

Course-Section: ARBC 102 0101
 Title ELEMENTARY ARABIC II
 Instructor: EL OMARI, SAMIR
 Enrollment: 19
 Questionnaires: 14

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 72
 JUL 2, 2009
 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	1	0	0	0	3	0	10	4.54	595/1576	4.67	4.34	4.30	4.11	4.54	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	3	3	7	4.31	891/1576	4.55	4.32	4.27	4.18	4.31	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	2	1	10	4.62	467/1342	4.77	4.48	4.32	4.19	4.62	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	0	0	1	2	1	8	4.33	768/1520	4.67	4.30	4.25	4.09	4.33	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	2	2	8	4.50	366/1465	4.71	4.26	4.12	4.02	4.50	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	2	2	8	4.50	398/1434	4.67	4.22	4.14	3.94	4.50	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	3	0	0	0	3	0	8	4.45	608/1547	4.65	4.12	4.19	4.10	4.45	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	8	5	4.38	1219/1574	4.51	4.55	4.64	4.59	4.38	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	8	0	0	0	1	3	2	4.17	805/1554	4.36	4.13	4.10	4.01	4.17	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	1	1	11	4.77	484/1488	4.78	4.39	4.47	4.41	4.77	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	1	0	12	4.85	708/1493	4.92	4.78	4.73	4.65	4.85	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	2	1	11	4.64	499/1486	4.79	4.33	4.32	4.26	4.64	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	1	1	11	4.50	696/1489	4.71	4.40	4.32	4.22	4.50	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	1	0	0	2	11	4.57	273/1277	4.71	3.99	4.03	3.91	4.57	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	1	0	6	4.71	296/1279	4.86	4.30	4.17	3.96	4.71	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	0	0	2	0	4	4.33	784/1270	4.67	4.57	4.35	4.09	4.33	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	0	0	2	0	5	4.43	711/1269	4.71	4.38	4.35	4.09	4.43	
4. Were special techniques successful	8	2	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	221/ 878	4.75	4.19	4.05	3.91	4.50	
Laboratory															
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	12	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 240	****	5.00	4.35	4.29	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	12	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 229	****	5.00	4.51	4.43	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	12	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 232	****	5.00	4.29	4.27	****	
Seminar															
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 79	****	4.67	4.69	4.52	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 72	****	5.00	4.64	4.43	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 80	****	5.00	4.61	4.55	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 375	5.00	4.97	4.01	3.78	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 52	****	5.00	4.48	4.20	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 48	****	5.00	4.40	4.11	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 44	****	5.00	4.73	4.71	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 45	****	5.00	4.57	4.72	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	10	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/ 326	5.00	4.99	4.03	3.64	5.00	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 40	****	5.00	4.60	4.44	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	12	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 24	****	5.00	4.83	4.71	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	12	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 35	****	5.00	4.67	4.68	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	11	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 382	5.00	4.99	4.08	3.86	****	

Course-Section: ARBC 102 0101
 Title ELEMENTARY ARABIC II
 Instructor: EL OMARI, SAMIR
 Enrollment: 19
 Questionnaires: 14

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 72
 JUL 2, 2009
 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	7	Required for Majors	3	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B	2						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	1	C	1	General	4	Under-grad	14	Non-major	13
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	3	D	1						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	2				
				?	0						

Course-Section: ARBC 102 0102
 Title ELEMENTARY ARABIC II
 Instructor: EL OMARI, SAMIR
 Enrollment: 25
 Questionnaires: 15

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 73
 JUL 2, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor Mean	Instructor Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5								
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	3	12	4.80	243/1576	4.67	4.34	4.30	4.11	4.80	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	1	13	4.80	222/1576	4.55	4.32	4.27	4.18	4.80	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	14	4.93	125/1342	4.77	4.48	4.32	4.19	4.93	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	15	5.00	1/1520	4.67	4.30	4.25	4.09	5.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	1	13	4.93	97/1465	4.71	4.26	4.12	4.02	4.93	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	2	11	4.85	134/1434	4.67	4.22	4.14	3.94	4.85	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	0	1	0	12	4.85	160/1547	4.65	4.12	4.19	4.10	4.85	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	5	9	4.64	942/1574	4.51	4.55	4.64	4.59	4.64	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	1	0	0	0	5	6	4.55	363/1554	4.36	4.13	4.10	4.01	4.55	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	1	1	12	4.79	442/1488	4.78	4.39	4.47	4.41	4.79	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	14	5.00	1/1493	4.92	4.78	4.73	4.65	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	1	13	4.93	137/1486	4.79	4.33	4.32	4.26	4.93	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	1	13	4.93	155/1489	4.71	4.40	4.32	4.22	4.93	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	0	0	2	12	4.86	118/1277	4.71	3.99	4.03	3.91	4.86	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1279	4.86	4.30	4.17	3.96	5.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1270	4.67	4.57	4.35	4.09	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1269	4.71	4.38	4.35	4.09	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	7	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/ 878	4.75	4.19	4.05	3.91	5.00	
Seminar															
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	0	0	0	0	0	0	15	5.00	1/ 375	5.00	4.97	4.01	3.78	5.00	
Field Work															
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	0	0	0	0	0	0	15	5.00	1/ 326	5.00	4.99	4.03	3.64	5.00	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 40	****	5.00	4.60	4.44	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 24	****	5.00	4.83	4.71	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 35	****	5.00	4.67	4.68	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 28	****	5.00	4.78	4.65	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	0	0	0	0	0	0	15	5.00	1/ 382	5.00	4.99	4.08	3.86	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 3	Graduate 0	Major 0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B 4			
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	2	C 0	General 2	Under-grad 15	Non-major 15
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	2	D 0			
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F 0	Electives 2	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	
				P 0			
				I 0	Other 3		
				? 1			

Course-Section: ARBC 202 0101
 Title INTERMEDIATE ARABIC II
 Instructor: EL OMARI, SAMIR
 Enrollment: 6
 Questionnaires: 4

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 74
 JUL 2, 2009
 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	3	4.75	301/1576	4.75	4.34	4.30	4.35	4.75	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1576	5.00	4.32	4.27	4.32	5.00	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	298/1342	4.75	4.48	4.32	4.41	4.75	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1520	5.00	4.30	4.25	4.26	5.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	206/1465	4.75	4.26	4.12	4.09	4.75	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	193/1434	4.75	4.22	4.14	4.06	4.75	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	238/1547	4.75	4.12	4.19	4.22	4.75	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	1079/1574	4.50	4.55	4.64	4.62	4.50	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	1	0	0	0	2	3.67	1227/1554	3.67	4.13	4.10	4.05	3.67	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	505/1488	4.75	4.39	4.47	4.44	4.75	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1493	5.00	4.78	4.73	4.75	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	339/1486	4.75	4.33	4.32	4.29	4.75	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	378/1489	4.75	4.40	4.32	4.31	4.75	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	309/1277	4.50	3.99	4.03	4.01	4.50	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	262/1279	4.75	4.30	4.17	4.14	4.75	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	505/1270	4.67	4.57	4.35	4.30	4.67	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	1	0	0	0	3	4.00	928/1269	4.00	4.38	4.35	4.29	4.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	0	0	1	0	0	0	3	4.00	464/ 878	4.00	4.19	4.05	3.92	4.00	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 234	5.00	5.00	4.23	4.44	5.00	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 240	5.00	5.00	4.35	4.47	5.00	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 229	5.00	5.00	4.51	4.65	5.00	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 232	5.00	5.00	4.29	4.38	5.00	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 379	5.00	5.00	4.20	4.29	5.00	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 85	5.00	4.67	4.72	4.78	5.00	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 79	5.00	4.67	4.69	4.72	5.00	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 72	5.00	5.00	4.64	4.83	5.00	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 80	5.00	5.00	4.61	4.80	5.00	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 375	5.00	4.97	4.01	4.21	5.00	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 52	5.00	5.00	4.48	4.74	5.00	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 48	5.00	5.00	4.40	4.71	5.00	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 44	5.00	5.00	4.73	4.69	5.00	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 45	5.00	5.00	4.57	4.64	5.00	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	2	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 326	5.00	4.99	4.03	4.43	5.00	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 40	5.00	5.00	4.60	5.00	5.00	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 24	5.00	5.00	4.83	5.00	5.00	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 35	5.00	5.00	4.67	5.00	5.00	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 28	5.00	5.00	4.78	5.00	5.00	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 382	5.00	4.99	4.08	4.39	5.00	

Course-Section: ARBC 202 0101
 Title INTERMEDIATE ARABIC II
 Instructor: EL OMARI, SAMIR
 Enrollment: 6
 Questionnaires: 4

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 74
 JUL 2, 2009
 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	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	1						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	1	C	0	General	1	Under-grad	4	Non-major	4
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						