Course-Section: FREN 101 0101

Title ELEMENTARY FRENCH I

Instructor: DIGEON, LANDRY

Enrollment: 25 Questionnaires: 16

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2008

Page 835 AUG 6, 2008 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

	Frequencies		Instructor		tructor	Course Dept		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	2	0	2	5	7	3.94	1305/1670	4.10	4.36	4.31	4.23	3.94
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	2	3	4	2	5	3.31	1570/1666	3.89	4.31	4.27	4.30	3.31
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	1	0	5	9	4.25	876/1406	4.39	4.48	4.32	4.31	4.25
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	3	2	1	4	1	5	3.46	1467/1615	4.02	4.34	4.24	4.17	3.46
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	3	2	0	3	4	3	3.50	1285/1566	4.11	4.26	4.07	4.03	3.50
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	5	1	1	2	4	2	3.50	1274/1528	3.94	4.23	4.12	4.00	3.50
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	3	0	1	6	6	3.75	1359/1650	3.81	4.16	4.22	4.28	3.75
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	15	1	4.06	1492/1667	4.26	4.47	4.67	4.61	4.06
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	3	0	3	6	2	3.29	1480/1626	3.75	4.08	4.11	4.07	3.29
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	1	0	1	7	5	4 07	1263/1559	4.04	4.38	4.46	4.47	4.07
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	1	1	3	9		1310/1560		4.75	4.72		4.43
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	1	0	2	6			1146/1549	3.93	4.34		4.32	4.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	0	1	6			1071/1546		4.40	4.32		4.14
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	0	0	2	1	8	-		857/1323		3.96	4.00	3.91	
5. Did addiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	U	U	2	1	0	3	3.00	031/1323	3.00	3.90	4.00	3.91	3.00
Discussion			_				_		000/4004					
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	1	0	4	2	6	3.92	909/1384		4.29	4.10	3.92	3.92
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	4	2	7	4.23	- ,	4.48	4.56	4.29	4.09	4.23
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	1	2	6		4.00	977/1378	4.00	4.45	4.31	4.08	4.00
4. Were special techniques successful	3	4	1	2	2	2	2	3.22	799/ 904	3.74	4.11	4.03	3.94	3.22
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	15	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 232	****	****	4.19	4.25	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	15	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 239	****	****	4.21	4.35	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	15	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 230	****	****	4.44	4.58	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	15	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 231	****	****	4.31	4.45	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	15	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 87	****	5.00	4.65	4.67	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	15	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 79	****	4.63	4.64	4.72	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 79	****	4.88	4.45	4.59	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	15	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 80	****	4.13	3.97	3.99	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	15	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 41	****	****	4.50	3.91	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	15	0	0	0	1	0	n	3.00	****/ 38	****	****	4.19	4.07	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	15	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	,	****	****	4.62	4.63	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	15	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.27	4.42	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	15	0	0	1	0	0	0		****/ 31	****	****	4.47	4.28	****
5. 212 conferences help you carry out field detivities	10	J	J	_	J	J	J	2.00	, 51			1.1/	1.20	
Self Paced				_										****
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	1	0	0	0		****/ 28	****	****	4.64	4.59	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	15	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	,	****	****	4.67	4.83	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	15	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 27	****	****	4.54	4.46	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	15	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 6	****	***	4.92	4.83	****

Course-Section: FREN 101 0101
Title ELEMENTARY FRENCH

ELEMENTARY FRENCH I DIGEON, LANDRY

Enrollment: 25
Questionnaires: 16

Instructor:

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2008

Page 835 AUG 6, 2008 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	А	3	Required for Majors	8	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	В	4						
56-83	5	2.00-2.99	0	C	5	General	3	Under-grad	16	Non-major	15
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	n
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	1				
				?	0						

Course-Section: FREN 101 0201 University of Maryland Title ELEMENTARY FRENCH I MBAYE, ABDOULAY Instructor:

Baltimore County Spring 2008

Enrollment: 29 Ouestionnaires: 15

4. Were special techniques successful

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Page 836 AUG 6, 2008

Job IRBR3029

													_	
			Fre	equei		S			ructor	Course	_		Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	1	7	4 20	1060/1670	4.10	4.36	4.31	4.23	4.20
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	0	2	1	0		1037/1666		4.31	4.27	4.30	4.20
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	1	13	4.80	261/1406		4.48	4.32	4.31	4.80
	0	4	0	0	3	2	13	4.27	849/1615		4.40		4.17	4.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	-	_	0	0	3	2	0		,			4.24		
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	4	•	•	2		/	4.45	440/1566		4.26	4.07	4.03	4.45
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	5	0	2	2	Ţ	5		1039/1528		4.23	4.12	4.00	3.90
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	2	3	3	2	5		1521/1650		4.16	4.22	4.28	3.33
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	3	10	2		1583/1667	4.26	4.47	4.67	4.61	3.93
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	2	5	5	4.25	728/1626	3.75	4.08	4.11	4.07	4.25
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	Ο	2	2	2	9	4 20	1199/1559	4.04	4.38	4.46	4.47	4.20
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	2	1	12		1090/1560	4.62	4.75	4.72	4.68	4.67
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	2	1	4	7		1070/1549	3.93	4.34	4.31	4.32	4.14
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	1	4	ο,	4.33	919/1546	4.09	4.40	4.32	4.32	4.33
_	0	4	1	0	Τ.	7	2	4.09	659/1323				3.91	4.09
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	U	4	Т	U	2	4	О	4.09	059/1323	3.66	3.96	4.00	3.91	4.09
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	1	0	1	3	5	4.10	796/1384	3.98	4.29	4.10	3.92	4.10
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	348/1378		4.56	4.29	4.09	4.80
-:	_	•	-	-	•	_	•		2 22 / 23 / 0				02	

Frequency Distribution

3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 5 0 0 0 1 2 7 4.60 590/1378 4.00 4.45 4.31 4.08 4.60

5 3 1 1 2 0 3 3.43 752/904 3.74 4.11 4.03 3.94 3.43

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA	-	Expected	Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	 А	7	Required for Majors	4	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	В	4						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	1	C	3	General	2	Under-grad	15	Non-major	15
84-150	6	3.00-3.49	0	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	6	F	0	Electives	4	#### - Means	there	are not enough	n
				P	0			responses to	be sig	nificant	
				I	0	Other	1	-			
				?	0						

Course-Section: FREN 101 0301 Title

ELEMENTARY FRENCH I

Instructor: BADAGBO, YAWO

Enrollment: 26 Questionnaires: 17

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2008

Page 837 AUG 6, 2008 Job IRBR3029

Student	Course	${\tt Evaluation}$	Questionnaire
---------	--------	--------------------	---------------

Ouestions				_	ncies		_		tructor	Course	_	UMBC		Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5 	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	8	5	4	3.76	1436/1670	4.10	4.36	4.31	4.23	3.76
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	2	1	4	6	4	3.53	1502/1666	3.89	4.31	4.27	4.30	3.53
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	0	5	5	6	3.88	1142/1406	4.39	4.48	4.32	4.31	3.88
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	4	0	1	2	7	3	3.92	1203/1615	4.02	4.34	4.24	4.17	3.92
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	4	0	1	1	5	6	4.23	664/1566	4.11	4.26	4.07	4.03	4.23
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	8	0	1	0	7	1	3.89	1055/1528	3.94	4.23	4.12	4.00	3.89
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	5	9	3	3.88	1288/1650	3.81	4.16	4.22	4.28	3.88
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	7	10	4.59	1097/1667	4.26	4.47	4.67	4.61	4.59
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	2	0	6	5	1	3.21	1505/1626	3.75	4.08	4.11	4.07	3.21
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	1	1	5	8	1	3.44	1475/1559	4.04	4.38	4.46	4.47	3.44
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	1	4	11		1138/1560	4.62	4.75	4.72	4.68	4.63
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	2	0	7	6	1		1459/1549	3.93	4.34	4.31	4.32	3.25
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	2	2	3	6	3		1417/1546		4.40	4.32	4.32	3.38
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	5	4	3	1	1	1	2.20	1290/1323	3.66	3.96	4.00	3.91	2.20
Discussion		_			_	_	_							
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	12	0	1	0	Τ	2	Ι		1141/1384		4.29	4.10	3.92	3.40
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	12	0	1	0	0	1	3		970/1378	4.48	4.56	4.29	4.09	4.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	12	0	1	2	1	0	1		1346/1378		4.45	4.31	4.08	2.60
4. Were special techniques successful	12	4	0	0	0	Τ	0	4.00	****/ 904	3.74	4.11	4.03	3.94	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	15	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 232	****	****	4.19	4.25	***
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	16	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 239	****	****	4.21	4.35	***
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	15	1	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 230	****	****	4.44	4.58	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	15	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 231	****	****	4.31	4.45	***
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	15	1	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 218	****	****	4.18	4.47	****

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	d Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	8	Required for Majors	8	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	В	3						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	1	C	0	General	1	Under-grad	17	Non-major	17
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	n
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	3	-			
				?	1						

Course-Section: FREN 101 0401 Title ELEMENTARY FRENCH I Baltimore County

University of Maryland Page 838 AUG 6, 2008 DIGEON, LANDRY Spring 2008 Job IRBR3029 Instructor:

Frequencies

Instructor

Course Dept UMBC Level Sect

responses to be significant

Enrollment:	25			
Questionnaires:	16	Student Course	Evaluation	Questionnaire

Ρ

I

?

0

0

0

								eque.	TOTCE	,		1110	Laccor	COULDO	DCPC	OTIDO	TC A C T	DCCC
		Questions	3		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		General	 L															
1. Did you	u gain ne	ew insights,skil	lls fro	m this course	0	0	0	0	1	6	9	4.50	665/1670	4.10	4.36	4.31	4.23	4.50
2. Did the	e instru	ctor make clear	the ex	pected goals	0	0	0	0	1	6	9	4.50	622/1666	3.89	4.31	4.27	4.30	4.50
3. Did the	e exam q	uestions reflect	the e	expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	6	10	4.63	471/1406	4.39	4.48	4.32	4.31	4.63
4. Did oth	her eval	uations reflect	the ex	spected goals	0	2	0	0	0	8	6	4.43	660/1615	4.02	4.34	4.24	4.17	4.43
5. Did ass	signed re	eadings contribu	ite to	what you learned	0	1	0	0	2	7	6	4.27	632/1566	4.11	4.26	4.07	4.03	4.27
6. Did wr	itten as:	signments contr	ibute t	o what you learned	1	2	0	0	1	5	7	4.46	476/1528	3.94	4.23	4.12	4.00	4.46
		g system clearly			1	0	0	0	2	7	6	4.27	891/1650	3.81	4.16	4.22	4.28	4.27
	-	was class cance	-		1	0	0	0	0	8		4.47	1196/1667	4.26	4.47	4.67	4.61	4.47
9. How wor	uld you	grade the overa	ll tead	hing effectiveness	1	0	0	1	1	6	7	4.27	716/1626	3.75	4.08	4.11	4.07	4.27
		Lecture	2															
1. Were th	he instr	uctor's lectures	s well	prepared	1	0	0	0	1	6	8	4.47	946/1559	4.04	4.38	4.46	4.47	4.47
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject				n the subject	0	0	0	0	0	4	12	4.75	948/1560	4.62	4.75	4.72	4.68	4.75
3. Was led	cture mat	terial presented	d and e	explained clearly	0	0	0	1	0	8	7	4.31	924/1549	3.93	4.34	4.31	4.32	4.31
4. Did the	e lectur	es contribute to	what	you learned	0	0	0	0	1	6	9	4.50	715/1546	4.09	4.40	4.32	4.32	4.50
5. Did aud	diovisua	l techniques enl	nance y	our understanding	0	0	0	1	1	3	11	4.50	326/1323	3.66	3.96	4.00	3.91	4.50
		Discuss	sion															
1. Did cla	ass disc	ussions contribu	ite to	what you learned	6	0	0	0	1	3	6	4.50	434/1384	3.98	4.29	4.10	3.92	4.50
				ed to participate	6	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	243/1378	4.48	4.56	4.29	4.09	4.90
3. Did the	e instru	ctor encourage i	fair ar	d open discussion	6	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	386/1378	4.00	4.45	4.31	4.08	4.80
4. Were sp	pecial te	echniques succes	ssful	-	6	1	0	0	0	4	5	4.56	222/ 904	3.74	4.11	4.03	3.94	4.56
				Frequ	iency	/ Dis	trib	utio	n									
Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades								Rea	asons	3			Ту	pe			Majors	
				·														
00-27 28-55	1 4	0.00-0.99 1.00-1.99	0 0	A 8 B 7		Re	quir	ed f	or Ma	ajor	S	7	Graduat	е	0	Majo	r	1
56-83	5	2.00-2.99	3	Б / С 0		Co	nera	1				3	Under-q	rad 1	.6	Non	-major	15
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	3	D 0		GE.	iici a	T				J	onder -g.	Lau I	.0	11011-	ilia JUI	13
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	Б 0 F 0		₽1.	ecti [,]	700				2	#### _ 1	Meane +	here a	re not	- anour	h
Grau.	U	3.50-4.00	4	r U		БŢ	CC LT.	ves	s 2 #### - Means there are not en			. emoug	11					

Other

1

Course-Section: FREN 102 0101

Title ELEMENTARY FRENCH II

Instructor: APPADOO, YOGEND

Enrollment: 22 Questionnaires: 13

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2008

Page 839 AUG 6, 2008 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

			Frequencies		Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect			
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank		Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General	-1	0	_	^	4	4	4	4 00	1016/1670	2.06	1 26	4 21	4 00	4 00
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	0	0	4 3	4	4 7	4.00	1216/1670		4.36	4.31	4.23	4.00 4.31
 Did the instructor make clear the expected goals Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals 	0	0	0	1	2	2	8	4.31	908/1666 836/1406		4.31 4.48	4.27	4.30 4.31	4.31
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	1	6	5	4.31	775/1615		4.40	4.24	4.17	4.31
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	2	3	7	4.33	480/1566		4.34	4.24	4.17	4.33
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	2	0	0	2	4	4	4.42	760/1528	3.63	4.23	4.12	4.00	4.42
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	1	6	_	4.33	806/1650		4.16	4.22	4.28	4.33
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	1	0	3	5			1633/1667	3.75	4.17	4.67	4.61	3.75
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	0	3	3			1152/1626				4.07	3.88
J. now would you grade the overall teaching circultures	,	U	U	Ü	5	3	2	3.00	1132/1020	3.07	1.00	1.11	1.07	3.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	1	1	4	7	4.31	1122/1559	4.27	4.38	4.46	4.47	4.31
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	1	0	2	2	8	4.23	1416/1560	4.48	4.75	4.72	4.68	4.23
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	5	7	4.46	736/1549	4.30	4.34	4.31	4.32	4.46
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	3	2	7	4.33	919/1546	4.19	4.40	4.32	4.32	4.33
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	1	0	0	3	3	6	4.25	545/1323	3.59	3.96	4.00	3.91	4.25
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	1	0	3	1	3.80	975/1384	3.88	4.29	4.10	3.92	3.80
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	894/1378	3.99	4.56	4.29	4.09	4.20
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	1	0	1	3	0		1287/1378		4.45	4.31	4.08	3.20
4. Were special techniques successful	8	2	0	0	1	2	0		****/ 904		4.11	4.03	3.94	****
4. Were special techniques succession	O	2	U	U	_	2	U	3.07	/ 504	3.33	7.11	1.03	3.94	
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 232	****	****	4.19	4.25	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 239	****	****	4.21	4.35	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 230	****	****	4.44	4.58	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 231	****	****	4.31	4.45	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 218	****	****	4.18	4.47	****
Seminar 1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 87	****	5.00	4.65	4.67	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 79	****	4.63	4.64	4.72	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 75	****	5.00	4.57	4.46	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 79	****	4.88	4.45	4.59	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	12	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 80	****	4.13	3.97	3.99	****
									,					
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 41	****	****	4.50	3.91	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 38	****	****	4.19	4.07	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 38	****	****	4.62	4.63	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.27	4.42	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 28	****	****	4.64	4.59	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 16	****	****	4.67	4.83	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 27	****	****	4.54	4.63	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 10	***	***	4.84	4.75	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	12	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 6	****	****	4.92	4.83	****
5. Here there though proceeds for all the students	- 4	U	5	3	5	5		5.00	, 0			1.72	1.05	

Course-Section: FREN 102 0101 Title

ELEMENTARY FRENCH II

Instructor: APPADOO, YOGEND

Enrollment: 22 Questionnaires: 13

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2008

Page 839 AUG 6, 2008 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	 А	3	Required for Majors	 7	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	2						
56-83	5	2.00-2.99	0	C	4	General	0	Under-grad	13	Non-major	13
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	ı
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	2				
				?	0						

Course-Section: FREN 102 0201 University of Maryla Title ELEMENTARY FRENCH II Baltimore County Instructor: MBAYE, ABDOULAY Spring 2008

Enrollment:

Grad.

23

University of Maryland Page 840
Baltimore County AUG 6, 2008
Spring 2008 Job IRBR3029

Ouestionnaires:	13	Student	Course	Evaluation	Ouestionnaire
Queberonnari eb	13	Deddelle	COULDC	n varaacron	Queberonnarie

							Fr	eque	ncie	s		Ins	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
		Question	S		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		 Genera	 1															
1. Did v	ou gain r	new insights,ski		m this course	0	0	0	0	1	7	5	4.31	943/1670	3.96	4.36	4.31	4.23	4.31
		ctor make clear			0	0	1	0	2	4	6		1154/1666		4.31	4.27	4.30	4.08
		questions reflec			0	0	1	0	1	3	8		836/1406		4.48	4.32	4.31	4.31
		uations reflect			0	4	0	1	3	3	2		1380/1615		4.34	4.24	4.17	3.67
				what you learned	0	2	0	1	3	4	3		1098/1566		4.26	4.07	4.03	3.82
	_	_		o what you learned	0	5	0	1	3	3	1	3.50	1274/1528	3.63	4.23	4.12	4.00	3.50
7. Was t	he gradin	ng system clearl	y expla	ined	0	0	0	4	2	1	6	3.69	1392/1650	4.02	4.16	4.22	4.28	3.69
		was class canc			0	0	0	0	0	13	0	4.00	1524/1667	3.75	4.47	4.67	4.61	4.00
9. How w	ould you	grade the overa	ll teac	hing effectiveness	0	0	0	0	3	7	3	4.00	953/1626	3.87	4.08	4.11	4.07	4.00
		Lectur	0															
1 Were	the instr	ructor's lecture	nrenared	0	0	0	1	1	6	5	4 15	1224/1559	4.27	4.38	4.46	4.47	4.15	
		n the subject	0	0	0	1	0	3	9		1224/1559		4.75	4.72	4.68	4.54		
		xplained clearly	1	0	0	0	2	3	7	4.42	,		4.34	4.31	4.32	4.42		
		you learned	0	0	0	1	2	1	9		869/1546		4.40	4.32	4.32	4.38		
				our understanding	1	5	1	1	3	1			1179/1323		3.96	4.00	3.91	
		_																
1 5 1		Discus			_	•	0	0		-	_	2 51	1012/1204	2 00	4 00	4 10	2 00	2 81
				what you learned	6	0	0	0	4	Ţ			1013/1384		4.29	4.10	3.92	
				d to participate	6	0	0	0	1	2			695/1378		4.56	4.29	4.09	4.43
				d open discussion	6 6	0 4	0	0 1	2	2			926/1378 ****/ 904			4.31	4.08	4.14
4. were	special t	echniques succe	SSIUI		ь	4	U	Τ	U	2	U	3.33	^^^^/ 904	3.33	4.11	4.03	3.94	^ ^ ^ ^
		Labora	torv															
1. Did t	he lab in	crease understa	-	f the material	12	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 232	****	****	4.19	4.25	****
		Frequ	ienai	, Dia	trib	utio	2											
				rredo	ienc)	DIS	CLID	ucio	.1									
Credits	Earned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	ason	s			Ту	pe			Majors	
00-27	0	0 0.00-0.99 0 A 5					quir	ed f	or M	ajors	 3	7	 Graduat	 е	0	Majo	r r	0
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B 5			-			-						,		
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	2	C 2		Ger	nera	1				2	Under-g	rad 1	3	Non-	major	13
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	1	D 0														

Electives

Other

0

2

- Means there are not enough
responses to be significant

0

0

0

0

F

I

3.50-4.00 1

Course-Section: FREN 102 0301 University of Maryla:
Title ELEMENTARY FRENCH II Baltimore County
Instructor: MBAYE, ABDOULAY Spring 2008

Enrollment:

56-83

Grad.

84-150

4

1

2.00-2.99

3.00-3.49

3.50-4.00

3

2

С

D

Ρ

I

6

0

0

0

0

1

Questionnaires: 20

30

University of Maryland Page 841
Baltimore County AUG 6, 2008
Spring 2008 Job IRBR3029

2

2

Under-grad 20

- Means there are not enough

responses to be significant

Non-major 20

	Ouestionnaire

			Fre	eque	ncie	s		Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	2	1	3	7	7	3.80	1414/1670	3.96	4.36	4.31	4.23	3.80
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	2	3	7	8	4.05	1167/1666	4.07	4.31	4.27	4.30	4.05
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	1	2	7	9	4.26	868/1406	4.29	4.48	4.32	4.31	4.26
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	6	0	0	4	3	7	4.21	922/1615	3.95	4.34	4.24	4.17	4.21
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	5	1	0	5	1	8	4.00	851/1566	3.99	4.26	4.07	4.03	4.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	6	1	1	4	3	4	3.62	1227/1528	3.63	4.23	4.12	4.00	3.62
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	4	1	7	7	3.75	1359/1650	4.02	4.16	4.22	4.28	3.75
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	1	1	16	2	3.95	1566/1667	3.75	4.47	4.67	4.61	3.95
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	1	4	6	8	4.11	900/1626	3.87	4.08	4.11	4.07	4.11
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	1	3	4	10	4.28	1143/1559	4.27	4.38	4.46	4.47	4.28
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	1	1	16	4.83	777/1560	4.48	4.75	4.72	4.68	4.83
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	1	1	3	5	8	4.00	1146/1549	4.30	4.34	4.31	4.32	4.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	0	3	7	7	4.06	1121/1546	4.19	4.40	4.32	4.32	4.06
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	5	1	2	3	2	5	3.62	985/1323	3.59	3.96	4.00	3.91	3.62
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	1	2	2	4	4.00	820/1384	3.88	4.29	4.10	3.92	4.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	11	0	0	0	2	2	5	4.33	797/1378	3.99	4.56	4.29	4.09	4.33
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	11	0	0	0	2	3	4	4.22	883/1378	3.81	4.45	4.31	4.08	4.22
4. Were special techniques successful	11	3	1	1	1	1	2	3.33	779/ 904	3.33	4.11	4.03	3.94	3.33
Frequ	lency	Dist	crib	utio	n									
•	_													
Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades				Rea	ason	ıs			Ту	pe			Majors	\$
00-27 4 0.00-0.99 0 A 6		Red	quir	ed f	or M	lajor	s 1	5	Graduat	 e	0	Majo	r r	0
28-55 3 1.00-1.99 0 B 6														

General

Other

Electives

Course-Section: FREN 102 0401 University of Maryl Title ELEMENTARY FRENCH II Baltimore County Instructor: APPADOO, YOGEND Spring 2008

Ρ

I

0

0

0

Enrollment:

Questionnaires: 7

10

University of Maryland Page 842
Baltimore County AUG 6, 2008
Spring 2008 Job IRBR3029

1

responses to be significant

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

							Fre	equer					tructor	Course	_		Level	Sect
		Questions	3		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		Genera	 L															
1. Did you	gain new	w insights,ski	lls fro	om this course	0	0	0	0	4	1	2	3.71	1464/1670	3.96	4.36	4.31	4.23	3.71
2. Did the	instruct	or make clear	the ex	spected goals	0	0	0	0	3	2	2	3.86	1350/1666	4.07	4.31	4.27	4.30	3.86
3. Did the	exam que	estions reflect	t the e	expected goals	0	0	0	1	0	2	4	4.29	852/1406	4.29	4.48	4.32	4.31	4.29
4. Did othe	er evalua	ations reflect	the ex	spected goals	0	2	1	0	0	3	1	3.60	1418/1615	3.95	4.34	4.24	4.17	3.60
5. Did assi	igned rea	adings contrib	ite to	what you learned	0	0	0	0	3	3	1	3.71	1173/1566	3.99	4.26	4.07	4.03	3.71
6. Did writ	tten assi	ignments contr	ibute t	o what you learned	0	2	1	0	2	1	1	3.20	1413/1528	3.63	4.23	4.12	4.00	3.20
		system clearly		ined	0	0	0	0	2	1	4	4.29	867/1650	4.02	4.16	4.22	4.28	4.29
-		was class cance			0	0	0	0	5	2	0		1657/1667	3.75	4.47	4.67	4.61	3.29
9. How woul	ld you gr	rade the overa	ll tead	ching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	3	3	0	3.50	1384/1626	3.87	4.08	4.11	4.07	3.50
		T																
1 Wara the		Lecture ctor's lectures	nanarad	1	0	0	0	1	2	2	1 22	1092/1559	4.27	4.38	4.46	4.47	4.33	
		tor's lectures			1	0	0	0	2	0	3 4		1376/1560	4.48	4.38	4.46	4.47	4.33
				explained clearly	1	0	0	0	1	2	2		900/1549	4.40	4.75	4.72	4.32	4.33
		s contribute to			1	0	0	1	1	1	2		1139/1546	4.19	4.40	4.31	4.32	4.33
				you rearned your understanding	1	0	0	Τ	3	T	0		1040/1323		3.96	4.00	3.91	
J. Did audi	IOVISUAI	teciniiques em	iance y	our understanding		U	U	U	3	3	U	3.30	1040/1323	3.33	3.90	4.00	3.91	3.30
		Discus	sion															
1. Did clas	ss discus	ssions contrib	ite to	what you learned	4	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	820/1384	3.88	4.29	4.10	3.92	4.00
2. Were all	l student	s actively end	courage	ed to participate	4	0	0	1	1	1	0	3.00	1297/1378	3.99	4.56	4.29	4.09	3.00
3. Did the	instruct	or encourage	fair ar	nd open discussion	4	0	0	0	1	2	0	3.67	1147/1378	3.81	4.45	4.31	4.08	3.67
				Frequ	iency	Dist	rib	utior	1									
		Cum. GPA																
Credits Ear	Expected Grades				Rea	sons				Туј	pe			Majors				
00-27	A 2		Rec	quire	ed fo	or Ma	jors	;	3	Graduat	e	0	Majo	r or	0			
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	в 1	111111111111111111111111111111111111111													
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	1	C 2	General							1	Under-g	rad	7	Non-	major	7
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	1	D 0														
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	0	F 0		Ele	ectiv	ves				0	#### - 1	Means t	here a		enoug	rh

Other

Course-Section: FREN 103 0101 University of Maryl Title INT REV ELEM FRENCH Baltimore County Instructor: EL OMARI, SAMIR Spring 2008

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2008 Page 843

AUG 6, 2008

Job IRBR3029

Enrollment: 21
Questionnaires: 14 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

						Fr	eque:	ncie	:S		Ins	tructor	Course	e Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
		Questions		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		 General															
1 Did you	u dain ne	General ew insights,skills fr	om this course	1	0	0	0	1	6	6	4.38	835/1670	4.38	4.36	4.31	4.23	4.38
_	-	ctor make clear the e		0	0	0	0	0	5	9	4.64	440/1666		4.31	4.27	4.30	4.64
		uestions reflect the	_	0	0	0	0	1	2	11	4.71	363/1406		4.48	4.32	4.31	4.71
	_	uations reflect the e	-	0	6	0	0	1	2	5	4.50	552/1615		4.34	4.24	4.17	4.50
		eadings contribute to		1	1	0	0	0	3	9	4.75	226/1566		4.26	4.07	4.03	4.75
	_	signments contribute	2	0	6	1	0	0	3	4	4.13			4.23	4.12	4.00	4.13
7. Was the	e grading	g system clearly expl	ained	1	0	0	0	2	2	9	4.54	527/1650	4.54	4.16	4.22	4.28	4.54
8. How man	ny times	was class cancelled		0	0	0	0	0	11	3	4.21	1395/1667	4.21	4.47	4.67	4.61	4.21
9. How wor	uld you g	grade the overall tea	ching effectiveness	5	1	0	0	0	4	4	4.50	403/1626	4.50	4.08	4.11	4.07	4.50
		Lecture															
1. Were th	he instru	actor's lectures well	prepared	1	0	0	0	1	2	10	4.69	623/1559	4.69	4.38	4.46	4.47	4.69
2. Did the	e instruc	ctor seem interested	in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	1	12	4.92	477/1560	4.92	4.75	4.72	4.68	4.92
3. Was le	cture mat	terial presented and	explained clearly	2	0	0	0	0	5	7	4.58	586/1549	4.58	4.34	4.31	4.32	4.58
		es contribute to what		2	0	0	0	0	3	9	4.75	407/1546	4.75	4.40	4.32	4.32	4.75
5. Did au	diovisual	your understanding	3	2	0	0	1	5	3	4.22	567/1323	4.22	3.96	4.00	3.91	4.22	
		Discussion															
1. Did cla	ass discu	ussions contribute to	what you learned	3	0	0	0	2	6	3	4.09	798/1384	4.09	4.29	4.10	3.92	4.09
		nts actively encourag		3	0	0	0	1	4	6	4.45	660/1378	4.45	4.56	4.29	4.09	4.45
		ctor encourage fair a	nd open discussion	3	0	0	0	2	4	5	4.27	856/1378	4.27	4.45	4.31	4.08	4.27
4. Were s	pecial te	echniques successful		3	5	0	0	2	2	2	4.00	461/ 904	4.00	4.11	4.03	3.94	4.00
		Laboratory															
		crease understanding		13	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	,		****	4.19	4.25	****
2. Were yo	ou provid	ded with adequate bac	kground information	13	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 239	****	****	4.21	4.35	****
		Self Paced															
	_	system contribute to	_	12	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 28	****	****	4.64	4.59	****
		tions make clear the	-	12	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 16		****	4.67	4.83	****
		acts with the instruc		12	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	,		****	4.54	4.46	****
4. Was the	e feedbac	ck/tutoring by procto	rs helpful	12	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 10	****	****	4.84	4.75	****
			Frequ	iency	Dis	trib	utio	n									
Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades				Re	ason	ıs			Ту	ре			Majors	;
00-27	1	 A 5		Re	 quir	ed f	or M	 Iaior	s 1	.3	 Graduat	 е	0	Majo	 or	0	
28-55	2	0.00-0.99 0 1.00-1.99 0	В 8						, 01		-	~~~	-	-	- 100) (ŭ
56-83	1	2.00-2.99 1	C 0		Ger	nera	1				0	Under-g	rad 1	.4	Non-	-major	14
84-150	84-150 2 3.00-3.49 1 D 0															-	
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 3	F 0		Ele	ecti	ves				0	#### -	Means t	here a	are not	enoug	rh
			P 0									respons	es to b	e sigr	nificar	nt	
			I 0		Ot1	her					0						
			? 0														

Course-Section: FREN 201 0101 University of Maryland INTERMEDIATE FRENCH I Baltimore County

Title AUG 6, 2008 Instructor: DIALLO, MAMADOU
Enrollment: 21 Spring 2008 Job IRBR3029

Page 844

BIII OTTINCIIC •	21				
Questionnaires:	11	Student	Course	Evaluation	Questionnaire

			Fr	eaue:	ncie	S		Inst	ructor	Course	e Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions		NA	1	2	3	4		Mean	Rank		Mean			
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	3	1	4	2	0	2.50	1654/1670	3.10	4.36	4.31	4.32	2.50
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	2	4	1	2	1	2.60	1641/1666	3.16	4.31	4.27	4.27	2.60
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	2	2	1	4	1	3.00	1343/1406	3.54	4.48	4.32	4.39	3.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	3	3	2	0	1	1	2.29	1607/1615	3.36	4.34	4.24	4.29	2.29
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	4	1	1	2	0	2	3.17	1440/1566	3.44	4.26	4.07	4.00	3.17
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	5	4	0	0	1	0	1.60	1524/1528	2.60	4.23	4.12	4.11	1.60
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	2	2	3	2	3.30	1530/1650	3.29	4.16	4.22	4.20	3.30
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	2	5	3	0	3.10	1660/1667	3.98	4.47	4.67	4.64	3.10
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness $% \left(1\right) =\left(1\right) \left(1\right) \left($	2	0	3	2	4	0	0	2.11	1610/1626	2.97	4.08	4.11	4.06	2.11
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	3	3	2	1	1	2.40	1545/1559	3.22	4.38	4.46	4.40	2.40
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	1	1	2	2	4	3.70	1508/1560	4.10	4.75	4.72	4.73	3.70
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	3	1	5	1	0	2.40	1528/1549	3.10	4.34	4.31	4.25	2.40
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	2	2	5	1	0	2.50	1523/1546	3.02	4.40	4.32	4.30	2.50
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	2	4	1	3	0			1307/1323					
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	2	0	2	1	3	3.38	1154/1384	2.85	4.29	4.10	4.07	3.38
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	2	0	4	2	0	2.75	1336/1378	3.10	4.56	4.29	4.25	2.75
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	3	0	3	0	2	2.75	1333/1378	2.90	4.45	4.31	4.26	2.75
4. Were special techniques successful	3	4	2	0	2	0	0	2.00	878/ 904	2.44	4.11	4.03	4.01	2.00
Freq	ıency	Dis	trib	utio	n									
Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades				Re	ason	S			Ту	pe			Majors	;
00-27		 Pa	auir	 ed f		aior		 6	Graduat		0	Maic		

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

Course-Section: FREN 201 0201 University of Marylar
Title INTERMEDIATE FRENCH I Baltimore County
Instructor: DIALLO, MAMADOU Spring 2008

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2008 Page 845

AUG 6, 2008

Job IRBR3029

Enrollment:	18				
Questionnaires:	11	Student	Course	Evaluation	Questionnaire

			Fr	eque	ncies	3		Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sŧ
Questions		NA		_	3	_		Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mε
. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	2	2	3	4	0	2.82	1639/1670	3.10	4.36	4.31	4.32	2
Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	2	6	2	0	2.82	1635/1666	3.16	4.31	4.27	4.27	2
Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	2	2	5	1	3.27	1321/1406	3.54	4.48	4.32	4.39	3
Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	4	1	1	2	2	0	2.83	1593/1615	3.36	4.34	4.24	4.29	2
Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	2	0	3	2	2	3.22	1419/1566	3.44	4.26	4.07	4.00	:
Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	3		1	2	1	0	2.00	1515/1528	2.60	4.23	4.12	4.11	:
Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	2	0	6	1	2	3.09	1569/1650	3.29	4.16	4.22	4.20	
How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	2	8	1	3.91	1609/1667	3.98	4.47	4.67	4.64	
How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	1	3	4	0	0	2.38	1603/1626	2.97	4.08	4.11	4.06	
Lecture														
Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	2	4	3	1	0	2.30	1546/1559	3.22	4.38	4.46	4.40	
Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	4	5			1508/1560					
Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	1	3	4	2	0	2.70	1516/1549	3.10	4.34	4.31	4.25	
Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	3	2	4	1	0	2.30	1528/1546	3.02	4.40	4.32	4.30	
Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	3	1	2	1	1	0	2.40	1279/1323	2.68	3.96	4.00	4.08	
Discussion														
Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	1	1	1	1	0	2.50	1333/1384	2.85	4.29	4.10	4.07	
Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	1	1	1	1	0	2.50	1348/1378	3.10	4.56	4.29	4.25	
Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	1	1	0	2	0	2.75	1333/1378	2.90	4.45	4.31	4.26	
Were special techniques successful	7	2	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/ 904	2.44	4.11	4.03	4.01	
Field Work														
Did conferences help you carry out field activities	10	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.47	4.00	
Frequ	ency	Dis	trib	utio	n									
edits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades				Re:	asons	3			Ty	ne			Majors	7

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

Course-Section: FREN 201 0301 University of Maryland Title INTERMEDIATE FRENCH I Baltimore County

INTERMEDIATE FRENCH I DIALLO, MAMADOU

Instructor: DIAI Enrollment: 24 Questionnaires: 18 Baltimore County Spring 2008 Page 846 AUG 6, 2008 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

		Ouestions	3		NR	NA	Fre	equer 2	ncies 3	4	5	Inst Mean	ructo Ra	_	Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
		General																	
_	-	insights, skil			0	0	6	5	5	1	1		1661/			4.36	4.31	4.32	2.22
		or make clear	_	_	0	0	4	5	6	2	1		1645/		3.16	4.31	4.27	4.27	2.50
		stions reflect			0	0	3	6	5 3	2 4	2 1		1392/		3.54	4.48	4.32	4.39	2.67
		tions reflect		hat you learned	0	4 2	4	3 3	5	4	U T		1597/ 1536/		3.36 3.44	4.34 4.26	4.24	4.29	2.79 2.56
	-	-		what you learned	0	8	5	2	1	2	0		1515/		2.60	4.23	4.12	4.11	2.00
		system clearly		_	0	0	8	3	3	2	2		1632/		3.29	4.16	4.22	4.20	2.28
		as class cance		iicu	0	0	0	0	0	1	17		405/		3.98	4.47	4.67	4.64	4.94
	-			ing effectiveness	2	0	6	6	3	1			1616/		2.97	4.08	4.11	4.06	1.94
		Lecture	9																
1. Were th	ne instruct	tor's lectures	well p	repared	2	0	4	4	4	2	2	2.63	1536/	1559	3.22	4.38	4.46	4.40	2.63
2. Did the	e instructo	or seem intere	ested in	the subject	2	0	0	3	5	2	6	3.69	1510/	1560	4.10	4.75	4.72	4.73	3.69
				plained clearly	2	0	6	4	4	2	0	2.13	1533/	1549	3.10	4.34	4.31	4.25	2.13
4. Did the	e lectures	contribute to	what y	ou learned	2	0	7	4	3	1	1	2.06	1534/	1546	3.02	4.40	4.32	4.30	2.06
5. Did aud	diovisual t	techniques enh	nance yo	ur understanding	3	3	5	4	2	1	0	1.92	1304/	1323	2.68	3.96	4.00	4.08	1.92
		Discuss																	
1. Did cla	ass discus	sions contribu	ite to w	hat you learned	5	0	6	3	2	2	0	2.00	1362/	1384	2.85	4.29	4.10	4.07	2.00
	Did class discussions contribute to what you learn Were all students actively encouraged to participa					0	2	3	5	1	2	2.85	1330/	1378	3.10	4.56	4.29	4.25	2.85
	Did the instructor encourage fair and open discuss					0	4	5	3	1			1361/		2.90	4.45	4.31	4.26	2.08
4. Were sp	pecial tech	nniques succes	ssful		5	11	1	1	0	0	0	1.50	****/	904	2.44	4.11	4.03	4.01	****
		Laborat																	
		ease understar			17	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/		****	****	4.19	4.35	****
				round information	17	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/		****	****	4.21	4.33	****
3. Were ne	ecessary ma	aterials avail	lable fo	r lab activities	17	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/	230	****	***	4.44	4.61	****
		Self I																	
				hat you learned	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/	28	****	****	4.64	****	****
		ons make clear		_	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/	16	****	***	4.67	****	****
_		ts with the ir		_	17	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/	27	****	****	4.54	****	****
		tutoring by proctors for		-	17 17	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ ****/	10	****	****	4.84	****	****
5. were ti	nere enougi	n proctors for	r all th	e students	1/	U	U	U	U	1	U	4.00	***/	О			4.92		
	F								1										
Credits Ea	Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grad								sons					Тур	pe			Majors	
00-27						Rec	quire	ed fo	or Ma	jors	 s 1	 1	Gra	 duate	 e	0	Majo	r or	1
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	0	в 8															
56-83						Ger	neral					0	Und	er-gı	rad 1	.8	Non-	major	17
84-150																			
Grad.	Grad. 0 3.50-4.00 6 F 1						ectiv	res				0			Means t es to b			_	ıh
				I 0		Otł	ner					4	res	FOIIR	a co L	e sign	ıııcalı	ıL	
		? 3		OCI	LUL					1									

Course-Section: FREN 201 0401

• FKEN ZOI 0401

Title INTERMEDIATE FRENCH I

Instructor: DIALLO, MAMADOU

Enrollment: 23
Questionnaires: 11

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2008

Page 847 AUG 6, 2008 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

			Fre	eanei	ncies	3		Instructor	Course	Dept.	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean Rank		Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General			_	_	_	_	_	0 50 4646465					
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	1	3	5	2	0	2.73 1646/1670		4.36	4.31	4.32	2.73
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	2	2	6	0	1	2.64 1640/1666		4.31	4.27	4.27	2.64
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	1	6	2	1	3.09 1341/1406		4.48	4.32	4.39	3.09
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	4	0	0	4	3	0	3.43 1486/1615		4.34	4.24	4.29	3.43
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	1	3	1	2	2	3.11 1456/1566		4.26	4.07	4.00	3.11
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	4	2	2	2	0	1	2.43 1510/1528		4.23	4.12	4.11	2.43
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	2	1	3	4		3.09 1569/1650		4.16	4.22	4.20	3.09
8. How many times was class cancelled	•	0	0 1	0 2	0	7		4.36 1287/1667		4.47	4.67	4.64	4.36
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	U	Т	2	3	2	U	2.75 1579/1626	2.97	4.08	4.11	4.06	2.75
Lecture													
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	3	3	2	1	3.11 1514/1559	3.22	4.38	4.46	4.40	3.11
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	1	7	1	4.00 1467/1560	4.10	4.75	4.72	4.73	4.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	4	3	2	0	2.78 1513/1549		4.34	4.31	4.25	2.78
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	2	2	4	1	0	2.44 1526/1546		4.40	4.32	4.30	2.44
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	2	4	1	1	1	0	1.86 1308/1323	2.68	3.96	4.00	4.08	1.86
Discussion	_	0	2	1	_	0	0	1 02 1272/120/	0.05	4 00	4 10	4 07	1 02
 Did class discussions contribute to what you learned Were all students actively encouraged to participate 	5 5	0	3	1	2 1	0 2	0	1.83 1373/1384		4.29 4.56	4.10 4.29	4.07 4.25	1.83
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5 5	0	3	1	0	2	0	2.33 1358/1378 2.17 1358/1378			4.29	4.25	2.33
4. Were special techniques successful	5 5	3	2	1	0	0	0	1.33 897/ 904				4.20	
4. Were special techniques successful	5	3	2	_	U	U	U	1.33 697/ 905	2.44	4.11	4.03	4.01	1.33
Laboratory													
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	9	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00 ****/ 232	****	****	4.19	4.35	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	10	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00 ****/ 239	****	****	4.21	4.33	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	10	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00 ****/ 230	****	****	4.44	4.61	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	10	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00 ****/ 231	****	****	4.31	4.52	****
Quality and													
Seminar	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	2 00 ++++/ 05	****	F 00	4 (5	г оо	****
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	9	0	0	1	0	1	0	3.00 ****/ 87		5.00	4.65	5.00	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	9 9	1 1	1 1	0	0	0	0	1.00 ****/ 79		4.63	4.64	4.75	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	9					0	0			5.00	4.57	4.25	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	9	1 1	0	1 1	0	0	0	2.00 ****/ 79 2.00 ****/ 80		4.88	4.45	3.95 4.30	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	9	T	U	Τ	U	U	U	2.00 ****/ 80		4.13	3.97	4.30	
Field Work													
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	9	0	1	1	0	0	0	1.50 ****/ 41	****	****	4.50	2.00	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	10	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00 ****/ 38	****	****	4.19	2.50	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	9	0	1	0	0	1	0	2.50 ****/ 38	****	***	4.62	4.50	***
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	9	0	0	1	1	0	0	2.50 ****/ 39	****	***	4.27	4.00	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	9	0	2	0	0	0	0	1.00 ****/ 31	****	****	4.47	4.00	****
0.10 - 1													
Self Paced	0	0	-		•	0	0	1 50 4444 / 00	at at at a	also also also d	4	ale ale ale al	also also also al
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	9	0	1	1	0	0	0	1.50 ****/ 28		****	4.64	****	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	9	1	1	0	0	0	0	1.00 ****/ 16		****	4.67	***	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	9	0	1	1	0	0	0	1.50 ****/ 27		****	4.54	****	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	9	1 1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00 ****/ 10		****	4.84	****	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	9	Τ	0	0	1	0	0	3.00 ****/	, ***	****	4.92	***	****

Course-Section: FREN 201 0401

Title INTERMEDIATE FRENCH I

Instructor: DIALLO, MAMADOU

Enrollment: 23
Questionnaires: 11

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2008 Page 847 AUG 6, 2008 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	А	1	Required for Majors	7	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	3						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	3	C	5	General	0	Under-grad	11	Non-major	11
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	n
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	4				
				?	1						

Course-Section: FREN 201 0501 University of Maryland Baltimore County INTERMEDIATE FRENCH I Instructor: APPADOO, YOGEND

Title

Enrollment:

9

Page 848 AUG 6, 2008 Spring 2008 Job IRBR3029

Instructor

Course Dept UMBC Level Sect

responses to be significant

Ouestionnaires: 8 Student Course Evaluat
--

Ρ

I

?

0

0

1

							т. т. с	Eque	TCTE	•		TILD	LIUCCOI	COULDE	: Debr	UNDC	пелет	משכני
		Questions	\$		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		General																
1. Did you	u gain ne	ew insights,skil	ls fro	om this course	0	0	0	0	0	3	5	4.63	531/1670	3.10	4.36	4.31	4.32	4.63
2. Did the	e instruc	ctor make clear	the ex	spected goals	0	0	0	0	1	2	5	4.50	622/1666	3.16	4.31	4.27	4.27	4.50
3. Did the	e exam qu	uestions reflect	the e	expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	212/1406	3.54	4.48	4.32	4.39	4.88
4. Did oth	her evalı	uations reflect	the ex	spected goals	0	2	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	224/1615	3.36	4.34	4.24	4.29	4.83
5. Did ass	signed re	eadings contribu	ite to	what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	4	4	4.50	389/1566	3.44	4.26	4.07	4.00	4.50
6. Did wri	itten ass	signments contri	bute t	o what you learned	0	2	0	0	3	1	2	3.83	1097/1528	2.60	4.23	4.12	4.11	3.83
7. Was the	e grading	g system clearly	expla	ained	0	0	0	0	1	4	3	4.25	903/1650	3.29	4.16	4.22	4.20	4.25
8. How mar	ny times	was class cance	elled		0	0	0	0	2	6	0	3.75	1633/1667	3.98	4.47	4.67	4.64	3.75
9. How wou	uld you g	grade the overal	l tead	ching effectiveness	1	1	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	151/1626	2.97	4.08	4.11	4.06	4.83
		Lecture	<u>.</u>															
1. Were th	he instru	uctor's lectures	well	prepared	0	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	521/1559	3.22	4.38	4.46	4.40	4.75
		ctor seem intere			0	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	948/1560	4.10	4.75	4.72	4.73	4.75
				explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	3	5	4.63		3.10	4.34	4.31	4.25	4.63
		es contribute to			1	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71				4.32	4.30	4.71
				our understanding	1	3	0	1	0	0	3	4.25	545/1323		3.96	4.00	4.08	
		Discuss	sion															
1. Did cla	ass disci			what you learned	4	0	0	0	2	1	1	3.75	996/1384	2.85	4.29	4.10	4.07	3.75
				ed to participate	4	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	400/1378	3.10	4.56	4.29	4.25	4.75
		_	_	nd open discussion	4	0	0	0	1	2	1		977/1378	2.90	4.45	4.31	4.26	4.00
		echniques succes			4	2	0	0	1	0	1		461/ 904			4.03	4.01	
				Frequ	ency	7 Dist	tribu	utio	n									
Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Po:	asons				Ту	20			Majors	,
CLEGICS E				Expedied Grades						, - – – – -							a JUIS	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 2		Red	quire	ed f	or Ma	jors	3	4	Graduat	е	0	Majo	or	1
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	В 2														
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C 2		Ger	nera.	L				0	Under-g	rad	8	Non-	-major	7
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	1	D 0											_			
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F 0		Ele	ectiv	ves				0	#### - 1	Means t	here a	re not	: enoug	ſh

Other

Frequencies

Course-Section: FREN 201 0601 University of Maryland INTERMEDIATE FRENCH I Baltimore County

> I ?

1

Page 849 AUG 6, 2008 Title Instructor: EL OMARI, SAMIR Spring 2008 Job IRBR3029

Frequencies

Instructor

Course Dept UMBC Level Sect

Enrollment:	21				
Questionnaires:	18	Student	Course	Evaluation	Questionnaire

							L I	cquc.	LICIC			1115	CIUCCOI	COULDO	. DCPC	OLIDC	TIC A C T	DCCC
		Question	3		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		Genera	 l															,
1. Did you	u gain ne	w insights,ski	lls fro	m this course	3	0	1	0	4	7	3	3.73	1453/1670	3.10	4.36	4.31	4.32	3.73
		ctor make clear			3	0	1	0	4	4	6		1282/1666		4.31	4.27	4.27	3.93
		estions reflec			4	0	0	0	2	5	7	4.36	775/1406	3.54	4.48	4.32	4.39	4.36
4. Did oth	her evalu	ations reflect	the ex	pected goals	5	3	0	0	4	2	4	4.00	1083/1615	3.36	4.34	4.24	4.29	4.00
5. Did ass	signed re	eadings contrib	ate to	what you learned	3	0	1	0	3	4	7	4.07	814/1566	3.44	4.26	4.07	4.00	4.07
6. Did wr	itten ass	signments contr	ibute t	o what you learned	3	3	1	0	4	3	4	3.75	1152/1528	2.60	4.23	4.12	4.11	3.75
7. Was the	e grading	system clearly	y expla	ined	3	0	1	0	4	7	3	3.73	1370/1650	3.29	4.16	4.22	4.20	3.73
8. How man	ny times	was class canc	elled		3	0	0	0	3	12	0	3.80	1625/1667	3.98	4.47	4.67	4.64	3.80
9. How wor	uld you g	grade the overa	ll teac	hing effectiveness	7	1	1	0	1	6	2	3.80	1220/1626	2.97	4.08	4.11	4.06	3.80
		Lectur	9															
1 Were th	he instri	actor's lecture		prepared	5	0	1	0	1	5	6	4 15	1224/1559	3.22	4.38	4.46	4.40	4.15
		ctor seem inter			5	0	0	0	1	1		4.77			4.75	4.72	4.73	4.77
				xplained clearly	5	0	0	1	2	6			1146/1549		4.34	4.31	4.25	4.00
		es contribute t			5	0	1	1	0	5			1113/1546			4.32		4.08
				our understanding	5	0	1	1	2	5			912/1323				4.08	
3. <u>21</u> a aa	a10 v 10 aa 1	. ocomingaco cin	idiloc 1	our underpounding		Ü	_	_	_		-	3.,,	712,1323	2.00	3.70	1.00	1.00	3
		Discus	sion															
1. Did cla	ass discu	ssions contrib	ate to	what you learned	9	0	2	0	1	2	4	3.67	1033/1384	2.85	4.29	4.10	4.07	3.67
2. Were al	ll studer	nts actively en	courage	d to participate	9	0	2	1	0	3	3	3.44	1214/1378	3.10	4.56	4.29	4.25	3.44
3. Did the	e instruc	ctor encourage	fair an	d open discussion	9	0	2	0	1	2	4	3.67	1147/1378	2.90	4.45	4.31	4.26	3.67
4. Were sp	pecial te	echniques succe	ssful		9	5	1	0	0	1	2	3.75	****/ 904	2.44	4.11	4.03	4.01	****
				Frequ	ıency	/ Dis	trib	utio	n									
Guadita B		G GDA		D				ъ.		_							No	
Credits Ea	arnea 	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades					ason	.s 			Ту]	ре 			Majors	
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	A 3		Re	quir	ed f	or M	ajor	s	8	Graduat	e	0	Majo	or	0
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	в 6														
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	2	C 2		Ge	nera	1				1	Under-g	rad 1	.8	Non-	-major	18
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	1	D 0														
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F 0		El	ecti	ves				0	#### - 1				_	jh
				P 0									respons	es to b	e sign	nificar	ıt	
				I 0		Ot	her					2						

Course-Section: FREN 202 0101 University of Maryland Page 850 Title INTERMEDIATE FRENCH II AUG 6, 2008 Job IRBR3029

Baltimore County Instructor: EL OMARI, SAMIR Spring 2008

Ρ

I

0

0

0

Enrollment: 19 Questionnaires: 13

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

Questions	NR	NA	Fro	-	ncies 3	4	5	Ins Mean	tructor Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean			Sect Mean
General	0	•	0	-	0	_	_	4 00	1100/1600	4 00	4 26	4 21	4 20	4 00
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	5 7	5		1178/1670		4.36	4.31		4.08
• • •	0	0	0	0	3 2	3	0	4.00	1199/1666 644/1406		4.31	4.27 4.32	4.27 4.39	4.00 4.46
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	5	1	0	1	<i>5</i>	0		1405/1615		4.40	4.34	4.39	3.63
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	5 6	T	4.38	,		4.34	4.24	4.29	4.38
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	6	0	0	2	3	2		899/1528		4.20	4.07	4.00	4.38
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	0	2	<i>5</i>			1135/1650		4.16	4.12	4.11	4.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	13	5.00	1/1667		4.10	4.22	4.64	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	2	6	Τ2		953/1626		4.47	4.07	4.04	
7. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	U	U	U	2	O		4.00	953/1020	4.00	4.00	4.11	4.00	4.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	3	7	2	3 92	1344/1559	3.92	4.38	4.46	4.40	3.92
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	2			777/1560		4.75	4.72	4.73	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	4	4			1237/1549			4.31	4.25	3.91
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	6			919/1546		4.40	4.32	4.30	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	1	3	4			807/1323			4.00	4.08	
J. Did addiovibadi teciminques cimanee your anderstanding	_	O	O		5	1	1	3.72	007/1323	3.72	3.70	1.00	1.00	3.72
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	5	1	2	3.63	1049/1384	3.63	4.29	4.10	4.07	3.63
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	0	2	3	3	4.13			4.56	4.29	4.25	4.13
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	0	3	2	3	4.00	,		4.45	4.31	4.26	4.00
4. Were special techniques successful	5	6	0	0	1	0	1		****/ 904		4.11	4.03	4.01	****
									,					
Freq	uency	Dis	trib	utio	n									
	_													
Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades				Rea	asons	5			Ту	pe			Majors	
00-27 2 0.00-0.99 0 A 7		Re	quir	ed f	or Ma	jor	 s	3	Graduat	 e	0	Majo	r	3
28-55 3 1.00-1.99 0 B 5														
28-55 3 1.00-1.99 0 B 5 56-83 3 2.00-2.99 1 C 0		Ge	nera	1				1	Under-g	rad 1	.3	Non-	major	10
		Ge	nera	1				1	Under-g	rad 1	.3	Non-	major	10

Other

6

responses to be significant

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2008

Course-Section: FREN 301 0101 Title ADVANCED FRENCH I Instructor: DE VERNEIL, MAR

Enrollment: 25 Questionnaires: 20

Page 851 AUG 6, 2008 Job IRBR3029

O +	a	Evaluation	0	
Student	Course	Evaluation	Ouestroi	шатге

			Fre	equei	ncies	3		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	3	0	0	0	1	4	12	4.65	505/1670	4.65	4.36	4.31	4.24	4.65
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	0	0	1	3	14	4.72	344/1666	4.72	4.31	4.27	4.18	4.72
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	0	0	0	0	1	17	4.94	115/1406	4.94	4.48	4.32	4.22	4.94
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	3	0	0	0	0	3	14	4.82	231/1615	4.82	4.34	4.24	4.18	4.82
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	5	13	4.72	250/1566	4.72	4.26	4.07	4.04	4.72
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	1	4	13	4.67	300/1528	4.67	4.23	4.12	4.07	4.67
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	0	2	5	11	4.50	570/1650	4.50	4.16	4.22	4.12	4.50
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	9	9	4.50	1157/1667	4.50	4.47	4.67	4.67	4.50
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness		0	0	0	0	4	9	4.69	255/1626	4.69	4.08	4.11	4.06	4.69
Lecture	_					_					4 00			
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	5	0	0	0	0	5	10	4.67	673/1559	4.67	4.38	4.46	4.40	4.67
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	5	0	0	0	0	2	13	4.87	699/1560	4.87	4.75	4.72	4.67	4.87
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	5	0	0	0	Τ	2	12	4.73	395/1549	4.73	4.34	4.31	4.25	4.73
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	Τ	0	3	11	4.60	595/1546	4.60	4.40	4.32	4.24	4.60
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	5	0	0	0	0	3	12	4.80	156/1323	4.80	3.96	4.00	3.99	4.80
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1384	5.00	4.29	4.10	4.12	5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	14	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1378	5.00	4.56	4.29	4.30	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion		0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1378	5.00	4.45	4.31	4.33	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful		2	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	****/ 904	****	4.11	4.03	4.03	****
From	anas	Diet	rih	ıtio	2									
Freq			-110	ac I OI	.1									

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors	
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	0	 А	9	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	2
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	В	2						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	1	C	1	General	6	Under-grad	20	Non-major	18
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	9	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means	there	are not enough	n
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	6	-			
				2	1						

Course-Section: FREN 302 0101 University of Maryland ADVANCED FRENCH II Baltimore County MCCRAY, STANLEY Spring 2008

Instructor: Enrollment: 18 Questionnaires: 14 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Title

			Fre	equer	ncies	5		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions		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	0	4	9	4.50	665/1670	4.50	4.36	4.31	4.24	4.50
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	4	10	4.71	355/1666	4.71	4.31	4.27	4.18	4.71
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	12	4.86	226/1406	4.86	4.48	4.32	4.22	4.86
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	0	13	4.86	210/1615	4.86	4.34	4.24	4.18	4.86
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	2	3	8	4.29	610/1566	4.29	4.26	4.07	4.04	4.29
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	0	3	10	4.57	368/1528	4.57	4.23	4.12	4.07	4.57
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	2	2	10	4.57	471/1650	4.57	4.16	4.22	4.12	4.57
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	9	5		1295/1667	4.36	4.47	4.67	4.67	4.36
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	7	1	0	0	1	2	3	4.33	637/1626	4.33	4.08	4.11	4.06	4.33
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	1	3	9	4.62	755/1559	4.62	4.38	4.46	4.40	4.62
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	1	2	10	4.69	1054/1560	4.69	4.75	4.72	4.67	4.69
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	1	3	8	4.58	586/1549	4.58	4.34	4.31	4.25	4.58
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	0	2	10	4.62	582/1546	4.62	4.40	4.32	4.24	4.62
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	1	1	0	0	1	10	4.58	283/1323	4.58	3.96	4.00	3.99	4.58
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	Λ	Λ	1	2	7	4.55	409/1384	4.55	4.29	4.10	4.12	4.55
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	2	0	9	4.64	503/1378	4.64	4.56	4.29	4.30	4.64
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	1	0	10	4.82	375/1378	4.82	4.45	4.31	4.33	4.82
4. Were special techniques successful	3	2	0	0	0	3	- 6	4.67	179/ 904	4.67	4.11	4.03	4.03	4.67
1. Here Special committees Successful	5		3	J	J		O	07	1.5, 501	2.07		1.05	1.05	2.07

Page 852

AUG 6, 2008

Job IRBR3029

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	d Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27 28-55	0 2	0.00-0.99 1.00-1.99	0	. — А В	9	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	0
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	1	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	14	Non-major	14
84-150 Grad.	4 0	3.00-3.49 3.50-4.00	2 3	D F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means	there	are not enough	n
oraa.	J	3.30 1.00		P	0		_	responses to		_	-
				? ?	0 0	Other	8				

Course-Section: FREN 310 0101 University of Maryland Page 853 INTERCONNECTIONS: LANG AUG 6, 2008 Title Baltimore County

MCCRAY, STANLEY

Instructor: Enrollment: 23

Questionnaires: 9

Questions

	5	Spring	2008	
Student	Course	Evalua	ation	Ouestionnaire

Job IRBR3029

Frequencies Instructor Course Dept UMBC Level Sect

NR NA 1 2 3 4 5 Mean Rank Mean Mean Mean Mean Mean

2. Did the 3. Did the 4. Did oth 5. Did ass 6. Did wr 7. Was the 8. How man	e instru e exam q her eval signed r itten as e gradin ny times	Genera Lew insights, ski Lotor make clear Luestions reflect Luations reflect Luations contrib Signments contr Lucy system clear Lucy was class canc Lucy grade the overa	lls from the expect the expect to the expect	pected goal expected goal pected goal what you le o what you ined	ls als ls earned learned	0 0 0 0 0 0 0	0 0 0 0 0 0	0 0 0 0 0 0 0	0 0 0 0 0 0 0	1 0 0 0 1 1 1 0	4 3 1 4 1 1 0 4	4 6 8 5 7 6 9 3	4.33 4.67 4.89 4.56 4.67 4.67 4.33 5.00 4.43	902/1670 415/1666 205/1406 499/1615 295/1566 300/1528 806/1650 1/1667 531/1626	4.33 4.67 4.89 4.56 4.67 4.67 4.33 5.00 4.43	4.36 4.31 4.48 4.34 4.26 4.23 4.16 4.47 4.08	4.31 4.27 4.32 4.24 4.07 4.12 4.22 4.67 4.11	4.24 4.18 4.22 4.18 4.04 4.07 4.12 4.67 4.06	4.33 4.67 4.89 4.56 4.67 4.67 4.33 5.00 4.43
2. Did the 3. Was lee 4. Did the 5. Did auc 1. Did cla 2. Were a. 3. Did the	e instru cture ma e lectur diovisua ass disc ll stude e instru	Lectur uctor's lecture ctor seem inter terial presente es contribute t l techniques en Discus ussions contrib nts actively en ctor encourage echniques succe	s well ested i d and e o what hance y sion ute to courage fair an	n the subject plant of the subject plant of the subject plant is subject to the subject plant of the subject plant is subject to the subject plant is subject plant of the subject plant is subject plant in the subject plant in the subject plant is subject plant in the subject plant is subject plant in the subject plant is subject plant in the subject plant in the subject plant is subject plant in the subject plant i	learly d canding earned cipate	0 0 0 0 0	0 0 0 0 0	0 0 0 0 0	0 0 0 0 0	0 0 0 1 2	3 0 2 2 2 3	6 9 7 6 4 7 8 7 5	4.67 5.00 4.78 4.56 4.22 4.75 5.00 4.75 4.83	673/1559 1/1560 337/1549 655/1546 567/1323 257/1384 1/1378 439/1378 123/ 904	4.67 5.00 4.78 4.56 4.22 4.75 5.00 4.75 4.83	4.38 4.75 4.34 4.40 3.96 4.29 4.56 4.45 4.11	4.46 4.72 4.31 4.32 4.00 4.10 4.29 4.31 4.03	4.40 4.67 4.25 4.24 3.99 4.12 4.30 4.33 4.03	4.67 5.00 4.78 4.56 4.22 4.75 5.00 4.75 4.83
					Frequ	ency	Dist	ribu	ıtioı	n									
Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	d Grades				Rea	ason	S			Тур	e			Majors	
00-27 28-55 56-83 84-150 Grad.	0 1 1 3 0	0.00-0.99 1.00-1.99 2.00-2.99 3.00-3.49 3.50-4.00	0 0 0 1 5	A B C D F P I ?	8 1 0 0 0 0 0		Ger	eral	L	or Ma	ajors		0 1 0 8	Graduate Under-gr #### - M	ad Jeans t		ıre not	major enoug	6 3

Course-Section: FREN 320 0101 University of Maryland Page 854 Title INTERCONNECTIONS: TRADE Baltimore County AUG 6, 2008 Job IRBR3029

Instructor: DE VERNEIL, MAR

Enrollment: 18 Questionnaires: 15

Spring 2008 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

							Fr	emiei	ncies	2		Tnst	ructor	Course	Dent	TIMBC	Level	Sect
		Question	.s		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank		Mean		Mean	Mean
1 51		Genera		. 1 . 1	0	0	-	0	0	_	•	1 16	E00 /16E0	1 16	1 26	4 21	4 0 4	4 46
		ew insights,ski			2	0	Τ	0	0	3	9	4.46	722/1670		4.36	4.31	4.24	4.46
		ctor make clear			2	0	0	0	0	3	10	4.77	301/1666	4.77	4.31	4.27	4.18	4.77
	_	uestions reflec		_	2	6	0	0	0	Τ	6	4.86	226/1406	4.86	4.48	4.32	4.22	4.86
		uations reflect		1 3	3	Ţ	0	0	Τ	0	10	4.82	238/1615	4.82	4.34	4.24	4.18	4.82
	_	_		what you learned	2	0	0	0	Τ	Τ	11	4.77	218/1566	4.77	4.26	4.07	4.04	4.77
		_		o what you learned	2	0	0	0	1	3	9	4.62	338/1528	4.62	4.23	4.12	4.07	4.62
		g system clearl		ained	2	0	0	0	2	2	9	4.54	527/1650		4.16	4.22	4.12	4.54
	-	was class canc			2	0	0	0	0	8	5		1271/1667	4.38	4.47	4.67	4.67	4.38
9. How wor	uld you g	grade the overa	.ll tead	ching effectiveness	5	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	167/1626	4.80	4.08	4.11	4.06	4.80
		Lectur	e															
1. Were th	he instr	uctor's lecture	s well	prepared	2	0	0	0	0	0	13	5.00	1/1559	5.00	4.38	4.46	4.40	5.00
		ctor seem inter			2	0	0	0	0	0	13	5.00	1/1560	5.00	4.75	4.72	4.67	5.00
				explained clearly	2	0	0	0	0	2	11	4.85	257/1549	4.85	4.34	4.31	4.25	4.85
4. Did the	e lecture	es contribute t	o what	you learned	2	0	0	0	0	2	11	4.85	299/1546	4.85	4.40	4.32	4.24	4.85
5. Did aud	diovisual	l techniques en	hance y	our understanding	4	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	119/1323	4.91	3.96	4.00	3.99	4.91
		Discus																
ו הגם ו					0	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	285/1384	4.71	4.29	4.10	4.12	4.71
				what you learned	8	0	0	0	0		_	4.71	285/1384	4.71	4.29	4.10	4.12	4.71
		_	_	ed to participate	8	0	0	0	0	1	6 7	5.00	1/1378		4.45	4.29		
		_		nd open discussion	8 8	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/13/8		4.45	4.31	4.33	5.00
4. were sp	рестат с	echniques succe	SSLUI		8	U	U	U	U	U	/	5.00	1/ 904	5.00	4.11	4.03	4.03	5.00
				Frequ	iency	Dist	trib	ution	ı									
Credits Ea	own od	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Do					П				Majawa	
CLEATER FO	arneu 	Cuiii. GPA		Expected Grades					asons	· 			Ту]	 Pe			Majors	, . – – – –
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 8		Red	quir	ed fo	or Ma	jor	s	1	Graduat	e	0	Majo	or	4
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	в 1														
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	0	C 0		Gei	nera	1				0	Under-g	rad 1	.5	Non-	-major	11

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

University of Maryland Baltimore County STUDIES IN FRENCH LIT

Course-Section: FREN 430 0101 Page 855 AUG 6, 2008 Title Instructor: SCHNEIDER, JUDI Spring 2008 Job IRBR3029

Frequencies

Instructor

Course Dept UMBC Level Sect

Enrollment:	5	
Questionnaires:	5	Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

							L I	cquc.	110101	,		1115	LIUCCOI	COULDC	DCPC	OFIDC	псист	טטטט
		Question	S		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		 Genera	 1															
1. Did you	u gain ne	ew insights,ski	lls fro	m this course	0	0	1	0	0	0	4	4.20	1060/1670	4.20	4.36	4.31	4.45	4.20
		ctor make clear			0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	259/1666	4.80	4.31	4.27	4.35	4.80
		uestions reflec			0	3	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1406	5.00	4.48	4.32	4.48	5.00
4. Did oth	her evalı	uations reflect	the ex	pected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	446/1615	4.60	4.34	4.24	4.37	4.60
5. Did ass	signed re	eadings contrib	ute to	what you learned	0	0	1	0	0	0	4	4.20	706/1566	4.20	4.26	4.07	4.17	4.20
6. Did wri	itten ass	signments contr	ibute t	o what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	346/1528	4.60	4.23	4.12	4.26	4.60
7. Was the	e grading	g system clearly	y expla	ined	0	1	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	903/1650	4.25	4.16	4.22	4.28	4.25
8. How mar	ny times	was class canc	elled		0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1667	5.00	4.47	4.67	4.73	5.00
9. How wou	uld you g	grade the overa	ll teac	hing effectiveness	0	0	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	797/1626	4.20	4.08	4.11	4.28	4.20
		T	_															
1 Wome +h	ho inata	Lectur actor's lecture		nanarad	1	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	896/1559	4.50	4.38	4.46	4.58	4.50
		ctor seem inter			0	0	0	0	0	1		4.80			4.36	4.72	4.80	4.80
				explained clearly	0	0	0	1	0	0	4		,	4.40	4.73	4.31	4.43	4.40
		es contribute t		-	0	0	0	0	1	0	4		,		4.40	4.32	4.43	
				our understanding	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1323		3.96		4.10	5.00
J. Dia auc	aiovibua.	r ccciniiques en	ilalice y	our unactificationing	O	O	U	O	O	O	5	3.00	1/1323	3.00	3.70	1.00	1.10	3.00
		Discus	sion															
1. Did cla	ass discu	ussions contrib	ute to	what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1384	5.00	4.29	4.10	4.32	5.00
2. Were al	ll studer	nts actively en	courage	ed to participate	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	348/1378	4.80	4.56	4.29	4.55	4.80
3. Did the	e instru	ctor encourage	fair an	d open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1378	5.00	4.45	4.31	4.60	5.00
4. Were sp	pecial te	echniques succe	ssful		0	1	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/ 904	5.00	4.11	4.03	4.22	5.00
				Frequ	ency	, Dis	trib	utio	n									
				11040	.01107	210	01 120	u 0 1 0.										
Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Re	asons	3			Ty	pe			Majors	;
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 4		Re	guir	ed f	or Ma	ajors	 3	0	Graduat	 e	0	Majo	or	3
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В 1			=			J								
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C 0		Ger	nera	1				0	Under-g	rad	5	Non-	major	2
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	0	D 0														
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F 0		El	ecti	ves				0	#### - 1	Means t	here a	re not	enoug	jh
				P 0									respons	es to b	e sign	ificar	ıt	

Other

4

0

0

I ? University of Maryland Baltimore County

Course-Section: FREN 630 0101 Page 856 Title AUG 6, 2008 STUDIES IN FRENCH LIT Instructor: SCHNEIDER, JUDI Spring 2008 Job IRBR3029

Enrollment:	3	
Ougstionnaires:	2	

Enrollment:	3			
Questionnaires:	2	Student Course	Evaluation	Questionnaire

I

0 0

							Fr	eque:	ncies	3		Ins	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
		Question	S		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		Genera	 1															
1. Did vo	nı gain ne	ew insights,ski	_	m this course	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	665/1670	4.50	4.36	4.31	4.46	4.50
		ctor make clear			0	0	0	0	0	2	0		1199/1666		4.31	4.27	4.34	4.00
		ations reflect			0	0	0	0	1	0	1		1083/1615		4.34	4.24	4.33	4.00
				what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	2		1/1566		4.26	4.07	4.20	5.00
	_	_		o what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1528	5.00	4.23	4.12	4.33	5.00
		system clearl		-	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	570/1650	4.50	4.16	4.22	4.30	4.50
8. How ma	ny times	was class canc	elled		0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1667	5.00	4.47	4.67	4.74	5.00
9. How wo	uld you g	grade the overa	ll tead	hing effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	953/1626	4.00	4.08	4.11	4.20	4.00
		Lectur																
		actor's lecture			0	0	0	0	1	1	0		1461/1559		4.38	4.46	4.49	3.50
		ctor seem inter			0	0	0	0	0	0	2		1/1560		4.75	4.72		
	3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly						0	0	0	2	0		1146/1549		4.34	4.31	4.37	4.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned					0	0	0	0	0	1	1		-,		4.40	4.32	4.40	4.50
5. Did au	ıdiovisual	l techniques en	hance y	our understanding	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	326/1323	4.50	3.96	4.00	4.03	4.50
		Discus	aion															
1 Did al	acc dica			what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	434/1384	4.50	4.29	4.10	4.21	4.50
				d to participate	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1378		4.56	4.29	4.42	5.00
		_	_	d open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	1	1		,		4.45	4.31		4.50
		echniques succe		a open arbeassion	0	0	0	0	1	1	0		718/ 904			4.03		3.50
		1000 0000											,					
				Frequ	ency	Dist	trib	utio	n									
Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Re	asons	5			Ту	pe			Majors	\$
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	 0	A 2		 Re(anir	 ed f	or Ma	ior	 e	0	 Graduat		2	Majo		0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B 0		1/6/	quil!	cu I	OT 1416	11011	٥	U	Graduat	_	۷	Ma JC	, <u> </u>	U
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C 0		Gei	nera	1				1	Under-g	rad	0	Non-	-major	2
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D 0		00.		_				-	onder 9		•	2,011		-
Grad.	2	3.50-4.00	1	F 0		Ele	ecti [.]	ves				0	#### - :	Means t	here a	re not	enous	rh
	_	2.23 2.00	_	P 0								-	respons				_	,
												_					-	

Other

1