

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

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	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	5.00	****/ 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 Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	10	Required for Majors	3	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	4						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	0	C	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 responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	2				
				?	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	0	0	3	12	4.80	244/1509	4.72	4.42	4.31	4.18	4.80	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	4	6	5	4.07	1042/1509	4.21	4.39	4.26	4.25	4.07	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the 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 other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	4	4	6	4.14	877/1459	4.36	4.32	4.22	4.11	4.14	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	5	8	4.40	446/1406	4.55	4.19	4.09	4.02	4.40	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	4	9	4.47	385/1384	4.41	4.17	4.11	3.98	4.47	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	3	4	7	4.13	885/1489	4.18	4.07	4.17	4.20	4.13	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	13	2	4.13	1330/1506	4.14	4.55	4.67	4.66	4.13	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	2	6	4	4.17	726/1463	4.19	4.16	4.09	4.02	4.17	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	6	8	4.47	852/1438	4.52	4.48	4.46	4.44	4.47	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	14	4.93	376/1421	4.97	4.75	4.73	4.66	4.93	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	3	6	6	4.20	936/1411	4.21	4.39	4.31	4.27	4.20	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	3	3	9	4.40	758/1405	4.51	4.45	4.32	4.27	4.40	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	0	2	3	9	4.50	274/1236	4.54	3.92	4.00	3.87	4.50	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	1	2	0	6	4.22	645/1260	4.43	4.32	4.14	3.95	4.22	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	1	0	3	0	5	3.89	1001/1255	4.26	4.53	4.33	4.15	3.89	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	0	0	1	5	2	4.13	889/1258	4.38	4.46	4.38	4.18	4.13	
4. Were special techniques successful	7	2	1	0	2	0	3	3.67	650/ 873	4.27	4.14	4.03	3.89	3.67	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	13	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 184	****	****	4.16	4.06	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	13	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 198	****	****	4.22	4.14	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	13	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 184	****	****	4.48	4.48	****	
Field Work															
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.41	4.29	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 47	****	****	4.18	4.26	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 49	****	****	4.26	4.28	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	13	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 41	****	****	4.14	4.13	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	13	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 46	****	****	4.31	4.52	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors		
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	A 9	Required for Majors 2	Graduate 0	Major 2
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B 5			
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	1	C 0	General 7	Under-grad 15	Non-major 13
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	1	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 3		
				? 1			

Course-Section: ARBC 201 1
 Title Intermediate Arabic I
 Instructor: El Omari, Samir
 Enrollment: 13
 Questionnaires: 7

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2009

Page 60
 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	3	3	4.29	852/1509	4.54	4.42	4.31	4.34	4.29
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	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	2	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	4	4.57	378/1459	4.59	4.32	4.22	4.30	4.57
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	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	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
Lecture														
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	810/1411	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														
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	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			
				P	1						
				I	0	Other	1				
				?	0						

Course-Section: ARBC 201 2
 Title Intermediate Arabic I
 Instructor: El Omari, Samir
 Enrollment: 18
 Questionnaires: 6

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2009

Page 61
 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	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
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
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	496/1411	4.47	4.39	4.31	4.37	4.60
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
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	211/1236	4.30	3.92	4.00	4.11	4.60
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
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	620/1258	4.75	4.46	4.38	4.44	4.50
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 Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	1	0.00-0.99 0	A 3	Required for Majors 2	Graduate 0 Major 0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99 0	B 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 responses to be significant
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 2	
			? 0		