

Course Section: FREN 101 0101
 Title: ELEMENTARY FRENCH I
 Instructor: PROVENCHER, DEN
 Enrollment: 27
 Questionnaires: 22

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2006

Page 917
 JAN 18, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	5	17	4.77	244/1669	4.52	4.33	4.23	4.02	4.77	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	21	4.95	52/1666	4.75	4.28	4.19	4.11	4.95	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	21	4.95	76/1421	4.82	4.36	4.24	4.11	4.95	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	4	0	0	3	3	11	4.47	539/1617	4.32	4.27	4.15	3.99	4.47	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	3	1	0	1	2	13	4.53	324/1555	4.47	4.17	4.00	3.92	4.53	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	5	0	1	4	1	9	4.20	723/1543	4.26	4.19	4.06	3.86	4.20	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	2	20	4.91	112/1647	4.49	4.18	4.12	4.06	4.91	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	6	16	4.73	1004/1668	4.25	4.60	4.67	4.62	4.73	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	2	0	0	0	7	12	4.63	268/1605	4.51	4.13	4.07	3.96	4.63	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	1	20	4.95	95/1514	4.60	4.39	4.39	4.32	4.95	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	21	5.00	1/1551	4.85	4.72	4.66	4.55	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	0	1	19	4.95	76/1503	4.62	4.31	4.24	4.17	4.95	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	1	20	4.95	82/1506	4.78	4.40	4.26	4.17	4.95	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	0	1	0	4	4	11	4.20	483/1311	4.41	3.78	3.85	3.68	4.20	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	3	14	4.82	199/1490	4.63	4.26	4.05	3.85	4.82	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	0	1	2	14	4.76	381/1502	4.67	4.54	4.26	4.06	4.76	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	0	0	0	17	5.00	1/1489	4.53	4.43	4.29	4.07	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	4	1	0	0	2	5	10	4.47	256/1006	4.15	4.14	4.00	3.81	4.47	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	19	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 226	****	****	4.20	3.98	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	20	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 233	****	****	4.19	4.09	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	20	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 225	****	****	4.50	4.42	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	20	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 223	****	****	4.35	4.19	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	20	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 206	****	****	4.15	4.01	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	20	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 55	4.33	4.42	4.34	4.17	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	20	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 42	****	****	4.31	4.08	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	20	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 46	4.33	4.33	4.45	4.26	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 33	****	****	4.25	4.25	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 29	****	5.00	4.34	4.22	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 10	Required for Majors 14
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	0	B 7	
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	4	C 2	General 3
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	1	D 0	Under-grad 22
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	7	F 0	Non-major 22
				P 0	
				I 0	
				? 0	Electives 1
					Other 2

- Means there are not enough responses to be significant

Course Section: FREN 101 0201
 Title: ELEMENTARY FRENCH I
 Instructor: APPADOO, YOGEND
 Enrollment: 26
 Questionnaires: 12

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2006

Page 918
 JAN 18, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	2	1	9	4.58	500/1669	4.52	4.33	4.23	4.02	4.58	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	3	8	4.73	281/1666	4.75	4.28	4.19	4.11	4.73	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	0	1	10	4.67	392/1421	4.82	4.36	4.24	4.11	4.67	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	1	0	2	3	5	4.00	1029/1617	4.32	4.27	4.15	3.99	4.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	2	0	4	6	4.17	644/1555	4.47	4.17	4.00	3.92	4.17	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	3	2	6	4.27	638/1543	4.26	4.19	4.06	3.86	4.27	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	3	0	8	4.45	566/1647	4.49	4.18	4.12	4.06	4.45	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	1	0	10	1	3.92	1587/1668	4.25	4.60	4.67	4.62	3.92	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	1	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	119/1605	4.51	4.13	4.07	3.96	4.86	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	3	8	4.58	703/1514	4.60	4.39	4.39	4.32	4.58	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	3	9	4.75	880/1551	4.85	4.72	4.66	4.55	4.75	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	3	8	4.73	312/1503	4.62	4.31	4.24	4.17	4.73	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	10	4.83	249/1506	4.78	4.40	4.26	4.17	4.83	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	1	4	7	4.50	264/1311	4.41	3.78	3.85	3.68	4.50	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	2	9	4.67	340/1490	4.63	4.26	4.05	3.85	4.67	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	2	10	4.83	306/1502	4.67	4.54	4.26	4.06	4.83	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	1	3	8	4.58	613/1489	4.53	4.43	4.29	4.07	4.58	
4. Were special techniques successful	0	4	1	0	0	3	4	4.13	447/1006	4.15	4.14	4.00	3.81	4.13	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	10	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 226	****	****	4.20	3.98	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 233	****	****	4.19	4.09	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 225	****	****	4.50	4.42	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 223	****	****	4.35	4.19	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 206	****	****	4.15	4.01	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	10	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 112	****	4.00	4.38	4.04	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 97	****	3.00	4.36	4.19	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 92	****	3.50	4.22	3.79	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 105	****	4.00	4.20	3.94	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 98	****	4.00	3.95	3.90	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 58	****	4.33	4.22	4.00	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 52	****	4.00	4.06	3.81	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 39	****	5.00	4.39	4.30	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	11	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 40	****	4.00	3.97	4.00	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 30	****	5.00	4.33	4.30	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 55	4.33	4.42	4.34	4.17	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 42	****	****	4.31	4.08	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	10	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 46	4.33	4.33	4.45	4.26	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 33	****	****	4.25	4.25	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 29	****	5.00	4.34	4.22	****	

Course Section: FREN 101 0201
 Title ELEMENTARY FRENCH I
 Instructor: APPADOO, YOGEND
 Enrollment: 26
 Questionnaires: 12

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2006

Page 918
 JAN 18, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	7	Required for Majors	6	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B	2						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	1	C	1	General	2	Under-grad	12	Non-major	12
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	2	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	2				
				?	0						

Course Section: FREN 101 0301
 Title: ELEMENTARY FRENCH I
 Instructor: DE VERNEIL, MAR
 Enrollment: 30
 Questionnaires: 16

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2006

Page 919
 JAN 18, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	3	13	4.81	199/1669	4.52	4.33	4.23	4.02	4.81	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	16	5.00	1/1666	4.75	4.28	4.19	4.11	5.00	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	16	5.00	1/1421	4.82	4.36	4.24	4.11	5.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	4	11	4.73	242/1617	4.32	4.27	4.15	3.99	4.73	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	0	0	1	13	4.93	80/1555	4.47	4.17	4.00	3.92	4.93	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	1	3	11	4.67	250/1543	4.26	4.19	4.06	3.86	4.67	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	2	1	13	4.69	281/1647	4.49	4.18	4.12	4.06	4.69	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	1	14	4.93	499/1668	4.25	4.60	4.67	4.62	4.93	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	2	0	0	0	6	7	4.54	350/1605	4.51	4.13	4.07	3.96	4.54	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	1	14	4.93	132/1514	4.60	4.39	4.39	4.32	4.93	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	15	5.00	1/1551	4.85	4.72	4.66	4.55	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	2	13	4.87	163/1503	4.62	4.31	4.24	4.17	4.87	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	15	5.00	1/1506	4.78	4.40	4.26	4.17	5.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	1	0	0	0	2	12	4.86	97/1311	4.41	3.78	3.85	3.68	4.86	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	1	2	11	4.71	298/1490	4.63	4.26	4.05	3.85	4.71	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	1	1	0	12	4.64	504/1502	4.67	4.54	4.26	4.06	4.64	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	2	4	8	4.43	776/1489	4.53	4.43	4.29	4.07	4.43	
4. Were special techniques successful	2	2	0	0	3	2	7	4.33	344/1006	4.15	4.14	4.00	3.81	4.33	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	13	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 226	****	****	4.20	3.98	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	13	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 233	****	****	4.19	4.09	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	13	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 225	****	****	4.50	4.42	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	13	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 223	****	****	4.35	4.19	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	13	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 206	****	****	4.15	4.01	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	13	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 112	****	4.00	4.38	4.04	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	13	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 97	****	3.00	4.36	4.19	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 92	****	3.50	4.22	3.79	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 105	****	4.00	4.20	3.94	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	13	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 98	****	4.00	3.95	3.90	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/ 58	****	4.33	4.22	4.00	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	13	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 52	****	4.00	4.06	3.81	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	13	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 39	****	5.00	4.39	4.30	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	13	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 40	****	4.00	3.97	4.00	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	13	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 30	****	5.00	4.33	4.30	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 55	4.33	4.42	4.34	4.17	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	13	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 42	****	****	4.31	4.08	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	13	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 46	4.33	4.33	4.45	4.26	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	13	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 33	****	****	4.25	4.25	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	13	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 29	****	5.00	4.34	4.22	****	

Course Section: FREN 101 0301
 Title ELEMENTARY FRENCH I
 Instructor: DE VERNEIL, MAR
 Enrollment: 30
 Questionnaires: 16

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2006

Page 919
 JAN 18, 2007
 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	8	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	5						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	1	C	0	General	6	Under-grad	16	Non-major	16
84-150	3	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	3				
				?	0						

Course Section: FREN 101 0401
 Title: ELEMENTARY FRENCH I
 Instructor: APPADOO, YOGEND
 Enrollment: 29
 Questionnaires: 12

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2006

Page 920
 JAN 18, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	1	1	1	4	5	3.92	1276/1669	4.52	4.33	4.23	4.02	3.92	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	4	6	4.33	777/1666	4.75	4.28	4.19	4.11	4.33	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	2	9	4.67	392/1421	4.82	4.36	4.24	4.11	4.67	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	1	3	1	6	4.09	975/1617	4.32	4.27	4.15	3.99	4.09	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	5	5	4.25	558/1555	4.47	4.17	4.00	3.92	4.25	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	2	1	4	4	3.91	1019/1543	4.26	4.19	4.06	3.86	3.91	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	4	2	5	3.92	1149/1647	4.49	4.18	4.12	4.06	3.92	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	7	5	0	3.42	1641/1668	4.25	4.60	4.67	4.62	3.42	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	3	5	3	4.00	918/1605	4.51	4.13	4.07	3.96	4.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	1	3	4	4	3.92	1262/1514	4.60	4.39	4.39	4.32	3.92	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	2	9	4.67	1028/1551	4.85	4.72	4.66	4.55	4.67	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	3	1	2	6	3.92	1157/1503	4.62	4.31	4.24	4.17	3.92	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	1	3	7	4.33	838/1506	4.78	4.40	4.26	4.17	4.33	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	0	0	0	2	5	3	4.10	538/1311	4.41	3.78	3.85	3.68	4.10	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	1	0	3	5	4.33	622/1490	4.63	4.26	4.05	3.85	4.33	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	2	1	6	4.44	705/1502	4.67	4.54	4.26	4.06	4.44	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	1	0	1	2	5	4.11	1006/1489	4.53	4.43	4.29	4.07	4.11	
4. Were special techniques successful	3	0	1	1	1	3	3	3.67	694/1006	4.15	4.14	4.00	3.81	3.67	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	10	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 226	****	****	4.20	3.98	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	10	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 233	****	****	4.19	4.09	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	10	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 225	****	****	4.50	4.42	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	10	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 223	****	****	4.35	4.19	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	10	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 206	****	****	4.15	4.01	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	10	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 112	****	4.00	4.38	4.04	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	10	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 97	****	3.00	4.36	4.19	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 92	****	3.50	4.22	3.79	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 105	****	4.00	4.20	3.94	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	10	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 98	****	4.00	3.95	3.90	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 58	****	4.33	4.22	4.00	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	10	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 52	****	4.00	4.06	3.81	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	10	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 39	****	5.00	4.39	4.30	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	10	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 40	****	4.00	3.97	4.00	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	10	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 30	****	5.00	4.33	4.30	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	34/ 55	4.33	4.42	4.34	4.17	4.33	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	10	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 42	****	****	4.31	4.08	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	9	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	30/ 46	4.33	4.33	4.45	4.26	4.33	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	9	1	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 33	****	****	4.25	4.25	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	9	1	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 29	****	5.00	4.34	4.22	****	

Course Section: FREN 101 0401
 Title ELEMENTARY FRENCH I
 Instructor: APPADOO, YOGEND
 Enrollment: 29
 Questionnaires: 12

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2006

Page 920
 JAN 18, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

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

Course Section: FREN 102 0101
 Title: ELEMENTARY FRENCH II
 Instructor: FATIH, ZAKARIA
 Enrollment: 23
 Questionnaires: 16

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2006

Page 921
 JAN 18, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	1	2	4	9	4.31	840/1669	3.47	4.33	4.23	4.02	4.31	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	4	10	4.44	648/1666	3.56	4.28	4.19	4.11	4.44	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	4	10	4.44	645/1421	3.48	4.36	4.24	4.11	4.44	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	1	5	4	3	3.69	1284/1617	3.11	4.27	4.15	3.99	3.69	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	2	1	0	2	4	6	4.08	728/1555	3.44	4.17	4.00	3.92	4.08	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	4	1	0	3	4	3	3.73	1160/1543	3.16	4.19	4.06	3.86	3.73	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	2	4	9	4.31	790/1647	3.28	4.18	4.12	4.06	4.31	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	16	5.00	1/1668	4.16	4.60	4.67	4.62	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	2	7	4	4.15	800/1605	3.16	4.13	4.07	3.96	4.15	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	2	6	7	4.33	1022/1514	3.35	4.39	4.39	4.32	4.33	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	1	2	12	4.73	917/1551	3.96	4.72	4.66	4.55	4.73	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	2	7	6	4.27	870/1503	3.32	4.31	4.24	4.17	4.27	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	3	4	8	4.33	838/1506	3.54	4.40	4.26	4.17	4.33	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	10	0	3	1	0	0	2.25	1260/1311	2.30	3.78	3.85	3.68	2.25	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	2	4	2	4.00	849/1490	3.19	4.26	4.05	3.85	4.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	0	1	0	3	5	4.33	818/1502	3.58	4.54	4.26	4.06	4.33	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	10	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	532/1489	3.73	4.43	4.29	4.07	4.67	
4. Were special techniques successful	10	4	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1006	2.85	4.14	4.00	3.81	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 55	****	4.42	4.34	4.17	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 8	Required for Majors	9
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	B 1		Graduate 0
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	C 2	General	0
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad 16
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	1
			? 0		

Course Section: FREN 102 0201
 Title: ELEMENTARY FRENCH II
 Instructor: DIALLO, MAMADOU
 Enrollment: 18
 Questionnaires: 14

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2006

Page 922
 JAN 18, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	6	1	2	4	1	2.50	1648/1669	3.47	4.33	4.23	4.02	2.50	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	5	2	1	4	2	2.71	1619/1666	3.56	4.28	4.19	4.11	2.71	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	2	4	0	6	2	3.14	1339/1421	3.48	4.36	4.24	4.11	3.14	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	3	3	3	2	1	2.58	1585/1617	3.11	4.27	4.15	3.99	2.58	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	3	0	4	5	1	3.08	1417/1555	3.44	4.17	4.00	3.92	3.08	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	2	4	2	4	2	0	2.33	1525/1543	3.16	4.19	4.06	3.86	2.33	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	3	5	2	1	2	2.54	1584/1647	3.28	4.18	4.12	4.06	2.54	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	7	6	0	3.46	1639/1668	4.16	4.60	4.67	4.62	3.46	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	5	1	2	2	0	2.10	1582/1605	3.16	4.13	4.07	3.96	2.10	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	5	3	2	4	0	2.36	1491/1514	3.35	4.39	4.39	4.32	2.36	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	2	4	4	3	1	2.79	1546/1551	3.96	4.72	4.66	4.55	2.79	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	6	1	3	1	1	2.17	1485/1503	3.32	4.31	4.24	4.17	2.17	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	1	5	1	2	5	0	2.54	1454/1506	3.54	4.40	4.26	4.17	2.54	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	4	3	4	1	1	0	2.00	1269/1311	2.30	3.78	3.85	3.68	2.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	4	2	1	2	0	2.11	1470/1490	3.19	4.26	4.05	3.85	2.11	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	3	1	1	3	1	2.78	1445/1502	3.58	4.54	4.26	4.06	2.78	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	2	0	3	3	1	3.11	1390/1489	3.73	4.43	4.29	4.07	3.11	
4. Were special techniques successful	5	3	3	0	0	3	0	2.50	967/1006	2.85	4.14	4.00	3.81	2.50	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	12	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 226	****	****	4.20	3.98	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	12	0	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/ 233	****	****	4.19	4.09	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	12	0	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/ 225	****	****	4.50	4.42	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	12	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 223	****	****	4.35	4.19	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	12	0	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	****/ 206	****	****	4.15	4.01	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	12	0	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	****/ 112	****	4.00	4.38	4.04	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	12	0	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/ 97	****	3.00	4.36	4.19	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/ 92	****	3.50	4.22	3.79	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	12	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 105	****	4.00	4.20	3.94	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	12	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 98	****	4.00	3.95	3.90	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	****/ 58	****	4.33	4.22	4.00	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	12	0	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	****/ 52	****	4.00	4.06	3.81	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	12	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 39	****	5.00	4.39	4.30	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	12	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 40	****	4.00	3.97	4.00	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	12	0	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	****/ 30	****	5.00	4.33	4.30	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	****/ 55	****	4.42	4.34	4.17	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	12	0	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/ 42	****	****	4.31	4.08	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	12	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 46	****	4.33	4.45	4.26	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	12	0	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/ 33	****	****	4.25	4.25	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	12	0	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/ 29	****	5.00	4.34	4.22	****	

Course Section: FREN 102 0201
 Title ELEMENTARY FRENCH II
 Instructor: DIALLO, MAMADOU
 Enrollment: 18
 Questionnaires: 14

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2006

Page 922
 JAN 18, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

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

Course Section: FREN 102 0301
 Title ELEMENTARY FRENCH II
 Instructor: FATIH, ZAKARIA
 Enrollment: 29
 Questionnaires: 19

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2006

Page 923
 JAN 18, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	2	5	12	4.53	567/1669	3.47	4.33	4.23	4.02	4.53	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	5	13	4.63	399/1666	3.56	4.28	4.19	4.11	4.63	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	4	15	4.79	242/1421	3.48	4.36	4.24	4.11	4.79	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	5	0	1	2	3	8	4.29	770/1617	3.11	4.27	4.15	3.99	4.29	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	7	0	0	2	5	5	4.25	558/1555	3.44	4.17	4.00	3.92	4.25	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	4	1	1	1	5	7	4.07	857/1543	3.16	4.19	4.06	3.86	4.07	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	2	5	11	4.37	713/1647	3.28	4.18	4.12	4.06	4.37	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	4	15	4.79	926/1668	4.16	4.60	4.67	4.62	4.79	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	0	0	1	1	3	8	4.38	525/1605	3.16	4.13	4.07	3.96	4.38	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	0	5	12	4.71	522/1514	3.35	4.39	4.39	4.32	4.71	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	2	15	4.88	567/1551	3.96	4.72	4.66	4.55	4.88	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	0	6	11	4.65	412/1503	3.32	4.31	4.24	4.17	4.65	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	2	15	4.88	188/1506	3.54	4.40	4.26	4.17	4.88	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	7	2	0	2	0	6	3.80	764/1311	2.30	3.78	3.85	3.68	3.80	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	2	3	8	4.46	490/1490	3.19	4.26	4.05	3.85	4.46	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	0	0	1	12	4.92	189/1502	3.58	4.54	4.26	4.06	4.92	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	0	0	1	2	8	4.64	564/1489	3.73	4.43	4.29	4.07	4.64	
4. Were special techniques successful	6	6	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	159/1006	2.85	4.14	4.00	3.81	4.71	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	16	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 226	****	****	4.20	3.98	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	17	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 233	****	****	4.19	4.09	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	17	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 225	****	****	4.50	4.42	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	17	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 223	****	****	4.35	4.19	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	17	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 206	****	****	4.15	4.01	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	16	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 112	****	4.00	4.38	4.04	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	17	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 97	****	3.00	4.36	4.19	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	17	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 92	****	3.50	4.22	3.79	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	17	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 105	****	4.00	4.20	3.94	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	17	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 98	****	4.00	3.95	3.90	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 58	****	4.33	4.22	4.00	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	17	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 52	****	4.00	4.06	3.81	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	17	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 39	****	5.00	4.39	4.30	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	17	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 40	****	4.00	3.97	4.00	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	17	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 30	****	5.00	4.33	4.30	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	17	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 55	****	4.42	4.34	4.17	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	17	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 42	****	****	4.31	4.08	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	17	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 46	****	4.33	4.45	4.26	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	17	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 33	****	****	4.25	4.25	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	17	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 29	****	5.00	4.34	4.22	****	

Course Section: FREN 102 0301
 Title ELEMENTARY FRENCH II
 Instructor: FATIH, ZAKARIA
 Enrollment: 29
 Questionnaires: 19

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2006

Page 923
 JAN 18, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

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

Course Section: FREN 102 0401
 Title ELEMENTARY FRENCH II
 Instructor: DIALLO, MAMADOU
 Enrollment: 20
 Questionnaires: 11

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2006

Page 924
 JAN 18, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	2	5	1	2	1	2.55	1643/1669	3.47	4.33	4.23	4.02	2.55	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	3	3	2	3	0	2.45	1638/1666	3.56	4.28	4.19	4.11	2.45	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	6	4	1	0	0	1.55	1421/1421	3.48	4.36	4.24	4.11	1.55	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	5	2	1	0	1	1.89	1617/1617	3.11	4.27	4.15	3.99	1.89	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	3	3	1	2	2	0	2.38	1535/1555	3.44	4.17	4.00	3.92	2.38	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	3	2	3	1	1	1	2.50	1516/1543	3.16	4.19	4.06	3.86	2.50	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	4	4	3	0	0	1.91	1629/1647	3.28	4.18	4.12	4.06	1.91	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	1	0	2	2	6	0	3.40	1642/1668	4.16	4.60	4.67	4.62	3.40	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	1	3	1	3	0	0	2.00	1585/1605	3.16	4.13	4.07	3.96	2.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	4	4	2	1	0	2.00	1501/1514	3.35	4.39	4.39	4.32	2.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	1	1	3	4	2	3.45	1495/1551	3.96	4.72	4.66	4.55	3.45	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	4	2	4	1	0	2.18	1484/1503	3.32	4.31	4.24	4.17	2.18	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	1	3	3	1	3	0	2.40	1470/1506	3.54	4.40	4.26	4.17	2.40	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	4	5	1	0	0	0	1.17	1294/1311	2.30	3.78	3.85	3.68	1.17	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	3	5	1	2	0	2.18	1464/1490	3.19	4.26	4.05	3.85	2.18	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	3	3	2	2	0	2.30	1488/1502	3.58	4.54	4.26	4.06	2.30	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	2	2	5	1	0	2.50	1468/1489	3.73	4.43	4.29	4.07	2.50	
4. Were special techniques successful	0	8	2	1	0	0	0	1.33	1004/1006	2.85	4.14	4.00	3.81	1.33	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	9	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 226	****	****	4.20	3.98	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	10	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 233	****	****	4.19	4.09	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	10	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 225	****	****	4.50	4.42	****	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course Section: FREN 103 0101
 Title INT REV ELEM FRENCH
 Instructor: EL OMARI, SAMIR
 Enrollment: 24
 Questionnaires: 18

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2006

Page 925
 JAN 18, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	0	2	2	7	6	4.00	1173/1669	4.00	4.33	4.23	4.02	4.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	2	1	9	6	4.06	1065/1666	4.06	4.28	4.19	4.11	4.06	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	6	10	4.39	701/1421	4.39	4.36	4.24	4.11	4.39	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	3	1	2	5	3	4	3.47	1393/1617	3.47	4.27	4.15	3.99	3.47	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	3	0	2	2	6	5	3.93	889/1555	3.93	4.17	4.00	3.92	3.93	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	2	1	3	3	6	3	3.44	1290/1543	3.44	4.19	4.06	3.86	3.44	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	2	4	6	6	3.89	1178/1647	3.89	4.18	4.12	4.06	3.89	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	3	15	4.83	844/1668	4.83	4.60	4.67	4.62	4.83	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	1	2	7	3	3.92	1057/1605	3.92	4.13	4.07	3.96	3.92	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	2	7	7	4.31	1042/1514	4.31	4.39	4.39	4.32	4.31	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	2	5	10	4.47	1216/1551	4.47	4.72	4.66	4.55	4.47	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	3	6	7	4.25	879/1503	4.25	4.31	4.24	4.17	4.25	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	2	3	5	6	3.94	1142/1506	3.94	4.40	4.26	4.17	3.94	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	1	2	1	3	6	2	3.36	1018/1311	3.36	3.78	3.85	3.68	3.36	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	1	2	3	2	4	3.50	1154/1490	3.50	4.26	4.05	3.85	3.50	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	0	3	4	5	4.17	938/1502	4.17	4.54	4.26	4.06	4.17	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	0	0	4	2	6	4.17	973/1489	4.17	4.43	4.29	4.07	4.17	
4. Were special techniques successful	6	4	2	0	1	5	0	3.13	914/1006	3.13	4.14	4.00	3.81	3.13	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	5	0.00-0.99	1	A	8	Required for Majors	9	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	7						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	2	C	1	General	3	Under-grad	18	Non-major	18
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	1	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 0101
 Title INTERMEDIATE FRENCH I
 Instructor: TADE, SOPHIA
 Enrollment: 25
 Questionnaires: 18

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2006

Page 926
 JAN 18, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	1	3	7	7	4.11	1090/1669	3.96	4.33	4.23	4.34	4.11	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	6	10	4.39	715/1666	4.06	4.28	4.19	4.29	4.39	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	1	15	4.72	318/1421	4.36	4.36	4.24	4.35	4.72	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	1	1	0	1	4	10	4.38	673/1617	4.02	4.27	4.15	4.24	4.38	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	0	2	4	10	4.29	524/1555	4.12	4.17	4.00	3.96	4.29	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	1	0	0	2	4	10	4.50	390/1543	4.03	4.19	4.06	4.10	4.50	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	3	6	9	4.33	759/1647	4.02	4.18	4.12	4.19	4.33	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	11	6	4.35	1313/1668	4.43	4.60	4.67	4.59	4.35	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	4	2	11	4.41	486/1605	3.68	4.13	4.07	4.15	4.41	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	0	5	10	4.67	584/1514	4.03	4.39	4.39	4.39	4.67	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	1	15	4.94	358/1551	4.61	4.72	4.66	4.72	4.94	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	1	2	12	4.73	300/1503	4.08	4.31	4.24	4.29	4.73	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	2	13	4.87	212/1506	4.06	4.40	4.26	4.33	4.87	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	1	0	2	4	3	5	3.79	774/1311	3.58	3.78	3.85	3.96	3.79	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	1	3	4	4.38	585/1490	3.83	4.26	4.05	4.11	4.38	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	10	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	266/1502	4.33	4.54	4.26	4.31	4.88	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	10	0	0	0	2	1	5	4.38	827/1489	4.02	4.43	4.29	4.36	4.38	
4. Were special techniques successful	10	2	2	0	1	1	2	3.17	902/1006	4.24	4.14	4.00	3.99	3.17	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	17	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 226	****	****	4.20	4.42	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	17	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 233	****	****	4.19	4.36	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	17	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 225	****	****	4.50	4.74	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	17	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 223	****	****	4.35	4.71	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	17	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 206	****	****	4.15	4.59	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	17	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 112	****	4.00	4.38	4.59	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	17	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 97	****	3.00	4.36	4.60	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 92	****	3.50	4.22	4.50	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 105	****	4.00	4.20	4.63	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	17	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 98	****	4.00	3.95	4.20	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 58	****	4.33	4.22	4.20	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	17	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 52	****	4.00	4.06	5.00	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	17	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 39	****	5.00	4.39	5.00	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	17	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 40	****	4.00	3.97	5.00	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	17	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 30	****	5.00	4.33	5.00	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 55	****	4.42	4.34	4.67	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	17	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 42	****	****	4.31	5.00	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	17	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 46	****	4.33	4.45	5.00	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	17	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 33	****	****	4.25	5.00	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	17	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 29	****	5.00	4.34	5.00	****	

Course Section: FREN 201 0101
 Title INTERMEDIATE FRENCH I
 Instructor: TADE, SOPHIA
 Enrollment: 25
 Questionnaires: 18

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2006

Page 926
 JAN 18, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	6	Required for Majors	9	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	B	6						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	0	C	2	General	0	Under-grad	18	Non-major	17
84-150	2	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	6				
				?	0						

Course Section: FREN 201 0201
 Title INTERMEDIATE FRENCH I
 Instructor: TADE, SOPHIA
 Enrollment: 26
 Questionnaires: 19

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2006

Page 927
 JAN 18, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	3	15	4.74	293/1669	3.96	4.33	4.23	4.34	4.74	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	3	15	4.74	268/1666	4.06	4.28	4.19	4.29	4.74	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	2	15	4.63	429/1421	4.36	4.36	4.24	4.35	4.63	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	2	5	11	4.50	496/1617	4.02	4.27	4.15	4.24	4.50	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	1	1	2	14	4.61	255/1555	4.12	4.17	4.00	3.96	4.61	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	2	0	1	2	2	11	4.44	478/1543	4.03	4.19	4.06	4.10	4.44	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	4	14	4.68	281/1647	4.02	4.18	4.12	4.19	4.68	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	12	7	4.37	1305/1668	4.43	4.60	4.67	4.59	4.37	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	1	1	1	5	8	4.13	830/1605	3.68	4.13	4.07	4.15	4.13	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	2	5	11	4.50	799/1514	4.03	4.39	4.39	4.39	4.50	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	1	3	14	4.72	936/1551	4.61	4.72	4.66	4.72	4.72	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	2	3	13	4.61	451/1503	4.08	4.31	4.24	4.29	4.61	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	0	5	12	4.56	594/1506	4.06	4.40	4.26	4.33	4.56	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	2	0	2	0	5	8	4.27	439/1311	3.58	3.78	3.85	3.96	4.27	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	242/1490	3.83	4.26	4.05	4.11	4.78	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	10	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	256/1502	4.33	4.54	4.26	4.31	4.89	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	10	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	411/1489	4.02	4.43	4.29	4.36	4.78	
4. Were special techniques successful	10	1	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	105/1006	4.24	4.14	4.00	3.99	4.88	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	16	0	1	1	0	0	1	2.67	****/ 226	****	****	4.20	4.42	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	17	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 233	****	****	4.19	4.36	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	17	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 225	****	****	4.50	4.74	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	17	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 223	****	****	4.35	4.71	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	17	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 206	****	****	4.15	4.59	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 112	****	4.00	4.38	4.59	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 97	****	3.00	4.36	4.60	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 105	****	4.00	4.20	4.63	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 98	****	4.00	3.95	4.20	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 58	****	4.33	4.22	4.20	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 52	****	4.00	4.06	5.00	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 39	****	5.00	4.39	5.00	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 40	****	4.00	3.97	5.00	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 55	****	4.42	4.34	4.67	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 42	****	****	4.31	5.00	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 46	****	4.33	4.45	5.00	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 33	****	****	4.25	5.00	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 29	****	5.00	4.34	5.00	****	

Course Section: FREN 201 0201
 Title INTERMEDIATE FRENCH I
 Instructor: TADE, SOPHIA
 Enrollment: 26
 Questionnaires: 19

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2006

Page 927
 JAN 18, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	10	Required for Majors	12	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	0						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	1	C	4	General	2	Under-grad	19	Non-major	19
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	2				
				?	1						

Course Section: FREN 201 0301
 Title INTERMEDIATE FRENCH I
 Instructor: DIALLO, M.
 Enrollment: 23
 Questionnaires: 17

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2006

Page 928
 JAN 18, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	6	6	3	2	0	2.06	1664/1669	3.96	4.33	4.23	4.34	2.06	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	7	4	5	1	0	2.00	1660/1666	4.06	4.28	4.19	4.29	2.00	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	3	3	4	4	3	3.06	1355/1421	4.36	4.36	4.24	4.35	3.06	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	7	3	2	3	1	1	2.50	1591/1617	4.02	4.27	4.15	4.24	2.50	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	3	5	0	3	3	3	2.93	1461/1555	4.12	4.17	4.00	3.96	2.93	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	3	3	2	4	4	1	2.86	1472/1543	4.03	4.19	4.06	4.10	2.86	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	5	5	1	3	2	2.50	1586/1647	4.02	4.18	4.12	4.19	2.50	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	6	9	2	3.76	1613/1668	4.43	4.60	4.67	4.59	3.76	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	1	10	1	2	0	0	1.38	1603/1605	3.68	4.13	4.07	4.15	1.38	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	10	4	1	2	0	1.71	1511/1514	4.03	4.39	4.39	4.39	1.71	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	2	2	4	8	1	3.24	1516/1551	4.61	4.72	4.66	4.72	3.24	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	8	3	4	2	0	2.00	1492/1503	4.08	4.31	4.24	4.29	2.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	11	2	2	2	0	1.71	1500/1506	4.06	4.40	4.26	4.33	1.71	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	9	7	0	0	1	0	1.38	1292/1311	3.58	3.78	3.85	3.96	1.38	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	8	2	1	1	0	1.58	1487/1490	3.83	4.26	4.05	4.11	1.58	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	4	3	2	3	1	2.54	1472/1502	4.33	4.54	4.26	4.31	2.54	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	6	1	2	2	1	2.25	1477/1489	4.02	4.43	4.29	4.36	2.25	
4. Were special techniques successful	6	8	2	0	1	0	0	1.67	****/1006	4.24	4.14	4.00	3.99	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 2	Required for Majors	11
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	B 11		Graduate 0
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	C 2	General	0
84-150	8	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad 17
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	6
			? 0		

Course Section: FREN 201 0401
 Title INTERMEDIATE FRENCH I
 Instructor: DIALLO, M
 Enrollment: 19
 Questionnaires: 14

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2006

Page 929
 JAN 18, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	3	9	2	3.93	1265/1669	3.96	4.33	4.23	4.34	3.93	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	5	9	4.64	385/1666	4.06	4.28	4.19	4.29	4.64	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	11	4.79	242/1421	4.36	4.36	4.24	4.35	4.79	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	4	3	5	4.08	981/1617	4.02	4.27	4.15	4.24	4.08	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	3	4	6	4.23	575/1555	4.12	4.17	4.00	3.96	4.23	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	1	0	1	7	4	4.00	895/1543	4.03	4.19	4.06	4.10	4.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	4	9	4.57	401/1647	4.02	4.18	4.12	4.19	4.57	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	6	8	4.57	1144/1668	4.43	4.60	4.67	4.59	4.57	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	3	5	3	4.00	918/1605	3.68	4.13	4.07	4.15	4.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	1	4	7	4.50	799/1514	4.03	4.39	4.39	4.39	4.50	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	460/1551	4.61	4.72	4.66	4.72	4.92	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	1	0	2	9	4.58	482/1503	4.08	4.31	4.24	4.29	4.58	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	2	3	7	4.42	757/1506	4.06	4.40	4.26	4.33	4.42	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	3	0	1	0	4	3	4.13	525/1311	3.58	3.78	3.85	3.96	4.13	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	2	0	2	4	2	3.40	1215/1490	3.83	4.26	4.05	4.11	3.40	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	0	4	1	5	4.10	975/1502	4.33	4.54	4.26	4.31	4.10	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	0	4	2	3	3.89	1133/1489	4.02	4.43	4.29	4.36	3.89	
4. Were special techniques successful	4	6	0	1	0	2	1	3.75	657/1006	4.24	4.14	4.00	3.99	3.75	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	2	0.00-0.99 1	A 3	Required for Majors 8	Graduate 0 Major 0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99 0	B 9		
56-83	1	2.00-2.99 2	C 0	General 0	Under-grad 14 Non-major 14
84-150	4	3.00-3.49 2	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 5	
			? 0		

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	0	0	0	6	11	4.65	419/1669	3.96	4.33	4.23	4.34	4.65	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	4	13	4.67	359/1666	4.06	4.28	4.19	4.29	4.67	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	4	12	4.65	417/1421	4.36	4.36	4.24	4.35	4.65	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	2	0	0	1	4	10	4.60	394/1617	4.02	4.27	4.15	4.24	4.60	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	6	10	4.53	324/1555	4.12	4.17	4.00	3.96	4.53	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	1	4	4	8	4.12	819/1543	4.03	4.19	4.06	4.10	4.12	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	1	6	10	4.53	458/1647	4.02	4.18	4.12	4.19	4.53	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	4	13	4.76	952/1668	4.43	4.60	4.67	4.59	4.76	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	0	5	9	4.64	259/1605	3.68	4.13	4.07	4.15	4.64	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	1	0	4	10	4.53	763/1514	4.03	4.39	4.39	4.39	4.53	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	0	1	14	4.93	358/1551	4.61	4.72	4.66	4.72	4.93	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	2	4	9	4.47	621/1503	4.08	4.31	4.24	4.29	4.47	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	3	12	4.80	286/1506	4.06	4.40	4.26	4.33	4.80	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	1	0	0	3	2	9	4.43	319/1311	3.58	3.78	3.85	3.96	4.43	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	0	4	3	4.43	535/1490	3.83	4.26	4.05	4.11	4.43	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	11	0	0	0	2	0	5	4.43	729/1502	4.33	4.54	4.26	4.31	4.43	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	11	0	0	0	1	1	5	4.57	622/1489	4.02	4.43	4.29	4.36	4.57	
4. Were special techniques successful	11	3	1	0	1	0	2	3.50	****/1006	4.24	4.14	4.00	3.99	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	15	0	1	0	1	1	0	2.67	****/ 226	****	****	4.20	4.42	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	15	0	1	0	0	1	1	3.33	****/ 233	****	****	4.19	4.36	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	15	0	0	0	1	2	0	3.67	****/ 225	****	****	4.50	4.74	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	16	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 223	****	****	4.35	4.71	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	16	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 206	****	****	4.15	4.59	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	16	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 112	****	4.00	4.38	4.59	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	16	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 97	****	3.00	4.36	4.60	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 92	****	3.50	4.22	4.50	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 105	****	4.00	4.20	4.63	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	16	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 98	****	4.00	3.95	4.20	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 58	****	4.33	4.22	4.20	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	15	0	1	0	0	2	0	3.00	****/ 52	****	4.00	4.06	5.00	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	16	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 39	****	5.00	4.39	5.00	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	16	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 40	****	4.00	3.97	5.00	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	16	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 30	****	5.00	4.33	5.00	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	3	0	0	3.00	****/ 55	****	4.42	4.34	4.67	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	15	0	1	0	1	1	0	2.67	****/ 42	****	****	4.31	5.00	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	15	0	0	0	2	0	1	3.67	****/ 46	****	4.33	4.45	5.00	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	15	2	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 33	****	****	4.25	5.00	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	15	2	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 29	****	5.00	4.34	5.00	****	

Course Section: FREN 201 0501
 Title INTERMEDIATE FRENCH I
 Instructor: EL OMARI, SAMIR
 Enrollment: 20
 Questionnaires: 18

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2006

Page 930
 JAN 18, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	3	0.00-0.99 1	A 9	Required for Majors 9	Graduate 0 Major 0
28-55	3	1.00-1.99 0	B 7		
56-83	0	2.00-2.99 0	C 0	General 1	Under-grad 18 Non-major 18
84-150	5	3.00-3.49 8	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 6	
			? 0		

Course Section: FREN 201 0601
 Title INTERMEDIATE FRENCH I
 Instructor: TADE, SOPHIA
 Enrollment: 9
 Questionnaires: 6

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2006

Page 931
 JAN 18, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	4	0	2	3.67	1409/1669	3.96	4.33	4.23	4.34	3.67	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	2	2	0	2	3.33	1527/1666	4.06	4.28	4.19	4.29	3.33	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	1	3	4.17	886/1421	4.36	4.36	4.24	4.35	4.17	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	2	1	2	4.00	1029/1617	4.02	4.27	4.15	4.24	4.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	1	3	4.17	644/1555	4.12	4.17	4.00	3.96	4.17	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	2	2	4.00	895/1543	4.03	4.19	4.06	4.10	4.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	2	0	1	2	1	3.00	1526/1647	4.02	4.18	4.12	4.19	3.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	4	2	4.33	1329/1668	4.43	4.60	4.67	4.59	4.33	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	2.50	1561/1605	3.68	4.13	4.07	4.15	2.50	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	3	2	1	3.67	1352/1514	4.03	4.39	4.39	4.39	3.67	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	705/1551	4.61	4.72	4.66	4.72	4.83	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	4	1	1	3.50	1330/1503	4.08	4.31	4.24	4.29	3.50	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	3	0	2	3.50	1319/1506	4.06	4.40	4.26	4.33	3.50	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	1	2	1	1	1	2.83	1178/1311	3.58	3.78	3.85	3.96	2.83	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	0	1	1	2	3.60	1117/1490	3.83	4.26	4.05	4.11	3.60	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	336/1502	4.33	4.54	4.26	4.31	4.80	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	1	0	1	0	3	3.80	1168/1489	4.02	4.43	4.29	4.36	3.80	
4. Were special techniques successful	1	3	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1006	4.24	4.14	4.00	3.99	5.00	

Frequency Distribution

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

- Means there are not enough responses to be significant

Course Section: FREN 201 0701
 Title INTERMEDIATE FRENCH I
 Instructor: PROVENCHER, DEN
 Enrollment: 13
 Questionnaires: 12

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2006

Page 932
 JAN 18, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	1	0	2	9	4.58	500/1669	3.96	4.33	4.23	4.34	4.58	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	0	1	10	4.67	359/1666	4.06	4.28	4.19	4.29	4.67	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	4	7	4.50	557/1421	4.36	4.36	4.24	4.35	4.50		
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	1	0	2	2	6	4.09	975/1617	4.02	4.27	4.15	4.24	4.09	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	3	0	1	2	1	5	4.11	698/1555	4.12	4.17	4.00	3.96	4.11	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	0	2	3	5	4.30	608/1543	4.03	4.19	4.06	4.10	4.30	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	0	3	8	4.50	481/1647	4.02	4.18	4.12	4.19	4.50	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	2	10	4.83	844/1668	4.43	4.60	4.67	4.59	4.83	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	0	3	7	4.70	210/1605	3.68	4.13	4.07	4.15	4.70	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	1	1	7	4.67	584/1514	4.03	4.39	4.39	4.39	4.67	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	1	1	7	4.67	1028/1551	4.61	4.72	4.66	4.72	4.67	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	1	1	7	4.67	386/1503	4.08	4.31	4.24	4.29	4.67	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	1	0	1	7	4.56	594/1506	4.06	4.40	4.26	4.33	4.56	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	0	0	0	2	3	4	4.22	464/1311	3.58	3.78	3.85	3.96	4.22	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	1	0	5	4.67	340/1490	3.83	4.26	4.05	4.11	4.67	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	0	1	0	5	4.67	486/1502	4.33	4.54	4.26	4.31	4.67	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	0	1	0	0	5	4.50	684/1489	4.02	4.43	4.29	4.36	4.50	
4. Were special techniques successful	6	1	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	307/1006	4.24	4.14	4.00	3.99	4.40	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	11	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 226	****	****	4.20	4.42	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 55	****	4.42	4.34	4.67	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 42	****	****	4.31	5.00	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	11	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 46	****	4.33	4.45	5.00	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	11	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 33	****	****	4.25	5.00	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 29	****	5.00	4.34	5.00	****	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course Section: FREN 202 0101
 Title INTERMEDIATE FRENCH II
 Instructor: REZVANI, MARJAN
 Enrollment: 18
 Questionnaires: 10

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2006

Page 933
 JAN 18, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	0	0	3	2	4	4.11	1090/1669	4.11	4.33	4.23	4.34	4.11	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	1	7	4.67	359/1666	4.67	4.28	4.19	4.29	4.67	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	3	6	4.67	392/1421	4.67	4.36	4.24	4.35	4.67	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	2	6	4.56	445/1617	4.56	4.27	4.15	4.24	4.56	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	2	4	2	3.78	1045/1555	3.78	4.17	4.00	3.96	3.78	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	1	0	0	0	3	5	4.63	282/1543	4.63	4.19	4.06	4.10	4.63	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	1	5	3	4.22	896/1647	4.22	4.18	4.12	4.19	4.22	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	8	1	4.11	1470/1668	4.11	4.60	4.67	4.59	4.11	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	1	5	3	4.22	725/1605	4.22	4.13	4.07	4.15	4.22	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	408/1514	4.78	4.39	4.39	4.39	4.78	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	567/1551	4.89	4.72	4.66	4.72	4.89	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	0	4	4	4.50	556/1503	4.50	4.31	4.24	4.29	4.50	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	5	4	4.44	718/1506	4.44	4.40	4.26	4.33	4.44	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	1	1	3	4	4.11	531/1311	4.11	3.78	3.85	3.96	4.11	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	1	3	2	4.17	764/1490	4.17	4.26	4.05	4.11	4.17	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	0	1	0	5	4.67	486/1502	4.67	4.54	4.26	4.31	4.67	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	532/1489	4.67	4.43	4.29	4.36	4.67	
4. Were special techniques successful	4	0	0	0	0	4	2	4.33	344/1006	4.33	4.14	4.00	3.99	4.33	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course Section: FREN 301 0101
 Title ADVANCED FRENCH I
 Instructor: DE VERNEIL, MAR
 Enrollment: 24
 Questionnaires: 17

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2006

Page 934
 JAN 18, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	1	1	6	9	4.35	793/1669	4.35	4.33	4.23	4.28	4.35	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	4	13	4.76	231/1666	4.76	4.28	4.19	4.20	4.76	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	15	4.88	164/1421	4.88	4.36	4.24	4.25	4.88	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	5	12	4.71	277/1617	4.71	4.27	4.15	4.22	4.71	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	5	10	4.67	225/1555	4.67	4.17	4.00	4.03	4.67	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	3	12	4.69	234/1543	4.69	4.19	4.06	4.14	4.69	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	0	4	12	4.75	213/1647	4.75	4.18	4.12	4.14	4.75	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	16	5.00	1/1668	5.00	4.60	4.67	4.68	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	1	8	5	4.29	654/1605	4.29	4.13	4.07	4.09	4.29	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	1	2	11	4.71	505/1514	4.71	4.39	4.39	4.46	4.71	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	0	0	14	5.00	1/1551	5.00	4.72	4.66	4.70	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	0	3	11	4.79	243/1503	4.79	4.31	4.24	4.28	4.79	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	1	1	12	4.79	313/1506	4.79	4.40	4.26	4.30	4.79	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	0	0	0	0	3	11	4.79	126/1311	4.79	3.78	3.85	3.97	4.79	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	1	4	7	4.50	445/1490	4.50	4.26	4.05	4.11	4.50	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	1	1	2	7	4.36	790/1502	4.36	4.54	4.26	4.28	4.36	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	0	0	0	2	9	4.82	368/1489	4.82	4.43	4.29	4.35	4.82	
4. Were special techniques successful	6	2	0	1	0	2	6	4.44	278/1006	4.44	4.14	4.00	4.10	4.44	

Frequency Distribution

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

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

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2006

Page 935
 JAN 18, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	1	0	3	3	4.14	1052/1669	4.14	4.33	4.23	4.28	4.14	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	2	3	4.00	1094/1666	4.00	4.28	4.19	4.20	4.00	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	0	2	4	4.29	789/1421	4.29	4.36	4.24	4.25	4.29	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	1	4	4.14	922/1617	4.14	4.27	4.15	4.22	4.14	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	3	3	1	3.71	1095/1555	3.71	4.17	4.00	4.03	3.71	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	1	4	1	3.57	1236/1543	3.57	4.19	4.06	4.14	3.57	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	1	3	2	3.86	1205/1647	3.86	4.18	4.12	4.14	3.86	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	2	5	0	3.71	1620/1668	3.71	4.60	4.67	4.68	3.71	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	2	0	3	0	3.20	1470/1605	3.20	4.13	4.07	4.09	3.20	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	3	0	4	4.14	1148/1514	4.14	4.39	4.39	4.46	4.14	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	2	2	3	4.14	1377/1551	4.14	4.72	4.66	4.70	4.14	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	1	2	2	2	3.71	1255/1503	3.71	4.31	4.24	4.28	3.71	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	1	4	1	3.71	1258/1506	3.71	4.40	4.26	4.30	3.71	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	1	0	4	2	4.00	587/1311	4.00	3.78	3.85	3.97	4.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	1328/1490	3.00	4.26	4.05	4.11	3.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	1395/1502	3.00	4.54	4.26	4.28	3.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	1	1	0	0	0	1.50	1488/1489	1.50	4.43	4.29	4.35	1.50	
4. Were special techniques successful	5	1	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/1006	****	4.14	4.00	4.10	****	

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	0	2.00-2.99	C 0	General	1
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad 7
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 310 0101
 Title INTERCONNECTIONS: LANG
 Instructor: MCCRAY, STANLEY
 Enrollment: 14
 Questionnaires: 8

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2006

Page 936
 JAN 18, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	3	5	4.63	448/1669	4.63	4.33	4.23	4.28	4.63	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	2	5	4.50	549/1666	4.50	4.28	4.19	4.20	4.50	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	217/1421	4.80	4.36	4.24	4.25	4.80	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	219/1617	4.75	4.27	4.15	4.22	4.75	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	285/1555	4.57	4.17	4.00	4.03	4.57	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	1	5	4.57	325/1543	4.57	4.19	4.06	4.14	4.57	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	1	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	481/1647	4.50	4.18	4.12	4.14	4.50	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	6	1	4.14	1451/1668	4.14	4.60	4.67	4.68	4.14	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	2	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	298/1605	4.60	4.13	4.07	4.09	4.60	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	2	5	4.50	799/1514	4.50	4.39	4.39	4.46	4.50	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1551	5.00	4.72	4.66	4.70	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	154/1503	4.88	4.31	4.24	4.28	4.88	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	353/1506	4.75	4.40	4.26	4.30	4.75	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	1	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	232/1311	4.57	3.78	3.85	3.97	4.57	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1490	5.00	4.26	4.05	4.11	5.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1502	5.00	4.54	4.26	4.28	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1489	5.00	4.43	4.29	4.35	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	1	1	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	115/1006	4.83	4.14	4.00	4.10	4.83	
Seminar															
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	7	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 97	****	3.00	4.36	4.12	****	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course Section: FREN 315 0101
 Title FRENCH PHONETICS
 Instructor: KA, OMAR
 Enrollment: 11
 Questionnaires: 9

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2006

Page 937
 JAN 18, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	3	6	4.67	389/1669	4.67	4.33	4.23	4.28	4.67	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	6	4.67	359/1666	4.67	4.28	4.19	4.20	4.67	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	164/1421	4.89	4.36	4.24	4.25	4.89	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	219/1617	4.75	4.27	4.15	4.22	4.75	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	1	2	5	4.50	340/1555	4.50	4.17	4.00	4.03	4.50	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	1	1	6	4.63	282/1543	4.63	4.19	4.06	4.14	4.63	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1647	5.00	4.18	4.12	4.14	5.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1668	5.00	4.60	4.67	4.68	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	5	4	4.44	448/1605	4.44	4.13	4.07	4.09	4.44	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	223/1514	4.89	4.39	4.39	4.46	4.89	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1551	5.00	4.72	4.66	4.70	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1503	5.00	4.31	4.24	4.28	5.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1506	5.00	4.40	4.26	4.30	5.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	4	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1311	5.00	3.78	3.85	3.97	5.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	192/1490	4.83	4.26	4.05	4.11	4.83	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1502	5.00	4.54	4.26	4.28	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	348/1489	4.83	4.43	4.29	4.35	4.83	
4. Were special techniques successful	3	4	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1006	****	4.14	4.00	4.10	****	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course Section: FREN 430 0101
 Title: STUDIES IN FRENCH LIT
 Instructor: FATIH, ZAKARIA
 Enrollment: 11
 Questionnaires: 9

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2006

Page 938
 JAN 18, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	6	2	4.11	1090/1669	4.11	4.33	4.23	4.39	4.11	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	3	3	3.89	1250/1666	3.89	4.28	4.19	4.22	3.89	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	5	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	280/1421	4.75	4.36	4.24	4.38	4.75	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	3	5	4.44	583/1617	4.44	4.27	4.15	4.22	4.44	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	112/1555	4.88	4.17	4.00	4.08	4.88	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	1	6	4.63	282/1543	4.63	4.19	4.06	4.18	4.63	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	1	4	1	2	3.50	1393/1647	3.50	4.18	4.12	4.14	3.50	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1668	5.00	4.60	4.67	4.70	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	2	7	0	3.78	1195/1605	3.78	4.13	4.07	4.16	3.78	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	3	5	4.44	892/1514	4.44	4.39	4.39	4.45	4.44	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	843/1551	4.78	4.72	4.66	4.73	4.78	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	1	0	3	5	4.33	800/1503	4.33	4.31	4.24	4.27	4.33	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	1	3	4	4.11	1017/1506	4.11	4.40	4.26	4.29	4.11	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	1	0	2	3	0	2	3.29	1048/1311	3.29	3.78	3.85	3.88	3.29	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	1	4	2	3.88	970/1490	3.88	4.26	4.05	4.26	3.88	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	0	3	5	4.63	522/1502	4.63	4.54	4.26	4.46	4.63	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	309/1489	4.88	4.43	4.29	4.52	4.88	
4. Were special techniques successful	1	4	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	235/1006	4.50	4.14	4.00	4.21	4.50	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	8	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 226	****	****	4.20	4.61	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 233	****	****	4.19	4.40	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	8	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 225	****	****	4.50	4.39	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	8	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 223	****	****	4.35	4.56	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	8	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 206	****	****	4.15	4.20	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 112	****	4.00	4.38	4.74	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	8	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 97	****	3.00	4.36	4.69	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 92	****	3.50	4.22	4.48	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 98	****	4.00	3.95	3.86	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 58	****	4.33	4.22	3.94	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	8	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 52	****	4.00	4.06	3.80	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	8	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 39	****	5.00	4.39	3.78	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	8	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 40	****	4.00	3.97	3.81	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	8	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 30	****	5.00	4.33	4.50	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 55	****	4.42	4.34	5.00	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	8	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 42	****	****	4.31	5.00	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 46	****	4.33	4.45	4.92	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	8	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 33	****	****	4.25	3.00	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	8	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 29	****	5.00	4.34	2.00	****	

Course Section: FREN 430 0101
 Title: STUDIES IN FRENCH LIT
 Instructor: FATIH, ZAKARIA
 Enrollment: 11
 Questionnaires: 9

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2006

Page 938
 JAN 18, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	6	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	3
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	1						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	0	C	1	General	3	Under-grad	9	Non-major	6
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	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	5				
				?	0						

Course Section: FREN 630 0101
 Title STUDIES IN FRENCH LIT
 Instructor: FATIH, ZAKARIA
 Enrollment: 5
 Questionnaires: 5

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2006

Page 939
 JAN 18, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	478/1669	4.60	4.33	4.23	4.35	4.60	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	1	1	3.60	1432/1666	3.60	4.28	4.19	4.19	3.60	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	3	1	4.00	1029/1617	4.00	4.27	4.15	4.24	4.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	141/1555	4.80	4.17	4.00	4.07	4.80	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	3	1	4.00	895/1543	4.00	4.19	4.06	4.27	4.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	367/1647	4.60	4.18	4.12	4.15	4.60	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1668	5.00	4.60	4.67	4.83	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	3	2	4.40	499/1605	4.40	4.13	4.07	4.13	4.40	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	1199/1514	4.00	4.39	4.39	4.37	4.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1551	5.00	4.72	4.66	4.72	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	3	1	4.00	1066/1503	4.00	4.31	4.24	4.22	4.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	3	2	4.40	770/1506	4.40	4.40	4.26	4.24	4.40	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	1	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	587/1311	4.00	3.78	3.85	3.89	4.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	2	1	3.80	1003/1490	3.80	4.26	4.05	4.18	3.80	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	754/1502	4.40	4.54	4.26	4.46	4.40	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	378/1489	4.80	4.43	4.29	4.44	4.80	

Frequency Distribution

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