| | | | 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	3	9	4.54	603/1649	4.30	4.34	4.28	4.11	4.54
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	0	4	8	4.46	614/1648	3.98	4.31	4.23	4.16	4.46
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	0	2	10	4.62	453/1375	4.31	4.42	4.27	4.10	4.62
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	1	3	7	4.55	451/1595	4.04	4.29	4.20	4.03	4.55
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	1	1	1	1	8	4.17	703/1533	3.90	4.16	4.04	3.87	4.17
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	1	0	0	1	2	8	4.64	286/1512	3.99	4.19	4.10	3.86	4.64
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	2	2	9	4.54	469/1623	3.70	4.08	4.16	4.08	4.54
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	597/1646	4.71	4.59	4.69	4.67	4.92
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	0	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	313/1621	4.12	4.14	4.06	3.96	4.57
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	273/1568	4.33	4.39	4.43	4.39	4.89
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	640/1572	4.66	4.79	4.70	4.64	4.89
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	0	0	1	2	6	4.56	600/1564	4.11	4.28	4.28	4.20	4.56
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	227/1559	4.37	4.43	4.29	4.20	4.89
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	0	0	0	1	1	7	4.67	208/1352	3.60	3.97	3.98	3.86	4.67
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	3	6	4.67	326/1384	4.23	4.28	4.08	3.86	4.67
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	0	1	2	6	4.56	578/1382	4.31	4.57	4.29	4.03	4.56
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	0	1	2	6	4.56	616/1368	4.17	4.42	4.30	4.01	4.56
4. Were special techniques successful	4	1	1	0	2	1	4	3.88	546/ 948	3.86	4.10	3.95	3.75	3.88
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 221	****	4.38	4.16	4.05	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 243	****	4.69	4.12	4.08	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 212	****	5.00	4.40	4.43	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 209	****	4.35	4.38	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	11	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 555	2.75	2.56	4.29	4.14	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 88	****	4.39	4.54	4.31	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 85	****	4.20	4.47	4.30	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 81	****	4.23	4.43	4.39	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 92	****	4.32	4.35	4.01	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	10	0	1	0	0	1	1	3.33	****/ 288	****	2.95	3.68	3.54	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 52	****	5.00	4.06	3.72	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 48	****	5.00	4.09	3.65	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 39	****	4.67	4.47	4.36	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 39	****	4.67	4.38	4.37	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	10	0	1	0	1	0	1	3.00	****/ 312	****	2.48	3.68	3.51	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 53	****	5.00	4.30	4.17	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	11	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.16	4.06	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	11	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 41	****	****	4.43	4.27	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	11	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 24	****	****	4.42	4.24	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	11	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 110	****	4.13	3.99	3.83	****

```
Title          ELEMENTARY FRENCH I                Baltimore County                          FEB 11, 2009
Instructor:    BAZGAN, NICOLET                      Fall   2008                             Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:    20
Questionnaires: 13                       Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire
```

                                          Frequency Distribution

```
Credits Earned         Cum. GPA        Expected Grades              Reasons                Type                    Majors
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
00-27    0        0.00-0.99   0        A   6        Required for Majors   4      Graduate    0        Major       0
28-55    1        1.00-1.99   0        B   0
56-83    2        2.00-2.99   0        C   3        General               2      Under-grad  13       Non-major   13
84-150   0        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                 3
                                       ?   0
```

```
Course-Section: FREN 101  0201           University of Maryland                                Page  860
Title        ELEMENTARY FRENCH I         Baltimore County                                      FEB 11, 2009
Instructor:  BADAGBO, YAWO               Fall  2008                                             Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:      30
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   0   0   0   1   6   4   3  3.64 1443/1649  4.30  4.34  4.28  4.11  3.64
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    0   0   2   4   4   2   2  2.86 1609/1648  3.98  4.31  4.23  4.16  2.86
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   1   0   1   2   3   3   4  3.54 1196/1375  4.31  4.42  4.27  4.10  3.54
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    1   1   2   3   1   4   2  3.08 1529/1595  4.04  4.29  4.20  4.03  3.08
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 1  2   2   2   3   2   2  3.00 1441/1533  3.90  4.16  4.04  3.87  3.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 1 2  2   3   4   0   2  2.73 1483/1512  3.99  4.19  4.10  3.86  2.73
7. Was the grading system clearly explained            1   0   4   2   2   3   2  2.77 1577/1623  3.70  4.08  4.16  4.08  2.77
8. How many times was class cancelled                  1   0   0   0   0   6   7  4.54 1166/1646  4.71  4.59  4.69  4.67  4.54
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 3 0  1   2   4   3   1  3.09 1489/1621  4.12  4.14  4.06  3.96  3.09

                Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        2   0   2   3   4   1   2  2.83 1543/1568  4.33  4.39  4.43  4.39  2.83
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   0   0   0   1   3   5   5  4.00 1463/1572  4.66  4.79  4.70  4.64  4.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0  0   0   4   5   3   2  3.21 1469/1564  4.11  4.28  4.28  4.20  3.21
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     1   0   0   2   4   5   2  3.54 1362/1559  4.37  4.43  4.29  4.20  3.54
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 3 0  6   0   3   2   0  2.09 1334/1352  3.60  3.97  3.98  3.86  2.09

                Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 5  0   2   0   3   2   2  3.22 1202/1384  4.23  4.28  4.08  3.86  3.22
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 5  0   2   0   3   2   2  3.22 1284/1382  4.31  4.57  4.29  4.03  3.22
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 5 0  1   1   4   1   2  3.22 1260/1368  4.17  4.42  4.30  4.01  3.22
4. Were special techniques successful                  5   3   0   2   2   2   0  3.00  844/ 948  3.86  4.10  3.95  3.75  3.00

                Laboratory
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material  13  0   0   0   1   0   0  3.00 ****/ 221  ****  4.38  4.16  4.05  ****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information 13 0 0  0   0   1   0  4.00 ****/ 243  ****  4.69  4.12  4.08  ****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 13 0 0  0   1   0   0  3.00 ****/ 212  ****  5.00  4.40  4.43  ****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance           13  0   0   0   1   0   0  3.00 ****/ 209  ****  ****  4.35  4.38  ****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified  10  0   0   1   3   0   0  2.75  506/ 555  2.75  2.56  4.29  4.14  2.75

                Seminar
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 13  0   0   0   1   0   0  3.00 ****/  88  ****  4.39  4.54  4.31  ****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 13 0 0  0   1   0   0  3.00 ****/  85  ****  4.20  4.47  4.30  ****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 13  0   0   0   1   0   0  3.00 ****/  81  ****  4.23  4.43  4.39  ****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned    13  0   0   1   0   0   0  2.00 ****/  92  ****  4.32  4.35  4.01  ****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear                10  1   1   1   1   0   0  2.00 ****/ 288  ****  2.95  3.68  3.54  ****

                Field Work
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 13  0   0   0   1   0   0  3.00 ****/  52  ****  5.00  4.06  3.72  ****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria  13  0   0   0   1   0   0  3.00 ****/  48  ****  5.00  4.09  3.65  ****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation       13  0   0   1   0   0   0  2.00 ****/  39  ****  4.67  4.47  4.36  ****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations   13  0   0   0   1   0   0  3.00 ****/  39  ****  4.67  4.38  4.37  ****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities 11  0   2   0   1   0   0  1.67 ****/ 312  ****  2.48  3.68  3.51  ****

                Self  Paced
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 13  0   0   0   1   0   0  3.00 ****/  53  ****  5.00  4.30  4.17  ****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal    13  0   0   0   1   0   0  3.00 ****/  30  ****  ****  4.16  4.06  ****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful      13  0   0   0   1   0   0  3.00 ****/  41  ****  ****  4.43  4.27  ****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful       13  0   0   0   1   0   0  3.00 ****/  24  ****  ****  4.42  4.24  ****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students     13  0   0   0   1   0   0  3.00 ****/ 110  ****  4.13  3.99  3.83  ****
```

```
Course-Section: FREN 101  0201          University of Maryland                      Page  860
Title        ELEMENTARY FRENCH I            Baltimore County                      FEB 11, 2009
Instructor:  BADAGBO, YAWO                    Fall   2008                         Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:     30
Questionnaires: 14                  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  10   Graduate     0        Major       1
  28-55    2        1.00-1.99   0        B   5
  56-83    3        2.00-2.99   1        C   0        General              1    Under-grad  14        Non-major  13
  84-150   0        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 101  0301            University of Maryland                                      Page  861
Title       ELEMENTARY FRENCH I            Baltimore County                                          FEB 11, 2009
Instructor:    DE VERNEIL, MAR             Fall   2008                                               Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:     23
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  4  8  4.67  433/1649  4.30  4.34  4.28  4.11  4.67
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals     0  0  0  0  0  5  7  4.58  464/1648  3.98  4.31  4.23  4.16  4.58
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals    0  0  0  0  0  3  9  4.75  296/1375  4.31  4.42  4.27  4.10  4.75
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals     0  4  0  0  0  3  5  4.63  362/1595  4.04  4.29  4.20  4.03  4.63
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0  3  0  0  3  3  3  4.00  815/1533  3.90  4.16  4.04  3.87  4.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 4 0 0 2 1 5  4.38  553/1512  3.99  4.19  4.10  3.86  4.38
7. Was the grading system clearly explained             0  0  0  2  4  3  3  3.58 1355/1623  3.70  4.08  4.16  4.08  3.58
8. How many times was class cancelled                   0  0  0  0  0  0 12  5.00    1/1646  4.71  4.59  4.69  4.67  5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 2 0 0 0 1 1 8  4.70  207/1621  4.12  4.14  4.06  3.96  4.70


                Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared         1  0  0  0  0  1 10  4.91  245/1568  4.33  4.39  4.43  4.39  4.91
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject    1  0  0  0  0  1 10  4.91  591/1572  4.66  4.79  4.70  4.64  4.91
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 1  0  0  0  2  2  7  4.45  715/1564  4.11  4.28  4.28  4.20  4.45
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned      1  0  0  0  0  3  8  4.73  434/1559  4.37  4.43  4.29  4.20  4.73
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 1 2 1 1 1 0 6  4.00  690/1352  3.60  3.97  3.98  3.86  4.00


                Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 7  0  0  0  0  1  4  4.80  201/1384  4.23  4.28  4.08  3.86  4.80
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 7  0  0  0  0  0  5  5.00    1/1382  4.31  4.57  4.29  4.03  5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 8 0 0 0 0 0 4  5.00    1/1368  4.17  4.42  4.30  4.01  5.00
4. Were special techniques successful                   7  1  0  0  1  0  3  4.50  203/ 948  3.86  4.10  3.95  3.75  4.50

                Seminar
5. Were criteria for grading made clear                11  0  1  0  0  0  0  1.00 ****/ 288  ****  2.95  3.68  3.54  ****


                Field Work
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities 10  0  0  1  0  1  0  3.00 ****/ 312  ****  2.48  3.68  3.51  ****

                                  Frequency Distribution


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

```
Course-Section: FREN 101  0401                University of Maryland                                Page  862
Title        ELEMENTARY FRENCH I              Baltimore County                                     FEB 11, 2009
Instructor:  BADAGBO, YAWO                    Fall   2008                                           Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:      27
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   1   0  0  0  3  6 10  4.37  830/1649  4.30  4.34  4.28 4.11  4.37
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    0   0  1  1  2  9  7  4.00 1124/1648  3.98  4.31  4.23 4.16  4.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   0   0  1  1  1  4 13  4.35  714/1375  4.31  4.42  4.27 4.10  4.35
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    0   0  0  4  2  6  8  3.90 1202/1595  4.04  4.29  4.20 4.03  3.90
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0  1  1  1  0  4 13  4.42  454/1533  3.90  4.16  4.04 3.87  4.42
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 2 0 0 4 6  8  4.22  723/1512  3.99  4.19  4.10 3.86  4.22
7. Was the grading system clearly explained            0   0  1  2  3  6  8  3.90 1180/1623  3.70  4.08  4.16 4.08  3.90
8. How many times was class cancelled                  0   0  0  0  0 12  8  4.40 1287/1646  4.71  4.59  4.69 4.67  4.40
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 3 0 0 0 4 7  6  4.12  847/1621  4.12  4.14  4.06 3.96  4.12


          Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        1   0  0  0  0  6 13  4.68  604/1568  4.33  4.39  4.43 4.39  4.68
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   1   0  0  0  1  1 17  4.84  740/1572  4.66  4.79  4.70 4.64  4.84
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 1  0  0  2  1  7  9  4.21  981/1564  4.11  4.28  4.28 4.20  4.21
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     1   0  0  2  2  3 12  4.32  921/1559  4.37  4.43  4.29 4.20  4.32
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 1 2 2 0 3 9  3  3.65  981/1352  3.60  3.97  3.98 3.86  3.65


          Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 4  0  0  1  3  3  9  4.25  673/1384  4.23  4.28  4.08 3.86  4.25
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 3  0  0  1  1  4 11  4.47  646/1382  4.31  4.57  4.29 4.03  4.47
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 3 0 1 1 1 10  4  3.88 1039/1368  4.17  4.42  4.30 4.01  3.88
4. Were special techniques successful                  3   2  1  0  2  6  6  4.07  417/ 948  3.86  4.10  3.95 3.75  4.07


          Laboratory
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material  15  4  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/ 221  ****  4.38  4.16 4.05  ****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information 16 0 2 0 0 2 0  2.50 ****/ 243  ****  4.69  4.12 4.08  ****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 16 2 0 0 0 1  1  4.50 ****/ 212  ****  5.00  4.40 4.43  ****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance           16  2  0  0  0  0  2  5.00 ****/ 209  ****  ****  4.35 4.38  ****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 16  2  0  0  0  1  1  4.50 ****/ 555  2.75  2.56  4.29 4.14  ****


          Seminar
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 16 2 0 0 0 0  2  5.00 ****/  88  ****  4.39  4.54 4.31  ****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 17 2 0 0 0 0  1  5.00 ****/  85  ****  4.20  4.47 4.30  ****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 17 2 0 0 0 0  1  5.00 ****/  81  ****  4.23  4.43 4.39  ****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned    17  1  0  0  0  0  2  5.00 ****/  92  ****  4.32  4.35 4.01  ****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear                17  1  0  0  0  0  2  5.00 ****/ 288  ****  2.95  3.68 3.54  ****


          Field Work
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 18  0  0  0  0  1  1  4.50 ****/  52  ****  5.00  4.06 3.72  ****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 18  0  0  0  0  2  0  4.00 ****/  48  ****  5.00  4.09 3.65  ****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation       17  1  0  0  0  0  2  5.00 ****/  39  ****  4.67  4.47 4.36  ****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations   18  1  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  39  ****  4.67  4.38 4.37  ****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities 18  1  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/ 312  ****  2.48  3.68 3.51  ****


          Self  Paced
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 17 0 0 0 0 1  2  4.67 ****/  53  ****  5.00  4.30 4.17  ****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal    17  0  0  0  0  0  3  5.00 ****/  30  ****  ****  4.16 4.06  ****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful      17  0  0  0  0  1  2  4.67 ****/  41  ****  ****  4.43 4.27  ****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful       17  1  0  0  0  0  2  5.00 ****/  24  ****  ****  4.42 4.24  ****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students     17  1  0  0  0  1  1  4.50 ****/ 110  ****  4.13  3.99 3.83  ****
```

                                              Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned   Cum. GPA   Expected Grades   Reasons   Type   Majors
----
00-27   0   0.00-0.99   0   A   11   Required for Majors 12   Graduate   0   Major   0
28-55   2   1.00-1.99   0   B   2
56-83   3   2.00-2.99   0   C   0   General   1   Under-grad   20   Non-major 20
84-150   1   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   0
                                               ?   0

```
Course-Section: FREN 102  0101            University of Maryland                             Page  863
Title        ELEMENTARY FRENCH II          Baltimore County                             FEB 11, 2009
Instructor:    FATIH, ZAKARIA              Fall  2008                                    Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:     24
Questionnaires: 17                    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   0   6   9  4.29   922/1649  4.46 4.34 4.28 4.11 4.29
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    0   0   0   0   3   2  12  4.53   533/1648  4.47 4.31 4.23 4.16 4.53
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   0   0   0   2   1   4  10  4.29   771/1375  4.42 4.42 4.27 4.10 4.29
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    0   5   2   1   1   3   5  3.67  1335/1595  4.14 4.29 4.20 4.03 3.67
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 1   1   0   2   0   5   8  4.27   614/1533  3.77 4.16 4.04 3.87 4.27
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 1  2  1  1  0  3   9  4.29   651/1512  4.07 4.19 4.10 3.86 4.29
7. Was the grading system clearly explained            0   0   1   2   1   7   6  3.88  1192/1623  4.16 4.08 4.16 4.08 3.88
8. How many times was class cancelled                  0   0   0   0   0   7  10  4.59  1121/1646  4.57 4.59 4.69 4.67 4.59
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 5  2  0  0  2  3   5  4.30   632/1621  4.41 4.14 4.06 3.96 4.30


             Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        0   0   0   1   1   6   9  4.35  1031/1568  4.50 4.39 4.43 4.39 4.35
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   0   0   0   0   1   3  13  4.71  1022/1572  4.85 4.79 4.70 4.64 4.71
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0  0  0  1  0  5  11  4.53   630/1564  4.63 4.28 4.28 4.20 4.53
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     0   0   1   0   1   4  11  4.41   818/1559  4.57 4.43 4.29 4.20 4.41
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 1  9  0  0  0  4   3  4.43   379/1352  4.07 3.97 3.98 3.86 4.43


             Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 8  0  1  0  1  3   4  4.00   795/1384  4.31 4.28 4.08 3.86 4.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 8  0  0  1  1  2   5  4.22   851/1382  4.41 4.57 4.29 4.03 4.22
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 8  0  1  1  2  2   3  3.56  1162/1368  4.23 4.42 4.30 4.01 3.56
4. Were special techniques successful                  8   3   1   0   1   2   2  3.67   645/ 948  4.03 4.10 3.95 3.75 3.67


             Laboratory
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material  16   0   0   0   0   0   1  5.00  ****/ 221  4.00 4.38 4.16 4.05 ****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information 16 0 0 0 0 0  1  5.00  ****/ 243  5.00 4.69 4.12 4.08 ****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 16 0 0 0 0 0  1  5.00  ****/ 212  5.00 5.00 4.40 4.43 ****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance           16   0   0   0   0   0   1  5.00  ****/ 209  **** **** 4.35 4.38 ****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 10   0   0   4   1   1   1  2.86   503/ 555  2.86 2.56 4.29 4.14 2.86


             Seminar
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 16  0  0  0  0  1   0  4.00  ****/  88  **** 4.39 4.54 4.31 ****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 16 0 0 0 0 1  0  4.00  ****/  85  3.50 4.20 4.47 4.30 ****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 16  0  0  1  0  0   0  2.00  ****/  81  **** 4.23 4.43 4.39 ****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned    16   0   0   0   1   0   0  3.00  ****/  92  3.50 4.32 4.35 4.01 ****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear                12   1   1   1   1   1   0  2.50  ****/ 288  3.75 2.95 3.68 3.54 ****


             Field Work
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 16  0  0  0  0  0   1  5.00  ****/  52  **** 5.00 4.06 3.72 ****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 16   0   0   0   0   0   1  5.00  ****/  48  **** 5.00 4.09 3.65 ****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation       16   0   0   0   0   1   0  4.00  ****/  39  **** 4.67 4.47 4.36 ****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations   16   0   0   0   0   0   1  5.00  ****/  39  **** 4.67 4.38 4.37 ****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities 12   1   1   0   0   3   0  3.25  ****/ 312  **** 2.48 3.68 3.51 ****


             Self  Paced
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 16  0  0  0  0  1   0  4.00  ****/  53  **** 5.00 4.30 4.17 ****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal    16   0   0   0   0   1   0  4.00  ****/  30  **** **** 4.16 4.06 ****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful      16   0   0   0   0   1   0  4.00  ****/  41  **** **** 4.43 4.27 ****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful       16   0   0   0   0   1   0  4.00  ****/  24  **** **** 4.42 4.24 ****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students     15   1   0   0   0   1   0  4.00  ****/ 110  **** 4.13 3.99 3.83 ****
```

```
Course-Section: FREN 102  0101              University of Maryland                    Page  863
Title         ELEMENTARY FRENCH II           Baltimore County                        FEB 11, 2009
Instructor:   FATIH, ZAKARIA                 Fall   2008                              Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:    24
Questionnaires: 17                  Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire


                                    Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned          Cum. GPA         Expected Grades          Reasons              Type                  Majors
-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
  00-27    1         0.00-0.99    0      A    6      Required for Majors  8     Graduate      0      Major        0
  28-55    3         1.00-1.99    0      B    4
  56-83    3         2.00-2.99    0      C    3      General              2     Under-grad   17      Non-major   17
  84-150   1         3.00-3.49    3      D    1
  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                5
                                         ?    0
```

```
Course-Section: FREN 102  0201                University of Maryland                              Page  864
Title         ELEMENTARY FRENCH II              Baltimore County                               FEB 11, 2009
Instructor:   FATIH, ZAKARIA                     Fall   2008                                    Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:      3
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   1/1649   4.46  4.34  4.28  4.11  5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals     0   0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00   1/1648   4.47  4.31  4.23  4.16  5.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals    0   0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00   1/1375   4.42  4.42  4.27  4.10  5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals     0   0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00   1/1595   4.14  4.29  4.20  4.03  5.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0   0  0  0  1  0  0  3.00 1441/1533   3.77  4.16  4.04  3.87  3.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00   1/1512   4.07  4.19  4.10  3.86  5.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained             0   0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00   1/1623   4.16  4.08  4.16  4.08  5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled                   0   0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00   1/1646   4.57  4.59  4.69  4.67  5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 0 0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00   1/1621   4.41  4.14  4.06  3.96  5.00

                 Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared         0   0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00   1/1568   4.50  4.39  4.43  4.39  5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject    0   0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00   1/1572   4.85  4.79  4.70  4.64  5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0   0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00   1/1564   4.63  4.28  4.28  4.20  5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned      0   0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00   1/1559   4.57  4.43  4.29  4.20  5.00

                 Laboratory
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material   0   0  0  0  0  1  0  4.00  129/ 221   4.00  4.38  4.16  4.05  4.00
2. Were you provided with adequate background information 0 0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00   1/ 243   5.00  4.69  4.12  4.08  5.00
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 0  0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00   1/ 212   5.00  5.00  4.40  4.43  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  1    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              0    Under-grad    1      Non-major   1
84-150     1         3.00-3.49   1         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 102  0301              University of Maryland                                    Page  865
Title       ELEMENTARY FRENCH II            Baltimore County                                         FEB 11, 2009
Instructor:  DIGEON, LANDRY                 Fall   2008                                               Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:    22
Questionnaires:  16                    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   2   5   7  4.00 1183/1649  4.46  4.34  4.28  4.11  4.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals     0   0   1   1   3   4   7  3.94 1197/1648  4.47  4.31  4.23  4.16  3.94
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals    0   0   3   1   0   6   6  3.69 1144/1375  4.42  4.42  4.27  4.10  3.69
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals     0   3   1   2   3   4   3  3.46 1416/1595  4.14  4.29  4.20  4.03  3.46
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 1   5   0   2   2   5   1  3.50 1249/1533  3.77  4.16  4.04  3.87  3.50
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 1 3   4   1   1   3   3  3.00 1428/1512  4.07  4.19  4.10  3.86  3.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained             1   1   2   1   4   3   4  3.43 1424/1623  4.16  4.08  4.16  4.08  3.43
8. How many times was class cancelled                   0   0   0   0   3  13   0  3.81 1615/1646  4.57  4.59  4.69  4.67  3.81
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 3 0   0   2   2   7   2  3.69 1240/1621  4.41  4.14  4.06  3.96  3.69


          Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared         3   0   0   0   2   7   4  4.15 1198/1568  4.50  4.39  4.43  4.39  4.15
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject    2   0   0   0   0   2  12  4.86  715/1572  4.85  4.79  4.70  4.64  4.86
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 3   0   0   0   2   5   6  4.31  887/1564  4.63  4.28  4.28  4.20  4.31
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned      2   1   0   0   3   3   7  4.31  931/1559  4.57  4.43  4.29  4.20  4.31
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 3  0   2   0   2   4   5  3.77  907/1352  4.07  3.97  3.98  3.86  3.77


          Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 4   0   0   1   1   2   8  4.42  530/1384  4.31  4.28  4.08  3.86  4.42
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 4   0   0   0   1   4   7  4.50  616/1382  4.41  4.57  4.29  4.03  4.50
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 4  0   0   1   1   1   9  4.50  654/1368  4.23  4.42  4.30  4.01  4.50
4. Were special techniques successful                   4   5   0   1   1   2   3  4.00  431/ 948  4.03  4.10  3.95  3.75  4.00


          Laboratory
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material  14   1   0   0   0   0   1  5.00 ****/ 221  4.00  4.38  4.16  4.05  ****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information 14 0  0   0   0   2   0  4.00 ****/ 243  5.00  4.69  4.12  4.08  ****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 14 0  0   0   2   0   0  3.00 ****/ 212  5.00  5.00  4.40  4.43  ****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance           14   0   0   0   1   0   1  4.00 ****/ 209  ****  ****  4.35  4.38  ****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified  12  1   0   1   1   0   1  3.33 ****/ 555  2.86  2.56  4.29  4.14  ****


          Seminar
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 12  1   0   0   0   0   3  5.00 ****/  88  ****  4.39  4.54  4.31  ****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 12 0  0   1   1   1   1  3.50   81/  85  3.50  4.20  4.47  4.30  3.50
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 12  1   0   0   0   1   2  4.67 ****/  81  ****  4.23  4.43  4.39  ****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned    12   0   0   1   1   1   1  3.50   81/  92  3.50  4.32  4.35  4.01  3.50
5. Were criteria for grading made clear                12   0   0   1   1   0   2  3.75  173/ 288  3.75  2.95  3.68  3.54  3.75


          Field Work
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 14   0   2   0   0   0   0  1.00 ****/  52  ****  5.00  4.06  3.72  ****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria  14  0   0   1   0   1   0  3.00 ****/  48  ****  5.00  4.09  3.65  ****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation       14   0   0   1   0   1   0  3.00 ****/  39  ****  4.67  4.47  4.36  ****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations   14   0   0   1   0   1   0  3.00 ****/  39  ****  4.67  4.38  4.37  ****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities 14   1   0   0   0   0   1  5.00 ****/ 312  ****  2.48  3.68  3.51  ****


          Self  Paced
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 13  0   1   0   0   1   1  3.33 ****/  53  ****  5.00  4.30  4.17  ****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal    13   1   0   0   0   1   1  4.50 ****/  30  ****  ****  4.16  4.06  ****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful      13   0   1   0   1   0   1  3.00 ****/  41  ****  ****  4.43  4.27  ****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful       13   1   0   0   0   1   1  4.50 ****/  24  ****  ****  4.42  4.24  ****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students     13   1   0   0   0   0   2  5.00 ****/ 110  ****  4.13  3.99  3.83  ****
```

```
                                            Frequency Distribution


Credits Earned            Cum. GPA          Expected Grades            Reasons                   Type                    Majors
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
00-27      0       0.00-0.99    0          A    7          Required for Majors   5      Graduate      0        Major        1
28-55      0       1.00-1.99    0          B    2
56-83      1       2.00-2.99    0          C    2          General               4      Under-grad   16        Non-major   15
84-150     1       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                 2
                                           ?    1
```

```
Course-Section: FREN 102  0401           University of Maryland                                    Page  866
Title      ELEMENTARY FRENCH II           Baltimore County                                         FEB 11, 2009
Instructor:  DIGEON, LANDRY               Fall   2008                                              Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:     26
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    1   0  0  0  2  5  12  4.53  617/1649  4.46  4.34  4.28  4.11  4.53
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals     1   0  0  0  2  7  10  4.42  672/1648  4.47  4.31  4.23  4.16  4.42
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals    1   0  0  0  2  2  15  4.68  380/1375  4.42  4.42  4.27  4.10  4.68
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals     1   1  0  0  3  4  11  4.44  580/1595  4.14  4.29  4.20  4.03  4.44
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 1   0  0  0  5  3  11  4.32  565/1533  3.77  4.16  4.04  3.87  4.32
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 1  6  0  0  6  1   6  4.00  883/1512  4.07  4.19  4.10  3.86  4.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained             1   0  0  0  3  7   9  4.32  744/1623  4.16  4.08  4.16  4.08  4.32
8. How many times was class cancelled                   1   0  0  0  0  2  17  4.89  680/1646  4.57  4.59  4.69  4.67  4.89
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 5  1  0  0  0  5   9  4.64  252/1621  4.41  4.14  4.06  3.96  4.64

              Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared         2   0  0  0  1  7  10  4.50  852/1568  4.50  4.39  4.43  4.39  4.50
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject    1   0  0  0  1  1  17  4.84  740/1572  4.85  4.79  4.70  4.64  4.84
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 1   0  0  0  1  4  14  4.68  447/1564  4.63  4.28  4.28  4.20  4.68
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned      1   0  0  0  1  6  12  4.58  618/1559  4.57  4.43  4.29  4.20  4.58
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 1  1  2  0  0 10   6  4.00  690/1352  4.07  3.97  3.98  3.86  4.00

              Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 12  0  0  0  1  2   5  4.50  437/1384  4.31  4.28  4.08  3.86  4.50
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 12  0  0  0  1  2   5  4.50  616/1382  4.41  4.57  4.29  4.03  4.50
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 12  0  0  0  1  1   6  4.63  560/1368  4.23  4.42  4.30  4.01  4.63
4. Were special techniques successful                   12  1  0  0  1  2   4  4.43  265/ 948  4.03  4.10  3.95  3.75  4.43

              Laboratory
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified  19  0  0  1  0  0   0  2.00 ****/ 555  2.86  2.56  4.29  4.14  ****

              Seminar
5. Were criteria for grading made clear                 19  0  1  0  0  0   0  1.00 ****/ 288  3.75  2.95  3.68  3.54  ****

              Self  Paced
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 19  0  1  0  0  0   0  1.00 ****/  53  ****  5.00  4.30  4.17  ****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal     19  0  0  1  0  0   0  2.00 ****/  30  ****  ****  4.16  4.06  ****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful       19  0  0  0  1  0   0  3.00 ****/  41  ****  ****  4.43  4.27  ****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful        19  0  0  1  0  0   0  2.00 ****/  24  ****  ****  4.42  4.24  ****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students      19  0  0  0  0  1   0  4.00 ****/ 110  ****  4.13  3.99  3.83  ****

                                   Frequency Distribution


Credits Earned        Cum. GPA        Expected Grades        Reasons              Type                Majors
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
 00-27      3      0.00-0.99   0        A   8        Required for Majors  10    Graduate      0     Major        0
 28-55      2      1.00-1.99   0        B  11
 56-83      3      2.00-2.99   3        C   1        General               1    Under-grad   20     Non-major   20
 84-150     3      3.00-3.49   2        D   0
 Grad.      0      3.50-4.00   3        F   0        Electives             1    #### - Means there are not enough
                                       P   0                                   responses to be significant
                                       I   0        Other                 8
                                       ?   0
```

```
Course-Section: FREN 103  0101            University of Maryland                              Page  867
Title       INT REV ELEM FRENCH           Baltimore County                                   FEB 11, 2009
Instructor:   EL OMARI, SAMIR             Fall   2008                                        Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:    23
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  1  4  1  9  5  3.65 1436/1649  3.65  4.34  4.28  4.11  3.65
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals     0   0  0  1  3  6 10  4.25  897/1648  4.25  4.31  4.23  4.16  4.25
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals    0   0  0  2  2  7  9  4.15  882/1375  4.15  4.42  4.27  4.10  4.15
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals     0   5  0  1  4  4  6  4.00 1067/1595  4.00  4.29  4.20  4.03  4.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0   3  0  0  5  6  6  4.06  781/1533  4.06  4.16  4.04  3.87  4.06
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 5  1  4  2  5  3  3.33 1345/1512  3.33  4.19  4.10  3.86  3.33
7. Was the grading system clearly explained             1   0  1  2  2  7  7  3.89 1186/1623  3.89  4.08  4.16  4.08  3.89
8. How many times was class cancelled                   0   0  0  0  0  4 16  4.80  833/1646  4.80  4.59  4.69  4.67  4.80
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 4 0  1  1  3  7  4  3.75 1192/1621  3.75  4.14  4.06  3.96  3.75


            Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared         0   0  0  0  4  5 11  4.35 1031/1568  4.35  4.39  4.43  4.39  4.35
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject    0   0  0  0  1  3 16  4.75  931/1572  4.75  4.79  4.70  4.64  4.75
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0   0  0  1  3  6 10  4.25  939/1564  4.25  4.28  4.28  4.20  4.25
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned      0   0  1  1  2  5 11  4.20 1009/1559  4.20  4.43  4.29  4.20  4.20
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 0  0  1  1  3  9  6  3.90  818/1352  3.90  3.97  3.98  3.86  3.90


            Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 6   0  1  2  4  4  3  3.43 1113/1384  3.43  4.28  4.08  3.86  3.43
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 5   0  0  0  3  6  6  4.20  869/1382  4.20  4.57  4.29  4.03  4.20
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 5  0  0  2  4  5  4  3.73 1105/1368  3.73  4.42  4.30  4.01  3.73
4. Were special techniques successful                   5   4  0  2  5  3  1  3.27  795/ 948  3.27  4.10  3.95  3.75  3.27


            Laboratory
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material   18  1  0  0  1  0  0  3.00 ****/ 221  ****  4.38  4.16  4.05  ****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information 18 0  0  0  1  0  1  4.00 ****/ 243  ****  4.69  4.12  4.08  ****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance            18  1  0  0  1  0  0  3.00 ****/ 209  ****  ****  4.35  4.38  ****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified  18  1  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/ 555  ****  2.56  4.29  4.14  ****


            Seminar
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 19  0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  88  ****  4.39  4.54  4.31  ****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 18 1  0  0  1  0  0  3.00 ****/  85  ****  4.20  4.47  4.30  ****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned     18  1  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  92  ****  4.32  4.35  4.01  ****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear                 18  0  0  0  1  0  1  4.00 ****/ 288  ****  2.95  3.68  3.54  ****


            Field Work
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned  19  0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  52  ****  5.00  4.06  3.72  ****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria  18  0  0  0  1  0  1  4.00 ****/  48  ****  5.00  4.09  3.65  ****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation        18  0  0  1  1  0  0  2.50 ****/  39  ****  4.67  4.47  4.36  ****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations    17  1  0  1  1  0  0  2.50 ****/  39  ****  4.67  4.38  4.37  ****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities  18  0  0  0  1  0  1  4.00 ****/ 312  ****  2.48  3.68  3.51  ****


            Self  Paced
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 18  0  0  0  2  0  0  3.00 ****/  53  ****  5.00  4.30  4.17  ****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal     18  0  0  0  1  0  1  4.00 ****/  30  ****  ****  4.16  4.06  ****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful       18  0  0  0  1  1  0  3.50 ****/  41  ****  ****  4.43  4.27  ****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful        18  1  0  1  0  0  0  2.00 ****/  24  ****  ****  4.42  4.24  ****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students      18  1  0  0  1  0  0  3.00 ****/ 110  ****  4.13  3.99  3.83  ****
```

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	4	0.00-0.99	1	A	7	Required for Majors	12	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B	9						
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	0	C	2	General	0	Under-grad	20	Non-major	20
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5	F	0	Electives	4	#### - Means there are not enough			
				P	0			responses to be significant			
				I	0	Other	3				
				?	1						

```
Course-Section: FREN 201  0101            University of Maryland                                  Page  868
Title          INTERMEDIATE FRENCH I       Baltimore County                                     FEB 11, 2009
Instructor:    DIALLO, MAMADOU             Fall   2008                                          Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:      17
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	2	0	6	3	2	3.23	1564/1649	3.13	4.34	4.28	4.29	3.23
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	2	5	3	3	3.54	1471/1648	3.41	4.31	4.23	4.25	3.54
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	2	5	4	2	3.46	1222/1375	3.79	4.42	4.27	4.37	3.46
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	4	0	1	4	2	2	3.56	1384/1595	3.39	4.29	4.20	4.22	3.56
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	2	1	1	3	3	2	3.40	1317/1533	3.46	4.16	4.04	4.04	3.40
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	6	0	0	4	0	3	3.86	1055/1512	3.20	4.19	4.10	4.14	3.86
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	0	3	3	6	4.00	1029/1623	3.30	4.08	4.16	4.21	4.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	13	0	4.00	1544/1646	4.24	4.59	4.69	4.63	4.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	1	2	6	1	0	2.70	1568/1621	2.92	4.14	4.06	4.01	2.70
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	1	2	6	1	2	3.08	1511/1568	3.25	4.39	4.43	4.39	3.08
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	2	4	0	6	3.83	1506/1572	4.07	4.79	4.70	4.73	3.83
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	1	2	4	3	2	3.25	1460/1564	3.07	4.28	4.28	4.27	3.25
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	3	3	3	2	3.17	1456/1559	3.39	4.43	4.29	4.33	3.17
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	2	2	3	3	2	0	2.50	1301/1352	2.60	3.97	3.98	4.07	2.50
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	2	1	3	1	1	2.75	1322/1384	3.38	4.28	4.08	3.99	2.75
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	2	2	1	3	3.63	1165/1382	3.99	4.57	4.29	4.19	3.63
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	1	2	3	1	1	2.88	1316/1368	3.44	4.42	4.30	4.21	2.88
4. Were special techniques successful	5	4	0	2	1	1	0	2.75	894/ 948	3.18	4.10	3.95	3.89	2.75
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	12	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 221	****	4.38	4.16	4.45	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	12	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 243	****	4.69	4.12	4.47	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	12	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 212	****	5.00	4.40	4.62	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	12	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 209	****	****	4.35	4.64	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	10	0	1	1	1	0	0	2.00	****/ 555	****	2.56	4.29	4.33	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	12	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 88	****	4.39	4.54	3.75	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	12	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 85	****	4.20	4.47	3.33	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 81	****	4.23	4.43	3.67	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 92	****	4.32	4.35	5.00	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	11	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 288	****	2.95	3.68	3.65	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 52	****	5.00	4.06	3.93	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	12	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 48	****	5.00	4.09	4.05	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	12	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 39	****	4.67	4.47	4.49	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	12	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 39	****	4.67	4.38	3.66	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	9	0	0	0	1	3	0	3.75	193/ 312	3.75	2.48	3.68	3.59	3.75
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 53	****	5.00	4.30	4.07	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	12	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.16	1.50	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	12	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 41	****	****	4.43	3.50	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	12	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 24	****	****	4.42	2.00	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	12	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 110	****	4.13	3.99	3.72	****

```
                                       Frequency Distribution


Credits Earned         Cum. GPA         Expected Grades            Reasons                Type                  Majors
-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
 00-27    2        0.00-0.99    0        A    3         Required for Majors  8      Graduate     0       Major        0
 28-55    0        1.00-1.99    0        B    4
 56-83    0        2.00-2.99    0        C    2         General              2      Under-grad  13       Non-major   13
 84-150   0        3.00-3.49    1        D    1
 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                2
                                         ?    0
```

```
Course-Section: FREN 201  0201                University of Maryland                                    Page  869
Title         INTERMEDIATE FRENCH I             Baltimore County                                       FEB 11, 2009
Instructor:   DIALLO, MAMADOU                   Fall   2008                                            Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:      12
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  2  2  2  0  1  2.43 1641/1649  3.13  4.34  4.28 4.29  2.43
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    0   0  0  2  3  1  1  3.14 1580/1648  3.41  4.31  4.23 4.25  3.14
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   0   0  0  2  1  1  3  3.71 1132/1375  3.79  4.42  4.27 4.37  3.71
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    0   3  0  1  2  0  1  3.25 1490/1595  3.39  4.29  4.20 4.22  3.25
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0  0  0  2  3  0  2  3.29 1354/1533  3.46  4.16  4.04 4.04  3.29
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 3 0  2  2  1  0  2.75 1480/1512  3.20  4.19  4.10 4.14  2.75
7. Was the grading system clearly explained            0   0  0  2  2  1  2  3.43 1424/1623  3.30  4.08  4.16 4.21  3.43
8. How many times was class cancelled                  0   0  0  0  0  7  0  4.00 1544/1646  4.24  4.59  4.69 4.63  4.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 0 0 1  2  3  1  0  2.57 1580/1621  2.92  4.14  4.06 4.01  2.57

              Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        0   0  0  2  1  3  1  3.43 1476/1568  3.25  4.39  4.43 4.39  3.43
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   0   0  1  1  1  1  3  3.57 1531/1572  4.07  4.79  4.70 4.73  3.57
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0  0  2  1  2  1  1  2.71 1537/1564  3.07  4.28  4.28 4.27  2.71
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     0   0  1  1  2  1  2  3.29 1435/1559  3.39  4.43  4.29 4.33  3.29
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 0 1 3  1  0  1  1  2.33 1323/1352  2.60  3.97  3.98 4.07  2.33

              Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 5  0  0  0  1  0  1  4.00  795/1384  3.38  4.28  4.08 3.99  4.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 5  0  0  0  0  1  1  4.50  616/1382  3.99  4.57  4.29 4.19  4.50
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 5 0 0  0  1  1  0  3.50 1181/1368  3.44  4.42  4.30 4.21  3.50
4. Were special techniques successful                  4   2  0  0  0  1  0  4.00 ****/ 948  3.18  4.10  3.95 3.89  ****

              Laboratory
2. Were you provided with adequate background information 6 0 0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/ 243  ****  4.69  4.12 4.47  ****

              Seminar
5. Were criteria for grading made clear                6   0  0  0  1  0  0  3.00 ****/ 288  ****  2.95  3.68 3.65  ****

              Field Work
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned  6  0  1  0  0  0  0  1.00 ****/  52  ****  5.00  4.06 3.93  ****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria  6  0  1  0  0  0  0  1.00 ****/  48  ****  5.00  4.09 4.05  ****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities  5  1  0  0  0  1  0  4.00 ****/ 312  3.75  2.48  3.68 3.59  ****

              Self  Paced
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 6  0  1  0  0  0  0  1.00 ****/  53  ****  5.00  4.30 4.07  ****
```

```
                                        Frequency Distribution

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

```
Course-Section: FREN 201  0301                University of Maryland                         Page  870
Title       INTERMEDIATE FRENCH I              Baltimore County                              FEB 11, 2009
Instructor:  DIALLO, MAMADOU                   Fall   2008                                   Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:    24
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  1  1  3  2  2  3.33 1540/1649  3.13  4.34  4.28  4.29  3.33
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    0   0  1  1  1  2  4  3.78 1333/1648  3.41  4.31  4.23  4.25  3.78
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   0   0  0  1  2  3  3  3.89 1044/1375  3.79  4.42  4.27  4.37  3.89
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    0   2  1  0  2  3  1  3.43 1435/1595  3.39  4.29  4.20  4.22  3.43
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0  2  0  0  3  2  2  3.86  966/1533  3.46  4.16  4.04  4.04  3.86
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 2  0  1  4  1  1  3.29 1363/1512  3.20  4.19  4.10  4.14  3.29
7. Was the grading system clearly explained            0   0  1  3  2  0  3  3.11 1520/1623  3.30  4.08  4.16  4.21  3.11
8. How many times was class cancelled                  0   0  0  0  1  7  1  4.00 1544/1646  4.24  4.59  4.69  4.63  4.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 1 0  2  1  2  2  1  2.88 1541/1621  2.92  4.14  4.06  4.01  2.88


          Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        3   0  1  2  1  1  1  2.83 1543/1568  3.25  4.39  4.43  4.39  2.83
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   3   0  1  1  0  1  3  3.67 1524/1572  4.07  4.79  4.70  4.73  3.67
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 3  0  1  2  0  1  2  3.17 1478/1564  3.07  4.28  4.28  4.27  3.17
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     3   0  0  2  1  0  3  3.67 1322/1559  3.39  4.43  4.29  4.33  3.67
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 3  2  1  0  1  1  1  3.25 1160/1352  2.60  3.97  3.98  4.07  3.25


          Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 5  0  1  1  0  1  1  3.00 1254/1384  3.38  4.28  4.08  3.99  3.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 5  0  1  1  0  0  2  3.25 1275/1382  3.99  4.57  4.29  4.19  3.25
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 5 0  1  1  0  0  2  3.25 1252/1368  3.44  4.42  4.30  4.21  3.25
4. Were special techniques successful                  5   2  0  1  0  0  1  3.50 ****/ 948  3.18  4.10  3.95  3.89  ****


          Laboratory
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 7   0  1  1  0  0  0  1.50 ****/ 555  ****  2.56  4.29  4.33  ****


          Seminar
5. Were criteria for grading made clear                8   0  0  0  0  1  0  4.00 ****/ 288  ****  2.95  3.68  3.65  ****


          Field Work
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities 7   0  2  0  0  0  0  1.00 ****/ 312  3.75  2.48  3.68  3.59  ****


                                       Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned       Cum. GPA         Expected Grades        Reasons              Type                Majors
--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
 00-27    0          0.00-0.99  0      A   1      Required for Majors  6    Graduate    0     Major       0
 28-55    1          1.00-1.99  0      B   4                                Under-grad  9     Non-major   9
 56-83    0          2.00-2.99  0      C   1      General              1    Under-grad  9     Non-major   9
 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                1
                                       ?   0
```

```
Course-Section: FREN 201  0401            University of Maryland                                    Page  871
Title        INTERMEDIATE FRENCH I          Baltimore County                                       FEB 11, 2009
Instructor:  BADAGBO, YAWO                  Fall  2008                                             Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:     20
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   0   0   2   2   6   4   1  3.00 1603/1649  3.13  4.34  4.28 4.29  3.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    0   0   3   2   5   1   4  3.07 1588/1648  3.41  4.31  4.23 4.25  3.07
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   0   0   1   1   4   3   6  3.80 1087/1375  3.79  4.42  4.27 4.37  3.80
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    0   4   3   2   2   2   2  2.82 1564/1595  3.39  4.29  4.20 4.22  2.82
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0  1   2   2   3   2   5  3.43 1303/1533  3.46  4.16  4.04 4.04  3.43
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 4  1   2   5   1   2  3.09 1418/1512  3.20  4.19  4.10 4.14  3.09
7. Was the grading system clearly explained            0   0   5   2   4   2   2  2.60 1596/1623  3.30  4.08  4.16 4.21  2.60
8. How many times was class cancelled                  0   0   0   0   1  10   4  4.20 1440/1646  4.24  4.59  4.69 4.63  4.20
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 4 0  2   3   6   0   0  2.36 1600/1621  2.92  4.14  4.06 4.01  2.36


              Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        2   0   1   2   7   2   1  3.00 1515/1568  3.25  4.39  4.43 4.39  3.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   2   0   1   0   1   2   9  4.38 1333/1572  4.07  4.79  4.70 4.73  4.38
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 2  0   4   3   2   3   1  2.54 1545/1564  3.07  4.28  4.28 4.27  2.54
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     2   0   3   0   3   5   2  3.23 1443/1559  3.39  4.43  4.29 4.33  3.23
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 2 1  5   0   5   2   0  2.33 1323/1352  2.60  3.97  3.98 4.07  2.33


              Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 8  0   1   1   3   0   2  3.14 1232/1384  3.38  4.28  4.08 3.99  3.14
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 8  0   1   0   0   3   3  4.00  946/1382  3.99  4.57  4.29 4.19  4.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 8 0  1   1   1   2   2  3.43 1201/1368  3.44  4.42  4.30 4.21  3.43
4. Were special techniques successful                  8   4   0   0   0   2   1  4.33 ****/ 948  3.18  4.10  3.95 3.89  ****

              Laboratory
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material  14  0   0   0   1   0   0  3.00 ****/ 221  ****  4.38  4.16 4.45  ****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 12  0   0   0   0   0   3  5.00 ****/ 555  ****  2.56  4.29 4.33  ****

                                     Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned          Cum. GPA          Expected Grades          Reasons                 Type                    Majors
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
  00-27      1        0.00-0.99    0         A    4       Required for Majors   8     Graduate      0      Major         0
  28-55      2        1.00-1.99    0         B    8
  56-83      1        2.00-2.99    1         C    1       General               1     Under-grad   15     Non-major    15
  84-150     2        3.00-3.49    4         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                 5
                                            ?    0
```

```
Course-Section: FREN 201  0501              University of Maryland                              Page  872
Title       INTERMEDIATE FRENCH I              Baltimore County                               FEB 11, 2009
Instructor: BADAGBO, YAWO                       Fall   2008                                   Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:      21
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  3  3  5  5  2  3.00 1603/1649  3.13  4.34  4.28 4.29  3.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    0  0  4  3  6  3  2  2.78 1615/1648  3.41  4.31  4.23 4.25  2.78
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   0  0  2  2  3  5  6  3.61 1165/1375  3.79  4.42  4.27 4.37  3.61
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    0  6  0  3  3  4  2  3.42 1440/1595  3.39  4.29  4.20 4.22  3.42
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0  3  2  3  5  3  2  3.00 1441/1533  3.46  4.16  4.04 4.04  3.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0  4  4  2  5  0  3  2.71 1484/1512  3.20  4.19  4.10 4.14  2.71
7. Was the grading system clearly explained            0  0  2  5  5  3  3  3.00 1533/1623  3.30  4.08  4.16 4.21  3.00
8. How many times was class cancelled                  0  0  0  0  0 14  4  4.22 1419/1646  4.24  4.59  4.69 4.63  4.22
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 1  0  0  4 10  2  1  3.00 1504/1621  2.92  4.14  4.06 4.01  3.00

             Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        3  0  2  2  8  1  2  2.93 1530/1568  3.25  4.39  4.43 4.39  2.93
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   3  0  0  0  2  6  7  4.33 1365/1572  4.07  4.79  4.70 4.73  4.33
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 3  0  3  2  7  2  1  2.73 1535/1564  3.07  4.28  4.28 4.27  2.73
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     3  0  2  4  5  2  2  2.87 1507/1559  3.39  4.43  4.29 4.33  2.87
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 3  4  6  2  2  1  0  1.82 1345/1352  2.60  3.97  3.98 4.07  1.82

             Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 8  0  2  1  2  2  3  3.30 1175/1384  3.38  4.28  4.08 3.99  3.30
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 8  0  0  0  2  3  5  4.30  799/1382  3.99  4.57  4.29 4.19  4.30
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 8  0  1  1  3  1  4  3.60 1143/1368  3.44  4.42  4.30 4.21  3.60
4. Were special techniques successful                  8  3  0  1  3  1  2  3.57  684/ 948  3.18  4.10  3.95 3.89  3.57

             Laboratory
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 15  0  0  0  0  0  3  5.00 ****/ 555  ****  2.56  4.29 4.33  ****


                               Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned        Cum. GPA        Expected Grades          Reasons                Type                 Majors
---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
 00-27     1       0.00-0.99   0       A   5       Required for Majors  12   Graduate      0      Major        0
 28-55     3       1.00-1.99   0       B   6
 56-83     2       2.00-2.99   1       C   1       General               2   Under-grad   18      Non-major   18
 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                 3
                                       ?   4
```

```
Course-Section: FREN 201  0601                University of Maryland                                    Page  873
Title         INTERMEDIATE FRENCH I                Baltimore County                                  FEB 11, 2009
Instructor:   EL OMARI, SAMIR                      Fall   2008                                        Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:      25
Questionnaires:  21                       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  9  8  4  3.76 1371/1649  3.13  4.34  4.28 4.29  3.76
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    0  0  0  2  4  4 11  4.14 1021/1648  3.41  4.31  4.23 4.25  4.14
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   0  0  0  1  3  7 10  4.24  823/1375  3.79  4.42  4.27 4.37  4.24
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    0  0  0  2  7  4  8  3.86 1231/1595  3.39  4.29  4.20 4.22  3.86
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0  0  1  1  5  9  5  3.76 1055/1533  3.46  4.16  4.04 4.04  3.76
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 2 2 1 6  5  5  3.53 1253/1512  3.20  4.19  4.10 4.14  3.53
7. Was the grading system clearly explained            0  0  1  1  7  7  5  3.67 1318/1623  3.30  4.08  4.16 4.21  3.67
8. How many times was class cancelled                  0  0  0  0  0  0 21  5.00    1/1646  4.24  4.59  4.69 4.63  5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 4 0 0 1 3  8  5  4.00  914/1621  2.92  4.14  4.06 4.01  4.00


                 Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        1  0  0  0  6  4 10  4.20 1169/1568  3.25  4.39  4.43 4.39  4.20
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   1  0  0  0  1  5 14  4.65 1084/1572  4.07  4.79  4.70 4.73  4.65
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 1 0  0  1  6  5  8  4.00 1127/1564  3.07  4.28  4.28 4.27  4.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     1  0  0  0  6  5  9  4.15 1038/1559  3.39  4.43  4.29 4.33  4.15
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 1 2 2 4 3  3  6  3.39 1109/1352  2.60  3.97  3.98 4.07  3.39


                 Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 10 0 0 1 2  3  5  4.09  764/1384  3.38  4.28  4.08 3.99  4.09
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 10 0 0 0 3  2  6  4.27  818/1382  3.99  4.57  4.29 4.19  4.27
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 10 0 1 0 1 5  4  4.00  948/1368  3.44  4.42  4.30 4.21  4.00
4. Were special techniques successful                  10  2  2  1  2  1  3  3.22  806/ 948  3.18  4.10  3.95 3.89  3.22


                 Laboratory
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material  20  0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/ 221  ****  4.38  4.16 4.45  ****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information 20 0 1 0 0 0  0  1.00 ****/ 243  ****  4.69  4.12 4.47  ****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 18  1  1  0  1  0  0  2.00 ****/ 555  ****  2.56  4.29 4.33  ****


                 Seminar
5. Were criteria for grading made clear                19  1  0  0  0  1  0  4.00 ****/ 288  ****  2.95  3.68 3.65  ****


                 Field Work
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities 19  0  0  2  0  0  0  2.00 ****/ 312  3.75  2.48  3.68 3.59  ****


                               Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned         Cum. GPA         Expected Grades          Reasons               Type                Majors
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
 00-27     0           0.00-0.99   0      A    7        Required for Majors  18    Graduate    0       Major       0
 28-55     1           1.00-1.99   0      B   11
 56-83     4           2.00-2.99   4      C    1        General               1    Under-grad  21      Non-major  21
 84-150    6           3.00-3.49   5      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                 2
                                          ?    0
```

```
Course-Section: FREN 202  0101            University of Maryland                        Page  874
Title           INTERMEDIATE FRENCH II    Baltimore County                              FEB 11, 2009
Instructor:     PROVENCHER, DEN           Fall   2008                                   Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:     24
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  1  2  9  11  4.30  912/1649  4.30  4.34  4.28  4.29  4.30
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    0  0  0  0  0  2  21  4.91  133/1648  4.91  4.31  4.23  4.25  4.91
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   0  0  0  0  1  2  20  4.83  219/1375  4.83  4.42  4.27  4.37  4.83
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    1  7  1  1  1  3   9  4.20  890/1595  4.20  4.29  4.20  4.22  4.20
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0  0  0  0  1  9  13  4.52  350/1533  4.52  4.16  4.04  4.04  4.52
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 3 2 3 3 3 9  3.70 1149/1512  3.70  4.19  4.10  4.14  3.70
7. Was the grading system clearly explained            0  0  0  1  0  4  18  4.70  284/1623  4.70  4.08  4.16  4.21  4.70
8. How many times was class cancelled                  0  0  0  0  0 11  12  4.52 1175/1646  4.52  4.59  4.69  4.63  4.52
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 4 0 0 0 0 6 13  4.68  216/1621  4.68  4.14  4.06  4.01  4.68


         Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        1  0  1  0  0  3  18  4.68  604/1568  4.68  4.39  4.43  4.39  4.68
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   1  0  0  0  0  1  21  4.95  296/1572  4.95  4.79  4.70  4.73  4.95
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 1 0 0 0 1 5 16  4.68  447/1564  4.68  4.28  4.28  4.27  4.68
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     1  0  0  0  1  2  19  4.82  306/1559  4.82  4.43  4.29  4.33  4.82
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 1 1 1 0 3 5 12  4.29  495/1352  4.29  3.97  3.98  4.07  4.29


         Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 8 0 0 0 1 4 10  4.60  376/1384  4.60  4.28  4.08  3.99  4.60
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 8 0 0 0 0 3 12  4.80  342/1382  4.80  4.57  4.29  4.19  4.80
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 8 0 0 0 2 1 12  4.67  522/1368  4.67  4.42  4.30  4.21  4.67
4. Were special techniques successful                  8  3  0  0  1  3   8  4.58  176/ 948  4.58  4.10  3.95  3.89  4.58


         Laboratory
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material  22  0  0  0  0  0   1  5.00 ****/ 221  ****  4.38  4.16  4.45  ****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information 22 0 0 0 0 0 1  5.00 ****/ 243  ****  4.69  4.12  4.47  ****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 22 0 0 0 0 0 1  5.00 ****/ 212  ****  5.00  4.40  4.62  ****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance           22  0  0  0  0  0   1  5.00 ****/ 209  ****  ****  4.35  4.64  ****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 14  0  3  5  0  0   1  2.00  522/ 555  2.00  2.56  4.29  4.33  2.00


         Seminar
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 21 0 0 0 0 0 2  5.00 ****/  88  ****  4.39  4.54  3.75  ****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 22 0 0 0 0 0 1  5.00 ****/  85  ****  4.20  4.47  3.33  ****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 22 0 0 0 0 0 1  5.00 ****/  81  ****  4.23  4.43  3.67  ****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned    22  0  0  0  0  0   1  5.00 ****/  92  ****  4.32  4.35  5.00  ****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear                17  1  1  1  0  2   1  3.20 ****/ 288  ****  2.95  3.68  3.65  ****


         Field Work
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 22 0 0 0 0 0 1  5.00 ****/  52  ****  5.00  4.06  3.93  ****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 22  0  0  0  0  0   1  5.00 ****/  48  ****  5.00  4.09  4.05  ****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation       22  0  0  0  0  0   1  5.00 ****/  39  ****  4.67  4.47  4.49  ****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations   22  0  0  0  0  0   1  5.00 ****/  39  ****  4.67  4.38  3.66  ****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities 14  1  3  1  0  3   1  2.75  270/ 312  2.75  2.48  3.68  3.59  2.75


         Self  Paced
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 22 0 0 0 0 0 1  5.00 ****/  53  ****  5.00  4.30  4.07  ****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal    22  0  0  0  0  0   1  5.00 ****/  30  ****  ****  4.16  1.50  ****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful      22  0  0  0  0  0   1  5.00 ****/  41  ****  ****  4.43  3.50  ****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful       22  0  0  0  0  0   1  5.00 ****/  24  ****  ****  4.42  2.00  ****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students     21  0  0  0  0  1   1  4.50 ****/ 110  ****  4.13  3.99  3.72  ****
```

```
                                          Frequency Distribution


Credits Earned              Cum. GPA          Expected Grades              Reasons                  Type                    Majors
-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
 00-27     1        0.00-0.99    0        A   12        Required for Majors  2      Graduate      0        Major        5
 28-55     0        1.00-1.99    0        B    6                                                           
 56-83     2        2.00-2.99    1        C    3        General              6      Under-grad   23        Non-major   18
 84-150    4        3.00-3.49    5        D    0                                                           
 Grad.     0        3.50-4.00    4        F    0        Electives            1      #### - Means there are not enough
                                          P    0                                   responses to be significant
                                          I    0        Other                9
                                          ?    0
```

```
Course-Section: FREN 301  0101            University of Maryland                          Page  875
Title        ADVANCED FRENCH I             Baltimore County                               FEB 11, 2009
Instructor:  DE VERNEIL, MAR               Fall   2008                                     Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:     22
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   0  0  0  0  1  3 11  4.67  433/1649  4.67  4.34  4.28  4.27  4.67
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    0  0  0  0  0  7  8  4.53  521/1648  4.53  4.31  4.23  4.18  4.53
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   0  0  0  0  0  2 13  4.87  192/1375  4.87  4.42  4.27  4.22  4.87
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    0  0  0  0  0  3 12  4.80  192/1595  4.80  4.29  4.20  4.21  4.80
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0  0  0  1  3  3  8  4.20  680/1533  4.20  4.16  4.04  4.05  4.20
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 0 0 0 2 4 9 4.47 436/1512 4.47 4.19 4.10 4.11 4.47
7. Was the grading system clearly explained            0  0  0  1  4  5  5  3.93 1134/1623  3.93  4.08  4.16  4.08  3.93
8. How many times was class cancelled                  0  0  0  0  0  0 15  5.00    1/1646  5.00  4.59  4.69  4.67  5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 2 0 0 0 0 5 8 4.62 279/1621 4.62 4.14 4.06 4.02 4.62


              Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        0  0  0  0  0  2 13  4.87  301/1568  4.87  4.39  4.43  4.39  4.87
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   0  0  0  0  0  0 15  5.00    1/1572  5.00  4.79  4.70  4.64  5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0 0  0  0  0  6  9  4.60  550/1564  4.60  4.28  4.28  4.25  4.60
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     0  0  0  0  0  4 11  4.73  419/1559  4.73  4.43  4.29  4.23  4.73
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 0 0 0 0 1 3 11 4.67 208/1352 4.67 3.97 3.98 3.97 4.67


              Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 6  0  0  0  1  2  6  4.56  406/1384  4.56  4.28  4.08  4.11  4.56
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 6  0  0  0  1  1  7  4.67  483/1382  4.67  4.57  4.29  4.37  4.67
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 6 0  0  0  1  1  7  4.67  522/1368  4.67  4.42  4.30  4.39  4.67
4. Were special techniques successful                  6  0  0  0  1  1  7  4.67  152/ 948  4.67  4.10  3.95  4.00  4.67


              Laboratory
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 12  0  0  2  1  0  0  2.33 ****/ 555  ****  2.56  4.29  4.22  ****


              Seminar
5. Were criteria for grading made clear                9  1  2  3  0  0  0  1.60  280/ 288  1.60  2.95  3.68  3.58  1.60


              Field Work
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities 12  0  0  3  0  0  0  2.00 ****/ 312  ****  2.48  3.68  3.60  ****


                                     Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned        Cum. GPA        Expected Grades        Reasons                Type                  Majors
---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
 00-27     2      0.00-0.99    1       A    6        Required for Majors  3    Graduate      0      Major       2
 28-55     3      1.00-1.99    0       B    6                                  Under-grad   15      Non-major  13
 56-83     1      2.00-2.99    0       C    1        General              3    Under-grad   15
 84-150    0      3.00-3.49    1       D    0
 Grad.     0      3.50-4.00    4       F    0        Electives            1    #### - Means there are not enough
                                       P    0                                  responses to be significant
                                       I    0        Other                6
                                       ?    1
```

```
Course-Section: FREN 302  0101            University of Maryland                                Page  876
Title         ADVANCED FRENCH II          Baltimore County                                     FEB 11, 2009
Instructor:   PROVENCHER, DEN             Fall  2008                                            Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:      14
Questionnaires:  10                       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 10  5.00    1/1649   5.00  4.34  4.28  4.27  5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    0  0  0  0  0  2  8  4.80  216/1648   4.80  4.31  4.23  4.18  4.80
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   0  0  0  0  0  0 10  5.00    1/1375   5.00  4.42  4.27  4.22  5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    0  0  0  0  0  1  9  4.90  133/1595   4.90  4.29  4.20  4.21  4.90
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0 0  0  0  0  1  9  4.90  106/1533   4.90  4.16  4.04  4.05  4.90
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 0 0  0  0  1  9  4.90  110/1512   4.90  4.19  4.10  4.11  4.90
7. Was the grading system clearly explained            0  0  0  0  1  0  9  4.80  169/1623   4.80  4.08  4.16  4.08  4.80
8. How many times was class cancelled                  0  0  0  0  0  4  6  4.60 1103/1646   4.60  4.59  4.69  4.67  4.60
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 1 0 0 0  0  1  8  4.89  101/1621   4.89  4.14  4.06  4.02  4.89

              Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        0  0  0  0  0  1  9  4.90  245/1568   4.90  4.39  4.43  4.39  4.90
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   0  0  0  0  0  0 10  5.00    1/1572   5.00  4.79  4.70  4.64  5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0 0  0  0  0  0 10  5.00    1/1564   5.00  4.28  4.28  4.25  5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     0  0  0  0  0  0 10  5.00    1/1559   5.00  4.43  4.29  4.23  5.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 0 1 0  0  0  0  9  5.00    1/1352   5.00  3.97  3.98  3.97  5.00

              Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 2 0  0  0  0  0  8  5.00    1/1384   5.00  4.28  4.08  4.11  5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 2 0  0  0  0  0  8  5.00    1/1382   5.00  4.57  4.29  4.37  5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 2 0 0  0  0  0  8  5.00    1/1368   5.00  4.42  4.30  4.39  5.00
4. Were special techniques successful                  2  0  0  0  2  1  5  4.38  293/ 948   4.38  4.10  3.95  4.00  4.38

              Laboratory
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material  9  0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/ 221   ****  4.38  4.16  4.07  ****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information 9 0 0 0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/ 243   ****  4.69  4.12  3.89  ****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 9 0 0 0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/ 212   ****  5.00  4.40  4.21  ****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance           9  0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/ 209   ****  ****  4.35  4.12  ****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified  8  0  0  1  0  0  1  3.50 ****/ 555   ****  2.56  4.29  4.22  ****

              Seminar
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 9 0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  88   ****  4.39  4.54  4.63  ****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 9 0 0 0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  85   ****  4.20  4.47  4.55  ****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 9 0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  81   ****  4.23  4.43  4.30  ****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned    9  0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  92   ****  4.32  4.35  4.46  ****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear                7  0  1  1  0  0  1  2.67  250/ 288   2.67  2.95  3.68  3.58  2.67

              Field Work
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 9  0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  52   ****  5.00  4.06  3.59  ****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria  9  0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  48   ****  5.00  4.09  4.21  ****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation       9  0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  39   ****  4.67  4.47  4.43  ****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations   9  0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  39   ****  4.67  4.38  4.32  ****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities 9  0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/ 312   ****  2.48  3.68  3.60  ****

              Self  Paced
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 9 0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  53   ****  5.00  4.30  4.32  ****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal    9  0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  30   ****  ****  4.16  4.44  ****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful      9  0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  41   ****  ****  4.43  5.00  ****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful       9  0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  24   ****  ****  4.42  5.00  ****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students     9  0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/ 110   ****  4.13  3.99  4.05  ****
```

```
                                              Frequency Distribution


Credits Earned           Cum. GPA          Expected Grades              Reasons                    Type                    Majors
-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
00-27      2         0.00-0.99    1         A    6        Required for Majors   0        Graduate     0         Major        2
28-55      1         1.00-1.99    0         B    3
56-83      2         2.00-2.99    0         C    0        General               3        Under-grad  10         Non-major    8
84-150     2         3.00-3.49    0         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                 7
                                            ?    0
```

```
Course-Section: FREN 315  0101              University of Maryland                                   Page  877
Title        FRENCH PHONETICS                Baltimore County                                       FEB 11, 2009
Instructor:  KA, OMAR                        Fall  2008                                             Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:     16
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    0  0  0  0  1  4  9  4.57  550/1649  4.57  4.34  4.28  4.27  4.57
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals     0  0  0  0  1  3 10  4.64  388/1648  4.64  4.31  4.23  4.18  4.64
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals    0  0  0  0  1  3 10  4.64  422/1375  4.64  4.42  4.27  4.22  4.64
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals     0  6  0  0  0  1  7  4.88  150/1595  4.88  4.29  4.20  4.21  4.88
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0  2  0  0  2  3  7  4.42  465/1533  4.42  4.16  4.04  4.05  4.42
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 0  0  0  3  2  9  4.43  493/1512  4.43  4.19  4.10  4.11  4.43
7. Was the grading system clearly explained             0  0  0  3  3  0  8  3.93 1149/1623  3.93  4.08  4.16  4.08  3.93
8. How many times was class cancelled                   0  0  0  0  0  6  8  4.57 1130/1646  4.57  4.59  4.69  4.67  4.57
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 2 0  0  0  1  6  5  4.33  595/1621  4.33  4.14  4.06  4.02  4.33


             Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared         1  0  0  0  2  1 10  4.62  715/1568  4.62  4.39  4.43  4.39  4.62
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject    1  0  0  0  0  0 13  5.00    1/1572  5.00  4.79  4.70  4.64  5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 1  0  0  0  0  2 11  4.85  225/1564  4.85  4.28  4.28  4.25  4.85
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned      1  0  0  0  1  1 11  4.77  376/1559  4.77  4.43  4.29  4.23  4.77
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 2  6  1  1  0  0  4  3.83  860/1352  3.83  3.97  3.98  3.97  3.83


             Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 10  0  1  0  0  0  3  4.00  795/1384  4.00  4.28  4.08  4.11  4.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 10  0  0  0  0  0  4  5.00    1/1382  5.00  4.57  4.29  4.37  5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 10 0  0  0  0  0  4  5.00    1/1368  5.00  4.42  4.30  4.39  5.00
4. Were special techniques successful                   10  1  0  0  0  1  2  4.67 ****/ 948  ****  4.10  3.95  4.00  ****


             Seminar
5. Were criteria for grading made clear                 13  0  0  0  0  1  0  4.00 ****/ 288  ****  2.95  3.68  3.58  ****


             Field Work
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities  13  0  0  1  0  0  0  2.00 ****/ 312  ****  2.48  3.68  3.60  ****


                                    Frequency Distribution


Credits Earned         Cum. GPA         Expected Grades          Reasons              Type                Majors
---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
 00-27      1      0.00-0.99   0         A    7      Required for Majors  0      Graduate     0       Major        4
 28-55      2      1.00-1.99   0         B    4                                                       
 56-83      2      2.00-2.99   3         C    1      General              5      Under-grad  14       Non-major   10
 84-150     2      3.00-3.49   2         D    1                                                       
 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                7
                                         ?    1
```

```
Course-Section: FREN 330  0101              University of Maryland                              Page  878
Title       INTERCONNECTIONS:IDEAS          Baltimore County                                   FEB 11, 2009
Instructor:     FATIH, ZAKARIA              Fall   2008                                         Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:     10
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   1   2   2  4.20 1027/1649  4.20  4.34  4.28  4.27  4.20
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    0   0   0   0   1   2   2  4.20  966/1648  4.20  4.31  4.23  4.18  4.20
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   0   0   0   0   1   2   2  4.20  855/1375  4.20  4.42  4.27  4.22  4.20
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    1   0   0   0   1   2   1  4.00 1067/1595  4.00  4.29  4.20  4.21  4.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0   0   0   0   0   2   3  4.60  288/1533  4.60  4.16  4.04  4.05  4.60
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 1 1   0   0   0   1   2  4.67  263/1512  4.67  4.19  4.10  4.11  4.67
7. Was the grading system clearly explained            1   0   0   1   0   0   3  4.25  815/1623  4.25  4.08  4.16  4.08  4.25
8. How many times was class cancelled                  0   0   0   0   0   1   4  4.80  833/1646  4.80  4.59  4.69  4.67  4.80
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 0 0   0   0   1   2   2  4.20  754/1621  4.20  4.14  4.06  4.02  4.20

             Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        0   0   0   0   0   0   5  5.00    1/1568  5.00  4.39  4.43  4.39  5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   0   0   0   0   0   0   5  5.00    1/1572  5.00  4.79  4.70  4.64  5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0  0   0   0   1   2   2  4.20 1001/1564  4.20  4.28  4.28  4.25  4.20
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     0   0   0   0   0   2   3  4.60  586/1559  4.60  4.43  4.29  4.23  4.60

             Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 2  0   0   0   1   0   2  4.33  613/1384  4.33  4.28  4.08  4.11  4.33
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 2  0   0   0   0   1   2  4.67  483/1382  4.67  4.57  4.29  4.37  4.67
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 2 0   0   0   1   0   2  4.33  796/1368  4.33  4.42  4.30  4.39  4.33
4. Were special techniques successful                  2   1   1   0   1   0   0  2.00  936/ 948  2.00  4.10  3.95  4.00  2.00

                                      Frequency Distribution


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

```
Course-Section: FREN 349  0101              University of Maryland                              Page  879
Title       MOD FRENCH CIVILIZATIO          Baltimore County                                   FEB 11, 2009
Instructor:  SCHNEIDER, JUDI                Fall  2008                                          Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:       6
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  510/1649  4.60  4.34  4.28  4.27  4.60
 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals     0  0  0  0  2  3  0  3.60 1448/1648  3.60  4.31  4.23  4.18  3.60
 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals    0  0  2  1  0  2  0  2.40 1367/1375  2.40  4.42  4.27  4.22  2.40
 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals     0  0  1  0  2  0  2  3.40 1445/1595  3.40  4.29  4.20  4.21  3.40
 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0  0  0  0  0  1  3  4.40  476/1533  4.40  4.16  4.04  4.05  4.40
 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0  0  0  1  1  1  2  3.80 1089/1512  3.80  4.19  4.10  4.11  3.80
 7. Was the grading system clearly explained             0  1  1  0  2  1  0  2.75 1579/1623  2.75  4.08  4.16  4.08  2.75
 8. How many times was class cancelled                   0  0  0  0  0  3  2  4.40 1287/1646  4.40  4.59  4.69  4.67  4.40
 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 2  0  0  0  0  3  0  4.00  914/1621  4.00  4.14  4.06  4.02  4.00


                Lecture
 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared         0  0  0  0  2  3  0  3.60 1440/1568  3.60  4.39  4.43  4.39  3.60
 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject    0  0  0  0  0  0  5  5.00    1/1572  5.00  4.79  4.70  4.64  5.00
 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0  0  0  2  2  1  0  2.80 1526/1564  2.80  4.28  4.28  4.25  2.80
 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned      0  0  0  0  2  2  1  3.80 1246/1559  3.80  4.43  4.29  4.23  3.80
 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 0  1  0  0  4  0  0  3.00 1219/1352  3.00  3.97  3.98  3.97  3.00


                Discussion
 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 2  0  0  0  0  2  1  4.33  613/1384  4.33  4.28  4.08  4.11  4.33
 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 2  0  0  0  0  0  3  5.00    1/1382  5.00  4.57  4.29  4.37  5.00
 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 2  0  0  0  0  1  2  4.67  522/1368  4.67  4.42  4.30  4.39  4.67

                Seminar
 5. Were criteria for grading made clear                 4  0  1  0  0  0  0  1.00 ****/ 288  ****  2.95  3.68  3.58  ****


                             Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned        Cum. GPA        Expected Grades        Reasons              Type              Majors
-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
  00-27    0        0.00-0.99   0       A    4       Required for Majors  1    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              2    Under-grad   5      Non-major  5
  84-150   3        3.00-3.49   0       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                1
                                        ?    0
```

```
Course-Section: FREN 440  0101              University of Maryland                                    Page  880
Title         STUDY IN FRENCH CULTUR          Baltimore County                                       FEB 11, 2009
Instructor:   PROVENCHER, DEN                 Fall  2008                                             Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:      16
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    0   0  0  0  0  0 14  5.00     1/1649  5.00  4.34  4.28  4.50  5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals     1   0  0  0  0  1 12  4.92   118/1648  4.92  4.31  4.23  4.36  4.92
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals    1   0  0  0  0  1 12  4.92   133/1375  4.92  4.42  4.27  4.48  4.92
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals     1   0  0  0  0  1 12  4.92   106/1595  4.92  4.29  4.20  4.36  4.92
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 1   0  0  0  0  1 12  4.92    85/1533  4.92  4.16  4.04  4.14  4.92
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 1 0  0  0  0  3 10  4.77   186/1512  4.77  4.19  4.10  4.26  4.77
7. Was the grading system clearly explained             1   0  0  0  0  5  8  4.62   382/1623  4.62  4.08  4.16  4.27  4.62
8. How many times was class cancelled                   1   0  0  0  0  1 12  4.92   531/1646  4.92  4.59  4.69  4.71  4.92
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 2 1  0  0  0  2  9  4.82   129/1621  4.82  4.14  4.06  4.24  4.82

                Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared         0   0  0  0  0  1 13  4.93   196/1568  4.93  4.39  4.43  4.54  4.93
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject    0   0  0  0  0  0 14  5.00     1/1572  5.00  4.79  4.70  4.79  5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 1   0  0  0  0  1 12  4.92   135/1564  4.92  4.28  4.28  4.40  4.92
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned      0   0  0  0  0  1 13  4.93   164/1559  4.93  4.43  4.29  4.41  4.93
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 0  3  0  0  0  1 10  4.91   101/1352  4.91  3.97  3.98  4.07  4.91

                Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 1   0  0  0  0  1 12  4.92   120/1384  4.92  4.28  4.08  4.35  4.92
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 1   0  0  0  0  1 12  4.92   194/1382  4.92  4.57  4.29  4.56  4.92
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 1  0  0  0  0  1 12  4.92   211/1368  4.92  4.42  4.30  4.58  4.92
4. Were special techniques successful                   2   5  0  0  1  1  5  4.57   179/ 948  4.57  4.10  3.95  4.31  4.57

                Laboratory
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified  8   0  3  3  0  0  0  1.50   544/ 555  1.50  2.56  4.29  4.41  1.50

                Seminar
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 10  1  0  0  0  0  3  5.00  ****/  88  ****  4.39  4.54  4.66  ****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 11 0  0  0  0  0  3  5.00  ****/  85  ****  4.20  4.47  4.54  ****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 11  1  0  0  0  1  1  4.50  ****/  81  ****  4.23  4.43  4.57  ****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned     11  0  0  0  0  0  3  5.00  ****/  92  ****  4.32  4.35  4.44  ****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear                  6  3  1  0  0  3  1  3.60   184/ 288  3.60  2.95  3.68  3.71  3.60

                Field Work
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned  13  0  1  0  0  0  0  1.00  ****/  52  ****  5.00  4.06  4.86  ****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria  13  0  1  0  0  0  0  1.00  ****/  48  ****  5.00  4.09  4.42  ****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities  12  1  1  0  0  0  0  1.00  ****/ 312  ****  2.48  3.68  3.95  ****

                Self  Paced
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 13  0  1  0  0  0  0  1.00  ****/  53  ****  5.00  4.30  4.64  ****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students      12  1  0  0  1  0  0  3.00  ****/ 110  ****  4.13  3.99  4.22  ****
```

Frequency Distribution

```
Credits Earned          Cum. GPA          Expected Grades          Reasons                    Type                   Majors
----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
00-27      3       0.00-0.99    2        A   10       Required for Majors   0      Graduate      1       Major        5
28-55      0       1.00-1.99    0        B    2                                    Under-grad   13       Non-major    9
56-83      0       2.00-2.99    1        C    1       General               2
84-150     4       3.00-3.49    0        D    0                                    #### - Means there are not enough
Grad.      1       3.50-4.00    2        F    0       Electives             0      responses to be significant
                                         P    0
                                         I    0       Other                11
```

?   0