	4.29	539/1406	4.54	4.19	4.09	4.12	4.29
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	2	2	4	8	3.94	886/1384	4.42	4.17	4.11	4.15	3.94
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	3	3	3	4	4	3.18	1386/1489	3.65	4.07	4.17	4.14	3.18
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	1	13	3	4.12	1340/1506	4.41	4.55	4.67	4.67	4.12
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	0	0	2	0	5	5	4.08	809/1463	4.19	4.16	4.09	4.08	4.08
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	1	2	4	8	4.27	1063/1438	4.48	4.48	4.46	4.43	4.27
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	1	2	13	4.75	881/1421	4.88	4.75	4.73	4.73	4.75
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	1	0	2	4	8	4.20	936/1411	4.30	4.39	4.31	4.29	4.20
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	2	5	8	4.40	758/1405	4.46	4.45	4.32	4.32	4.40
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	13	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1236	4.17	3.92	4.00	4.07	****
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	1	0	3	7	4.45	460/1260	4.77	4.32	4.14	4.22	4.45
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	0	0	0	2	9	4.82	278/1255	4.91	4.53	4.33	4.37	4.82
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	0	0	0	2	9	4.82	350/1258	4.81	4.46	4.38	4.42	4.82
4. Were special techniques successful	7	1	0	1	1	3	5	4.20	366/ 873	4.59	4.14	4.03	4.08	4.20

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors		
00-27	4	0.00-0.99	0	A 6	Required for Majors 11	Graduate 0	Major 3
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B 6			
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	1	C 1	General 1	Under-grad 18	Non-major 15
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	2	D 0			
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5	F 0	Electives 2	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	
				P 0			
				I 0	Other 2		
				? 0			

Course-Section: SPAN 301 3
 Title Advanced Spanish I
 Instructor: Stolle-McAllist
 Enrollment: 19
 Questionnaires: 19

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2009

Page 1449
 MAR 22, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	1	3	7	8	4.16	987/1509	4.54	4.42	4.31	4.32	4.16
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	5	12	4.53	519/1509	4.48	4.39	4.26	4.25	4.53
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	4	14	4.68	337/1287	4.65	4.48	4.30	4.33	4.68
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	7	12	4.63	313/1459	4.57	4.32	4.22	4.26	4.63
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	3	5	11	4.42	423/1406	4.54	4.19	4.09	4.12	4.42
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	2	5	11	4.32	557/1384	4.42	4.17	4.11	4.15	4.32
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	3	8	8	4.26	749/1489	3.65	4.07	4.17	4.14	4.26
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	12	7	4.37	1188/1506	4.41	4.55	4.67	4.67	4.37
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	1	0	0	3	10	3	4.00	853/1463	4.19	4.16	4.09	4.08	4.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	7	11	4.61	660/1438	4.48	4.48	4.46	4.43	4.61
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	2	16	4.89	588/1421	4.88	4.75	4.73	4.73	4.89
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	9	9	4.50	617/1411	4.30	4.39	4.31	4.29	4.50
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	2	6	9	4.28	881/1405	4.46	4.45	4.32	4.32	4.28
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	1	1	1	2	6	7	4.00	664/1236	4.17	3.92	4.00	4.07	4.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	0	4	7	4.64	330/1260	4.77	4.32	4.14	4.22	4.64
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	0	0	1	0	10	4.82	278/1255	4.91	4.53	4.33	4.37	4.82
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	0	0	0	2	9	4.82	350/1258	4.81	4.46	4.38	4.42	4.82
4. Were special techniques successful	8	4	0	1	0	3	3	4.14	394/ 873	4.59	4.14	4.03	4.08	4.14

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors		
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	A 5	Required for Majors 8	Graduate 0	Major 5
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	0	B 8			
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	0	C 4	General 1	Under-grad 19	Non-major 14
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	4	D 0			
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F 0	Electives 6	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	
				P 0			
				I 0	Other 2		
				? 1			

Course-Section: SPAN 302 1
 Title Advanced Spanish II
 Instructor: Schneider, Judit
 Enrollment: 6
 Questionnaires: 5

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2009

Page 1450
 MAR 22, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	482/1509	3.96	4.42	4.31	4.32	4.60
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1509	4.19	4.39	4.26	4.25	5.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1287	4.53	4.48	4.30	4.33	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1459	4.23	4.32	4.22	4.26	5.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	135/1406	4.53	4.19	4.09	4.12	4.80
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1384	4.25	4.17	4.11	4.15	5.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	151/1489	3.78	4.07	4.17	4.14	4.80
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1506	4.47	4.55	4.67	4.67	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1463	4.08	4.16	4.09	4.08	5.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1438	4.17	4.48	4.46	4.43	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1421	4.92	4.75	4.73	4.73	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	243/1411	4.32	4.39	4.31	4.29	4.80
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1405	4.33	4.45	4.32	4.32	5.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	1	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1236	4.62	3.92	4.00	4.07	5.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1260	3.75	4.32	4.14	4.22	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1255	4.33	4.53	4.33	4.37	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1258	4.75	4.46	4.38	4.42	****
4. Were special techniques successful	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 873	3.91	4.14	4.03	4.08	****

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: SPAN 302 2
 Title Advanced Spanish II
 Instructor: Sloane, Robert A
 Enrollment: 19
 Questionnaires: 16

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2009

Page 1451
 MAR 22, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	2	2	4	5	3	3.31	1438/1509	3.96	4.42	4.31	4.32	3.31
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	3	1	3	5	4	3.38	1410/1509	4.19	4.39	4.26	4.25	3.38
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	4	4	4	7	4.06	898/1287	4.53	4.48	4.30	4.33	4.06
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	3	5	4	3	3.47	1325/1459	4.23	4.32	4.22	4.26	3.47
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	8	6	4.25	587/1406	4.53	4.19	4.09	4.12	4.25
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	2	4	6	3	3.50	1192/1384	4.25	4.17	4.11	4.15	3.50
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	4	4	2	4	2	2.75	1438/1489	3.78	4.07	4.17	4.14	2.75
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	2	13	1	3.94	1428/1506	4.47	4.55	4.67	4.67	3.94
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	2	2	3	4	2	3.15	1367/1463	4.08	4.16	4.09	4.08	3.15
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	2	2	0	6	2	3.33	1388/1438	4.17	4.48	4.46	4.43	3.33
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	0	0	2	10	4.83	716/1421	4.92	4.75	4.73	4.73	4.83
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	0	2	1	6	3	3.83	1174/1411	4.32	4.39	4.31	4.29	3.83
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	1	1	3	3	4	3.67	1220/1405	4.33	4.45	4.32	4.32	3.67
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	0	0	1	2	3	7	4.23	504/1236	4.62	3.92	4.00	4.07	4.23
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	1	1	3	2	5	3.75	936/1260	3.75	4.32	4.14	4.22	3.75
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	0	2	4	6	4.33	723/1255	4.33	4.53	4.33	4.37	4.33
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	0	1	1	10	4.75	421/1258	4.75	4.46	4.38	4.42	4.75
4. Were special techniques successful	4	1	0	0	4	4	3	3.91	536/ 873	3.91	4.14	4.03	4.08	3.91
Laboratory														
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	15	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 198	****	****	4.22	4.17	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	15	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 184	****	****	4.48	4.52	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	15	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 89	****	5.00	4.49	4.86	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 92	****	4.93	4.54	4.67	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 90	****	4.62	4.50	4.63	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 92	****	4.93	4.38	4.73	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	15	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 93	****	4.86	4.06	3.94	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.39	4.61	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	15	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.41	4.34	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	15	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 47	****	****	4.51	4.62	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	15	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 47	****	****	4.18	4.47	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	15	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 44	****	****	4.32	4.40	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 49	****	****	4.26	5.00	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	15	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 41	****	****	4.14	5.00	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	15	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 46	****	****	4.31	5.00	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	15	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 37	****	****	4.05	5.00	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	15	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.27	5.00	****

Course-Section: SPAN 302 2
 Title Advanced Spanish II
 Instructor: Sloane, Robert A
 Enrollment: 19
 Questionnaires: 16

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2009

Page 1451
 MAR 22, 2010
 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	11	Graduate	0	Major	8
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	0	B	5						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	16	Non-major	8
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	2	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	1				
				?	4						

Course-Section: SPAN 305 1
 Title Span For Heritage Span
 Instructor: Schwartz, Ana M
 Enrollment: 11
 Questionnaires: 10

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2009

Page 1452
 MAR 22, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

Course-Section: SPAN 305 1
 Title Span For Heritage Span
 Instructor: Schwartz, Ana M
 Enrollment: 11
 Questionnaires: 10

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2009

Page 1452
 MAR 22, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: SPAN 307 1
 Title Espana Y Sus Culturas
 Instructor: Sloane,Robert A
 Enrollment: 25
 Questionnaires: 17

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2009

Page 1453
 MAR 22, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

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

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: SPAN 308 1
 Title Latinoamerica Y Sus Cu
 Instructor: Poggio,Sara Z
 Enrollment: 14
 Questionnaires: 12

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2009

Page 1454
 MAR 22, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	1	0	1	4	6	4.17	976/1509	4.17	4.42	4.31	4.32	4.17
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	1	2	3	5	3.83	1208/1509	3.83	4.39	4.26	4.25	3.83
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	0	3	1	7	4.08	890/1287	4.08	4.48	4.30	4.33	4.08
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	1	1	1	3	5	3.91	1088/1459	3.91	4.32	4.22	4.26	3.91
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	1	6	4	4.00	813/1406	4.00	4.19	4.09	4.12	4.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	2	4	5	4.00	807/1384	4.00	4.17	4.11	4.15	4.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	2	2	3	2	3	3.17	1388/1489	3.17	4.07	4.17	4.14	3.17
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	7	5	4.42	1156/1506	4.42	4.55	4.67	4.67	4.42
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	1	2	3	4	1	3.18	1359/1463	3.18	4.16	4.09	4.08	3.18
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	1	0	4	2	2	3.44	1377/1438	3.44	4.48	4.46	4.43	3.44
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	4	2	3	3.89	1369/1421	3.89	4.75	4.73	4.73	3.89
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	2	1	2	2	2	3.11	1352/1411	3.11	4.39	4.31	4.29	3.11
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	1	1	1	3	3	3.67	1220/1405	3.67	4.45	4.32	4.32	3.67
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	0	2	0	1	3	3	3.56	960/1236	3.56	3.92	4.00	4.07	3.56
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	505/1260	4.40	4.32	4.14	4.22	4.40
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	665/1255	4.40	4.53	4.33	4.37	4.40
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	850/1258	4.20	4.46	4.38	4.42	4.20
4. Were special techniques successful	7	1	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	442/ 873	4.00	4.14	4.03	4.08	4.00

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors					
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	A 9	Required for Majors 9	Graduate	0	Major	4	
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B 1						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	0	C 1	General	1	Under-grad	12	Non-major	8
84-150	2	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	1				
				? 0						

Course-Section: SPAN 312 1
 Title Intro To Latin Amer Li
 Instructor: Bell,Alan S
 Enrollment: 13
 Questionnaires: 11

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2009

Page 1455
 MAR 22, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	1	1	1	2	6	4.00	1114/1509	4.00	4.42	4.31	4.32	4.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	0	3	3	4	3.82	1221/1509	3.82	4.39	4.26	4.25	3.82
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	1	1	3	5	4.20	826/1287	4.20	4.48	4.30	4.33	4.20
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	1	1	3	5	3.91	1088/1459	3.91	4.32	4.22	4.26	3.91
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	1	3	6	4.27	563/1406	4.27	4.19	4.09	4.12	4.27
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	1	2	3	4	3.73	1069/1384	3.73	4.17	4.11	4.15	3.73
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	2	2	1	5	3.64	1249/1489	3.64	4.07	4.17	4.14	3.64
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	3	8	4.73	883/1506	4.73	4.55	4.67	4.67	4.73
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	2	0	2	3	1	3.13	1375/1463	3.13	4.16	4.09	4.08	3.13
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	2	3	5	4.30	1032/1438	4.30	4.48	4.46	4.43	4.30
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	1	2	7	4.60	1084/1421	4.60	4.75	4.73	4.73	4.60
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	2	2	6	4.40	738/1411	4.40	4.39	4.31	4.29	4.40
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	2	1	1	6	4.10	1001/1405	4.10	4.45	4.32	4.32	4.10
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	2	0	1	2	3	2	3.75	853/1236	3.75	3.92	4.00	4.07	3.75
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1260	5.00	4.32	4.14	4.22	5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	321/1255	4.78	4.53	4.33	4.37	4.78
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	1	0	2	0	6	4.11	895/1258	4.11	4.46	4.38	4.42	4.11
4. Were special techniques successful	2	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	105/ 873	4.78	4.14	4.03	4.08	4.78

Frequency Distribution

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

- Means there are not enough responses to be significant

Course-Section: SPAN 401 1
 Title Studies In Spanish Lan
 Instructor: Sinnigen,John H
 Enrollment: 12
 Questionnaires: 10

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2009

Page 1456
 MAR 22, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	4	5	4.40	724/1509	4.40	4.42	4.31	4.39	4.40
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	3	6	4.50	543/1509	4.50	4.39	4.26	4.26	4.50
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	0	1	8	4.60	426/1287	4.60	4.48	4.30	4.38	4.60
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	0	1	8	4.60	346/1459	4.60	4.32	4.22	4.32	4.60
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	0	2	7	4.40	446/1406	4.40	4.19	4.09	4.11	4.40
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	3	7	4.70	199/1384	4.70	4.17	4.11	4.23	4.70
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	2	7	4.60	341/1489	4.60	4.07	4.17	4.18	4.60
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1506	5.00	4.55	4.67	4.67	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	2	5	1	3.88	1006/1463	3.88	4.16	4.09	4.18	3.88
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	413/1438	4.78	4.48	4.46	4.50	4.78
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	794/1421	4.80	4.75	4.73	4.76	4.80
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	1	8	4.70	376/1411	4.70	4.39	4.31	4.35	4.70
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	1	1	6	4.33	828/1405	4.33	4.45	4.32	4.34	4.33
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	2	0	2	2	4	3.60	936/1236	3.60	3.92	4.00	4.03	3.60
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	1	1	1	3	4.00	746/1260	4.00	4.32	4.14	4.25	4.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	2	1	1	2	3.50	1127/1255	3.50	4.53	4.33	4.46	3.50
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	1	1	1	0	3	3.50	1143/1258	3.50	4.46	4.38	4.51	3.50
4. Were special techniques successful	4	0	2	0	2	0	2	3.00	801/ 873	3.00	4.14	4.03	4.26	3.00

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: SPAN 421 1
 Title Studies In Hispanic Li
 Instructor: Schneider, Judit
 Enrollment: 13
 Questionnaires: 9

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2009

Page 1457
 MAR 22, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

Frequency Distribution

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

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	4	10	4.60	482/1509	4.60	4.42	4.31	4.39	4.60
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	2	1	4	8	4.20	922/1509	4.20	4.39	4.26	4.26	4.20
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	1	1	2	9	4.46	566/1287	4.46	4.48	4.30	4.38	4.46
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	2	10	4.47	520/1459	4.47	4.32	4.22	4.32	4.47
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	2	1	3	9	4.27	575/1406	4.27	4.19	4.09	4.11	4.27
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	3	4	7	4.29	589/1384	4.29	4.17	4.11	4.23	4.29
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	1	2	3	8	4.07	944/1489	4.07	4.07	4.17	4.18	4.07
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	2	13	4.87	662/1506	4.87	4.55	4.67	4.67	4.87
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	1	1	1	3	5	3.91	983/1463	3.91	4.16	4.09	4.18	3.91
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	1	0	4	9	4.50	800/1438	4.50	4.48	4.46	4.50	4.50
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	1	13	4.93	429/1421	4.93	4.75	4.73	4.76	4.93
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	1	0	2	2	9	4.29	858/1411	4.29	4.39	4.31	4.35	4.29
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	2	2	9	4.36	808/1405	4.36	4.45	4.32	4.34	4.36
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	0	4	2	8	4.29	466/1236	4.29	3.92	4.00	4.03	4.29
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	1	4	5	4.40	505/1260	4.40	4.32	4.14	4.25	4.40
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	287/1255	4.80	4.53	4.33	4.46	4.80
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1258	5.00	4.46	4.38	4.51	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	5	1	0	0	0	4	5	4.56	193/ 873	4.56	4.14	4.03	4.26	4.56
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	12	0	0	0	2	1	0	3.33	****/ 89	****	5.00	4.49	4.71	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	12	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/ 92	****	4.93	4.54	4.83	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	1	1	1	0	3.00	****/ 90	****	4.62	4.50	4.69	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	1	2	0	3.67	****/ 92	****	4.93	4.38	4.64	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	12	0	1	1	0	1	0	2.33	****/ 93	****	4.86	4.06	4.32	****

Frequency Distribution

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