

Course-Section: FREN 101 0101
 Title ELEMENTARY FRENCH I
 Instructor: PROVENCHER, DEN
 Enrollment: 27
 Questionnaires: 15

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 843
 FEB 13, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	0	0	0	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	4.75	
Discussion															
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	1	4.33	****/ 958	4.00	4.02	3.93	3.71	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 85	****	4.67	4.58	4.50	****	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: FREN 101 0201
 Title ELEMENTARY FRENCH I
 Instructor: DIGEON, LANDRY
 Enrollment: 26
 Questionnaires: 17

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 844
 FEB 13, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	1	0	3	4	9	4.18	977/1639	4.32	4.22	4.27	4.08	4.18	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	6	8	4.29	822/1639	4.46	4.15	4.22	4.17	4.29	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	5	12	4.71	334/1397	4.73	4.37	4.28	4.18	4.71		
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	5	5	6	4.06	967/1583	4.17	4.18	4.19	4.01	4.06	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	4	0	0	2	6	5	4.23	598/1532	4.22	4.10	4.01	3.88	4.23	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	3	0	0	5	5	4	3.93	920/1504	3.79	4.04	4.05	3.78	3.93	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	3	5	5	4	3.59	1367/1612	4.08	4.02	4.16	4.10	3.59	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	1	14	2	4.06	1475/1635	3.44	4.38	4.65	4.56	4.06	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	1	2	6	5	4.07	847/1579	4.07	4.00	4.08	3.95	4.07	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	5	0	0	1	1	5	5	4.17	1162/1518	4.41	4.23	4.43	4.38	4.17	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	5	0	0	0	0	2	10	4.83	725/1520	4.81	4.67	4.70	4.61	4.83	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	5	0	0	0	3	3	6	4.25	886/1517	4.39	4.15	4.27	4.20	4.25	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	2	2	8	4.50	638/1550	4.55	4.27	4.22	4.17	4.50	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	5	0	1	0	0	3	8	4.42	337/1295	4.13	3.77	3.94	3.84	4.42	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	242/1398	4.44	4.18	4.07	3.85	4.78	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	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	8	0	0	0	0	3	6	4.67	496/1388	4.29	4.35	4.28	4.01	4.67	
4. Were special techniques successful	8	0	0	0	1	4	4	4.33	307/ 958	4.00	4.02	3.93	3.71	4.33	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	14	2	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 224	****	4.00	4.10	3.90	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	14	0	1	0	0	1	1	3.33	****/ 240	****	4.75	4.11	4.01	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.04	3.61	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 53	****	****	4.05	3.51	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 42	****	****	4.75	4.79	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 37	****	****	4.58	5.00	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	15	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 32	****	****	4.56	4.60	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 50	****	4.33	4.45	4.54	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	15	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 32	****	4.33	4.51	4.67	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	15	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 43	****	****	4.69	4.69	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	15	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 32	****	****	4.37	4.67	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	15	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 21	****	****	4.52	5.00	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	0	A 7	Required for Majors 10
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	B 6	
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	2	C 1	General 3
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	2	D 0	Under-grad 17
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F 0	Non-major 15
				P 0	
				I 0	
				? 0	Electives 2
					Other 1

- Means there are not enough responses to be significant

Course-Section: FREN 101 0301
 Title ELEMENTARY FRENCH I
 Instructor: MBAYE, ABDOULAY
 Enrollment: 27
 Questionnaires: 18

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 845
 FEB 13, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	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	3.00	****/ 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	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	2	A	8	Required for Majors	11	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B	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 responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	1				
				?	0						

Course-Section: FREN 101 0401
 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

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	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	4.08	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	5.00	****/ 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	3.00	****/ 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	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/ 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	****	

Course-Section: FREN 101 0401
 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

Frequency Distribution

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	B	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 responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	1				
				?	0						

Course-Section: FREN 102 0101
 Title ELEMENTARY FRENCH II
 Instructor: APPADOO, YOGEND
 Enrollment: 16
 Questionnaires: 11

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 847
 FEB 13, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	1	0	0	5	5	4.18	964/1639	4.01	4.22	4.27	4.08	4.18	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	4	5	4.27	840/1639	4.04	4.15	4.22	4.17	4.27	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	5	5	4.36	696/1397	4.32	4.37	4.28	4.18	4.36	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	3	6	1	3.80	1226/1583	3.94	4.18	4.19	4.01	3.80	
5. Did assigned readings contribute 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 written assignments contribute to 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 grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	2	6	3	4.09	982/1612	4.09	4.02	4.16	4.10	4.09	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	7	4	0	0	0	1.36	1635/1635	2.68	4.38	4.65	4.56	1.36	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching 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 the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	9	2	4.18	1148/1518	4.04	4.23	4.43	4.38	4.18	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	4	7	4.64	1074/1520	4.32	4.67	4.70	4.61	4.64	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	1	1	4	5	4.18	956/1517	3.97	4.15	4.27	4.20	4.18	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	1	4	5	4.18	953/1550	4.06	4.27	4.22	4.17	4.18	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	1	0	1	4	1	4	3.80	806/1295	3.35	3.77	3.94	3.84	3.80	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	2	2	1	3	3.63	1059/1398	4.00	4.18	4.07	3.85	3.63	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	1	4	3	4.25	816/1391	4.46	4.51	4.30	4.07	4.25	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	1	0	3	1	3	3.63	1148/1388	4.12	4.35	4.28	4.01	3.63	
4. Were special techniques successful	3	3	0	1	1	1	2	3.80	577/ 958	4.16	4.02	3.93	3.71	3.80	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	A 2	Required for Majors	5
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	B 6	Graduate	0
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	C 1	General	2
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	D 0	Under-grad	11
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	
			I 0	Other	2
			? 0		

Course-Section: FREN 102 0201
 Title ELEMENTARY FRENCH II
 Instructor: FATIH, ZAKARIA
 Enrollment: 10
 Questionnaires: 9

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 848
 FEB 13, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	1	7	4.67	430/1639	4.01	4.22	4.27	4.08	4.67	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	2	6	4.56	466/1639	4.04	4.15	4.22	4.17	4.56	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	3	5	4.44	603/1397	4.32	4.37	4.28	4.18	4.44	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	2	2	4	4.25	792/1583	3.94	4.18	4.19	4.01	4.25	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	2	5	4.33	506/1532	4.10	4.10	4.01	3.88	4.33	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	1	0	1	1	5	4.13	747/1504	3.49	4.04	4.05	3.78	4.13	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	2	6	4.56	439/1612	4.09	4.02	4.16	4.10	4.56	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	1	6	2	4.11	1447/1635	2.68	4.38	4.65	4.56	4.11	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	496/1579	3.46	4.00	4.08	3.95	4.40	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	1	0	2	6	4.44	891/1518	4.04	4.23	4.43	4.38	4.44	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	597/1520	4.32	4.67	4.70	4.61	4.89	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	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	0	1	0	1	7	4.56	580/1550	4.06	4.27	4.22	4.17	4.56	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	3	1	0	1	1	3	3.83	783/1295	3.35	3.77	3.94	3.84	3.83	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to 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 all students actively encouraged 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 instructor encourage fair and 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 special techniques successful	0	0	2	0	1	2	4	3.67	658/ 958	4.16	4.02	3.93	3.71	3.67	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: FREN 102 0301
 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

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	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	3.39	1453/1583	3.94	4.18	4.19	4.01	3.39	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	7	1	1	6	2	5	3.60	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	2	2.50	1477/1504	3.49	4.04	4.05	3.78	2.50	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	3	5	7	2	5	3.05	1515/1612	4.09	4.02	4.16	4.10	3.05	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	17	5	0	3.23	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	1	2.79	1527/1579	3.46	4.00	4.08	3.95	2.79	
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	3.77	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	3.38	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	3.18	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	2.29	1263/1295	3.35	3.77	3.94	3.84	2.29	
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	3.82	1112/1391	4.46	4.51	4.30	4.07	3.82	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	5	1	2	6	3	3.06	1313/1388	4.12	4.35	4.28	4.01	3.06	
4. Were special techniques successful	5	12	0	0	2	2	1	3.80	****/ 958	4.16	4.02	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	3.33	****/ 219	****	****	4.44	4.44	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	19	0	1	0	1	1	0	2.67	****/ 215	****	****	4.35	4.43	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	19	1	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/ 198	****	****	4.18	4.25	****	
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	5.00	****/ 82	****	3.00	4.16	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	1.00	****/ 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	1.00	****/ 32	****	****	4.56	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	0	1.00	****/ 32	****	4.33	4.51	4.67	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	20	1	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 43	****	****	4.69	4.69	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	20	1	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 32	****	****	4.37	4.67	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	20	1	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 21	****	****	4.52	5.00	****	

Course-Section: FREN 102 0301
 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

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	12	Required for Majors	13	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	0	B	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 responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	6				
				?	0						

Course-Section: FREN 102 0401
 Title ELEMENTARY FRENCH II
 Instructor: APPADOO, YOGEND
 Enrollment: 13
 Questionnaires: 3

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 850
 FEB 13, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	814/1639	4.01	4.22	4.27	4.08	4.33	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected 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 questions reflect the expected 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 evaluations reflect the expected 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 readings contribute 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 assignments contribute to 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 grading system clearly explained	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 cancelled	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 overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	2	1	0	3.33	1390/1579	3.46	4.00	4.08	3.95	3.33	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	1021/1518	4.04	4.23	4.43	4.38	4.33	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	1	0	0	2	4.00	1414/1520	4.32	4.67	4.70	4.61	4.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	1	0	1	1	3.67	1292/1517	3.97	4.15	4.27	4.20	3.67	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	832/1550	4.06	4.27	4.22	4.17	4.33	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	1	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	978/1295	3.35	3.77	3.94	3.84	3.50	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1398	4.00	4.18	4.07	3.85	5.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1391	4.46	4.51	4.30	4.07	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1388	4.12	4.35	4.28	4.01	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 958	4.16	4.02	3.93	3.71	5.00	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: FREN 103 0101
 Title INT REV ELEM FRENCH
 Instructor: EL OMARI, SAMIR
 Enrollment: 25
 Questionnaires: 20

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 851
 FEB 13, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	1	4	9	6	4.00	1138/1639	4.00	4.22	4.27	4.08	4.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	11	8	4.35	748/1639	4.35	4.15	4.22	4.17	4.35	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	7	13	4.65	375/1397	4.65	4.37	4.28	4.18	4.65		
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	4	1	1	2	6	6	3.94	1113/1583	3.94	4.18	4.19	4.01	3.94	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	5	5	9	4.10	700/1532	4.10	4.10	4.01	3.88	4.10	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	5	1	2	2	7	3	3.60	1154/1504	3.60	4.04	4.05	3.78	3.60	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	2	1	5	7	5	3.60	1360/1612	3.60	4.02	4.16	4.10	3.60	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	14	5	4.26	1342/1635	4.26	4.38	4.65	4.56	4.26	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	2	8	6	4.25	657/1579	4.25	4.00	4.08	3.95	4.25	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	1	1	6	12	4.45	891/1518	4.45	4.23	4.43	4.38	4.45	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	3	17	4.85	674/1520	4.85	4.67	4.70	4.61	4.85	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	2	9	9	4.35	779/1517	4.35	4.15	4.27	4.20	4.35	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	2	8	9	4.37	805/1550	4.37	4.27	4.22	4.17	4.37	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	2	0	2	5	8	3	3.67	894/1295	3.67	3.77	3.94	3.84	3.67	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	2	2	4	4.25	625/1398	4.25	4.18	4.07	3.85	4.25	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	11	0	0	1	1	1	6	4.33	752/1391	4.33	4.51	4.30	4.07	4.33	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	12	0	1	1	2	2	2	3.38	1235/1388	3.38	4.35	4.28	4.01	3.38	
4. Were special techniques successful	11	3	1	1	0	4	0	3.17	824/ 958	3.17	4.02	3.93	3.71	3.17	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 85	****	4.67	4.58	4.50	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 82	****	4.60	4.52	4.12	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 78	****	4.80	4.47	4.25	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 80	****	4.20	4.47	4.39	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 82	****	3.00	4.16	3.90	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 50	****	4.33	4.45	4.54	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	4	0.00-0.99	1	A	8	Required for Majors	12	Graduate	1	Major	1
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	B	8						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	1	C	1	General	2	Under-grad	19	Non-major	19
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00	1	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	5				
				?	0						

Course-Section: FREN 201 0101
 Title INTERMEDIATE FRENCH I
 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

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	3	2	3	4.00	1138/1639	3.60	4.22	4.27	4.35	4.00	
2. 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	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	1	5	4.38	687/1397	4.13	4.37	4.28	4.39	4.38	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	3	0	4	4.14	900/1583	3.54	4.18	4.19	4.28	4.14	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	1	0	1	4	4.33	506/1532	3.61	4.10	4.01	4.09	4.33	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	2	1	4	4.29	585/1504	3.39	4.04	4.05	4.09	4.29	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	0	2	2	3	3.75	1279/1612	3.51	4.02	4.16	4.21	3.75	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	2	3	3	0	3.13	1617/1635	3.47	4.38	4.65	4.63	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															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	1141/1518	3.66	4.23	4.43	4.48	4.20	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	1033/1520	4.48	4.67	4.70	4.78	4.67	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	1	2	3	4.33	800/1517	3.66	4.15	4.27	4.34	4.33	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	522/1550	3.77	4.27	4.22	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															
1. 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	
2. 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															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	7	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 224	****	4.00	4.10	4.33	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	7	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 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															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	7	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 85	****	4.67	4.58	4.00	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 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	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	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	B 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 0	Electives 1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	
				P 0			

I	0	Other	3
?	0		

Course-Section: FREN 201 0201
 Title INTERMEDIATE FRENCH I
 Instructor: MBAYE, ABDOULAY
 Enrollment: 18
 Questionnaires: 10

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 853
 FEB 13, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	3	2	4	1	3.30	1553/1639	3.60	4.22	4.27	4.35	3.30	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	6	1	3.80	1326/1639	3.64	4.15	4.22	4.27	3.80	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	5	3	4.10	935/1397	4.13	4.37	4.28	4.39	4.10	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	4	2	2	3.75	1261/1583	3.54	4.18	4.19	4.28	3.75	
5. Did assigned readings contribute 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 written assignments contribute to 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 the grading system clearly explained	0	1	0	0	5	3	1	3.56	1379/1612	3.51	4.02	4.16	4.21	3.56	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	4	2	4	0	0	2.00	1631/1635	3.47	4.38	4.65	4.63	2.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	1	5	3	1	3.40	1364/1579	3.20	4.00	4.08	4.14	3.40	

Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	4	3	3	3.90	1318/1518	3.66	4.23	4.43	4.48	3.90	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in 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 lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	2	6	2	4.00	1083/1517	3.66	4.15	4.27	4.34	4.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to 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 audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	3	2	1	1	3	0	2.71	1223/1295	2.91	3.77	3.94	4.07	2.71	

Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute 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 all students actively encouraged 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 the instructor encourage fair and 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 special techniques successful	4	3	0	1	0	1	1	3.67	658/ 958	2.91	4.02	3.93	4.00	3.67	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: FREN 201 0301
 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

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	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	3.79	1240/1583	3.54	4.18	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	3.47	1230/1504	3.39	4.04	4.05	4.09	3.47	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	3	2	7	3	3.50	1399/1612	3.51	4.02	4.16	4.21	3.50	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	4	4	8	0	3.25	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	3.53	1303/1579	3.20	4.00	4.08	4.14	3.53	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	0	1	3	1	8	4.23	1110/1518	3.66	4.23	4.43	4.48	4.23	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	0	0	3	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	3.76	4.35	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	5.00	****/ 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	5.00	****/ 32	****	****	4.56	****	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 50	****	4.33	4.45	3.24	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	15	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 32	****	4.33	4.51	4.33	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	15	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 43	****	****	4.69	****	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	15	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 32	****	****	4.37	1.00	****	

Course-Section: FREN 201 0301
 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

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected 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	B	7						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	2	C	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 responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	0						

Course-Section: FREN 201 0401
 Title INTERMEDIATE FRENCH I
 Instructor: DIALLO, MAMADOU
 Enrollment: 23
 Questionnaires: 14

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 855
 FEB 13, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	2	3	4	4	1	2.93	1615/1639	3.60	4.22	4.27	4.35	2.93	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	3	4	3	3	1	2.64	1620/1639	3.64	4.15	4.22	4.27	2.64	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	1	2	8	2	3.64	1228/1397	4.13	4.37	4.28	4.39	3.64	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	3	1	2	5	1	3.00	1532/1583	3.54	4.18	4.19	4.28	3.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute 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 written assignments contribute to 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 the grading system clearly explained	0	0	2	0	5	6	1	3.29	1466/1612	3.51	4.02	4.16	4.21	3.29	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	11	3	4.21	1382/1635	3.47	4.38	4.65	4.63	4.21	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	1	0	8	0	0	2.78	1528/1579	3.20	4.00	4.08	4.14	2.78	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	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	0	1	1	4	8	4.36	1305/1520	4.48	4.67	4.70	4.78	4.36	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	2	2	4	5	0	2.92	1470/1517	3.66	4.15	4.27	4.34	2.92	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	2	2	2	4	2	3.17	1419/1550	3.77	4.27	4.22	4.33	3.17	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	5	2	2	2	0	0	2.00	1273/1295	2.91	3.77	3.94	4.07	2.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	3	0	2	4	1	3.00	1271/1398	3.60	4.18	4.07	4.14	3.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	3	1	4	2	3.50	1220/1391	4.14	4.51	4.30	4.35	3.50	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and 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 special techniques successful	4	2	2	1	3	2	0	2.63	906/ 958	2.91	4.02	3.93	4.00	2.63	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 5	Required for Majors	9
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	B 7		Graduate 0
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	C 1	General	14
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	D 0		Non-major 14
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	2
			? 0		

Course-Section: FREN 201 0501
 Title INTERMEDIATE FRENCH I
 Instructor: DIALLO, MAMADOU
 Enrollment: 19
 Questionnaires: 12

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 856
 FEB 13, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	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	5	3	4	3	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	6	0	0	2	3	0	1	3.00	1321/1391	4.14	4.51	4.30	4.35	3.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	2	1	1	2	0	2.50	1371/1388	3.76	4.35	4.28	4.37	2.50	
4. Were special techniques successful	6	4	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/ 958	2.91	4.02	3.93	4.00	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	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	B	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 responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	4				
				?	0						

Course-Section: FREN 201 0601
 Title INTERMEDIATE FRENCH I
 Instructor: EL OMARI, SAMIR
 Enrollment: 8
 Questionnaires: 6

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 857
 FEB 13, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	2	1	3	4.17	990/1639	3.60	4.22	4.27	4.35	4.17	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	1	2	3.83	1306/1639	3.64	4.15	4.22	4.27	3.83	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	1	3	4.17	878/1397	4.13	4.37	4.28	4.39	4.17	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	1	2	1	0	3.00	1532/1583	3.54	4.18	4.19	4.28	3.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute 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 written assignments contribute to 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 the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	2	1	2	3.67	1327/1612	3.51	4.02	4.16	4.21	3.67	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	4	2	4.33	1288/1635	3.47	4.38	4.65	4.63	4.33	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	1	0	0	2	2	0	3.50	1318/1579	3.20	4.00	4.08	4.14	3.50	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	1	1	3	1	3.67	1392/1518	3.66	4.23	4.43	4.48	3.67	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	1033/1520	4.48	4.67	4.70	4.78	4.67	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	1	1	3	1	3.67	1292/1517	3.66	4.15	4.27	4.34	3.67	
4. Did the lectures contribute to 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 audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	1	1	2	2	3.83	783/1295	2.91	3.77	3.94	4.07	3.83	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	3	0	4.00	770/1398	3.60	4.18	4.07	4.14	4.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1391	4.14	4.51	4.30	4.35	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	1	0	1	1	3.67	1130/1388	3.76	4.35	4.28	4.37	3.67	
4. Were special techniques successful	3	1	2	0	0	0	0	1.00	951/ 958	2.91	4.02	3.93	4.00	1.00	

Frequency Distribution

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

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	2	14	4.88	196/1639	4.88	4.22	4.27	4.35	4.88	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	15	4.94	89/1639	4.94	4.15	4.22	4.27	4.94	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	15	4.94	113/1397	4.94	4.37	4.28	4.39	4.94	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	0	3	11	4.79	207/1583	4.79	4.18	4.19	4.28	4.79	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	1	13	4.80	146/1532	4.80	4.10	4.01	4.09	4.80	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	4	0	0	1	1	9	4.73	202/1504	4.73	4.04	4.05	4.09	4.73	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	0	4	11	4.73	238/1612	4.73	4.02	4.16	4.21	4.73	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	13	3	4.19	1402/1635	4.19	4.38	4.65	4.63	4.19	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	1	1	12	4.79	152/1579	4.79	4.00	4.08	4.14	4.79	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	1	15	4.94	149/1518	4.94	4.23	4.43	4.48	4.94	
2. 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 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 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 audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	0	1	15	4.94	57/1295	4.94	3.77	3.94	4.07	4.94	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	1	1	12	4.79	234/1398	4.79	4.18	4.07	4.14	4.79	
2. Were all students actively encouraged 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 the instructor encourage fair and 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 special techniques successful	2	1	0	0	3	2	8	4.38	278/ 958	4.38	4.02	3.93	4.00	4.38	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	15	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 224	****	4.00	4.10	4.33	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 240	****	4.75	4.11	4.47	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 219	****	****	4.44	4.61	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 215	****	****	4.35	4.43	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 198	****	****	4.18	4.08	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 50	****	4.33	4.45	3.24	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	15	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 32	****	4.33	4.51	4.33	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 43	****	****	4.69	****	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	1	A	10	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	4
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B	3						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	1	C	1	General	8	Under-grad	16	Non-major	12
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	6	F	0	Electives	3	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	2						
				I	0	Other	5				
				?	0						

Course-Section: FREN 301 0101
 Title ADVANCED FRENCH I
 Instructor: INGRAM, MARK
 Enrollment: 21
 Questionnaires: 15

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 859
 FEB 13, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	1	0	4	3	7	4.00	1138/1639	4.00	4.22	4.27	4.28	4.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	2	3	4	6	3.93	1210/1639	3.93	4.15	4.22	4.20	3.93	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	0	3	11	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	4	4	7	4.20	852/1583	4.20	4.18	4.19	4.24	4.20	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	2	2	4	7	4.07	729/1532	4.07	4.10	4.01	4.05	4.07	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	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 system clearly explained	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 was class cancelled	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 grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	1	2	5	5	4.08	847/1579	4.08	4.00	4.08	4.07	4.08	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	1	3	3	6	4.08	1213/1518	4.08	4.23	4.43	4.39	4.08	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	1	2	11	4.71	961/1520	4.71	4.67	4.70	4.68	4.71	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	2	1	4	6	4.08	1042/1517	4.08	4.15	4.27	4.23	4.08	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	1	2	2	7	4.00	1077/1550	4.00	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 discussions 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 students actively encouraged 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 instructor encourage fair and 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	5	1	2	1	2	1	3	3.22	813/ 958	3.22	4.02	3.93	3.97	3.22	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: FREN 302 0101
 Title ADVANCED FRENCH II
 Instructor: PROVENCHER, DEN
 Enrollment: 12
 Questionnaires: 9

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 860
 FEB 13, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	3	5	4.44	698/1639	4.44	4.22	4.27	4.28	4.44	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	4	4	4.33	774/1639	4.33	4.15	4.22	4.20	4.33	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	261/1397	4.78	4.37	4.28	4.26	4.78	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	3	5	4.44	548/1583	4.44	4.18	4.19	4.24	4.44	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	2	5	4.33	506/1532	4.33	4.10	4.01	4.05	4.33	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	169/1504	4.78	4.04	4.05	4.12	4.78	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	6	3	4.33	718/1612	4.33	4.02	4.16	4.12	4.33	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	7	2	4.22	1374/1635	4.22	4.38	4.65	4.66	4.22	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	241/1579	4.67	4.00	4.08	4.07	4.67	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	454/1518	4.75	4.23	4.43	4.39	4.75	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in 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 lecture material presented and explained 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	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1398	5.00	4.18	4.07	4.13	5.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1391	5.00	4.51	4.30	4.35	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	387/1388	4.75	4.35	4.28	4.34	4.75	
4. Were special techniques successful	5	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/958	5.00	4.02	3.93	3.97	5.00	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 8	Required for Majors	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	B 1		Graduate 0
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	C 0	General	9
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	D 0		Major 7
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	5
			? 0		

Course-Section: FREN 319 0101
 Title FRENCH TRANSLATION
 Instructor: FATIH, ZAKARIA
 Enrollment: 13
 Questionnaires: 9

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 861
 FEB 13, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	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	0	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	1/1388	5.00	4.35	4.28	4.34	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	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: FREN 339 0101
 Title: EXPLORATION IN IDEAS
 Instructor: SCHNEIDER, JUDI
 Enrollment: 7
 Questionnaires: 5

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 862
 FEB 13, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	1	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	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 3	Required for Majors	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	B 0		Graduate
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	C 1	General	0
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	D 0		5
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		
			I 0		
			? 0	Other	3

- Means there are not enough responses to be significant