

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	FREN 101 01
Title:	Elementary French I
Instructor:	Mushayuma,Georg

Term - Fall 2012

Enrollment:	30
Questionnaires:	26

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			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	0	7	18	4.62	505/1589	4.36	4.47	4.32	4.20	4.62
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	8	18	4.69	367/1589	4.44	4.43	4.29	4.28	4.69
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	4	22	4.85	213/1391	4.59	4.54	4.34	4.29	4.85
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	0	2	5	16	4.61	405/1552	4.37	4.42	4.25	4.16	4.61
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	1	0	0	0	3	21	4.88	117/1495	4.30	4.40	4.14	4.07	4.88
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	7	1	1	2	3	11	4.22	711/1457	4.10	4.34	4.15	3.99	4.22
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	2	3	20	4.72	267/1572	4.39	4.30	4.21	4.18	4.72
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	0	0	0	0	0	23	5.00	1/1589	4.92	4.69	4.66	4.59	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	0	0	1	2	7	10	4.30	634/1569	4.19	4.22	4.13	4.08	4.30
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	5	20	4.73	523/1530	4.65	4.55	4.49	4.45	4.73
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	3	23	4.88	643/1533	4.77	4.81	4.75	4.69	4.88
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	10	16	4.62	554/1528	4.58	4.44	4.35	4.31	4.62
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	3	22	4.81	321/1529	4.66	4.55	4.36	4.31	4.81
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	1	2	1	2	6	14	4.16	674/1393	4.17	4.21	4.06	3.99	4.16
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	1	5	10	4.56	408/1337	4.52	4.30	4.17	4.01	4.56
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	10	0	0	0	1	4	11	4.63	521/1331	4.72	4.58	4.35	4.18	4.63
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	10	0	0	0	2	3	11	4.56	649/1333	4.52	4.51	4.40	4.22	4.56
4. Were special techniques successful	10	3	1	1	1	3	7	4.08	521/1014	4.14	4.21	4.05	3.91	4.08

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	FREN 101 01
Title:	Elementary French I
Instructor:	Mushayuma,Georg

Term - Fall 2012

Enrollment:	30
Questionnaires:	26

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	25	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/180	****	****	4.20	4.25	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	1 A 14	Required for Majors	3 Graduate 0 Major 2
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0 B 6		
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	1 C 2	General	12 Under-grad 26 Non-major 24
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	2 D 0		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3 F 0	Electives	7 **** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 0		
			I 0	Other	0
			? 4		

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	FREN 101 02
Title:	Elementary French I
Instructor:	Cooke,Laura

Term - Fall 2012

Enrollment:	30
Questionnaires:	21

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			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	7	3	11	4.19	1015/1589	4.36	4.47	4.32	4.20	4.19
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	5	4	12	4.33	853/1589	4.44	4.43	4.29	4.28	4.33
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	5	13	4.43	706/1391	4.59	4.54	4.34	4.29	4.43
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	2	2	5	10	4.21	889/1552	4.37	4.42	4.25	4.16	4.21
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	0	5	7	7	4.11	844/1495	4.30	4.40	4.14	4.07	4.11
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	6	0	3	2	4	6	3.87	1033/1457	4.10	4.34	4.15	3.99	3.87
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	2	6	12	4.38	672/1572	4.39	4.30	4.21	4.18	4.38
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	21	5.00	1/1589	4.92	4.69	4.66	4.59	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	1	0	0	5	7	5	4.00	957/1569	4.19	4.22	4.13	4.08	4.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	5	3	13	4.38	1038/1530	4.65	4.55	4.49	4.45	4.38
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	5	15	4.75	959/1533	4.77	4.81	4.75	4.69	4.75
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	2	6	12	4.50	695/1528	4.58	4.44	4.35	4.31	4.50
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	6	13	4.60	615/1529	4.66	4.55	4.36	4.31	4.60
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	0	1	1	1	5	11	4.26	577/1393	4.17	4.21	4.06	3.99	4.26
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	2	4	10	4.50	452/1337	4.52	4.30	4.17	4.01	4.50
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	0	1	4	11	4.63	521/1331	4.72	4.58	4.35	4.18	4.63
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	0	0	1	4	10	4.60	615/1333	4.52	4.51	4.40	4.22	4.60
4. Were special techniques successful	6	0	0	0	4	3	8	4.27	388/1014	4.14	4.21	4.05	3.91	4.27

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	FREN 101 02	Term - Fall 2012	Enrollment:	30
Title:	Elementary French I		Questionnaires:	21
Instructor:	Cooke,Laura			

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	19	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/180	****	****	4.20	4.25	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	19	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/194	****	3.40	4.17	4.36	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	19	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/178	****	****	4.47	4.57	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	19	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/181	****	****	4.40	4.54	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	19	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/165	****	****	4.12	4.37	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/62	****	4.20	4.46	4.33	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/65	****	4.25	4.43	4.13	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/63	****	4.00	4.29	4.12	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/61	****	4.25	4.47	4.61	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/61	****	4.00	4.19	3.98	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/40	****	3.20	3.85	3.17	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/40	****	2.80	3.89	3.11	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/32	****	****	4.30	3.86	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/29	****	****	4.15	4.81	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/21	****	****	4.32	4.57	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/39	****	3.20	4.00	3.52	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	19	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/22	****	3.20	4.12	3.23	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	19	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/33	****	3.20	4.42	4.30	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	FREN 101 02
Title:	Elementary French I
Instructor:	Cooke,Laura

Term - Fall 2012

Enrollment:	30
Questionnaires:	21

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Self Paced														
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	19	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/19	****	****	4.44	5.00	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	19	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/16	****	****	4.25	5.00	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	2	0.00-0.99 0	A 5	Required for Majors 8	Graduate 0
28-55	5	1.00-1.99 0	B 6		
56-83	3	2.00-2.99 0	C 6	General 7	Under-grad 21
84-150	0	3.00-3.49 3	D 0		Non-major 21
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 5	F 0	Electives 1	
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 3	
			? 4		

**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	FREN 101 03
Title:	Elementary French I
Instructor:	Mushayuma,Georg

Term - Fall 2012

Enrollment:	31
Questionnaires:	25

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			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	22	4.88	175/1589	4.36	4.47	4.32	4.20	4.88
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	3	21	4.80	228/1589	4.44	4.43	4.29	4.28	4.80
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	22	4.88	175/1391	4.59	4.54	4.34	4.29	4.88
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	2	0	1	0	1	20	4.82	170/1552	4.37	4.42	4.25	4.16	4.82
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	1	0	1	1	4	17	4.61	309/1495	4.30	4.40	4.14	4.07	4.61
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	5	0	0	1	4	14	4.68	228/1457	4.10	4.34	4.15	3.99	4.68
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	0	2	0	21	4.83	160/1572	4.39	4.30	4.21	4.18	4.83
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	3	21	4.88	545/1589	4.92	4.69	4.66	4.59	4.88
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	7	0	0	0	0	4	14	4.78	171/1569	4.19	4.22	4.13	4.08	4.78
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	2	22	4.92	201/1530	4.65	4.55	4.49	4.45	4.92
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	1	23	4.96	293/1533	4.77	4.81	4.75	4.69	4.96
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	1	2	21	4.83	248/1528	4.58	4.44	4.35	4.31	4.83
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	1	23	4.96	97/1529	4.66	4.55	4.36	4.31	4.96
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	1	1	2	0	3	16	4.41	435/1393	4.17	4.21	4.06	3.99	4.41
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	0	1	14	4.93	102/1337	4.52	4.30	4.17	4.01	4.93
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	10	0	0	0	0	1	14	4.93	152/1331	4.72	4.58	4.35	4.18	4.93
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	10	0	0	0	0	1	14	4.93	177/1333	4.52	4.51	4.40	4.22	4.93
4. Were special techniques successful	10	5	0	0	1	2	7	4.60	205/1014	4.14	4.21	4.05	3.91	4.60

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	FREN 101 03
Title:	Elementary French I
Instructor:	Mushayuma,Georg

Term - Fall 2012

Enrollment:	31
Questionnaires:	25

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	23	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/180	****	****	4.20	4.25	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	24	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/194	****	3.40	4.17	4.36	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	24	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/178	****	****	4.47	4.57	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	24	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/181	****	****	4.40	4.54	****
Seminar														
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	24	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/65	****	4.25	4.43	4.13	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	24	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/40	****	3.20	3.85	3.17	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	24	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/40	****	2.80	3.89	3.11	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	24	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/32	****	****	4.30	3.86	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	24	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/29	****	****	4.15	4.81	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	24	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/39	****	3.20	4.00	3.52	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	FREN 101 03
Title:	Elementary French I
Instructor:	Mushayuma,Georg

Term - Fall 2012

Enrollment:	31
Questionnaires:	25

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Self Paced														
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	24	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/33	****	3.20	4.42	4.30	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	2	0.00-0.99 0	A 17	Required for Majors 5	Graduate 0
28-55	4	1.00-1.99 0	B 7		
56-83	4	2.00-2.99 4	C 0	General 13	Under-grad 25
84-150	4	3.00-3.49 8	D 0		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 1	F 0	Electives 3	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 0	
			? 1		

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	FREN 101 04
Title:	Elementary French I
Instructor:	Cooke,Laura

Term - Fall 2012

Enrollment:	28
Questionnaires:	16

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			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	3	0	2	4	7	3.75	1391/1589	4.36	4.47	4.32	4.20	3.75
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	1	2	2	2	8	3.93	1232/1589	4.44	4.43	4.29	4.28	3.93
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	2	1	1	11	4.19	937/1391	4.59	4.54	4.34	4.29	4.19
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	3	2	0	2	3	6	3.85	1235/1552	4.37	4.42	4.25	4.16	3.85
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	2	2	2	3	6	3.60	1251/1495	4.30	4.40	4.14	4.07	3.60
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	2	3	1	1	2	7	3.64	1205/1457	4.10	4.34	4.15	3.99	3.64
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	3	3	3	6	3.63	1355/1572	4.39	4.30	4.21	4.18	3.63
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	3	13	4.81	703/1589	4.92	4.69	4.66	4.59	4.81
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	0	0	0	4	5	1	3.70	1249/1569	4.19	4.22	4.13	4.08	3.70
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	1	0	3	10	4.57	787/1530	4.65	4.55	4.49	4.45	4.57
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	3	1	10	4.50	1261/1533	4.77	4.81	4.75	4.69	4.50
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	1	0	1	3	9	4.36	883/1528	4.58	4.44	4.35	4.31	4.36
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	3	4	7	4.29	974/1529	4.66	4.55	4.36	4.31	4.29
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	0	2	1	0	3	6	3.83	949/1393	4.17	4.21	4.06	3.99	3.83
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	1	3	3	6	4.08	788/1337	4.52	4.30	4.17	4.01	4.08
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	1	2	10	4.69	446/1331	4.72	4.58	4.35	4.18	4.69
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	1	0	3	3	6	4.00	1007/1333	4.52	4.51	4.40	4.22	4.00
4. Were special techniques successful	3	0	1	0	6	2	4	3.62	785/1014	4.14	4.21	4.05	3.91	3.62

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	FREN 101 04	Term - Fall 2012	Enrollment:	28
Title:	Elementary French I		Questionnaires:	16
Instructor:	Cooke,Laura			

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	14	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/180	****	****	4.20	4.25	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	14	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/194	****	3.40	4.17	4.36	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	14	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/178	****	****	4.47	4.57	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	14	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/181	****	****	4.40	4.54	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	14	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/165	****	****	4.12	4.37	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	14	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/62	****	4.20	4.46	4.33	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	14	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/65	****	4.25	4.43	4.13	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	14	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/63	****	4.00	4.29	4.12	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	14	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/61	****	4.25	4.47	4.61	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	14	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/61	****	4.00	4.19	3.98	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/40	****	3.20	3.85	3.17	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	14	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/40	****	2.80	3.89	3.11	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	14	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/32	****	****	4.30	3.86	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	14	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/29	****	****	4.15	4.81	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/39	****	3.20	4.00	3.52	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	14	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/22	****	3.20	4.12	3.23	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	14	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/33	****	3.20	4.42	4.30	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	14	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/19	****	****	4.44	5.00	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	FREN 101 04
Title:	Elementary French I
Instructor:	Cooke,Laura

Term - Fall 2012

Enrollment:	28
Questionnaires:	16

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Self Paced														
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	14	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/16	****	****	4.25	5.00	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	4	0.00-0.99 1	A 4	Required for Majors 3	Graduate 0
28-55	3	1.00-1.99 0	B 6		
56-83	0	2.00-2.99 0	C 3	General 8	Under-grad 16
84-150	0	3.00-3.49 0	D 1		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 1	F 1	Electives 0	
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 2	
			? 1		

**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	FREN 102 01
Title:	Elementary French II
Instructor:	Bengochea-Cohen

Term - Fall 2012

Enrollment:	31
Questionnaires:	24

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			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	3	18	4.63	491/1589	3.52	4.47	4.32	4.20	4.63
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	3	20	4.79	240/1589	3.77	4.43	4.29	4.28	4.79
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	0	4	19	4.71	350/1391	3.96	4.54	4.34	4.29	4.71
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	1	3	5	12	4.33	756/1552	3.47	4.42	4.25	4.16	4.33
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	0	5	4	13	4.36	575/1495	3.68	4.40	4.14	4.07	4.36
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	8	0	0	4	5	7	4.19	750/1457	3.33	4.34	4.15	3.99	4.19
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	7	17	4.71	290/1572	3.73	4.30	4.21	4.18	4.71
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	24	5.00	1/1589	4.82	4.69	4.66	4.59	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	2	11	9	4.32	621/1569	3.26	4.22	4.13	4.08	4.32
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	4	19	4.75	488/1530	3.77	4.55	4.49	4.45	4.75
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	23	4.96	293/1533	4.13	4.81	4.75	4.69	4.96
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	5	19	4.79	294/1528	3.69	4.44	4.35	4.31	4.79
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	3	21	4.88	232/1529	3.72	4.55	4.36	4.31	4.88
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	5	7	12	4.29	551/1393	3.49	4.21	4.06	3.99	4.29
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	2	3	7	4.42	540/1337	3.33	4.30	4.17	4.01	4.42
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	12	0	0	1	2	2	7	4.25	824/1331	3.75	4.58	4.35	4.18	4.25
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	12	0	0	0	3	1	8	4.42	773/1333	3.59	4.51	4.40	4.22	4.42

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	FREN 102 01
Title:	Elementary French II
Instructor:	Bengochea-Cohen

Term - Fall 2012

Enrollment:	31
Questionnaires:	24

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Discussion														
4. Were special techniques successful	12	5	0	0	2	1	4	4.29	375/1014	4.21	4.21	4.05	3.91	4.29

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	2	0.00-0.99 0	A 6	Required for Majors 5	Graduate 1
28-55	1	1.00-1.99 0	B 12		Major 0
56-83	2	2.00-2.99 3	C 3	General 16	Under-grad 23
84-150	3	3.00-3.49 3	D 1		Non-major 24
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00 2	F 0	Electives 0	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 0	
			? 2		

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	FREN 102 02
Title:	Elementary French II
Instructor:	Bengochea-Cohen

Term - Fall 2012

Enrollment:	29
Questionnaires:	24

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	2	0	1	1	2	2	16	4.41	780/1589	3.52	4.47	4.32	4.20	4.41
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	0	0	0	5	17	4.77	266/1589	3.77	4.43	4.29	4.28	4.77
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	0	0	0	1	3	18	4.77	281/1391	3.96	4.54	4.34	4.29	4.77
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	6	0	1	2	3	10	4.38	706/1552	3.47	4.42	4.25	4.16	4.38
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	3	3	0	1	1	4	12	4.50	416/1495	3.68	4.40	4.14	4.07	4.50
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	6	0	2	1	4	9	4.25	680/1457	3.33	4.34	4.15	3.99	4.25
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	3	0	0	0	3	3	15	4.57	420/1572	3.73	4.30	4.21	4.18	4.57
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	0	22	5.00	1/1589	4.82	4.69	4.66	4.59	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	8	0	0	1	3	5	7	4.13	854/1569	3.26	4.22	4.13	4.08	4.13
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	0	1	20	4.95	112/1530	3.77	4.55	4.49	4.45	4.95
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	0	1	20	4.95	293/1533	4.13	4.81	4.75	4.69	4.95
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	0	4	17	4.81	281/1528	3.69	4.44	4.35	4.31	4.81
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	4	17	4.81	321/1529	3.72	4.55	4.36	4.31	4.81
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	0	0	0	4	5	12	4.38	456/1393	3.49	4.21	4.06	3.99	4.38
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	12	0	1	0	1	3	7	4.25	663/1337	3.33	4.30	4.17	4.01	4.25
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	12	0	0	0	1	2	9	4.67	478/1331	3.75	4.58	4.35	4.18	4.67
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	12	0	0	0	2	1	9	4.58	632/1333	3.59	4.51	4.40	4.22	4.58
4. Were special techniques successful	12	4	0	0	2	3	3	4.13	491/1014	4.21	4.21	4.05	3.91	4.13

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	FREN 102 02
Title:	Elementary French II
Instructor:	Bengochea-Cohen

Term - Fall 2012

Enrollment:	29
Questionnaires:	24

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	23	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/180	****	****	4.20	4.25	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	23	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/194	****	3.40	4.17	4.36	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	23	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/178	****	****	4.47	4.57	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	23	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/165	****	****	4.12	4.37	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	23	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/62	****	4.20	4.46	4.33	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	23	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/65	****	4.25	4.43	4.13	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	23	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/40	****	3.20	3.85	3.17	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	23	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/40	****	2.80	3.89	3.11	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	23	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/29	****	****	4.15	4.81	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	23	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/39	****	3.20	4.00	3.52	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	23	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/22	****	3.20	4.12	3.23	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section: FREN 102 02	Term - Fall 2012	Enrollment: 29
Title: Elementary French II		Questionnaires: 24
Instructor: Bengochea-Cohen		

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Self Paced														
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	23	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/33	****	3.20	4.42	4.30	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	2	0.00-0.99 0	A 9	Required for Majors 5	Graduate 0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99 0	B 6		
56-83	0	2.00-2.99 2	C 3	General 14	Under-grad 24
84-150	3	3.00-3.49 2	D 0		Non-major 24
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 3	F 0	Electives 0	
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 0	
			? 5		

**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	FREN 102 03
Title:	Elementary French II
Instructor:	Badagbo,Yawo

Term - Fall 2012

Enrollment:	29
Questionnaires:	15

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			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	10	3	1	1	0	1.53	1589/1589	3.52	4.47	4.32	4.20	1.53
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	10	1	2	2	0	1.73	1588/1589	3.77	4.43	4.29	4.28	1.73
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	8	0	2	3	2	2.40	1386/1391	3.96	4.54	4.34	4.29	2.40
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	8	3	1	0	1	1.69	1552/1552	3.47	4.42	4.25	4.16	1.69
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	3	6	0	4	2	0	2.17	1490/1495	3.68	4.40	4.14	4.07	2.17
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	4	8	0	3	0	0	1.55	1456/1457	3.33	4.34	4.15	3.99	1.55
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	3	7	3	0	0	2	1.92	1567/1572	3.73	4.30	4.21	4.18	1.92
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	8	7	4.47	1154/1589	4.82	4.69	4.66	4.59	4.47
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	11	3	1	0	0	1.33	1569/1569	3.26	4.22	4.13	4.08	1.33
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	11	2	0	1	1	1.60	1530/1530	3.77	4.55	4.49	4.45	1.60
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	6	4	0	2	3	2.47	1533/1533	4.13	4.81	4.75	4.69	2.47
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	11	1	3	0	0	1.47	1528/1528	3.69	4.44	4.35	4.31	1.47
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	12	1	0	2	0	1.47	1528/1529	3.72	4.55	4.36	4.31	1.47
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	10	2	1	0	2	1.80	1388/1393	3.49	4.21	4.06	3.99	1.80
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	7	1	1	0	0	1.33	1337/1337	3.33	4.30	4.17	4.01	1.33
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	4	1	2	1	1	2.33	1326/1331	3.75	4.58	4.35	4.18	2.33
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	6	0	2	1	0	1.78	1330/1333	3.59	4.51	4.40	4.22	1.78

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	FREN 102 03
Title:	Elementary French II
Instructor:	Badagbo, Yawo

Term - Fall 2012

Enrollment:	29
Questionnaires:	15

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Discussion														
4. Were special techniques successful	6	6	2	1	0	0	0	1.33	****/1014	4.21	4.21	4.05	3.91	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	1 A 5	Required for Majors	3 Graduate 0 Major 0
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0 B 4		
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	3 C 3	General	10 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 responses to be significant
			P 0		
			I 0	Other	0
			? 3		

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section: FREN 103 01	Term - Fall 2012	Enrollment: 22
Title: Int Rev Elem French		Questionnaires: 14
Instructor: El Omari,Samir		

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			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	7	5	4.21	995/1589	4.21	4.47	4.32	4.20	4.21
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	4	5	4	3.86	1296/1589	3.86	4.43	4.29	4.28	3.86
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	11	4.79	271/1391	4.79	4.54	4.34	4.29	4.79
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	3	5	5	4.15	954/1552	4.15	4.42	4.25	4.16	4.15
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	1	0	3	5	4	3.85	1076/1495	3.85	4.40	4.14	4.07	3.85
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	2	4	3	5	3.79	1104/1457	3.79	4.34	4.15	3.99	3.79
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	3	3	2	6	3.79	1272/1572	3.79	4.30	4.21	4.18	3.79
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	9	5	4.36	1258/1589	4.36	4.69	4.66	4.59	4.36
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	2	6	4	4.17	804/1569	4.17	4.22	4.13	4.08	4.17
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	1	3	6	4	3.93	1371/1530	3.93	4.55	4.49	4.45	3.93
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	13	4.93	469/1533	4.93	4.81	4.75	4.69	4.93
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	1	2	6	5	4.07	1129/1528	4.07	4.44	4.35	4.31	4.07
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	4	2	7	4.00	1174/1529	4.00	4.55	4.36	4.31	4.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	1	1	1	3	4	4	3.69	1041/1393	3.69	4.21	4.06	3.99	3.69
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	2	4	2	4.00	823/1337	4.00	4.30	4.17	4.01	4.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	248/1331	4.88	4.58	4.35	4.18	4.88
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	0	0	1	2	4	4.43	765/1333	4.43	4.51	4.40	4.22	4.43
4. Were special techniques successful	6	5	0	1	0	2	0	3.33	****/1014	****	4.21	4.05	3.91	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	FREN 103 01
Title:	Int Rev Elem French
Instructor:	El Omari,Samir

Term - Fall 2012

Enrollment:	22
Questionnaires:	14

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/39	****	3.20	4.00	3.52	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	13	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/22	****	3.20	4.12	3.23	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	13	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/33	****	3.20	4.42	4.30	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	2	0.00-0.99 0	A 11	Required for Majors 2	Graduate 0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99 0	B 1		Major 0
56-83	2	2.00-2.99 5	C 1	General 8	Under-grad 14
84-150	1	3.00-3.49 2	D 0		Non-major 14
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 2	F 0	Electives 2	
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 1	
			? 1		

**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section: FREN 201 01	Term - Fall 2012	Enrollment: 26
Title: Intermediate French I		Questionnaires: 18
Instructor: Badagbo-Adzra,L		

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	2	0	0	0	3	6	7	4.25	957/1589	4.08	4.47	4.32	4.33	4.25
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	0	0	3	4	9	4.38	802/1589	4.47	4.43	4.29	4.30	4.38
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	0	0	1	3	3	9	4.25	874/1391	4.59	4.54	4.34	4.36	4.25
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	4	1	0	5	2	4	3.67	1352/1552	4.22	4.42	4.25	4.26	3.67
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	1	1	0	4	3	7	4.00	899/1495	4.21	4.40	4.14	4.18	4.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	7	2	1	2	1	3	3.22	1371/1457	3.95	4.34	4.15	4.14	3.22
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	0	4	3	9	4.31	761/1572	4.48	4.30	4.21	4.19	4.31
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	1	15	4.94	327/1589	4.67	4.69	4.66	4.63	4.94
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	1	1	3	4	5	3.79	1185/1569	4.05	4.22	4.13	4.12	3.79
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	3	2	10	4.47	938/1530	4.69	4.55	4.49	4.47	4.47
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	5	4	7	4.13	1462/1533	4.67	4.81	4.75	4.78	4.13
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	4	6	5	4.07	1135/1528	4.41	4.44	4.35	4.35	4.07
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	2	2	4	7	4.07	1147/1529	4.38	4.55	4.36	4.39	4.07
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	1	1	3	5	1	4	3.29	1240/1393	4.14	4.21	4.06	4.13	3.29
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	9	0	1	2	2	3	1	3.11	1263/1337	4.05	4.30	4.17	4.16	3.11
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	9	0	1	0	1	2	5	4.11	948/1331	4.55	4.58	4.35	4.32	4.11
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	1	0	3	1	4	3.78	1139/1333	4.47	4.51	4.40	4.39	3.78

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section: FREN 201 01	Term - Fall 2012	Enrollment: 26
Title: Intermediate French I		Questionnaires: 18
Instructor: Badagbo-Adzra,L		

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Discussion														
4. Were special techniques successful	9	3	2	1	1	1	1	2.67	989/1014	4.27	4.21	4.05	4.03	2.67

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	11	Required for Majors	3	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	B	1						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	1	C	1	General	7	Under-grad	18	Non-major	18
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	1	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	1				
				?	5						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	FREN 201 02	Term - Fall 2012	Enrollment:	28
Title:	Intermediate French I		Questionnaires:	12
Instructor:	Badagbo-Adzra,L			

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			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	0	0	3	7	4.08	1124/1589	4.08	4.47	4.32	4.33	4.08
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	0	1	1	9	4.42	749/1589	4.47	4.43	4.29	4.30	4.42
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	140/1391	4.59	4.54	4.34	4.36	4.92
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	2	9	4.82	170/1552	4.22	4.42	4.25	4.26	4.82
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	3	0	0	1	3	5	4.44	485/1495	4.21	4.40	4.14	4.18	4.44
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	5	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	200/1457	3.95	4.34	4.15	4.14	4.71
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	4	8	4.67	329/1572	4.48	4.30	4.21	4.19	4.67
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	2	10	4.83	651/1589	4.67	4.69	4.66	4.63	4.83
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	1	0	3	3	4.14	829/1569	4.05	4.22	4.13	4.12	4.14
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	1	2	7	4.60	745/1530	4.69	4.55	4.49	4.47	4.60
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	1	1	8	4.70	1047/1533	4.67	4.81	4.75	4.78	4.70
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	0	3	6	4.67	479/1528	4.41	4.44	4.35	4.35	4.67
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	3	6	4.67	530/1529	4.38	4.55	4.36	4.39	4.67
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	0	0	0	0	4	5	4.56	307/1393	4.14	4.21	4.06	4.13	4.56
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	452/1337	4.05	4.30	4.17	4.16	4.50
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	623/1331	4.55	4.58	4.35	4.32	4.50
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	702/1333	4.47	4.51	4.40	4.39	4.50

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section: FREN 201 02	Term - Fall 2012	Enrollment: 28
Title: Intermediate French I		Questionnaires: 12
Instructor: Badagbo-Adzra,L		

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Discussion														
4. Were special techniques successful	6	3	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	180/1014	4.27	4.21	4.05	4.03	4.67

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades		Reasons			Type	Majors			
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	1	A	5	Required for Majors	3	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	5						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	3	C	1	General	8	Under-grad	12	Non-major	12
84-150	6	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	0				
				?	1						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

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

Term - Fall 2012

Enrollment:	25
Questionnaires:	15

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			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	1	2	4	3	4	3.50	1502/1589	4.08	4.47	4.32	4.33	3.50
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	7	6	4.36	828/1589	4.47	4.43	4.29	4.30	4.36
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	2	6	6	4.29	846/1391	4.59	4.54	4.34	4.36	4.29
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	3	1	1	2	3	4	3.73	1320/1552	4.22	4.42	4.25	4.26	3.73
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	3	1	1	1	3	4	3.80	1115/1495	4.21	4.40	4.14	4.18	3.80
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	4	0	0	1	7	1	4.00	886/1457	3.95	4.34	4.15	4.14	4.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	0	1	7	5	4.31	774/1572	4.48	4.30	4.21	4.19	4.31
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	7	6	4.46	1154/1589	4.67	4.69	4.66	4.63	4.46
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	1	0	0	3	4	2	3.89	1098/1569	4.05	4.22	4.13	4.12	3.89
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	0	2	11	4.85	329/1530	4.69	4.55	4.49	4.47	4.85
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	1	12	4.92	469/1533	4.67	4.81	4.75	4.78	4.92
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	2	7	4	4.15	1073/1528	4.41	4.44	4.35	4.35	4.15
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	1	1	4	6	4.00	1174/1529	4.38	4.55	4.36	4.39	4.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	1	1	1	0	4	6	4.08	753/1393	4.14	4.21	4.06	4.13	4.08
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/1337	4.05	4.30	4.17	4.16	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	11	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	379/1331	4.55	4.58	4.35	4.32	4.75
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	11	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1333	4.47	4.51	4.40	4.39	5.00

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

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

Term - Fall 2012

Enrollment:	25
Questionnaires:	15

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Discussion														
4. Were special techniques successful	11	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1014	4.27	4.21	4.05	4.03	5.00

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	1	A	6	Required for Majors	3	Graduate	0	Major	2
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	3						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	1	C	2	General	8	Under-grad	15	Non-major	13
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	3	D	1						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	1	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	3						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

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

Term - Fall 2012

Enrollment:	25
Questionnaires:	20

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			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	2	6	11	4.47	686/1589	4.08	4.47	4.32	4.33	4.47
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	3	15	4.74	317/1589	4.47	4.43	4.29	4.30	4.74
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	0	0	0	0	2	16	4.89	175/1391	4.59	4.54	4.34	4.36	4.89
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	3	0	0	1	3	12	4.69	320/1552	4.22	4.42	4.25	4.26	4.69
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	3	0	1	0	3	11	4.60	309/1495	4.21	4.40	4.14	4.18	4.60
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	5	1	1	3	3	6	3.86	1042/1457	3.95	4.34	4.15	4.14	3.86
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	2	3	14	4.63	358/1572	4.48	4.30	4.21	4.19	4.63
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	10	8	4.44	1174/1589	4.67	4.69	4.66	4.63	4.44
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	1	8	7	4.38	546/1569	4.05	4.22	4.13	4.12	4.38
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	1	1	17	4.84	329/1530	4.69	4.55	4.49	4.47	4.84
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	1	18	4.95	352/1533	4.67	4.81	4.75	4.78	4.95
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	1	3	15	4.74	377/1528	4.41	4.44	4.35	4.35	4.74
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	2	16	4.79	351/1529	4.38	4.55	4.36	4.39	4.79
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	1	1	2	15	4.63	243/1393	4.14	4.21	4.06	4.13	4.63
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	1	4	8	4.54	430/1337	4.05	4.30	4.17	4.16	4.54
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	0	0	1	0	12	4.85	280/1331	4.55	4.58	4.35	4.32	4.85
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	0	0	1	3	9	4.62	603/1333	4.47	4.51	4.40	4.39	4.62
4. Were special techniques successful	7	1	0	0	0	3	9	4.75	137/1014	4.27	4.21	4.05	4.03	4.75

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

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

Term - Fall 2012

Enrollment:	25
Questionnaires:	20

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	19	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/180	****	****	4.20	4.50	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/194	****	3.40	4.17	4.12	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/178	****	****	4.47	4.63	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/181	****	****	4.40	4.55	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	19	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/165	****	****	4.12	4.42	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/62	****	4.20	4.46	4.07	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/65	****	4.25	4.43	4.06	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/63	****	4.00	4.29	3.83	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/61	****	4.25	4.47	4.25	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/61	****	4.00	4.19	4.26	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/40	****	3.20	3.85	3.77	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/40	****	2.80	3.89	3.86	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/32	****	****	4.30	4.42	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/29	****	****	4.15	3.26	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/21	****	****	4.32	4.60	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/39	****	3.20	4.00	4.01	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/22	****	3.20	4.12	3.93	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/33	****	3.20	4.42	4.30	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

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

Term - Fall 2012

Enrollment:	25
Questionnaires:	20

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Self Paced														
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/19	****	****	4.44	4.67	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/16	****	****	4.25	4.56	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	1	A	6	Required for Majors	3	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	B	8						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	3	General	11	Under-grad	20	Non-major	19
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	4	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	2	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	1				
				?	3						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	FREN 202 01
Title:	Intermediate French II
Instructor:	Fatih,Zakaria

Term - Fall 2012

Enrollment:	16
Questionnaires:	12

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			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	1	5	5	4.36	832/1589	4.36	4.47	4.32	4.33	4.36
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	0	3	1	3	3	3.60	1446/1589	3.60	4.43	4.29	4.30	3.60
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	0	0	0	3	2	5	4.20	921/1391	4.20	4.54	4.34	4.36	4.20
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	0	0	1	5	2	2	3.50	1421/1552	3.50	4.42	4.25	4.26	3.50
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	2	5	3	4.10	844/1495	4.10	4.40	4.14	4.18	4.10
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	1	0	1	2	3	3	3.89	1015/1457	3.89	4.34	4.15	4.14	3.89
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	3	2	3	2	1	0	1	2.14	1561/1572	2.14	4.30	4.21	4.19	2.14
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	8	2	4.20	1395/1589	4.20	4.69	4.66	4.63	4.20
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	1	2	5	1	3.67	1277/1569	3.67	4.22	4.13	4.12	3.67
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	5	3	1	3.56	1462/1530	3.56	4.55	4.49	4.47	3.56
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	1	2	6	4.56	1221/1533	4.56	4.81	4.75	4.78	4.56
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	1	7	1	4.00	1171/1528	4.00	4.44	4.35	4.35	4.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	1	0	3	5	4.33	924/1529	4.33	4.55	4.36	4.39	4.33
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	0	0	0	3	3	4	4.10	743/1393	4.10	4.21	4.06	4.13	4.10
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	1	0	2	3	3	3.78	1009/1337	3.78	4.30	4.17	4.16	3.78
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	1	5	3	4.22	846/1331	4.22	4.58	4.35	4.32	4.22
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	3	2	4	4.11	971/1333	4.11	4.51	4.40	4.39	4.11

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	FREN 202 01
Title:	Intermediate French II
Instructor:	Fatih,Zakaria

Term - Fall 2012

Enrollment:	16
Questionnaires:	12

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Discussion														
4. Were special techniques successful	4	3	0	0	3	1	1	3.60	791/1014	3.60	4.21	4.05	4.03	3.60

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors				
00-27	2	0.00-0.99 0	A 5	Required for Majors	4	Graduate	0	Major	2
28-55	0	1.00-1.99 0	B 2						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99 0	C 1	General	1	Under-grad	12	Non-major	10
84-150	1	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				
			? 3						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section: FREN 301 01		Term - Fall 2012								Enrollment: 20					
Title: Advanced French I										Questionnaires: 12					
Instructor: Deverneil,Marie															
		Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect		
Questions		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course		0	0	0	0	0	4	8	4.67	435/1589	4.67	4.47	4.32	4.33	4.67
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals		0	0	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	122/1589	4.92	4.43	4.29	4.26	4.92
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals		0	0	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	140/1391	4.92	4.54	4.34	4.30	4.92
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals		0	1	0	0	0	3	8	4.73	274/1552	4.73	4.42	4.25	4.24	4.73
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned		0	2	0	0	3	2	5	4.20	744/1495	4.20	4.40	4.14	4.11	4.20
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned		0	0	0	0	0	5	7	4.58	326/1457	4.58	4.34	4.15	4.13	4.58
7. Was the grading system clearly explained		0	0	0	0	1	3	8	4.58	409/1572	4.58	4.30	4.21	4.18	4.58
8. How many times was class cancelled		0	0	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/1589	5.00	4.69	4.66	4.67	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness		3	1	0	0	0	4	4	4.50	369/1569	4.50	4.22	4.13	4.10	4.50
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared		1	0	0	0	0	4	7	4.64	694/1530	4.64	4.55	4.49	4.49	4.64
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject		1	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1533	5.00	4.81	4.75	4.75	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly		1	0	0	0	0	3	8	4.73	391/1528	4.73	4.44	4.35	4.33	4.73
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned		1	0	0	0	1	1	9	4.73	443/1529	4.73	4.55	4.36	4.34	4.73
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding		3	1	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	158/1393	4.75	4.21	4.06	4.10	4.75
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned		3	0	0	1	2	0	6	4.22	686/1337	4.22	4.30	4.17	4.20	4.22
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate		3	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	356/1331	4.78	4.58	4.35	4.35	4.78
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion		3	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	277/1333	4.89	4.51	4.40	4.41	4.89

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	FREN 301 01
Title:	Advanced French I
Instructor:	Deverneil,Marie

Term - Fall 2012

Enrollment:	20
Questionnaires:	12

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Discussion														
4. Were special techniques successful	3	2	0	0	2	1	4	4.29	375/1014	4.29	4.21	4.05	4.04	4.29

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	8	Required for Majors	7	Graduate	0	Major	4
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B	3						
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	1	Under-grad	12	Non-major	8
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	1	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	1						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	FREN 302 01
Title:	Advanced French II
Instructor:	Fatih,Zakaria

Term - Fall 2012

Enrollment:	18
Questionnaires:	15

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			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	1	7	4	2	3.33	1534/1589	3.33	4.47	4.32	4.33	3.33
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	0	7	5	2	3.47	1481/1589	3.47	4.43	4.29	4.26	3.47
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	3	4	5	3	3.53	1292/1391	3.53	4.54	4.34	4.30	3.53
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	1	4	5	4	3.67	1352/1552	3.67	4.42	4.25	4.24	3.67
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	2	9	1	3	3.33	1381/1495	3.33	4.40	4.14	4.11	3.33
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	2	5	6	2	3.53	1256/1457	3.53	4.34	4.15	4.13	3.53
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	5	5	5	4.00	1095/1572	4.00	4.30	4.21	4.18	4.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	9	6	4.40	1213/1589	4.40	4.69	4.66	4.67	4.40
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	3	7	4	0	3.07	1498/1569	3.07	4.22	4.13	4.10	3.07
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	3	3	5	3	3.57	1459/1530	3.57	4.55	4.49	4.49	3.57
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	1	6	7	4.43	1332/1533	4.43	4.81	4.75	4.75	4.43
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	3	6	2	3	3.36	1442/1528	3.36	4.44	4.35	4.33	3.36
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	3	5	2	3	3.21	1466/1529	3.21	4.55	4.36	4.34	3.21
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	1	0	2	2	4	4	3.83	949/1393	3.83	4.21	4.06	4.10	3.83
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	2	2	3	1	3	3.09	1265/1337	3.09	4.30	4.17	4.20	3.09
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	1	1	4	5	4.18	880/1331	4.18	4.58	4.35	4.35	4.18
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	1	1	6	3	4.00	1007/1333	4.00	4.51	4.40	4.41	4.00

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	FREN 302 01
Title:	Advanced French II
Instructor:	Fatih,Zakaria

Term - Fall 2012

Enrollment:	18
Questionnaires:	15

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Discussion														
4. Were special techniques successful	4	6	1	0	1	1	2	3.60	791/1014	3.60	4.21	4.05	4.04	3.60

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	6	Required for Majors	11	Graduate	0	Major	2
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	8						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	1	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	15	Non-major	13
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	2	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	2				
				?	0						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	FREN 310 01
Title:	Interconnections: Lang
Instructor:	Field,Thomas T

Term - Fall 2012

Enrollment:	17
Questionnaires:	15

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			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	4	10	4.60	519/1589	4.60	4.47	4.32	4.33	4.60
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	2	11	4.71	343/1589	4.71	4.43	4.29	4.26	4.71
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	3	11	4.67	402/1391	4.67	4.54	4.34	4.30	4.67
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	4	10	4.60	405/1552	4.60	4.42	4.25	4.24	4.60
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	2	12	4.73	197/1495	4.73	4.40	4.14	4.11	4.73
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	2	11	4.60	308/1457	4.60	4.34	4.15	4.13	4.60
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	2	5	8	4.40	647/1572	4.40	4.30	4.21	4.18	4.40
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	2	13	4.87	572/1589	4.87	4.69	4.66	4.67	4.87
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	0	0	3	7	4.70	211/1569	4.70	4.22	4.13	4.10	4.70
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	1	13	4.93	179/1530	4.93	4.55	4.49	4.49	4.93
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	14	5.00	1/1533	5.00	4.81	4.75	4.75	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	0	1	12	4.92	139/1528	4.92	4.44	4.35	4.33	4.92
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	2	12	4.86	257/1529	4.86	4.55	4.36	4.34	4.86
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	1	0	0	0	3	10	4.77	151/1393	4.77	4.21	4.06	4.10	4.77
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	226/1337	4.80	4.30	4.17	4.20	4.80
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	217/1331	4.90	4.58	4.35	4.35	4.90
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	253/1333	4.90	4.51	4.40	4.41	4.90
4. Were special techniques successful	6	3	3	0	0	1	2	2.83	978/1014	2.83	4.21	4.05	4.04	2.83

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section: FREN 310 01	Term - Fall 2012	Enrollment: 17
Title: Interconnections: Lang		Questionnaires: 15
Instructor: Field,Thomas T		

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/194	****	3.40	4.17	4.05	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades		Reasons			Type	Majors			
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	1	A	12	Required for Majors	7	Graduate	1	Major	3
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	0						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	2	Under-grad	14	Non-major	12
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00	5	F	0	Electives	2	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	1						
				I	0	Other	1				
				?	2						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	FREN 340 01
Title:	Interconnections: Social
Instructor:	Schneider,Judit

Term - Fall 2012

Enrollment:	19
Questionnaires:	18

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	6	0	0	2	1	2	7	4.17	1047/1589	4.17	4.47	4.32	4.33	4.17
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	6	0	1	0	3	2	6	4.00	1151/1589	4.00	4.43	4.29	4.26	4.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	6	0	0	1	2	1	8	4.33	799/1391	4.33	4.54	4.34	4.30	4.33
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	6	0	1	0	3	1	7	4.08	1023/1552	4.08	4.42	4.25	4.24	4.08
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	2	1	7	4.50	416/1495	4.50	4.40	4.14	4.11	4.50
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	1	4	1	6	4.00	886/1457	4.00	4.34	4.15	4.13	4.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	8	0	0	3	0	2	5	3.90	1190/1572	3.90	4.30	4.21	4.18	3.90
8. How many times was class cancelled	7	0	1	1	0	0	9	4.36	1249/1589	4.36	4.69	4.66	4.67	4.36
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	7	0	0	0	3	6	2	3.91	1081/1569	3.91	4.22	4.13	4.10	3.91
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	8	0	0	0	4	2	4	4.00	1319/1530	4.00	4.55	4.49	4.49	4.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	7	0	0	0	2	2	7	4.45	1305/1533	4.45	4.81	4.75	4.75	4.45
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	7	0	0	1	4	2	4	3.82	1305/1528	3.82	4.44	4.35	4.33	3.82
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	7	0	1	0	4	2	4	3.73	1347/1529	3.73	4.55	4.36	4.34	3.73
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	9	0	1	2	0	2	4	3.67	1057/1393	3.67	4.21	4.06	4.10	3.67
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	3	2	2	3.86	958/1337	3.86	4.30	4.17	4.20	3.86
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	11	0	0	0	3	0	4	4.14	919/1331	4.14	4.58	4.35	4.35	4.14
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	11	0	0	0	2	1	4	4.29	866/1333	4.29	4.51	4.40	4.41	4.29
4. Were special techniques successful	11	0	0	2	1	2	2	3.57	800/1014	3.57	4.21	4.05	4.04	3.57

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	FREN 340 01	Term - Fall 2012	Enrollment:	19
Title:	Interconnections: Social		Questionnaires:	18
Instructor:	Schneider, Judit			

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	16	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/180	****	****	4.20	4.08	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	16	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/194	****	3.40	4.17	4.05	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	16	0	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	****/178	****	****	4.47	4.42	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	16	0	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/181	****	****	4.40	4.31	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	16	0	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/165	****	****	4.12	3.94	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	16	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/62	****	4.20	4.46	5.00	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	16	0	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/65	****	4.25	4.43	4.58	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/63	****	4.00	4.29	4.53	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/61	****	4.25	4.47	5.00	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	16	0	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/61	****	4.00	4.19	4.80	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/40	****	3.20	3.85	3.93	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	16	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/40	****	2.80	3.89	4.16	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	16	0	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/32	****	****	4.30	4.48	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	16	0	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/29	****	****	4.15	4.15	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	16	0	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/21	****	****	4.32	4.25	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/39	****	3.20	4.00	4.49	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	16	0	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/22	****	3.20	4.12	5.00	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	16	0	0	2	0	0	0	2.00	****/33	****	3.20	4.42	4.25	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	FREN 340 01
Title:	Interconnections: Social
Instructor:	Schneider,Judit

Term - Fall 2012

Enrollment:	19
Questionnaires:	18

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Self Paced														
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	16	0	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/19	****	****	4.44	5.00	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	16	0	0	2	0	0	0	2.00	****/16	****	****	4.25	5.00	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	2	0.00-0.99 0	A 8	Required for Majors 7	Graduate 0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99 0	B 1		Major 2
56-83	2	2.00-2.99 1	C 0	General 2	Under-grad 18
84-150	0	3.00-3.49 0	D 0		Non-major 16
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 6	F 0	Electives 0	
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 0	
			? 9		

**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	FREN 440 01
Title:	Study In French Culture
Instructor:	Fatih,Zakaria

Term - Fall 2012

Enrollment:	9
Questionnaires:	8

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			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	7	4.88	185/1589	4.88	4.47	4.32	4.46	4.88
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	2	4	4.43	734/1589	4.43	4.43	4.29	4.35	4.43
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	1	5	4.57	517/1391	4.57	4.54	4.34	4.46	4.57
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	286/1552	4.71	4.42	4.25	4.37	4.71
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	126/1495	4.86	4.40	4.14	4.25	4.86
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	95/1457	4.88	4.34	4.15	4.30	4.88
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	121/1572	4.88	4.30	4.21	4.28	4.88
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	7	1	4.13	1452/1589	4.13	4.69	4.66	4.68	4.13
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	4	3	4.43	481/1569	4.43	4.22	4.13	4.22	4.43
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	2	5	4.50	887/1530	4.50	4.55	4.49	4.56	4.50
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1533	5.00	4.81	4.75	4.76	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	4	4	4.50	695/1528	4.50	4.44	4.35	4.41	4.50
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	397/1529	4.75	4.55	4.36	4.44	4.75
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	93/1393	4.88	4.21	4.06	4.18	4.88
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	4	4	4.50	452/1337	4.50	4.30	4.17	4.36	4.50
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	2	1	5	4.38	736/1331	4.38	4.58	4.35	4.56	4.38
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1333	5.00	4.51	4.40	4.63	5.00

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	FREN 440 01
Title:	Study In French Culture
Instructor:	Fatih,Zakaria

Term - Fall 2012

Enrollment:	9
Questionnaires:	8

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Discussion														
4. Were special techniques successful	0	6	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	944/1014	3.00	4.21	4.05	4.32	3.00

Frequency Distribution

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