

Course-Section: FREN 101 1  
 Title Elementary French I  
 Instructor: Gueye,Sokhna Fa  
 Enrollment: 23  
 Questionnaires: 14

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2009

Page 771  
 MAR 22, 2010  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	0	0	1	5	7	4.46	648/1509	4.42	4.42	4.31	4.18	4.46
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	2	4	7	4.38	720/1509	4.46	4.39	4.26	4.25	4.38
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	2	5	6	4.31	739/1287	4.56	4.48	4.30	4.24	4.31
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	1	0	0	1	3	8	4.58	367/1459	4.40	4.32	4.22	4.11	4.58
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	1	0	1	1	3	7	4.33	502/1406	4.34	4.19	4.09	4.02	4.33
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	3	0	0	1	1	8	4.70	199/1384	4.15	4.17	4.11	3.98	4.70
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	1	2	3	6	4.17	854/1489	4.17	4.07	4.17	4.20	4.17
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	10	3	4.23	1273/1506	4.81	4.55	4.67	4.66	4.23
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	2	0	0	4	3	3	3.90	983/1463	4.08	4.16	4.09	4.02	3.90
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	2	3	6	4.36	970/1438	4.45	4.48	4.46	4.44	4.36
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	1	2	8	4.64	1049/1421	4.68	4.75	4.73	4.66	4.64
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	1	2	2	6	4.18	943/1411	4.38	4.39	4.31	4.27	4.18
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	1	0	5	5	4.27	881/1405	4.42	4.45	4.32	4.27	4.27
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	0	1	1	2	3	4	3.73	871/1236	4.00	3.92	4.00	3.87	3.73
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	1	2	4	4.43	487/1260	4.12	4.32	4.14	3.95	4.43
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	390/1255	4.68	4.53	4.33	4.15	4.71
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	468/1258	4.35	4.46	4.38	4.18	4.71
4. Were special techniques successful	8	0	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	209/ 873	4.06	4.14	4.03	3.89	4.50

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	A 12	Required for Majors	0	
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	B 1		Graduate 0	
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	C 0	General	5	
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad 14	
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	5	
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	
			I 0	Other		0
			? 0			

Course-Section: FREN 101 2  
 Title Elementary French I  
 Instructor: Badagbo,Ama  
 Enrollment: 26  
 Questionnaires: 15

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2009

Page 772  
 MAR 22, 2010  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean		
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5						Mean	Rank
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	3	2	10	4.47	648/1509	4.42	4.42	4.31	4.18	4.47
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	5	8	4.40	699/1509	4.46	4.39	4.26	4.25	4.40
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	1	11	4.53	491/1287	4.56	4.48	4.30	4.24	4.53
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	1	3	10	4.64	302/1459	4.40	4.32	4.22	4.11	4.64
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	2	2	10	4.57	287/1406	4.34	4.19	4.09	4.02	4.57
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	3	1	1	1	1	8	4.17	701/1384	4.15	4.17	4.11	3.98	4.17
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	3	1	2	7	3.79	1184/1489	4.17	4.07	4.17	4.20	3.79
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	14	5.00	1/1506	4.81	4.55	4.67	4.66	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	1	0	1	1	4	2	3.88	1006/1463	4.08	4.16	4.09	4.02	3.88
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	2	3	9	4.50	800/1438	4.45	4.48	4.46	4.44	4.50
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	3	3	9	4.40	1217/1421	4.68	4.75	4.73	4.66	4.40
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	1	0	7	7	4.33	810/1411	4.38	4.39	4.31	4.27	4.33
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	2	0	4	9	4.33	828/1405	4.42	4.45	4.32	4.27	4.33
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	1	2	2	4	6	3.80	824/1236	4.00	3.92	4.00	3.87	3.80
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	1	3	6	4.50	415/1260	4.12	4.32	4.14	3.95	4.50
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	0	0	3	7	4.70	412/1255	4.68	4.53	4.33	4.15	4.70
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	0	2	2	6	4.40	721/1258	4.35	4.46	4.38	4.18	4.40
4. Were special techniques successful	5	2	0	1	1	1	5	4.25	333/ 873	4.06	4.14	4.03	3.89	4.25
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	14	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 184	****	****	4.16	4.06	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	14	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 198	****	****	4.22	4.14	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	14	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 184	****	****	4.48	4.48	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	14	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 177	****	****	4.36	4.29	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	14	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 165	****	****	4.18	4.15	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	14	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 89	****	5.00	4.49	4.31	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	14	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 92	****	4.93	4.54	4.16	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 90	****	4.62	4.50	4.21	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 92	****	4.93	4.38	4.21	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	14	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 93	****	4.86	4.06	3.92	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.39	3.75	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	14	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.41	4.29	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	14	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 47	****	****	4.51	4.53	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	14	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 47	****	****	4.18	4.26	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	14	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 44	****	****	4.32	4.12	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 49	****	****	4.26	4.28	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	14	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 41	****	****	4.14	4.13	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	14	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 46	****	****	4.31	4.52	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	14	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 37	****	****	4.05	4.47	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	14	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.27	4.21	****

Course-Section: FREN 101 2  
 Title Elementary French I  
 Instructor: Badagbo,Ama  
 Enrollment: 26  
 Questionnaires: 15

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2009

Page 772  
 MAR 22, 2010  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	3	Required for Majors	3	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	5						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	5	Under-grad	15	Non-major	15
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	0	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	0						

Course-Section: FREN 101 3  
 Title Elementary French I  
 Instructor: Wecker, Donna L.  
 Enrollment: 25  
 Questionnaires: 17

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2009

Page 773  
 MAR 22, 2010  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean		
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5						Mean	Rank
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	3	5	9	4.35	778/1509	4.42	4.42	4.31	4.18	4.35
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	5	10	4.47	589/1509	4.46	4.39	4.26	4.25	4.47
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	4	12	4.65	381/1287	4.56	4.48	4.30	4.24	4.65
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	1	3	3	8	4.20	834/1459	4.40	4.32	4.22	4.11	4.20
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	1	0	2	5	8	4.19	665/1406	4.34	4.19	4.09	4.02	4.19
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	5	1	1	3	2	5	3.75	1050/1384	4.15	4.17	4.11	3.98	3.75
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	3	3	11	4.47	499/1489	4.17	4.07	4.17	4.20	4.47
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	17	5.00	1/1506	4.81	4.55	4.67	4.66	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	0	10	5	4.33	545/1463	4.08	4.16	4.09	4.02	4.33
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	1	1	3	12	4.53	775/1438	4.45	4.48	4.46	4.44	4.53
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	17	5.00	1/1421	4.68	4.75	4.73	4.66	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	2	3	12	4.59	520/1411	4.38	4.39	4.31	4.27	4.59
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	1	2	13	4.59	558/1405	4.42	4.45	4.32	4.27	4.59
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	3	4	10	4.41	346/1236	4.00	3.92	4.00	3.87	4.41
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	1	0	4	6	3	3.71	958/1260	4.12	4.32	4.14	3.95	3.71
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	1	2	11	4.71	390/1255	4.68	4.53	4.33	4.15	4.71
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	1	0	1	5	7	4.21	839/1258	4.35	4.46	4.38	4.18	4.21
4. Were special techniques successful	3	2	0	2	1	2	7	4.17	383/ 873	4.06	4.14	4.03	3.89	4.17
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	14	1	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/ 184	****	****	4.16	4.06	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	16	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 198	****	****	4.22	4.14	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	15	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 165	****	****	4.18	4.15	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 49	****	****	4.26	4.28	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	16	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 41	****	****	4.14	4.13	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 46	****	****	4.31	4.52	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 37	****	****	4.05	4.47	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	1	A	4	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	6						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	0	C	4	General	11	Under-grad	17	Non-major	16
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	3	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	1						
				I	0	Other	1				
				?	0						

Course-Section: FREN 101 4  
 Title Elementary French I  
 Instructor: Badagbo, Ama  
 Enrollment: 29  
 Questionnaires: 15

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2009

Page 774  
 MAR 22, 2010  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	3	3	9	4.40	724/1509	4.42	4.42	4.31	4.18	4.40
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	1	1	1	11	4.57	459/1509	4.46	4.39	4.26	4.25	4.57
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	2	12	4.73	282/1287	4.56	4.48	4.30	4.24	4.73
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	3	1	1	1	1	8	4.17	860/1459	4.40	4.32	4.22	4.11	4.17
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	1	2	3	8	4.29	551/1406	4.34	4.19	4.09	4.02	4.29
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	5	0	1	2	2	4	4.00	807/1384	4.15	4.17	4.11	3.98	4.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	1	1	2	10	4.27	749/1489	4.17	4.07	4.17	4.20	4.27
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	15	5.00	1/1506	4.81	4.55	4.67	4.66	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	1	1	6	6	4.21	668/1463	4.08	4.16	4.09	4.02	4.21
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	1	0	1	3	10	4.40	930/1438	4.45	4.48	4.46	4.44	4.40
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	3	11	4.67	1014/1421	4.68	4.75	4.73	4.66	4.67
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	1	0	1	3	10	4.40	738/1411	4.38	4.39	4.31	4.27	4.40
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	1	3	10	4.47	683/1405	4.42	4.45	4.32	4.27	4.47
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	1	3	4	6	4.07	630/1236	4.00	3.92	4.00	3.87	4.07
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	1	0	3	4	4	3.83	896/1260	4.12	4.32	4.14	3.95	3.83
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	1	3	8	4.58	519/1255	4.68	4.53	4.33	4.15	4.58
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	1	0	2	3	6	4.08	907/1258	4.35	4.46	4.38	4.18	4.08
4. Were special techniques successful	3	3	2	1	1	2	3	3.33	754/ 873	4.06	4.14	4.03	3.89	3.33
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	14	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 184	****	****	4.16	4.06	****

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	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	2							
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	2	C	0	General		11	Under-grad	15	Non-major	15
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	3	D	0							
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	0	F	0	Electives		1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0							
				I	0	Other		0				
				?	0							

Course-Section: FREN 102 1  
 Title Elementary French II  
 Instructor: Wecker, Donna L.  
 Enrollment: 19  
 Questionnaires: 14

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2009

Page 775  
 MAR 22, 2010  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	5	8	4.50	598/1509	4.21	4.42	4.31	4.18	4.50
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	5	9	4.64	378/1509	4.38	4.39	4.26	4.25	4.64
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	5	9	4.64	381/1287	4.62	4.48	4.30	4.24	4.64
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	8	4	4.14	877/1459	4.21	4.32	4.22	4.11	4.14
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	1	1	4	6	4.25	587/1406	4.08	4.19	4.09	4.02	4.25
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	1	1	5	5	4.17	701/1384	4.03	4.17	4.11	3.98	4.17
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	0	1	6	6	4.14	875/1489	4.26	4.07	4.17	4.20	4.14
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	14	5.00	1/1506	4.71	4.55	4.67	4.66	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	2	8	3	4.08	815/1463	3.92	4.16	4.09	4.02	4.08
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	5	9	4.64	617/1438	4.57	4.48	4.46	4.44	4.64
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	14	5.00	1/1421	4.77	4.75	4.73	4.66	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	9	5	4.36	789/1411	4.24	4.39	4.31	4.27	4.36
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	6	8	4.57	568/1405	4.39	4.45	4.32	4.27	4.57
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	2	5	7	4.36	402/1236	3.69	3.92	4.00	3.87	4.36
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	1	2	6	3	3.92	856/1260	3.76	4.32	4.14	3.95	3.92
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	0	4	8	4.67	443/1255	4.36	4.53	4.33	4.15	4.67
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	1	3	4	4	3.92	1004/1258	3.98	4.46	4.38	4.18	3.92
4. Were special techniques successful	2	0	0	1	1	3	7	4.33	292/ 873	4.05	4.14	4.03	3.89	4.33

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors		
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A 6	Required for Majors 2	Graduate 0	Major 0
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B 3			
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	1	C 2	General 10	Under-grad 14	Non-major 14
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	3	D 1			
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F 0	Electives 1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	
				P 0			
				I 0	Other 0		
				? 0			

Course-Section: FREN 102 2  
 Title Elementary French II  
 Instructor: Wecker, Donna L.  
 Enrollment: 24  
 Questionnaires: 15

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2009

Page 776  
 MAR 22, 2010  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	3	6	6	4.20	942/1509	4.21	4.42	4.31	4.18	4.20
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	1	0	1	5	7	4.21	901/1509	4.38	4.39	4.26	4.25	4.21
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	4	11	4.73	282/1287	4.62	4.48	4.30	4.24	4.73
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	1	0	2	5	6	4.07	931/1459	4.21	4.32	4.22	4.11	4.07
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	3	1	0	1	4	5	4.09	746/1406	4.08	4.19	4.09	4.02	4.09
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	3	2	0	1	5	3	3.64	1126/1384	4.03	4.17	4.11	3.98	3.64
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	1	4	9	4.57	376/1489	4.26	4.07	4.17	4.20	4.57
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	14	5.00	1/1506	4.71	4.55	4.67	4.66	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	1	1	0	2	5	4	3.92	970/1463	3.92	4.16	4.09	4.02	3.92
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	5	9	4.53	762/1438	4.57	4.48	4.46	4.44	4.53
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	14	4.93	376/1421	4.77	4.75	4.73	4.66	4.93
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	1	0	1	6	7	4.20	936/1411	4.24	4.39	4.31	4.27	4.20
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	1	4	9	4.33	828/1405	4.39	4.45	4.32	4.27	4.33
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	1	0	2	5	6	4.07	630/1236	3.69	3.92	4.00	3.87	4.07
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	1	1	2	2	1	3.14	1142/1260	3.76	4.32	4.14	3.95	3.14
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	0	1	0	2	4	4.29	762/1255	4.36	4.53	4.33	4.15	4.29
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	1	2	0	2	2	3.29	1193/1258	3.98	4.46	4.38	4.18	3.29
4. Were special techniques successful	7	0	0	1	1	2	4	4.13	405/ 873	4.05	4.14	4.03	3.89	4.13
Laboratory														
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	14	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 198	****	****	4.22	4.14	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	14	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.39	3.75	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	14	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.41	4.29	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	5	0.00-0.99	0	A	9	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	4						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	8	Under-grad	15	Non-major	14
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	3				
				?	1						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean		
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5						Mean	Rank
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	1	2	4	6	4.15	987/1509	4.21	4.42	4.31	4.18	4.15
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	3	7	4.31	807/1509	4.38	4.39	4.26	4.25	4.31
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	2	2	8	4.50	519/1287	4.62	4.48	4.30	4.24	4.50
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	4	0	1	1	3	4	4.11	902/1459	4.21	4.32	4.22	4.11	4.11
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	3	2	1	1	2	4	3.50	1178/1406	4.08	4.19	4.09	4.02	3.50
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	5	0	1	2	1	4	4.00	807/1384	4.03	4.17	4.11	3.98	4.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	3	3	6	4.08	937/1489	4.26	4.07	4.17	4.20	4.08
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	4	9	4.69	917/1506	4.71	4.55	4.67	4.66	4.69
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	2	5	2	4.00	853/1463	3.92	4.16	4.09	4.02	4.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	0	4	6	4.60	675/1438	4.57	4.48	4.46	4.44	4.60
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	1	1	1	8	4.45	1189/1421	4.77	4.75	4.73	4.66	4.45
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	1	1	3	6	4.27	867/1411	4.24	4.39	4.31	4.27	4.27
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	1	1	2	6	4.30	859/1405	4.39	4.45	4.32	4.27	4.30
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	6	2	0	1	0	1	2.50	1197/1236	3.69	3.92	4.00	3.87	2.50
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	2	0	2	1	3	3.38	1096/1260	3.76	4.32	4.14	3.95	3.38
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	0	3	2	3	4.00	904/1255	4.36	4.53	4.33	4.15	4.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	0	0	2	2	3	4.14	878/1258	3.98	4.46	4.38	4.18	4.14
4. Were special techniques successful	5	4	0	1	1	1	1	3.50	705/ 873	4.05	4.14	4.03	3.89	3.50
Laboratory														
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	12	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 198	****	****	4.22	4.14	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	12	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.39	3.75	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	12	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.41	4.29	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 47	****	****	4.51	4.53	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 49	****	****	4.26	4.28	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	12	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 41	****	****	4.14	4.13	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 46	****	****	4.31	4.52	****

Frequency Distribution

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



Course-Section: FREN 102 4  
 Title Elementary French II  
 Instructor: Gueye,Sokhna Fa  
 Enrollment: 30  
 Questionnaires: 21

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2009

Page 778  
 MAR 22, 2010  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	0	1	5	7	7	4.00	1114/1509	4.21	4.42	4.31	4.18	4.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	2	3	1	14	4.35	753/1509	4.38	4.39	4.26	4.25	4.35
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	6	13	4.60	426/1287	4.62	4.48	4.30	4.24	4.60
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	6	0	0	3	1	10	4.50	454/1459	4.21	4.32	4.22	4.11	4.50
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	5	0	0	1	6	8	4.47	377/1406	4.08	4.19	4.09	4.02	4.47
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	4	0	1	0	8	7	4.31	557/1384	4.03	4.17	4.11	3.98	4.31
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	0	3	5	11	4.25	760/1489	4.26	4.07	4.17	4.20	4.25
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	17	3	4.15	1320/1506	4.71	4.55	4.67	4.66	4.15
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	2	3	9	2	3.69	1155/1463	3.92	4.16	4.09	4.02	3.69
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	1	8	11	4.50	800/1438	4.57	4.48	4.46	4.44	4.50
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	1	4	15	4.70	979/1421	4.77	4.75	4.73	4.66	4.70
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	6	5	9	4.15	964/1411	4.24	4.39	4.31	4.27	4.15
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	2	6	11	4.35	808/1405	4.39	4.45	4.32	4.27	4.35
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	2	0	0	8	4	5	3.82	814/1236	3.69	3.92	4.00	3.87	3.82
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	3	1	13	4.59	364/1260	3.76	4.32	4.14	3.95	4.59
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	1	2	2	12	4.47	602/1255	4.36	4.53	4.33	4.15	4.47
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	0	3	1	13	4.59	563/1258	3.98	4.46	4.38	4.18	4.59
4. Were special techniques successful	3	6	0	0	3	3	6	4.25	333/ 873	4.05	4.14	4.03	3.89	4.25
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	18	1	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 184	****	****	4.16	4.06	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	18	0	0	1	1	0	1	3.33	****/ 198	****	****	4.22	4.14	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	18	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 184	****	****	4.48	4.48	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	18	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 177	****	****	4.36	4.29	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	18	1	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 165	****	****	4.18	4.15	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	18	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 89	****	5.00	4.49	4.31	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	18	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 92	****	4.93	4.54	4.16	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	18	1	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 90	****	4.62	4.50	4.21	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	18	1	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 92	****	4.93	4.38	4.21	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	18	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 93	****	4.86	4.06	3.92	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 48	****	****	4.39	3.75	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	19	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 48	****	****	4.41	4.29	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	19	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 47	****	****	4.51	4.53	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	19	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 47	****	****	4.18	4.26	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	19	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 44	****	****	4.32	4.12	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 49	****	****	4.26	4.28	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	19	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 41	****	****	4.14	4.13	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	19	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 46	****	****	4.31	4.52	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	19	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 37	****	****	4.05	4.47	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	19	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.27	4.21	****

Course-Section: FREN 102 4  
 Title Elementary French II  
 Instructor: Gueye, Sokhna Fa  
 Enrollment: 30  
 Questionnaires: 21

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2009

Page 778  
 MAR 22, 2010  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	0	A	9	Required for Majors	6	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B	9						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	2	C	0	General	11	Under-grad	21	Non-major	21
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	1				
				?	1						

Course-Section: FREN 103 1  
 Title Int Rev Elem French  
 Instructor: El Omari, Samir  
 Enrollment: 19  
 Questionnaires: 13

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2009

Page 779  
 MAR 22, 2010  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	0	0	1	3	8	4.58	505/1509	4.58	4.42	4.31	4.18	4.58
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	6	7	4.54	507/1509	4.54	4.39	4.26	4.25	4.54
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	5	8	4.62	414/1287	4.62	4.48	4.30	4.24	4.62
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	5	6	4.23	792/1459	4.23	4.32	4.22	4.11	4.23
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	3	4	6	4.23	611/1406	4.23	4.19	4.09	4.02	4.23
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	2	1	5	4	3.92	925/1384	3.92	4.17	4.11	3.98	3.92
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	1	5	1	5	3.83	1155/1489	3.83	4.07	4.17	4.20	3.83
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	8	4	4.33	1205/1506	4.33	4.55	4.67	4.66	4.33
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	0	4	6	4.60	248/1463	4.60	4.16	4.09	4.02	4.60
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	1	6	5	4.33	1001/1438	4.33	4.48	4.46	4.44	4.33
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	12	4.92	429/1421	4.92	4.75	4.73	4.66	4.92
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	7	6	4.46	665/1411	4.46	4.39	4.31	4.27	4.46
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	4	8	4.67	459/1405	4.67	4.45	4.32	4.27	4.67
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	1	1	0	0	6	4	4.09	620/1236	4.09	3.92	4.00	3.87	4.09
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	1	2	6	4.56	383/1260	4.56	4.32	4.14	3.95	4.56
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	1	1	3	4	4.11	868/1255	4.11	4.53	4.33	4.15	4.11
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	0	3	2	4	4.11	895/1258	4.11	4.46	4.38	4.18	4.11
4. Were special techniques successful	4	2	1	0	1	2	3	3.86	560/ 873	3.86	4.14	4.03	3.89	3.86

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors		
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 6	Required for Majors 2	Graduate 0	Major 0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B 4			
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C 0	General 7	Under-grad 13	Non-major 13
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	1	D 0			
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	0	F 0	Electives 2	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	
				P 0			
				I 0	Other 0		
				? 1			

Course-Section: FREN 201 1  
 Title Intermediate French I  
 Instructor: Badagbo, Yawo  
 Enrollment: 18  
 Questionnaires: 10

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2009

Page 780  
 MAR 22, 2010  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	1	0	3	3	3	3.70	1321/1509	3.69	4.42	4.31	4.34	3.70
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	4	4	4.20	922/1509	3.99	4.39	4.26	4.32	4.20
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	7	4.70	326/1287	4.32	4.48	4.30	4.35	4.70
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	4	0	1	1	0	4	4.17	860/1459	4.19	4.32	4.22	4.30	4.17
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	3	5	4.30	527/1406	4.16	4.19	4.09	4.09	4.30
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	4	0	0	1	2	3	4.33	531/1384	3.81	4.17	4.11	4.09	4.33
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	2	2	6	4.40	597/1489	4.22	4.07	4.17	4.19	4.40
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	583/1506	4.82	4.55	4.67	4.61	4.90
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	1	3	3	1	3.50	1241/1463	3.52	4.16	4.09	4.08	3.50
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	2	1	1	4	3.88	1276/1438	3.86	4.48	4.46	4.48	3.88
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	614/1421	4.37	4.75	4.73	4.76	4.88
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	1	2	2	3	3.88	1157/1411	3.70	4.39	4.31	4.37	3.88
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	1	2	1	4	4.00	1047/1405	3.81	4.45	4.32	4.39	4.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	0	3	0	1	1	3	3.13	1110/1236	3.45	3.92	4.00	4.11	3.13
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	1	1	1	1	3	3.57	1021/1260	3.66	4.32	4.14	4.19	3.57
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	390/1255	4.10	4.53	4.33	4.37	4.71
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	570/1258	3.91	4.46	4.38	4.44	4.57
4. Were special techniques successful	4	3	0	1	0	2	0	3.33	754/ 873	3.29	4.14	4.03	4.04	3.33
Laboratory														
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	8	0	2	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 198	****	****	4.22	4.51	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	9	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.39	4.79	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	9	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.41	4.50	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	8	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 47	****	****	4.18	4.56	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	8	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 44	****	****	4.32	4.67	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 49	****	****	4.26	4.33	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 41	****	****	4.14	****	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 46	****	****	4.31	4.00	****

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: FREN 201 2  
 Title Intermediate French I  
 Instructor: Badagbo, Yawo  
 Enrollment: 19  
 Questionnaires: 16

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2009

Page 781  
 MAR 22, 2010  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	4	6	6	4.13	1021/1509	3.69	4.42	4.31	4.34	4.13
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	5	2	8	4.06	1042/1509	3.99	4.39	4.26	4.32	4.06
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	4	10	4.50	519/1287	4.32	4.48	4.30	4.35	4.50
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	2	7	6	4.27	759/1459	4.19	4.32	4.22	4.30	4.27
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	2	6	7	4.19	665/1406	4.16	4.19	4.09	4.09	4.19
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	8	7	4.38	479/1384	3.81	4.17	4.11	4.09	4.38
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	1	0	7	7	4.33	674/1489	4.22	4.07	4.17	4.19	4.33
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	1	0	15	4.88	642/1506	4.82	4.55	4.67	4.61	4.88
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	1	1	0	4	3	3	3.64	1187/1463	3.52	4.16	4.09	4.08	3.64
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	1	3	4	7	4.13	1154/1438	3.86	4.48	4.46	4.48	4.13
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	4	11	4.63	1060/1421	4.37	4.75	4.73	4.76	4.63
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	1	3	6	5	4.00	1051/1411	3.70	4.39	4.31	4.37	4.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	3	5	7	4.27	889/1405	3.81	4.45	4.32	4.39	4.27
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	0	1	0	3	6	4	3.86	799/1236	3.45	3.92	4.00	4.11	3.86
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	1	2	5	4	4.00	746/1260	3.66	4.32	4.14	4.19	4.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	0	1	7	4	4.25	783/1255	4.10	4.53	4.33	4.37	4.25
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	2	1	5	4	3.92	1004/1258	3.91	4.46	4.38	4.44	3.92
4. Were special techniques successful	4	1	1	1	1	5	3	3.73	625/ 873	3.29	4.14	4.03	4.04	3.73
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	15	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 184	****	****	4.16	4.54	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	15	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 198	****	****	4.22	4.51	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	15	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 184	****	****	4.48	4.62	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	15	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 177	****	****	4.36	4.65	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	15	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 165	****	****	4.18	4.56	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	15	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 89	****	5.00	4.49	5.00	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	15	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 92	****	4.93	4.54	****	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 90	****	4.62	4.50	****	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 92	****	4.93	4.38	4.00	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	15	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 93	****	4.86	4.06	2.88	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.39	4.79	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	15	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.41	4.50	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	15	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 47	****	****	4.51	4.83	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	15	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 47	****	****	4.18	4.56	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	15	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 44	****	****	4.32	4.67	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 49	****	****	4.26	4.33	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	15	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 41	****	****	4.14	****	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	15	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 46	****	****	4.31	4.00	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	15	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 37	****	****	4.05	****	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	15	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.27	****	****

Course-Section: FREN 201 2  
 Title Intermediate French I  
 Instructor: Badagbo, Yawo  
 Enrollment: 19  
 Questionnaires: 16

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2009

Page 781  
 MAR 22, 2010  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	6	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	4						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	10	Under-grad	16	Non-major	16
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	0	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	0						

Course-Section: FREN 201 3  
 Title Intermediate French I  
 Instructor: Badagbo, Ama  
 Enrollment: 23  
 Questionnaires: 14

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2009

Page 782  
 MAR 22, 2010  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	1	2	3	5	3	3.50	1399/1509	3.69	4.42	4.31	4.34	3.50
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	0	1	4	8	4.29	828/1509	3.99	4.39	4.26	4.32	4.29
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	0	0	6	7	4.29	755/1287	4.32	4.48	4.30	4.35	4.29
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	1	0	2	4	6	4.08	931/1459	4.19	4.32	4.22	4.30	4.08
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	4	0	0	0	5	5	4.50	332/1406	4.16	4.19	4.09	4.09	4.50
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	5	0	1	1	2	5	4.22	649/1384	3.81	4.17	4.11	4.09	4.22
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	1	0	4	8	4.21	802/1489	4.22	4.07	4.17	4.19	4.21
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	1	4	9	4.57	1014/1506	4.82	4.55	4.67	4.61	4.57
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	1	0	6	5	1	3.38	1300/1463	3.52	4.16	4.09	4.08	3.38
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	2	1	1	4	5	3.69	1336/1438	3.86	4.48	4.46	4.48	3.69
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	1	0	1	4	6	4.17	1318/1421	4.37	4.75	4.73	4.76	4.17
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	1	1	3	4	4	3.69	1225/1411	3.70	4.39	4.31	4.37	3.69
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	2	0	6	4	3.77	1188/1405	3.81	4.45	4.32	4.39	3.77
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	1	1	1	4	3	3	3.50	984/1236	3.45	3.92	4.00	4.11	3.50
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	1	0	1	2	2	3.67	982/1260	3.66	4.32	4.14	4.19	3.67
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	1	0	1	1	3	3.83	1023/1255	4.10	4.53	4.33	4.37	3.83
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	1	0	1	1	3	3.83	1041/1258	3.91	4.46	4.38	4.44	3.83
4. Were special techniques successful	8	4	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/ 873	3.29	4.14	4.03	4.04	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	12	1	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 184	****	****	4.16	4.54	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	13	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 198	****	****	4.22	4.51	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	13	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 177	****	****	4.36	4.65	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors		
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 9	Required for Majors 2	Graduate 0	Major 0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B 3			
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	1	C 0	General 11	Under-grad 14	Non-major 14
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	3	D 0			
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F 0	Electives 0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	
				P 0			
				I 0	Other 0		
				? 0			

Course-Section: FREN 201 4  
 Title Intermediate French I  
 Instructor: Badagbo, Ama  
 Enrollment: 23  
 Questionnaires: 13

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2009

Page 783  
 MAR 22, 2010  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	1	0	3	6	3	3.77	1301/1509	3.69	4.42	4.31	4.34	3.77
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	5	3	4	3.77	1252/1509	3.99	4.39	4.26	4.32	3.77
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	3	7	4.31	739/1287	4.32	4.48	4.30	4.35	4.31
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	4	0	0	2	2	5	4.33	686/1459	4.19	4.32	4.22	4.30	4.33
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	4	0	0	1	3	5	4.44	400/1406	4.16	4.19	4.09	4.09	4.44
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	4	2	2	0	2	3	3.22	1292/1384	3.81	4.17	4.11	4.09	3.22
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	2	3	7	4.23	781/1489	4.22	4.07	4.17	4.19	4.23
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	12	4.92	466/1506	4.82	4.55	4.67	4.61	4.92
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	1	0	5	2	3	3.55	1227/1463	3.52	4.16	4.09	4.08	3.55
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	1	0	2	2	7	4.17	1135/1438	3.86	4.48	4.46	4.48	4.17
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	1	1	1	2	7	4.08	1333/1421	4.37	4.75	4.73	4.76	4.08
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	1	1	4	2	3	3.45	1293/1411	3.70	4.39	4.31	4.37	3.45
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	2	1	2	2	5	3.58	1245/1405	3.81	4.45	4.32	4.39	3.58
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	3	2	3	4	3.67	904/1236	3.45	3.92	4.00	4.11	3.67
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	1	1	0	1	3.33	****/1260	3.66	4.32	4.14	4.19	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	10	0	0	0	2	0	1	3.67	****/1255	4.10	4.53	4.33	4.37	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	10	0	0	0	2	1	0	3.33	****/1258	3.91	4.46	4.38	4.44	****
4. Were special techniques successful	10	2	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 873	3.29	4.14	4.03	4.04	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors		
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	1	A 9	Required for Majors 5	Graduate 0	Major 0
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B 2			
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	1	C 0	General 4	Under-grad 13	Non-major 13
84-150	6	3.00-3.49	2	D 0			
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F 0	Electives 1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	
				P 0			
				I 0	Other 0		
				? 0			



Course-Section: FREN 201 5  
 Title Intermediate French I  
 Instructor: Diallo,Mamadou  
 Enrollment: 17  
 Questionnaires: 12

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2009

Page 784  
 MAR 22, 2010  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	0	4	2	2	3	3.36	1431/1509	3.69	4.42	4.31	4.34	3.36
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	1	0	2	7	1	3.64	1318/1509	3.99	4.39	4.26	4.32	3.64
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	1	1	1	4	4	3.82	1069/1287	4.32	4.48	4.30	4.35	3.82
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	1	0	0	2	5	3	4.10	911/1459	4.19	4.32	4.22	4.30	4.10
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	2	0	3	4	2	3.36	1249/1406	4.16	4.19	4.09	4.09	3.36
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	2	1	2	3	3	0	2.89	1345/1384	3.81	4.17	4.11	4.09	2.89
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	1	4	1	5	3.91	1106/1489	4.22	4.07	4.17	4.19	3.91
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	2	9	4.82	762/1506	4.82	4.55	4.67	4.61	4.82
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	2	0	0	5	3	1	3.56	1224/1463	3.52	4.16	4.09	4.08	3.56
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	1	0	4	5	1	3.45	1376/1438	3.86	4.48	4.46	4.48	3.45
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	1	1	5	4	4.09	1332/1421	4.37	4.75	4.73	4.76	4.09
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	2	3	5	1	3.45	1293/1411	3.70	4.39	4.31	4.37	3.45
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	3	2	4	2	3.45	1279/1405	3.81	4.45	4.32	4.39	3.45
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	0	1	2	2	5	0	3.10	1116/1236	3.45	3.92	4.00	4.11	3.10
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	2	4	2	2	3.40	1091/1260	3.66	4.32	4.14	4.19	3.40
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	1	1	2	3	3	3.60	1104/1255	4.10	4.53	4.33	4.37	3.60
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	4	1	3	2	3.30	1190/1258	3.91	4.46	4.38	4.44	3.30
4. Were special techniques successful	2	0	2	2	3	2	1	2.80	842/ 873	3.29	4.14	4.03	4.04	2.80
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	11	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 89	****	5.00	4.49	5.00	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 92	****	4.93	4.38	4.00	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 49	****	****	4.26	4.33	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	11	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 46	****	****	4.31	4.00	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	11	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 37	****	****	4.05	****	****

Frequency Distribution

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

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	3	11	4.67	410/1509	4.67	4.42	4.31	4.34	4.67
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	13	4.87	150/1509	4.87	4.39	4.26	4.32	4.87
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	1	13	4.93	101/1287	4.93	4.48	4.30	4.35	4.93
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	0	1	2	9	4.67	280/1459	4.67	4.32	4.22	4.30	4.67
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	4	0	0	2	3	6	4.36	478/1406	4.36	4.19	4.09	4.09	4.36
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	1	0	0	2	3	8	4.46	385/1384	4.46	4.17	4.11	4.09	4.46
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	4	11	4.73	208/1489	4.73	4.07	4.17	4.19	4.73
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	7	8	4.53	1046/1506	4.53	4.55	4.67	4.61	4.53
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	1	4	10	4.60	248/1463	4.60	4.16	4.09	4.08	4.60
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	2	12	4.73	480/1438	4.73	4.48	4.46	4.48	4.73
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	14	4.93	376/1421	4.93	4.75	4.73	4.76	4.93
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	0	14	4.87	180/1411	4.87	4.39	4.31	4.37	4.87
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	0	0	14	4.80	285/1405	4.80	4.45	4.32	4.39	4.80
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	1	0	1	1	11	4.50	274/1236	4.50	3.92	4.00	4.11	4.50
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	2	10	4.83	187/1260	4.83	4.32	4.14	4.19	4.83
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	1	0	11	4.83	262/1255	4.83	4.53	4.33	4.37	4.83
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	212/1258	4.92	4.46	4.38	4.44	4.92
4. Were special techniques successful	4	3	0	0	0	3	5	4.63	169/ 873	4.63	4.14	4.03	4.04	4.63
Laboratory														
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	13	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 198	****	****	4.22	4.51	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	13	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 184	****	****	4.48	4.62	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	14	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.39	4.79	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	14	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.41	4.50	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 49	****	****	4.26	4.33	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 41	****	****	4.14	****	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 46	****	****	4.31	4.00	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors		
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	0	A 8	Required for Majors 5	Graduate 0	Major 2
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B 5			
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C 1	General 2	Under-grad 15	Non-major 13
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	0	D 0			
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F 0	Electives 3	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	
				P 0			
				I 0	Other 2		
				? 0			

Course-Section: FREN 301 1  
 Title Advanced French I  
 Instructor: Deverneil,Marie  
 Enrollment: 15  
 Questionnaires: 8

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2009

Page 786  
 MAR 22, 2010  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean		
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5						Mean	Rank
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	0	2	0	3	2	3.71	1317/1509	3.71	4.42	4.31	4.32	3.71
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	256/1509	4.75	4.39	4.26	4.25	4.75
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	151/1287	4.88	4.48	4.30	4.33	4.88
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	4	4	4.50	454/1459	4.50	4.32	4.22	4.26	4.50
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	2	1	1	4	3.88	956/1406	3.88	4.19	4.09	4.12	3.88
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	4	3	4.25	619/1384	4.25	4.17	4.11	4.15	4.25
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	1	2	4	4.13	896/1489	4.13	4.07	4.17	4.14	4.13
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1506	5.00	4.55	4.67	4.67	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	248/1463	4.60	4.16	4.09	4.08	4.60
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	319/1438	4.83	4.48	4.46	4.43	4.83
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	881/1421	4.75	4.75	4.73	4.73	4.75
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	1	0	0	7	4.63	469/1411	4.63	4.39	4.31	4.29	4.63
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	1	6	4.63	513/1405	4.63	4.45	4.32	4.32	4.63
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	1	0	1	0	4	2	4.00	664/1236	4.00	3.92	4.00	4.07	4.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	415/1260	4.50	4.32	4.14	4.22	4.50
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1255	5.00	4.53	4.33	4.37	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	421/1258	4.75	4.46	4.38	4.42	4.75
4. Were special techniques successful	4	1	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	292/ 873	4.33	4.14	4.03	4.08	4.33
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 49	****	****	4.26	5.00	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 41	****	****	4.14	5.00	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 46	****	****	4.31	5.00	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	2	0.00-0.99 0	A 3	Required for Majors	7
28-55	1	1.00-1.99 0	B 3		Graduate 0
56-83	1	2.00-2.99 0	C 1	General	0
84-150	1	3.00-3.49 0	D 0		Under-grad 8
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 3	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		
			I 0		
			? 0	Other	0

#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant

Course-Section: FREN 302 1  
 Title Advanced French II  
 Instructor: Provencher,Deni  
 Enrollment: 10  
 Questionnaires: 6

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2009

Page 787  
 MAR 22, 2010  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	410/1509	4.67	4.42	4.31	4.32	4.67
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	2	3	4.33	774/1509	4.33	4.39	4.26	4.25	4.33
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1287	5.00	4.48	4.30	4.33	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	2	3	4.33	686/1459	4.33	4.32	4.22	4.26	4.33
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	2	3	4.33	502/1406	4.33	4.19	4.09	4.12	4.33
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	96/1384	4.83	4.17	4.11	4.15	4.83
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	0	5	4.67	276/1489	4.67	4.07	4.17	4.14	4.67
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	722/1506	4.83	4.55	4.67	4.67	4.83
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	151/1463	4.75	4.16	4.09	4.08	4.75
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	319/1438	4.83	4.48	4.46	4.43	4.83
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1421	5.00	4.75	4.73	4.73	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	496/1411	4.60	4.39	4.31	4.29	4.60
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1405	5.00	4.45	4.32	4.32	5.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	0	3	3	4.50	274/1236	4.50	3.92	4.00	4.07	4.50
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	209/1260	4.80	4.32	4.14	4.22	4.80
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	287/1255	4.80	4.53	4.33	4.37	4.80
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	363/1258	4.80	4.46	4.38	4.42	4.80
4. Were special techniques successful	1	1	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	114/ 873	4.75	4.14	4.03	4.08	4.75

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: FREN 319 1  
 Title French Translation  
 Instructor: McCray, Stanley  
 Enrollment: 23  
 Questionnaires: 11

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2009

Page 788  
 MAR 22, 2010  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	3	7	4.55	551/1509	4.55	4.42	4.31	4.32	4.55
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	8	4.73	289/1509	4.73	4.39	4.26	4.25	4.73
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	208/1287	4.80	4.48	4.30	4.33	4.80
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	0	0	4	6	4.27	748/1459	4.27	4.32	4.22	4.26	4.27
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	1	0	0	1	0	8	4.78	152/1406	4.78	4.19	4.09	4.12	4.78
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	107/1384	4.80	4.17	4.11	4.15	4.80
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	1	0	0	3	2	4	4.11	906/1489	4.11	4.07	4.17	4.14	4.11
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	1	10	0	3.91	1448/1506	3.91	4.55	4.67	4.67	3.91
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	1	5	4	4.30	579/1463	4.30	4.16	4.09	4.08	4.30
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	413/1438	4.78	4.48	4.46	4.43	4.78
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1421	5.00	4.75	4.73	4.73	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	159/1411	4.89	4.39	4.31	4.29	4.89
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	321/1405	4.78	4.45	4.32	4.32	4.78
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	2	0	0	3	1	3	4.00	664/1236	4.00	3.92	4.00	4.07	4.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1260	5.00	4.32	4.14	4.22	5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	0	1	0	5	4.67	443/1255	4.67	4.53	4.33	4.37	4.67
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	324/1258	4.83	4.46	4.38	4.42	4.83
4. Were special techniques successful	5	2	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/ 873	5.00	4.14	4.03	4.08	5.00

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	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	1						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	1	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	11	Non-major	10
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	0	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	0						

Course-Section: FREN 330 1  
 Title Interconnections:Ideas  
 Instructor: Fatih,Zakaria  
 Enrollment: 15  
 Questionnaires: 11

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2009

Page 789  
 MAR 22, 2010  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	3	8	4.73	339/1509	4.73	4.42	4.31	4.32	4.73
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	1	9	4.73	289/1509	4.73	4.39	4.26	4.25	4.73
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	1	8	4.45	578/1287	4.45	4.48	4.30	4.33	4.45
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	1	9	4.73	218/1459	4.73	4.32	4.22	4.26	4.73
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	135/1406	4.80	4.19	4.09	4.12	4.80
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	2	7	4.60	278/1384	4.60	4.17	4.11	4.15	4.60
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	2	2	6	4.40	597/1489	4.40	4.07	4.17	4.14	4.40
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1506	5.00	4.55	4.67	4.67	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	2	3	5	4.30	579/1463	4.30	4.16	4.09	4.08	4.30
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	4	6	4.60	675/1438	4.60	4.48	4.46	4.43	4.60
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	537/1421	4.90	4.75	4.73	4.73	4.90
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	1	1	8	4.70	376/1411	4.70	4.39	4.31	4.29	4.70
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	172/1405	4.90	4.45	4.32	4.32	4.90
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	7	1	0	1	1	0	2.67	1188/1236	2.67	3.92	4.00	4.07	2.67
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	272/1260	4.71	4.32	4.14	4.22	4.71
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	0	1	1	5	4.57	526/1255	4.57	4.53	4.33	4.37	4.57
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	299/1258	4.86	4.46	4.38	4.42	4.86
4. Were special techniques successful	4	4	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	292/ 873	4.33	4.14	4.03	4.08	4.33

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: FREN 340 1  
 Title Interconnections: Soci  
 Instructor: Provencher,Deni  
 Enrollment: 17  
 Questionnaires: 15

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2009

Page 790  
 MAR 22, 2010  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean		
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5						Mean	Rank
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	1	13	4.80	244/1509	4.80	4.42	4.31	4.32	4.80
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	6	9	4.60	424/1509	4.60	4.39	4.26	4.25	4.60
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	4	10	4.60	426/1287	4.60	4.48	4.30	4.33	4.60
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	4	11	4.73	209/1459	4.73	4.32	4.22	4.26	4.73
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	1	13	4.80	135/1406	4.80	4.19	4.09	4.12	4.80
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	13	4.87	85/1384	4.87	4.17	4.11	4.15	4.87
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	5	10	4.67	276/1489	4.67	4.07	4.17	4.14	4.67
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	8	7	4.47	1108/1506	4.47	4.55	4.67	4.67	4.47
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	1	0	0	2	8	4.45	396/1463	4.45	4.16	4.09	4.08	4.45
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	2	13	4.87	276/1438	4.87	4.48	4.46	4.43	4.87
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	14	4.93	376/1421	4.93	4.75	4.73	4.73	4.93
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	2	13	4.87	180/1411	4.87	4.39	4.31	4.29	4.87
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	14	4.93	120/1405	4.93	4.45	4.32	4.32	4.93
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	0	1	2	11	4.71	147/1236	4.71	3.92	4.00	4.07	4.71
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1260	5.00	4.32	4.14	4.22	5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	0	1	0	0	6	4.57	526/1255	4.57	4.53	4.33	4.37	4.57
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	0	1	0	0	6	4.57	570/1258	4.57	4.46	4.38	4.42	4.57
4. Were special techniques successful	8	0	1	0	1	1	4	4.00	442/ 873	4.00	4.14	4.03	4.08	4.00
Laboratory														
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	14	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 198	****	****	4.22	4.17	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	14	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 177	****	****	4.36	4.30	****
Seminar														
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 90	****	4.62	4.50	4.63	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	14	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.39	4.61	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	14	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.41	4.34	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	5	Required for Majors	10	Graduate	0	Major	7
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	4						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	1	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	15	Non-major	8
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	1				
				?	2						

Course-Section: FREN 430 1  
 Title Studies In French Lit  
 Instructor: Fatih,Zakaria  
 Enrollment: 16  
 Questionnaires: 11

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2009

Page 791  
 MAR 22, 2010  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	3	7	4.55	551/1509	4.55	4.42	4.31	4.39	4.55
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	3	5	4.09	1020/1509	4.09	4.39	4.26	4.26	4.09
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	4	0	0	1	6	4.86	167/1287	4.86	4.48	4.30	4.38	4.86	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	1	0	0	3	0	6	4.33	686/1459	4.33	4.32	4.22	4.32	4.33
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	3	8	4.73	181/1406	4.73	4.19	4.09	4.11	4.73
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	4	6	4.45	394/1384	4.45	4.17	4.11	4.23	4.45
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	0	3	7	4.45	527/1489	4.45	4.07	4.17	4.18	4.45
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	782/1506	4.80	4.55	4.67	4.67	4.80
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	2	3	3	4.13	774/1463	4.13	4.16	4.09	4.18	4.13
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	1	9	4.73	497/1438	4.73	4.48	4.46	4.50	4.73
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1421	5.00	4.75	4.73	4.76	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	2	2	6	4.40	738/1411	4.40	4.39	4.31	4.35	4.40
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	1	2	6	4.30	859/1405	4.30	4.45	4.32	4.34	4.30
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	0	0	1	1	3	4	4.11	607/1236	4.11	3.92	4.00	4.03	4.11
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	3	6	4.50	415/1260	4.50	4.32	4.14	4.25	4.50
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	1	3	1	5	4.00	904/1255	4.00	4.53	4.33	4.46	4.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	363/1258	4.80	4.46	4.38	4.51	4.80
4. Were special techniques successful	1	7	1	0	0	0	2	3.67	650/ 873	3.67	4.14	4.03	4.26	3.67
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 89	****	5.00	4.49	4.71	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 92	****	4.93	4.54	4.83	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 90	****	4.62	4.50	4.69	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 92	****	4.93	4.38	4.64	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 93	****	4.86	4.06	4.32	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	4	0.00-0.99	0	A	7	Required for Majors	5	Graduate	2	Major	6
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	0						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	1	C	1	General	0	Under-grad	9	Non-major	5
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	0	D	0						
Grad.	2	3.50-4.00	6	F	0	Electives	2	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	0						