Course-Section: WOL 102 0101 University of Maryland Title ELEMENTARY WOLOF II Baltimore County

Title ELEMENTARY WOLOF II Baltimore Count Instructor: GUEYE, SOKHNA F (Instr. A) Spring 2009

Enrollment: 2
Questionnaires: 2

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Page 1580

JUL 2, 2009

Job IRBR3029

	Questions		NR	NA	Fre	equei 2	ncies 3	§ 4	5	Inst Mean	ructor Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean		
		Genera	 1															
1. Did voi	u gain ne	Genera ew insights,ski	_	this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1576	5.00	4.34	4.30	4.11	5.00
		ctor make clear			0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1576	5.00	4.32	4.27	4.18	5.00
		uestions reflec			0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1342	5.00	4.48	4.32	4.19	5.00
		uations reflect			0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1520	5.00	4.30	4.25	4.09	5.00
5. Did as:	signed re	eadings contrib	ute to w	hat you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	366/1465	4.50	4.26	4.12	4.02	4.50
6. Did wr	itten ass	signments contr	ibute to	what you learned	0 E	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	398/1434	4.50	4.22	4.14	3.94	4.50
7. Was the	e grading	g system clearly	y explai	ned	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	527/1547	4.50	4.12	4.19	4.10	4.50
		was class cance			0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	1079/1574	4.50	4.55	4.64	4.59	4.50
9. How wo	uld you g	grade the overa	ll teach	ing effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	395/1554	4.50	4.13	4.10	4.01	4.50
		Lectur	e															
		actor's lecture			0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1488	5.00	4.39	4.47	4.41	5.00
		ctor seem inter			0	0	0	0	0	0	2		1/1493	5.00	4.78	4.73	4.65	5.00
				plained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1486	5.00	4.33	4.32	4.26	5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding				0	0	0	0	0	0	2		1/1489	5.00	4.40	4.32	4.22	5.00	
5. Did au	diovisual	l techniques en	hance yo	ur understanding	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1277	5.00	3.99	4.03	3.91	5.00
		Discus	sion															
1. Did cla	ass discu	ussions contrib	ute to w	hat you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1279	5.00	4.30	4.17	3.96	5.00
2. Were a	ll studer	nts actively en	couraged	to participate	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1270	5.00	4.57	4.35	4.09	5.00
3. Did the	e instruc	ctor encourage :	fair and	open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1269	5.00	4.38	4.35	4.09	5.00
4. Were s	pecial te	echniques succe	ssful		1	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	464/ 878	4.00	4.19	4.05	3.91	4.00
		Self	Paced															
5. Were t	here enou	ugh proctors for	r all th	e students	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 382	5.00	4.99	4.08	3.86	5.00
				Free	quency	/ Dis	trib	ution	n									
Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades	5			Rea	asons	5			Туј	pe			Majors	;
														- 				
00-27 28-55	0	0.00-0.99 1.00-1.99	0	A 0 B 0		ке	quir	ea I	or Ma	a jors	5	0	Graduat	=	0	Majo	or.	0
28-55 56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C 0		G o	nera	1				0	Under-g	rad	2	Non	-major	2
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D 0		GE	пета.	L				U	onder-g.	Lau	4	MOII-	iiia jul	4
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	0	F 0		Εl	ecti	ves				1	#### - I	Means t	here a	re not	enous	rh
02 00.	Ü	3.30 1.30	ŭ	P 0								_	respons				_	,==
				I O		Ot	her					0			3			
				? 1														

Course-Section: WOL 102 0101 University of Maryland Title ELEMENTARY WOLOF II Baltimore County JUL 2, 2009

Instructor: (Instr. B)

Enrollment: 2 Questionnaires: 2

0

Grad.

3.50-4.00

F

Ρ

Ι

?

0

0

0

1

Spring 2009 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire Page 1581

Job IRBR3029

- Means there are not enough

responses to be significant

	Questions						Fre	Frequencies				Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	l Sect
					NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		General	- -															
1. Did yo	ou gain n	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1576	5.00	4.34	4.30	4.11	5.00			
2. Did th	2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals								0	0	2	5.00	1/1576	5.00	4.32	4.27	4.18	5.00
3. Did th	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1342	5.00	4.48	4.32	4.19	5.00				
4. Did ot	4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals								0	0	2	5.00	1/1520	5.00	4.30	4.25	4.09	5.00
5. Did as	ssigned r	eadings contribu	ite to	what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	366/1465	4.50	4.26	4.12	4.02	4.50
6. Did wr	ritten as	signments contri	bute t	o what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	398/1434	4.50	4.22	4.14	3.94	4.50
7. Was th	ne gradin	g system clearly	expla expla	ined	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	527/1547	4.50	4.12	4.19	4.10	4.50
8. How ma	any times	was class cance	elled		0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	1079/1574	4.50	4.55	4.64	4.59	4.50
		Lecture	2															
1. Were t	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1488	5.00	4.39	4.47	4.41	5.00				
2. Did th	ne instru	ctor seem intere	ested i	n the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1493	5.00	4.78	4.73	4.65	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly							0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1486	5.00	4.33	4.32	4.26	5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned							0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1489	5.00	4.40	4.32	4.22	5.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding						0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1277	5.00	3.99	4.03	3.91	5.00
		Discuss	sion															
1. Did cl	lass disc	ussions contribu	ite to	what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1279	5.00	4.30	4.17	3.96	5.00
2. Were a	all stude	nts actively end	courage	d to participate	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1270	5.00	4.57	4.35	4.09	5.00
3. Did th	ne instru	ctor encourage f	air an	d open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1269	5.00	4.38	4.35	4.09	5.00
4. Were s	special t	echniques succes	sful		1	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	464/ 878	4.00	4.19	4.05	3.91	4.00
		Self F	aced															
5. Were t	there eno	ugh proctors for	all t	he students	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 382	5.00	4.99	4.08	3.86	5.00
				Frequ	iency	Dist	trib	ution	n									
Credits E				Por	asons	,			Тът			24						
crearcs i		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades						- 			Ту]	 be			Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 0		Red	quir	ed fo	or Ma	ajor	S	0	Graduat	е	0	Majo	or	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B 0		~		,				0	1	,	0			0
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C 0		Gei	nera	T				0	Under-g	rad	2	Non-	-major	2
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D 0		_									_			

Electives

0

Other

Course-Section: WOL 102 0101 University of Maryland Title ELEMENTARY WOLOF II Baltimore County JUL 2, 2009 Spring 2009

Instructor: (Instr. C)

Enrollment: 2 Questionnaires: 2

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Page 1582

Job IRBR3029

	Questions				Frequencies					Inst	tructor	Course	e Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect		
			NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean		
		Genera	1															
1. Did yo	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1576	5.00	4.34	4.30	4.11	5.00				
2. Did th	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1576	5.00	4.32	4.27	4.18	5.00				
3. Did the	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1342	5.00	4.48	4.32	4.19	5.00				
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals							0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1520	5.00	4.30	4.25	4.09	5.00
5. Did as	signed re	eadings contrib	ute to	what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	366/1465	4.50	4.26	4.12	4.02	4.50
6. Did wr	itten ass	signments contr	ibute t	o what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	398/1434	4.50	4.22	4.14	3.94	4.50
7. Was th	e gradino	system clearl	y expla	ined	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	527/1547	4.50	4.12	4.19	4.10	4.50
8. How ma	ny times	was class cand	elled		0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	1079/1574	4.50	4.55	4.64	4.59	4.50
		Lectur	e															
1. Were t	he instru	actor's lecture	s well	prepared	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1488	5.00	4.39	4.47	4.41	5.00
2. Did th	e instruc	ctor seem inter	ested i	n the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1493	5.00	4.78	4.73	4.65	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly						0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1486	5.00	4.33	4.32	4.26	5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned						0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1489	5.00	4.40	4.32	4.22	5.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding						0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1277	5.00	3.99	4.03	3.91	5.00
		Discus	sion															
1. Did cl	ass discu	ssions contrib	ute to	what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1279	5.00	4.30	4.17	3.96	5.00
2. Were a	ll studer	nts actively en	courage	ed to participate	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1270	5.00	4.57	4.35	4.09	5.00
3. Did th	e instruc	ctor encourage	fair ar	d open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1269	5.00	4.38	4.35	4.09	5.00
4. Were s	pecial te	echniques succe	ssful	-	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	464/ 878	4.00	4.19	4.05	3.91	4.00
		Self	Paced															
5. Were t	here enou	igh proctors fo	r all t	the students	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 382	5.00	4.99	4.08	3.86	5.00
				Frequ	ıency	y Dis	trib	utio	n									
Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Re	asons	5			Туј	pe.			Majors	:
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 0		Re	quir	ed f	or Ma	ijors	3	0	Graduat	е	0	Maj	or	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	в 0														
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C 0		Ge	nera	1				0	Under-g	rad	2	Non	-major	2
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D 0														
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	0	F 0		El	ecti	ves				1	#### - 1				_	βh
				P 0									respons	responses to be significant				
				I 0		Ot	her					0						

Course-Section: WOL 102 0101 University of Maryland Title ELEMENTARY WOLOF II Baltimore County JUL 2, 2009 Spring 2009

Page 1583

Job IRBR3029

Instructor: (Instr. D)

2 Enrollment: Questionnaires: 2

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

							Fre	Frequencies				Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC Level		Sect
Questions				NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
		Genera	 1															
1. Did you	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1576	5.00	4.34	4.30	4.11	5.00				
2. Did the	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1576	5.00	4.32	4.27	4.18	5.00				
3. Did the	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1342	5.00	4.48	4.32	4.19	5.00				
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals							0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1520	5.00	4.30	4.25	4.09	5.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned						0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	366/1465	4.50	4.26	4.12	4.02	4.50
6. Did wr	6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned						0	0	0	1	1	4.50	398/1434	4.50	4.22	4.14	3.94	4.50
7. Was the	e grading	g system clearl	y expla	ined	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	527/1547	4.50	4.12	4.19	4.10	4.50
8. How man	ny times	was class canc	elled		0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	1079/1574	4.50	4.55	4.64	4.59	4.50
		Lectur	e															
1. Were th	he instr	actor's lecture	s well 1	prepared	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1488	5.00	4.39	4.47	4.41	5.00
		ctor seem inter			1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1493	5.00	4.78	4.73	4.65	5.00
				xplained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1486	5.00	4.33	4.32	4.26	5.00
		es contribute t			1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1489	5.00	4.40	4.32	4.22	5.00
5. Did au	diovisual	l techniques en	hance y	our understanding	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1277	5.00	3.99	4.03	3.91	5.00
		Discus	sion															
1. Did cla	ass disc			what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1279	5.00	4.30	4.17	3.96	5.00
				d to participate	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1270	5.00	4.57	4.35	4.09	5.00
		_	_	d open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1269	5.00	4.38	4.35	4.09	5.00
		echniques succe		•	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	464/ 878	4.00	4.19	4.05	3.91	4.00
		Self	Paced															
5. Were th	here enou	ugh proctors fo		he students	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 382	5.00	4.99	4.08	3.86	5.00
				Frequ	ienai	, Die	-rih	1+10	n									
				ried	aenc _y	DIS	CIID	1010.	.1									
Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Re	asons	3			Ty	pe			Majors	3
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 0		Re	quir	ed f	or Ma	ajors	5	0	Graduat	e	0	Majo	r	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	в 0														
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C 0		Gei	nera:	1				0	Under-g	rad	2	Non-	-major	2
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D 0														
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	0	F 0		Ele	ecti	ves				1	#### - 1					jh
				P 0									responses to be significant				ıt	
				I 0		Ot1	ner					0						
				? 1														