Course-Section: FREN 101 0101 University of Maryland Title ELEMENTARY FRENCH I Baltimore County

Baltimore County
Fall 2007

Page 843

FEB 13, 2008

Job IRBR3029

Instructor: PROVENCHER, DEN Fall 2007
Enrollment: 27
Questionnaires: 15 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

	Frequencies					Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect		
Questions	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	Ο	Ο	0	Ο	4	10	4.71	366/1639	4.32	4.22	4.27	4.08	4.71
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	1	13	4.93	102/1639	4.46	4.15	4.22	4.17	4.93
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	1	13	4.93	129/1397	4.73	4.37	4.28	4.18	4.93
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	4	0	1	0	2	7	4.50	476/1583	4.17	4.18	4.19	4.01	4.50
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	2	0	1	0	2	9	4.58	287/1532	4.22	4.10	4.01	3.88	4.58
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	4	0	2	1	1	6	4.10	770/1504	3.79	4.04	4.05	3.78	4.10
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	0	3	11	4.79	186/1612	4.08	4.02	4.16	4.10	4.79
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	12	1	4.08	1466/1635	3.44	4.38	4.65	4.56	4.08
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	1	4	7	4.50	382/1579	4.07	4.00	4.08	3.95	4.50
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	0	2	11	4.85	301/1518	4.41	4.23	4.43	4.38	4.85
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	0	13	5.00	1/1520	4.81	4.67	4.70	4.61	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	0	3	9	4.75	299/1517	4.39	4.15	4.27	4.20	4.75
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/1550	4.55	4.27	4.22	4.17	5.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	0	0	0	0	3	9	4.75	135/1295	4.13	3.77	3.94	3.84	
Discussion	1.0	0	_	_	_	_	2	4 60	260/1200	4 44	4 10	4 00	2 05	4 60
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	369/1398	4.44	4.18	4.07	3.85	4.60
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	10	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	332/1391	4.46	4.51	4.30	4.07	4.80
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	10	0	0	0	2	0	3	4.20	872/1388	4.29	4.35	4.28	4.01	4.20
4. Were special techniques successful	10	2	0	0	0	2	Τ	4.33	****/ 958	4.00	4.02	3.93	3.71	****
Seminar														

Frequency Distribution

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	d Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	 6	Required for Majors	6	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	В	3						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	1	C	1	General	1	Under-grad	15	Non-major	15
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means	there	are not enough	n
				P	0	BICCCIVES		responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	2	_			
				2	Λ						

Title ELEMENTARY FRENCH I

Instructor: DIGEON, LANDRY

Enrollment: 26
Questionnaires: 17

Baltimore County Fall 2007 Page 844 FEB 13, 2008 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

University of Maryland

Questions				NR	NA	Fr 1	eque: 2	ncies	5 4	5	Inst Mean	tructor Rank			e Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
		1																
1 Did v	ou gain n	General	s from this course	0	0	1	0	3	4	9	4.18	977/16	30	4.32	4.22	4.27	4.08	4.18
			he expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	6	8	4.29	822/16		4.46	4.15	4.27	4.17	4.29
			the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	5	12	4.71	334/13		4.73	4.13	4.28	4.17	4.71
	_				1	0			5			967/15						
			he expected goals	0	4		0	5 2		6 5	4.06			4.17	4.18	4.19	4.01	4.06
			e to what you learned	0	_	0	-		6	-	4.23	598/15		4.22	4.10	4.01	3.88	4.23
		_	ute to what you learned	0	3	0	0	5	5		3.93	920/15		3.79	4.04	4.05	3.78	3.93
	_	g system clearly	-	0	0	0	3	5	5			1367/16		4.08	4.02	4.16	4.10	3.59
		was class cancel		0	0	0	0		14	2		1475/16		3.44	4.38	4.65	4.56	4.06
9. How wo	ould you	grade the overall	teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	1	2	6	5	4.07	847/15	79	4.07	4.00	4.08	3.95	4.07
		Lecture																
1. Were	the instr	uctor's lectures	well prepared	5	0	0	1	1	5	5	4.17	1162/15	18	4.41	4.23	4.43	4.38	4.17
2. Did tl	he instru	ctor seem interes	ted in the subject	5	0	0	0	0	2	10	4.83	725/15	20	4.81	4.67	4.70	4.61	4.83
			and explained clearly	5	0	0	0	3	3	6	4.25	886/15	17	4.39	4.15	4.27	4.20	4.25
		es contribute to	_	5	0	0	0	2	2	8	4.50	638/15		4.55	4.27	4.22	4.17	4.50
			nce your understanding	5	0	1	0	0	3	8	4.42	337/12		4.13	3.77	3.94		4.42
J. Dia a	ddiovibua.	r ccciniiques cinia	nee your understanding	3	O	_	Ü	Ü	3	O	1.12	337/12	,,	1.15	3.77	3.71	3.01	1.12
		Discussi								_		040440						
			e to what you learned	8	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	242/13		4.44	4.18	4.07	3.85	4.78
		_	uraged to participate	8	0	0	0	1	2		4.56	579/13		4.46	4.51	4.30	4.07	4.56
		_	ir and open discussion	8	0	0	0	0	3	6	4.67	496/13		4.29	4.35	4.28	4.01	4.67
4. Were	special to	echniques success	ful	8	0	0	0	1	4	4	4.33	307/ 9	58	4.00	4.02	3.93	3.71	4.33
	Laboratory																	
1. Did tl	. Did the lab increase understanding of the material					0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 2	24	****	4.00	4.10	3.90	***
2. Were	you provi	ded with adequate	background information	14	0	1	0	0	1	1	3.33	****/ 2	40	****	4.75	4.11	4.01	****
		Field Wo	rk															
1. Did f	ield expe	rience contribute	to what you learned	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/	52	****	****	4.04	3.61	****
			evaluation criteria	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/	53	****	****	4.05	3.51	****
_		ctor available fo		16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00		42	****	****	4.75	4.79	****
			s your evaluations	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00		37	****	****	4.58	5.00	****
			out field activities	15	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00		32	****	****	4.56	4.60	****
J. DIG C	OHI CI CHCC	s help you early	out field decivities	13	_	O	Ü	Ü	Ü	_	3.00	,	22			1.50	1.00	
		Self Pa			_					_								
	_	_	e to what you learned	15	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00		50	****	4.33	4.45	4.54	****
			the expected goal	15	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00		32	****	4.33	4.51	4.67	****
	-	acts with the ins	_	15	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00		43	****	****	4.69	4.69	****
4. Was tl	he feedba	ck/tutoring by pr	octors helpful	15	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/	32	****	****	4.37	4.67	****
5. Were	there eno	ugh proctors for	all the students	15	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/	21	****	****	4.52	5.00	****
	Fre					trib	utio	n										
Credita	Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grade							asons	2				ጥ፣ ም	20			Majors	2
													Тур					,
00-27	3		0 A 7		Re	quir	ed f	or Ma	ajor	s 1	.0	Gradu	ate	9	0	Majo	or	2
28-55							,				2			, .	-			
56-83 2 2.00-2.99 2 C 1					Ge	nera	Τ				3	Under	-gr	rad 1	L7	Non-	-major	15
84-150 2 3.00-3.49 2 D 0																		
Grad. 0 3.50-4.00 1 F 0					El	ecti	ctives 2 #### - Means there are not enoug					gh						
Р 0											responses to be significant							
			I 0		Other					1								
			2 0															

Title ELEMENTARY FRENCH I

Instructor:

Enrollment:

MBAYE, ABDOULAY

27 Questionnaires: 18

Baltimore County Fall 2007

Page 845 FEB 13, 2008 Job IRBR3029

University of Maryland

	Frequencies NR NA 1 2 3 4 5 M						Inst	ructor			UMBC	Level	Sect	
Questions	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	1	5	12	4.61	495/1639	4.32	4.22	4.27	4.08	4.61
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	4	12	4.56	466/1639	4.46	4.15	4.22	4.17	4.56
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	4	14	4.78	261/1397	4.73	4.37	4.28	4.18	4.78
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	1	1	3	2	10	4.12	929/1583	4.17	4.18	4.19	4.01	4.12
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	2	0	1	2	5	7	4.20	633/1532	4.22	4.10	4.01	3.88	4.20
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	2	2	3	4	6	3.59	1165/1504	3.79	4.04	4.05	3.78	3.59
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	1	6	4	6	3.88	1190/1612	4.08	4.02	4.16	4.10	3.88
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	3	14	0	3.82	1581/1635	3.44	4.38	4.65	4.56	3.82
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	0	0	0	1	6	5	4.33	569/1579	4.07	4.00	4.08	3.95	4.33
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	1	8	8	4.41	933/1518	4.41	4.23	4.43	4.38	4.41
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	1	1	15	4.82	750/1520	4.81	4.67	4.70	4.61	4.82
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	1	3	13	4.71	360/1517	4.39	4.15	4.27	4.20	4.71
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	2	14	4.76	338/1550	4.55	4.27	4.22	4.17	4.76
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	1	1	1	5	5	4	3.63	917/1295	4.13	3.77	3.94	3.84	3.63
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	0	4	5	4.56	397/1398	4.44	4.18	4.07	3.85	4.56
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	9	0	0	0	1	2	6	4.56	579/1391	4.46	4.51	4.30	4.07	4.56
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	10	0	0	0	0	5	3	4.38	758/1388	4.29	4.35	4.28	4.01	4.38
4. Were special techniques successful	9	3	0	1	0	3	2	4.00	456/ 958	4.00	4.02	3.93	3.71	4.00
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	17	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 224	****	4.00	4.10	3.90	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 240	****	4.75	4.11	4.01	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 219	****	****	4.44	4.44	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 215	****	****	4.35	4.43	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 198	****	****	4.18	4.25	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	1	0	0		****/ 52	****	****	4.04	3.61	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	17	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 53	****	****	4.05	3.51	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 42	****	****	4.75	4.79	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 50	****	4.33	4.45	4.54	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 32	****	4.33	4.51	4.67	****
Frequ	ency	Dist	ribu	ıtioı	n									

Credits E	edits Earned Cum. GPA			Expected	Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	2	 А	8	Required for Majors	11	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	В	8						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	4	C	0	General	5	Under-grad	18	Non-major	18
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	ı
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	1	_			
				?	0						

Title ELEMENTARY FRENCH I

Instructor: Enrollment:

APPADOO, YOGEND

28 Questionnaires: 14 Fall 2007

Page 846 FEB 13, 2008 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

University of Maryland

Baltimore County

		Frequencies			Inst	Instructor C		Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect			
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	_		Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	2	2	7	3	3.79	1339/1639	4.32	4.22	4.27	4.08	3.79
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	0	4	1	8	4.07	1036/1639	4.46	4.15	4.22	4.17	4.07
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	2	10	4.50	517/1397	4.73	4.37	4.28	4.18	4.50
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	1	1	6	3	4.00	1010/1583	4.17	4.18	4.19	4.01	4.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	0	3	5	4	3.85	957/1532	4.22	4.10	4.01	3.88	3.85
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	2	0	2	3	4	2	3.55	1188/1504	3.79	4.04	4.05	3.78	3.55
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	2	6	5	4.07	996/1612	4.08	4.02	4.16	4.10	4.07
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	7	5	1	0	1	1.79	1633/1635	3.44	4.38	4.65	4.56	1.79
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	2	4	4	1	3.36	1379/1579	4.07	4.00		3.95	3.36
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	1	2	4	7	4.21	1126/1518	4.41	4.23	4.43	4.38	4.21
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	1	0	3	10	4.57	1136/1520	4.81	4.67	4.70	4.61	4.57
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	1	1	2	5	5	3.86	1211/1517	4.39	4.15	4.27	4.20	3.86
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	2	1	3	7	3.93	1144/1550	4.55	4.27	4.22	4.17	3.93
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	2	0	4	2	6	3.71	864/1295	4.13	3.77	3.94	3.84	3.71
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	2	0	0	5	4	3.82	924/1398	4.44	4.18	4.07	3.85	3.82
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	1	0	2	4	4	3.91	1065/1391	4.46	4.51	4.30	4.07	3.91
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	1	3	3	4	3.91	1035/1388	4.29	4.35	4.28	4.01	3.91
4. Were special techniques successful	3	5	0	1	2	1	2	3.67	658/ 958	4.00	4.02	3.93	3.71	3.67
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	10	3	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 224	****	4.00	4.10	3.90	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	11	0	0	0	2	0	1	3.67	****/ 240	****	4.75	4.11	4.01	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	11	1	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 219	****	****	4.44	4.44	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	11	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 215	****	****	4.35	4.43	* * * *
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	11	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 198	****	****	4.18	4.25	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	11	2	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 85	****	4.67	4.58	4.50	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	11	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 82	****	4.60	4.52	4.12	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	11	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 78	****	4.80	4.47	4.25	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	11	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 80	****	4.20	4.47	4.39	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	11	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 82	****	3.00	4.16	3.90	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/ 52	****	****	4.04	3.61	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	12	0	0	0	2	0	0	5.00	****/ 53	****	****	4.05	3.51	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	12	1	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 42	****	****	4.75	4.79	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	12	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 37	****	****	4.58	5.00	****
O-16 Pared														
Self Paced		0	0	0	-	-	-	4 00		ale ale ale al	4 22	4 45	4 - 4	also also also al
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	1	1	1		****/ 50	****	4.33	4.45	4.54	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	11	1	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/ 32	****	4.33	4.51	4.67	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	11	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 43	****	****	4.69	4.69	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	11	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 32	****	****	4.37	4.67	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	11	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 21	****	****	4.52	5.00	****

Title ELEMENTARY FRENCH I

Instructor: APPADOO, YOGEND

Enrollment: 28
Questionnaires: 14

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2007 Page 846 FEB 13, 2008 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits E	Credits Earned Cum. GPA			Expected	Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	4	Required for Majors	10	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	В	5						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	0	C	4	General	1	Under-grad	14	Non-major	14
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	2	#### - Means	there	are not enough	h
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	1				
				?	0						

Course-Section: FREN 102 0101 University of Maryland ELEMENTARY FRENCH II Baltimore County

Page 847 Title FEB 13, 2008 Instructor: APPADOO, YOGEND Fall 2007 Job IRBR3029

Enrollment:	16			
Questionnaires:	11	Student Course	Evaluation	Questionnaire

					Frequencies						Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect	
		Question	S		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		 Genera	 1															
1. Did von	ı gain ne	w insights,ski		m this course	0	0	1	0	0	5	5	4.18	964/1639	4.01	4.22	4.27	4.08	4.18
-	_	tor make clear			0	0	0	0	2	4	5	4.27	840/1639		4.15	4.22	4.17	4.27
		estions reflec		-	0	0	0	0	1	5	5	4.36	696/1397	4.32	4.37	4.28	4.18	4.36
	_	ations reflect		_	0	1	0	0	3	6	1	3.80	1226/1583	3.94	4.18	4.19	4.01	3.80
5. Did ass	signed re	adings contrib	ute to	what you learned	0	1	0	0	4	4	2	3.80	989/1532	4.10	4.10	4.01	3.88	3.80
6. Did wri	itten ass	ignments contr	ibute t	o what you learned	0	2	0	0	3	6	0	3.67	1116/1504	3.49	4.04	4.05	3.78	3.67
7. Was the	e grading	system clearly	y expla	ined	0	0	0	0	2	6	3	4.09	982/1612	4.09	4.02	4.16	4.10	4.09
8. How mar	ny times	was class canc	elled		0	0	7	4	0	0	0	1.36	1635/1635	2.68	4.38	4.65	4.56	1.36
9. How wor	ıld you g	rade the overa	ll teac	hing effectiveness	2	0	1	1	1	6	0	3.33	1390/1579	3.46	4.00	4.08	3.95	3.33
	Lecture																	
1 Were th	ne instru	prepared	Λ	0	0	0	Ω	9	2	4 18	1148/1518	4.04	4.23	4.43	4.38	4.18		
	1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject						0	0	0	4	7		1074/1520		4.67	4.70	4.61	4.64
				xplained clearly	0	0	0	1	1	4	5	4.18	956/1517		4.15	4.27	4.20	4.18
		s contribute to			0	0	0	1	1	4	5	4.18	953/1550		4.27	4.22	4.17	4.18
				our understanding	0	1	0	1	4	1	4	3.80	806/1295		3.77	3.94	3.84	3.80
1 5 1		Discus			_	0	•	•	0		2	2 62	1050/1200	4 00	4 10	4 00	2 05	2 62
				what you learned	3	0	0	2	2	1	3		1059/1398		4.18	4.07	3.85	3.63
		_	_	d to participate	3	0	0 1	0	3	4	3	4.25	816/1391 1148/1388	4.46 4.12	4.51	4.30 4.28	4.07 4.01	4.25
		chniques succe		d open discussion	3	3	U T	1	3 1	1	3	3.80	577/ 958		4.35	3.93		3.80
4. Were St	pecial te	cilitques succe	ssiui		3	3	U		1		۷	3.00	3/1/ 930	4.10	4.02	3.93	3.71	3.00
				Frequ	ency	Dist	cribu	ution	ı									
Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grade						Reasons							Ту	pe			Majors	5
00 27	1	0.00.0.00											Candust					2
00-27 28-55	7	0.00-0.99 1.00-1.99	0 0	A 2 B 6		Red	<u>quir</u> e	eu I	or Ma	ijors	5	5	Graduat	е	0	Majo	or.	2
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	1	В 0 С 1	General						2	Under-g	1	Non-	major	9		
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D 0	General						_	onaci -g.	grad ii Noir-major				,	
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F 0	Electives							0	#### - 1	Means t	here a	re not	enoug	gh

Other

2

responses to be significant

0

0

I

?

Course-Section: FREN 102 0201 University of Maryland Title ELEMENTARY FRENCH II Baltimore County Instructor: FATIH, ZAKARIA

Page 848 FEB 13, 2008 Fall 2007 Job IRBR3029

Enrollment:	10	
Questionnaires:	9	Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

					Frequencies					Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect		
		Questions	5		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
1 Did 1101	aain na	General w insights,skil	=	. this source	0	0	0	0	1	1	7	4.67	430/1639	4.01	4.22	4.27	4.08	4.67
		tor make clear			0	0	0	0	1	2	6	4.56	450/1639	4.01	4.15	4.27	4.17	4.56
		estions reflect			0	0	0	0	1	3	5	4.44	603/1397		4.13	4.28	4.18	4.44
		ations reflect			0	1	0	0	2	2	1	4.25	792/1583		4.18	4.19	4.10	4.25
			-	what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	2	5		506/1532		4.10	4.19	3.88	4.33
	_	_		what you learned what you learned	0	1	1	0	1	1	5	4.13	747/1504		4.04	4.05	3.78	4.13
		signments contri system clearly		-	0	0	0	0	1	2	6	4.56	439/1612		4.02	4.16	4.10	4.56
		was class cance		inea	0	0	0	0	1	6	2		1447/1635		4.38	4.65	4.56	4.11
				ning effectiveness	4	0	0	0	1	1	3		496/1579		4.00	4.08		4.40
J. 110W WO	ara you g	jiaac che overa.	LI CCACI	ing circultations	-	O	U	U	_	_	J	1.10	150/15/5	3.10	1.00	1.00	3.75	1.10
		Lecture	خ															
1. Were th	he instru	ctor's lectures		prepared	0	0	0	1	0	2	6	4.44	891/1518	4.04	4.23	4.43	4.38	4.44
		tor seem intere	-	_	0	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	597/1520		4.67	4.70	4.61	4.89
	. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly					0	0	0	1	1	7	4.67	405/1517	3.97	4.15	4.27	4.20	4.67
	4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned					0	0	1	0	1	7	4.56	580/1550		4.27	4.22	4.17	4.56
5. Did aud	5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding					3	1	0	1	1	3	3.83	783/1295	3.35	3.77	3.94	3.84	3.83
		-	-	5														
		Discuss	sion															
1. Did cla	ass discu	ssions contribu	ite to v	what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	2	6	4.56	397/1398	4.00	4.18	4.07	3.85	4.56
2. Were a	ll studer	nts actively end	courage	d to participate	0	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	368/1391	4.46	4.51	4.30	4.07	4.78
3. Did the	e instruc	ctor encourage i	air and	d open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	363/1388	4.12	4.35	4.28	4.01	4.78
4. Were sp	pecial te	chniques succes	ssful		0	0	2	0	1	2	4	3.67	658/ 958	4.16	4.02	3.93	3.71	3.67
				Frequ	ıency	/ Dis	trib	ution	1									
Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	asons	3			Туј	pe			Majors	\$
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A 7		Re	quir	ed fo	or Ma	ajors	\$	0	Graduate	е	0	Majo	or	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	в 1														
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C 0		Ger	nera	1				1	Under-g	rad	9	Non-	-major	9
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	0	D 0														
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F 0		El	ecti	ves				1	#### - 1				_	jh
				P 0						response	es to b	e sign	nificar	ıt				
				I 0	Other				4									
				3 0														

ELEMENTARY FRENCH II

Title Instructor: MBAYE, ABDOULAY

Enrollment: 30 Questionnaires: 22

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2007

Page 849 FEB 13, 2008 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

			Fre	aniei	ncies	:		Tnst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank		Mean	Mean		Mean
׫«»														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	6	3	4	6	3	2.86	1620/1639	4.01	4.22	4.27	4.08	2.86
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	3	5	5	5	3	3.00	1579/1639	4.04	4.15	4.22	4.17	3.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	3	4	5	9	3.82	1144/1397	4.32	4.37	4.28	4.18	3.82
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	4	1	3	6	4	4		1453/1583	3.94		4.19	4.01	3.39
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	7	1	1	6	2	5		1184/1532	4.10	4.10	4.01	3.88	3.60
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	7	3	8	2	-		1477/1504		4.04	4.05	3.78	2.50
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	3	5	7	2			1515/1612	4.09		4.16	4.10	3.05
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	17	5	-		1612/1635	2.68	4.38	4.65	4.56	3.23
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	4	4	4	6			1527/1579	3.46	4.00	4.08		2.79
J. now would you grade the overall teaching circultaness	3	Ü	-	-	-	Ü	_	2.75	1327/1379	3.10	1.00	1.00	3.75	2.75
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	3	3	8	3	5	3 18	1468/1518	4.04	4.23	4.43	4.38	3.18
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	3	1	4	4	10		1462/1520	4.32	4.67	4.70	4.61	3.77
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	3	3	5	3	7		1390/1517	3.97	4.15	4.27	4.20	3.38
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	5	3	4	3	7		1415/1550	4.06	4.27	4.22	4.17	3.18
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	8	8	0	2	2	2		1263/1295		3.77			2.29
5. Did addiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	U	O	O	U	2	2	2	2.29	1203/1293	3.33	3.11	J. J.	3.01	2.25
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	5	3	2	4	3	2 82	1321/1398	4.00	4.18	4.07	3.85	2.82
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	1	1	3	7	5		1112/1391		4.51	4.30	4.07	3.82
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	5	1	2	6	3		1313/1388	4.12	4.35	4.28	4.01	3.06
4. Were special techniques successful	5	12	0	0	2	2	1		****/ 958	4.16		3.93	3.71	****
1. Were special techniques successivi	J	12	U	U	2	2		3.00	/ 550	1.10	1.02	3.93	3.71	
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	19	1	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	****/ 224	****	4.00	4.10	3.90	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	19	0	2	0	0	1	0	2.00	****/ 240	****	4.75	4.11	4.01	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	19	0	0	0	2	1	0		****/ 219	****	****	4.44	4.44	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	19	0	1	0	1	1	0		****/ 215	****	****	4.35	4.43	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	19	1	1	0	1	0	0		****/ 198	****	****	4.18	4.25	****
J. Were requirements for tab reports elearly specified	17	_	_	O	_	U	U	2.00	, 100			1.10	1.25	
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	19	2	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 85	****	4.67	4.58	4.50	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	19	2	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 82	****	4.60	4.52	4.12	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	19	2	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 82	****	3.00	4.16	3.90	****
J. Were criteria for grading made crear	10	2	U	U	U	U		3.00	/ 02		3.00	1.10	3.90	
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	19	0	3	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.04	3.61	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	19	0	3	0	0	0	0		****/ 53	****	****	4.05	3.51	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	19	0	2	0	0	0	1	2.33	****/ 42	****	****	4.75	4.79	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	20	1	1	0	0	0	0		****/ 32	****	****	4.75	4.79	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	20	1	Т	U	U	U	U	1.00	***/ 32			4.50	4.60	
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	20	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 50	****	4.33	4.45	4.54	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	20	1	1	0	0	0	U T		****/ 32	****	4.33	4.45	4.54	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	20	1	0	1	0	0	0		****/ 43	****	4.33	4.51	4.67	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	20	1	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 32	****	****	4.69		****
7 7 7	20	1	1	0	0	0	0		****/ 21	****	****	4.52	4.67 5.00	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	۷∠	Τ	Т	U	U	U	U	1.00	/ 21			4.54	5.00	

Title ELEMENTARY FRENCH II

Instructor:

MBAYE, ABDOULAY

Enrollment: 30
Questionnaires: 22

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2007 Page 849 FEB 13, 2008 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits	Earned	Cum. GPA		Expecte	d Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	 А	12	Required for Majors	13	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	0	В	4						
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	2	C	4	General	1	Under-grad	22	Non-major	21
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	4	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	n
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	6				
				?	0						

University of Maryland Course-Section: FREN 102 0401 ELEMENTARY FRENCH II Title Instructor: APPADOO YOGEND

Baltimore County
Fall 2007

Page 850

FEB 13, 2008

Job IRBR3029

Instructor.	APPADOO,	YOGEND		1	all 2007		
Enrollment:	13						
Questionnaires:	3		Student	Course	Evaluation	Questionnaire	

		Ouestion	G.		MD	NA	Fre	equei 2	ncie:	3 4	5	Inst Mean	ructor Rank		Dept Mean		Level Mean	Sect Mean
		Quescion			1111	INA.						Mean	Raiik	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		Genera	1															
1. Did	you gain n	ew insights,ski	lls fro	m this course	0	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	814/1639	4.01	4.22	4.27	4.08	4.33
2. Did	the instru	ctor make clear	the ex	pected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	774/1639	4.04	4.15	4.22	4.17	4.33
3. Did	the exam q	uestions reflec	t the e	xpected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	367/1397	4.32	4.37	4.28	4.18	4.67
4. Did	other eval	uations reflect	the ex	pected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	697/1583	3.94	4.18	4.19	4.01	4.33
5. Did	assigned r	eadings contrib	ute to	what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	236/1532	4.10	4.10	4.01	3.88	4.67
6. Did	written as	signments contr	ibute t	o what you learned	0	0	0	1	0	1	1	3.67	1116/1504	3.49	4.04	4.05	3.78	3.67
7. Was	the gradin	g system clearl	y expla	ined	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	317/1612	4.09	4.02	4.16	4.10	4.67
8. How	many times	was class cand	elled		0	0	1	1	1	0	0	2.00	1631/1635	2.68	4.38	4.65	4.56	2.00
9. How	would you	grade the overa	ll teac	hing effectiveness	ss 0 0 0 0 2 1 0							3.33	1390/1579	3.46	4.00	4.08	3.95	3.33
		Lectur																
1 Word	tho ingtr	uctor's lecture		propared	0 0 0 0 1 0 2							1 22	1021/1518	4.04	4.23	4.43	4.38	4.33
		ctor seem inter											1414/1520		4.67	4.70	4.61	4.00
				xplained clearly	0	0 0 0 1 0 0 2							1292/1517		4.15	4.70	4.20	3.67
		es contribute t			٥	0	0	0	1	0	_	4.33			4.27	4.22	4.17	4.33
				our understanding	0	1	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	,		3.77	3.94	3.84	
					-	_	-	-	_	_	-		,					
		Discus																
				what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	0	1		1/1398		4.18	4.07	3.85	5.00
		_	_	d to participate	2	0	0	0	0	0	1		1/1391		4.51	4.30	4.07	5.00
				d open discussion	2	0	0	0	0	0	1		1/1388		4.35	4.28	4.01	5.00
4. Were	e special t	echniques succe	ssiul		2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 958	4.16	4.02	3.93	3.71	5.00
				Frequ	ency	Dist	trib	ution	n									
Credits	s Earned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Re:	asons	3			Ту	ne			Majors	ı.
										- 								
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 1		Required for Majors						2	Graduat	е	0	Majo	or	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В 0														
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C 1		General						0	Under-g	rad	3	Non-	major	3
84-150) 1	3.00-3.49	0	D 0														
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F 0		Ele	ecti	ves				0	#### - 1				_	ſh
				P 0									respons	es to b	e sign	ificar	ıt	

Other

0

0

I ? 0 Course-Section: FREN 103 0101 University of Maryland Title

INT REV ELEM FRENCH Baltimore County EL OMARI, SAMIR Fall 2007

Instructor: Enrollment: 25

Questionnaires: 20

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Page 851 FEB 13, 2008 Job IRBR3029

		Questions	5		Frequencies NR NA 1 2 3 4							Inst Mean	tructo: Rar	_	Course Mean	-	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
		General	 																
1. Did vo	nı gain ne	ew insights,skil		this course	0	0	0	1	4	9	6	4.00	1138/1	1639	4.00	4.22	4.27	4.08	4.00
		ctor make clear			0	0	0	0	1	11	8	4.35	748/1		4.35	4.15	4.22	4.17	4.35
		estions reflect			0	0	0	0	0	7	13	4.65	375/1		4.65	4.37	4.28	4.18	4.65
	_	ations reflect			0	4	1	1	2	6	6	3.94	1113/1	1583	3.94	4.18	4.19	4.01	3.94
5. Did as	signed re	eadings contribu	ite to wh	nat you learned	0	0	0	1	5	5	9	4.10	700/1	1532	4.10	4.10	4.01	3.88	4.10
	_	-		what you learned	0	5	1	2	2	7	3	3.60	1154/1	1504	3.60	4.04	4.05	3.78	3.60
7. Was th	ne grading	system clearly	explair	ned	0	0	2	1	5	7	5	3.60	1360/1	1612	3.60	4.02	4.16	4.10	3.60
8. How ma	ny times	was class cance	elled		1	0	0	0	0	14	5	4.26	1342/1	1635	4.26	4.38	4.65	4.56	4.26
9. How wo	ould you s	grade the overal	ll teachi	ing effectiveness	4	0	0	0	2	8	6	4.25	657/1	1579	4.25	4.00	4.08	3.95	4.25
		Lecture	9																
1. Were t	he instru	actor's lectures	well pr	repared	0	0	0	1	1	6	12	4.45	891/1	1518	4.45	4.23	4.43	4.38	4.45
2. Did th	ne instruc	ctor seem intere	ested in	the subject	0	0	0	0	0	3	17	4.85	674/1	1520	4.85	4.67	4.70	4.61	4.85
3. Was le	cture mat	erial presented	d and exp	plained clearly	0	0	0	0	2	9	9	4.35	779/1	1517	4.35	4.15	4.27	4.20	4.35
4. Did th	ne lecture	es contribute to	what yo	ou learned	0	1	0	0	2	8	9	4.37	805/1	1550	4.37	4.27	4.22	4.17	4.37
5. Did au	diovisual	techniques enh	nance you	ır understanding	0	2	0	2	5	8	3	3.67	894/1	1295	3.67	3.77	3.94	3.84	3.67
		Discuss																	
1. Did cl	ass discu	ussions contribu	ite to wh	nat you learned	12	0	0	0	2	2	4	4.25	625/1	1398	4.25	4.18	4.07	3.85	4.25
		nts actively end			11	0	0	1	1	1	6	4.33	752/1	1391	4.33	4.51	4.30	4.07	4.33
				open discussion	12	0	1	1	2	2	2	3.38	1235/1	1388	3.38	4.35	4.28	4.01	3.38
		echniques succes		-	11	3	1	1	0	4	0	3.17	824/	958	3.17	4.02	3.93	3.71	3.17
		Seminar	<u>.</u>																
1. Were a	assigned t	opics relevant	to the a	announced theme	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/	85	****	4.67	4.58	4.50	****
2. Was th	ne instruc	ctor available f	or indiv	vidual attention	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/	82	****	4.60	4.52	4.12	***
3. Did re	esearch pr	rojects contribu	ite to wh	nat you learned	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/	78	****	4.80	4.47	4.25	****
		ons contribute t		ou learned	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/	80	****	4.20	4.47	4.39	***
5. Were d	riteria f	or grading made	e clear		19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/	82	****	3.00	4.16	3.90	****
		Self E	Paced																
1. Did se	elf-paced	system contribu	ite to wh	nat you learned	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/	50	****	4.33	4.45	4.54	***
				Frequ	equency Distribution														
Credits E	Carned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	asons	5				Тур	oe e			Majors	;
00-27	4	0.00-0.99	1	 A 8					or Ma		 ng 1	2		duate		 1	 Mo∹a		1
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	A 8 B 8		кес	4urr	eu I	⊃τ I⁄Iç	a JOE	. S 1		Grad	Juale	=	Т	Majo	JΤ	Т
28-55 56-83	0	2.00-2.99	1	в 8 С 1		Cox	nera	1				2	IInd	22-02	- nd 1	.9	Non	ma iom	19
84-150	0	3.00-2.99	3	D 0		Ger	iera.	т				۷	OHAG	er-gi	.au I	. >	MOI1-	-major	13
84-150 Grad.	1	3.50-4.00	3 1	Б 0 F 0	Electives							0	####	+ _ 1x	leane +	here -	re not	enouc	rh
Grau.	т	3.30-4.00	_	P 0	Electives							U			es to b			_	111
				I O		O+1	ner					5	Test	01126	רט רט ד	o argi	ıııcaı	10	
				3 0		ULI	161					J							
				: 0															

INTERMEDIATE FRENCH I

Title

Instructor: MBAYE, ABDOULAY

Enrollment: 10 Questionnaires: 8

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2007

Page 852 FEB 13, 2008 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

		Frequencies							Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank		-		Mean	
	General														
	Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	3	2	3		1138/1639		4.22		4.35	4.00
	Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	2	4	4.13	992/1639	3.64	4.15	4.22	4.27	4.13
	Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	1		4.38	687/1397				4.39	4.38
	Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	3	0		4.14	900/1583			4.19	4.28	4.14
	Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	1	0	1		4.33	506/1532		4.10	4.01	4.09	4.33
	Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	2	1		4.29	585/1504			4.05	4.09	4.29
	Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	0	2	2			1279/1612		4.02		4.21	3.75
	How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	2	3	3			1617/1635		4.38			3.13
9.	How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	1	0	0	2	3	0	3.60	1270/1579	3.20	4.00	4.08	4.14	3.60
	Lecture														
	Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	1	2			1141/1518	3.66	4.23	4.43	4.48	4.20
	Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	2	4		1033/1520	4.48	4.67		4.78	4.67
	Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	1	2		4.33	800/1517			4.27	4.34	4.33
	Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	1	0		4.60	522/1550		4.27		4.33	4.60
5.	Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	1	0	1	0	1	2	4.00	623/1295	2.91	3.77	3.94	4.07	4.00
	Discussion														
	Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	675/1398	3.60	4.18	4.07	4.14	4.20
	Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	2	1	2	4.00	983/1391	4.14	4.51	4.30	4.35	4.00
3.	Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	1	3	1	4.00	944/1388	3.76	4.35	4.28	4.37	4.00
4.	Were special techniques successful	3	2	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	307/ 958	2.91	4.02	3.93	4.00	4.33
	Laboratory														
	Did the lab increase understanding of the material	7	0	0	0	1	0	0		****/ 224	****	4.00	4.10	4.33	****
2.	Were you provided with adequate background information	7	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 240	****	4.75	4.11	4.47	****
3.	Were necessary materials available for lab activities	7	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 219	****	****	4.44	4.61	****
5.	Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	7	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 198	****	****	4.18	4.08	****
	Seminar														
	Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	7	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 85	****	4.67	4.58	4.00	****
	Did presentations contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	1	0	0		****/ 80	****	4.20	4.47	2.00	****
5.	Were criteria for grading made clear	7	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 82	****	3.00	4.16	4.00	****
	Field Work														
1.	Did field experience contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.04	4.78	****
2.	Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 53	***	****	4.05	4.28	****
	Self Paced														
1.	Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 50	****	4.33	4.45	3.24	****
4.	Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	7	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 32	****	****	4.37	1.00	****
5.	Were there enough proctors for all the students	7	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 21	****	****	4.52	3.00	****
	Frem	anas	niet	rih	ıt i or	1									

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	1	A	3	Required for Majors	2	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	2						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	2	General	1	Under-grad	8	Non-major	8
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	0	F P	0	Electives	1	#### - Means responses to		are not enough gnificant	L

I 0 Other 3 ? 0

Course-Section: FREN 201 0201 University of Maryland INTERMEDIATE FRENCH I Baltimore County

?

0

Title Fall 2007 Instructor: MBAYE, ABDOULAY

Enrollment: 18 Questionnaires: 10

	Ouestionnaire

Page 853

FEB 13, 2008

Job IRBR3029

							Fre	equei	ncies	3		Inst	ructor	Course	e Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
		Question	s		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		 Genera	 1															
1. Did yo	u gain ne	ew insights,ski	- lls fro	m this course	0	0	0	3	2	4	1	3.30	1553/1639	3.60	4.22	4.27	4.35	3.30
		ctor make clear			0	0	0	0	3	6	1	3.80	1326/1639	3.64	4.15	4.22	4.27	3.80
3. Did th	e exam qu	uestions reflec	t the e	xpected goals	0	0	0	0	2	5	3	4.10	935/1397	4.13	4.37	4.28	4.39	4.10
4. Did ot	her evalı	uations reflect	the ex	pected goals	0	2	0	0	4	2	2	3.75	1261/1583	3.54	4.18	4.19	4.28	3.75
5. Did as	signed re	eadings contrib	ute to	what you learned	0	1	1	1	2	4	1	3.33	1330/1532	3.61	4.10	4.01	4.09	3.33
6. Did wr	itten ass	signments contr	ibute t	o what you learned	0	2	2	0	3	3	0	2.88	1438/1504	3.39	4.04	4.05	4.09	2.88
7. Was th	e grading	g system clearl	y expla	ined	0	1	0	0	5	3	1	3.56	1379/1612	3.51	4.02	4.16	4.21	3.56
8. How ma	ny times	was class canc	elled		0	0	4	2	4	0	0	2.00	1631/1635	3.47	4.38	4.65	4.63	2.00
9. How wo	uld you	grade the overa	ll teac	hing effectiveness	0	0	0	1	5	3	1	3.40	1364/1579	3.20	4.00	4.08	4.14	3.40
		Lectur	e															
1. Were t	he instr	uctor's lecture	s well	prepared	0 0 0 0 4 3 3								1318/1518	3.66	4.23	4.43	4.48	3.90
2. Did th	e instru	ctor seem inter	ested i	n the subject	0	0	0	0	1	2	7	4.60	1115/1520	4.48	4.67	4.70	4.78	4.60
3. Was le	cture mat	terial presente	d and e	xplained clearly	0	0	0	0	2	6	2	4.00	1083/1517	3.66	4.15	4.27	4.34	4.00
4. Did th	e lecture	es contribute t	o what	you learned	0	0	0	2	0	3	5	4.10	1029/1550	3.77	4.27	4.22	4.33	4.10
5. Did au	diovisua	l techniques en	hance y	our understanding	0	3	2	1	1	3	0	2.71	1223/1295	2.91	3.77	3.94	4.07	2.71
		Discus	sion															
1. Did cl	ass disc	ussions contrib	ute to	what you learned	4	0	0	0	2	3	1	3.83	916/1398	3.60	4.18	4.07	4.14	3.83
2. Were a	ll studer	nts actively en	courage	d to participate	4	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	489/1391	4.14	4.51	4.30	4.35	4.67
3. Did th	e instru	ctor encourage	fair an	d open discussion	4	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	496/1388	3.76	4.35	4.28	4.37	4.67
4. Were s	pecial te	echniques succe	ssful		4	3	0	1	0	1	1	3.67	658/ 958	2.91	4.02	3.93	4.00	3.67
				Frequ	iency	Dist	trib	ution	n									
Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	asons	3			Ту	pe			Majors	\$
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 6	Required for Majors							6	Graduat	е	0	Majo	r	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B 2	Conoral								1					
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C 0	General							1	Under-g	rad 1	LO	Non-	major	10
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	1	D 0	Electives							0			,			,
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F 0		Ele	ectiv	ves				0	#### - 1				_	ın
				P 0								0	respons	es to k	oe sign	uiicar	1T	
				I 0		Otl	her					2						

Title INTERMEDIATE FRENCH I

Instructor: MBAYE, ABDOULAY

Enrollment: 25
Questionnaires: 17

MBAYE, ABDOULAY Fall 2007

Page 854 FEB 13, 2008 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

University of Maryland

Baltimore County

			Fre	equer	ncies	;		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Ouestions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	_	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	0	2	3	2	9	4.13	1042/1639	3.60	4.22	4.27	4.35	4.13
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	1	0	7	8	4.38	722/1639	3.64	4.15	4.22	4.27	4.38
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	2	3	11	4.56	457/1397	4.13	4.37	4.28	4.39	4.56
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	2	0	1	5	4	4		1240/1583	3.54		4.19	4.28	3.79
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	2	0	1	5	3	5	3.86	950/1532	3.61	4.10	4.01	4.09	3.86
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	1	2	1	5	2	5		1230/1504	3.39		4.05	4.09	3.47
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	3	2	7	-		1399/1612	3.51		4.16	4.21	3.50
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	4	4	8			1610/1635	3.47	4.38	4.65	4.63	3.25
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	2	4	8	1		1303/1579	3.20	4.00	4.08		3.53
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	U	U	4	4	0	1	3.33	1303/1379	3.20	4.00	4.00	4.14	3.33
T a mba														
Lecture	4	0	0	1	3	1	0	4 22	1110/1510	2 ((4.23	1 12	4.48	4.23
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4				0	1 3	8		1110/1518	3.66		4.43		
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	0	•	-	10	4.77	872/1520	4.48	4.67	4.70	4.78	4.77
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	0	0	2	2	9	4.54	560/1517	3.66	4.15	4.27	4.34	4.54
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	2	1	1	9	4.31	860/1550	3.77	4.27	4.22	4.33	4.31
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	3	2	1	3	2	2	3.10	1149/1295	2.91	3.77	3.94	4.07	3.10
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	2	3	4	4.22	651/1398	3.60	4.18	4.07	4.14	4.22
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	0	0	1	1	7	4.67	489/1391	4.14	4.51	4.30	4.35	4.67
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	0	0	1	3	5	4.44	702/1388			4.28	4.37	4.44
4. Were special techniques successful	8	5	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	****/ 958	2.91	4.02	3.93	4.00	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	14	2	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 224	****	4.00	4.10	4.33	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	14	0	1	0	2	0	0	2.33	****/ 240	****	4.75	4.11	4.47	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	14	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 219	****	****	4.44	4.61	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	14	2	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 215	****	****	4.35	4.43	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	14	2	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 198	***	****	4.18	4.08	****
Seminar														
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	14	2	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 82	****	4.60	4.52	3.00	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	14	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 82	****	3.00	4.16	4.00	****
									, -					
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	15	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.04	4.78	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	15	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 53	****	****	4.05	4.28	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	15	1	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 42	****	****	4.75	****	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	15	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 37	****	****	4.58	****	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	15	1	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 32	****	****	4.56	****	****
J. Did conferences help you carry out fred accivities	тэ	Т	U	U	U	U	Т	5.00	/ 32			4.50		
Self Paced														
	15	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 50	****	1 22	4 45	2 24	****
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned		0	-	0	•	0	2		,	****	4.33	4.45	3.24	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	15		0		0	-	_		****/ 32 ****/ 43	****	4.33	4.51	4.33	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	15	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	/ 13	****	****	4.69	1 00	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	15	1	0	U	U	0	1	5.00	****/ 32	****	****	4.37	1.00	

Title INTERMEDIATE FRENCH I

Instructor: MBAYE, ABDOULAY

Enrollment: 25
Questionnaires: 17

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2007 Page 854 FEB 13, 2008 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	l Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	0	A	2	Required for Majors	6	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	В	7						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	2	С	2	General	2	Under-grad	17	Non-major	17
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means	there	are not enough	n
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	0						

Course-Section: FREN 201 0401 University of Maryland
Title INTERMEDIATE FRENCH I Baltimore County
Instructor: DIALLO, MAMADOU Fall 2007

I

?

0

0

Enrollment:

Questionnaires: 14

23

University of Maryland Page 855
Baltimore County FEB 13, 2008
Fall 2007 Job IRBR3029

2

Student	Course	Firalijation	Ouestionnaire	
Student	Course	Evaluation	Questionnaire	

						Frequencies							tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
		Question	s		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		 Genera	1															
1. Did vo	u gain ne	ew insights,ski		om this course	0	0	2	3	4	4	1	2.93	1615/1639	3.60	4.22	4.27	4.35	2.93
		ctor make clear			0	0	3	4	3	3	1		1620/1639		4.15	4.22	4.27	2.64
		uestions reflec			0	0	1	1	2	8	2	3.64	1228/1397	4.13	4.37	4.28	4.39	3.64
4. Did ot	her evalu	uations reflect	the ex	spected goals	0	2	3	1	2	5	1	3.00	1532/1583	3.54	4.18	4.19	4.28	3.00
5. Did as	signed re	eadings contrib	ute to	what you learned	1	2	3	1	2	5	0	2.82	1470/1532	3.61	4.10	4.01	4.09	2.82
6. Did wr	itten ass	signments contr	ibute t	o what you learned	0	4	2	2	2	3	1	2.90	1436/1504	3.39	4.04	4.05	4.09	2.90
7. Was th	7. Was the grading system clearly explained					0	2	0	5	6	1	3.29	1466/1612	3.51	4.02	4.16	4.21	3.29
8. How ma	8. How many times was class cancelled					0	0	0	0	11	3	4.21	1382/1635	3.47	4.38	4.65	4.63	4.21
9. How wo	9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectivenes					0	1	0	8	0	0	2.78	1528/1579	3.20	4.00	4.08	4.14	2.78
	Lecture																	
1. Were t	. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared					0	2	3	1	5	2	3.15	1471/1518	3.66	4.23	4.43	4.48	3.15
	2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject					0	0	1	1	4	8		1305/1520		4.67	4.70	4.78	4.36
				explained clearly	1	0		2	4	5	0	2.92	1470/1517	3.66	4.15	4.27	4.34	2.92
		es contribute t			2	0	2	2	2	4	2	3.17	1419/1550	3.77	4.27	4.22	4.33	3.17
5. Did au	diovisual	l techniques en	hance y	our understanding	3	5	2	2	2	0	0	2.00	1273/1295	2.91	3.77	3.94	4.07	2.00
		Discus	sion															
1. Did cl	ass discu			what you learned	4	0	3	0	2	4	1	3.00	1271/1398	3.60	4.18	4.07	4.14	3.00
				ed to participate	4	0	0	3	1	4	2	3.50	1220/1391	4.14	4.51	4.30	4.35	3.50
				nd open discussion	4	0	0	4	0	5	1	3.30	1258/1388	3.76	4.35	4.28	4.37	3.30
4. Were s	special te	echniques succe	ssful	-	4	2	2	1	3	2	0	2.63	906/ 958	2.91	4.02	3.93	4.00	2.63
				Frequ	ency	Dist	trib	atior	n									
	_				_													
Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	ason	S 			Ту	pe 			Majors	;
00-27						Red	quire	ed fo	or M	ajors		9	Graduat	e	0	Majo	r	0
28-55																		
56-83						Ger	nera:	l				1	Under-g	rad 1	.4	Non-	major	14
	84-150 2 3.00-3.49 3 D 0																	
Grad. 0 3.50-4.00 2 F 0					Ele	ecti	ves				0	#### - 1				_	jh	
	P 0												respons	es to b	e sign	nificar	ıt	

Other

Course-Section: FREN 201 0501 University of Maryland Title INTERMEDIATE FRENCH I

Baltimore County

Instructor: DIALLO, MAMADOU Enrollment:

Furoriment.	19
Questionnaires:	12

Page 856 FEB 13, 2008 Fall 2007 Job IRBR3029

C+	a	The second second second	0
Student	course	Evaluation	Ouestionnaire

			Frequencies					Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	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	1	3	4	2	2	3.08	1592/1639	3.60	4.22	4.27	4.35	3.08
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	3	6	2	1	3.08	1575/1639	3.64	4.15	4.22	4.27	3.08
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	5	3	4	3.92	1074/1397	4.13	4.37	4.28	4.39	3.92
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	5	1	0	2	2	2	3.57	1378/1583	3.54	4.18	4.19	4.28	3.57
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	2	0	0	2	2	5	4.33	506/1532	3.61	4.10	4.01	4.09	4.33
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	3	1	0	3	2	2	3.50	1212/1504	3.39	4.04	4.05	4.09	3.50
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	3	4	2	2	3.27	1469/1612	3.51	4.02	4.16	4.21	3.27
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	1	10	0	3.91	1569/1635	3.47	4.38	4.65	4.63	3.91
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	1	3	2	5	1	0	2.36	1563/1579	3.20	4.00	4.08	4.14	2.36
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	1	3	4	1	1	2.80	1497/1518	3.66	4.23	4.43	4.48	2.80
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	1	3	3	3	3.80	1457/1520	4.48	4.67	4.70	4.78	3.80
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	1	6	1	1	1	2.50	1501/1517	3.66	4.15	4.27	4.34	2.50
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	3	4	1	1	2.80	1473/1550	3.77	4.27	4.22	4.33	2.80
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	4	2	3	1	0	0	1.83	1287/1295	2.91	3.77	3.94	4.07	1.83
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	2	2	1	0	1	2.33	1373/1398	3.60	4.18	4.07	4.14	2.33
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate			0	2	3	0	1		1321/1391	4.14	4.51	4.30	4.35	3.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6 6	0	2	1	1	2	0		1371/1388	3.76	4.35	4.28	4.37	2.50
4. Were special techniques successful	6	4	1	0	1	0	0		****/ 958	2.91	4.02	3.93	4.00	****

Credits Earned Cum. GPA			Expected	Grades	Reasons		Туре	Majors			
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	1	A	4	Required for Majors	7	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	В	4						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	2	C	4	General	1	Under-grad	12	Non-major	12
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	0	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	n
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	4	_			
				?	0						

Course-Section: FREN 201 0601 University of Maryland Title INTERMEDIATE FRENCH I Baltimore County Instructor: EL OMARI, SAMIR

Page 857 FEB 13, 2008 Fall 2007 Job IRBR3029

Enrollment:	8	
Questionnaires:	6	Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

?

0

	Ouestions				МR	NA		-	ncies 3	5 4	5	Inst Mean	ructor Rank		Dept Mean			
		Genera	1															
1. Did yo	ou gain n	ew insights,ski	lls fro	m this course	0	0	0	0	2	1	3	4.17	990/1639	3.60	4.22	4.27	4.35	4.17
2. Did th	ne instru	ctor make clear	the ex	pected goals	0	0	0	0	3	1	2	3.83	1306/1639	3.64	4.15	4.22	4.27	3.83
3. Did th	ne exam q	uestions reflec	t the e	xpected goals	0	0	0	0	2	1	3	4.17	878/1397	4.13	4.37	4.28	4.39	4.17
4. Did ot	her eval	uations reflect	the ex	pected goals	0	2	0	1	2	1	0	3.00	1532/1583	3.54	4.18	4.19	4.28	3.00
5. Did as	ssigned r	eadings contrib	ute to	what you learned	0	2	0	1	2	1	0	3.00	1421/1532	3.61	4.10	4.01	4.09	3.00
6. Did wr	ritten as	signments contr	ibute t	o what you learned	0	0	0	2	1	2	1	3.33	1303/1504	3.39	4.04	4.05	4.09	3.33
7. Was th	7. Was the grading system clearly explained					0	0	1	2	1	2	3.67	1327/1612	3.51	4.02	4.16	4.21	3.67
8. How ma	8. How many times was class cancelled					0	0	0	0	4	2	4.33	1288/1635	3.47	4.38	4.65	4.63	4.33
9. How wo	9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectivenes					1	0	0	2	2	0	3.50	1318/1579	3.20	4.00	4.08	4.14	3.50
	Lecture																	
1. Were t	. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared						0	1	1	3	1	3.67	1392/1518	3.66	4.23	4.43	4.48	3.67
2. Did th	2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject					0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	1033/1520	4.48	4.67	4.70	4.78	4.67
3. Was le	ecture ma	terial presente	d and e	xplained clearly	0	0			1	3	1	3.67	1292/1517	3.66	4.15	4.27	4.34	3.67
4. Did th	ne lectur	es contribute t	o what	you learned	0	0	0	0	3	2	1	3.67	1274/1550	3.77	4.27	4.22	4.33	3.67
5. Did au	ıdiovisua	l techniques en	hance y	our understanding	0	0	0	1	1	2	2	3.83	783/1295	2.91	3.77	3.94	4.07	3.83
		Discus																
				what you learned	3	-	0	0	0	3	0		770/1398		4.18			4.00
				d to participate	3	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1391		4.51	4.30	4.35	5.00
				d open discussion	3	-	0	1	0	1	1	3.67	1130/1388		4.35	4.28	4.37	3.67
4. Were s	special t	echniques succe	ssful		3	1	2	0	0	0	0	1.00	951/ 958	2.91	4.02	3.93	4.00	1.00
				Frequ	ency	Dist	trib	utio	n									
Credits E	Earned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	asons	5			Ту	pe			Majors	5
00-27	 0	0.00.0.00											 Graduat		 0	Majo		0
00-27 28-55	2	0.00-0.99 0 A 4 1.00-1.99 0 B 2				кес	quir	eu I	Jr. Mg	ajors		5	Graduat	е	U	мајс) T	U
	26-55 2 1.00-1.99 0 B 2 56-83 0 2.00-2.99 0 C 0					Cos	nera	1				0	Under-q	rad	6	Non	major	6
	84-150 3 3.00-3.49 1 D 0					Gei	иста.	T				U	onder-9	Lau	U	MOII-	iia jul	U
Grad.	01 100 0 0.00 0.10 1					r12	ecti	760				0	#### - :	Meane +	here =	re not	enous	rh
Grad. 0 3.50-4.00 2 F 0					11.1	CCCI	v CD				J	respons				_	,	
	P 0					Otl	her					1	I CBPOHB		c bigi	car		
1 0																		

Course-Section: FREN 202 0101 Title

INTERMEDIATE FRENCH II

Instructor: PROVENCHER, DEN

Enrollment: 23 Questionnaires: 16

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2007

Page 858 FEB 13, 2008 Job IRBR3029

						Fre	equei	ncie	S		Inst	tructor	Course	e Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect	
		Question	s		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank		Mean		Mean	Mean
		 Genera	 1															
1 Did vo	nı dain ne	ew insights,ski		m this course	0	0	0	0	0	2	14	4.88	196/1639	4.88	4.22	4.27	4.35	4.88
		ctor make clear			0	0	0	0	0	1	15	4.94			4.15	4.22	4.27	4.94
		uestions reflec			0	0	0	0	0	1	15		113/1397			4.28	4.39	4.94
	_	uations reflect			0	2	0	0	0	3	11	4.79			4.18	4.19	4.28	4.79
				what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	1	13	4.80			4.10	4.01	4.09	4.80
	_	-		o what you learned	1	4	0	0	1	1		4.73			4.04	4.05	4.09	4.73
		g system clearl		_	1	0	0	0	0	4	11		238/1612		4.02	4.16	4.21	4.73
	-	was class canc			0	0	0	0	0	13	3		1402/1635		4.38	4.65	4.63	4.19
	-			hing effectiveness	2	0	0	0	1	1	12		152/1579			4.08		4.79
	Lecture																	
1. Were t	1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared					0	0	0	0	1	15	4.94	149/1518	4.94	4.23	4.43	4.48	4.94
2. Did th	. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject				0	0	0	0	0	0	16	5.00	1/1520	5.00	4.67	4.70	4.78	5.00
3. Was le	Was lecture material presented and explained clearly				0	0	0	0	0	0	16	5.00	1/1517	5.00	4.15	4.27	4.34	5.00
4. Did th	Did the lectures contribute to what you learned				0	0	0	0	0	1	15	4.94	122/1550	4.94	4.27	4.22	4.33	4.94
5. Did au	. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding					0	0	0	0	1	15	4.94	57/1295	4.94	3.77	3.94	4.07	4.94
	Discussion																	
				what you learned	2	0	0	0	1	1	12	4.79	234/1398	4.79	4.18	4.07	4.14	4.79
				d to participate	2	0	0	0	0	0	14	5.00	1/1391	5.00	4.51	4.30	4.35	5.00
3. Did th	ne instru	ctor encourage	fair an	d open discussion	2	0	0	0	1	1	12	4.79	351/1388	4.79	4.35	4.28	4.37	4.79
4. Were s	special to	echniques succe	ssful		2	1	0	0	3	2	8	4.38	278/ 958	4.38	4.02	3.93	4.00	4.38
		Labora	_					_		_								
		crease understa			15	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 224		4.00	4.10	4.33	****
				ground information	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 240		4.75	4.11	4.47	****
	_			or lab activities	15	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 219	****	****	4.44	4.61	****
		structor provid			15	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 215		****	4.35	4.43	****
5. Were r	requiremen	nts for lab rep	orts cl	early specified	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 198	****	****	4.18	4.08	****
1 544	16	Self			1.5	0	0	0	1	0	0	2 00	****/ 50	****	4 22	4 45	2 04	****
				what you learned	15	0	0	0	1 1	0	0	3.00	****/ 50		4.33	4.45	3.24	****
		tions make clea acts with the i			15 15	0	0	0	0	0	0 1	3.00	****/ 32 ****/ 43		4.33	4.51	4.33	****
3. were y	our conta	acts with the i	nstruct	or neipiui	15	U	U	U	U	U	Τ	5.00	^^^^/ 43	****	* * * *	4.69	* * * *	* * * *
	Free						trib	utio	n									
Credits E	Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grade							Rea	ason	S			Ту	pe			Majors	3
00-27						Red	quir	ed f	or Ma	ajor	`s	0	 Graduat	 е	0	Majo	 or	4
28-55																		
56-83						Gei	nera	1				8	Under-g	rad 1	L6	Non-	-major	12
84-150														1.011 , 01				
Grad.					Ele	ecti	ves				3	#### - 1	Means t	here a	are not	enoug	_J h	
				P 2									respons	es to k	oe sign	nificar	nt	
	P 2					O+1						г						

Other

5

I

0

0

Course-Section: FREN 301 0101 University of Maryland Title Baltimore County

ADVANCED FRENCH I INGRAM, MARK

Instructor: Enrollment: 21 Questionnaires: 15 Fall 2007

Page 859 FEB 13, 2008 Job IRBR3029

	Ouestionnaire

					Frequencies					Inst	cructor	Course Dep		pt UMBC Level		Sect
	Questions		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
	 General															
1. Did you gain new		om this course	0	0	1	0	4	3	7	4.00	1138/1639	4.00	4.22	4.27	4.28	4.00
2. Did the instruct	J ,		0	0	0	2	3	4	6		1210/1639		4.15	4.22	4.20	3.93
3. Did the exam que		1 3	0	0	0	1	0	3	11	4.60	417/1397		4.37	4.28	4.26	4.60
4. Did other evalua			0	0	0	0	4	4	7	4.20	852/1583		4.18	4.19	4.24	4.20
	5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned					2	2	4	7	4.07	729/1532	4.07	4.10	4.01	4.05	4.07
6. Did written assi	0	0	0	2	1	5	7	4.13	735/1504	4.13	4.04	4.05	4.12	4.13		
7. Was the grading	0	1	1	2	2	2	7	3.86	1214/1612	3.86	4.02	4.16	4.12	3.86		
8. How many times w	0	0	0	0	0	10	5	4.33	1288/1635	4.33	4.38	4.65	4.66	4.33		
9. How would you gr	9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness					1	2	5	5	4.08	847/1579	4.08	4.00	4.08	4.07	4.08
	T a #ha															
1 77 +1	Lecture		_	0	^	1	2	2	_	4 00	1012/1510	4 00	4 00	4 42	4 20	4 00
1. Were the instruc				0	0	Τ	3	3	11		1213/1518		4.23	4.43	4.39	4.08
2. Did the instruct			Ţ	0	0	0	1	2	11		961/1520		4.67	4.70	4.68	4.71
3. Was lecture mate	_	-	2	0	0	2	Ţ	4	6		1042/1517		4.15	4.27	4.23	4.08
4. Did the lectures		-	2	0	1	1	2	2	7		1077/1550		4.27	4.22	4.20	4.00
5. Did audiovisual	techniques enhance	your understanding	1	3	0	1	0	1	9	4.64	203/1295	4.64	3.77	3.94	3.95	4.64
	Discussion															
1. Did class discus	sions contribute to	what you learned	5	0	1	2	4	1	2	3.10	1260/1398	3.10	4.18	4.07	4.13	3.10
2. Were all student	s actively encourag	red to participate	5	0	1	1	2	0	6	3.90	1065/1391	3.90	4.51	4.30	4.35	3.90
3. Did the instruct	or encourage fair a	nd open discussion	5	0	0	1	1	2	6	4.30	802/1388	4.30	4.35	4.28	4.34	4.30
	4. Were special techniques successful			1	2	1	2	1	3	3.22	813/ 958	3.22	4.02	3.93	3.97	3.22
Frequ				Dis	trib	ution	n									
Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades						Rea	ason	.s			Ty	pe			Majors	1

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected	d Grades	Reasons		Type	Majors		
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	7	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	В	5						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	1	C	0	General	3	Under-grad	15	Non-major	15
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means	there	are not enough	n
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	9				
				?	1						

University of Maryland Baltimore County

Course-Section: FREN 302 0101

12

ADVANCED FRENCH II

PROVENCHER, DEN

Title

Instructor:

Enrollment:

Questionnaires: 9

Fall 2007

Page 860 FEB 13, 2008 Job IRBR3029

Student Course	Evaluation	Questionnaire
----------------	------------	---------------

							Frequencies				Inst	ructor	Course	ourse Dept		Level	Sect	
		Questions	S		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	1	3	5	4.44	698/1639	4.44	4.22	4.27	4.28	4.44
		ctor make clear			0	0	0	0	1	4	4	4.33	774/1639	4.33	4.15	4.22	4.20	4.33
		uestions reflect			0	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	261/1397	4.78	4.37	4.28	4.26	4.78
	_	uations reflect		_	0	0	0	0	1	3	5	4.44	548/1583	4.44	4.18	4.19	4.24	4.44
				what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	2	5	4.33	506/1532		4.10	4.01	4.05	4.33
	_	_		what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	169/1504	4.78	4.04	4.05	4.12	4.78
		g system clearl		2	0	0	0	0	0	6	3	4.33	718/1612		4.02	4.16	4.12	4.33
		was class cance			0	0	0	0	0	7	2		1374/1635	4.22	4.38	4.65	4.66	4.22
				ning effectiveness	3	0	0	0	0	2	4		241/1579	4.67	4.00	4.08		4.67
				J														
		Lecture	е															
1. Were t	the instru	actor's lectures	s well j	prepared	1	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	454/1518	4.75	4.23	4.43	4.39	4.75
2. Did th	ne instruc	ctor seem inter	ested in	n the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1520	5.00	4.67	4.70	4.68	5.00
3. Was le	ecture mat	terial presented	d and ex	xplained clearly	1	0	0	0	1	3	4	4.38	758/1517	4.38	4.15	4.27	4.23	4.38
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned					1	0	0	0	2	1	5	4.38	796/1550	4.38	4.27	4.22	4.20	4.38
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding					1	2	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	265/1295	4.50	3.77	3.94	3.95	4.50
		Discus																
1. Did cl	lass discu	ussions contrib	ute to 1	what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1398	5.00	4.18	4.07	4.13	5.00
		-	_	d to participate	5	0	0	0	0	0	4		1/1391	5.00	4.51	4.30	4.35	5.00
				d open discussion	5	0	0	0	0	1	3		387/1388	4.75	4.35	4.28	4.34	4.75
4. Were s	special te	echniques succes	ssful		5	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/ 958	5.00	4.02	3.93	3.97	5.00
				Frequ	lency	[,] Dist	cribu	utio:	n									
Credits E	Earned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Re	asons	5			Ту	pe			Majors	3
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 8		Per			or Ma	ior		0	Graduat	 -	0	Majo		2
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B 1		1000	1ull c	su I	OI MC	1)01;	5	U	Graduat	_	U	Majo)	2
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	1	C 0		Ger	nera.	1				4	Under-q	rad	9	Non-	-major	7
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	3	D 0		061	a.	-				-	onaci -g.	Luu	_	14011		,
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F 0		Ele	ectiv	ves				0	#### - 1	Means t	here a	re not	enous	ιh
0100.	Ü	2.20 1.00	-	P 0								-	respons				_	,
				I O		Oth	ıer					5			9-		-	
				3 0		001						-						
				• •														

University of Maryland Baltimore County

Course-Section: FREN 319 0101 FRENCH TRANSLATION Fall 2007

Instructor: FATIH, ZAKARIA Enrollment: 13

Title

Questionnaires: 9

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Page 861

FEB 13, 2008

Job IRBR3029

		Frequencies						Inst	ructor	Course Dept		UMBC Level		Sect
Questions	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	3	6	4.67	430/1639	4.67	4.22	4.27	4.28	4.67
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	2	6	4.56	466/1639	4.56	4.15	4.22	4.20	4.56
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1397	5.00	4.37	4.28	4.26	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	4	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	476/1583	4.50	4.18	4.19	4.24	4.50
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	5	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1532	5.00	4.10	4.01	4.05	5.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	4	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	150/1504	4.80	4.04	4.05	4.12	4.80
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	2	6	4.56	439/1612	4.56	4.02	4.16	4.12	4.56
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	1	5	3	4.22	1374/1635	4.22	4.38	4.65	4.66	4.22
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	0	3	2	4.40	496/1579	4.40	4.00	4.08	4.07	4.40
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	3	6	4.67	602/1518	4.67	4.23	4.43	4.39	4.67
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1520	5.00	4.67	4.70	4.68	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	173/1517	4.89	4.15	4.27	4.23	4.89
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	325/1550	4.78	4.27	4.22	4.20	4.78
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	5	0	0	2	1	1	3.75	838/1295	3.75	3.77	3.94	3.95	3.75
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	189/1398	4.86	4.18	4.07	4.13	4.86
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	0	U	7	5.00	1/1391	5.00	4.51	4.30	4.35	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1391	5.00	4.35	4.28	4.35	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	2	0	0	0	1	0	6	4.71	135/ 958	4.71	4.02	3.93	3.97	4.71
1. Here special econityaes successful	2	U	3	5	_	9	O	1.71	133, 330	1.71	1.02	5.75	5.51	1.71

Credits E	arned Cum. GPA			Expected	d Grades	Reasons		Туре	Majors		
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	5	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	В	1						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	1	Under-grad	9	Non-major	8
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	
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	7	_			
				2	1						

Course-Section: FREN 339 0101 University of Maryland
Title EXPLORATION IN IDEAS Baltimore County
Instructor: SCHNEIDER, JUDI Fall 2007

Enrollment:	7
Questionnaires:	5

FEB 13, 2008 Job IRBR3029

Page 862

		Frequencies					Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC Level		Sect	
Questions	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	4	4.80	257/1639	4.80	4.22	4.27	4.28	4.80
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	915/1639	4.20	4.15	4.22	4.20	4.20
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	417/1397	4.60	4.37	4.28	4.26	4.60
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	371/1583	4.60	4.18	4.19	4.24	4.60
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	146/1532	4.80	4.10	4.01	4.05	4.80
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	291/1504	4.60	4.04	4.05	4.12	4.60
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	2	0	2	3.60	1360/1612	3.60	4.02	4.16	4.12	3.60
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1635	5.00	4.38	4.65	4.66	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	1	3	1	4.00	889/1579	4.00	4.00	4.08	4.07	4.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	3	2	4.40	947/1518	4.40	4.23	4.43	4.39	4.40
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1520	5.00	4.67	4.70	4.68	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	726/1517	4.40	4.15	4.27	4.23	4.40
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	288/1550	4.80	4.27	4.22	4.20	4.80
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	1	0	1	0	0	3	4.25	459/1295	4.25	3.77	3.94	3.95	4.25
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1398	5.00	4.18	4.07	4.13	5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1391	5.00	4.51	4.30	4.35	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1388	5.00	4.35	4.28	4.34	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	2	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/ 958	5.00	4.02	3.93	3.97	5.00

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	d Grades	Reasons		Type	Majors		
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	3	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	В	0						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	0	C	1	General	1	Under-grad	5	Non-major	4
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	ı
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	3				
				?	0						