

Course-Section: FREN 101 0101
 Title ELEMENTARY FRENCH I
 Instructor: PROVENCHER, DEN
 Enrollment: 25
 Questionnaires: 14

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 871
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	0	1	0	2	10	4.62	471/1674	4.44	4.23	4.27	4.07	4.62	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	1	12	4.92	110/1674	4.62	4.26	4.23	4.16	4.92	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	1	12	4.92	105/1423	4.73	4.36	4.27	4.16	4.92	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	4	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	131/1609	4.46	4.23	4.22	4.05	4.89	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	1	0	0	2	3	7	4.42	404/1585	4.28	4.04	3.96	3.88	4.42	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	2	0	0	2	1	8	4.55	337/1535	4.49	4.08	4.08	3.89	4.55	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	0	3	10	4.77	220/1651	4.44	4.20	4.18	4.10	4.77	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	8	5	4.38	1325/1673	4.55	4.65	4.69	4.67	4.38	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	1	1	0	3	6	4.09	900/1656	4.01	4.06	4.07	3.96	4.09	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	0	2	10	4.83	336/1586	4.61	4.43	4.43	4.37	4.83	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/1585	4.89	4.72	4.69	4.60	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	136/1582	4.51	4.30	4.26	4.17	4.92	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	154/1575	4.66	4.32	4.27	4.17	4.92	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	1	2	0	2	2	4	3.60	998/1380	3.84	3.94	3.94	3.78	3.60	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	1	0	1	2	7	4.27	626/1520	4.18	4.14	4.01	3.76	4.27	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1515	4.69	4.37	4.24	3.97	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	244/1511	4.33	4.37	4.27	4.00	4.91	
4. Were special techniques successful	3	4	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	131/ 994	4.21	3.97	3.94	3.73	4.71	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 265	****	4.06	4.23	3.97	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 278	****	4.21	4.19	3.97	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 260	****	4.43	4.46	4.41	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 259	****	4.21	4.33	4.19	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 233	****	4.36	4.20	4.00	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 103	****	4.39	4.41	4.33	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 101	****	4.33	4.48	4.18	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 95	****	4.15	4.31	3.99	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 99	****	4.36	4.39	4.10	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 97	****	3.76	4.14	3.69	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 76	****	3.36	3.98	3.32	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 77	****	3.65	3.93	3.42	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 53	****	4.19	4.45	4.34	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 48	****	3.86	4.12	4.00	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 49	****	3.74	4.27	4.30	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 61	****	4.03	4.09	3.87	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 52	****	4.21	4.26	3.91	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 50	****	4.23	4.44	4.39	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 35	****	4.22	4.36	3.92	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 31	****	4.25	4.34	3.88	****	

Course-Section: FREN 101 0101
 Title ELEMENTARY FRENCH I
 Instructor: PROVENCHER, DEN
 Enrollment: 25
 Questionnaires: 14

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 871
 JAN 21, 2006
 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	6	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	4						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	0	C	1	General	1	Under-grad	14	Non-major	2
84-150	3	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	0						
				I	0	Other	3				
				?	0						

Course-Section: FREN 101 0201
 Title ELEMENTARY FRENCH I
 Instructor: ROSENTHAL, ALAN
 Enrollment: 29
 Questionnaires: 17

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 872
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	6	10	4.53	582/1674	4.44	4.23	4.27	4.07	4.53	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	15	4.88	153/1674	4.62	4.26	4.23	4.16	4.88	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	1	15	4.82	188/1423	4.73	4.36	4.27	4.16	4.82	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	4	1	0	2	4	6	4.08	1048/1609	4.46	4.23	4.22	4.05	4.08	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	1	0	4	5	6	3.94	865/1585	4.28	4.04	3.96	3.88	3.94	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	3	0	0	2	5	7	4.36	558/1535	4.49	4.08	4.08	3.89	4.36	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	2	5	10	4.47	568/1651	4.44	4.20	4.18	4.10	4.47	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	17	5.00	1/1673	4.55	4.65	4.69	4.67	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	1	8	6	4.33	615/1656	4.01	4.06	4.07	3.96	4.33	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	3	14	4.82	354/1586	4.61	4.43	4.43	4.37	4.82	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	16	4.94	340/1585	4.89	4.72	4.69	4.60	4.94	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	2	4	11	4.53	610/1582	4.51	4.30	4.26	4.17	4.53	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	3	14	4.82	257/1575	4.66	4.32	4.27	4.17	4.82	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	1	5	6	5	3.88	810/1380	3.84	3.94	3.94	3.78	3.88	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	0	4	3	8	4.06	790/1520	4.18	4.14	4.01	3.76	4.06	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	1	0	0	1	14	4.69	463/1515	4.69	4.37	4.24	3.97	4.69	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	1	0	4	3	8	4.06	1030/1511	4.33	4.37	4.27	4.00	4.06	
4. Were special techniques successful	1	3	1	1	3	3	5	3.77	633/ 994	4.21	3.97	3.94	3.73	3.77	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	3	0.00-0.99 1	A 4	Required for Majors 10	Graduate 0 Major 0
28-55	6	1.00-1.99 0	B 11		
56-83	3	2.00-2.99 1	C 1	General 4	Under-grad 17 Non-major 2
84-150	1	3.00-3.49 5	D 0		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 3	F 0	Electives 3	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 0	
			? 1		

Course-Section: FREN 101 0301
 Title ELEMENTARY FRENCH I
 Instructor: DE VERNEIL, MAR
 Enrollment: 23
 Questionnaires: 19

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 873
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	1	1	1	16	4.68	380/1674	4.44	4.23	4.27	4.07	4.68	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	16	4.84	184/1674	4.62	4.26	4.23	4.16	4.84	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	16	4.84	174/1423	4.73	4.36	4.27	4.16	4.84	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	1	0	3	14	4.67	312/1609	4.46	4.23	4.22	4.05	4.67	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	3	0	1	2	1	12	4.50	326/1585	4.28	4.04	3.96	3.88	4.50	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	4	0	0	1	0	14	4.87	108/1535	4.49	4.08	4.08	3.89	4.87	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	1	1	5	11	4.44	613/1651	4.44	4.20	4.18	4.10	4.44	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	11	8	4.42	1289/1673	4.55	4.65	4.69	4.67	4.42	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	1	1	0	0	8	7	4.25	719/1656	4.01	4.06	4.07	3.96	4.25	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	3	15	4.74	538/1586	4.61	4.43	4.43	4.37	4.74	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	18	5.00	1/1585	4.89	4.72	4.69	4.60	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	1	0	0	1	17	4.74	339/1582	4.51	4.30	4.26	4.17	4.74	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	0	18	4.89	181/1575	4.66	4.32	4.27	4.17	4.89	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	2	1	1	2	6	7	4.00	666/1380	3.84	3.94	3.94	3.78	4.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	1	0	3	7	4.45	454/1520	4.18	4.14	4.01	3.76	4.45	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	0	0	0	2	9	4.82	313/1515	4.69	4.37	4.24	3.97	4.82	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	1	0	2	0	8	4.27	875/1511	4.33	4.37	4.27	4.00	4.27	
4. Were special techniques successful	8	3	0	0	1	3	4	4.38	302/ 994	4.21	3.97	3.94	3.73	4.38	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 61	****	4.03	4.09	3.87	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 52	****	4.21	4.26	3.91	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	A 10	Required for Majors	14
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	B 5		Graduate 0
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	C 2	General	19
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	D 0		Non-major 10
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	4
			? 0		

Course-Section: FREN 101 0401
 Title ELEMENTARY FRENCH I
 Instructor: APPADOO, YOGEND
 Enrollment: 23
 Questionnaires: 16

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 874
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	2	0	2	5	7	3.94	1284/1674	4.44	4.23	4.27	4.07	3.94	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	1	2	8	4	3.81	1333/1674	4.62	4.26	4.23	4.16	3.81	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	6	8	4.31	792/1423	4.73	4.36	4.27	4.16	4.31	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	3	5	6	4.21	905/1609	4.46	4.23	4.22	4.05	4.21	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	1	1	5	7	4.29	530/1585	4.28	4.04	3.96	3.88	4.29	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	4	4	7	4.20	737/1535	4.49	4.08	4.08	3.89	4.20	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	0	4	3	8	4.06	1057/1651	4.44	4.20	4.18	4.10	4.06	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	10	6	4.38	1332/1673	4.55	4.65	4.69	4.67	4.38	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	1	0	2	5	7	0	3.36	1438/1656	4.01	4.06	4.07	3.96	3.36	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	2	2	5	7	4.06	1270/1586	4.61	4.43	4.43	4.37	4.06	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	6	10	4.63	1118/1585	4.89	4.72	4.69	4.60	4.63	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	1	5	5	5	3.88	1233/1582	4.51	4.30	4.26	4.17	3.88	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	2	1	7	5	4.00	1138/1575	4.66	4.32	4.27	4.17	4.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	1	1	0	3	7	4	3.87	824/1380	3.84	3.94	3.94	3.78	3.87	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	4	5	3	3.92	912/1520	4.18	4.14	4.01	3.76	3.92	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	0	2	5	5	4.25	898/1515	4.69	4.37	4.24	3.97	4.25	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	1	2	4	5	4.08	1024/1511	4.33	4.37	4.27	4.00	4.08	
4. Were special techniques successful	4	2	0	0	3	4	3	4.00	474/ 994	4.21	3.97	3.94	3.73	4.00	
Field Work															
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 53	****	4.19	4.45	4.34	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 48	****	3.86	4.12	4.00	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 49	****	3.74	4.27	4.30	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 5	Required for Majors	8
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	B 4		
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	C 5	General	1
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	D 0	Under-grad	16
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0		
			P 0		
			I 0		
			? 0		
				Electives	0
				Other	4
				#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	

Course-Section: FREN 102 0101
 Title ELEMENTARY FRENCH II
 Instructor: Fatih, Zakaria
 Enrollment: 14
 Questionnaires: 10

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 875
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	1	0	0	9	4.70	367/1674	4.22	4.23	4.27	4.07	4.70	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1674	4.40	4.26	4.23	4.16	5.00	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	132/1423	4.51	4.36	4.27	4.16	4.90	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	1	0	8	4.78	202/1609	4.21	4.23	4.22	4.05	4.78	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	101/1585	4.33	4.04	3.96	3.88	4.88	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	105/1535	4.32	4.08	4.08	3.89	4.88	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	3	6	4.50	524/1651	4.34	4.20	4.18	4.10	4.50	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	1	4.10	1525/1673	4.21	4.65	4.69	4.67	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	1	1	8	4.70	230/1656	4.05	4.06	4.07	3.96	4.70	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1586	4.41	4.43	4.43	4.37	5.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1585	4.68	4.72	4.69	4.60	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1582	4.37	4.30	4.26	4.17	5.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1575	4.48	4.32	4.27	4.17	5.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	8	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1380	3.64	3.94	3.94	3.78	****	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1520	4.20	4.14	4.01	3.76	5.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1515	4.58	4.37	4.24	3.97	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1511	4.44	4.37	4.27	4.00	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	4	2	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	115/ 994	4.06	3.97	3.94	3.73	4.75	

Frequency Distribution

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

- Means there are not enough responses to be significant

Course-Section: FREN 102 0201
 Title ELEMENTARY FRENCH II
 Instructor: Fatih, Zakaria
 Enrollment: 28
 Questionnaires: 22

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 876
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	1	1	4	6	9	4.00	1196/1674	4.22	4.23	4.27	4.07	4.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	0	0	9	12	4.41	737/1674	4.40	4.26	4.23	4.16	4.41	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	7	14	4.67	376/1423	4.51	4.36	4.27	4.16	4.67		
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	7	0	0	1	8	5	4.29	812/1609	4.21	4.23	4.22	4.05	4.29	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	3	4	0	1	3	6	5	4.00	769/1585	4.33	4.04	3.96	3.88	4.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	4	9	0	1	2	3	3	3.89	1039/1535	4.32	4.08	4.08	3.89	3.89	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	4	0	0	0	2	3	13	4.61	382/1651	4.34	4.20	4.18	4.10	4.61	
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	1	0	0	2	13	3	4.06	1545/1673	4.21	4.65	4.69	4.67	4.06	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	1	13	5	4.21	770/1656	4.05	4.06	4.07	3.96	4.21	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	2	7	11	4.45	945/1586	4.41	4.43	4.43	4.37	4.45	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	5	16	4.68	1047/1585	4.68	4.72	4.69	4.60	4.68	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	1	0	7	13	4.52	610/1582	4.37	4.30	4.26	4.17	4.52	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	1	0	7	11	4.47	730/1575	4.48	4.32	4.27	4.17	4.47	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	14	0	1	1	2	2	3.83	845/1380	3.64	3.94	3.94	3.78	3.83	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	2	5	4	4.18	709/1520	4.20	4.14	4.01	3.76	4.18	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	11	0	0	1	1	2	7	4.36	798/1515	4.58	4.37	4.24	3.97	4.36	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	11	0	0	0	5	2	4	3.91	1139/1511	4.44	4.37	4.27	4.00	3.91	
4. Were special techniques successful	12	1	0	1	2	2	4	4.00	474/ 994	4.06	3.97	3.94	3.73	4.00	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	21	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 61	****	4.03	4.09	3.87	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	21	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 52	****	4.21	4.26	3.91	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	21	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 50	****	4.23	4.44	4.39	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	21	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 35	****	4.22	4.36	3.92	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	21	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 31	****	4.25	4.34	3.88	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors				
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 8	Required for Majors	14	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	B 6						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	C 5	General	0	Under-grad	22	Non-major	9
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	D 0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	2	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
			P 0						
			I 0	Other	2				
			? 1						

Course-Section: FREN 102 0301
 Title ELEMENTARY FRENCH II
 Instructor: MBAYE, ABDOULAY
 Enrollment: 25
 Questionnaires: 14

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 877
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	0	0	1	3	9	4.62	471/1674	4.22	4.23	4.27	4.07	4.62	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	2	10	4.69	338/1674	4.40	4.26	4.23	4.16	4.69	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	1	11	4.77	250/1423	4.51	4.36	4.27	4.16	4.77	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	2	1	0	1	2	7	4.27	825/1609	4.21	4.23	4.22	4.05	4.27	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	4	8	4.54	307/1585	4.33	4.04	3.96	3.88	4.54	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	3	0	0	2	1	7	4.50	373/1535	4.32	4.08	4.08	3.89	4.50	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	1	0	4	8	4.46	583/1651	4.34	4.20	4.18	4.10	4.46	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	7	6	4.46	1246/1673	4.21	4.65	4.69	4.67	4.46	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	0	0	4	5	4.56	345/1656	4.05	4.06	4.07	3.96	4.56	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	214/1586	4.41	4.43	4.43	4.37	4.90	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	567/1585	4.68	4.72	4.69	4.60	4.90	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	0	0	0	5	5	4.50	632/1582	4.37	4.30	4.26	4.17	4.50	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	1	0	0	0	5	4	4.44	768/1575	4.48	4.32	4.27	4.17	4.44	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	0	0	1	2	4	4	4.00	666/1380	3.64	3.94	3.94	3.78	4.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	1	2	5	4.50	397/1520	4.20	4.14	4.01	3.76	4.50	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	242/1515	4.58	4.37	4.24	3.97	4.88	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	301/1511	4.44	4.37	4.27	4.00	4.86	
4. Were special techniques successful	7	1	0	0	2	1	3	4.17	408/ 994	4.06	3.97	3.94	3.73	4.17	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	11	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	****/ 265	****	4.06	4.23	3.97	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	11	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 278	****	4.21	4.19	3.97	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	11	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 260	****	4.43	4.46	4.41	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	12	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 259	****	4.21	4.33	4.19	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	12	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 233	****	4.36	4.20	4.00	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	12	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 103	****	4.39	4.41	4.33	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	12	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 101	****	4.33	4.48	4.18	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	12	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 95	****	4.15	4.31	3.99	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 99	****	4.36	4.39	4.10	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	12	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 97	****	3.76	4.14	3.69	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/ 76	****	3.36	3.98	3.32	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	12	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 77	****	3.65	3.93	3.42	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	12	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 53	****	4.19	4.45	4.34	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	12	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 48	****	3.86	4.12	4.00	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	12	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 49	****	3.74	4.27	4.30	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 61	****	4.03	4.09	3.87	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	12	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 52	****	4.21	4.26	3.91	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	12	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/ 50	****	4.23	4.44	4.39	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	12	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 35	****	4.22	4.36	3.92	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	12	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 31	****	4.25	4.34	3.88	****	

Course-Section: FREN 102 0301
 Title ELEMENTARY FRENCH II
 Instructor: MBAYE, ABDOULAY
 Enrollment: 25
 Questionnaires: 14

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 877
 JAN 21, 2006
 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	5	Required for Majors	6	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	3						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	1	C	1	General	1	Under-grad	14	Non-major	1
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	1				
				?	0						

Course-Section: FREN 102 0401
 Title ELEMENTARY FRENCH II
 Instructor: DIALLO, MAMADOU
 Enrollment: 19
 Questionnaires: 14

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 878
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	2	0	3	6	3	3.57	1489/1674	4.22	4.23	4.27	4.07	3.57	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	2	1	3	4	4	3.50	1499/1674	4.40	4.26	4.23	4.16	3.50	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	2	2	4	5	3.71	1188/1423	4.51	4.36	4.27	4.16	3.71	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	3	3	3	3	3.50	1452/1609	4.21	4.23	4.22	4.05	3.50	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	2	2	4	5	3.92	879/1585	4.33	4.04	3.96	3.88	3.92	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	3	5	5	4.00	870/1535	4.32	4.08	4.08	3.89	4.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	1	3	4	5	3.79	1303/1651	4.34	4.20	4.18	4.10	3.79	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	11	3	4.21	1449/1673	4.21	4.65	4.69	4.67	4.21	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	2	1	6	2	0	2.73	1604/1656	4.05	4.06	4.07	3.96	2.73	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	3	0	4	4	3	3.29	1518/1586	4.41	4.43	4.43	4.37	3.29	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	3	6	5	4.14	1441/1585	4.68	4.72	4.69	4.60	4.14	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	2	1	2	5	3	3.46	1420/1582	4.37	4.30	4.26	4.17	3.46	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	2	6	5	4.00	1138/1575	4.48	4.32	4.27	4.17	4.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	2	1	2	4	5	0	3.08	1209/1380	3.64	3.94	3.94	3.78	3.08	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	2	1	3	2	2	3.10	1333/1520	4.20	4.14	4.01	3.76	3.10	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	1	0	1	3	5	4.10	993/1515	4.58	4.37	4.24	3.97	4.10	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	0	3	4	3	4.00	1050/1511	4.44	4.37	4.27	4.00	4.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	4	1	1	1	3	2	2	3.33	811/ 994	4.06	3.97	3.94	3.73	3.33	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	11	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 265	****	4.06	4.23	3.97	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	12	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/ 278	****	4.21	4.19	3.97	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	13	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 260	****	4.43	4.46	4.41	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	13	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 259	****	4.21	4.33	4.19	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	13	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 233	****	4.36	4.20	4.00	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	7	Required for Majors	8	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	4						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	1	Under-grad	14	Non-major	1
84-150	0	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	2				
				?	0						

Course-Section: FREN 103 0101
 Title INT REV ELEM FRENCH
 Instructor: EL OMARI, SAMIR
 Enrollment: 24
 Questionnaires: 16

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 879
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	1	4	2	9	4.19	1036/1674	4.19	4.23	4.27	4.07	4.19	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	0	1	3	11	4.44	689/1674	4.44	4.26	4.23	4.16	4.44	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	3	12	4.69	349/1423	4.69	4.36	4.27	4.16	4.69	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	5	0	0	4	1	6	4.18	941/1609	4.18	4.23	4.22	4.05	4.18	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	1	1	6	7	4.06	728/1585	4.06	4.04	3.96	3.88	4.06	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	3	0	1	2	6	4	4.00	870/1535	4.00	4.08	4.08	3.89	4.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	1	0	2	12	4.44	628/1651	4.44	4.20	4.18	4.10	4.44	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	13	3	4.19	1470/1673	4.19	4.65	4.69	4.67	4.19	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	1	6	7	4.43	493/1656	4.43	4.06	4.07	3.96	4.43	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	3	12	4.80	389/1586	4.80	4.43	4.43	4.37	4.80	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	3	12	4.80	811/1585	4.80	4.72	4.69	4.60	4.80	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	3	3	9	4.40	777/1582	4.40	4.30	4.26	4.17	4.40	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	3	11	4.67	495/1575	4.67	4.32	4.27	4.17	4.67	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	2	1	1	1	3	6	4.00	666/1380	4.00	3.94	3.94	3.78	4.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	4	3	4	4.00	810/1520	4.00	4.14	4.01	3.76	4.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	0	0	2	9	4.82	313/1515	4.82	4.37	4.24	3.97	4.82	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	0	0	2	2	6	4.40	751/1511	4.40	4.37	4.27	4.00	4.40	
4. Were special techniques successful	5	4	0	0	2	3	2	4.00	474/ 994	4.00	3.97	3.94	3.73	4.00	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	A 7	Required for Majors	10
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	B 4		Graduate 0
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	C 2	General	16
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	D 1		Non-major 3
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	3
			? 0		

Course-Section: FREN 201 0101
 Title INTERMEDIATE FRENCH I
 Instructor: TADE, SOPHIA
 Enrollment: 21
 Questionnaires: 17

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 880
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	4	1	4	2	6	3.29	1574/1674	3.76	4.23	4.27	4.32	3.29	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	3	3	1	4	6	3.41	1535/1674	3.98	4.26	4.23	4.26	3.41	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	1	3	3	9	4.06	986/1423	4.18	4.36	4.27	4.36	4.06	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	3	3	4	4	3	3.06	1554/1609	3.59	4.23	4.22	4.23	3.06	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	4	2	3	6	3.41	1289/1585	3.71	4.04	3.96	3.91	3.41	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	2	2	3	2	1	7	3.53	1278/1535	3.40	4.08	4.08	4.03	3.53	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	3	3	2	4	5	3.29	1515/1651	3.97	4.20	4.18	4.20	3.29	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	1	0	0	4	12	4.53	1189/1673	4.46	4.65	4.69	4.67	4.53	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	4	0	4	6	0	2.86	1586/1656	3.52	4.06	4.07	4.10	2.86	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	3	3	1	5	5	3.35	1507/1586	4.08	4.43	4.43	4.48	3.35	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	2	3	3	9	4.12	1451/1585	4.64	4.72	4.69	4.76	4.12	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	2	3	3	2	6	3.44	1431/1582	3.92	4.30	4.26	4.35	3.44	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	3	2	3	3	6	3.41	1398/1575	4.10	4.32	4.27	4.39	3.41	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	1	4	5	3	1	3	2.63	1308/1380	3.33	3.94	3.94	4.03	2.63	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	3	0	3	3	5	3.50	1169/1520	3.94	4.14	4.01	4.03	3.50	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	2	0	3	3	6	3.79	1191/1515	4.24	4.37	4.24	4.28	3.79	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	2	2	6	1	3	3.07	1409/1511	3.96	4.37	4.27	4.28	3.07	
4. Were special techniques successful	3	3	3	1	3	1	3	3.00	881/ 994	3.44	3.97	3.94	3.98	3.00	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	16	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 265	3.50	4.06	4.23	4.34	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	16	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 278	3.50	4.21	4.19	4.36	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	16	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 259	3.50	4.21	4.33	4.42	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	16	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 233	4.00	4.36	4.20	4.48	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	15	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 103	3.50	4.39	4.41	4.07	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	15	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 101	4.00	4.33	4.48	4.45	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	15	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 95	****	4.15	4.31	4.33	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 99	3.50	4.36	4.39	4.22	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	15	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/ 97	3.00	3.76	4.14	4.63	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 76	3.00	3.36	3.98	3.97	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 77	4.00	3.65	3.93	4.20	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	16	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 53	3.00	4.19	4.45	4.50	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	16	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 48	3.50	3.86	4.12	4.50	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 49	4.00	3.74	4.27	4.82	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 61	4.00	4.03	4.09	4.23	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	15	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/ 52	3.50	4.21	4.26	4.53	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	15	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 50	3.50	4.23	4.44	4.42	****	

Course-Section: FREN 201 0101
 Title INTERMEDIATE FRENCH I
 Instructor: TADE, SOPHIA
 Enrollment: 21
 Questionnaires: 17

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 880
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	1	A	10	Required for Majors	10	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B	3						
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	1	C	2	General	2	Under-grad	17	Non-major	9
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	5	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	2				
				?	0						

Course-Section: FREN 201 0201
 Title INTERMEDIATE FRENCH I
 Instructor: TADE, SOPHIA
 Enrollment: 20
 Questionnaires: 16

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 881
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	1	0	4	4	7	4.00	1196/1674	3.76	4.23	4.27	4.32	4.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	0	0	7	8	4.31	856/1674	3.98	4.26	4.23	4.26	4.31	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	3	10	4.38	728/1423	4.18	4.36	4.27	4.36	4.38	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	1	2	3	1	7	3.79	1299/1609	3.59	4.23	4.22	4.23	3.79	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	3	1	4	7	4.00	769/1585	3.71	4.04	3.96	3.91	4.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	2	1	2	3	4	4	3.57	1256/1535	3.40	4.08	4.08	4.03	3.57	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	1	3	5	6	4.07	1057/1651	3.97	4.20	4.18	4.20	4.07	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	1	4	10	4.60	1135/1673	4.46	4.65	4.69	4.67	4.60	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	1	1	9	3	4.00	955/1656	3.52	4.06	4.07	4.10	4.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	1	6	8	4.47	916/1586	4.08	4.43	4.43	4.48	4.47	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	2	13	4.87	664/1585	4.64	4.72	4.69	4.76	4.87	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	1	5	8	4.50	632/1582	3.92	4.30	4.26	4.35	4.50	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	2	5	8	4.40	819/1575	4.10	4.32	4.27	4.39	4.40	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	3	1	1	2	4	3	3.64	980/1380	3.33	3.94	3.94	4.03	3.64	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	2	2	6	4.40	512/1520	3.94	4.14	4.01	4.03	4.40	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	0	1	2	7	4.60	543/1515	4.24	4.37	4.24	4.28	4.60	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	0	1	1	2	6	4.30	845/1511	3.96	4.37	4.27	4.28	4.30	
4. Were special techniques successful	6	2	0	2	3	1	2	3.38	795/ 994	3.44	3.97	3.94	3.98	3.38	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	14	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 265	3.50	4.06	4.23	4.34	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	14	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 278	3.50	4.21	4.19	4.36	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	14	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 260	4.00	4.43	4.46	4.51	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	14	0	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	****/ 259	3.50	4.21	4.33	4.42	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	15	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 233	4.00	4.36	4.20	4.48	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	15	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 103	3.50	4.39	4.41	4.07	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	15	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 101	4.00	4.33	4.48	4.45	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 95	****	4.15	4.31	4.33	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 99	3.50	4.36	4.39	4.22	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	15	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 97	3.00	3.76	4.14	4.63	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 76	3.00	3.36	3.98	3.97	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	15	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 77	4.00	3.65	3.93	4.20	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	15	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 53	3.00	4.19	4.45	4.50	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	15	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 48	3.50	3.86	4.12	4.50	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	15	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 49	4.00	3.74	4.27	4.82	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 61	4.00	4.03	4.09	4.23	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	15	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 52	3.50	4.21	4.26	4.53	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	15	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 50	3.50	4.23	4.44	4.42	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	15	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 35	4.00	4.22	4.36	4.63	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	15	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 31	3.50	4.25	4.34	4.50	****	

Course-Section: FREN 201 0201
 Title INTERMEDIATE FRENCH I
 Instructor: TADE, SOPHIA
 Enrollment: 20
 Questionnaires: 16

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 881
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	6	0.00-0.99 0	A 8	Required for Majors 12	Graduate 0 Major 0
28-55	3	1.00-1.99 0	B 4		
56-83	3	2.00-2.99 1	C 3	General 2	Under-grad 16 Non-major 0
84-150	1	3.00-3.49 3	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 4	
			? 1		

Course-Section: FREN 201 0301
 Title INTERMEDIATE FRENCH I
 Instructor: MBAYE, ABDOULAY
 Enrollment: 28
 Questionnaires: 20

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 882
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	1	0	3	6	9	4.16	1066/1674	3.76	4.23	4.27	4.32	4.16	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	9	9	4.42	705/1674	3.98	4.26	4.23	4.26	4.42	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	1	1	0	4	13	4.42	672/1423	4.18	4.36	4.27	4.36	4.42	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	5	2	0	0	6	6	4.00	1094/1609	3.59	4.23	4.22	4.23	4.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	3	3	0	1	6	2	5	3.79	1023/1585	3.71	4.04	3.96	3.91	3.79	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	5	1	2	2	2	6	3.77	1140/1535	3.40	4.08	4.08	4.03	3.77	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	1	0	6	11	4.50	524/1651	3.97	4.20	4.18	4.20	4.50	
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	14	4	4.22	1442/1673	4.46	4.65	4.69	4.67	4.22	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	2	5	11	4.50	381/1656	3.52	4.06	4.07	4.10	4.50	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	1	0	2	14	4.71	603/1586	4.08	4.43	4.43	4.48	4.71	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	1	0	16	4.88	615/1585	4.64	4.72	4.69	4.76	4.88	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	1	3	13	4.71	380/1582	3.92	4.30	4.26	4.35	4.71	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	1	4	12	4.65	523/1575	4.10	4.32	4.27	4.39	4.65	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	11	1	0	0	2	2	3.80	866/1380	3.33	3.94	3.94	4.03	3.80	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	2	3	8	4.46	443/1520	3.94	4.14	4.01	4.03	4.46	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	0	0	1	4	8	4.54	603/1515	4.24	4.37	4.24	4.28	4.54	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	0	0	0	6	6	4.50	642/1511	3.96	4.37	4.27	4.28	4.50	
4. Were special techniques successful	7	8	0	0	2	3	0	3.60	699/ 994	3.44	3.97	3.94	3.98	3.60	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	18	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 265	3.50	4.06	4.23	4.34	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	18	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 278	3.50	4.21	4.19	4.36	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	18	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 260	4.00	4.43	4.46	4.51	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	18	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 259	3.50	4.21	4.33	4.42	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	18	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 233	4.00	4.36	4.20	4.48	****	
Seminar															
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	18	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 99	3.50	4.36	4.39	4.22	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	18	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 97	3.00	3.76	4.14	4.63	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	18	0	1	1	0	0	0	1.50	****/ 76	3.00	3.36	3.98	3.97	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	19	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 77	4.00	3.65	3.93	4.20	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	18	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 48	3.50	3.86	4.12	4.50	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	****/ 61	4.00	4.03	4.09	4.23	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	17	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 52	3.50	4.21	4.26	4.53	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	17	2	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 50	3.50	4.23	4.44	4.42	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	17	2	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 35	4.00	4.22	4.36	4.63	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	17	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 31	3.50	4.25	4.34	4.50	****	

Course-Section: FREN 201 0301
 Title INTERMEDIATE FRENCH I
 Instructor: MBAYE, ABDOULAY
 Enrollment: 28
 Questionnaires: 20

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 882
 JAN 21, 2006
 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	12	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B	8						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	2	C	3	General	1	Under-grad	20	Non-major	4
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	4	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	4				
				?	0						

Course-Section: FREN 201 0401
 Title INTERMEDIATE FRENCH I
 Instructor: TADE, SOPHIA
 Enrollment: 15
 Questionnaires: 12

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 883
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	1	2	4	5	4.08	1131/1674	3.76	4.23	4.27	4.32	4.08	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	1	0	4	4	2	3.55	1479/1674	3.98	4.26	4.23	4.26	3.55	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	1	1	7	2	3.91	1107/1423	4.18	4.36	4.27	4.36	3.91	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	1	0	1	2	6	1	3.70	1355/1609	3.59	4.23	4.22	4.23	3.70	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	1	0	1	1	3	4	4.11	692/1585	3.71	4.04	3.96	3.91	4.11	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	1	4	1	4	3.80	1110/1535	3.40	4.08	4.08	4.03	3.80	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	1	2	2	5	4.10	1031/1651	3.97	4.20	4.18	4.20	4.10	
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	1	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1673	4.46	4.65	4.69	4.67	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	1	1	2	2	1	3.14	1513/1656	3.52	4.06	4.07	4.10	3.14	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	1	0	5	3	4.11	1243/1586	4.08	4.43	4.43	4.48	4.11	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	1	2	6	4.56	1183/1585	4.64	4.72	4.69	4.76	4.56	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	1	0	1	5	2	3.78	1290/1582	3.92	4.30	4.26	4.35	3.78	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	1	0	1	0	5	3	4.11	1090/1575	4.10	4.32	4.27	4.39	4.11	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	2	0	1	2	3	1	3.57	1009/1380	3.33	3.94	3.94	4.03	3.57	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	1	3	5	4.44	466/1520	3.94	4.14	4.01	4.03	4.44	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	0	4	5	4.56	586/1515	4.24	4.37	4.24	4.28	4.56	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	2	3	4	4.22	927/1511	3.96	4.37	4.27	4.28	4.22	
4. Were special techniques successful	3	1	0	0	3	3	2	3.88	581/ 994	3.44	3.97	3.94	3.98	3.88	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: FREN 201 0501
 Title INTERMEDIATE FRENCH I
 Instructor: DIALLO, MAMADOU
 Enrollment: 12
 Questionnaires: 8

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 884
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	4	3	1	3.63	1469/1674	3.76	4.23	4.27	4.32	3.63	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	2	4	4.25	931/1674	3.98	4.26	4.23	4.26	4.25	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	4	3	4.25	845/1423	4.18	4.36	4.27	4.36	4.25	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	4	3	1	3.63	1399/1609	3.59	4.23	4.22	4.23	3.63	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	4	1	2	3.50	1223/1585	3.71	4.04	3.96	3.91	3.50	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	1	1	3	1	1	3.00	1435/1535	3.40	4.08	4.08	4.03	3.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	3	1	2	2	3.38	1493/1651	3.97	4.20	4.18	4.20	3.38	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	6	2	4.25	1420/1673	4.46	4.65	4.69	4.67	4.25	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	1	2	1	1	3.40	1421/1656	3.52	4.06	4.07	4.10	3.40	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	1	0	1	0	5	4.14	1224/1586	4.08	4.43	4.43	4.48	4.14	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	1002/1585	4.64	4.72	4.69	4.76	4.71	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	1	1	0	3	2	3.57	1381/1582	3.92	4.30	4.26	4.35	3.57	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	0	1	0	5	4.14	1060/1575	4.10	4.32	4.27	4.39	4.14	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	4	0	2	0	0	1	3.00	1217/1380	3.33	3.94	3.94	4.03	3.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	0	0	4	2	3.86	955/1520	3.94	4.14	4.01	4.03	3.86	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	1	0	1	2	3	3.86	1158/1515	4.24	4.37	4.24	4.28	3.86	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	1	0	4	0	2	3.29	1363/1511	3.96	4.37	4.27	4.28	3.29	
4. Were special techniques successful	1	1	0	1	3	1	1	3.33	811/ 994	3.44	3.97	3.94	3.98	3.33	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	6	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	229/ 265	3.50	4.06	4.23	4.34	3.50	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	6	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	241/ 278	3.50	4.21	4.19	4.36	3.50	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	6	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	215/ 260	4.00	4.43	4.46	4.51	4.00	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	6	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	236/ 259	3.50	4.21	4.33	4.42	3.50	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	6	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	150/ 233	4.00	4.36	4.20	4.48	4.00	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	6	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	89/ 103	3.50	4.39	4.41	4.07	3.50	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	6	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	72/ 101	4.00	4.33	4.48	4.45	4.00	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 95	****	4.15	4.31	4.33	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	89/ 99	3.50	4.36	4.39	4.22	3.50	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	6	0	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	88/ 97	3.00	3.76	4.14	4.63	3.00	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	60/ 76	3.00	3.36	3.98	3.97	3.00	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	6	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	37/ 77	4.00	3.65	3.93	4.20	4.00	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	6	0	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	50/ 53	3.00	4.19	4.45	4.50	3.00	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	6	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	41/ 48	3.50	3.86	4.12	4.50	3.50	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	6	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	34/ 49	4.00	3.74	4.27	4.82	4.00	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	29/ 61	4.00	4.03	4.09	4.23	4.00	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	6	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	40/ 52	3.50	4.21	4.26	4.53	3.50	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	6	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	44/ 50	3.50	4.23	4.44	4.42	3.50	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	6	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	23/ 35	4.00	4.22	4.36	4.63	4.00	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	6	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	25/ 31	3.50	4.25	4.34	4.50	3.50	

Course-Section: FREN 201 0501
 Title INTERMEDIATE FRENCH I
 Instructor: DIALLO, MAMADOU
 Enrollment: 12
 Questionnaires: 8

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 884
 JAN 21, 2006
 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	2	Required for Majors	2	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	3						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	1	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	8	Non-major	4
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	0	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	5				
				?	1						

Course-Section: FREN 201 0601
 Title INTERMEDIATE FRENCH I
 Instructor: EL OMARI, SAMIR
 Enrollment: 16
 Questionnaires: 12

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 885
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	1	1	4	4	2	3.42	1541/1674	3.76	4.23	4.27	4.32	3.42	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	3	4	4	3.92	1258/1674	3.98	4.26	4.23	4.26	3.92	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	1	2	3	5	4.09	962/1423	4.18	4.36	4.27	4.36	4.09	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	4	1	0	3	3	1	3.38	1490/1609	3.59	4.23	4.22	4.23	3.38	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	2	0	2	1	6	0	3.44	1267/1585	3.71	4.04	3.96	3.91	3.44	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	4	2	1	2	3	0	2.75	1492/1535	3.40	4.08	4.08	4.03	2.75	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	2	2	7	4.45	598/1651	3.97	4.20	4.18	4.20	4.45	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	1	8	3	4.17	1484/1673	4.46	4.65	4.69	4.67	4.17	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	1	1	2	5	0	3.22	1486/1656	3.52	4.06	4.07	4.10	3.22	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	2	0	1	4	4	3.73	1424/1586	4.08	4.43	4.43	4.48	3.73	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	1	1	9	4.73	981/1585	4.64	4.72	4.69	4.76	4.73	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	2	0	1	6	2	3.55	1392/1582	3.92	4.30	4.26	4.35	3.55	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	1	1	3	5	3.91	1216/1575	4.10	4.32	4.27	4.39	3.91	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	2	2	0	2	3	2	3.33	1127/1380	3.33	3.94	3.94	4.03	3.33	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	2	1	1	3	1	3.00	1353/1520	3.94	4.14	4.01	4.03	3.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	1	1	2	4	4.13	982/1515	4.24	4.37	4.24	4.28	4.13	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	0	1	3	4	4.38	779/1511	3.96	4.37	4.27	4.28	4.38	
4. Were special techniques successful	4	6	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 994	3.44	3.97	3.94	3.98	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	2	0.00-0.99 0	A 5	Required for Majors 7	Graduate 0 Major 0
28-55	3	1.00-1.99 0	B 5		
56-83	1	2.00-2.99 2	C 0	General 1	Under-grad 12 Non-major 5
84-150	3	3.00-3.49 2	D 1		
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 3	
			? 0		

Course-Section: FREN 202 0101
 Title INTERMEDIATE FRENCH II
 Instructor: REZVANI, MARJAN
 Enrollment: 26
 Questionnaires: 19

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 886
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	3	15	4.74	320/1674	4.74	4.23	4.27	4.32	4.74	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	3	15	4.74	292/1674	4.74	4.26	4.23	4.26	4.74	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	17	4.89	139/1423	4.89	4.36	4.27	4.36	4.89	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	4	14	4.68	292/1609	4.68	4.23	4.22	4.23	4.68	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	0	3	4	10	4.41	404/1585	4.41	4.04	3.96	3.91	4.41	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	4	13	4.58	310/1535	4.58	4.08	4.08	4.03	4.58	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	2	4	12	4.42	643/1651	4.42	4.20	4.18	4.20	4.42	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	19	5.00	1/1673	5.00	4.65	4.69	4.67	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	0	3	12	4.80	149/1656	4.80	4.06	4.07	4.10	4.80	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	2	17	4.89	231/1586	4.89	4.43	4.43	4.48	4.89	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	0	18	4.89	591/1585	4.89	4.72	4.69	4.76	4.89	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	4	15	4.79	272/1582	4.79	4.30	4.26	4.35	4.79	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	4	15	4.79	311/1575	4.79	4.32	4.27	4.39	4.79	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	5	0	0	2	1	11	4.64	213/1380	4.64	3.94	3.94	4.03	4.64	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	3	0	11	4.57	355/1520	4.57	4.14	4.01	4.03	4.57	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	0	1	1	12	4.79	348/1515	4.79	4.37	4.24	4.28	4.79	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	0	2	1	11	4.64	525/1511	4.64	4.37	4.27	4.28	4.64	
4. Were special techniques successful	5	1	1	0	0	5	7	4.31	337/ 994	4.31	3.97	3.94	3.98	4.31	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	6	0.00-0.99 0	A 9	Required for Majors 7	Graduate 0 Major 0
28-55	3	1.00-1.99 0	B 7		
56-83	2	2.00-2.99 0	C 0	General 4	Under-grad 19 Non-major 4
84-150	1	3.00-3.49 2	D 0		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 3	F 0	Electives 3	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 4	
			? 0		

Course-Section: FREN 301 0101
 Title ADVANCED FRENCH I
 Instructor: DE VERNEIL, MAR
 Enrollment: 19
 Questionnaires: 16

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 887
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	2	0	0	1	2	5	6	4.14	1075/1674	4.14	4.23	4.27	4.26	4.14	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	0	0	1	2	11	4.71	314/1674	4.71	4.26	4.23	4.21	4.71	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	0	0	0	1	1	12	4.79	226/1423	4.79	4.36	4.27	4.27	4.79	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	0	0	0	2	3	9	4.50	490/1609	4.50	4.23	4.22	4.27	4.50	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	1	0	5	0	2	6	3.69	1100/1585	3.69	4.04	3.96	3.95	3.69	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	3	5	6	4.21	715/1535	4.21	4.08	4.08	4.15	4.21	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	0	1	5	8	4.50	524/1651	4.50	4.20	4.18	4.16	4.50	
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	3	11	4.79	915/1673	4.79	4.65	4.69	4.68	4.79	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	1	7	6	4.36	588/1656	4.36	4.06	4.07	4.07	4.36	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	1	2	11	4.71	581/1586	4.71	4.43	4.43	4.42	4.71	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	1	0	13	4.86	689/1585	4.86	4.72	4.69	4.66	4.86	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	1	3	10	4.64	467/1582	4.64	4.30	4.26	4.26	4.64	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	1	1	12	4.79	311/1575	4.79	4.32	4.27	4.25	4.79	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	1	0	0	0	4	9	4.69	179/1380	4.69	3.94	3.94	4.01	4.69	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	2	0	0	3	5	3.90	924/1520	3.90	4.14	4.01	4.09	3.90	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	1	1	0	8	4.50	629/1515	4.50	4.37	4.24	4.32	4.50	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	0	1	1	0	8	4.50	642/1511	4.50	4.37	4.27	4.34	4.50	
4. Were special techniques successful	6	1	1	2	3	1	2	3.11	871/ 994	3.11	3.97	3.94	3.96	3.11	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	6	0.00-0.99 2	A 9	Required for Majors	3
28-55	4	1.00-1.99 0	B 3		Graduate 0
56-83	0	2.00-2.99 0	C 0	General	5
84-150	0	3.00-3.49 2	D 0		Under-grad 16
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 2	F 0	Electives	3
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	4
			? 0		

Course-Section: FREN 302 0101
 Title ADVANCED FRENCH II
 Instructor: REZVANI, MARJAN
 Enrollment: 11
 Questionnaires: 7

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 888
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	1	2	0	4	4.00	1196/1674	4.00	4.23	4.27	4.26	4.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	1	2	0	0	3	3.33	1559/1674	3.33	4.26	4.23	4.21	3.33	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	2	0	4	4.33	771/1423	4.33	4.36	4.27	4.27	4.33	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	0	4	4.14	985/1609	4.14	4.23	4.22	4.27	4.14	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	1	0	0	1	3	4.00	769/1585	4.00	4.04	3.96	3.95	4.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	4	3	4.43	481/1535	4.43	4.08	4.08	4.15	4.43	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	2	0	1	2	1	3.00	1562/1651	3.00	4.20	4.18	4.16	3.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	796/1673	4.86	4.65	4.69	4.68	4.86	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	1	1	3	0	3.40	1421/1656	3.40	4.06	4.07	4.07	3.40	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	2	0	0	2	3	3.57	1466/1586	3.57	4.43	4.43	4.42	3.57	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	1	5	4.57	1166/1585	4.57	4.72	4.69	4.66	4.57	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	1	0	1	1	3	3.83	1255/1582	3.83	4.30	4.26	4.26	3.83	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	3	1	3	4.00	1138/1575	4.00	4.32	4.27	4.25	4.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	1	0	1	1	3	3.83	845/1380	3.83	3.94	3.94	4.01	3.83	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	3	3	4.29	616/1520	4.29	4.14	4.01	4.09	4.29	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	266/1515	4.86	4.37	4.24	4.32	4.86	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	1	2	4	4.43	729/1511	4.43	4.37	4.27	4.34	4.43	
4. Were special techniques successful	0	0	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	178/ 994	4.57	3.97	3.94	3.96	4.57	
Seminar															
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 101	****	4.33	4.48	4.30	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 99	****	4.36	4.39	4.29	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	6	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 97	****	3.76	4.14	3.48	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	6	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 76	****	3.36	3.98	4.03	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	6	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 77	****	3.65	3.93	3.70	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 53	****	4.19	4.45	3.87	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 48	****	3.86	4.12	3.67	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 49	****	3.74	4.27	3.27	****	
Self Paced															
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 52	****	4.21	4.26	3.50	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	6	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 50	****	4.23	4.44	3.82	****	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: FREN 339 0101
 Title: EXPLORATION IN IDEAS
 Instructor: Fatih, Zakaria
 Enrollment: 13
 Questionnaires: 7

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 889
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	2	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	243/1674	4.80	4.23	4.27	4.26	4.80	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	737/1674	4.40	4.26	4.23	4.21	4.40	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1423	5.00	4.36	4.27	4.27	5.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1609	5.00	4.23	4.22	4.27	5.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1585	5.00	4.04	3.96	3.95	5.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1535	5.00	4.08	4.08	4.15	5.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	1	0	0	2	2	3.80	1289/1651	3.80	4.20	4.18	4.16	3.80	
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	5	0	4.00	1566/1673	4.00	4.65	4.69	4.68	4.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	310/1656	4.60	4.06	4.07	4.07	4.60	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	1004/1586	4.40	4.43	4.43	4.42	4.40	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1585	5.00	4.72	4.69	4.66	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	525/1582	4.60	4.30	4.26	4.26	4.60	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	279/1575	4.80	4.32	4.27	4.25	4.80	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	0	1	0	1	1	2	3.60	998/1380	3.60	3.94	3.94	4.01	3.60	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	338/1520	4.60	4.14	4.01	4.09	4.60	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1515	5.00	4.37	4.24	4.32	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1511	5.00	4.37	4.27	4.34	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	2	0	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	390/ 994	4.20	3.97	3.94	3.96	4.20	

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
28-55	0	1.00-1.99 0	B 0		Graduate 0
56-83	0	2.00-2.99 0	C 0	General	1
84-150	4	3.00-3.49 1	D 0		Under-grad 7
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 3	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		
			I 0	Other	4
			? 1		

- Means there are not enough responses to be significant

Course-Section: FREN 340 0101
 Title INTERCONNECTIONS: SOCI
 Instructor: PROVENCHER, DEN
 Enrollment: 18
 Questionnaires: 16

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 890
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	5	11	4.69	380/1674	4.69	4.23	4.27	4.26	4.69	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	8	8	4.50	578/1674	4.50	4.26	4.23	4.21	4.50	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	13	4.81	195/1423	4.81	4.36	4.27	4.27	4.81	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	1	5	9	4.53	455/1609	4.53	4.23	4.22	4.27	4.53	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	7	9	4.56	289/1585	4.56	4.04	3.96	3.95	4.56	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	5	0	0	1	3	7	4.55	337/1535	4.55	4.08	4.08	4.15	4.55	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	1	0	2	11	4.40	673/1651	4.40	4.20	4.18	4.16	4.40	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	4	12	4.75	958/1673	4.75	4.65	4.69	4.68	4.75	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	1	0	0	10	3	4.00	955/1656	4.00	4.06	4.07	4.07	4.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	5	11	4.69	633/1586	4.69	4.43	4.43	4.42	4.69	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	15	4.94	397/1585	4.94	4.72	4.69	4.66	4.94	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	5	10	4.56	567/1582	4.56	4.30	4.26	4.26	4.56	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	0	5	10	4.67	495/1575	4.67	4.32	4.27	4.25	4.67	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	3	1	1	4	5	2	3.46	1059/1380	3.46	3.94	3.94	4.01	3.46	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	2	4	5	4.27	626/1520	4.27	4.14	4.01	4.09	4.27	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	0	0	3	8	4.73	420/1515	4.73	4.37	4.24	4.32	4.73	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	0	0	3	8	4.73	447/1511	4.73	4.37	4.27	4.34	4.73	
4. Were special techniques successful	5	1	2	1	2	3	2	3.20	847/ 994	3.20	3.97	3.94	3.96	3.20	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	15	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 265	****	4.06	4.23	4.26	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 278	****	4.21	4.19	4.24	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 260	****	4.43	4.46	4.49	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	14	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 103	****	4.39	4.41	4.10	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	15	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 101	****	4.33	4.48	4.30	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 95	****	4.15	4.31	3.91	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 99	****	4.36	4.39	4.29	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 97	****	3.76	4.14	3.48	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	15	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 76	****	3.36	3.98	4.03	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 61	****	4.03	4.09	3.20	****	

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	3	1.00-1.99	1	B 5			
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	4	C 1	General 2	Under-grad 16	Non-major 0
84-150	5	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 12		
				? 0			

Course-Section: FREN 610 0101
 Title STUDIES FREN LANG & LI
 Instructor: MCCRAY, STANLEY
 Enrollment: 24
 Questionnaires: 14

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 891
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	2	2	3	7	4.07	1139/1674	4.07	4.23	4.27	4.44	4.07	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	2	10	4.50	578/1674	4.50	4.26	4.23	4.34	4.50	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	11	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/1423	****	4.36	4.27	4.28	****	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	1	2	10	4.69	282/1609	4.69	4.23	4.22	4.34	4.69	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	4	1	8	4.14	662/1585	4.14	4.04	3.96	4.23	4.14	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	5	9	4.64	253/1535	4.64	4.08	4.08	4.27	4.64	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	2	1	3	7	3.93	1201/1651	3.93	4.20	4.18	4.32	3.93	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	12	2	4.14	1497/1673	4.14	4.65	4.69	4.78	4.14	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	1	4	5	2	3.67	1297/1656	3.67	4.06	4.07	4.15	3.67	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	4	3	7	4.21	1176/1586	4.21	4.43	4.43	4.50	4.21	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	4	9	4.57	1166/1585	4.57	4.72	4.69	4.79	4.57	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	2	5	7	4.36	829/1582	4.36	4.30	4.26	4.33	4.36	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	3	2	8	4.14	1060/1575	4.14	4.32	4.27	4.30	4.14	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	10	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	489/1380	4.25	3.94	3.94	3.85	4.25	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	4	0	9	4.38	529/1520	4.38	4.14	4.01	4.19	4.38	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	1	1	11	4.77	372/1515	4.77	4.37	4.24	4.47	4.77	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	2	11	4.85	312/1511	4.85	4.37	4.27	4.49	4.85	
4. Were special techniques successful	1	1	0	0	2	3	7	4.42	278/ 994	4.42	3.97	3.94	4.07	4.42	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 11	Required for Majors	0
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	B 0		Graduate 4
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	C 0	General	3
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad 10
Grad.	4	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	9
			? 0		

Course-Section: FREN 650 0101
 Title SEMINAR IN FRENCH
 Instructor: ROSENTHAL, ALAN
 Enrollment: 16
 Questionnaires: 12

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 892
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	133/1674	4.92	4.23	4.27	4.44	4.92	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	10	4.83	191/1674	4.83	4.26	4.23	4.34	4.83	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	2	0	1	1	7	4.00	1016/1423	4.00	4.36	4.27	4.28	4.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	3	7	4.33	743/1609	4.33	4.23	4.22	4.34	4.33	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1585	5.00	4.04	3.96	4.23	5.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1535	5.00	4.08	4.08	4.27	5.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	1	2	1	7	4.27	843/1651	4.27	4.20	4.18	4.32	4.27	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	706/1673	4.91	4.65	4.69	4.78	4.91	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	114/1656	4.89	4.06	4.07	4.15	4.89	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	192/1586	4.92	4.43	4.43	4.50	4.92	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	510/1585	4.92	4.72	4.69	4.79	4.92	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	136/1582	4.92	4.30	4.26	4.33	4.92	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	3	9	4.75	359/1575	4.75	4.32	4.27	4.30	4.75	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	2	2	8	4.50	303/1380	4.50	3.94	3.94	3.85	4.50	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	3	7	4.55	373/1520	4.55	4.14	4.01	4.19	4.55	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	207/1515	4.91	4.37	4.24	4.47	4.91	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	244/1511	4.91	4.37	4.27	4.49	4.91	
4. Were special techniques successful	1	5	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	148/ 994	4.67	3.97	3.94	4.07	4.67	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 265	****	4.06	4.23	4.51	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 278	****	4.21	4.19	4.42	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 103	****	4.39	4.41	4.56	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 101	****	4.33	4.48	4.62	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 95	****	4.15	4.31	4.43	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 99	****	4.36	4.39	4.54	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 97	****	3.76	4.14	4.26	****	

Frequency Distribution

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