

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	2	0	2	5	7	3.94	1305/1670	4.10	4.36	4.31	4.23	3.94
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	2	3	4	2	5	3.31	1570/1666	3.89	4.31	4.27	4.30	3.31
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	1	0	5	9	4.25	876/1406	4.39	4.48	4.32	4.31	4.25
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	3	2	1	4	1	5	3.46	1467/1615	4.02	4.34	4.24	4.17	3.46
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	3	2	0	3	4	3	3.50	1285/1566	4.11	4.26	4.07	4.03	3.50
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	5	1	1	2	4	2	3.50	1274/1528	3.94	4.23	4.12	4.00	3.50
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	3	0	1	6	6	3.75	1359/1650	3.81	4.16	4.22	4.28	3.75
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	15	1	4.06	1492/1667	4.26	4.47	4.67	4.61	4.06
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	3	0	3	6	2	3.29	1480/1626	3.75	4.08	4.11	4.07	3.29
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	1	0	1	7	5	4.07	1263/1559	4.04	4.38	4.46	4.47	4.07
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	1	1	3	9	4.43	1310/1560	4.62	4.75	4.72	4.68	4.43
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	1	0	2	6	5	4.00	1146/1549	3.93	4.34	4.31	4.32	4.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	0	1	6	6	4.14	1071/1546	4.09	4.40	4.32	4.32	4.14
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	0	0	2	1	8	3	3.86	857/1323	3.66	3.96	4.00	3.91	3.86
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	1	0	4	2	6	3.92	909/1384	3.98	4.29	4.10	3.92	3.92
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	4	2	7	4.23	872/1378	4.48	4.56	4.29	4.09	4.23
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	1	2	6	4	4.00	977/1378	4.00	4.45	4.31	4.08	4.00
4. Were special techniques successful	3	4	1	2	2	2	2	3.22	799/ 904	3.74	4.11	4.03	3.94	3.22
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	15	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 232	****	****	4.19	4.25	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	15	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 239	****	****	4.21	4.35	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	15	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 230	****	****	4.44	4.58	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	15	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 231	****	****	4.31	4.45	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	15	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 87	****	5.00	4.65	4.67	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	15	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 79	****	4.63	4.64	4.72	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 79	****	4.88	4.45	4.59	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	15	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 80	****	4.13	3.97	3.99	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	15	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 41	****	****	4.50	3.91	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	15	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 38	****	****	4.19	4.07	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	15	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 38	****	****	4.62	4.63	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	15	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.27	4.42	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	15	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.47	4.28	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 28	****	****	4.64	4.59	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	15	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 16	****	****	4.67	4.83	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	15	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 27	****	****	4.54	4.46	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	15	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 6	****	****	4.92	4.83	****

Course-Section: FREN 101 0101
 Title ELEMENTARY FRENCH I
 Instructor: DIGEON, LANDRY
 Enrollment: 25
 Questionnaires: 16

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2008

Page 835
 AUG 6, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	A	3	Required for Majors	8	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	4						
56-83	5	2.00-2.99	0	C	5	General	3	Under-grad	16	Non-major	15
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	1				
				?	0						

Course-Section: FREN 101 0201
 Title ELEMENTARY FRENCH I
 Instructor: MBAYE, ABDOULAY
 Enrollment: 29
 Questionnaires: 15

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2008

Page 836
 AUG 6, 2008
 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	4	7	4.20	1060/1670	4.10	4.36	4.31	4.23	4.20
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	0	2	4	8	4.20	1037/1666	3.89	4.31	4.27	4.30	4.20
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	1	13	4.80	261/1406	4.39	4.48	4.32	4.31	4.80
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	4	0	0	3	2	6	4.27	849/1615	4.02	4.34	4.24	4.17	4.27
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	4	0	0	2	2	7	4.45	440/1566	4.11	4.26	4.07	4.03	4.45
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	5	0	2	2	1	5	3.90	1039/1528	3.94	4.23	4.12	4.00	3.90
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	2	3	3	2	5	3.33	1521/1650	3.81	4.16	4.22	4.28	3.33
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	3	10	2	3.93	1583/1667	4.26	4.47	4.67	4.61	3.93
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	2	5	5	4.25	728/1626	3.75	4.08	4.11	4.07	4.25
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	2	2	2	9	4.20	1199/1559	4.04	4.38	4.46	4.47	4.20
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	2	1	12	4.67	1090/1560	4.62	4.75	4.72	4.68	4.67
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	2	1	4	7	4.14	1070/1549	3.93	4.34	4.31	4.32	4.14
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	1	4	9	4.33	919/1546	4.09	4.40	4.32	4.32	4.33
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	4	1	0	2	2	6	4.09	659/1323	3.66	3.96	4.00	3.91	4.09
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	1	0	1	3	5	4.10	796/1384	3.98	4.29	4.10	3.92	4.10
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	348/1378	4.48	4.56	4.29	4.09	4.80
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	0	1	2	7	4.60	590/1378	4.00	4.45	4.31	4.08	4.60
4. Were special techniques successful	5	3	1	1	2	0	3	3.43	752/ 904	3.74	4.11	4.03	3.94	3.43

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors				
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 7	Required for Majors	4	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	B 4						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	C 3	General	2	Under-grad	15	Non-major	15
84-150	6	3.00-3.49	D 0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	4	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
			P 0						
			I 0	Other	1				
			? 0						

Course-Section: FREN 101 0301
 Title ELEMENTARY FRENCH I
 Instructor: BADAGBO, YAWO
 Enrollment: 26
 Questionnaires: 17

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2008

Page 837
 AUG 6, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	8	5	4	3.76	1436/1670	4.10	4.36	4.31	4.23	3.76	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	2	1	4	6	4	3.53	1502/1666	3.89	4.31	4.27	4.30	3.53	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	0	5	5	6	3.88	1142/1406	4.39	4.48	4.32	4.31	3.88	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	4	0	1	2	7	3	3.92	1203/1615	4.02	4.34	4.24	4.17	3.92	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	4	0	1	1	5	6	4.23	664/1566	4.11	4.26	4.07	4.03	4.23	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	8	0	1	0	7	1	3.89	1055/1528	3.94	4.23	4.12	4.00	3.89	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	5	9	3	3.88	1288/1650	3.81	4.16	4.22	4.28	3.88	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	7	10	4.59	1097/1667	4.26	4.47	4.67	4.61	4.59	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	2	0	6	5	1	3.21	1505/1626	3.75	4.08	4.11	4.07	3.21	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	1	1	5	8	1	3.44	1475/1559	4.04	4.38	4.46	4.47	3.44	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	1	4	11	4.63	1138/1560	4.62	4.75	4.72	4.68	4.63	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	2	0	7	6	1	3.25	1459/1549	3.93	4.34	4.31	4.32	3.25	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	2	2	3	6	3	3.38	1417/1546	4.09	4.40	4.32	4.32	3.38	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	5	4	3	1	1	1	2.20	1290/1323	3.66	3.96	4.00	3.91	2.20	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	12	0	1	0	1	2	1	3.40	1141/1384	3.98	4.29	4.10	3.92	3.40	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	12	0	1	0	0	1	3	4.00	970/1378	4.48	4.56	4.29	4.09	4.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	12	0	1	2	1	0	1	2.60	1346/1378	4.00	4.45	4.31	4.08	2.60	
4. Were special techniques successful	12	4	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 904	3.74	4.11	4.03	3.94	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	15	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 232	****	****	4.19	4.25	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	16	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 239	****	****	4.21	4.35	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	15	1	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 230	****	****	4.44	4.58	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	15	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 231	****	****	4.31	4.45	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	15	1	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 218	****	****	4.18	4.47	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors				
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	A 8	Required for Majors	8	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	B 3						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	C 0	General	1	Under-grad	17	Non-major	17
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	D 0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
			P 0						
			I 0	Other	3				
			? 1						

Course-Section: FREN 101 0401
 Title ELEMENTARY FRENCH I
 Instructor: DIGEON, LANDRY
 Enrollment: 25
 Questionnaires: 16

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2008

Page 838
 AUG 6, 2008
 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	6	9	4.50	665/1670	4.10	4.36	4.31	4.23	4.50
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	6	9	4.50	622/1666	3.89	4.31	4.27	4.30	4.50
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	6	10	4.63	471/1406	4.39	4.48	4.32	4.31	4.63
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	0	8	6	4.43	660/1615	4.02	4.34	4.24	4.17	4.43
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	2	7	6	4.27	632/1566	4.11	4.26	4.07	4.03	4.27
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	2	0	0	1	5	7	4.46	476/1528	3.94	4.23	4.12	4.00	4.46
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	2	7	6	4.27	891/1650	3.81	4.16	4.22	4.28	4.27
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	8	7	4.47	1196/1667	4.26	4.47	4.67	4.61	4.47
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	1	1	6	7	4.27	716/1626	3.75	4.08	4.11	4.07	4.27
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	1	6	8	4.47	946/1559	4.04	4.38	4.46	4.47	4.47
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	4	12	4.75	948/1560	4.62	4.75	4.72	4.68	4.75
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	1	0	8	7	4.31	924/1549	3.93	4.34	4.31	4.32	4.31
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	6	9	4.50	715/1546	4.09	4.40	4.32	4.32	4.50
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	1	1	3	11	4.50	326/1323	3.66	3.96	4.00	3.91	4.50
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	1	3	6	4.50	434/1384	3.98	4.29	4.10	3.92	4.50
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	243/1378	4.48	4.56	4.29	4.09	4.90
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	386/1378	4.00	4.45	4.31	4.08	4.80
4. Were special techniques successful	6	1	0	0	0	4	5	4.56	222/ 904	3.74	4.11	4.03	3.94	4.56

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors		
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A 8	Required for Majors 7	Graduate 0	Major 1
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	0	B 7			
56-83	5	2.00-2.99	3	C 0	General 3	Under-grad 16	Non-major 15
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	3	D 0			
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F 0	Electives 2	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	
				P 0			
				I 0	Other 1		
				? 0			

Course-Section: FREN 102 0101
 Title ELEMENTARY FRENCH II
 Instructor: APPADOO, YOGEND
 Enrollment: 22
 Questionnaires: 13

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2008

Page 839
 AUG 6, 2008
 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	4	4	4	4.00	1216/1670	3.96	4.36	4.31	4.23	4.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	3	7	4.31	908/1666	4.07	4.31	4.27	4.30	4.31
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	2	8	4.31	836/1406	4.29	4.48	4.32	4.31	4.31
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	1	6	5	4.33	775/1615	3.95	4.34	4.24	4.17	4.33
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	2	3	7	4.42	480/1566	3.99	4.26	4.07	4.03	4.42
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	2	0	0	2	4	4	4.20	760/1528	3.63	4.23	4.12	4.00	4.20
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	1	6	5	4.33	806/1650	4.02	4.16	4.22	4.28	4.33
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	1	0	3	5	3	3.75	1633/1667	3.75	4.47	4.67	4.61	3.75
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	0	3	3	2	3.88	1152/1626	3.87	4.08	4.11	4.07	3.88
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	1	1	4	7	4.31	1122/1559	4.27	4.38	4.46	4.47	4.31
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	1	0	2	2	8	4.23	1416/1560	4.48	4.75	4.72	4.68	4.23
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	5	7	4.46	736/1549	4.30	4.34	4.31	4.32	4.46
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	3	2	7	4.33	919/1546	4.19	4.40	4.32	4.32	4.33
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	1	0	0	3	3	6	4.25	545/1323	3.59	3.96	4.00	3.91	4.25
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	1	0	3	1	3.80	975/1384	3.88	4.29	4.10	3.92	3.80
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	894/1378	3.99	4.56	4.29	4.09	4.20
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	1	0	1	3	0	3.20	1287/1378	3.81	4.45	4.31	4.08	3.20
4. Were special techniques successful	8	2	0	0	1	2	0	3.67	****/ 904	3.33	4.11	4.03	3.94	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 232	****	****	4.19	4.25	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 239	****	****	4.21	4.35	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 230	****	****	4.44	4.58	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 231	****	****	4.31	4.45	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 218	****	****	4.18	4.47	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 87	****	5.00	4.65	4.67	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 79	****	4.63	4.64	4.72	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 75	****	5.00	4.57	4.46	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 79	****	4.88	4.45	4.59	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 80	****	4.13	3.97	3.99	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 41	****	****	4.50	3.91	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 38	****	****	4.19	4.07	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 38	****	****	4.62	4.63	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.27	4.42	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 28	****	****	4.64	4.59	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 16	****	****	4.67	4.83	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 27	****	****	4.54	4.46	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 10	****	****	4.84	4.75	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 6	****	****	4.92	4.83	****

Course-Section: FREN 102 0101
 Title ELEMENTARY FRENCH II
 Instructor: APPADOO, YOGEND
 Enrollment: 22
 Questionnaires: 13

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2008

Page 839
 AUG 6, 2008
 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	7	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	2						
56-83	5	2.00-2.99	0	C	4	General	0	Under-grad	13	Non-major	13
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	2				
				?	0						

Course-Section: FREN 102 0201
 Title ELEMENTARY FRENCH II
 Instructor: MBAYE, ABDOULAY
 Enrollment: 23
 Questionnaires: 13

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2008

Page 840
 AUG 6, 2008
 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	7	5	4.31	943/1670	3.96	4.36	4.31	4.23	4.31
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	0	2	4	6	4.08	1154/1666	4.07	4.31	4.27	4.30	4.08
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	0	1	3	8	4.31	836/1406	4.29	4.48	4.32	4.31	4.31
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	4	0	1	3	3	2	3.67	1380/1615	3.95	4.34	4.24	4.17	3.67
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	1	3	4	3	3.82	1098/1566	3.99	4.26	4.07	4.03	3.82
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	5	0	1	3	3	1	3.50	1274/1528	3.63	4.23	4.12	4.00	3.50
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	4	2	1	6	3.69	1392/1650	4.02	4.16	4.22	4.28	3.69
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	13	0	4.00	1524/1667	3.75	4.47	4.67	4.61	4.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	3	7	3	4.00	953/1626	3.87	4.08	4.11	4.07	4.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	1	1	6	5	4.15	1224/1559	4.27	4.38	4.46	4.47	4.15
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	1	0	3	9	4.54	1222/1560	4.48	4.75	4.72	4.68	4.54
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	2	3	7	4.42	802/1549	4.30	4.34	4.31	4.32	4.42
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	2	1	9	4.38	869/1546	4.19	4.40	4.32	4.32	4.38
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	5	1	1	3	1	1	3.00	1179/1323	3.59	3.96	4.00	3.91	3.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	4	1	2	3.71	1013/1384	3.88	4.29	4.10	3.92	3.71
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	0	1	2	4	4.43	695/1378	3.99	4.56	4.29	4.09	4.43
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	0	0	2	2	3	4.14	926/1378	3.81	4.45	4.31	4.08	4.14
4. Were special techniques successful	6	4	0	1	0	2	0	3.33	****/ 904	3.33	4.11	4.03	3.94	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	12	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 232	****	****	4.19	4.25	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors		
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	5	Required for Majors		7	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B	5							
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	2	C	2	General		2	Under-grad	13	Non-major	13
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	1	D	0							
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F	0	Electives		0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0							
				I	0	Other		2				
				?	0							

Course-Section: FREN 102 0301
 Title ELEMENTARY FRENCH II
 Instructor: MBAYE, ABDOULAY
 Enrollment: 30
 Questionnaires: 20

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2008

Page 841
 AUG 6, 2008
 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	2	1	3	7	7	3.80	1414/1670	3.96	4.36	4.31	4.23	3.80
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	2	3	7	8	4.05	1167/1666	4.07	4.31	4.27	4.30	4.05
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	1	2	7	9	4.26	868/1406	4.29	4.48	4.32	4.31	4.26
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	6	0	0	4	3	7	4.21	922/1615	3.95	4.34	4.24	4.17	4.21
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	5	1	0	5	1	8	4.00	851/1566	3.99	4.26	4.07	4.03	4.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	6	1	1	4	3	4	3.62	1227/1528	3.63	4.23	4.12	4.00	3.62
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	4	1	7	7	3.75	1359/1650	4.02	4.16	4.22	4.28	3.75
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	1	1	16	2	3.95	1566/1667	3.75	4.47	4.67	4.61	3.95
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	1	4	6	8	4.11	900/1626	3.87	4.08	4.11	4.07	4.11
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	1	3	4	10	4.28	1143/1559	4.27	4.38	4.46	4.47	4.28
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	1	1	16	4.83	777/1560	4.48	4.75	4.72	4.68	4.83
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	1	1	3	5	8	4.00	1146/1549	4.30	4.34	4.31	4.32	4.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	0	3	7	7	4.06	1121/1546	4.19	4.40	4.32	4.32	4.06
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	5	1	2	3	2	5	3.62	985/1323	3.59	3.96	4.00	3.91	3.62
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	1	2	2	4	4.00	820/1384	3.88	4.29	4.10	3.92	4.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	11	0	0	0	2	2	5	4.33	797/1378	3.99	4.56	4.29	4.09	4.33
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	11	0	0	0	2	3	4	4.22	883/1378	3.81	4.45	4.31	4.08	4.22
4. Were special techniques successful	11	3	1	1	1	1	2	3.33	779/ 904	3.33	4.11	4.03	3.94	3.33

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors		
00-27	4	0.00-0.99	0	A 6	Required for Majors 15	Graduate 0	Major 0
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	B 6			
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	3	C 6	General 2	Under-grad 20	Non-major 20
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	2	D 0			
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	7	F 0	Electives 0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	
				P 0			
				I 0	Other 2		
				? 1			

Course-Section: FREN 102 0401
 Title ELEMENTARY FRENCH II
 Instructor: APPADOO, YOGEND
 Enrollment: 10
 Questionnaires: 7

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2008

Page 842
 AUG 6, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	4	1	2	3.71	1464/1670	3.96	4.36	4.31	4.23	3.71
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	2	2	3.86	1350/1666	4.07	4.31	4.27	4.30	3.86
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	0	2	4	4.29	852/1406	4.29	4.48	4.32	4.31	4.29
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	1	0	0	3	1	3.60	1418/1615	3.95	4.34	4.24	4.17	3.60
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	3	3	1	3.71	1173/1566	3.99	4.26	4.07	4.03	3.71
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	2	1	0	2	1	1	3.20	1413/1528	3.63	4.23	4.12	4.00	3.20
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	2	1	4	4.29	867/1650	4.02	4.16	4.22	4.28	4.29
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	5	2	0	3.29	1657/1667	3.75	4.47	4.67	4.61	3.29
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	3	3	0	3.50	1384/1626	3.87	4.08	4.11	4.07	3.50
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	1	2	3	4.33	1092/1559	4.27	4.38	4.46	4.47	4.33
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	2	0	4	4.33	1376/1560	4.48	4.75	4.72	4.68	4.33
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	1	2	3	4.33	900/1549	4.30	4.34	4.31	4.32	4.33
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	1	1	3	4.00	1139/1546	4.19	4.40	4.32	4.32	4.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	0	3	3	0	3.50	1040/1323	3.59	3.96	4.00	3.91	3.50
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	820/1384	3.88	4.29	4.10	3.92	4.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	1	1	1	0	3.00	1297/1378	3.99	4.56	4.29	4.09	3.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	0	1	2	0	3.67	1147/1378	3.81	4.45	4.31	4.08	3.67

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	

00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	2	Required for Majors	3	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	1						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	1	C	2	General	1	Under-grad	7	Non-major	7
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	1	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	1				
				?	0						

Course-Section: FREN 103 0101
 Title INT REV ELEM FRENCH
 Instructor: EL OMARI, SAMIR
 Enrollment: 21
 Questionnaires: 14

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2008

Page 843
 AUG 6, 2008
 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	6	6	4.38	835/1670	4.38	4.36	4.31	4.23	4.38
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	5	9	4.64	440/1666	4.64	4.31	4.27	4.30	4.64
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	2	11	4.71	363/1406	4.71	4.48	4.32	4.31	4.71
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	6	0	0	1	2	5	4.50	552/1615	4.50	4.34	4.24	4.17	4.50
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	1	0	0	0	3	9	4.75	226/1566	4.75	4.26	4.07	4.03	4.75
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	6	1	0	0	3	4	4.13	823/1528	4.13	4.23	4.12	4.00	4.13
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	2	2	9	4.54	527/1650	4.54	4.16	4.22	4.28	4.54
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	11	3	4.21	1395/1667	4.21	4.47	4.67	4.61	4.21
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	1	0	0	0	4	4	4.50	403/1626	4.50	4.08	4.11	4.07	4.50
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	1	2	10	4.69	623/1559	4.69	4.38	4.46	4.47	4.69
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	1	12	4.92	477/1560	4.92	4.75	4.72	4.68	4.92
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	0	5	7	4.58	586/1549	4.58	4.34	4.31	4.32	4.58
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	3	9	4.75	407/1546	4.75	4.40	4.32	4.32	4.75
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	2	0	0	1	5	3	4.22	567/1323	4.22	3.96	4.00	3.91	4.22
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	2	6	3	4.09	798/1384	4.09	4.29	4.10	3.92	4.09
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	1	4	6	4.45	660/1378	4.45	4.56	4.29	4.09	4.45
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	2	4	5	4.27	856/1378	4.27	4.45	4.31	4.08	4.27
4. Were special techniques successful	3	5	0	0	2	2	2	4.00	461/ 904	4.00	4.11	4.03	3.94	4.00
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	13	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 232	****	****	4.19	4.25	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	13	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 239	****	****	4.21	4.35	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 28	****	****	4.64	4.59	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	12	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 16	****	****	4.67	4.83	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	12	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 27	****	****	4.54	4.46	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	12	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 10	****	****	4.84	4.75	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors		
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A 5	Required for Majors 13	Graduate 0	Major 0
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B 8			
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	1	C 0	General 0	Under-grad 14	Non-major 14
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 0101
 Title INTERMEDIATE FRENCH I
 Instructor: DIALLO, MAMADOU
 Enrollment: 21
 Questionnaires: 11

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2008

Page 844
 AUG 6, 2008
 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	3	1	4	2	0	2.50	1654/1670	3.10	4.36	4.31	4.32	2.50
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	2	4	1	2	1	2.60	1641/1666	3.16	4.31	4.27	4.27	2.60
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	2	2	1	4	1	3.00	1343/1406	3.54	4.48	4.32	4.39	3.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	3	3	2	0	1	1	2.29	1607/1615	3.36	4.34	4.24	4.29	2.29
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	4	1	1	2	0	2	3.17	1440/1566	3.44	4.26	4.07	4.00	3.17
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	5	4	0	0	1	0	1.60	1524/1528	2.60	4.23	4.12	4.11	1.60
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	2	2	3	2	3.30	1530/1650	3.29	4.16	4.22	4.20	3.30
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	2	5	3	0	3.10	1660/1667	3.98	4.47	4.67	4.64	3.10
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	3	2	4	0	0	2.11	1610/1626	2.97	4.08	4.11	4.06	2.11
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	3	3	2	1	1	2.40	1545/1559	3.22	4.38	4.46	4.40	2.40
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	1	1	2	2	4	3.70	1508/1560	4.10	4.75	4.72	4.73	3.70
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	3	1	5	1	0	2.40	1528/1549	3.10	4.34	4.31	4.25	2.40
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	2	2	5	1	0	2.50	1523/1546	3.02	4.40	4.32	4.30	2.50
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	2	4	1	3	0	0	1.88	1307/1323	2.68	3.96	4.00	4.08	1.88
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	2	0	2	1	3	3.38	1154/1384	2.85	4.29	4.10	4.07	3.38
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	2	0	4	2	0	2.75	1336/1378	3.10	4.56	4.29	4.25	2.75
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	3	0	3	0	2	2.75	1333/1378	2.90	4.45	4.31	4.26	2.75
4. Were special techniques successful	3	4	2	0	2	0	0	2.00	878/ 904	2.44	4.11	4.03	4.01	2.00

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors		
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 3	Required for Majors 6	Graduate 0	Major 0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B 1			
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	2	C 5	General 1	Under-grad 11	Non-major 11
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	5	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 1		
				? 0			

Course-Section: FREN 201 0201
 Title INTERMEDIATE FRENCH I
 Instructor: DIALLO, MAMADOU
 Enrollment: 18
 Questionnaires: 11

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2008

Page 845
 AUG 6, 2008
 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	2	2	3	4	0	2.82	1639/1670	3.10	4.36	4.31	4.32	2.82
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	2	6	2	0	2.82	1635/1666	3.16	4.31	4.27	4.27	2.82
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	2	2	5	1	3.27	1321/1406	3.54	4.48	4.32	4.39	3.27
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	4	1	1	2	2	0	2.83	1593/1615	3.36	4.34	4.24	4.29	2.83
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	2	0	3	2	2	3.22	1419/1566	3.44	4.26	4.07	4.00	3.22
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	3	4	1	2	1	0	2.00	1515/1528	2.60	4.23	4.12	4.11	2.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	2	0	6	1	2	3.09	1569/1650	3.29	4.16	4.22	4.20	3.09
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	2	8	1	3.91	1609/1667	3.98	4.47	4.67	4.64	3.91
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	1	3	4	0	0	2.38	1603/1626	2.97	4.08	4.11	4.06	2.38
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	2	4	3	1	0	2.30	1546/1559	3.22	4.38	4.46	4.40	2.30
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	4	5	1	3.70	1508/1560	4.10	4.75	4.72	4.73	3.70
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	1	3	4	2	0	2.70	1516/1549	3.10	4.34	4.31	4.25	2.70
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	3	2	4	1	0	2.30	1528/1546	3.02	4.40	4.32	4.30	2.30
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	3	1	2	1	1	0	2.40	1279/1323	2.68	3.96	4.00	4.08	2.40
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	1	1	1	1	0	2.50	1333/1384	2.85	4.29	4.10	4.07	2.50
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	1	1	1	1	0	2.50	1348/1378	3.10	4.56	4.29	4.25	2.50
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	1	1	0	2	0	2.75	1333/1378	2.90	4.45	4.31	4.26	2.75
4. Were special techniques successful	7	2	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/ 904	2.44	4.11	4.03	4.01	****
Field Work														
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	10	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.47	4.00	****

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: FREN 201 0301
 Title INTERMEDIATE FRENCH I
 Instructor: DIALLO, MAMADOU
 Enrollment: 24
 Questionnaires: 18

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2008

Page 846
 AUG 6, 2008
 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	6	5	5	1	1	2.22	1661/1670	3.10	4.36	4.31	4.32	2.22
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	4	5	6	2	1	2.50	1645/1666	3.16	4.31	4.27	4.27	2.50
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	3	6	5	2	2	2.67	1392/1406	3.54	4.48	4.32	4.39	2.67
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	4	3	3	3	4	1	2.79	1597/1615	3.36	4.34	4.24	4.29	2.79
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	4	3	5	4	0	2.56	1536/1566	3.44	4.26	4.07	4.00	2.56
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	8	5	2	1	2	0	2.00	1515/1528	2.60	4.23	4.12	4.11	2.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	8	3	3	2	2	2.28	1632/1650	3.29	4.16	4.22	4.20	2.28
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	17	4.94	405/1667	3.98	4.47	4.67	4.64	4.94
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	6	6	3	1	0	1.94	1616/1626	2.97	4.08	4.11	4.06	1.94
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	4	4	4	2	2	2.63	1536/1559	3.22	4.38	4.46	4.40	2.63
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	3	5	2	6	3.69	1510/1560	4.10	4.75	4.72	4.73	3.69
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	6	4	4	2	0	2.13	1533/1549	3.10	4.34	4.31	4.25	2.13
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	7	4	3	1	1	2.06	1534/1546	3.02	4.40	4.32	4.30	2.06
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	3	5	4	2	1	0	1.92	1304/1323	2.68	3.96	4.00	4.08	1.92
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	6	3	2	2	0	2.00	1362/1384	2.85	4.29	4.10	4.07	2.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	2	3	5	1	2	2.85	1330/1378	3.10	4.56	4.29	4.25	2.85
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	4	5	3	1	0	2.08	1361/1378	2.90	4.45	4.31	4.26	2.08
4. Were special techniques successful	5	11	1	1	0	0	0	1.50	****/ 904	2.44	4.11	4.03	4.01	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	17	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 232	****	****	4.19	4.35	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	17	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 239	****	****	4.21	4.33	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	17	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 230	****	****	4.44	4.61	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 28	****	****	4.64	****	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 16	****	****	4.67	****	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	17	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 27	****	****	4.54	****	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	17	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 10	****	****	4.84	****	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	17	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 6	****	****	4.92	****	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	0	A 1	Required for Majors 11
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	0	B 8	
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	1	C 3	General 0
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	4	D 0	Under-grad 18
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	6	F 1	Non-major 17
				P 0	
				I 0	
				? 3	
					Electives 0
					Other 4

- Means there are not enough responses to be significant

Course-Section: FREN 201 0401
 Title INTERMEDIATE FRENCH I
 Instructor: DIALLO, MAMADOU
 Enrollment: 23
 Questionnaires: 11

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2008

Page 847
 AUG 6, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR NA		Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	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	3	5	2	0	2.73	1646/1670	3.10	4.36	4.31	4.32	2.73
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	2	2	6	0	1	2.64	1640/1666	3.16	4.31	4.27	4.27	2.64
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	1	6	2	1	3.09	1341/1406	3.54	4.48	4.32	4.39	3.09
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	4	0	0	4	3	0	3.43	1486/1615	3.36	4.34	4.24	4.29	3.43
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	1	3	1	2	2	3.11	1456/1566	3.44	4.26	4.07	4.00	3.11
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	4	2	2	2	0	1	2.43	1510/1528	2.60	4.23	4.12	4.11	2.43
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	2	1	3	4	1	3.09	1569/1650	3.29	4.16	4.22	4.20	3.09
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	7	4	4.36	1287/1667	3.98	4.47	4.67	4.64	4.36
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	1	2	3	2	0	2.75	1579/1626	2.97	4.08	4.11	4.06	2.75
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	3	3	2	1	3.11	1514/1559	3.22	4.38	4.46	4.40	3.11
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	1	7	1	4.00	1467/1560	4.10	4.75	4.72	4.73	4.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	4	3	2	0	2.78	1513/1549	3.10	4.34	4.31	4.25	2.78
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	2	2	4	1	0	2.44	1526/1546	3.02	4.40	4.32	4.30	2.44
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	2	4	1	1	1	0	1.86	1308/1323	2.68	3.96	4.00	4.08	1.86
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	3	1	2	0	0	1.83	1373/1384	2.85	4.29	4.10	4.07	1.83
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	3	0	1	2	0	2.33	1358/1378	3.10	4.56	4.29	4.25	2.33
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	3	1	0	2	0	2.17	1358/1378	2.90	4.45	4.31	4.26	2.17
4. Were special techniques successful	5	3	2	1	0	0	0	1.33	897/ 904	2.44	4.11	4.03	4.01	1.33
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	9	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 232	****	****	4.19	4.35	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	10	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 239	****	****	4.21	4.33	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	10	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 230	****	****	4.44	4.61	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	10	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 231	****	****	4.31	4.52	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	9	0	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	****/ 87	****	5.00	4.65	5.00	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	9	1	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 79	****	4.63	4.64	4.75	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	9	1	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 75	****	5.00	4.57	4.25	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	9	1	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 79	****	4.88	4.45	3.95	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	9	1	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 80	****	4.13	3.97	4.30	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	9	0	1	1	0	0	0	1.50	****/ 41	****	****	4.50	2.00	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	10	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 38	****	****	4.19	2.50	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	9	0	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/ 38	****	****	4.62	4.50	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	9	0	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/ 39	****	****	4.27	4.00	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	9	0	2	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.47	4.00	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	9	0	1	1	0	0	0	1.50	****/ 28	****	****	4.64	****	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	9	1	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 16	****	****	4.67	****	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	9	0	1	1	0	0	0	1.50	****/ 27	****	****	4.54	****	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	9	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 10	****	****	4.84	****	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	9	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 6	****	****	4.92	****	****

Course-Section: FREN 201 0401
 Title INTERMEDIATE FRENCH I
 Instructor: DIALLO, MAMADOU
 Enrollment: 23
 Questionnaires: 11

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2008

Page 847
 AUG 6, 2008
 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	1	Required for Majors	7	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	3						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	3	C	5	General	0	Under-grad	11	Non-major	11
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	4				
				?	1						

Course-Section: FREN 201 0501
 Title INTERMEDIATE FRENCH I
 Instructor: APPADOO, YOGEND
 Enrollment: 9
 Questionnaires: 8

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2008

Page 848
 AUG 6, 2008
 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	0	3	5	4.63	531/1670	3.10	4.36	4.31	4.32	4.63
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	2	5	4.50	622/1666	3.16	4.31	4.27	4.27	4.50
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	212/1406	3.54	4.48	4.32	4.39	4.88
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	224/1615	3.36	4.34	4.24	4.29	4.83
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	4	4	4.50	389/1566	3.44	4.26	4.07	4.00	4.50
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	0	3	1	2	3.83	1097/1528	2.60	4.23	4.12	4.11	3.83
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	4	3	4.25	903/1650	3.29	4.16	4.22	4.20	4.25
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	2	6	0	3.75	1633/1667	3.98	4.47	4.67	4.64	3.75
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	1	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	151/1626	2.97	4.08	4.11	4.06	4.83
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	521/1559	3.22	4.38	4.46	4.40	4.75
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	948/1560	4.10	4.75	4.72	4.73	4.75
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	3	5	4.63	537/1549	3.10	4.34	4.31	4.25	4.63
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	457/1546	3.02	4.40	4.32	4.30	4.71
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	3	0	1	0	0	3	4.25	545/1323	2.68	3.96	4.00	4.08	4.25
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	2	1	1	3.75	996/1384	2.85	4.29	4.10	4.07	3.75
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	400/1378	3.10	4.56	4.29	4.25	4.75
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	977/1378	2.90	4.45	4.31	4.26	4.00
4. Were special techniques successful	4	2	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	461/ 904	2.44	4.11	4.03	4.01	4.00

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: FREN 201 0601
 Title INTERMEDIATE FRENCH I
 Instructor: EL OMARI, SAMIR
 Enrollment: 21
 Questionnaires: 18

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2008

Page 849
 AUG 6, 2008
 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	3	0	1	0	4	7	3	3.73	1453/1670	3.10	4.36	4.31	4.32	3.73
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	3	0	1	0	4	4	6	3.93	1282/1666	3.16	4.31	4.27	4.27	3.93
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	4	0	0	0	2	5	7	4.36	775/1406	3.54	4.48	4.32	4.39	4.36
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	5	3	0	0	4	2	4	4.00	1083/1615	3.36	4.34	4.24	4.29	4.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	3	0	1	0	3	4	7	4.07	814/1566	3.44	4.26	4.07	4.00	4.07
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	3	3	1	0	4	3	4	3.75	1152/1528	2.60	4.23	4.12	4.11	3.75
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	3	0	1	0	4	7	3	3.73	1370/1650	3.29	4.16	4.22	4.20	3.73
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	0	0	0	3	12	0	3.80	1625/1667	3.98	4.47	4.67	4.64	3.80
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	7	1	1	0	1	6	2	3.80	1220/1626	2.97	4.08	4.11	4.06	3.80
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	5	0	1	0	1	5	6	4.15	1224/1559	3.22	4.38	4.46	4.40	4.15
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	5	0	0	0	1	1	11	4.77	929/1560	4.10	4.75	4.72	4.73	4.77
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	5	0	0	1	2	6	4	4.00	1146/1549	3.10	4.34	4.31	4.25	4.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	5	0	1	1	0	5	6	4.08	1113/1546	3.02	4.40	4.32	4.30	4.08
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	5	0	1	1	2	5	4	3.77	912/1323	2.68	3.96	4.00	4.08	3.77
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	9	0	2	0	1	2	4	3.67	1033/1384	2.85	4.29	4.10	4.07	3.67
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	9	0	2	1	0	3	3	3.44	1214/1378	3.10	4.56	4.29	4.25	3.44
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	2	0	1	2	4	3.67	1147/1378	2.90	4.45	4.31	4.26	3.67
4. Were special techniques successful	9	5	1	0	0	1	2	3.75	****/ 904	2.44	4.11	4.03	4.01	****

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	2	1.00-1.99	0	B 6			
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	2	C 2	General 1	Under-grad 18	Non-major 18
84-150	1	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 2		
				? 1			

Course-Section: FREN 202 0101
 Title INTERMEDIATE FRENCH II
 Instructor: EL OMARI, SAMIR
 Enrollment: 19
 Questionnaires: 13

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2008

Page 850
 AUG 6, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR		Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	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	5	5	4.08	1178/1670	4.08	4.36	4.31	4.32	4.08
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	7	3	4.00	1199/1666	4.00	4.31	4.27	4.27	4.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	3	8	4.46	644/1406	4.46	4.48	4.32	4.39	4.46
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	5	1	0	1	5	1	3.63	1405/1615	3.63	4.34	4.24	4.29	3.63
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	6	6	4.38	510/1566	4.38	4.26	4.07	4.00	4.38
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	6	0	0	2	3	2	4.00	899/1528	4.00	4.23	4.12	4.11	4.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	0	2	5	5	4.00	1135/1650	4.00	4.16	4.22	4.20	4.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	13	5.00	1/1667	5.00	4.47	4.67	4.64	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	2	6	2	4.00	953/1626	4.00	4.08	4.11	4.06	4.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	3	7	2	3.92	1344/1559	3.92	4.38	4.46	4.40	3.92
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	2	10	4.83	777/1560	4.83	4.75	4.72	4.73	4.83
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	4	4	3	3.91	1237/1549	3.91	4.34	4.31	4.25	3.91
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	6	5	4.33	919/1546	4.33	4.40	4.32	4.30	4.33
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	1	3	4	4	3.92	807/1323	3.92	3.96	4.00	4.08	3.92
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	5	1	2	3.63	1049/1384	3.63	4.29	4.10	4.07	3.63
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	0	2	3	3	4.13	923/1378	4.13	4.56	4.29	4.25	4.13
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	0	3	2	3	4.00	977/1378	4.00	4.45	4.31	4.26	4.00
4. Were special techniques successful	5	6	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 904	****	4.11	4.03	4.01	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors		
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	A 7	Required for Majors 3	Graduate 0	Major 3
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	B 5			
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	1	C 0	General 1	Under-grad 13	Non-major 10
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	2	D 0			
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	6	F 0	Electives 1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	
				P 0			
				I 0	Other 6		
				? 0			

Course-Section: FREN 301 0101
 Title ADVANCED FRENCH I
 Instructor: DE VERNEIL, MAR
 Enrollment: 25
 Questionnaires: 20

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2008

Page 851
 AUG 6, 2008
 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	3	0	0	0	1	4	12	4.65	505/1670	4.65	4.36	4.31	4.24	4.65
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	0	0	1	3	14	4.72	344/1666	4.72	4.31	4.27	4.18	4.72
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	0	0	0	0	1	17	4.94	115/1406	4.94	4.48	4.32	4.22	4.94
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	3	0	0	0	0	3	14	4.82	231/1615	4.82	4.34	4.24	4.18	4.82
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	5	13	4.72	250/1566	4.72	4.26	4.07	4.04	4.72
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	1	4	13	4.67	300/1528	4.67	4.23	4.12	4.07	4.67
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	0	2	5	11	4.50	570/1650	4.50	4.16	4.22	4.12	4.50
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	9	9	4.50	1157/1667	4.50	4.47	4.67	4.67	4.50
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	7	0	0	0	0	4	9	4.69	255/1626	4.69	4.08	4.11	4.06	4.69
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	5	0	0	0	0	5	10	4.67	673/1559	4.67	4.38	4.46	4.40	4.67
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	5	0	0	0	0	2	13	4.87	699/1560	4.87	4.75	4.72	4.67	4.87
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	5	0	0	0	1	2	12	4.73	395/1549	4.73	4.34	4.31	4.25	4.73
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	1	0	3	11	4.60	595/1546	4.60	4.40	4.32	4.24	4.60
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	5	0	0	0	0	3	12	4.80	156/1323	4.80	3.96	4.00	3.99	4.80
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1384	5.00	4.29	4.10	4.12	5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	14	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1378	5.00	4.56	4.29	4.30	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	14	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1378	5.00	4.45	4.31	4.33	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	14	2	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	****/ 904	****	4.11	4.03	4.03	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors		
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	0	A 9	Required for Majors 0	Graduate 0	Major 2
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	B 2			
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	1	C 1	General 6	Under-grad 20	Non-major 18
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	2	D 0			
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	9	F 0	Electives 1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	
				P 0			
				I 0	Other 6		
				? 1			

Course-Section: FREN 302 0101
 Title ADVANCED FRENCH II
 Instructor: MCCRAY, STANLEY
 Enrollment: 18
 Questionnaires: 14

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2008

Page 852
 AUG 6, 2008
 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	1	0	4	9	4.50	665/1670	4.50	4.36	4.31	4.24	4.50
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	4	10	4.71	355/1666	4.71	4.31	4.27	4.18	4.71
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	12	4.86	226/1406	4.86	4.48	4.32	4.22	4.86
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	0	13	4.86	210/1615	4.86	4.34	4.24	4.18	4.86
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	2	3	8	4.29	610/1566	4.29	4.26	4.07	4.04	4.29
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	0	3	10	4.57	368/1528	4.57	4.23	4.12	4.07	4.57
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	2	2	10	4.57	471/1650	4.57	4.16	4.22	4.12	4.57
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	2	9	4.36	1295/1667	4.36	4.47	4.67	4.67	4.36
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	7	1	0	0	1	2	3	4.33	637/1626	4.33	4.08	4.11	4.06	4.33
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	1	3	9	4.62	755/1559	4.62	4.38	4.46	4.40	4.62
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	1	2	10	4.69	1054/1560	4.69	4.75	4.72	4.67	4.69
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	1	3	8	4.58	586/1549	4.58	4.34	4.31	4.25	4.58
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	0	2	10	4.62	582/1546	4.62	4.40	4.32	4.24	4.62
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	1	1	0	0	1	10	4.58	283/1323	4.58	3.96	4.00	3.99	4.58
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	1	3	7	4.55	409/1384	4.55	4.29	4.10	4.12	4.55
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	2	0	9	4.64	503/1378	4.64	4.56	4.29	4.30	4.64
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	1	0	10	4.82	375/1378	4.82	4.45	4.31	4.33	4.82
4. Were special techniques successful	3	2	0	0	0	3	6	4.67	179/ 904	4.67	4.11	4.03	4.03	4.67

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: FREN 310 0101
 Title INTERCONNECTIONS: LANG
 Instructor: MCCRAY, STANLEY
 Enrollment: 23
 Questionnaires: 9

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2008

Page 853
 AUG 6, 2008
 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	4	4	4.33	902/1670	4.33	4.36	4.31	4.24	4.33
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	6	4.67	415/1666	4.67	4.31	4.27	4.18	4.67
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	205/1406	4.89	4.48	4.32	4.22	4.89
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	4	5	4.56	499/1615	4.56	4.34	4.24	4.18	4.56
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	1	7	4.67	295/1566	4.67	4.26	4.07	4.04	4.67
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	1	7	4.67	300/1528	4.67	4.23	4.12	4.07	4.67
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	1	1	6	4.33	806/1650	4.33	4.16	4.22	4.12	4.33
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1667	5.00	4.47	4.67	4.67	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	0	4	3	4.43	531/1626	4.43	4.08	4.11	4.06	4.43
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	3	6	4.67	673/1559	4.67	4.38	4.46	4.40	4.67
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1560	5.00	4.75	4.72	4.67	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	337/1549	4.78	4.34	4.31	4.25	4.78
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	2	6	4.56	655/1546	4.56	4.40	4.32	4.24	4.56
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	2	3	4	4.22	567/1323	4.22	3.96	4.00	3.99	4.22
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	0	7	4.75	257/1384	4.75	4.29	4.10	4.12	4.75
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1378	5.00	4.56	4.29	4.30	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	1	0	7	4.75	439/1378	4.75	4.45	4.31	4.33	4.75
4. Were special techniques successful	1	2	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	123/ 904	4.83	4.11	4.03	4.03	4.83

Frequency Distribution

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

- Means there are not enough responses to be significant

Course-Section: FREN 320 0101
 Title INTERCONNECTIONS:TRADE
 Instructor: DE VERNEIL, MAR
 Enrollment: 18
 Questionnaires: 15

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2008

Page 854
 AUG 6, 2008
 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	2	0	1	0	0	3	9	4.46	722/1670	4.46	4.36	4.31	4.24	4.46
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	0	0	0	3	10	4.77	301/1666	4.77	4.31	4.27	4.18	4.77
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	6	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	226/1406	4.86	4.48	4.32	4.22	4.86
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	3	1	0	0	1	0	10	4.82	238/1615	4.82	4.34	4.24	4.18	4.82
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	1	1	11	4.77	218/1566	4.77	4.26	4.07	4.04	4.77
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	1	3	9	4.62	338/1528	4.62	4.23	4.12	4.07	4.62
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	0	2	2	9	4.54	527/1650	4.54	4.16	4.22	4.12	4.54
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	8	5	4.38	1271/1667	4.38	4.47	4.67	4.67	4.38
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	167/1626	4.80	4.08	4.11	4.06	4.80
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	0	0	13	5.00	1/1559	5.00	4.38	4.46	4.40	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	0	13	5.00	1/1560	5.00	4.75	4.72	4.67	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	0	2	11	4.85	257/1549	4.85	4.34	4.31	4.25	4.85
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	2	11	4.85	299/1546	4.85	4.40	4.32	4.24	4.85
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	119/1323	4.91	3.96	4.00	3.99	4.91
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	285/1384	4.71	4.29	4.10	4.12	4.71
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	295/1378	4.86	4.56	4.29	4.30	4.86
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1378	5.00	4.45	4.31	4.33	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	8	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/ 904	5.00	4.11	4.03	4.03	5.00

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 8	Required for Majors	1 Graduate 0 Major 4
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	B 1		
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	C 0	General	0 Under-grad 15 Non-major 11
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	D 0		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		
			I 0	Other	8
			? 0		

- Means there are not enough responses to be significant

Course-Section: FREN 430 0101
 Title STUDIES IN FRENCH LIT
 Instructor: SCHNEIDER, JUDI
 Enrollment: 5
 Questionnaires: 5

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2008

Page 855
 AUG 6, 2008
 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	1	0	0	0	4	4.20	1060/1670	4.20	4.36	4.31	4.45	4.20
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	259/1666	4.80	4.31	4.27	4.35	4.80
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1406	5.00	4.48	4.32	4.48	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	446/1615	4.60	4.34	4.24	4.37	4.60
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	0	0	4	4.20	706/1566	4.20	4.26	4.07	4.17	4.20
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	346/1528	4.60	4.23	4.12	4.26	4.60
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	903/1650	4.25	4.16	4.22	4.28	4.25
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1667	5.00	4.47	4.67	4.73	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	797/1626	4.20	4.08	4.11	4.28	4.20
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	896/1559	4.50	4.38	4.46	4.58	4.50
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	855/1560	4.80	4.75	4.72	4.80	4.80
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	1	0	0	4	4.40	816/1549	4.40	4.34	4.31	4.43	4.40
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	595/1546	4.60	4.40	4.32	4.43	4.60
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1323	5.00	3.96	4.00	4.10	5.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1384	5.00	4.29	4.10	4.32	5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	348/1378	4.80	4.56	4.29	4.55	4.80
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1378	5.00	4.45	4.31	4.60	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	0	1	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/ 904	5.00	4.11	4.03	4.22	5.00

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 4	Required for Majors	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	B 1		Graduate
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	C 0	General	0
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	5
			P 0		
			I 0		
			? 0		
					Other
					4

- Means there are not enough responses to be significant

Course-Section: FREN 630 0101
 Title STUDIES IN FRENCH LIT
 Instructor: SCHNEIDER, JUDI
 Enrollment: 3
 Questionnaires: 2

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2008

Page 856
 AUG 6, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	665/1670	4.50	4.36	4.31	4.46	4.50	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	1199/1666	4.00	4.31	4.27	4.34	4.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	1083/1615	4.00	4.34	4.24	4.33	4.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1566	5.00	4.26	4.07	4.20	5.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1528	5.00	4.23	4.12	4.33	5.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	570/1650	4.50	4.16	4.22	4.30	4.50	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1667	5.00	4.47	4.67	4.74	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	953/1626	4.00	4.08	4.11	4.20	4.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	1461/1559	3.50	4.38	4.46	4.49	3.50	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1560	5.00	4.75	4.72	4.81	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	1146/1549	4.00	4.34	4.31	4.37	4.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	715/1546	4.50	4.40	4.32	4.40	4.50	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	326/1323	4.50	3.96	4.00	4.03	4.50	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	434/1384	4.50	4.29	4.10	4.21	4.50	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1378	5.00	4.56	4.29	4.42	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	653/1378	4.50	4.45	4.31	4.51	4.50	
4. Were special techniques successful	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	718/ 904	3.50	4.11	4.03	4.04	3.50	

Frequency Distribution

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