Course-Section: ARBC 101 1

University of Maryland

Elementary Arabic I El Omari, Samir

Baltimore County Fall 2009

Enrollment: 30 Questionnaires: 14

Title

Instructor:

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Page 58 MAR 22, 2010 Job IRBR3029

Questions			Fre	equer 2	ncies 3	4	5	Inst Mean	ructor Rank	Course Mean	_	UMBC Mean		Sect Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	3	10	4.64	434/1509	4.72	4.42	4.31	4.18	4.64
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	5	7	4.36	753/1509	4.21	4.39	4.26	4.25	4.36
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	4	10	4.71	304/1287	4.66	4.48	4.30	4.24	4.71
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	2	10	4.57	378/1459	4.36	4.32	4.22	4.11	4.57
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	1	2	10	4.69	200/1406	4.55	4.19	4.09	4.02	4.69
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	2	2	9	4.36	505/1384	4.41	4.17	4.11	3.98	4.36
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	0	0	2	6	5	4.23	781/1489	4.18	4.07	4.17	4.20	4.23
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	1	10	3	4.14	1325/1506	4.14	4.55	4.67	4.66	4.14
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	0	2	3	4	4.22	658/1463	4.19	4.16	4.09	4.02	4.22
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	2	2	10	4.57	712/1438	4.52	4.48	4.46	4.44	4.57
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	14	5.00	1/1421	4.97	4.75	4.73	4.66	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	4	3	7	4.21	920/1411	4.21	4.39	4.31	4.27	4.21
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	2	1	10	4.62	526/1405	4.51	4.45	4.32	4.27	4.62
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	1	4	9	4.57	229/1236	4.54	3.92	4.00	3.87	4.57
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	1	2	8	4.64	330/1260	4.43	4.32	4.14	3.95	4.64
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	1	2	8	4.64	474/1255	4.26	4.53	4.33	4.15	4.64
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	1	2	8	4.64	528/1258	4.38	4.46	4.38	4.18	4.64
4. Were special techniques successful	3	3	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	79/ 873	4.27	4.14	4.03	3.89	4.88
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 184	****	****	4.16	4.06	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 198	****	****	4.22	4.14	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 184	****	****	4.48	4.48	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 177	****	****	4.36	4.29	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 165	***	****	4.18	4.15	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 89	****	5.00	4.49	4.31	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 92	****	4.93	4.54	4.16	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 90	****	4.62	4.50	4.21	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 92	****	4.93	4.38	4.21	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	13	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	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.39	3.75	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.41	4.29	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 47	****	****	4.51	4.53	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 47	****	****	4.18	4.26	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	13	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	13	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 49	****	****	4.26	4.28	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 41	****	****	4.14	4.13	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 46	****	****	4.31	4.52	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 37	****	****	4.05	4.47	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.27	4.21	****

Course-Section: ARBC 101 1

Title Elementary Arabic I

Instructor: El Omari, Samir

Enrollment: 30
Questionnaires: 14

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2009 Page 58 MAR 22, 2010 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: ARBC 101 2

Elementary Arabic I

Title El Omari,Samir Instructor:

Enrollment: 27 Questionnaires: 15

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2009

Page 59 MAR 22, 2010 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions						NA	Fre	equei 2	ncies 3	s 4	5	Inst Mean	tructor Rank		e Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
		Genera	 1															
1. Did you	ı gain new	insights,ski		om this course	0	0	0	0	0	3	12	4.80	244/1509	4.72	4.42	4.31	4.18	4.80
		or make clear			0	0	0	0	4	6	5	4.07	1042/1509	4.21	4.39	4.26	4.25	4.07
3. Did the	e exam que	estions reflec	t the e	expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	4	10	4.60	426/1287	4.66	4.48	4.30	4.24	4.60
4. Did oth	4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals								4	4	6	4.14	877/1459	4.36	4.32	4.22	4.11	4.14
				what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	5	8	4.40	446/1406	4.55	4.19	4.09	4.02	4.40
				to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	4	9	4.47			4.17	4.11	3.98	4.47
		system clearly		ined	0	0	0	1	3	4			885/1489		4.07	4.17	4.20	4.13
		vas class canc			0	0	0	0		13			1330/1506		4.55	4.67	4.66	4.13
9. How wou	ıld you gr	rade the overa	ll teac	ching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	2	6	4	4.17	726/1463	4.19	4.16	4.09	4.02	4.17
		Lectur	e															
		ctor's lecture			0	0	0	0	1	6	8	4.47	852/1438	4.52	4.48	4.46	4.44	4.47
		or seem inter			0	0	0	0	0	1					4.75	4.73	4.66	4.93
				explained clearly	0	0	0	0	3	6					4.39		4.27	
		contribute t			0	0	0	0	3	3		4.40				4.32		4.40
5. Did aud	diovisual	techniques en	hance y	our understanding	1	0	0	0	2	3	9	4.50	274/1236	4.54	3.92	4.00	3.87	4.50
		Discus	sion															
1. Did cla	ass discus	ssions contrib	ute to	what you learned	6	0	0	1	2	0	6	4.22			4.32	4.14	3.95	4.22
				ed to participate	6	0	1	0	3	0	5	3.89	1001/1255	4.26	4.53	4.33	4.15	3.89
				nd open discussion	7	0	0	0	1	5	2	4.13			4.46	4.38		4.13
4. Were sp	pecial tec	chniques succe	ssful		7	2	1	0	2	0	3	3.67	650/ 873	4.27	4.14	4.03	3.89	3.67
		Labora	tory															
1. Did the	e lab incr	rease understa	nding c	of the material	13	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 184	****	****	4.16	4.06	***
				ground information	13	0	0	0	0	0	2		****/ 198		****	4.22	4.14	***
3. Were ne	ecessary m	materials avai	lable f	for lab activities	13	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 184	****	****	4.48	4.48	***
		Field	Work															
2. Did you	clearly	understand yo	ur eval	uation criteria	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.41	4.29	****
4. To what	degree o	could you disc	uss you	ır evaluations	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 47	****	****	4.18	4.26	***
		Self	Paced															
1. Did sel	lf-paced s	system contrib	ute to	what you learned	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 49	****	****	4.26	4.28	****
2. Did stu	ıdy questi	ons make clea	r the e	expected goal	13	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 41	****	****	4.14	4.13	****
3. Were yo	our contac	cts with the i	nstruct	or helpful	13	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 46	****	****	4.31	4.52	***
				Frequ	iency	Dist	cribu	utio	n									
Credits Ea	arned				Re:	asons	3			ጥ ኒ	ре			Majors				
00-27		Red	quire	ed f	or Ma	ajor	s	2	Graduat	e	0	Majo	r	2				
28-55	1 0	1.00-1.99 2.00-2.99	0 1	B 5 C 0		Con	nera]	ı				7	IIndo:	d 1	1 5	Non	ma i a	1 2
56-83 84-150	84-150 1 3.00-3.49 1 D 0							L				/	Under-9	rau l	L5	Non-	major	13
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	Б 0 F 0		교 1∠	act i t	70 S				3	#### -	Meane +	here =	re not	enous	rh
orau.	J	3.30 1.00	_	P 0		Electives					<pre>3 #### - Means there are not eno responses to be significant</pre>					_	,	
				I 0		Other						3	10050110	-5 00 k			-	
				? 1														

Course-Section: ARBC 201 1 University of Maryland
Title Intermediate Arabic I Baltimore County

Baltimore County
Fall 2009

Page 60

MAR 22, 2010

Job IRBR3029

Enrollment: 13
Questionnaires: 7 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Instructor:

El Omari,Samir

Questions			0	_		NID	3.7.7		_	ncies		_		ructor	Course	_			
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course			Question	S 		NR	NA			3	4	5 	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course			Genera	1															
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals 0 0 0 0 0 3 2 2 3 .86 1196/1509 4.23 4.39 4.26 4.32 3.86 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals 0 0 0 0 0 0 2 5 4.71 1304/1287 4.66 4.88 4.30 4.35 4.71 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals 0 0 0 0 0 0 2 5 4.71 1304/1287 4.66 4.88 4.30 4.157 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 1 0 1 0 0 2 3 4 4.00 813/1406 4.30 4.19 4.09 4.09 4.00 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 0 0 0 0 1 3 3 4 4.00 813/1406 4.30 4.19 4.09 4.09 4.09 4.00 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 0 0 0 0 1 1 3 3 4.29 588/1384 4.54 4.17 4.11 4.09 4.29 7. Was the grading system clearly explained 0 1 0 0 0 0 1 1 5 4.57 376/1489 4.49 4.07 4.17 4.19 4.57 8. How many times was class cancelled 0 1 0 0 0 0 1 1 3 1 4.00 853/1463 4.20 4.16 4.09 4.08 4.00 8.00 8.00 8.00 8.00 8.00 8.00	1. Did von	ı gain ne			this course	0	0	0	0	1	3	3	4.29	852/1509	4.54	4.42	4.31	4.34	4.29
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals 0 0 0 0 0 2 5 5 4.71 304/1287 4.66 4.48 4.30 4.35 4.71 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals 0 0 0 0 0 3 3 4 4.57 378/1459 4.52 4.22 4.30 4.55 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 1 0 1 0 0 2 3 4.00 813/1406 4.30 4.19 4.09 4.09 4.00 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 0 0 0 0 1 1 5 4.57 376/1489 4.54 4.17 4.11 4.09 4.29 4.00 4.00 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 0 0 0 0 1 1 5 4.57 376/1489 4.49 4.07 4.17 4.19 4.57 8. How many times was class cancelled 0 1 0 0 0 5 5 1 4.17 1315/1506 4.28 4.55 4.67 4.61 4.17 4.19 4.09 4.09 4.00 4.00 4.00 4.00 4.00 4.0	_	_	J ,				-	-	-	_	2								
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 7. Was the grading system clearly explained 8. How many times was class cancelled 9. 0 0 0 0 1 1 1 5 4.57 376/1489 4.49 4.07 4.17 4.11 4.09 4.29 7. Was the grading system clearly explained 9. 0 0 0 0 1 1 1 5 4.57 376/1489 4.49 4.07 4.17 4.11 4.09 4.29 8. How many times was class cancelled 9. 0 0 0 0 0 1 1 5 4.57 376/1489 4.49 4.07 4.17 4.19 4.57 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 2 0 0 0 0 1 3 1 4.00 853/1463 4.20 4.16 4.09 4.08 4.00 1. Lecture 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 7. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 8. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 8. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 9. Discussion 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 4. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 5. Did audiovisual techniques successful 8. Frequency Distribution Fre				_		0	0	0	0		2	5							
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 7. O 0 0 0 1 3 3 4.29 589/1384 4.54 4.17 4.11 4.09 4.29 7. Was the grading system clearly explained 0 0 0 0 0 1 1 1 5 4.57 376/1489 4.49 4.07 4.17 4.19 4.57 8. How many times was class cancelled 0 1 0 0 0 5 1 4.17 1315/1506 4.28 4.55 4.67 4.61 4.17 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 2 0 0 0 1 3 1 4.00 853/1463 4.20 4.16 4.09 4.09 4.09 4.00 6.00 6.00 6.00 6.00 6.00 6.00 6.00						0	0	0	0	0		4		,				4.30	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained 0 0 0 0 0 1 1 5 4.57 376/1489 4.49 4.07 4.17 4.19 4.57 8. How many times was class cancelled 0 1 0 0 0 0 1 1 1 5 4.57 376/1489 4.49 4.07 4.17 4.19 4.57 8. How many times was class cancelled 0 1 0 0 0 5 1 4.17 1315/1506 4.28 4.55 4.67 4.61 4.17 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 2 0 0 0 1 3 1 4.00 853/1463 4.20 4.16 4.09 4.08 4.00 4.09 4.08 4.00 4.09 4.08 4.00 4.09 4.08 4.00 4.09 4.08 4.00 4.09 4.08 4.00 4.09 4.08 4.00 4.09 4.08 4.00 4.09 4.09 4.08 4.00 4.09 4.08 4.00 4.09 4.08 4.00 4.09 4.08 4.00 4.09 4.08 4.00 4.09 4.08 4.00 4.09 4.08 4.00 4.09 4.08 4.00 4.09 4.08 4.00 4.09 4.08 4.00 4.09 4.08 4.00 4.09 4.08 4.00 4.09 4.09 4.09 4.09 4.09 4.09 4.09						1	0	1	0	0	2	3	4.00	813/1406	4.30	4.19	4.09	4.09	4.00
8. How many times was class cancelled 0 1 0 0 0 5 1 4.17 1315/1506 4.28 4.55 4.67 4.61 4.17 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 2 0 0 0 1 3 1 4.00 853/1463 4.20 4.16 4.09 4.08 4.00 Lecture 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 1 0 0 0 0 0 2 4 4.67 588/1438 4.73 4.48 4.46 4.48 4.67 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 1 0 0 0 0 1 5 4.83 716/1421 4.82 4.75 4.73 4.76 4.83 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 1 0 0 1 0 1 4 4.33 810/1411 4.47 4.39 4.31 4.37 4.38 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 1 0 0 0 0 1 1 4 4.50 634/1405 4.55 4.45 4.32 4.39 4.50 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 1 0 0 0 0 3 0 3 4.00 664/1236 4.30 3.92 4.00 4.11 4.00 Discussion 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 5 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 1/1260 5.00 4.32 4.14 4.19 5.00 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 5 0 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 1/1255 4.50 4.53 4.33 4.37 5.00 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 5 0 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 1/1255 4.50 4.53 4.33 4.37 5.00 4. Were special techniques successful 5 0 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 1/1258 4.75 4.46 4.38 4.44 5.00 4. Were special techniques successful 5 0 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 1/1258 4.75 4.46 4.38 4.44 5.00 5 0 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 1/1258 4.75 4.46 4.38 4.44 5.00 5 0 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 1/1258 4.75 4.46 4.38 4.44 5.00 7 Frequency Distribution Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades Reasons Type Majors Frequency Distribution Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades Reasons Type Majors 2 8 Graduate 0 Major 2 8 Graduate 0 Major 2 8 Graduate 0 Major 5 8 Graduate 0	6. Did wri	itten ass	signments contr	ibute to	what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	3	3	4.29	589/1384	4.54	4.17	4.11	4.09	4.29
Lecture Lect	7. Was the	e grading	g system clearly	y explai	ned	0	0	0	0	1	1	5	4.57	376/1489	4.49	4.07	4.17	4.19	4.57
Lecture 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 1. O 0 0 0 0 2 4 4.67 588/1438 4.73 4.48 4.46 4.48 4.67 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 1. O 0 0 0 0 1 5 4.83 716/1421 4.82 4.75 4.73 4.76 4.83 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 5. Did understanding 5. Did olass discussions contribute to what you learned 6. Were special techniques successful 6. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 7. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 8. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 8. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 8. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 9. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 9. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 9. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 9. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 9. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 9. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 9. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 9. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 9. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 9. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 9. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 9. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 9. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 9. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 9. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 9. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 9. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 9. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 9. Did the instructor encourage	8. How man	ny times	was class cance	elled		0	1	0	0	0	5	1	4.17	1315/1506	4.28	4.55	4.67	4.61	4.17
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 1 0 0 0 0 2 4 4.67 588/1438 4.73 4.48 4.46 4.48 4.67 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 1 0 0 0 0 1 5 4.83 716/1421 4.82 4.75 4.73 4.76 4.83 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 1 0 0 1 0 1 4 4.33 810/1421 4.47 4.39 4.31 4.37 4.33 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 1 0 0 0 0 1 1 4 4.50 634/1405 4.55 4.45 4.32 4.39 4.50 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 1 0 0 0 0 1 1 1 4 4.50 634/1405 4.55 4.45 4.32 4.39 4.50 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 1 0 0 0 0 3 0 3 4.00 664/1236 4.30 3.92 4.00 4.11 4.00 Discussion 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 5 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 1/1260 5.00 4.32 4.14 4.19 5.00 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 5 0 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 1/1255 4.50 4.53 4.33 4.37 5.00 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 5 0 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 1/1258 4.75 4.46 4.38 4.44 5.00 4. Were special techniques successful 5 0 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 1/1258 4.75 4.46 4.38 4.44 5.00 4. Were special techniques successful 5 0 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 1/1258 4.75 4.46 4.38 4.44 5.00 4. Were special techniques successful 5 0 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 1/1258 4.75 4.46 4.38 4.44 5.00 4.00 4.00 5.00 5 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0	9. How wou	ıld you g	grade the overa	ll teach	ing effectiveness	2	0	0	0	1	3	1	4.00	853/1463	4.20	4.16	4.09	4.08	4.00
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 1 0 0 0 0 2 4 4.67 588/1438 4.73 4.48 4.46 4.48 4.67 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 1 0 0 0 0 1 5 4.83 716/1421 4.82 4.75 4.73 4.76 4.83 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 1 0 0 1 0 1 4 4.33 810/1421 4.47 4.39 4.31 4.37 4.33 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 1 0 0 0 0 1 1 4 4.50 634/1405 4.55 4.45 4.32 4.39 4.50 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 1 0 0 0 0 1 1 1 4 4.50 634/1405 4.55 4.45 4.32 4.39 4.50 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 1 0 0 0 0 3 0 3 4.00 664/1236 4.30 3.92 4.00 4.11 4.00 Discussion 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 5 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 1/1260 5.00 4.32 4.14 4.19 5.00 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 5 0 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 1/1255 4.50 4.53 4.33 4.37 5.00 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 5 0 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 1/1258 4.75 4.46 4.38 4.44 5.00 4. Were special techniques successful 5 0 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 1/1258 4.75 4.46 4.38 4.44 5.00 4. Were special techniques successful 5 0 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 1/1258 4.75 4.46 4.38 4.44 5.00 4. Were special techniques successful 5 0 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 1/1258 4.75 4.46 4.38 4.44 5.00 4.00 4.00 5.00 5 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0																			
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 1 0 0 0 0 1 5 4.83 716/1421 4.82 4.75 4.73 4.76 4.83 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 1 0 0 1 0 1 4 4.33 810/1411 4.47 4.39 4.31 4.37 4.33 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 1 0 0 0 1 1 4 4.50 63/41405 4.55 4.45 4.32 4.39 4.50 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 1 0 0 0 0 3 0 3 4.00 664/1236 4.30 3.92 4.00 4.11 4.00 Discussion 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 5 0 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 1/1250 5.00 4.32 4.14 4.19 5.00 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 5 0 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 1/1255 4.50 4.53 4.33 4.37 5.00 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 5 0 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 1/1255 4.50 4.53 4.33 4.37 5.00 4. Were special techniques successful 5 0 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 1/1258 4.75 4.46 4.38 4.44 5.00 4.00 4.00 4.00 4.00 4.00 4.00			Lecture	е															
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 1 0 0 1 0 1 4 4.33 810/1411 4.47 4.39 4.31 4.37 4.33 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 1 0 0 0 1 1 4 4.50 634/1405 4.55 4.45 4.32 4.39 4.50 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 1 0 0 0 3 0 3 4.00 664/1236 4.30 3.92 4.00 4.11 4.00 Discussion Discussion Discussion 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 5 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 1/1260 5.00 4.32 4.14 4.19 5.00 1. Did the instructor encourage to participate 5 0 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 1/1255 4.50 4.53 4.33 4.37 5.00 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 5 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 1/1258 4.75 4.46 4.38 4.44 5.00 4. Were special techniques successful 5 0 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 1/1258 4.75 4.46 4.38 4.44 5.00 4. Were special techniques successful 5 0 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 1/873 4.50 4.14 4.03 4.04 5.00 Terquency Distribution Frequency Distribution Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades Reasons Type Majors Frequency Distribution Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades Reasons Type Majors 2 Graduate 0 Major 2 28-55 0 1.00-1.99 0 B 1 56-83 2 2.00-2.99 1 C 0 General 2 Under-grad 7 Non-major 5 84-150 0 3.00-3.49 0 D 0 Grad. 0 3.50-4.00 2 F 0 Electives 1 #### - Means there are not enough P 1 responses to be significant	1. Were th	ne instru	actor's lecture	s well p	prepared	1	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	588/1438	4.73	4.48	4.46	4.48	4.67
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 1 0 0 0 1 1 1 4 4.50 634/1405 4.55 4.45 4.32 4.39 4.50 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 1 0 0 0 0 3 0 3 4.00 664/1236 4.30 3.92 4.00 4.11 4.00 Discussion 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 5 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 1/1260 5.00 4.32 4.14 4.19 5.00 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 5 0 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 1/1255 4.50 4.53 4.33 4.37 5.00 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 5 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 1/1258 4.75 4.64 4.38 4.44 5.00 4. Were special techniques successful 5 0 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 1/1258 4.75 4.46 4.38 4.44 5.00 4. Were special techniques successful 5 0 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 1/1873 4.50 4.14 4.03 4.04 5.00 5.00 5.00 5.00 5.00 5.00 5.00	2. Did the	e instruc	ctor seem inter	ested ir	the subject	1	0	0		0	1	5	4.83	716/1421	4.82	4.75	4.73	4.76	4.83
Discussion 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 5 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 1/1260 5.00 4.32 4.14 4.19 5.00 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 5 0 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 1/1255 4.50 4.53 4.33 4.37 5.00 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 5 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 1/1258 4.75 4.46 4.38 4.44 5.00 4. Were special techniques successful 5 0 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 1/1258 4.75 4.46 4.38 4.44 5.00 4. Were special techniques successful 5 0 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 1/1258 4.75 4.46 4.38 4.44 5.00 4. Were special techniques successful 5 0 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 1/1258 4.75 4.46 4.38 4.44 5.00 4. Were special techniques successful 5 0 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 1/1258 4.75 4.46 4.38 4.44 5.00 4. Were special techniques successful 5 0 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 1/1258 4.75 4.46 4.38 4.44 5.00 4. Were special techniques successful 5 0 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 1/1258 4.75 4.46 4.38 4.44 5.00 4. Were special techniques successful 5 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 1/1258 4.75 4.46 4.38 4.44 5.00 4. Were special techniques successful 5 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0	3. Was led	cture mat	erial presente	d and ex	plained clearly	1	0	0	1			4	4.33	810/1411	4.47	4.39	4.31	4.37	4.33
Discussion 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 5 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 1/1260 5.00 4.32 4.14 4.19 5.00 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 5 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 1/1255 4.50 4.53 4.33 4.37 5.00 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 5 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 1/1258 4.75 4.46 4.38 4.44 5.00 4. Were special techniques successful 5 0 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 1/1258 4.75 4.46 4.38 4.44 5.00 Frequency Distribution Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades Reasons Type Majors O0-27 1 0.00-0.99 0 A 5 Required for Majors 2 Graduate 0 Major 2 28-55 0 1.00-1.99 0 B 1 56-83 2 2.00-2.99 1 C 0 General 2 Under-grad 7 Non-major 5 84-150 0 3.00-3.49 0 D 0 Grad. 0 3.50-4.00 2 F 0 Electives 1 #### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant I 0 Other 1				_			-	-	-		_	_		,					
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 5 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 1/1260 5.00 4.32 4.14 4.19 5.00 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 5 0 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 1/1255 4.50 4.53 4.33 4.37 5.00 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 5 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 1/1258 4.75 4.46 4.38 4.44 5.00 4. Were special techniques successful 5 0 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 1/1258 4.75 4.46 4.38 4.44 5.00 5 0 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 1/1258 4.75 4.46 4.38 4.44 5.00 5 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0	5. Did aud	diovisual	l techniques en	hance yo	our understanding	1	0	0	0	3	0	3	4.00	664/1236	4.30	3.92	4.00	4.11	4.00
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 5 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 1/1260 5.00 4.32 4.14 4.19 5.00 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 5 0 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 1/1255 4.50 4.53 4.33 4.37 5.00 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 5 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 1/1258 4.75 4.46 4.38 4.44 5.00 4. Were special techniques successful 5 0 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 1/1258 4.75 4.46 4.38 4.44 5.00 5 0 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 1/1258 4.75 4.46 4.38 4.44 5.00 5 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0																			
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 5 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 1/1255 4.50 4.53 4.33 4.37 5.00 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 5 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 1/1258 4.75 4.46 4.38 4.44 5.00 4. Were special techniques successful 5 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 1/873 4.50 4.14 4.03 4.04 5.00 Frequency Distribution Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades Reasons Type Majors																			
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 5 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 1/1258 4.75 4.46 4.38 4.44 5.00 4. Were special techniques successful 5 0 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 1/873 4.50 4.14 4.03 4.04 5.00 Frequency Distribution Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades Reasons Type Majors 00-27 1 0.00-0.99 0 A 5 Required for Majors 2 Graduate 0 Major 2 28-55 0 1.00-1.99 0 B 1 56-83 2 2.00-2.99 1 C 0 General 2 Under-grad 7 Non-major 5 84-150 0 3.00-3.49 0 D 0 Grad. 0 3.50-4.00 2 F 0 Electives 1 #### - Means there are not enough P 1							-	-	-	-	-	_		,					
4. Were special techniques successful 5 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 1/873 4.50 4.14 4.03 4.04 5.00 Frequency Distribution Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades Reasons Type Majors 00-27 1 0.00-0.99 0 A 5 Required for Majors 2 Graduate 0 Major 2 28-55 0 1.00-1.99 0 B 1 56-83 2 2.00-2.99 1 C 0 General 2 Under-grad 7 Non-major 5 84-150 0 3.00-3.49 0 D 0 Grad. 0 3.50-4.00 2 F 0 Electives 1 #### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant 1 0 Other 1			_	_			-							,					
Frequency Distribution Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades Reasons Type Majors 00-27 1 0.00-0.99 0 B 1 28-55 0 1.00-1.99 0 B 1 56-83 2 2.00-2.99 1 C 0 General 2 Under-grad 7 Non-major 5 84-150 0 3.00-3.49 0 D 0 Grad. 0 3.50-4.00 2 F 0 Electives 1 #### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant I 0 Other 1					l open discussion		-												
Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades Reasons Type Majors 00-27 1 0.00-0.99 0 B 1 0.00-1.99 0 B 1 <td>4. Were sp</td> <td>pecial te</td> <td>echniques succe</td> <td>ssful</td> <td></td> <td>5</td> <td>0</td> <td>0</td> <td>0</td> <td>0</td> <td>0</td> <td>2</td> <td>5.00</td> <td>1/ 873</td> <td>4.50</td> <td>4.14</td> <td>4.03</td> <td>4.04</td> <td>5.00</td>	4. Were sp	pecial te	echniques succe	ssful		5	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 873	4.50	4.14	4.03	4.04	5.00
Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades Reasons Type Majors 00-27 1 0.00-0.99 0 B 1 0.00-1.99 0 B 1 <td></td>																			
00-27					Frequ	ency	Dist	trib	utio	n									
28-55	Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	asons	3			Ту	pe			Majors	}
28-55	00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A 5		Red	auir	ed f	or Ma	iors	 3	2	Graduat	 e	0	Maio	r	2
84-150 0 3.00-3.49 0 D 0 Grad. 0 3.50-4.00 2 F 0 Electives 1 #### - Means there are not enough P 1 I 0 Other 1		0		0	в 1			1											
84-150 0 3.00-3.49 0 D 0 Grad. 0 3.50-4.00 2 F 0 Electives 1 #### - Means there are not enough P 1 I 0 Other 1							Gei	nera	1				2	Under-q	rad	7	Non-	major	5
Grad. 0 3.50-4.00 2 F 0 Electives 1 #### - Means there are not enough P 1 responses to be significant I 0 Other 1														5					
P 1 responses to be significant I 0 Other 1							Ele	ecti	ves				1	#### - 1	Means t	here a	re not	enoug	ıh
I 0 Other 1																			
? 0					I 0		Otl	her					1	-		5			
					? 0														

Course-Section: ARBC 201 2 University of Maryland Title

Intermediate Arabic I Baltimore County El Omari,Samir Fall 2009

Enrollment: Ouestionnaires: 6

Instructor:

18 Student Course Evaluation Ouestionnaire Frequencies Instructor Course Dept UMBC Level Sect Ouestions NR NA 1 2 3 4 5 Mean Rank Mean Mean Mean Mean Mean General 1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course 1 0 0 0 1 4 4.80 244/1509 4.54 4.42 4.31 4.34 4.80 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals 1 0 0 0 0 2 3 4.60 424/1509 4.23 4.39 4.26 4.32 4.60 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals 1 0 0 0 0 2 3 4.60 426/1287 4.66 4.48 4.30 4.35 4.60

Page 61 MAR 22, 2010

Job IRBR3029

3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	Τ.	U	U	U	U	2	3	4.00	420/128/	4.00	4.48	4.30	4.35	4.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	346/1459	4.59	4.32	4.22	4.30	4.60
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	269/1406	4.30	4.19	4.09	4.09	4.60
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	107/1384	4.54	4.17	4.11	4.09	4.80
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	1	0	0	4	4.40	597/1489	4.49	4.07	4.17	4.19	4.40
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	3	2	4.40	1166/1506	4.28	4.55	4.67	4.61	4.40
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	3	2	4.40	467/1463	4.20	4.16	4.09	4.08	4.40
Lecture														

1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 1 0 0 0 0 1 4 4.80 363/1438 4.73 4.48 4.46 4.48 4.80 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 1 0 0 0 0 1 4 4.80 794/1421 4.82 4.75 4.73 4.76 4.80 0 0 2 3 4.60 496/1411 4.47 4.39 4.31 4.37 4.60 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 1 0 0 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 1 0 0 0 0 2 3 4.60 540/1405 4.55 4.45 4.32 4.39 4.60 0 0 2 3 4.60 211/1236 4.30 3.92 4.00 4.11 4.60 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 1 0 0

Discussion 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 4 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 1/1260 5.00 4.32 4.14 4.19 5.00 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 4 0 0 0 1 0 1 4.00 904/1255 4.50 4.53 4.33 4.37 4.00

4. Were special techniques successful 4 0 0 0 1 0 1 4.00 442/873 4.50 4.14 4.03 4.04 4.00

Frequency Distribution

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