

Course-Section: FREN 101 01
 Title Elementary French I
 Instructor: Badagbo,Ama
 Enrollment: 30
 Questionnaires: 19

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 738
 JUN 28, 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	2	0	0	1	0	5	11	4.53	562/1447	4.43	4.31	4.31	4.18	4.53
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	6	0	0	0	0	5	8	4.62	413/1447	4.69	4.34	4.27	4.30	4.62
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	3	0	0	0	0	3	13	4.81	222/1241	4.84	4.48	4.33	4.25	4.81
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	3	0	0	0	0	5	11	4.69	292/1402	4.78	4.36	4.24	4.15	4.69
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	3	1	0	0	1	2	12	4.73	187/1358	4.54	4.26	4.11	4.03	4.73
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	3	2	0	0	3	1	10	4.50	392/1316	4.44	4.27	4.14	3.99	4.50
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	3	0	0	0	1	3	12	4.69	265/1427	4.55	4.21	4.19	4.24	4.69
8. How many times was class cancelled	5	0	0	0	0	9	5	4.36	1189/1447	4.62	4.66	4.69	4.68	4.36
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	8	0	0	0	2	4	5	4.27	611/1434	4.28	4.12	4.10	4.10	4.27
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	0	0	2	3	10	4.53	755/1387	4.68	4.45	4.46	4.46	4.53
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	1	2	13	4.75	859/1387	4.86	4.78	4.73	4.71	4.75
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	0	0	2	4	9	4.47	663/1386	4.59	4.35	4.32	4.32	4.47
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	2	2	11	4.60	549/1380	4.63	4.43	4.32	4.31	4.60
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	0	1	0	2	4	10	4.29	447/1193	4.38	4.02	4.02	3.99	4.29
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	1	3	4	4.38	487/1172	4.15	4.26	4.15	3.95	4.38
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	10	0	0	0	0	3	6	4.67	430/1182	4.72	4.56	4.35	4.18	4.67
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	11	0	0	0	1	3	4	4.38	679/1170	4.39	4.41	4.38	4.17	4.38
4. Were special techniques successful	11	2	1	0	0	1	4	4.17	380/ 800	4.00	4.17	4.06	3.95	4.17
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 189	****	3.00	4.34	4.18	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	18	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 192	****	4.00	4.34	4.31	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	18	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 186	****	****	4.48	4.46	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	18	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 168	****	3.67	4.20	4.29	****
Field Work														
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	18	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 36	****	4.70	4.25	4.26	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 31	****	5.00	4.72	4.50	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 21	****	5.00	4.57	4.38	****

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: FREN 101 02
 Title Elementary French I
 Instructor: Wecker, Donna L.
 Enrollment: 28
 Questionnaires: 20

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 739
 JUN 28, 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	2	0	0	0	0	5	13	4.72	342/1447	4.43	4.31	4.31	4.18	4.72
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	0	0	0	3	15	4.83	170/1447	4.69	4.34	4.27	4.30	4.83
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	0	0	0	0	3	15	4.83	204/1241	4.84	4.48	4.33	4.25	4.83
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	2	0	0	0	4	12	4.75	217/1402	4.78	4.36	4.24	4.15	4.75
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	3	1	0	0	1	5	10	4.56	306/1358	4.54	4.26	4.11	4.03	4.56
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	3	7	0	2	0	4	4	4.00	812/1316	4.44	4.27	4.14	3.99	4.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	3	0	0	0	2	2	13	4.65	301/1427	4.55	4.21	4.19	4.24	4.65
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	0	0	0	0	1	16	4.94	291/1447	4.62	4.66	4.69	4.68	4.94
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	1	0	0	0	5	8	4.62	270/1434	4.28	4.12	4.10	4.10	4.62
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	0	0	18	5.00	1/1387	4.68	4.45	4.46	4.46	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	1	17	4.94	317/1387	4.86	4.78	4.73	4.71	4.94
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	0	5	13	4.72	353/1386	4.59	4.35	4.32	4.32	4.72
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	1	3	14	4.72	379/1380	4.63	4.43	4.32	4.31	4.72
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	0	0	0	1	6	11	4.56	256/1193	4.38	4.02	4.02	3.99	4.56
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	2	5	7	4.36	504/1172	4.15	4.26	4.15	3.95	4.36
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	0	0	2	12	4.86	250/1182	4.72	4.56	4.35	4.18	4.86
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	0	0	3	5	6	4.21	787/1170	4.39	4.41	4.38	4.17	4.21
4. Were special techniques successful	6	0	0	0	0	5	9	4.64	142/ 800	4.00	4.17	4.06	3.95	4.64

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: FREN 101 03
 Title Elementary French I
 Instructor: Wecker, Donna L.
 Enrollment: 30
 Questionnaires: 15

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 740
 JUN 28, 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	2	1	4	8	4.20	927/1447	4.43	4.31	4.31	4.18	4.20
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	5	10	4.67	352/1447	4.69	4.34	4.27	4.30	4.67
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	12	4.80	231/1241	4.84	4.48	4.33	4.25	4.80
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	0	4	9	4.69	281/1402	4.78	4.36	4.24	4.15	4.69
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	2	1	4	8	4.20	663/1358	4.54	4.26	4.11	4.03	4.20
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	3	0	1	1	2	8	4.42	486/1316	4.44	4.27	4.14	3.99	4.42
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	2	3	9	4.33	680/1427	4.55	4.21	4.19	4.24	4.33
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	3	12	4.80	754/1447	4.62	4.66	4.69	4.68	4.80
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	2	7	5	4.21	679/1434	4.28	4.12	4.10	4.10	4.21
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	1	3	10	4.64	596/1387	4.68	4.45	4.46	4.46	4.64
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	1	13	4.93	422/1387	4.86	4.78	4.73	4.71	4.93
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	4	10	4.71	366/1386	4.59	4.35	4.32	4.32	4.71
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	2	2	10	4.57	582/1380	4.63	4.43	4.32	4.31	4.57
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	0	1	4	9	4.57	243/1193	4.38	4.02	4.02	3.99	4.57
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	2	2	4	4.25	580/1172	4.15	4.26	4.15	3.95	4.25
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	0	0	2	1	5	4.38	660/1182	4.72	4.56	4.35	4.18	4.38
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	1	0	1	1	5	4.13	839/1170	4.39	4.41	4.38	4.17	4.13
4. Were special techniques successful	7	1	0	0	1	2	4	4.43	239/ 800	4.00	4.17	4.06	3.95	4.43

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors		
00-27	5	0.00-0.99	0	A 7	Required for Majors 2	Graduate 0	Major 0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B 6			
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	3	C 1	General 5	Under-grad 15	Non-major 15
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	2	D 0			
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F 0	Electives 3	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	
				P 0			
				I 0	Other 3		
				? 0			

Course-Section: FREN 101 04
 Title Elementary French I
 Instructor: Badagbo,Ama
 Enrollment: 25
 Questionnaires: 11

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 741
 JUN 28, 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	1	0	1	2	7	4.27	849/1447	4.43	4.31	4.31	4.18	4.27
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	2	8	4.64	389/1447	4.69	4.34	4.27	4.30	4.64
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	141/1241	4.84	4.48	4.33	4.25	4.91
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	4	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1402	4.78	4.36	4.24	4.15	5.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	0	1	1	7	4.67	237/1358	4.54	4.26	4.11	4.03	4.67
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	5	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	112/1316	4.44	4.27	4.14	3.99	4.83
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	3	7	4.55	410/1427	4.55	4.21	4.19	4.24	4.55
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	6	4	4.40	1155/1447	4.62	4.66	4.69	4.68	4.40
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	2	5	2	4.00	849/1434	4.28	4.12	4.10	4.10	4.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	3	7	4.55	741/1387	4.68	4.45	4.46	4.46	4.55
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	0	10	4.82	758/1387	4.86	4.78	4.73	4.71	4.82
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	4	6	4.45	677/1386	4.59	4.35	4.32	4.32	4.45
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	2	8	4.64	506/1380	4.63	4.43	4.32	4.31	4.64
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	4	2	5	4.09	616/1193	4.38	4.02	4.02	3.99	4.09
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	2	0	1	2	3.60	958/1172	4.15	4.26	4.15	3.95	3.60
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1182	4.72	4.56	4.35	4.18	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	295/1170	4.39	4.41	4.38	4.17	4.83
4. Were special techniques successful	5	2	1	1	1	0	1	2.75	774/ 800	4.00	4.17	4.06	3.95	2.75
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 31	****	5.00	4.72	4.50	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	10	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 21	****	5.00	4.57	4.38	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 31	****	5.00	4.64	4.65	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 20	****	****	4.60	4.49	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 15	****	****	4.61	4.31	****

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 1 Major 1
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	B 1		
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	C 0	General	4 Under-grad 10 Non-major 10
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	D 0		
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	2
			P 0		
			I 0	Other	2
			? 0		

- Means there are not enough responses to be significant

Course-Section: FREN 102 01
 Title Elementary French II
 Instructor: Badagbo,Ama
 Enrollment: 16
 Questionnaires: 11

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 742
 JUN 28, 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	2	0	0	0	1	0	8	4.78	287/1447	4.16	4.31	4.31	4.18	4.78
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1447	4.34	4.34	4.27	4.30	5.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1241	4.62	4.48	4.33	4.25	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	0	0	0	1	0	8	4.78	196/1402	4.37	4.36	4.24	4.15	4.78
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	158/1358	4.34	4.26	4.11	4.03	4.78
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	1	2	0	6	4.22	644/1316	4.03	4.27	4.14	3.99	4.22
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	0	1	0	8	4.78	181/1427	4.34	4.21	4.19	4.24	4.78
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	5	4	4.44	1124/1447	4.69	4.66	4.69	4.68	4.44
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	0	5	2	4.29	600/1434	4.04	4.12	4.10	4.10	4.29
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	398/1387	4.50	4.45	4.46	4.46	4.78
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1387	4.74	4.78	4.73	4.71	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	290/1386	4.44	4.35	4.32	4.32	4.78
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	181/1380	4.55	4.43	4.32	4.31	4.89
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	1	0	0	1	2	5	4.50	288/1193	4.09	4.02	4.02	3.99	4.50
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1172	4.42	4.26	4.15	3.95	5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1182	4.66	4.56	4.35	4.18	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1170	4.58	4.41	4.38	4.17	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	6	1	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/ 800	4.60	4.17	4.06	3.95	5.00

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors		
00-27	0	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	1	2.00-2.99	3	C 0	General 5	Under-grad 11	Non-major 11
84-150	3	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 102 02
 Title Elementary French II
 Instructor: Gueye,Sokhna Fa
 Enrollment: 16
 Questionnaires: 7

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 743
 JUN 28, 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	2	0	5	4.43	695/1447	4.16	4.31	4.31	4.18	4.43
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	2	4	4.43	648/1447	4.34	4.34	4.27	4.30	4.43
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	323/1241	4.62	4.48	4.33	4.25	4.71
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	314/1402	4.37	4.36	4.24	4.15	4.67
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	0	5	4.67	237/1358	4.34	4.26	4.11	4.03	4.67
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	2	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	812/1316	4.03	4.27	4.14	3.99	4.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	459/1427	4.34	4.21	4.19	4.24	4.50
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1447	4.69	4.66	4.69	4.68	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	1	3	3	4.29	600/1434	4.04	4.12	4.10	4.10	4.29
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1387	4.50	4.45	4.46	4.46	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1387	4.74	4.78	4.73	4.71	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	217/1386	4.44	4.35	4.32	4.32	4.83
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	238/1380	4.55	4.43	4.32	4.31	4.83
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	1	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	224/1193	4.09	4.02	4.02	3.99	4.60
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	181/1172	4.42	4.26	4.15	3.95	4.80
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1182	4.66	4.56	4.35	4.18	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1170	4.58	4.41	4.38	4.17	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	2	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	159/ 800	4.60	4.17	4.06	3.95	4.60

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: FREN 102 03
 Title Elementary French II
 Instructor: Gueye,Sokhna Fa
 Enrollment: 30
 Questionnaires: 16

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 744
 JUN 28, 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	1	3	6	2	3	3.20	1389/1447	4.16	4.31	4.31	4.18	3.20
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	3	4	4	4	3.60	1286/1447	4.34	4.34	4.27	4.30	3.60
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	1	1	6	7	4.27	774/1241	4.62	4.48	4.33	4.25	4.27
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	5	1	1	1	3	4	3.80	1139/1402	4.37	4.36	4.24	4.15	3.80
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	4	1	1	3	2	4	3.64	1104/1358	4.34	4.26	4.11	4.03	3.64
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	5	1	1	2	3	3	3.60	1088/1316	4.03	4.27	4.14	3.99	3.60
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	3	0	6	0	6	3.40	1291/1427	4.34	4.21	4.19	4.24	3.40
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	2	12	4.86	619/1447	4.69	4.66	4.69	4.68	4.86
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	0	0	0	3	6	1	3.80	1052/1434	4.04	4.12	4.10	4.10	3.80
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	1	2	4	5	3	3.47	1309/1387	4.50	4.45	4.46	4.46	3.47
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	2	5	7	4.36	1222/1387	4.74	4.78	4.73	4.71	4.36
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	1	1	3	7	2	3.57	1243/1386	4.44	4.35	4.32	4.32	3.57
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	1	2	8	2	3.64	1204/1380	4.55	4.43	4.32	4.31	3.64
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	0	2	2	3	6	1	3.14	1065/1193	4.09	4.02	4.02	3.99	3.14
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	9	0	1	1	0	2	3	3.71	899/1172	4.42	4.26	4.15	3.95	3.71
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	9	0	0	1	1	1	4	4.14	803/1182	4.66	4.56	4.35	4.18	4.14
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	1	0	1	1	4	4.00	864/1170	4.58	4.41	4.38	4.17	4.00
4. Were special techniques successful	9	2	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	159/ 800	4.60	4.17	4.06	3.95	4.60

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors		
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A 10	Required for Majors 3	Graduate 0	Major 0
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	B 3			
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	2	C 0	General 9	Under-grad 16	Non-major 16
84-150	3	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 1		
				? 0			

Course-Section: FREN 102 04
 Title Elementary French II
 Instructor: Badagbo,Ama
 Enrollment: 25
 Questionnaires: 16

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 745
 JUN 28, 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	4	8	4.25	869/1447	4.16	4.31	4.31	4.18	4.25
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	4	3	9	4.31	792/1447	4.34	4.34	4.27	4.30	4.31
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	3	11	4.50	541/1241	4.62	4.48	4.33	4.25	4.50
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	2	1	2	8	4.23	787/1402	4.37	4.36	4.24	4.15	4.23
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	0	3	4	7	4.29	581/1358	4.34	4.26	4.11	4.03	4.29
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	3	0	0	3	3	7	4.31	572/1316	4.03	4.27	4.14	3.99	4.31
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	3	12	4.69	265/1427	4.34	4.21	4.19	4.24	4.69
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	8	7	4.47	1109/1447	4.69	4.66	4.69	4.68	4.47
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	1	0	1	3	2	3	3.78	1073/1434	4.04	4.12	4.10	4.10	3.78
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	0	0	0	3	9	4.75	429/1387	4.50	4.45	4.46	4.46	4.75
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	0	0	5	7	4.58	1072/1387	4.74	4.78	4.73	4.71	4.58
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	0	0	0	5	7	4.58	529/1386	4.44	4.35	4.32	4.32	4.58
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	2	10	4.83	238/1380	4.55	4.43	4.32	4.31	4.83
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	5	3	0	0	3	1	4	4.13	593/1193	4.09	4.02	4.02	3.99	4.13
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	2	1	3	4.17	637/1172	4.42	4.26	4.15	3.95	4.17
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	10	0	0	0	0	3	3	4.50	553/1182	4.66	4.56	4.35	4.18	4.50
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	10	0	0	0	1	2	3	4.33	710/1170	4.58	4.41	4.38	4.17	4.33
4. Were special techniques successful	10	1	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	366/ 800	4.60	4.17	4.06	3.95	4.20
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 31	****	5.00	4.72	4.50	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	15	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 21	****	5.00	4.57	4.38	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	15	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 31	****	5.00	4.64	4.65	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors					
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A 10	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B 2						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	2	C 0	General	9	Under-grad	16	Non-major	16
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	4	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 103 01
 Title Int Rev Elem French
 Instructor: El Omari, Samir
 Enrollment: 15
 Questionnaires: 7

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 746
 JUN 28, 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	2	4	4.43	695/1447	4.43	4.31	4.31	4.18	4.43
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	1	5	4.57	457/1447	4.57	4.34	4.27	4.30	4.57
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	186/1241	4.86	4.48	4.33	4.25	4.86
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	616/1402	4.40	4.36	4.24	4.15	4.40
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	1	4	4.29	581/1358	4.29	4.26	4.11	4.03	4.29
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	292/1316	4.60	4.27	4.14	3.99	4.60
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	0	0	6	4.57	373/1427	4.57	4.21	4.19	4.24	4.57
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	6	1	4.14	1311/1447	4.14	4.66	4.69	4.68	4.14
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	341/1434	4.50	4.12	4.10	4.10	4.50
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	2	4	4.43	881/1387	4.43	4.45	4.46	4.46	4.43
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1387	5.00	4.78	4.73	4.71	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	1	5	4.57	539/1386	4.57	4.35	4.32	4.32	4.57
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	582/1380	4.57	4.43	4.32	4.31	4.57
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	1	3	3	4.29	455/1193	4.29	4.02	4.02	3.99	4.29
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	1	0	0	0	2	3.67	925/1172	3.67	4.26	4.15	3.95	3.67
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1182	5.00	4.56	4.35	4.18	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	710/1170	4.33	4.41	4.38	4.17	4.33
4. Were special techniques successful	4	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	290/ 800	4.33	4.17	4.06	3.95	4.33

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors		

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

Course-Section: FREN 201 01
 Title Intermediate French I
 Instructor: Badagbo, Yawo
 Enrollment: 12
 Questionnaires: 9

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 747
 JUN 28, 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	1	5	2	3.78	1249/1447	4.10	4.31	4.31	4.31	3.78
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	0	2	4	2	3.67	1262/1447	4.23	4.34	4.27	4.23	3.67
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	2	0	5	2	3.78	1062/1241	4.29	4.48	4.33	4.35	3.78
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	5	0	0	2	1	1	3.75	1163/1402	4.12	4.36	4.24	4.24	3.75
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	3	3	2	3.88	938/1358	4.03	4.26	4.11	4.12	3.88
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	4	0	1	1	1	2	3.80	968/1316	3.94	4.27	4.14	4.08	3.80
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	4	1	2	2	3.22	1337/1427	4.03	4.21	4.19	4.14	3.22
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	5	4	4.44	1124/1447	4.52	4.66	4.69	4.70	4.44
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	1	0	4	0	1	3.00	1349/1434	3.74	4.12	4.10	3.97	3.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	1	0	4	0	2	3.29	1330/1387	4.25	4.45	4.46	4.42	3.29
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	1	0	3	3	4.14	1293/1387	4.71	4.78	4.73	4.71	4.14
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	1	0	2	2	2	3.57	1243/1386	4.13	4.35	4.32	4.24	3.57
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	1	3	0	3	3.71	1181/1380	4.24	4.43	4.32	4.30	3.71
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	1	2	1	0	2	0	2.40	1166/1193	3.88	4.02	4.02	4.04	2.40
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/1172	4.16	4.26	4.15	4.12	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/1182	4.51	4.56	4.35	4.30	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/1170	4.25	4.41	4.38	4.32	****
4. Were special techniques successful	7	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 800	4.38	4.17	4.06	4.01	****

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: FREN 201 02
 Title Intermediate French I
 Instructor: Badagbo, Yawo
 Enrollment: 21
 Questionnaires: 18

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 748
 JUN 28, 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	2	2	7	4	3	3.22	1385/1447	4.10	4.31	4.31	4.31	3.22
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	2	1	6	4	5	3.50	1323/1447	4.23	4.34	4.27	4.23	3.50
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	6	5	6	3.89	1002/1241	4.29	4.48	4.33	4.35	3.89
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	6	0	2	3	2	5	3.83	1120/1402	4.12	4.36	4.24	4.24	3.83
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	3	1	1	1	8	3	3.79	1001/1358	4.03	4.26	4.11	4.12	3.79
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	7	0	2	2	3	3	3.70	1026/1316	3.94	4.27	4.14	4.08	3.70
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	3	2	3	3	6	3.41	1287/1427	4.03	4.21	4.19	4.14	3.41
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	9	7	4.44	1132/1447	4.52	4.66	4.69	4.70	4.44
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	0	3	2	3	4	0	2.67	1395/1434	3.74	4.12	4.10	3.97	2.67
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	1	1	4	4	5	3.73	1266/1387	4.25	4.45	4.46	4.42	3.73
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	0	2	13	4.87	630/1387	4.71	4.78	4.73	4.71	4.87
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	1	2	3	7	2	3.47	1268/1386	4.13	4.35	4.32	4.24	3.47
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	2	1	1	5	6	3.80	1153/1380	4.24	4.43	4.32	4.30	3.80
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	1	1	1	3	4	4	3.69	879/1193	3.88	4.02	4.02	4.04	3.69
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	10	0	1	2	0	2	3	3.50	999/1172	4.16	4.26	4.15	4.12	3.50
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	10	0	0	1	2	2	3	3.88	957/1182	4.51	4.56	4.35	4.30	3.88
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	10	0	2	0	0	3	3	3.63	1025/1170	4.25	4.41	4.38	4.32	3.63
4. Were special techniques successful	10	4	0	1	0	2	1	3.75	****/ 800	4.38	4.17	4.06	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	1	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	1	B	6						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	1	C	3	General	15	Under-grad	18	Non-major	18
84-150	1	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	0				
				?	0						

Course-Section: FREN 201 03
 Title Intermediate French I
 Instructor: Wecker, Donna L.
 Enrollment: 23
 Questionnaires: 17

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 749
 JUN 28, 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	2	0	0	0	3	4	8	4.33	790/1447	4.10	4.31	4.31	4.31	4.33
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	0	0	0	4	11	4.73	270/1447	4.23	4.34	4.27	4.23	4.73
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	0	0	1	0	2	12	4.67	380/1241	4.29	4.48	4.33	4.35	4.67
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	1	1	2	3	0	8	3.86	1107/1402	4.12	4.36	4.24	4.24	3.86
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	3	3	1	0	1	2	7	4.27	590/1358	4.03	4.26	4.11	4.12	4.27
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	4	0	0	2	3	6	4.36	527/1316	3.94	4.27	4.14	4.08	4.36
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	0	1	3	11	4.67	283/1427	4.03	4.21	4.19	4.14	4.67
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	1	0	14	4.87	592/1447	4.52	4.66	4.69	4.70	4.87
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	2	5	7	4.36	516/1434	3.74	4.12	4.10	3.97	4.36
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	0	0	0	1	12	4.92	160/1387	4.25	4.45	4.46	4.42	4.92
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	0	0	0	13	5.00	1/1387	4.71	4.78	4.73	4.71	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	0	0	1	4	8	4.54	577/1386	4.13	4.35	4.32	4.24	4.54
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	1	1	1	10	4.54	626/1380	4.24	4.43	4.32	4.30	4.54
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	0	0	0	1	4	8	4.54	268/1193	3.88	4.02	4.02	4.04	4.54
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	3	1	3	4.00	710/1172	4.16	4.26	4.15	4.12	4.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	10	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	250/1182	4.51	4.56	4.35	4.30	4.86
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	10	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1170	4.25	4.41	4.38	4.32	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	10	0	0	0	2	2	3	4.14	389/ 800	4.38	4.17	4.06	4.01	4.14

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors		
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A 5	Required for Majors 6	Graduate 0	Major 0
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B 6			
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	1	C 3	General 9	Under-grad 17	Non-major 17
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	3	D 0			
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	6	F 0	Electives 0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	
				P 0			
				I 0	Other 0		
				? 1			

Course-Section: FREN 201 04
 Title Intermediate French I
 Instructor: Wecker, Donna L.
 Enrollment: 24
 Questionnaires: 16

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 750
 JUN 28, 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	10	4.44	681/1447	4.10	4.31	4.31	4.31	4.44
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	6	8	4.38	715/1447	4.23	4.34	4.27	4.23	4.38
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	3	10	4.44	622/1241	4.29	4.48	4.33	4.35	4.44
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	1	1	1	4	7	4.07	929/1402	4.12	4.36	4.24	4.24	4.07
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	4	4	7	4.00	799/1358	4.03	4.26	4.11	4.12	4.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	4	2	0	3	2	5	3.67	1050/1316	3.94	4.27	4.14	4.08	3.67
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	3	4	9	4.38	632/1427	4.03	4.21	4.19	4.14	4.38
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	16	5.00	1/1447	4.52	4.66	4.69	4.70	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	2	6	5	4.23	657/1434	3.74	4.12	4.10	3.97	4.23
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	2	2	11	4.60	656/1387	4.25	4.45	4.46	4.42	4.60
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	1	0	14	4.87	630/1387	4.71	4.78	4.73	4.71	4.87
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	1	7	7	4.40	748/1386	4.13	4.35	4.32	4.24	4.40
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	4	2	8	4.13	978/1380	4.24	4.43	4.32	4.30	4.13
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	1	3	4	7	4.13	583/1193	3.88	4.02	4.02	4.04	4.13
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	3	1	5	4.22	600/1172	4.16	4.26	4.15	4.12	4.22
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	0	0	0	3	6	4.67	430/1182	4.51	4.56	4.35	4.30	4.67
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	0	1	1	2	5	4.22	781/1170	4.25	4.41	4.38	4.32	4.22
4. Were special techniques successful	7	1	1	0	0	0	7	4.50	195/ 800	4.38	4.17	4.06	4.01	4.50

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors		
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 5	Required for Majors 1	Graduate 0	Major 1
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B 9			
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	3	C 0	General 11	Under-grad 16	Non-major 15
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	3	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 1		
				? 0			

Course-Section: FREN 201 05
 Title Intermediate French I
 Instructor: El Omari, Samir
 Enrollment: 23
 Questionnaires: 17

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 751
 JUN 28, 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	8	8	4.41	709/1447	4.10	4.31	4.31	4.31	4.41
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	0	5	11	4.53	510/1447	4.23	4.34	4.27	4.23	4.53
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	5	9	4.35	700/1241	4.29	4.48	4.33	4.35	4.35
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	0	2	4	8	4.43	591/1402	4.12	4.36	4.24	4.24	4.43
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	1	0	0	4	3	8	4.27	599/1358	4.03	4.26	4.11	4.12	4.27
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	0	0	6	9	4.60	292/1316	3.94	4.27	4.14	4.08	4.60
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	2	4	11	4.53	434/1427	4.03	4.21	4.19	4.14	4.53
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	1	9	7	4.35	1189/1447	4.52	4.66	4.69	4.70	4.35
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	0	0	0	1	4	6	4.45	397/1434	3.74	4.12	4.10	3.97	4.45
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	2	4	11	4.53	769/1387	4.25	4.45	4.46	4.42	4.53
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	3	13	4.81	758/1387	4.71	4.78	4.73	4.71	4.81
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	1	4	11	4.63	483/1386	4.13	4.35	4.32	4.24	4.63
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	6	10	4.53	637/1380	4.24	4.43	4.32	4.30	4.53
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	2	0	0	1	8	6	4.33	420/1193	3.88	4.02	4.02	4.04	4.33
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	1	1	10	4.75	218/1172	4.16	4.26	4.15	4.12	4.75
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	0	0	2	10	4.83	271/1182	4.51	4.56	4.35	4.30	4.83
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	0	0	3	9	4.75	390/1170	4.25	4.41	4.38	4.32	4.75
4. Were special techniques successful	5	3	0	0	2	3	4	4.22	351/ 800	4.38	4.17	4.06	4.01	4.22
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	16	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 189	****	3.00	4.34	4.47	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 192	****	4.00	4.34	4.38	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 186	****	****	4.48	4.57	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 66	****	3.99	4.58	4.43	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 65	****	4.55	4.42	4.36	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 64	****	4.45	4.09	3.70	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 38	****	5.00	4.49	2.25	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 36	****	4.70	4.25	3.25	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 28	****	****	4.52	****	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 30	****	4.00	4.30	****	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 27	****	4.50	4.43	****	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 31	****	5.00	4.72	****	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 21	****	5.00	4.57	****	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 31	****	5.00	4.64	****	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 20	****	****	4.60	****	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 15	****	****	4.61	****	****

Course-Section: FREN 201 05
 Title Intermediate French I
 Instructor: El Omari, Samir
 Enrollment: 23
 Questionnaires: 17

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 751
 JUN 28, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	3	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	10						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	0	C	4	General	13	Under-grad	17	Non-major	17
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	4	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 201 06
 Title Intermediate French I
 Instructor: Diallo, Mamadou
 Enrollment: 6
 Questionnaires: 5

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 752
 JUN 28, 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	1	0	0	4	4.40	723/1447	4.10	4.31	4.31	4.31	4.40
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	426/1447	4.23	4.34	4.27	4.23	4.60
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	451/1241	4.29	4.48	4.33	4.35	4.60
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	217/1402	4.12	4.36	4.24	4.24	4.75
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	0	1	3	4.00	799/1358	4.03	4.26	4.11	4.12	4.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	1	0	1	0	2	3.50	1134/1316	3.94	4.27	4.14	4.08	3.50
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	0	2	2	4.00	971/1427	4.03	4.21	4.19	4.14	4.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	5	0	4.00	1361/1447	4.52	4.66	4.69	4.70	4.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	1	3	0	3.75	1088/1434	3.74	4.12	4.10	3.97	3.75
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	902/1387	4.25	4.45	4.46	4.42	4.40
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	1055/1387	4.71	4.78	4.73	4.71	4.60
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	927/1386	4.13	4.35	4.32	4.24	4.20
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	339/1380	4.24	4.43	4.32	4.30	4.75
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	1	0	1	3	4.20	526/1193	3.88	4.02	4.02	4.04	4.20
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	521/1172	4.16	4.26	4.15	4.12	4.33
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	691/1182	4.51	4.56	4.35	4.30	4.33
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	1	0	0	0	2	3.67	1013/1170	4.25	4.41	4.38	4.32	3.67
4. Were special techniques successful	2	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	133/ 800	4.38	4.17	4.06	4.01	4.67

Frequency Distribution

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

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	0	6	4.71	353/1447	4.71	4.31	4.31	4.31	4.71
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	0	6	4.71	292/1447	4.71	4.34	4.27	4.23	4.71
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	186/1241	4.86	4.48	4.33	4.35	4.86
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	259/1402	4.71	4.36	4.24	4.24	4.71
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	0	1	5	4.43	430/1358	4.43	4.26	4.11	4.12	4.43
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	196/1316	4.71	4.27	4.14	4.08	4.71
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	373/1427	4.57	4.21	4.19	4.14	4.57
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	901/1447	4.71	4.66	4.69	4.70	4.71
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	1	0	1	1	3	3.83	1031/1434	3.83	4.12	4.10	3.97	3.83
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	276/1387	4.86	4.45	4.46	4.42	4.86
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1387	5.00	4.78	4.73	4.71	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	194/1386	4.86	4.35	4.32	4.24	4.86
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1380	5.00	4.43	4.32	4.30	5.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	1	0	6	4.71	155/1193	4.71	4.02	4.02	4.04	4.71
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	323/1172	4.60	4.26	4.15	4.12	4.60
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1182	5.00	4.56	4.35	4.30	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1170	5.00	4.41	4.38	4.32	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	2	3	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	195/ 800	4.50	4.17	4.06	4.01	4.50
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	5	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 189	****	3.00	4.34	4.47	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	6	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 192	****	4.00	4.34	4.38	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	6	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 186	****	****	4.48	4.57	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	6	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 187	****	3.67	4.33	4.46	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	6	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 168	****	3.67	4.20	4.15	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	5	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 66	****	3.99	4.58	4.43	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 62	****	4.90	4.56	4.28	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 58	****	4.80	4.41	3.79	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 65	****	4.55	4.42	4.36	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 64	****	4.45	4.09	3.70	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 38	****	5.00	4.49	2.25	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 36	****	4.70	4.25	3.25	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	6	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 28	****	****	4.52	****	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	6	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 30	****	4.00	4.30	****	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	6	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 27	****	4.50	4.43	****	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 31	****	5.00	4.72	****	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 21	****	5.00	4.57	****	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 31	****	5.00	4.64	****	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 20	****	****	4.60	****	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 15	****	****	4.61	****	****

Course-Section: FREN 202 01
 Title Intermediate French II
 Instructor: El Omari, Samir
 Enrollment: 11
 Questionnaires: 7

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 753
 JUN 28, 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	1	A	2	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	3						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	1	General	2	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	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	1				
				?	0						

Course-Section: FREN 301 01
 Title Advanced French I
 Instructor: Deverneil,Marie
 Enrollment: 14
 Questionnaires: 10

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 754
 JUN 28, 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	0	9	4.80	254/1447	4.80	4.31	4.31	4.32	4.80
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	112/1447	4.90	4.34	4.27	4.23	4.90
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1241	5.00	4.48	4.33	4.33	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	0	1	0	8	4.40	616/1402	4.40	4.36	4.24	4.24	4.40
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	1	1	7	4.67	237/1358	4.67	4.26	4.11	4.10	4.67
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	76/1316	4.90	4.27	4.14	4.13	4.90
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1427	5.00	4.21	4.19	4.15	5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	1	0	9	4.80	754/1447	4.80	4.66	4.69	4.65	4.80
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	141/1434	4.78	4.12	4.10	4.09	4.78
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1387	5.00	4.45	4.46	4.44	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1387	5.00	4.78	4.73	4.71	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1386	5.00	4.35	4.32	4.30	5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1380	5.00	4.43	4.32	4.32	5.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	1	1	0	0	0	7	4.50	288/1193	4.50	4.02	4.02	4.05	4.50
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1172	5.00	4.26	4.15	4.24	5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1182	5.00	4.56	4.35	4.42	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1170	5.00	4.41	4.38	4.49	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	3	0	0	1	1	0	5	4.29	318/ 800	4.29	4.17	4.06	4.12	4.29

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: FREN 302 01
 Title Advanced French II
 Instructor: Ka,Omar
 Enrollment: 16
 Questionnaires: 11

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 755
 JUN 28, 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	2	2	2	5	3.91	1159/1447	3.91	4.31	4.31	4.32	3.91
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	0	3	2	5	3.91	1141/1447	3.91	4.34	4.27	4.23	3.91
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	5	5	4.36	692/1241	4.36	4.48	4.33	4.33	4.36
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	0	3	7	4.45	555/1402	4.45	4.36	4.24	4.24	4.45
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	3	0	0	2	3	3	4.13	727/1358	4.13	4.26	4.11	4.10	4.13
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	2	1	7	4.27	599/1316	4.27	4.27	4.14	4.13	4.27
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	2	1	2	1	5	3.55	1246/1427	3.55	4.21	4.19	4.15	3.55
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	7	4	4.36	1182/1447	4.36	4.66	4.69	4.65	4.36
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	1	3	2	3	3.78	1073/1434	3.78	4.12	4.10	4.09	3.78
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	1	3	2	4	3.90	1228/1387	3.90	4.45	4.46	4.44	3.90
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1387	5.00	4.78	4.73	4.71	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	2	2	2	4	3.80	1174/1386	3.80	4.35	4.32	4.30	3.80
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	2	3	4	4.00	1030/1380	4.00	4.43	4.32	4.32	4.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	1	0	1	1	3	4	4.11	602/1193	4.11	4.02	4.02	4.05	4.11
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	3	0	0	3	3.50	999/1172	3.50	4.26	4.15	4.24	3.50
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	1	0	0	1	4	4.17	788/1182	4.17	4.56	4.35	4.42	4.17
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	0	1	2	3	4.33	710/1170	4.33	4.41	4.38	4.49	4.33
4. Were special techniques successful	6	4	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 800	****	4.17	4.06	4.12	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	0	A 4	Required for Majors 9	Graduate 0	Major 4	
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B 6				
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	1	C 0	General	0	Under-grad 11	Non-major 7
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	3	D 0				
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	6	F 0	Electives	2	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	
				P 0				
				I 0	Other	0		
				? 1				

Course-Section: FREN 310 01
 Title Interconnections: Lang
 Instructor: McCray, Stanley
 Enrollment: 15
 Questionnaires: 10

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 756
 JUN 28, 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	3	3	3.90	1159/1447	3.90	4.31	4.31	4.32	3.90
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	3	4	4.00	1053/1447	4.00	4.34	4.27	4.23	4.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	3	6	4.50	541/1241	4.50	4.48	4.33	4.33	4.50
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	3	5	4.20	827/1402	4.20	4.36	4.24	4.24	4.20
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	2	2	4	4.00	799/1358	4.00	4.26	4.11	4.10	4.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	5	4	4.44	455/1316	4.44	4.27	4.14	4.13	4.44
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	3	1	5	4.22	811/1427	4.22	4.21	4.19	4.15	4.22
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	8	1	4.11	1326/1447	4.11	4.66	4.69	4.65	4.11
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	1	5	2	4.13	775/1434	4.13	4.12	4.10	4.09	4.13
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	3	3	2	3.88	1235/1387	3.88	4.45	4.46	4.44	3.88
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	579/1387	4.89	4.78	4.73	4.71	4.89
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	2	4	2	4.00	1047/1386	4.00	4.35	4.32	4.30	4.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	4	4	4.33	815/1380	4.33	4.43	4.32	4.32	4.33
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	2	0	1	0	1	5	4.43	358/1193	4.43	4.02	4.02	4.05	4.43
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	3	2	4.40	463/1172	4.40	4.26	4.15	4.24	4.40
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	490/1182	4.60	4.56	4.35	4.42	4.60
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	657/1170	4.40	4.41	4.38	4.49	4.40
4. Were special techniques successful	5	2	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	423/ 800	4.00	4.17	4.06	4.12	4.00

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	7	Required for Majors	7	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	0						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	0	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	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	0						

Course-Section: FREN 320 01
 Title Interconnections:Trade
 Instructor: Deverneil,Marie
 Enrollment: 15
 Questionnaires: 11

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 757
 JUN 28, 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	342/1447	4.73	4.31	4.31	4.32	4.73
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	9	4.82	187/1447	4.82	4.34	4.27	4.23	4.82
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	4	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	186/1241	4.86	4.48	4.33	4.33	4.86
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	1	9	4.73	249/1402	4.73	4.36	4.24	4.24	4.73
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	87/1358	4.91	4.26	4.11	4.10	4.91
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	9	4.82	122/1316	4.82	4.27	4.14	4.13	4.82
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	2	9	4.82	147/1427	4.82	4.21	4.19	4.15	4.82
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1447	5.00	4.66	4.69	4.65	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	141/1434	4.78	4.12	4.10	4.09	4.78
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1387	5.00	4.45	4.46	4.44	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1387	5.00	4.78	4.73	4.71	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	2	9	4.82	241/1386	4.82	4.35	4.32	4.30	4.82
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	9	4.82	261/1380	4.82	4.43	4.32	4.32	4.82
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	65/1193	4.91	4.02	4.02	4.05	4.91
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1172	5.00	4.26	4.15	4.24	5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	229/1182	4.88	4.56	4.35	4.42	4.88
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1170	5.00	4.41	4.38	4.49	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	3	0	0	0	1	0	7	4.75	103/ 800	4.75	4.17	4.06	4.12	4.75

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99 0	A 10	Required for Majors 9	Graduate 0 Major 3
28-55	0	1.00-1.99 0	B 1		
56-83	2	2.00-2.99 0	C 0	General 0	Under-grad 11 Non-major 8
84-150	3	3.00-3.49 1	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 349 1
 Title Mod French Civilizatio
 Instructor: Field,Thomas T
 Enrollment: 10
 Questionnaires: 6

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 758
 JUN 28, 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	1	5	4.83	222/1447	4.83	4.31	4.31	4.32	4.83
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	352/1447	4.67	4.34	4.27	4.23	4.67
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	204/1241	4.83	4.48	4.33	4.33	4.83
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	143/1402	4.83	4.36	4.24	4.24	4.83
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1358	5.00	4.26	4.11	4.10	5.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	128/1316	4.80	4.27	4.14	4.13	4.80
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	842/1427	4.20	4.21	4.19	4.15	4.20
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	1018/1447	4.60	4.66	4.69	4.65	4.60
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	1	0	0	0	5	4.33	540/1434	4.33	4.12	4.10	4.09	4.33
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1387	5.00	4.45	4.46	4.44	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1387	5.00	4.78	4.73	4.71	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1386	5.00	4.35	4.32	4.30	5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1380	5.00	4.43	4.32	4.32	5.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1193	5.00	4.02	4.02	4.05	5.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	377/1172	4.50	4.26	4.15	4.24	4.50
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	347/1182	4.75	4.56	4.35	4.42	4.75
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1170	5.00	4.41	4.38	4.49	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	2	3	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 800	****	4.17	4.06	4.12	****

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: FREN 440 01
 Title Study In French Cultur
 Instructor: Schneider, Judit
 Enrollment: 16
 Questionnaires: 11

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 759
 JUN 28, 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	1	3	4	3	3.82	1230/1447	3.82	4.31	4.31	4.43	3.82
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	2	1	3	4	3.64	1274/1447	3.64	4.34	4.27	4.31	3.64
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	5	4	4.09	882/1241	4.09	4.48	4.33	4.41	4.09
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	1	3	2	4	3.64	1215/1402	3.64	4.36	4.24	4.34	3.64
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	5	0	0	5	3.27	1246/1358	3.27	4.26	4.11	4.15	3.27
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	0	2	3	4	3.64	1069/1316	3.64	4.27	4.14	4.27	3.64
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	1	4	2	3	3.45	1275/1427	3.45	4.21	4.19	4.20	3.45
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1447	5.00	4.66	4.69	4.72	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	1	0	1	2	2	2	3.71	1117/1434	3.71	4.12	4.10	4.17	3.71
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	1	2	3	5	4.09	1147/1387	4.09	4.45	4.46	4.48	4.09
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	528/1387	4.91	4.78	4.73	4.76	4.91
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	2	3	2	3	3.60	1237/1386	3.60	4.35	4.32	4.34	3.60
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	3	2	5	4.00	1030/1380	4.00	4.43	4.32	4.34	4.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	1	4	6	4.45	332/1193	4.45	4.02	4.02	4.00	4.45
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	5	2	2	3.67	925/1172	3.67	4.26	4.15	4.25	3.67
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	1	4	4	4.33	691/1182	4.33	4.56	4.35	4.49	4.33
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	1	3	5	4.44	624/1170	4.44	4.41	4.38	4.51	4.44
4. Were special techniques successful	2	1	0	1	2	0	5	4.13	398/ 800	4.13	4.17	4.06	4.19	4.13
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	10	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 66	****	3.99	4.58	4.87	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	10	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 62	****	4.90	4.56	4.80	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 58	****	4.80	4.41	4.59	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 65	****	4.55	4.42	4.55	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	10	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 64	****	4.45	4.09	4.43	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors				
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 4	Required for Majors	8	Graduate	2	Major	4
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	B 3						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	C 1	General	0	Under-grad	9	Non-major	7
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	D 0						
Grad.	2	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
			P 0						
			I 0	Other	0				
			? 1						