```
Course-Section: FREN 101  0101              University of Maryland                              Page  778
Title        ELEMENTARY FRENCH I            Baltimore County                                  JUN 13, 2006
Instructor:  APPADOO, YOGEND               Spring 2006                                        Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:      22
Questionnaires:  12                 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire
```

```
                                               Frequencies       Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
                Questions                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  9  4.75  292/1481  4.61  4.26  4.29  4.14  4.75
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals       0   0  0  0  0  3  9  4.75  228/1481  4.60  4.26  4.23  4.18  4.75
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals      0   0  0  1  0  2  9  4.58  423/1249  4.77  4.37  4.27  4.14  4.58
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals       0   0  0  0  1  3  8  4.58  354/1424  4.45  4.27  4.21  4.06  4.58
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned   0   0  0  0  0  5  7  4.58  252/1396  4.25  4.07  3.98  3.89  4.58
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0   0  0  0  0  3  9  4.75  135/1342  4.17  4.12  4.07  3.88  4.75
7. Was the grading system clearly explained               0   0  0  0  0  4  8  4.67  276/1459  4.41  4.19  4.16  4.17  4.67
8. How many times was class cancelled                     0   0  0  0  2 10  0  3.83 1429/1480  4.22  4.64  4.68  4.64  3.83
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 4   0  0  0  0  4  4  4.50  334/1450  4.20  4.10  4.09  3.97  4.50

                Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared           0   0  0  0  1  2  9  4.67  559/1409  4.58  4.46  4.42  4.36  4.67
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject      0   0  0  0  1  0 11  4.83  659/1407  4.86  4.77  4.69  4.57  4.83
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly   0   0  0  0  1  2  9  4.67  376/1399  4.55  4.30  4.26  4.23  4.67
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned        0   0  0  0  1  1 10  4.75  312/1400  4.52  4.35  4.27  4.19  4.75
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding  1   0  0  1  1  4  5  4.18  495/1179  4.05  3.94  3.96  3.85  4.18

                Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned   3   0  0  0  2  0  7  4.56  320/1262  4.16  4.18  4.05  3.77  4.56
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate   3   0  0  0  0  1  8  4.89  229/1259  4.77  4.40  4.29  4.06  4.89
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion  3   0  0  0  1  0  8  4.78  332/1256  4.40  4.34  4.30  4.08  4.78
4. Were special techniques successful                     3   2  0  0  0  1  6  4.86   83/ 788  4.38  4.03  4.00  3.80  4.86

                Laboratory
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material     9   1  0  0  0  1  1  4.50 ****/ 246  ****  4.26  4.20  3.93  ****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information  9   0  1  0  0  1  1  3.33  216/ 249  3.33  4.08  4.11  3.95  3.33
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities   9   1  0  0  0  1  1  4.50 ****/ 242  ****  4.45  4.40  4.33  ****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance              9   0  1  0  1  0  1  3.00  212/ 240  3.00  4.37  4.20  4.20  3.00
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified    9   1  0  0  0  1  1  4.50 ****/ 217  ****  4.42  4.04  4.02  ****

                Seminar
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme   9   1  0  0  1  1  0  3.50 ****/  68  ****  4.66  4.49  4.54  ****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention  9   1  0  1  0  1  0  3.00 ****/  69  ****  4.26  4.53  4.18  ****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned   9   2  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  63  ****  4.24  4.44  4.17  ****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned       9   1  0  1  0  1  0  3.00 ****/  69  ****  4.19  4.35  4.14  ****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear                   9   1  1  0  0  0  1  3.00 ****/  68  ****  3.98  3.92  3.80  ****

                Field Work
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned   10   0  1  0  0  1  0  2.50 ****/  59  ****  3.92  4.30  4.00  ****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria   10   0  1  0  0  0  1  3.00 ****/  51  ****  4.04  4.00  3.44  ****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation         10   0  0  0  1  0  1  4.00 ****/  36  ****  5.00  4.60  5.00  ****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations     10   1  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  41  ****  3.68  4.26  ****  ****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities   10   1  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  31  ****  3.50  4.42  ****  ****

                Self  Paced
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned  10   0  1  0  0  0  1  3.00 ****/  55  ****  3.90  4.55  4.48  ****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal      10   0  0  0  1  1  0  3.50 ****/  31  ****  4.28  4.75  4.42  ****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful        10   0  0  0  0  0  2  5.00 ****/  51  ****  4.42  4.65  4.63  ****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful         10   0  0  0  1  0  1  4.00 ****/  34  ****  4.50  4.83  4.67  ****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students       10   0  0  1  0  0  1  3.50 ****/  24  ****  4.50  4.82  4.58  ****
```

```
Course-Section: FREN 101  0101                    University of Maryland                          Page  778
Title          ELEMENTARY FRENCH I                 Baltimore County                               JUN 13, 2006
Instructor:    APPADOO, YOGEND                        Spring 2006                                 Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:    22
Questionnaires: 12                          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  7    Graduate     0      Major        0
 28-55     1         1.00-1.99   0         B    2                                                       
 56-83     1         2.00-2.99   2         C    2         General              1    Under-grad  12      Non-major    9
 84-150    1         3.00-3.49   1         D    0
 Grad.     0         3.50-4.00   2         F    0         Electives            1    #### - Means there are not enough
                                           P    0                                  responses to be significant
                                           I    0         Other                3
                                           ?    0
```

```
Course-Section: FREN 101  0201            University of Maryland                          Page  779
Title       ELEMENTARY FRENCH I           Baltimore County                               JUN 13, 2006
Instructor:   MBAYE, ABDOULAY             Spring 2006                                     Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:      26
Questionnaires: 15                   Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

                                      Frequencies      Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
            Questions               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 12  4.92  127/1481  4.61 4.26  4.29 4.14  4.92
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals   2  0  0  0  0  4  9  4.69  286/1481  4.60 4.26  4.23 4.18  4.69
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals  2  0  0  0  0  2 11  4.85  178/1249  4.77 4.37  4.27 4.14  4.85
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals   2  3  0  0  0  2  8  4.80  178/1424  4.45 4.27  4.21 4.06  4.80
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 3  1  0  0  0  3  8  4.73  151/1396  4.25 4.07  3.98 3.89  4.73
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 4  0  0  0  2  2  7  4.45  354/1342  4.17 4.12  4.07 3.88  4.45
7. Was the grading system clearly explained           2  0  0  1  1  4  7  4.31  732/1459  4.41 4.19  4.16 4.17  4.31
8. How many times was class cancelled                 2  0  0  0  0  3 10  4.77  871/1480  4.22 4.64  4.68 4.64  4.77
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 6  0  0  0  0  5  4  4.44  417/1450  4.20 4.10  4.09 3.97  4.44

            Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared       5  0  0  0  0  4  6  4.60  648/1409  4.58 4.46  4.42 4.36  4.60
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject  5  0  0  0  0  1  9  4.90  500/1407  4.86 4.77  4.69 4.57  4.90
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 5  0  0  0  0  4  6  4.60  459/1399  4.55 4.30  4.26 4.23  4.60
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned    5  0  0  0  1  2  7  4.60  492/1400  4.52 4.35  4.27 4.19  4.60
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 5  1  0  0  2  5  2  4.00  590/1179  4.05 3.94  3.96 3.85  4.00

            Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 9  0  0  0  1  2  3  4.33  507/1262  4.16 4.18  4.05 3.77  4.33
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 9  0  0  0  0  0  6  5.00    1/1259  4.77 4.40  4.29 4.06  5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 9  0  0  0  1  2  3  4.33  723/1256  4.40 4.34  4.30 4.08  4.33
4. Were special techniques successful                 9  0  0  0  1  3  2  4.17  335/ 788  4.38 4.03  4.00 3.80  4.17

            Laboratory
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material 14  0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/ 246  **** 4.26  4.20 3.93  ****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information 14  0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/ 249  3.33 4.08  4.11 3.95  ****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 14  0  0  0  1  0  0  3.00 ****/ 217  **** 4.42  4.04 4.02  ****

            Field Work
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 14  0  0  0  0  1  0  4.00 ****/  59  **** 3.92  4.30 4.00  ****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 14  0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  51  **** 4.04  4.00 3.44  ****

            Self  Paced
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 14  0  0  0  0  1  0  4.00 ****/  55  **** 3.90  4.55 4.48  ****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal   13  0  0  0  1  0  1  4.00 ****/  31  **** 4.28  4.75 4.42  ****

                              Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned        Cum. GPA        Expected Grades         Reasons              Type                Majors

00-27      2       0.00-0.99   0      A    9      Required for Majors   8     Graduate       0      Major        0
28-55      1       1.00-1.99   0      B    1
56-83      0       2.00-2.99   2      C    1      General               3     Under-grad    15      Non-major    3
84-150     2       3.00-3.49   2      D    0
Grad.      0       3.50-4.00   2      F    0      Electives             0     #### - Means there are not enough
                                      P    0                                 responses to be significant
                                      I    0      Other                 1
                                      ?    0
```

```
Course-Section: FREN 101  0301            University of Maryland                          Page  780
Title        ELEMENTARY FRENCH I          Baltimore County                               JUN 13, 2006
Instructor:  PROVENCHER, DEN              Spring 2006                                     Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:    24
Questionnaires:  18                  Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire
```

```
                                            Frequencies       Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
            Questions                   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  4 13  4.76  280/1481  4.61  4.26  4.29  4.14  4.76
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals   0   0  0  0  1  5 12  4.61  386/1481  4.60  4.26  4.23  4.18  4.61
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals  2   0  0  0  0  2 14  4.88  160/1249  4.77  4.37  4.27  4.14  4.88
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals   0   2  0  1  2  6  7  4.19  818/1424  4.45  4.27  4.21  4.06  4.19
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned  0  1  0  1  2  4 10  4.35  419/1396  4.25  4.07  3.98  3.89  4.35
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned  0  1  2  0  4  4  7  3.82  941/1342  4.17  4.12  4.07  3.88  3.82
7. Was the grading system clearly explained           0   0  0  0  0  4 14  4.78  182/1459  4.41  4.19  4.16  4.17  4.78
8. How many times was class cancelled                 1   0  0  0  0 12  5  4.29 1185/1480  4.22  4.64  4.68  4.64  4.29
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness  1  0  0  0  3  6  8  4.29  588/1450  4.20  4.10  4.09  3.97  4.29

            Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared       1   0  0  0  0  1 16  4.94  113/1409  4.58  4.46  4.42  4.36  4.94
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject  1   0  0  0  0  1 16  4.94  300/1407  4.86  4.77  4.69  4.57  4.94
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly  1  0  0  0  0  3 14  4.82  195/1399  4.55  4.30  4.26  4.23  4.82
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned    1   0  0  0  1  5 11  4.59  511/1400  4.52  4.35  4.27  4.19  4.59
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding  2  1  1  0  2  1 11  4.40  340/1179  4.05  3.94  3.96  3.85  4.40

            Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned  6  0  2  0  0  2  8  4.17  631/1262  4.16  4.18  4.05  3.77  4.17
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate  6  0  1  0  0  1 10  4.58  524/1259  4.77  4.40  4.29  4.06  4.58
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion  6  0  1  0  0  2  9  4.50  571/1256  4.40  4.34  4.30  4.08  4.50
4. Were special techniques successful                 6   2  0  1  0  2  7  4.50  176/ 788  4.38  4.03  4.00  3.80  4.50
```

```
                                        Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned          Cum. GPA          Expected Grades         Reasons                 Type                    Majors
--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
  00-27     5         0.00-0.99   0          A    9        Required for Majors  11     Graduate      0        Major        0
  28-55     1         1.00-1.99   0          B    5
  56-83     0         2.00-2.99   1          C    0        General               1     Under-grad   18        Non-major    5
  84-150    2         3.00-3.49   4          D    1
  Grad.     0         3.50-4.00   4          F    0        Electives             3     #### - Means there are not enough
                                             P    1                                    responses to be significant
                                             I    0        Other                 1
                                             ?    0
```

```
Course-Section: FREN 101  0401            University of Maryland                                    Page  781
Title       ELEMENTARY FRENCH I            Baltimore County                                         JUN 13, 2006
Instructor: APPADOO, YOGEND               Spring 2006                                               Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:    15
Questionnaires:  9                        Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire


                                      Frequencies          Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
            Questions                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  3  3  4.00 1069/1481  4.61  4.26  4.29  4.14  4.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals   0   0  0  0  0  6  3  4.33  736/1481   4.60  4.26  4.23  4.18  4.33
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals  0   0  0  0  0  2  7  4.78  228/1249   4.77  4.37  4.27  4.14  4.78
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals   0   0  0  0  1  5  3  4.22  773/1424   4.45  4.27  4.21  4.06  4.22
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0  0  0  2  3  3  1  3.33 1167/1396  4.25  4.07  3.98  3.89  3.33
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 0 0  0  4  4  1  3.67 1039/1342  4.17  4.12  4.07  3.88  3.67
7. Was the grading system clearly explained           0   0  0  1  1  5  2  3.89 1063/1459  4.41  4.19  4.16  4.17  3.89
8. How many times was class cancelled                 0   1  0  0  0  8  0  4.00 1349/1480  4.22  4.64  4.68  4.64  4.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 2 0 0  0  3  4  0  3.57 1199/1450  4.20  4.10  4.09  3.97  3.57

            Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared       1   0  0  0  1  5  2  4.13 1110/1409  4.58  4.46  4.42  4.36  4.13
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject  1   0  0  0  0  2  6  4.75  823/1407   4.86  4.77  4.69  4.57  4.75
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 1 0 0  0  1  5  2  4.13  947/1399   4.55  4.30  4.26  4.23  4.13
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned    1   0  0  1  0  4  3  4.13  969/1400   4.52  4.35  4.27  4.19  4.13
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 1 0 0  2  1  3  2  3.63  853/1179   4.05  3.94  3.96  3.85  3.63

            Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 4 0 0  1  1  2  1  3.60  958/1262   4.16  4.18  4.05  3.77  3.60
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 4 0 0  0  0  2  3  4.60  509/1259   4.77  4.40  4.29  4.06  4.60
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 4 0 0  0  1  3  1  4.00  901/1256   4.40  4.34  4.30  4.08  4.00
4. Were special techniques successful                 4   1  0  0  1  2  1  4.00  394/ 788   4.38  4.03  4.00  3.80  4.00


                                      Frequency Distribution

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

```
Course-Section: FREN 102  0101            University of Maryland                              Page  782
Title      ELEMENTARY FRENCH II                Baltimore County                            JUN 13, 2006
Instructor:  ZAIRI, MOHAMMED                     Spring 2006                               Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:    18
Questionnaires: 13                      Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

                                         Frequencies       Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
            Questions                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  4  8  4.67  395/1481  4.20  4.26  4.29  4.14  4.67
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    1   0  0  0  0  4  8  4.67  324/1481  4.04  4.26  4.23  4.18  4.67
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   1   0  0  0  1  2  9  4.67  334/1249  4.18  4.37  4.27  4.14  4.67
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    1   3  0  0  1  2  6  4.56  385/1424  4.02  4.27  4.21  4.06  4.56
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 1  1  0  1  1  3  6  4.27  484/1396  4.08  4.07  3.98  3.89  4.27
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 1 2 0 1 1  2  6  4.30  504/1342  3.97  4.12  4.07  3.88  4.30
7. Was the grading system clearly explained            1   0  0  0  2  2  8  4.50  460/1459  3.88  4.19  4.16  4.17  4.50
8. How many times was class cancelled                  1   0  0  0  0 10  2  4.17 1281/1480  4.32  4.64  4.68  4.64  4.17
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 2 0 0 0  2  4  5  4.27  609/1450  3.68  4.10  4.09  3.97  4.27

            Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        1   0  0  0  0  3  9  4.75  417/1409  4.27  4.46  4.42  4.36  4.75
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   1   0  0  0  0  2 10  4.83  659/1407  4.52  4.77  4.69  4.57  4.83
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 1  0  0  0  0  3  9  4.75  267/1399  4.09  4.30  4.26  4.23  4.75
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     1   0  0  0  0  3  9  4.75  312/1400  4.17  4.35  4.27  4.19  4.75
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 1 2 0 0  0  6  4  4.40  340/1179  3.50  3.94  3.96  3.85  4.40

            Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 3  0  0  0  2  0  8  4.60  295/1262  3.64  4.18  4.05  3.77  4.60
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 3  0  0  0  0  1  9  4.90  211/1259  4.35  4.40  4.29  4.06  4.90
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 4 0 0 1  3  0  5  4.00  901/1256  3.78  4.34  4.30  4.08  4.00
4. Were special techniques successful                  3   3  0  1  0  2  4  4.29  278/ 788  3.63  4.03  4.00  3.80  4.29

                              Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned        Cum. GPA         Expected Grades         Reasons              Type                Majors
--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
 00-27      2      0.00-0.99   0        A   5        Required for Majors  6     Graduate      0      Major       0
 28-55      2      1.00-1.99   0        B   6
 56-83      3      2.00-2.99   2        C   1        General              1     Under-grad   13      Non-major   0
 84-150     2      3.00-3.49   3        D   0
 Grad.      0      3.50-4.00   2        F   0        Electives            1     #### - Means there are not enough
                                        P   0                                  responses to be significant
                                        I   0        Other                6
                                        ?   0
```

```
                                             Frequencies          Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
            Questions                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   4   5  4.56   505/1481  4.20  4.26  4.29  4.14  4.56
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals   1   0   0   0   1   5   2  4.13   942/1481  4.04  4.26  4.23  4.18  4.13
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals  2   0   0   0   0   5   2  4.29   718/1249  4.18  4.37  4.27  4.14  4.29
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals   2   3   0   0   1   1   2  4.25   740/1424  4.02  4.27  4.21  4.06  4.25
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 1  0   0   1   1   2   4  4.13   623/1396  4.08  4.07  3.98  3.89  4.13
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 3  0   0   0   3   3  4.50   303/1342  3.97  4.12  4.07  3.88  4.50
7. Was the grading system clearly explained           1   0   0   0   3   3   2  3.88  1071/1459  3.88  4.19  4.16  4.17  3.88
8. How many times was class cancelled                 0   0   0   0   0   9   0  4.00  1349/1480  4.32  4.64  4.68  4.64  4.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 0 0  0   0   1   6   2  4.11   771/1450  3.68  4.10  4.09  3.97  4.11

                Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared       2   0   0   0   0   1   6  4.86   261/1409  4.27  4.46  4.42  4.36  4.86
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject  1   0   0   0   1   1   6  4.63  1008/1407  4.52  4.77  4.69  4.57  4.63
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 2  0   0   0   0   4   3  4.43   659/1399  4.09  4.30  4.26  4.23  4.43
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned    2   0   0   0   0   2   5  4.71   361/1400  4.17  4.35  4.27  4.19  4.71
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 2 1  0   2   2   0   2  3.33   972/1179  3.50  3.94  3.96  3.85  3.33

                Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 3  0   1   0   2   1   2  3.50   995/1262  3.64  4.18  4.05  3.77  3.50
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 4  0   0   0   1   2   2  4.20   821/1259  4.35  4.40  4.29  4.06  4.20
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 4 0  0   0   2   2   1  3.80  1025/1256  3.78  4.34  4.30  4.08  3.80
4. Were special techniques successful                 3   2   0   0   2   1   1  3.75   533/ 788  3.63  4.03  4.00  3.80  3.75
```

Frequency Distribution

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

```
Course-Section: FREN 102  0301              University of Maryland                        Page  784
Title      ELEMENTARY FRENCH II                 Baltimore County                         JUN 13, 2006
Instructor:  PROVENCHER, D                        Spring 2006                            Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:    24
Questionnaires:  20                     Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire
```

```
                                             Frequencies          Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
           Questions                    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  3  3  5  5  4  3.20 1426/1481  4.20  4.26  4.29  4.14  3.20
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals   0   0  4  5  3  5  3  2.90 1443/1481  4.04  4.26  4.23  4.18  2.90
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals  0   0  3  4  5  5  3  3.05 1188/1249  4.18  4.37  4.27  4.14  3.05
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals   0   6  3  2  4  0  5  3.14 1349/1424  4.02  4.27  4.21  4.06  3.14
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned  0   3  3  1  1  3  9  3.82  861/1396  4.08  4.07  3.98  3.89  3.82
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned  0   5  4  1  2  5  3  3.13 1245/1342  3.97  4.12  4.07  3.88  3.13
7. Was the grading system clearly explained           0   0  4  4  4  4  4  3.00 1380/1459  3.88  4.19  4.16  4.17  3.00
8. How many times was class cancelled                 0   0  0  0  0 15  5  4.25 1215/1480  4.32  4.64  4.68  4.64  4.25
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness  3   0  6  2  8  1  0  2.24 1440/1450  3.68  4.10  4.09  3.97  2.24

                   Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared       1   0  7  3  2  4  3  2.63 1392/1409  4.27  4.46  4.42  4.36  2.63
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject  1   0  2  1  5  4  7  3.68 1351/1407  4.52  4.77  4.69  4.57  3.68
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly  1   0  7  3  3  4  2  2.53 1379/1399  4.09  4.30  4.26  4.23  2.53
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned    1   0  7  3  2  3  4  2.68 1353/1400  4.17  4.35  4.27  4.19  2.68
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding  1   8  7  0  2  0  2  2.09 1155/1179  3.50  3.94  3.96  3.85  2.09

                   Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned  9   0  6  0  1  1  3  2.55 1219/1262  3.64  4.18  4.05  3.77  2.55
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate  9   0  3  0  3  0  5  3.36 1132/1259  4.35  4.40  4.29  4.06  3.36
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion  9   0  4  1  1  1  4  3.00 1167/1256  3.78  4.34  4.30  4.08  3.00
4. Were special techniques successful                 8   2  4  2  2  1  1  2.30  775/ 788  3.63  4.03  4.00  3.80  2.30
```

```
                                    Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned         Cum. GPA          Expected Grades        Reasons              Type               Majors
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
 00-27      1      0.00-0.99    0        A    6      Required for Majors  11    Graduate     0      Major      0
 28-55      2      1.00-1.99    0        B    9
 56-83      5      2.00-2.99    6        C    3      General               3    Under-grad  20      Non-major  5
 84-150     4      3.00-3.49    3        D    0
 Grad.      0      3.50-4.00    4        F    0      Electives             0    #### - Means there are not enough
                                        P    0                                 responses to be significant
                                        I    0      Other                 6
                                        ?    1
```

```
Course-Section: FREN 102  0401              University of Maryland                         Page  785
Title       ELEMENTARY FRENCH II             Baltimore County                              JUN 13, 2006
Instructor: ROSENTHAL, ALAN                  Spring 2006                                   Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:     30
Questionnaires: 23                   Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

                                            Frequencies      Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
            Questions                 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  8  12  4.39  688/1481  4.20  4.26  4.29  4.14  4.39
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals     0  0  0  1  1  7  14  4.48  560/1481  4.04  4.26  4.23  4.18  4.48
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals    1  0  0  0  2  2  18  4.73  270/1249  4.18  4.37  4.27  4.14  4.73
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals     0  6  0  2  2  5   8  4.12  896/1424  4.02  4.27  4.21  4.06  4.12
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0  4  0  2  3  5   9  4.11  643/1396  4.08  4.07  3.98  3.89  4.11
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0  9  2  0  2  3  7  3.93  858/1342  3.97  4.12  4.07  3.88  3.93
7. Was the grading system clearly explained             0  0  1  0  5  6  11  4.13  881/1459  3.88  4.19  4.16  4.17  4.13
8. How many times was class cancelled                   0  0  0  0  0  3  20  4.87  756/1480  4.32  4.64  4.68  4.64  4.87
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 4  0  0  0  3 11  5  4.11  781/1450  3.68  4.10  4.09  3.97  4.11

            Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared         0  0  0  0  0  4  19  4.83  304/1409  4.27  4.46  4.42  4.36  4.83
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject    0  0  0  0  0  1  22  4.96  250/1407  4.52  4.77  4.69  4.57  4.96
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0  0  0  0  1  6  16  4.65  390/1399  4.09  4.30  4.26  4.23  4.65
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned      0  0  0  1  1  6  15  4.52  571/1400  4.17  4.35  4.27  4.19  4.52
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 0  1  1  0  4  6  11  4.18  495/1179  3.50  3.94  3.96  3.85  4.18

            Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 11  0  0  1  4  2  5  3.92  788/1262  3.64  4.18  4.05  3.77  3.92
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 11  0  0  0  0  1 11  4.92  190/1259  4.35  4.40  4.29  4.06  4.92
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 11  0  1  0  1  2  8  4.33  723/1256  3.78  4.34  4.30  4.08  4.33
4. Were special techniques successful                   11  2  0  1  1  3  5  4.20  318/ 788  3.63  4.03  4.00  3.80  4.20

            Self  Paced
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 22  0  1  0  0  0  0  1.00 ****/  55  ****  3.90  4.55  4.48  ****

                                    Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned        Cum. GPA        Expected Grades        Reasons                Type                    Majors
------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
00-27     3      0.00-0.99    0      A    7      Required for Majors  18      Graduate      0      Major        0
28-55     1      1.00-1.99    0      B    6
56-83     4      2.00-2.99    3      C   10      General               1      Under-grad   23      Non-major    3
84-150    7      3.00-3.49   10      D    0
Grad.     0      3.50-4.00    5      F    0      Electives             0      #### - Means there are not enough
                                     P    0                                  responses to be significant
                                     I    0      Other                 3
                                     ?    0
```

```
Course-Section: FREN 103  0101            University of Maryland                      Page  786
Title        INT REV ELEM FRENCH          Baltimore County                           JUN 13, 2006
Instructor:  EL OMARI, SAMIR              Spring 2006                                 Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:     21
Questionnaires:  12                   Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire


                                        Frequencies       Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
             Questions               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  7  4  4.25  844/1481  4.25  4.26  4.29  4.14  4.25
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    0   0  0  0  0  4  8  4.67  324/1481  4.67  4.26  4.23  4.18  4.67
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   0   0  0  0  1  4  7  4.50  498/1249  4.50  4.37  4.27  4.14  4.50
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    0   0  0  0  2  4  6  4.33  645/1424  4.33  4.27  4.21  4.06  4.33
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0  0  0  0  0  5  7  4.58  252/1396  4.58  4.07  3.98  3.89  4.58
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 0  0  1  0  4  7  4.42  394/1342  4.42  4.12  4.07  3.88  4.42
7. Was the grading system clearly explained            0   0  0  1  1  2  8  4.42  595/1459  4.42  4.19  4.16  4.17  4.42
8. How many times was class cancelled                  0   0  0  0  0  1 11  4.92  631/1480  4.92  4.64  4.68  4.64  4.92
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 3 0  0  0  1  7  1  4.00  836/1450  4.00  4.10  4.09  3.97  4.00


             Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        1   0  0  0  1  5  5  4.36  935/1409  4.36  4.46  4.42  4.36  4.36
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   1   0  0  0  1  2  8  4.64  997/1407  4.64  4.77  4.69  4.57  4.64
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 1  0  0  0  0  4  7  4.64  417/1399  4.64  4.30  4.26  4.23  4.64
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     1   0  0  0  0  6  5  4.45  647/1400  4.45  4.35  4.27  4.19  4.45
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 2 2  2  1  0  2  3  3.38  956/1179  3.38  3.94  3.96  3.85  3.38


             Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 5  0  1  0  0  1  5  4.29  550/1262  4.29  4.18  4.05  3.77  4.29
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 5  0  0  1  1  0  5  4.29  764/1259  4.29  4.40  4.29  4.06  4.29
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 5 0  0  0  0  0  7  5.00    1/1256  5.00  4.34  4.30  4.08  5.00
4. Were special techniques successful                  5   1  1  0  0  1  4  4.17  335/ 788  4.17  4.03  4.00  3.80  4.17


                              Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned         Cum. GPA        Expected Grades          Reasons                Type                  Majors
-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
  00-27     4      0.00-0.99   0        A    7       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   1        C    0       General              1      Under-grad   12       Non-major    4
  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
                                        P    0                                  responses to be significant
                                        I    0       Other                3
                                        ?    0
```

```
Course-Section: FREN 201  0101              University of Maryland                              Page  787
Title           INTERMEDIATE FRENCH I        Baltimore County                                   JUN 13, 2006
Instructor:     TADE, SOPHIA                 Spring 2006                                         Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:     25
Questionnaires: 13                    Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire


                                             Frequencies        Instructor    Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
               Questions                 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  1  2  8  4.23  870/1481  4.21  4.26  4.29 4.40  4.23
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals     0  0  0  0  3  3  7  4.31  769/1481  4.44  4.26  4.23 4.29  4.31
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals    0  0  1  0  0  0 12  4.69  298/1249  4.64  4.37  4.27 4.36  4.69
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals     1  0  0  2  2  3  5  3.92 1074/1424  4.34  4.27  4.21 4.28  3.92
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 1  0  0  3  0  2  7  4.08  655/1396  4.28  4.07  3.98 3.94  4.08
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 0 1 1  2  2  7  4.00  755/1342  4.16  4.12  4.07 4.05  4.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained             1  0  1  0  1  2  8  4.33  695/1459  4.40  4.19  4.16 4.17  4.33
8. How many times was class cancelled                   1  0  0  0  0  0 12  5.00    1/1480  4.72  4.64  4.68 4.68  5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 2 0 0 0  3  4  4  4.09  786/1450  4.19  4.10  4.09 4.15  4.09

               Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared         0  0  0  2  0  2  9  4.38  913/1409  4.50  4.46  4.42 4.47  4.38
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject    0  0  0  0  0  2 11  4.85  636/1407  4.80  4.77  4.69 4.78  4.85
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0  0  0  0  1  4  8  4.54  534/1399  4.40  4.30  4.26 4.29  4.54
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned      1  0  1  0  1  1  9  4.42  692/1400  4.53  4.35  4.27 4.34  4.42
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 0 1 1 2  3  1  5  3.58  866/1179  4.00  3.94  3.96 4.05  3.58

               Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 4  0  0  0  0  5  4  4.44  400/1262  4.44  4.18  4.05 4.11  4.44
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 5  0  0  0  0  0  8  5.00    1/1259  4.84  4.40  4.29 4.34  5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 5 0 0 0  0  3  5  4.63  496/1256  4.56  4.34  4.30 4.28  4.63
4. Were special techniques successful                   4  5  1  0  0  1  2  3.75  533/ 788  4.23  4.03  4.00 3.98  3.75

               Laboratory
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material  11  0  1  0  0  0  1  3.00 ****/ 246  ****  4.26  4.20 4.51  ****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information 12 0 0 0 0  0  1  5.00 ****/ 249  ****  4.08  4.11 4.32  ****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 12 0 0 0 0  0  1  5.00 ****/ 242  ****  4.45  4.40 4.63  ****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance           12  0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/ 240  ****  4.37  4.20 4.58  ****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 12  0  0  0  1  0  0  3.00 ****/ 217  ****  4.42  4.04 4.28  ****

               Field Work
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 12  0  1  0  0  0  0  1.00 ****/  59  ****  3.92  4.30 4.67  ****


                                     Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned        Cum. GPA        Expected Grades          Reasons                 Type                    Majors
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
00-27     0           0.00-0.99   0    A   5      Required for Majors  10     Graduate     0      Major       0
28-55     1           1.00-1.99   0    B   4
56-83     5           2.00-2.99   1    C   1      General               0     Under-grad  13      Non-major   5
84-150    3           3.00-3.49   2    D   0
Grad.     0           3.50-4.00   3    F   0      Electives             0     #### - Means there are not enough
                                       P   0                                 responses to be significant
                                       I   0      Other                 2
                                       ?   0
```

```
Course-Section: FREN 201  0201          University of Maryland                                Page  788
Title           INTERMEDIATE FRENCH I    Baltimore County                                     JUN 13, 2006
Instructor:     TADE, SOPHIA             Spring 2006                                          Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:     16
Questionnaires: 11                      Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire
```

```
                                              Frequencies        Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
         Questions                      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  3  6  4.36   718/1481  4.21  4.26  4.29  4.40  4.36
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    0   0  0  0  0  1 10  4.91   115/1481  4.44  4.26  4.23  4.29  4.91
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   0   0  0  0  0  0 11  5.00     1/1249  4.64  4.37  4.27  4.36  5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    0   0  0  0  0  0 11  5.00     1/1424  4.34  4.27  4.21  4.28  5.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0  0  0  1  0  3  7  4.45   338/1396  4.28  4.07  3.98  3.94  4.45
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 0 0 1 0  2  8  4.55   277/1342  4.16  4.12  4.07  4.05  4.55
7. Was the grading system clearly explained            0   0  0  1  0  1  9  4.64   310/1459  4.40  4.19  4.16  4.17  4.64
8. How many times was class cancelled                  0   0  0  0  0  0 11  5.00     1/1480  4.72  4.64  4.68  4.68  5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 5 0 0 0 0  2  4  4.67   217/1450  4.19  4.10  4.09  4.15  4.67

             Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        0   0  0  0  0  2  9  4.82   319/1409  4.50  4.46  4.42  4.47  4.82
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   0   0  0  0  0  0 11  5.00     1/1407  4.80  4.77  4.69  4.78  5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0  0  0  0  1  0 10  4.82   203/1399  4.40  4.30  4.26  4.29  4.82
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     0   0  0  1  0  1  9  4.64   456/1400  4.53  4.35  4.27  4.34  4.64
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 0 1 0 1 0  2  7  4.50   259/1179  4.00  3.94  3.96  4.05  4.50

             Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 4  0  0  0  0  1  6  4.86   146/1262  4.44  4.18  4.05  4.11  4.86
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 4  0  0  0  0  0  7  5.00     1/1259  4.84  4.40  4.29  4.34  5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 4 0 0 0 0  0  7  5.00     1/1256  4.56  4.34  4.30  4.28  5.00
4. Were special techniques successful                  4   1  0  0  0  0  6  5.00     1/ 788  4.23  4.03  4.00  3.98  5.00

             Laboratory
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material  10  0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/ 246  ****  4.26  4.20  4.51  ****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information 10 0 0 0 0 0  1  5.00 ****/ 249  ****  4.08  4.11  4.32  ****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 10 0 0 0 0 0  1  5.00 ****/ 242  ****  4.45  4.40  4.63  ****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance           10  0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/ 240  ****  4.37  4.20  4.58  ****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 10  0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/ 217  ****  4.42  4.04  4.28  ****

             Seminar
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 10 0 0 0 0 0  1  5.00 ****/  69  ****  4.26  4.53  4.83  ****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned    10  0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  69  ****  4.19  4.35  4.72  ****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear                10  0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  68  ****  3.98  3.92  3.55  ****

             Field Work
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 10  0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  51  ****  4.04  4.00  4.07  ****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation       10  0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  36  ****  5.00  4.60  4.64  ****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations   10  0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  41  ****  3.68  4.26  4.69  ****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities 10  0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  31  ****  3.50  4.42  4.80  ****

             Self  Paced
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 10 0 0 0 0 0  1  5.00 ****/  55  ****  3.90  4.55  4.44  ****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal    10  0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  31  ****  4.28  4.75  4.50  ****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful      10  0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  51  ****  4.42  4.65  4.66  ****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful       10  0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  34  ****  4.50  4.83  4.43  ****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students     10  0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  24  ****  4.50  4.82  5.00  ****
```

```
Course-Section: FREN 201  0201                    University of Maryland                          Page  788
Title        INTERMEDIATE FRENCH I                  Baltimore County                            JUN 13, 2006
Instructor:   TADE, SOPHIA                            Spring 2006                                Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:   16
Questionnaires: 11                          Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire


                                              Frequency Distribution


Credits Earned            Cum. GPA          Expected Grades            Reasons                  Type                    Majors
---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
00-27      0           0.00-0.99    0        A    8       Required for Majors   6     Graduate      0      Major         0
28-55      0           1.00-1.99    0        B    1
56-83      3           2.00-2.99    2        C    0       General               2     Under-grad   11      Non-major     1
84-150     3           3.00-3.49    5        D    0
Grad.      0           3.50-4.00    0        F    0       Electives             0     #### - Means there are not enough
                                             P    0                                    responses to be significant
                                             I    0       Other                 0
                                             ?    0
```

```
Course-Section: FREN 201  0301                    University of Maryland                                      Page  789
Title           INTERMEDIATE FRENCH I             Baltimore County                                           JUN 13, 2006
Instructor:     MBAYE, ABDOULAY                    Spring 2006                                                Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:     28
Questionnaires: 18                         Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire
```

```
                                                        Frequencies      Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
               Questions                         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  3  4  9  4.06 1037/1481  4.21  4.26  4.29 4.40  4.06
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    0   0  0  1  3  4 10  4.28  801/1481  4.44  4.26  4.23 4.29  4.28
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   0   0  0  0  3  1 14  4.61  393/1249  4.64  4.37  4.27 4.36  4.61
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    0   3  0  1  2  4  8  4.27  728/1424  4.34  4.27  4.21 4.28  4.27
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0  5  0  1  2  6  4  4.00  707/1396  4.28  4.07  3.98 3.94  4.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 4 0 1 5 3 5  3.86  920/1342  4.16  4.12  4.07 4.05  3.86
7. Was the grading system clearly explained            0   0  0  0  7  2  9  4.11  899/1459  4.40  4.19  4.16 4.17  4.11
8. How many times was class cancelled                  0   0  0  0  0 13  5  4.28 1200/1480  4.72  4.64  4.68 4.68  4.28
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 2 1 0 1 2 4 8  4.27  620/1450  4.19  4.10  4.09 4.15  4.27

               Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        1   0  0  0  2  5 10  4.47  800/1409  4.50  4.46  4.42 4.47  4.47
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   1   0  0  0  0  4 13  4.76  804/1407  4.80  4.77  4.69 4.78  4.76
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 1  0  0  1  3  5  8  4.18  901/1399  4.40  4.30  4.26 4.29  4.18
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     1   0  0  0  1  6 10  4.53  571/1400  4.53  4.35  4.27 4.34  4.53
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 3 12 0 1 1 0 1  3.33 ****/1179  4.00  3.94  3.96 4.05  ****

               Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 7  0  0  0  4  1  6  4.18  617/1262  4.44  4.18  4.05 4.11  4.18
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 7  0  0  0  0  3  8  4.73  391/1259  4.84  4.40  4.29 4.34  4.73
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 8 0 0 0 1 4 5  4.40  680/1256  4.56  4.34  4.30 4.28  4.40
4. Were special techniques successful                  8   6  1  0  1  2  0  3.00 ****/ 788  4.23  4.03  4.00 3.98  ****

               Laboratory
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material  17  0  0  0  0  1  0  4.00 ****/ 246  ****  4.26  4.20 4.51  ****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information 17 0 0 0 1 0 0  3.00 ****/ 249  ****  4.08  4.11 4.32  ****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 17 0 0 0 1 0 0  3.00 ****/ 242  ****  4.45  4.40 4.63  ****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance           17  0  0  0  1  0  0  3.00 ****/ 240  ****  4.37  4.20 4.58  ****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 17  0  0  0  1  0  0  3.00 ****/ 217  ****  4.42  4.04 4.28  ****

               Field Work
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 17  0  0  0  1  0  0  3.00 ****/  59  ****  3.92  4.30 4.67  ****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 17  0  0  0  1  0  0  3.00 ****/  51  ****  4.04  4.00 4.07  ****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation       17  0  0  0  1  0  0  3.00 ****/  36  ****  5.00  4.60 4.64  ****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations   17  0  0  0  1  0  0  3.00 ****/  41  ****  3.68  4.26 4.69  ****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities 17  0  0  0  1  0  0  3.00 ****/  31  ****  3.50  4.42 4.80  ****

               Self  Paced
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 17 0 0 0 1 0 0  3.00 ****/  55  ****  3.90  4.55 4.44  ****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal    17  0  0  0  1  0  0  3.00 ****/  31  ****  4.28  4.75 4.50  ****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful      17  0  0  0  1  0  0  3.00 ****/  51  ****  4.42  4.65 4.66  ****
```

Frequency Distribution

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

```
Course-Section: FREN 201  0401                 University of Maryland                          Page  790
Title        INTERMEDIATE FRENCH I             Baltimore County                                JUN 13, 2006
Instructor:    EL OMARI, SAMIR                 Spring 2006                                      Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:    26
Questionnaires: 18                       Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire


                                              Frequencies        Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
            Questions                   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  7  7  4.17  947/1481  4.21  4.26  4.29  4.40  4.17
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    1  0  0  0  2  6  9  4.41  646/1481  4.44  4.26  4.23  4.29  4.41
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   1  0  0  0  0 10  7  4.41  611/1249  4.64  4.37  4.27  4.36  4.41
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    0  4  0  1  4  2  7  4.07  923/1424  4.34  4.27  4.21  4.28  4.07
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0  1  0  0  2  5 10  4.47  321/1396  4.28  4.07  3.98  3.94  4.47
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 1  1  0  0  3  8  5  4.13  672/1342  4.16  4.12  4.07  4.05  4.13
7. Was the grading system clearly explained            1  0  0  1  4  2 10  4.24  792/1459  4.40  4.19  4.16  4.17  4.24
8. How many times was class cancelled                  1  0  0  0  0  0 17  5.00    1/1480  4.72  4.64  4.68  4.68  5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 4  0  0  1  1  9  3  4.00  836/1450  4.19  4.10  4.09  4.15  4.00


            Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        1  0  0  0  0  6 11  4.65  588/1409  4.50  4.46  4.42  4.47  4.65
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   1  0  0  0  0  3 14  4.82  682/1407  4.80  4.77  4.69  4.78  4.82
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 1  0  0  1  1  8  7  4.24  846/1399  4.40  4.30  4.26  4.29  4.24
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     1  0  0  0  2  6  9  4.41  692/1400  4.53  4.35  4.27  4.34  4.41
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 1  2  0  3  2  5  5  3.80  760/1179  4.00  3.94  3.96  4.05  3.80


            Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 10  0  0  0  1  3  4  4.38  467/1262  4.44  4.18  4.05  4.11  4.38
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 11  0  0  0  0  2  5  4.71  402/1259  4.84  4.40  4.29  4.34  4.71
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 11  0  1  0  0  1  5  4.29  754/1256  4.56  4.34  4.30  4.28  4.29
4. Were special techniques successful                  11  1  0  0  3  0  3  4.00  394/ 788  4.23  4.03  4.00  3.98  4.00

            Laboratory
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material  17  0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/ 246  ****  4.26  4.20  4.51  ****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information 17  0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/ 249  ****  4.08  4.11  4.32  ****


                                    Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned        Cum. GPA        Expected Grades        Reasons                Type                    Majors
------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
00-27    2    0.00-0.99   0        A   8        Required for Majors  12    Graduate     0      Major        0
28-55    4    1.00-1.99   0        B   6
56-83    3    2.00-2.99   2        C   3        General               1    Under-grad  18      Non-major    3
84-150   2    3.00-3.49   3        D   0
Grad.    0    3.50-4.00   6        F   0        Electives             1    #### - Means there are not enough
                                   P   0                                   responses to be significant
                                   I   0        Other                 4
                                   ?   0
```

```
Course-Section: FREN 201  0501              University of Maryland                              Page  791
Title          INTERMEDIATE FRENCH I        Baltimore County                                   JUN 13, 2006
Instructor:    DIALLO, M                     Spring 2006                                        Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:    18
Questionnaires: 15                      Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire


                                          Frequencies       Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
            Questions                 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  2  3  8  4.21  896/1481  4.21  4.26  4.29  4.40  4.21
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals     1   0  0  0  2  6  6  4.29  790/1481  4.44  4.26  4.23  4.29  4.29
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals    1   0  0  0  2  3  9  4.50  498/1249  4.64  4.37  4.27  4.36  4.50
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals     1   1  0  0  1  5  7  4.46  485/1424  4.34  4.27  4.21  4.28  4.46
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 2   3  0  1  1  1  7  4.40  380/1396  4.28  4.07  3.98  3.94  4.40
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 2 2  0  1  1  3  6  4.27  527/1342  4.16  4.12  4.07  4.05  4.27
7. Was the grading system clearly explained             2   0  0  1  0  1 11  4.69  242/1459  4.40  4.19  4.16  4.17  4.69
8. How many times was class cancelled                   2   0  0  0  0  9  4  4.31 1178/1480  4.72  4.64  4.68  4.68  4.31
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 1 0  0  0  4  7  3  3.93  945/1450  4.19  4.10  4.09  4.15  3.93


            Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared         3   0  0  0  2  6  4  4.17 1086/1409  4.50  4.46  4.42  4.47  4.17
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject    3   0  0  0  1  3  8  4.58 1046/1407  4.80  4.77  4.69  4.78  4.58
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 3   0  0  0  1  7  4  4.25  828/1399  4.40  4.30  4.26  4.29  4.25
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned      3   0  0  0  0  4  8  4.67  421/1400  4.53  4.35  4.27  4.34  4.67
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 3  2  0  2  1  1  6  4.10  557/1179  4.00  3.94  3.96  4.05  4.10


            Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 6   0  0  0  1  4  4  4.33  507/1262  4.44  4.18  4.05  4.11  4.33
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 6   0  0  0  0  2  7  4.78  336/1259  4.84  4.40  4.29  4.34  4.78
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 7  0  0  0  0  4  4  4.50  571/1256  4.56  4.34  4.30  4.28  4.50
4. Were special techniques successful                   6   3  0  0  2  1  3  4.17  335/ 788  4.23  4.03  4.00  3.98  4.17


            Laboratory
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material  13   0  0  0  0  0  2  5.00 ****/ 246  ****  4.26  4.20  4.51  ****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information 13 0 0 0  0  0  2  5.00 ****/ 249  ****  4.08  4.11  4.32  ****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 13 1 0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/ 242  ****  4.45  4.40  4.63  ****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance           13   1  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/ 240  ****  4.37  4.20  4.58  ****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 13   1  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/ 217  ****  4.42  4.04  4.28  ****


            Seminar
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 13  1  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  68  ****  4.66  4.49  5.00  ****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 13 1 0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  69  ****  4.26  4.53  4.83  ****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 13  1  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  63  ****  4.24  4.44  4.00  ****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned    13   1  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  69  ****  4.19  4.35  4.72  ****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear                13   1  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  68  ****  3.98  3.92  3.55  ****


            Field Work
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 13   0  1  0  0  0  1  3.00 ****/  59  ****  3.92  4.30  4.67  ****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 13   0  0  0  0  0  2  5.00 ****/  51  ****  4.04  4.00  4.07  ****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation       13   0  0  0  0  1  1  4.50 ****/  36  ****  5.00  4.60  4.64  ****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations   13   0  0  0  0  1  1  4.50 ****/  41  ****  3.68  4.26  4.69  ****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities 13   1  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  31  ****  3.50  4.42  4.80  ****


            Self  Paced
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 13  0  0  0  0  0  2  5.00 ****/  55  ****  3.90  4.55  4.44  ****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal    13   1  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  31  ****  4.28  4.75  4.50  ****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful      13   0  0  0  0  1  1  4.50 ****/  51  ****  4.42  4.65  4.66  ****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful       13   1  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  34  ****  4.50  4.83  4.43  ****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students     13   1  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  24  ****  4.50  4.82  5.00  ****
```

```
Course-Section: FREN 201  0501                    University of Maryland                          Page  791
Title           INTERMEDIATE FRENCH I              Baltimore County                              JUN 13, 2006
Instructor:     DIALLO, M                          Spring 2006                                   Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:      18
Questionnaires:  15                        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  11       Graduate     0        Major      0
28-55     2          1.00-1.99   1         B    4
56-83     2          2.00-2.99   4         C    3        General               1       Under-grad  15        Non-major  4
84-150    6          3.00-3.49   2         D    0
Grad.     0          3.50-4.00   2         F    0        Electives             0       #### - Means there are not enough
                                           P    0                                      responses to be significant
                                           I    0        Other                 2
                                           ?    0
```

```
Course-Section: FREN 202  0101            University of Maryland                          Page  792
Title        INTERMEDIATE FRENCH II        Baltimore County                               JUN 13, 2006
Instructor:  REZVANI, MARJAN               Spring 2006                                    Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:     17
Questionnaires:  7                  Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire


                                        Frequencies        Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
          Questions                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  0  7  5.00    1/1481   5.00  4.26  4.29  4.40  5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals     0   0   0  0  0  1  6  4.86  149/1481   4.86  4.26  4.23  4.29  4.86
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals    0   0   0  0  0  0  7  5.00    1/1249   5.00  4.37  4.27  4.36  5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals     0   0   0  0  0  2  5  4.71  248/1424   4.71  4.27  4.21  4.28  4.71
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0   0   1  0  0  0  6  4.43  363/1396   4.43  4.07  3.98  3.94  4.43
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 1  0  0  0  1  1  4  4.50  303/1342   4.50  4.12  4.07  4.05  4.50
7. Was the grading system clearly explained             1   0   0  1  1  0  4  4.17  854/1459   4.17  4.19  4.16  4.17  4.17
8. How many times was class cancelled                   1   0   0  0  0  0  6  5.00    1/1480   5.00  4.64  4.68  4.68  5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 2  0  0  0  0  4  1  4.20  692/1450   4.20  4.10  4.09  4.15  4.20


               Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared         1   0   0  0  0  2  4  4.67  559/1409   4.67  4.46  4.42  4.47  4.67
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject    1   0   0  0  0  1  5  4.83  659/1407   4.83  4.77  4.69  4.78  4.83
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 1   0   0  1  0  0  5  4.50  567/1399   4.50  4.30  4.26  4.29  4.50
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned      1   0   0  0  0  1  5  4.83  218/1400   4.83  4.35  4.27  4.34  4.83
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 1  0  1  0  2  1  2  3.50  894/1179   3.50  3.94  3.96  4.05  3.50


               Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 5   0   0  0  0  0  2  5.00    1/1262   5.00  4.18  4.05  4.11  5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 5   0   0  0  0  0  2  5.00    1/1259   5.00  4.40  4.29  4.34  5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 5  0  0  0  0  0  2  5.00    1/1256   5.00  4.34  4.30  4.28  5.00
4. Were special techniques successful                   5   0   0  0  0  0  2  5.00    1/ 788   5.00  4.03  4.00  3.98  5.00


                                      Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned        Cum. GPA        Expected Grades        Reasons              Type                Majors
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
  00-27      0      0.00-0.99   0        A    4      Required for Majors   3    Graduate     0      Major      0
  28-55      1      1.00-1.99   0        B    1
  56-83      1      2.00-2.99   1        C    0      General               2    Under-grad   7      Non-major  2
  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
                                         P    0                                responses to be significant
                                         I    0      Other                 3
                                         ?    2
```

```
Course-Section: FREN 301  0101                University of Maryland                              Page  793
Title      ADVANCED FRENCH I                   Baltimore County                                  JUN 13, 2006
Instructor:  DE VERNEIL, MAR                   Spring 2006                                        Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:    15
Questionnaires: 14                      Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire


                                              Frequencies        Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
            Questions                   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    3   0  0  0  0  3  8  4.73   328/1481  4.73   4.26  4.29  4.29  4.73
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals     3   0  0  0  1  2  8  4.64   361/1481  4.64   4.26  4.23  4.23  4.64
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals    3   0  0  0  0  1 10  4.91   142/1249  4.91   4.37  4.27  4.28  4.91
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals     3   1  0  0  0  4  6  4.60   334/1424  4.60   4.27  4.21  4.27  4.60
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 3   1  0  1  1  5  3  4.00   707/1396  4.00   4.07  3.98  4.00  4.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 3 0  0  0  2  3  6  4.36   444/1342  4.36   4.12  4.07  4.12  4.36
7. Was the grading system clearly explained             3   0  0  0  1  3  7  4.55   413/1459  4.55   4.19  4.16  4.17  4.55
8. How many times was class cancelled                   3   1  0  0  0  0 10  5.00     1/1480  5.00   4.64  4.68  4.65  5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 4 0  0  0  0  4  6  4.60   259/1450  4.60   4.10  4.09  4.10  4.60

            Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared         3   0  0  0  0  3  8  4.73   466/1409  4.73   4.46  4.42  4.43  4.73
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject    3   0  0  0  0  0 11  5.00     1/1407  5.00   4.77  4.69  4.67  5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 3   0  0  0  1  2  8  4.64   417/1399  4.64   4.30  4.26  4.27  4.64
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned      3   0  0  0  0  3  8  4.73   349/1400  4.73   4.35  4.27  4.28  4.73
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 3  1  0  0  4  2  4  4.00   590/1179  4.00   3.94  3.96  4.02  4.00

            Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 8   0  0  1  0  1  4  4.33   507/1262  4.33   4.18  4.05  4.14  4.33
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 8   0  0  0  1  1  4  4.50   588/1259  4.50   4.40  4.29  4.34  4.50
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 8  0  0  0  1  1  4  4.50   571/1256  4.50   4.34  4.30  4.34  4.50
4. Were special techniques successful                   7   2  0  1  0  0  4  4.40   218/ 788  4.40   4.03  4.00  4.07  4.40


                                    Frequency Distribution

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

```
Course-Section: FREN 301H 0101                    University of Maryland                          Page  794
Title       ADV FRENCH I - HONORS                    Baltimore County                             JUN 13, 2006
Instructor:  DE VERNEIL, MAR                            Spring 2006                                Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:      1
Questionnaires:  1                          Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire


                                              Frequencies       Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
               Questions                 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  0  1  5.00    1/1481   5.00  4.26  4.29  4.29  5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals     0   0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00    1/1481   5.00  4.26  4.23  4.23  5.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals    0   0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00    1/1249   5.00  4.37  4.27  4.28  5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals     0   0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00    1/1424   5.00  4.27  4.21  4.27  5.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0   0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00    1/1396   5.00  4.07  3.98  4.00  5.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 0  0  0  1  0  0  3.00 1269/1342   3.00  4.12  4.07  4.12  3.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained             0   0  0  0  0  1  0  4.00  961/1459   4.00  4.19  4.16  4.17  4.00
8. How many times was class cancelled                   0   0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00    1/1480   5.00  4.64  4.68  4.65  5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 0 0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00    1/1450   5.00  4.10  4.09  4.10  5.00


                   Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared         0   0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00    1/1409   5.00  4.46  4.42  4.43  5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject    0   0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00    1/1407   5.00  4.77  4.69  4.67  5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0   0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00    1/1399   5.00  4.30  4.26  4.27  5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned      0   0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00    1/1400   5.00  4.35  4.27  4.28  5.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 0  0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00    1/1179   5.00  3.94  3.96  4.02  5.00


                              Frequency Distribution

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

```
Course-Section: FREN 302  0101            University of Maryland                        Page  795
Title      ADVANCED FRENCH II              Baltimore County                            JUN 13, 2006
Instructor:   REZVANI, MARJAN                Spring 2006                                Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:     7
Questionnaires:  7                    Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire
```

```
                                              Frequencies        Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
            Questions                 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  4  4.29  805/1481  4.29  4.26  4.29  4.29  4.29
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals   0  0  0  0  1  4  2  4.14  925/1481  4.14  4.26  4.23  4.23  4.14
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals  0  0  0  0  0  4  3  4.43  598/1249  4.43  4.37  4.27  4.28  4.43
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals   0  0  0  0  1  3  3  4.29  706/1424  4.29  4.27  4.21  4.27  4.29
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 1 4  0  0  0  0  2  5.00  1/1396   5.00  4.07  3.98  4.00  5.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 1 0 0 0 0 3 3 4.50 303/1342 4.50 4.12 4.07 4.12 4.50
7. Was the grading system clearly explained           1  0  0  0  1  1  4  4.50  460/1459  4.50  4.19  4.16  4.17  4.50
8. How many times was class cancelled                 1  0  0  0  0  0  6  5.00   1/1480   5.00  4.64  4.68  4.65  5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 0 0 0 0 0 3 4 4.57 281/1450 4.57 4.10 4.09 4.10 4.57

            Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared       0  0  0  0  0  4  3  4.43  865/1409  4.43  4.46  4.42  4.43  4.43
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject  0  0  0  0  0  0  7  5.00   1/1407   5.00  4.77  4.69  4.67  5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0 0 0 0 0 2 5 4.71 311/1399 4.71 4.30 4.26 4.27 4.71
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned    0  0  0  0  1  0  6  4.71  361/1400  4.71  4.35  4.27  4.28  4.71
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 0 0 0 0 0 1 6 4.86 99/1179 4.86 3.94 3.96 4.02 4.86

            Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 3 0 0 0 0 1 3 4.75 205/1262 4.75 4.18 4.05 4.14 4.75
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 3 0 0 0 0 0 4 5.00 1/1259 5.00 4.40 4.29 4.34 5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 3 0 0 0 0 2 2 4.50 571/1256 4.50 4.34 4.30 4.34 4.50
4. Were special techniques successful                 3  0  0  0  0  0  4  5.00  1/ 788   5.00  4.03  4.00  4.07  5.00

                                Frequency Distribution

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

```
Course-Section: FREN 319  0101              University of Maryland                              Page  796
Title          FRENCH TRANSLATION           Baltimore County                                  JUN 13, 2006
Instructor:    FATIH, ZAKARIA               Spring 2006                                        Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:    20
Questionnaires: 19                 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire


                                     Frequencies        Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
           Questions                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  2  16  4.89   173/1481   4.89  4.26  4.29  4.29  4.89
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    1   0  0  0  1  5  12  4.61   386/1481   4.61  4.26  4.23  4.23  4.61
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   1   0  0  0  1  2  15  4.78   228/1249   4.78  4.37  4.27  4.28  4.78
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    1   9  0  0  0  0   9  5.00     1/1424   5.00  4.27  4.21  4.27  5.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 2 10  0  0  1  0   6  4.71   156/1396   4.71  4.07  3.98  4.00  4.71
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 2 8  0  0  0  2   7  4.78   125/1342   4.78  4.12  4.07  4.12  4.78
7. Was the grading system clearly explained            1   0  0  0  1  2  15  4.78   182/1459   4.78  4.19  4.16  4.17  4.78
8. How many times was class cancelled                  2   0  0  0  0 11   6  4.35  1146/1480   4.35  4.64  4.68  4.65  4.35
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 6 0 0 0 1 4  8  4.54   311/1450   4.54  4.10  4.09  4.10  4.54


             Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        2   0  0  0  1  2  14  4.76   400/1409   4.76  4.46  4.42  4.43  4.76
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   2   0  0  0  0  0  17  5.00     1/1407   5.00  4.77  4.69  4.67  5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 3  0  0  0  0  3  13  4.81   203/1399   4.81  4.30  4.26  4.27  4.81
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     3   0  0  0  0  1  15  4.94   102/1400   4.94  4.35  4.27  4.28  4.94
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 5 8 1  0  0  0   5  4.33   384/1179   4.33  3.94  3.96  4.02  4.33


             Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 6  0  0  0  0  0  13  5.00     1/1262   5.00  4.18  4.05  4.14  5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 6  0  0  0  0  0  13  5.00     1/1259   5.00  4.40  4.29  4.34  5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 6 0 0 0  0  1  12  4.92   173/1256   4.92  4.34  4.30  4.34  4.92
4. Were special techniques successful                  6   2  0  0  0  1  10  4.91    78/ 788   4.91  4.03  4.00  4.07  4.91


                                   Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned          Cum. GPA         Expected Grades          Reasons              Type              Majors
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
  00-27      1       0.00-0.99    1       A   11      Required for Majors   1     Graduate     0      Major        0
  28-55      1       1.00-1.99    0       B    5
  56-83      3       2.00-2.99    1       C    0      General               5     Under-grad  19      Non-major    7
  84-150     7       3.00-3.49    2       D    0
  Grad.      0       3.50-4.00    8       F    0      Electives             0     #### - Means there are not enough
                                         P    0                                  responses to be significant
                                         I    0      Other                 9
                                         ?    0
```

```
Course-Section: FREN 320  0101               University of Maryland                        Page  797
Title       INTERCONNECTIONS:TRADE           Baltimore County                              JUN 13, 2006
Instructor:    DE VERNEIL, MAR               Spring 2006                                    Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:    14
Questionnaires: 12                    Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire


                                          Frequencies        Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
             Questions                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  4  7  4.50  549/1481  4.50  4.26  4.29  4.29  4.50
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals     0   0  0  1  3  4  4  3.92 1106/1481  3.92  4.26  4.23  4.23  3.92
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals    0  11  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/1249  ****  4.37  4.27  4.28  ****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals     0   0  0  0  1  6  5  4.33  645/1424  4.33  4.27  4.21  4.27  4.33
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0   0  0  1  1  3  7  4.33  435/1396  4.33  4.07  3.98  4.00  4.33
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 0  0  1  1  8  2  3.92  871/1342  3.92  4.12  4.07  4.12  3.92
7. Was the grading system clearly explained             0   0  0  0  2  6  4  4.17  854/1459  4.17  4.19  4.16  4.17  4.17
8. How many times was class cancelled                   0   0  0  0  0  0 12  5.00    1/1480  5.00  4.64  4.68  4.65  5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 1 0  0  0  0  5  6  4.55  304/1450  4.55  4.10  4.09  4.10  4.55


             Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared         0   0  0  0  0  6  6  4.50  762/1409  4.50  4.46  4.42  4.43  4.50
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject    0   0  0  0  0  1 11  4.92  450/1407  4.92  4.77  4.69  4.67  4.92
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 1   0  0  0  1  6  4  4.27  810/1399  4.27  4.30  4.26  4.27  4.27
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned      0   0  0  1  0  1 10  4.67  421/1400  4.67  4.35  4.27  4.28  4.67
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 0  0  0  0  1  3  8  4.58  218/1179  4.58  3.94  3.96  4.02  4.58


             Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 4   0  1  0  2  0  5  4.00  708/1262  4.00  4.18  4.05  4.14  4.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 4   0  0  0  1  1  6  4.63  489/1259  4.63  4.40  4.29  4.34  4.63
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 4  0  0  0  1  2  5  4.50  571/1256  4.50  4.34  4.30  4.34  4.50
4. Were special techniques successful                   4   2  0  0  1  3  2  4.17  335/ 788  4.17  4.03  4.00  4.07  4.17


                                    Frequency Distribution

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

```
Course-Section: FREN 440  0101            University of Maryland                              Page  798
Title        STUDY IN FRENCH CULTUR         Baltimore County                                 JUN 13, 2006
Instructor:  FATIH, ZAKARIA                 Spring 2006                                       Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:      8
Questionnaires:  6                   Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire


                                           Frequencies        Instructor   Course Dept UMBC Level  Sect
            Questions                   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  3  4.17  947/1481  4.17  4.26 4.29 4.45  4.17
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals      0   0  0  0  0  3  3  4.50  517/1481  4.50  4.26 4.23 4.32  4.50
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals     0   4  0  0  0  1  1  4.50  498/1249  4.50  4.37 4.27 4.44  4.50
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals      0   0  0  0  0  3  3  4.50  437/1424  4.50  4.27 4.21 4.35  4.50
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned  0   0  0  0  0  1  5  4.83  102/1396  4.83  4.07 3.98 4.09  4.83
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0  0  0  0  1  1  4  4.50  303/1342  4.50  4.12 4.07 4.21  4.50
7. Was the grading system clearly explained              0   0  0  0  0  2  4  4.67  276/1459  4.67  4.19 4.16 4.25  4.67
8. How many times was class cancelled                    0   0  0  0  0  2  4  4.67  951/1480  4.67  4.64 4.68 4.74  4.67
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 2  0  0  0  0  3  1  4.25  630/1450  4.25  4.10 4.09 4.28  4.25


            Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared          0   0  0  0  0  2  4  4.67  559/1409  4.67  4.46 4.42 4.51  4.67
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject     0   0  0  0  0  1  5  4.83  659/1407  4.83  4.77 4.69 4.79  4.83
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly  0   0  0  0  1  2  3  4.33  753/1399  4.33  4.30 4.26 4.36  4.33
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned       0   0  0  0  1  1  4  4.50  591/1400  4.50  4.35 4.27 4.38  4.50
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 0   0  0  0  1  2  3  4.33  384/1179  4.33  3.94 3.96 4.07  4.33


            Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned  1   0  0  0  0  2  3  4.60  295/1262  4.60  4.18 4.05 4.33  4.60
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate  1   0  0  0  0  2  3  4.60  509/1259  4.60  4.40 4.29 4.57  4.60
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 1   0  0  0  0  3  2  4.40  680/1256  4.40  4.34 4.30 4.60  4.40
4. Were special techniques successful                    1   1  0  0  0  3  1  4.25  291/ 788  4.25  4.03 4.00 4.26  4.25


            Laboratory
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material    5   0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/ 246  ****  4.26 4.20 4.45  ****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information 5   0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/ 249  ****  4.08 4.11 3.87  ****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities  5  0  1  0  0  0  0  1.00 ****/ 242  ****  4.45 4.40 4.45  ****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance             5   0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/ 240  ****  4.37 4.20 4.43  ****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified   5   0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/ 217  ****  4.42 4.04 3.86  ****


            Seminar
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme  5   0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  68  ****  4.66 4.49 4.68  ****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 5   0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  69  ****  4.26 4.53 4.64  ****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned  5   0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  63  ****  4.24 4.44 4.49  ****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned      5   0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  69  ****  4.19 4.35 4.53  ****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear                  5   0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  68  ****  3.98 3.92 4.10  ****


            Field Work
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned   5   0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  59  ****  3.92 4.30 4.93  ****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria   5   0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  51  ****  4.04 4.00 4.56  ****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation         5   0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  36  ****  5.00 4.60 4.91  ****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations     5   0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  41  ****  3.68 4.26 4.72  ****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities   5   0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  31  ****  3.50 4.42 4.83  ****


            Self  Paced
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned  5   0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  55  ****  3.90 4.55 4.86  ****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal      5   0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  31  ****  4.28 4.75 5.00  ****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful        5   0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  51  ****  4.42 4.65 4.71  ****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful         5   0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  34  ****  4.50 4.83 5.00  ****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students       5   0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  24  ****  4.50 4.82 5.00  ****
```

```
Course-Section: FREN 440  0101              University of Maryland                        Page  798
Title       STUDY IN FRENCH CULTUR           Baltimore County                             JUN 13, 2006
Instructor:  FATIH, ZAKARIA                    Spring 2006                                 Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:      8
Questionnaires:  6                  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  0     Graduate     0      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   6      Non-major   2
84-150    2         3.00-3.49    1         D    0
Grad.     0         3.50-4.00    1         F    0      Electives            0     #### - Means there are not enough
                                          P    0                                 responses to be significant
                                          I    0      Other                4
                                          ?    1
```

```
Course-Section: FREN 640  0101                University of Maryland                              Page  799
Title        STUDY IN FREN CULT & S            Baltimore County                                  JUN 13, 2006
Instructor:  FATIH, ZAKARIA                    Spring 2006                                        Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:    8
Questionnaires:  5                      Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire


                                         Frequencies          Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
            Questions                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   461/1481  4.60  4.26  4.29  4.28  4.60
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    0   0   0   0   0   2   3  4.60   399/1481  4.60  4.26  4.23  4.11  4.60
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   0   3   0   0   0   0   2  5.00     1/1249  5.00  4.37  4.27  4.24  5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    0   0   0   0   0   1   4  4.80   178/1424  4.80  4.27  4.21  4.16  4.80
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0   0   0   0   0   1   4  4.80   111/1396  4.80  4.07  3.98  4.00  4.80
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 0  0   0   0   2   3  4.60   238/1342  4.60  4.12  4.07  4.18  4.60
7. Was the grading system clearly explained            0   0   0   0   0   2   3  4.60   344/1459  4.60  4.19  4.16  4.01  4.60
8. How many times was class cancelled                  0   0   0   0   0   0   5  5.00     1/1480  5.00  4.64  4.68  4.74  5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 1 0  0   0   0   2   2  4.50   334/1450  4.50  4.10  4.09  3.96  4.50


            Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        0   0   0   0   0   1   4  4.80   334/1409  4.80  4.46  4.42  4.36  4.80
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   0   0   0   0   0   0   5  5.00     1/1407  5.00  4.77  4.69  4.73  5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0  0   0   0   0   2   3  4.60   459/1399  4.60  4.30  4.26  4.16  4.60
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     0   0   0   0   0   0   5  5.00     1/1400  5.00  4.35  4.27  4.17  5.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 0 0  0   0   0   0   5  5.00     1/1179  5.00  3.94  3.96  3.81  5.00


            Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 0  0   0   0   0   2   3  4.60   295/1262  4.60  4.18  4.05  4.07  4.60
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 0  0   0   0   0   1   4  4.80   304/1259  4.80  4.40  4.29  4.30  4.80
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 0 0  0   0   0   1   4  4.80   296/1256  4.80  4.34  4.30  4.33  4.80
4. Were special techniques successful                  0   4   0   0   0   0   1  5.00   ****/ 788  ****  4.03  4.00  3.97  ****


                                    Frequency Distribution

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