Course-Section: FREN 101 0101 Title

ELEMENTARY FRENCH I

Instructor: BADAGBO, AMA S

Enrollment: 28 Questionnaires: 21 University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2009

Page 833 JUL 2, 2009 Job IRBR3029

### Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions			Fre	equer 2	ncies 3	5 4	5	Ins Mean	tructor Rank	Course Mean	_	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	2	1	1	7	9		1148/1576	4.15	4.34	4.30	4.11	4.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	1	1	3	5	10		1076/1576	4.24	4.32	4.27	4.18	4.10
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	1	0	0	6	13	4.50	583/1342	4.42	4.48	4.32	4.19	4.50
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	2	1	0	3	7	7		1017/1520	4.10	4.30	4.25	4.09	4.06
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	2	1	0	4	6	7	4.00	850/1465	4.18	4.26	4.12	4.02	4.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	5	0	1	4	4	6	4.00	878/1434	4.19	4.22	4.14	3.94	4.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	1	0	9	9	4.20	900/1547	4.03	4.12	4.19	4.10	4.20
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	6	14	4.70	866/1574	4.87	4.55	4.64	4.59	4.70
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	1	0	4	6	6	3.94	1005/1554	3.93	4.13	4.10	4.01	3.94
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	2	3	3	12	4.25	1111/1488	4.41	4.39	4.47	4.41	4.25
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	1	1	3	15	4.60	1125/1493	4.75	4.78	4.73	4.65	4.60
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	1	1	1	6	11	4.25	959/1486	4.27	4.33	4.32	4.26	4.25
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	1	1	1	0	6	11	4.32	910/1489	4.23	4.40	4.32	4.22	4.32
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	1	1	1	2	7	8	4.05	672/1277		3.99	4.03	3.91	
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	1	0	3	3	10	4.24	681/1279	4.14	4.30	4.17	3.96	4.24
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	1	0	1	6	9	4.29	809/1270	4.48	4.57	4.35	4.09	4.29
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	1	0	2	6	8	4.18	864/1269	4.27	4.38	4.35	4.09	4.18
4. Were special techniques successful	5	4	1	1	0	6	4	3.92	547/ 878	4.15	4.19	4.05	3.91	3.92
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	20	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 40	****	5.00	4.60	4.44	***
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	20	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 24	****	5.00	4.83	4.71	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	20	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 35	****	5.00	4.67	4.68	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	20	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 28	****	5.00	4.78	4.65	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	20	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 382	****	4.99	4.08	3.86	****
	_		-	-	-		-		,					

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expecte	ed Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	1		11	Required for Majors	9	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	3	1					
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	2	C	0	General	2	Under-grad	21	Non-major	21
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	2	#### - Means	there	are not enough	n
				P	0	Electives		responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	3				
				?	0						

Course-Section: FREN 101 0201

ELEMENTARY FRENCH I

Title

Instructor: WECKER, DONNA L

Enrollment: 24 Questionnaires: 19

## University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2009

Page 834 JUL 2, 2009 Job IRBR3029

### Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

			Fre	equer	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	0	0	1	0	0	1		4.74	324/1576	4.15	4.34	4.30	4.11	4.74
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	4	12	4.47	653/1576	4.24	4.32	4.27	4.18	4.47
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	5	12	4.53	562/1342	4.42	4.48	4.32	4.19	4.53
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	1	0	2	4	10	4.29	815/1520	4.10	4.30	4.25	4.09	4.29
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	3	5		4.42	483/1465	4.18	4.26	4.12	4.02	4.42
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	3	5	10	4.26	670/1434	4.19	4.22	4.14	3.94	4.26
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	2	0	3	3	11	4.11	971/1547	4.03	4.12	4.19	4.10	4.11
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	2	17	4.89	488/1574	4.87	4.55	4.64	4.59	4.89
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness		1	0	0	2	6	8	4.38	571/1554	3.93	4.13	4.10	4.01	4.38
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	2	3	13	4.61	736/1488	4.41	4.39	4.47	4.41	4.61
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	1	16	4.94	334/1493	4.75	4.39	4.47	4.65	4.94
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	1	2	3		4.41	806/1486	4.73	4.78	4.32	4.26	4.41
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	0	5	1	10		1057/1489	4.23	4.40	4.32	4.22	4.12
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	1	1	0	2	2	10	4.33	463/1277	4.35	3.99	4.03	3.91	4.33
5. Did addiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3		1	U	4	4	10	4.33	403/12//	4.33	3.99	4.03	3.91	4.33
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	1	0	1	6	6	4.14	745/1279	4.14	4.30	4.17	3.96	4.14
Did class discussions contribute to what you learned Were all students actively encouraged to participate		0	0	0	0	2	11	4.85	317/1270	4.48	4.57	4.35	4.09	4.85
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6 5	0	0	0	1	3	10	4.64	551/1269	4.27	4.38	4.35	4.09	4.64
4. Were special techniques successful	5	2	0	0	1	4	7	4.50	221/ 878	4.15	4.19	4.05	3.91	4.50
1000									,					
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	17	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 234	****	5.00	4.23	4.08	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	17	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 240	****	5.00	4.35	4.29	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	17	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 229	****	5.00	4.51	4.43	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	17	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 232	****	5.00	4.29	4.27	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	17	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 379	****	5.00	4.20	4.15	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 85	****	4.67	4.72	4.52	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 79	****	4.67	4.69	4.52	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 72	****	5.00	4.64	4.43	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 80	****	5.00	4.61	4.55	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	17	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 375	****	4.97	4.01	3.78	****
Field Work			•	•	•			- 00				4 40	4 00	
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 52	****	5.00	4.48	4.20	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	18	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 48	****	5.00	4.40	4.11	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	18	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 44	****	5.00	4.73	4.71	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	18	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 45	****	5.00	4.57	4.72	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 326	***	4.99	4.03	3.64	****
Self Paced														
	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	E 00	****/ 10	****	E 00	1 60	1 11	***
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	0	0	0	1 1		****/ 40 ****/ 24	****	5.00	4.60	4.44 4.71	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	18 18	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 24 ****/ 35	****	5.00	4.83 4.67	4.71	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful 4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	18	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 28	****	5.00	4.67	4.68	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	18	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 382	****	4.99	4.78	3.86	****
J. Were there enough procedus for all the students	10	U	U	U	U	U	т	5.00	/ 302		<b>ユ・</b> シグ	1.00	3.00	

Course-Section: FREN 101 0201

Title ELEMENTARY FRENCH I

Instructor: WECKER, DONNA L

Enrollment: 24
Questionnaires: 19

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2009 Page 834 JUL 2, 2009 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	6	Required for Majors	5	Graduate	0	Major	2
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	В	3						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	2	С	3	General 4		Under-grad	19	Non-major	17
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	1	D	1	Concrat					
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F	0	Electives	2	#### - Means	there	are not enough	h
				P	0	FIECCIVES		responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	4	_			
				?	1						

Course-Section: FREN 101 0301 University of Maryland Title ELEMENTARY FRENCH I Baltimore County Instructor: WECKER, DONNA L Spring 2009

University of Maryland
Baltimore County
Spring 2009

Page 835

JUL 2, 2009

Job IRBR3029

Enrollment:	29	
Questionnaires:	17	Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

? 0

					Frequencies				5		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect	
		Question	s		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		 Genera	1															
1. Did v	ou gain n	ew insights,ski		m this course	0	0	1	0	2	5	9	4.24	976/1576	4.15	4.34	4.30	4.11	4.24
		ctor make clear			0	0	0	0	1	5	11	4.59	502/1576	4.24	4.32	4.27	4.18	4.59
		uestions reflec		_	0	0	1	0	0	5	11	4.47	620/1342	4.42	4.48	4.32	4.19	4.47
	_	uations reflect		_	0	1	1	0	2	6	7	4.13	977/1520	4.10	4.30	4.25	4.09	4.13
5. Did a	assigned re	eadings contrib	ute to	what you learned	0	0	1	1	1	4	10	4.24	668/1465	4.18	4.26	4.12	4.02	4.24
	-	-		o what you learned	0	1	2	0	0	5	9	4.19	758/1434	4.19	4.22	4.14	3.94	4.19
		g system clearl		-	0	0	1	1	4	4	7	3.88	1159/1547	4.03	4.12	4.19	4.10	3.88
		was class canc			0	0	0	0	0	1	16	4.94	281/1574	4.87		4.64	4.59	4.94
	-			hing effectiveness	0	0	0	0	4	7	6	4.12	860/1554		4.13		4.01	4.12
	Lecture																	
1 Were	. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared						0	0	0	5	11	4.69	638/1488	4.41	4.39	4.47	4.41	4.69
					1	0	0	0	0	0	16	5.00	1/1493	4.75	4.78	4.73	4.65	5.00
	. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject . Was lecture material presented and explained clearly					0	0	0	3	2	11		678/1486	4.27	4.33	4.32	4.26	4.50
		es contribute t			1	0	0	0	2	3	11	4.56	625/1489	4.23	4.40	4.32	4.22	4.56
				your understanding	1	0	0	0	2	3	11	4.56	278/1277		3.99			4.56
3. 21a a	tual over buas	1 000111114400 011	1	our unacrodunariis	_	ŭ	Ü	Ü	_	J		1.50	2.0,12	1.55	3.,,,	1.05	3.71	1.50
		Discus																
				what you learned	7	0	0	0	2	1	7	4.50	445/1279	4.14	4.30	4.17	3.96	4.50
				ed to participate	8	0	0	0	1	1	7	4.67	505/1270	4.48	4.57	4.35	4.09	4.67
3. Did t	he instru	ctor encourage	fair ar	nd open discussion	8	0	0	1	0	2	6	4.44	694/1269	4.27	4.38	4.35	4.09	4.44
4. Were	special to	echniques succe	ssful		9	0	0	0	1	1	6	4.63	179/ 878	4.15	4.19	4.05	3.91	4.63
				Frequ	iency	Dis	trib	ution	n									
Credits	Earned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	asons				Ту	ne			Majors	
			· 							, 								, 
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A 6		Red	quir	ed fo	or Ma	jor	s 1	.1	Graduat	е	0	Majo	r	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	в 7														
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	0	C 2		Ger	nera	l				0	Under-g	rad 1	7	Non-	-major	17
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	3	D 2														
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5	F 0		Ele	ecti	ves				3	#### - 1				_	jh
			P 0								respons	es to b	e sign	ifican	ıt			
I 0						Ot1	her					2						

Course-Section: FREN 101 0401

Title ELEMENTARY FRENCH I

Instructor: BADAGBO, AMA S

Enrollment: 29
Questionnaires: 16

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2009 Page 836 JUL 2, 2009 Job IRBR3029

### Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions			Fre	equer 2	ncies 3	s 4	5	Inst Mean	ructor Rank	Course	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean		Sect Mean
	NR	NA 												
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	1	2	4	4	5	3.63	1401/1576	4.15	4.34	4.30	4.11	3.63
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	1	4	4	6	3.81	1286/1576	4.24	4.32	4.27	4.18	3.81
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	0	3	3	9	4.19	886/1342	4.42	4.48	4.32	4.19	4.19
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	4	0	2	2	3	5	3.92	1153/1520	4.10	4.30	4.25	4.09	3.92
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	3	1	0	3	2	7	4.08	813/1465	4.18	4.26	4.12	4.02	4.08
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	6	0	1	1	2	6	4.30	625/1434	4.19	4.22	4.14	3.94	4.30
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	1	4	2	8	3.94	1113/1547	4.03	4.12	4.19	4.10	3.94
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	15	4.94	328/1574	4.87	4.55	4.64	4.59	4.94
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	1	0	8	4	1	3.29	1381/1554	3.93	4.13	4.10	4.01	3.29
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	1	3	4	6	4 07	1212/1488	4.41	4.39	4.47	4.41	4.07
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	1	0	5	9		1240/1493	4.75	4.78	4.73	4.65	4.47
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	2	4	1	7		1177/1486	4.27	4.33	4.32	4.26	3.93
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	2	0	2	3	7		1177/1489	4.23	4.40	4.32	4.22	3.93
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	1	0	0	0	7	6		347/1277		3.99	4.03	3.91	
5. Dia addiovibadi ecciniques emanee your anderseanding	_	-	Ü	Ü	Ü	,	J	1.10	31//12//	1.33	3.33	1.05	3.71	1.10
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	2	0	1	3	4	3.70	986/1279	4.14	4.30	4.17	3.96	3.70
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	1	0	1	3	5	4.10	903/1270	4.48	4.57	4.35	4.09	4.10
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	1	2	1	0	6	3.80	1018/1269	4.27	4.38	4.35	4.09	3.80
4. Were special techniques successful	5	2	2	0	1	3	3	3.56	698/ 878	4.15	4.19	4.05	3.91	3.56
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	Ο	0	1	Ο	4 00	****/ 40	****	5.00	4.60	4.44	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	15	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 24		5.00	4.83	4.71	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	15	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 35	****	5.00	4.67	4.68	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	15	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 28	****	5.00	4.78	4.65	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	15	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 382	****	4.99	4.08	3.86	****
1 c Find the formal bounds	_5		,	,	,	_	Ü		, 302				2.00	

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	l Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	 А	7	Required for Majors	8	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	0	В	6						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	0	C	2	General		Under-grad	16	Non-major	16
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	ı
				P	0	Electives		responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	4				
				?	0						

Course-Section: FREN 102 0101

ELEMENTARY FRENCH II

Title Instructor: BAZGAN, NICOLET

Enrollment: 26 Questionnaires: 15

56-83

84-150

Grad.

2

1

0

2.00-2.99

3.00-3.49

3.50-4.00

2

2

5

C 1

0

0

D

F

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2009

Page 837 JUL 2, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

						Fr	eane	ncies	3		Tnsi	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sec
		Questions	5	NR	NA	1	_		4	5		Rank		_	Mean		Mea
		General															
_	-	-	lls from this course	1	0	0	1	1	4	8	4.36			4.34	4.30	4.11	4.3
			the expected goals	1	0	1	0	1	1	11	4.50			4.32	4.27	4.18	4.5
			the expected goals	1	0	0	1	1	1			510/1342		4.48	4.32	4.19	4.5
			the expected goals	1	5	0	1	2	2			1041/1520		4.30	4.25	4.09	4.0
			ite to what you learned	0	2	0	1	1	2			424/1465		4.26	4.12	4.02	4.4
		-	ibute to what you learned	0	4	0	1	1	4			758/1434				3.94	4.1
	-	g system clearly	· <del>-</del>	1	0 0	1	0	1 1	2			657/1547		4.12	4.19	4.10	4.4
	-	was class cance		0 1	0	1	0	0	9	4	4.33	1262/1574 886/1554		4.55	4.64	4.59 4.01	4.3
. HOW WO	uia you g	grade the overal	ll teaching effectiveness	Т	U	1	U	U	9	4	4.07	880/1554	4.38	4.13	4.10	4.01	4.0
		Lecture	2														
. Were th	he instr	uctor's lectures	s well prepared	1	0	0	1	0	2	11	4.64	694/1488	4.72	4.39	4.47	4.41	4.6
			ested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	2		4.86			4.78	4.73	4.65	4.
			d and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	1	3			499/1486		4.33	4.32	4.26	4.
		_	what you learned	2	0	1	0	1	2	9	4.38	834/1489	4.70	4.40	4.32	4.22	4.3
. Did aud	diovisua	l techniques enh	nance your understanding	2	1	1	0	0	1	10	4.58	268/1277	4.34	3.99	4.03	3.91	4.
		sion	4	0													
	id class discussions contribute to what you learned ere all students actively encouraged to participate					0	0	2	2	7	4.45			4.30	4.17	3.96	4.
						0	0	0	1		4.90			4.57	4.35		4.
	Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussio Were special techniques successful					0	0	0	2		4.82	,		4.38	4.35	4.09	
. were s	pecial te	echniques succes	SSIUI	5	1	0	0	1	2	6	4.56	204/ 878	4.48	4.19	4.05	3.91	4.5
		Laborat	tory														
. Did the	e lab ind		nding of the material	14	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 234	****	5.00	4.23	4.08	***
			te background information	14	0	0	1	0	0	0		****/ 240		5.00		4.29	***
_	-	_	-														
		Semina															
			to the announced theme	14	0	0	1	0	0	0		****/ 85		4.67	4.72	4.52	**:
			for individual attention	14	0	0	1	0	0	0		****/ 79		4.67	4.69	4.52	**:
			to what you learned	14	0	1	0	0	0	0		****/ 80		5.00		4.55	***
. Were c	riteria 1	for grading made	e clear	14	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 375	5.00	4.97	4.01	3.78	**
		Field W	Nork														
Did fi	eld evne		te to what you learned	14	0	0	1	0	0	0	2 00	****/ 52	****	5.00	4.48	4.20	**
	_		ur evaluation criteria	14	0	0	1	0	0	0		****/ 48	****	5.00	4.40	4.11	**:
_	-		for consultation	14	0	0	1	0	0	0		****/ 44	****	5.00		4.71	**
. was cir	e inbera	cor avarrabre i	tor comparederon		J	Ü	_	Ü	Ü	Ü	2.00	, 11		3.00	1.75	1.71	
		Self I	Paced														
. Did se	lf-paced	system contribu	ute to what you learned	14	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 40	****	5.00	4.60	4.44	**:
	Did study questions make clear the expected goal					1	0	0	0	0		****/ 24		5.00	4.83	4.71	**
. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful				14	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 35	***	5.00	4.67	4.68	***
			Frequ	ıency	/ Dis	trib	utio	n									
Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades							Re	asons	5			Ty	pe			Majors	3
		0.00-0.99	0 A 8											·			
00-27 28-55	3 4		Ke	quir	ea I	or Ma	a JOY	s I	· U	Graduat	e	0	Majo	Σ	,		
20-33	-	1.00-1.99				_				_	1		_		_		

General

Electives

Under-grad 15

#### - Means there are not enough

responses to be significant

0

Non-major 15

I 0 Other 1 ? 0

University of Maryland Baltimore County

Course-Section: FREN 102 0201 Title ELEMENTARY FRENCH II Spring 2009 Instructor: BAZGAN, NICOLET

Enrollment: 9 Questionnaires: 7

Page 838 JUL 2, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluat	tion Questionnaire
------------------------	--------------------

						Inst	ructor	Course	: Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect		
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	Λ	Λ	Λ	1	5	4.83	219/1576	4 55	1 21	4.30	4.11	4.83
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	0	0	0	1	4		222/1576		4.32	4.27	4.11	4.80
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	1	_	4.83	221/1342				4.19	4.83
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	2	0	0	0	2		4.50	511/1520		4.30			4.50
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	1	0	0	0	1		4.75	206/1465			4.12	4.02	4.75
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	1	0	0	0	1	4		151/1434				3.94	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	0	1	-	4.83	167/1547		4.12	4.14	4.10	4.83
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	2		4.63	911/1574					
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	0	1		4.75	194/1554			4.10	4.01	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	U	U	U	U	Т	3	4.75	194/1554	4.38	4.13	4.10	4.01	4./5
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1488	4.72	4.39	4.47	4.41	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	0	5		1/1493				4.65	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	0	0			1/1486		4.33			5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	0	5		1/1489		4.40		4.22	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	1	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	159/1277		3.99		3.91	
	_	_	-	-	-	_	_							
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1279	4.58	4.30	4.17	3.96	5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	636/1270	4.76	4.57	4.35	4.09	4.50
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	644/1269	4.69	4.38	4.35	4.09	4.50
4. Were special techniques successful	5	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	221/ 878	4.48	4.19	4.05	3.91	4.50
Freq	ency	. Diei	trib	1 <b>t</b> i 01	n									
. redr	ciicy	יפוע	CIID	1010										
Goodita Barraia Goodina Goodina				ъ-					m				34-4	

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

Course-Section: FREN 102 0301 University of Maryland Title ELEMENTARY FRENCH II

Baltimore County Spring 2009

Instructor: DIGEON, LANDRY

Enrollment: 22 Questionnaires: 12

Page 839 JUL 2, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Ctudont	('011200	Evaluation	Olipetion	naira

							Fr	eque	ncies			Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
		Question	S		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mear
		Genera	 1															
1. Did vo	ou gain n	ew insights,ski		om this course	0	0	0	0	1	1	10	4.75	301/1576	4.55	4.34	4.30	4.11	4.75
		ctor make clear			0	0	0	0	1	2	9	4.67	392/1576	4.57	4.32	4.27	4.18	4.67
		uestions reflec			0	0	0	0	1	0	11	4.83	221/1342	4.65	4.48	4.32	4.19	4.83
l. Did ot	her eval	uations reflect	the ex	xpected goals	1	0	0	0	0	3	8	4.73	281/1520	4.39	4.30	4.25	4.09	4.7
				what you learned	0	2	0	0	1	1	8	4.70	244/1465	4.54	4.26	4.12	4.02	4.70
5. Did wr	itten as	signments contr	ibute t	to what you learned	0	1	0	1	2	2	6	4.18	758/1434	4.32	4.22	4.14	3.94	4.1
7. Was th	e gradin	g system clearl	y expla	ained	0	0	0	1	1	4	6	4.25	838/1547	4.39	4.12	4.19	4.10	4.2
		was class canc			0	0	0	0	5	5	2	3.75	1540/1574	4.23	4.55	4.64	4.59	3.7
. How wo	uld you	grade the overa	ll tead	ching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	0	5	4	4.44	477/1554	4.38	4.13	4.10	4.01	4.4
		Lectur	e															
L. Were t	he instr	uctor's lecture	s well	prepared	3	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	463/1488	4.72	4.39	4.47	4.41	4.78
2. Did th	e instru	ctor seem inter	ested i	in the subject	3	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1493	4.90	4.78	4.73	4.65	5.0
3. Was le	cture ma	terial presente	d and e	explained clearly	3	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	191/1486	4.74	4.33	4.32	4.26	4.8
l. Did th	e lectur	es contribute t	o what	you learned	3	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	217/1489	4.70	4.40	4.32	4.22	4.8
. Did au	diovisua	l techniques en	hance y	your understanding	3	0	0	0	3	1	5	4.22	560/1277	4.34	3.99	4.03	3.91	4.2
		Discus	sion															
. Did cl	ass disc			what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	400/1279	4.58	4.30	4.17	3.96	4.5
				ed to participate	5	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	307/1270	4.76	4.57	4.35	4.09	4.8
				nd open discussion	5	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	332/1269	4.69	4.38	4.35	4.09	4.8
. Were s	pecial to	echniques succe	ssful	-	5	0	0	0	1	1	5	4.57	197/ 878	4.48	4.19	4.05	3.91	4.5
		Semina	r															
. Were c	riteria	for grading mad	e clear	c	9	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/ 375	5.00	4.97	4.01	3.78	5.0
		Field	Work															
l. Did fi	eld expe			what you learned	11	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 52	****	5.00	4.48	4.20	***
		Self	Paced															
. Were t	here eno	ugh proctors for	r all t	the students	9	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/ 382	5.00	4.99	4.08	3.86	5.0
				Frequ	ency	Dist	trib	utio	n									
Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	asons				Туј	ne.			Majors	:
00-27	1 2	0.00-0.99	1 0	A 8 B 1		Red	quir	ed f	or Ma	jor	S	8	Graduat	е	0	Majo	or	0
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	1			Cc.	0.000	1				1	IIndox	d 1	2	More	ma i a	12
56-83 84-150	2	2.00-2.99 3.00-3.49	2	C 0 D 0		Gei	nera	Т				1	Under-g	Lau I	2	non-	-major	12
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	D 0 F 0		רק.	ecti <sup>.</sup>	7700				0	#### - I	Meane +	here -	re not	enous	rh
Grau.	U	3.30-4.00	3	P 0		ET.	=CLT	veb				U	response					111
				I 0		∩+1	her					2	T Capolla	-6 LO L	c argi	ıııcaı	10	
				2 2		OCI						-						
				; 4														

Course-Section: FREN 102 0401

ELEMENTARY FRENCH II

Title Instructor: GUEYE, SOKHNA F

Enrollment: 28 Questionnaires: 23

#### University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2009

Page 840 JUL 2, 2009 Job IRBR3029

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

			Fre	equei	ncie	s		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	-	3	4	5	Mean	Rank		Mean		Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	1	0	4	5	13	4.26	940/1576	4.55	4.34	4.30	4.11	4.26
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	4	8	11	4.30	891/1576	4.57	4.32	4.27	4.18	4.30
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	4	4	14	4.35	761/1342	4.65	4.48	4.32	4.19	4.35
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	4	0	0	5	3	11	4.32	792/1520	4.39	4.30	4.25	4.09	4.32
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	1	0	5	2	13	4.24	668/1465	4.54	4.26	4.12	4.02	4.24
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	3	1	1	3	5	10	4.10	836/1434	4.32	4.22	4.14	3.94	4.10
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	7	7	8	4.05	1013/1547	4.39	4.12	4.19	4.10	4.05
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	2	0	12	8	4.18	1373/1574	4.23	4.55	4.64	4.59	4.18
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	10	1	0	0	1	7	4	4.25	712/1554	4.38	4.13	4.10	4.01	4.25
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	0	0	2	6	11	4.47	907/1488	4.72	4.39	4.47	4.41	4.47
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	0	1	3	15	4.74	947/1493		4.78	4.73	4.65	4.74
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	5	0	0	0	1	8	9	4.44	763/1486		4.33	4.32	4.26	4.44
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	2	5	12	4.53	672/1489		4.40	4.32	4.22	4.53
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	5	4	1	0	3	7	3	3.79	869/1277		3.99	4.03	3.91	
5. Did addiovibadi eccimiques cimanee your anderstanding	,	-	_	Ü	3	,	3	3.75	005/12//	1.51	3.77	1.05	3.71	3.75
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	5	2	10	4.29	633/1279	4.58	4.30	4.17	3.96	4.29
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	0	1	2	14	4.76	401/1270	4.76	4.57	4.35	4.09	4.76
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	0	0	1	5	11	4.59	596/1269	4.69	4.38	4.35	4.09	4.59
4. Were special techniques successful	6	1	0	0	4	3	9	4.31	333/ 878	4.48	4.19	4.05	3.91	4.31
T also see a see a														
Laboratory	0.1	0	-	0	-	_	_	0 00	****	ale ale ale ale	F 00	4 25	4 00	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information		0	1	0	1	0	0		****/ 240	****	5.00	4.35	4.29	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	21	1	0	0	1	0	0		****/ 232	****	5.00	4.29	4.27	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	21	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 379	****	5.00	4.20	4.15	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	20	2	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 85	****	4.67	4.72	4.52	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	22	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 79	****	4.67	4.69	4.52	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	19	1	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 375	5.00	4.97	4.01	3.78	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	21	0	2	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 52	****	5.00	4.48	4.20	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	22	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 48	****	5.00	4.40	4.11	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	22	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 44	****	5.00	4.73	4.71	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	22	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 45	****	5.00	4.57	4.72	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	19	0	0	0	1	0	3		****/ 326	****	4.99	4.03	3.64	****
									,					
Self Paced	0.0	0	-	0	-	0	-	2 00	****		F 00	4 60	4 44	ale ale ale ale
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	20	0	1	0	1	0	1		****/ 40	***	5.00	4.60	4.44	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	21	1	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 24	****	5.00	4.83	4.71	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	21	1	0	0	1	0	0		****/ 35	****	5.00	4.67	4.68	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	21	1	0	0	1	0	0		****/ 28	****	5.00	4.78	4.65	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	18	1	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	****/ 382	5.00	4.99	4.08	3.86	****

Course-Section: FREN 102 0401

Title ELEMENTARY FRENCH II

Instructor: GUEYE, SOKHNA F

Enrollment: 28
Questionnaires: 23

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2009 Page 840 JUL 2, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expecte	ed Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	 А	12	Required for Majors	13	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	В	3						
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	3	С	0	General	0	Under-grad	23	Non-major	23
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	4	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means	there	are not enough	h
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	3	_			
				?	1						

Course-Section: FREN 103 0101

Title INT REV ELEM FRENCH

Instructor: EL OMARI, SAMIR

Enrollment: 18
Questionnaires: 16

Spring 2009

Page 841 JUL 2, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

University of Maryland

Baltimore County

Questions	NR	NA	Fre	equer 2	ncie:	s 4	5	Inst Mean	ructor Rank	Course Mean	_		Level Mean	
General	_	0	_	1	0	_	0	4 05	050/1576	4 05	4 24	4 20	4 11	4 05
<ol> <li>Did you gain new insights, skills from this course</li> <li>Did the instructor make clear the expected goals</li> </ol>	0	0	0 1	1 0	2 5	5 6	8	4.25	952/1576 1311/1576	4.25 3.75	4.34	4.30 4.27	4.11 4.18	4.25 3.75
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	4	Ω ±	4.31	788/1342		4.32		4.10	4.31
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	3	1	1	3	4			1285/1520	3.69	4.30	4.25	4.19	3.69
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	1	1	9		4.07	818/1465		4.26	4.12	4.02	4.07
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	1	5	5			1162/1434		4.22	4.14	3.94	3.63
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	2	0	5	2			1276/1547		4.12	4.19	4.10	3.67
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	11			1279/1574		4.55		4.59	4.31
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	1	0	2	6			892/1554				4.01	
Lecture	•	0	•	-	2		0	4 10	1160/1400	4 10	4 20	4 45	4 41	4 10
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	1	3 0	4	8		1160/1488		4.39	4.47	4.41	4.19
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0 1	0 0	5	1 2	15 7	4.94	390/1493		4.78 4.33	4.73	4.65	4.94
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1 0	0	0	1	3	4			1168/1486 1005/1489		4.33	4.32		3.93 4.19
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	1	0	3	3	9	4.19			3.99		3.91	
J. Did addiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	U	U		U	J	J	,	4.10	333/12//	4.10	3.99	1.03	3.91	4.10
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	5	1	6	4.08	777/1279	4.08	4.30	4.17	3.96	4.08
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	0	2	1	9	4.58	574/1270	4.58	4.57	4.35	4.09	4.58
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	1	1	2	1	6	3.91	992/1269	3.91	4.38	4.35	4.09	3.91
4. Were special techniques successful	5	5	1	0	1	2	2	3.67	671/ 878	3.67	4.19	4.05	3.91	3.67
Laboratory														
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	14	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 240	****	5.00	4.35	4.29	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	14	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 229	****	5.00	4.51	4.43	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	14	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 232	****	5.00	4.29	4.27	****
Seminar  1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	1.4	1	0	0	0	0	1	E 00	****/ 85	****	4.67	4 72	4.52	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	14 15	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 79	****	4.67	4.72 4.69	4.52	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	11	1	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/ 375	5.00	4.67	4.01		5.00
5. Were criteria for grading made crear	11	1	U	U	U	U	4	3.00	1/ 3/3	5.00	4.57	4.01	3.70	5.00
Field Work														
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	15	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 48	****	5.00	4.40	4.11	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 44	****	5.00	4.73	4.71	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	12	1	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 326	****	4.99	4.03	3.64	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/ 40	****	5.00	4.60	4.44	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	14	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 24	****	5.00	4.83	4.71	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	14	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 35	****	5.00	4.67	4.68	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	14	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 28	****	5.00	4.78	4.65	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	8	1	0	0	1	0	6	4.71	175/ 382	4.71	4.99	4.08	3.86	4.71

Course-Section: FREN 103 0101

Title INT REV ELEM FRENCH

Instructor: EL OMARI, SAMIR

Enrollment: 18
Questionnaires: 16

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2009 Page 841 JUL 2, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	l Grades	Reasons		Type	Majors	3
00-27	4	0.00-0.99	1	A	7	Required for Majors	8	Graduate (	0 Major	1
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	В	5					
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	2	C	4	General	2	Under-grad 16	.6 Non-major	15
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	5	D	0					
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means th	here are not enoug	<sub>j</sub> h
				P	0			responses to be	e significant	
				I	0	Other	5	_	_	
				?	0					

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

BADAGBO, YAWO

Instructor:

Baltimore County Spring 2009 Page 842

JUL 2, 2009

Job IRBR3029

Enrollment: 15
Questionnaires: 11 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

		Question	S		NR	NA	Fre	_	ncies 3	5 4	5	Inst Mean	tructor Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
						. – – – .												
1 1 1 1 1 1 1	vou goin n	Genera ew insights,ski		m this source	1	0	2	1	3	2	2	2 10	1528/1576	3.07	1 21	4.30	4.35	3.10
		ctor make clear			1	0	1	4	3	1	1		1555/1576		4.32	4.27	4.32	2.70
		uestions reflec			1	0	0	2	4	2	2		1249/1342		4.48	4.32	4.41	3.40
		uations reflect			1	3	2	1	3	0	1		1507/1520		4.30	4.25	4.26	2.57
				what you learned	1	1	0	4	1	1	3		1317/1465		4.26	4.12	4.09	3.33
	-	_		o what you learned	1	4	1	1	1	2	1		1339/1434		4.22	4.14	4.06	3.17
		g system clearl		-	1	0	1	3	3	1	2		1459/1547		4.12	4.19	4.22	3.00
		was class canc		11104	1	0	0	0	0	3	_		866/1574			4.64	4.62	4.70
				hing effectiveness	3	•	0	6	1	1			1534/1554		4.13	4.10		2.38
J. 110W V	would you	grade the overa	II ccac.	iiiig circciveness	5	Ü	Ü	O	_	-	Ü	2.30	1331/1331	2.52	1.15	1.10	1.05	2.50
		Lectur	e															
1. Were	the instr	uctor's lecture	-	prepared	1	0	4	2	2	1	1	2.30	1481/1488	2.90	4.39	4.47	4.44	2.30
		ctor seem inter			1	0	0	1	2	3	_		1411/1493		4.78	4.73	4.75	4.00
				xplained clearly	1	0	1	7	0	1	1		1477/1486		4.33	4.32	4.29	2.40
		es contribute t			1	0	3	2	3	0	_		1462/1489		4.40	4.32	4.31	
				our understanding	1	3	2	3	1	1	0		1263/1277		3.99			2.14
			2															
		Discus	sion															
1. Did o	class disc	ussions contrib	ute to	what you learned	5	0	0	2	3	1	0	2.83	1221/1279	2.44	4.30	4.17	4.14	2.83
				d to participate	5	0	0	1	1	3	1		1091/1270		4.57	4.35	4.30	3.67
				d open discussion	5	0	1	3	1	1	0		1253/1269		4.38	4.35	4.29	2.33
		echniques succe			5	1	0	1	2	1	1	3.40	742/ 878	2.70	4.19	4.05	3.92	3.40
		1											,					
				Frequ	iency	Dist	tribu	ıtior	n									
Credits	Earned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	asons	5			Ту	pe			Majors	3
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 4		Red	 quire	ed fo	or Ma	ajors		8	Graduat	 e	0	Majo	r •	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	в 5												_		
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C 1		Gei	nera:	L				0	Under-g	rad 1	1	Non-	major	11
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	3	D 0														
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F 0		Ele	ectiv	res				0	#### - 1	Means t	here a	re not	enoug	jh
				P 0									respons	es to b	e sign	ifican	ıt	
				I 0		Otl	her					2						
				? 0														

Course-Section: FREN 201 0201 Title

INTERMEDIATE FRENCH I

Instructor: BADAGBO, YAWO

Enrollment: 22 Questionnaires: 11 Spring 2009

Page 843 JUL 2, 2009 Job IRBR3029

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

University of Maryland

Baltimore County

		Question	s		NR	NA	Fre	_	ncies 3	4	5	Ins Mean	tructor Rank		e Dept Mean		Level Mean	Sect Mean
		 Genera																
1 Did vo	u gain n	Genera ew insights,ski	_	m this course	0	0	1	0	4	4	2	3 55	1431/1576	3.07	4.34	4.30	4.35	3.55
		ctor make clear			0	0	2	2	2	3	2		1515/1576		4.32	4.27	4.32	3.09
		uestions reflec			0	0	1	1	1	5	3		1146/1342		4.48	4.32	4.41	3.73
		uations reflect			0	5	1	0	0	2	3		1041/1520		4.30	4.25	4.26	4.00
				what you learned	0	1	1	1	2	4	2	3.50	1242/1465	3.52	4.26	4.12	4.09	3.50
6. Did wr	itten as	signments contr	ibute t	o what you learned	1	4	0	0	3	2	1	3.67	1142/1434	3.37	4.22	4.14	4.06	3.67
		g system clearl			0	1	1	1	2	3	3	3.60	1303/1547	3.14	4.12	4.19	4.22	3.60
8. How ma	ny times	was class canc	elled		0	0	0	1	0	0	10	4.73	813/1574	4.80	4.55	4.64	4.62	4.73
9. How wo	ould you	grade the overa	ll teac	thing effectiveness	4	0	1	2	1	3	0	2.86	1493/1554	2.52	4.13	4.10	4.05	2.86
		Lectur	е															
1. Were t	he instr	uctor's lecture	s well	prepared	2	0	0	1	3	4	1	3.56	1382/1488	2.90	4.39	4.47	4.44	3.56
2. Did th	e instru	ctor seem inter	ested i	n the subject	1	0	0	1	0	2	7	4.50	1210/1493	3.89	4.78	4.73	4.75	4.50
3. Was le	cture ma	terial presente	d and e	explained clearly	1	0	1	0	1	7	1	3.70	1273/1486	2.82	4.33	4.32	4.29	3.70
		es contribute t			1	0	1	2	1	3	3	3.50	1313/1489	3.02	4.40	4.32	4.31	3.50
5. Did au	diovisua	l techniques en	hance y	our understanding	2	4	1	1	1	0	2	3.20	1119/1277	2.40	3.99	4.03	4.01	3.20
		Discus	sion															
1. Did cl	ass disc	ussions contrib	ute to	what you learned	8	0	1	1	1	0	0	2.00	1270/1279	2.44	4.30	4.17	4.14	2.00
2. Were a	ill stude	nts actively en	courage	ed to participate	8	0	0	0	0	3	0	4.00	928/1270	3.43	4.57	4.35	4.30	4.00
				nd open discussion	8	0	0	0	2	1	0	3.33	1163/1269	2.77	4.38	4.35	4.29	3.33
4. Were s	special t	echniques succe	ssful		8	1	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/ 878	2.70	4.19	4.05	3.92	****
		Field	Work															
5. Did co	nference	s help you carr	y out f	ield activities	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 326	5.00	4.99	4.03	4.43	****
		Self																
5. Were t	here eno	ugh proctors fo	r all t	the students	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 382	5.00	4.99	4.08	4.39	****
				Frequ	iency	Dis	trib	utio	n									
Credits E	Carned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	asons				Ту	pe			Majors	\$
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	A 3					or Ma			8	 Graduat		 0	Majo		1
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B 3		r.e.	quil	eu I	or Ma	100	D	U	Graduat	C	U	Ma JC	) <u>T</u>	
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	2	В 3 С 2		Ger	nera	1				0	Under-q	rad	11	Non-	-major	10
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	1	D 0		Gel	LLCI a.	-				5	onder -g	ruu .		14011	a JUI	± 0
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F 0		E1	ecti	ves				1	#### -	Means	here :	re not	enous	rh
JI aa.	0 3.50-4.00 1 F 0 P 0					11.1	CCLI	v CD				_	respons				_	,
				I 0		O+1	her					2	TCDPOHD	22 20 1	oc bigi			
				1 0	Other							_						

Course-Section: FREN 201 0301

Title INTERMEDIATE FRENCH I

Instructor: DIALLO, MAMADOU

Enrollment: 23

23

Questionnaires: 14

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2009 Page 844 JUL 2, 2009 Job IRBR3029

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

			Questions			NR	NA	Fr 1	_	ncies 3	5 4	5	Ins Mean	tructor Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean		Level Mean	Sect Mean
			General																
1 г	nid voi	anin n	ew insights,skil		this gourse	2	0	2	3	3	3	1	2 83	1554/1576	3.07	4.34	4.30	4.35	2.83
			ctor make clear			2	0	1	2	4	2	3		1463/1576		4.32	4.27	4.32	3.33
			uestions reflect			3	0	1	1	3	3	3		1199/1342		4.48	4.32	4.41	3.55
		_	uations reflect	_	_	2	5	0	1	2	1	3		1199/1520		4.30	4.25	4.26	3.86
			eadings contribu			2	2	2	1	1	3	3		1292/1465		4.26	4.12	4.09	3.40
					what you learned	2	5	1	2	2	0	2		1380/1434		4.22	4.14	4.06	3.00
			g system clearly			2	0	4	0	1	5	2		1451/1547	3.14	4.12	4.19	4.22	3.08
			was class cance			3	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1574	4.80	4.55	4.64	4.62	5.00
9. H	low wor	ıld you	grade the overal	l teachi	ng effectiveness	3	0	4	1	3	2	1	2.55	1522/1554	2.52	4.13	4.10	4.05	2.55
			Lecture																
			uctor's lectures			3	0	3	2	2	3	1	2.73	1471/1488	2.90	4.39	4.47	4.44	2.73
2. I	Did the	e instru	ctor seem intere	sted in	the subject	3	0	1	1	2	3	4	3.73	1457/1493	3.89	4.78	4.73	4.75	3.73
			terial presented	_	-	3	0	2	3	4	1	1	2.64	1463/1486	2.82	4.33	4.32	4.29	2.64
			es contribute to			3	0	3	1	3	2			1440/1489		4.40	4.32	4.31	2.91
5. I	oid aud	liovisua	l techniques enh	ance you	ır understanding	3	2	6	0	2	1	0	1.78	1271/1277	2.40	3.99	4.03	4.01	1.78
			Discuss																
			ussions contribu			6	0	3	1	2	1	1		1249/1279		4.30	4.17	4.14	2.50
			nts actively enc			6	0	2	1	3	1	1		1238/1270		4.57	4.35	4.30	2.75
			ctor encourage f		open discussion	6	0	0	3	2	3			1210/1269		4.38	4.35	4.29	3.00
4. W	Vere sp	pecial t	echniques succes	sful		6	2	3	1	1	1	0	2.00	862/ 878	2.70	4.19	4.05	3.92	2.00
	_		Seminar				•									4 0 =	4 0 0	4 01	
5. W	Vere cr	riteria	for grading made	clear		12	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 375	5.00	4.97	4.01	4.21	****
		-	Field W			1.0	0	•	0	0	0		F 00	1 / 200	F 00	4 00	4 00	4 42	F 00
5. L	ola cor	nierence	s help you carry	out ile	eld activities	10	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/ 326	5.00	4.99	4.03	4.43	5.00
E W	Jana +h	owo ono	Self P ugh proctors for		atudonta	8	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/ 382	E 00	4 00	1 00	4.39	5.00
J. W	were ti	iere eno	ugii proctors for	all the	: students	0	U	U	U	U	U	0	5.00	1/ 302	5.00	4.99	4.00	4.39	5.00
					Frequ	iency	7 Dis	trib	utio	n									
Cred	dits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Re	asons	3			Ту	pe			Majors	3
00-	 -27	4	0.00-0.99	1	A 4		Re	quir	ed f	or Ma	 ajor	 s	7	Graduat	 e	0	Majo	or	0
28-	-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	в 4														
56-	-83	1	2.00-2.99	2	C 1		Ger	nera	1				1	Under-g	rad 1	.4	Non-	-major	14
	-150	3	3.00-3.49	2	D 0														
Gra	ad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F 1		Ele	ecti	ves				0	#### - 1					jh
				P 0									respons	es to b	e sign	ifican	ıt		
					I O		Ot]	her					4						
					? 1														

Course-Section: FREN 201 0401

Title INTERMEDIATE FRENCH I

Instructor:

Enrollment: 20 Questionnaires: 17

Spring 2009 DIALLO, MAMADOU

Page 845 JUL 2, 2009 Job IRBR3029

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

University of Maryland

Baltimore County

	Ouestions								_	ncies				tructor	Course	-		Level	
			Questions	5		NR	NA	1	2	3	4		Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
			General	l															
1. Dic	d you g	ain ne	w insights,skil	lls fro	om this course	0	0	2	4	3	6	2	3.12	1526/1576	3.07	4.34	4.30	4.35	3.12
2. Dic	d the i	nstruc	ctor make clear	the ex	pected goals	0	0	1	2	7	3	4	3.41	1433/1576	3.01	4.32	4.27	4.32	3.41
3. Did	d the e	xam qu	estions reflect	the e	expected goals	0	0	1	1	4	5	6	3.82	1101/1342	3.60	4.48	4.32	4.41	3.82
4. Dic	d other	evalu	ations reflect	the ex	pected goals	1	9	1	3	2	0	1	2.57	1507/1520	3.24	4.30	4.25	4.26	2.57
5. Dic	d assig	ned re	eadings contribu	ate to	what you learned	1	5	0	0	3	3	5	4.18	718/1465	3.52	4.26	4.12	4.09	4.18
6. Dic	d writt	en ass	signments contri	ibute t	o what you learned	1	10	1	0	1	1	3	3.83	1045/1434	3.37	4.22	4.14	4.06	3.83
			g system clearly		ined	1	1	1	1	7	1	5	3.53	1333/1547	3.14	4.12	4.19	4.22	3.53
			was class cance			1	0	0	0	0		15	4.94	328/1574	4.80	4.55	4.64		4.94
9. Hov	w would	you g	grade the overal	ll teac	hing effectiveness	5	0	2	1	7	1	1	2.83	1496/1554	2.52	4.13	4.10	4.05	2.83
			Lecture	9															
1. Wer	re the	instru	ctor's lectures	s well	prepared	2	0	1	2	7	3	2	3.20	1433/1488	2.90	4.39	4.47	4.44	3.20
2. Dic	d the i	nstruc	tor seem intere	ested i	n the subject	2	0	2	0	5	4	4	3.53	1471/1493	3.89	4.78	4.73	4.75	3.53
3. Was	s lectu	re mat	erial presented	d and e	explained clearly	2	0	2	3	6	2	2	2.93	1437/1486	2.82	4.33	4.32	4.29	2.93
4. Dic	d the l	ecture	es contribute to	what	you learned	2	0	2	1	6	4	2	3.20	1392/1489	3.02	4.40	4.32	4.31	3.20
5. Did	d audio	visual	techniques enl	nance y	our understanding	4	2	4	1	4	1	1	2.45	1243/1277	2.40	3.99	4.03	4.01	2.45
			Discuss	sion															
1. Dic	d class	discu			what you learned	12	0	3	1	1	0	0	1.60	1276/1279	2.44	4.30	4.17	4.14	1.60
					ed to participate	12	0	0	3	0	1			1208/1270		4.57		4.30	
					d open discussion	12	0	3	0	2	0			1267/1269				4.29	
			Semina	r															
5. Wer	re crit	eria f	or grading made	e clear		0	0	0	0	0	0	17	5.00	1/ 375	5.00	4.97	4.01	4.21	5.00
			Field W	Mork															
5. Dic	d confe	rences			ield activities	1	0	0	0	0	0	16	5.00	1/ 326	5.00	4.99	4.03	4.43	5.00
			Self I	base															
5. Wer	re ther	e enou	igh proctors for		he students	0	0	0	0	0	0	17	5.00	1/ 382	5.00	4.99	4.08	4.39	5.00
					Frequ	encv	Dist	trib	ution	า									
					_	.01107	210	0112											
Credit	ts Earn 	ed 	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	asons				Ту	pe 			Majors	
00-27		0	0.00-0.99	0	A 3		Red	quir	ed fo	or Ma	jor	s	8	Graduat	е	0	Majo	or	0
28-55	5	1	1.00-1.99	0	в 7														
56-83		1	2.00-2.99	1	C 3		Ger	nera	1				2	Under-g	rad 1	.7	Non-	-major	17
84-15	50	5	3.00-3.49	0	D 0														
Grad.		0	3.50-4.00	3	F 0		Ele	ecti	ves				0	#### - 1					ŗh
					P 0									respons	es to b	e sign	nifican	ıt	
					I 0		Ot1	her					3						
					? 2														

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

INTERMEDIATE FRENCH I Baltimore Count BADAGBO, YAWO Spring 2009

Instructor: BADAGBO,
Enrollment: 24

Questionnaires: 19

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Page 846 JUL 2, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Ouestions	NR	NA	Fre	equei 2	ncie:	5 4	5	Ins Mean	tructor Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
24CDC1OND														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	4	5	5	2	3	2.74	1558/1576	3.07	4.34	4.30	4.35	2.74
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	5	8	1	1	4	2.53	1566/1576	3.01	4.32	4.27	4.32	2.53
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	2	2	5	4	6	3.53	1204/1342	3.60	4.48	4.32	4.41	3.53
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	8	2	3	0	3	3	3.18	1451/1520	3.24	4.30	4.25	4.26	3.18
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	9	2	1	3	1	3	3.20	1347/1465	3.52	4.26	4.12	4.09	3.20
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	8	3	1	2	1	4	3.18	1332/1434	3.37	4.22	4.14	4.06	3.18
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	6	4	4	1	3	2.50	1516/1547	3.14	4.12	4.19	4.22	2.50
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	7	12	4.63	957/1574	4.80	4.55	4.64	4.62	4.63
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	6	4	4	1	0	2.00	1549/1554	2.52	4.13	4.10	4.05	2.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	4	4	4	3	2	2.71	1473/1488	2.90	4.39	4.47	4.44	2.71
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	3	4	5	5	3.71	1459/1493	3.89	4.78	4.73	4.75	3.71
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	3	8	2	1	2	2.44	1475/1486	2.82	4.33	4.32	4.29	2.44
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	2	6	3	4	2	2.88	1442/1489	3.02	4.40	4.32	4.31	2.88
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	3	7	1	1	3	2	2.43	1246/1277	2.40	3.99	4.03	4.01	2.43
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	11	0	1	2	1	2	2	3.25	1146/1279	2.44	4.30	4.17	4.14	3.25
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	11	0	0	2	1	2	3	3.75	1054/1270	3.43	4.57	4.35	4.30	3.75
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	11	0	1	2	0	3	2	3.38	1151/1269	2.77	4.38	4.35	4.29	3.38
4. Were special techniques successful	11	4	1	0	0	0	3	4.00	****/ 878	2.70	4.19	4.05	3.92	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	18	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 234	****	5.00	4.23	4.44	****
Frequ	iency	Dist	ribu	utio	n									
Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades				Po:	ason	,			Ty	00			Majors	
creates Earned Cum. GFA Expected Glades					20011	- 				 be			S	
00-27 2 0.00-0.99 0 A 7		Rec	quire	ed fo	or Ma	ajor	s 1	2	Graduat	е	0	Majo	r	1

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	Grades	Reasons		Туре	Majors		
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	 А	7	Required for Majors	12	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	В	5						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	1	C	3	General	1	Under-grad	19	Non-major	18
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	3	D	1						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	1
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	4				
				?	0						

Course-Section: FREN 202 0101

Title INTERMEDIATE FRENCH II

Instructor: EL OMARI, SAMIR

Enrollment: 12 Questionnaires: 8

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2009

Page 847 JUL 2, 2009 Job IRBR3029

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

	Frequencies					\$	Instructor		tructor	Course Dept		t UMBC Level		Sect
Ouestions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank		Mean			Mean
~~~~~~														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	1	0	2	4	1	3.50	1445/1576	3.50	4.34	4.30	4.35	3.50
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	1	6	4.63	448/1576	4.63		4.27	4.32	4.63
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	197/1342	4.88		4.32	4.41	4.88
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	1	0	0	2	3		1041/1520	4.00	4.30	4.25	4.26	4.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	1	0	4	0	1		1386/1465	3.00	4.26	4.12	4.09	3.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	1	0	4	2		1162/1434	3.63	4.22	4.14	4.06	3.63
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	1	6		387/1547	4.63		4.19	4.22	4.63
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	7			1411/1574	4.13	4.55	4.64	4.62	4.13
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	1	5			849/1554		4.13			4.13
y. non would jou grade one everall codoning erroceiveness	Ū	Ü	Ū	Ü	_		_	1.15	01971301	1.13	1.15	1.10	1.00	1115
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	4	4	4.50	870/1488	4.50	4.39	4.47	4.44	4.50
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1493	5.00	4.78	4.73	4.75	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	201/1486	4.88	4.33	4.32	4.29	4.88
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	4	4	4.50	696/1489	4.50	4.40	4.32	4.31	4.50
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	1	0	0	4	3	4.00	692/1277	4.00	3.99		4.01	4.00
J. Did addiovibual eccuniques childree your anderstanding	U	O	_	U	O	-	5	1.00	052/12//	1.00	3.77	1.05	1.01	1.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	1	1	1	2	3.80	938/1279	3.80	4.30	4.17	4.14	3.80
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	2	1	2	4.00	928/1270	4.00		4.35	4.30	4.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	2	1	_	4.00	928/1269	4.00	4.38	4.35	4.29	4.00
4. Were special techniques successful	3	3	0	0	1	0	_	4.00	464/ 878	4.00	4.19		3.92	
1. Were special techniques successful	3	J	U	U	_	U	_	1.00	404/ 0/0	1.00	4.17	1.05	3.72	1.00
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	7	0	1	0	0	0	0	1 00	****/ 234	****	5.00	4.23	4.44	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	7	0	0	0	1	0	0		****/ 240	****	5.00	4.35	4.47	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	7	0	0	0	1	0	0		****/ 229	****	5.00	4.51	4.65	****
J. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	,	O	O	U	_	O	U	3.00	/ 225		3.00	1.51	1.03	
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	6	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	76/ 85	4.00	4.67	4.72	4.78	4.00
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	6	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	67/ 79	4.00	4.67	4.69	4.72	4.00
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	6	1	0	0	1	0	0		****/ 72	****	5.00	4.64	4.83	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	6	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 80	****	5.00	4.61	4.80	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	5	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	171/ 375		4.97		4.21	
J. Were criteria for grading made crear	3	O	O	U	_	O	2	1.33	1717 373	1.33	1.07	1.01	1.21	1.55
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	1	0	0	3 00	****/ 52	****	5.00	4.48	4.74	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 48	****	5.00	4.40	4.71	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	7	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 44	****	5.00	4.73	4.69	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	7	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 45	****	5.00	4.57	4.64	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	5	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	142/ 326	4.67	4.99	4.03	4.43	4.67
5. Dia conferences help jou carry out richa activities	3	J	J	J	0	_	_	1.07	112/ 520	1.07	1.00	1.03	1.15	1.07
Self Paced														
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/ 382	5.00	4.99	4.08	4.39	5.00
5. Here shere changin proceeds for all the betaches	J	J	J	J	J	J	J	3.00	1, 302	3.00	1.77	1.00	1.55	3.00

Course-Section: FREN 202 0101

Title INTERMEDIATE FRENCH II

Instructor: EL OMARI

Enrollment: 12
Questionnaires: 8

EL OMARI, SAMIR

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2009 Page 847 JUL 2, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

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

Baltimore County Spring 2009

Enrollment:	17
Questionnaires:	16

Page 848 JUL 2, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Student Cour	se Evaluation	Questionnaire
--------------	---------------	---------------

							Inst	ructor	Course Dept		pt UMBC Level		Sect	
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	0	1	2	4	8	4.27	940/1576	4.27	4.34	4.30	4.30	4.27
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	3	3	9	4.40	759/1576	4.40	4.32	4.27	4.28	4.40
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	2	12	4.73	321/1342	4.73	4.48	4.32	4.30	4.73
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	2	2	11	4.60	395/1520	4.60	4.30	4.25	4.25	4.60
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	1	2	5	6	3.93	947/1465	3.93	4.26	4.12	4.09	3.93
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	3	2	9	4.27	670/1434	4.27	4.22	4.14	4.15	4.27
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	3	4	8	4.33	755/1547	4.33	4.12	4.19	4.21	4.33
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	3	12	4.80	665/1574	4.80	4.55	4.64	4.61	4.80
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	0	6	7	4.54	371/1554	4.54	4.13	4.10	4.09	4.54
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	1	5	9	4.53	834/1488	4.53	4.39	4.47	4.47	4.53
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	3	12	4.80	810/1493	4.80	4.78	4.73	4.70	4.80
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	3	4	8	4.33	891/1486	4.33	4.33	4.32	4.32	4.33
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	2	4	9	4.47	742/1489	4.47	4.40	4.32	4.34	4.47
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	0	2	3	10	4.53	293/1277	4.53	3.99	4.03	4.11	4.53
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	2	2	3	4.14	745/1279	4.14	4.30	4.17	4.20	4.14
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	9	0	0	0	1	1	5	4.57	582/1270	4.57	4.57	4.35	4.42	4.57
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	0	0	1	1	5	4.57	602/1269	4.57	4.38	4.35	4.41	4.57
4. Were special techniques successful	9	1	0	1	2	1	2	3.67	671/ 878	3.67	4.19	4.05	4.09	3.67

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

Course-Section: FREN 302 0101 University of Maryland Title ADVANCED FRENCH II Instructor: BAZGAN, NICOLET

Baltimore County Spring 2009

Enrollment: 18

Questionnaires: 16

Page 849 JUL 2, 2009 Job IRBR3029

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

	Frequencies			Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect							
		Questions		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank		_		Mean	
		General															
1 Did 110	u gain no	w insights, skills	from this source	0	0	0	0	3	6	7	4.25	952/1576	4.25	1 21	4.30	4.30	4.25
		tor make clear the		0	0	0	1	3	8	4		1207/1576		4.32	4.27		3.94
		estions reflect th		0	0	0	1	1	8	_	4.19	886/1342			4.32		4.19
	_	ations reflect the		0	0	0	0	2	8		4.25	859/1520		4.30	4.25		4.25
			to what you learned	1	0	0	1	2	5		4.20	708/1465		4.26	4.12		4.20
			te to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	7		4.40				4.14		4.40
		system clearly ex		1	0	0	0	2	6		4.33	- , -		4.12	4.14		
		was class cancelle		1	0	0	0	0	2	13	4.33	,			4.19		4.33
				0	0	0	1	2	9			- , -					
9. HOW WO	oula you g	rade the overall t	teaching effectiveness	U	U	U	Т	2	9	4	4.00	924/1554	4.00	4.13	4.10	4.09	4.00
		Lecture															
1. Were t	he instru	ctor's lectures we	ell prepared	1	0	0	0	1	4	10	4.60	750/1488	4.60	4.39	4.47	4.47	4.60
		tor seem intereste		1	0	0	0	0	2	13	4.87	658/1493	4.87	4.78	4.73	4.70	4.87
			nd explained clearly	1	0	0	0	3	6	6	4.20	1003/1486		4.33	4.32	4.32	4.20
		s contribute to wh		1	0	0	0	2	6		4.33					4.34	
			ce your understanding	1	0	0	1	0	6		4.40	404/1277		3.99		4.11	
J. Dia aa	alovibuai	ccciniiques ciniain	se your underseanding	_	Ü	J	-	J	Ü	Ü	1.10	101/12//	1.10	3.33	1.05		1.10
		Discussion															
1. Did cl	ass discu	ssions contribute	to what you learned	8	0	0	0	1	4		4.25	665/1279	4.25	4.30	4.17	4.20	4.25
2. Were a	ll studen	ts actively encous	raged to participate	8	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	412/1270	4.75	4.57	4.35	4.42	4.75
3. Did th	e instruc	tor encourage fair	and open discussion	8	0	0	0	0	5	3	4.38	747/1269	4.38	4.38	4.35	4.41	4.38
4. Were s	pecial te	chniques successfu	11	8	1	0	1	0	3	3	4.14	425/ 878	4.14	4.19	4.05	4.09	4.14
		Seminar															
5. Were c	riteria f	or grading made cl	lear	10	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/ 375	5.00	4.97	4.01	4.12	5.00
	_	Field Work				_				_							
5. Did co	nierences	help you carry or	ut field activities	9	0	0	0	0	0	./	5.00	1/ 326	5.00	4.99	4.03	4.23	5.00
		Self Pace	ed														
5. Were t	here enou	gh proctors for a	ll the students	9	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/ 382	5.00	4.99	4.08	4.24	5.00
			Frequ	encs	7 Dist	trib	utio	n									
			11040	iciic j	DID	C1 1D	acio										
Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades				Re	asons	3			Ty	pe			Majors	1
00-27	4	0.00-0.99 0	A 10		Re	auir	 ed f	or Ma			0	Graduat	 e	1	Majo	 or	1
28-55	2	1.00-1.99 0	B 4		1000	-1 a + 1	-u 1	OT 1.1C	10ر	~	J	Siddudi	_	-	.10. )		_
56-83	2	2.00-2.99 1	C 1		Co	nera	1				1	Under-g	rad 1	5	Non-	-major	15
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	D 0		061	c.a	_				_	onaci -g	Luu I	_	14011		10
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00 8	F 0		គ្រា	ecti <sup>.</sup>	WAG				2 #### - Means there are not enough		rh				
Grau.	1	3.30 T.00 0	P 0		11.11	CCLI	v CD				۷.	respons					11
			I 0		<b>∩</b> +1	her				1	1	T CPFOIIP	CD LO D	c argi	ııııcaı	.10	
			3 0		OCI	TICI				1	-						
			r U														

Course-Section: FREN 310 0101 University of Maryland Title INTERCONNECTIONS: LANG

Baltimore County Spring 2009

Page 850

JUL 2, 2009

Job IRBR3029

Enrollment: 19 Questionnaires: 11 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Instructor:

MCCRAY, STANLEY

		Ouestion	~		Frequencies NR NA 1 2 3 4 5 M				Inst Mean	tructor Rank	Course	_		Level Mean				
		Question	S 		NK	NA				- <del>4</del> 		Mean		mean	mean	mean	mean	Mean
		Genera	1															
1. Did vo	ou gain ne	ew insights,ski	_	m this course	0	0	0	0	2	1	8	4.55	582/1576	4.55	4.34	4.30	4.30	4.55
_	_	ctor make clear			0	0	0	0	1	1	9	4.73	313/1576		4.32	4.27	4.28	4.73
		estions reflec			0	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1342	5.00	4.48	4.32	4.30	5.00
		ations reflect			0	0	0	0	0	2	9	4.82	191/1520		4.30	4.25	4.25	4.82
				what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	1	8	4.55	341/1465	4.55	4.26	4.12	4.09	4.55
	_	_		o what you learned	d 0 0 0 0 2 1 8 4.55						368/1434	4.55	4.22	4.14	4.15	4.55		
		system clearl		-	0 0 0 1 1 1 8 4.45						608/1547	4.45	4.12	4.19	4.21	4.45		
8. How ma	any times	was class canc	elled		0 0 0 0 0 8 3 4						3	4.27	1309/1574	4.27	4.55	4.64	4.61	4.27
9. How wo	ould you g	grade the overa	ll teac	hing effectiveness	1 1 0 0 1 3 5						5	4.44	477/1554	4.44	4.13	4.10	4.09	4.44
		T	_															
1 1/2	-b	Lectur actor's lecture			1	0	0	0	2	2	_	4 20	1072/1488	4.30	4 20	4.47	4.47	4.30
		ctor's lecture			1	0	0	0	2 0	3	7		1072/1488		4.39 4.78	4.47	4.47	4.70
				xplained clearly	1	0	0	0	2	3	5	4.70	922/1486		4.76	4.73	4.70	4.70
		es contribute t			1	0	0	0	1	2	7		579/1489		4.40	4.32	4.34	4.60
				our understanding	2	1	0	0	1	4	3		579/1469		3.99	4.03		4.25
5. Did au	la Tovisua.	r rechniques en	nance y	our understanding	۷	1	U	U	T	4	3	4.25	533/12//	4.25	3.99	4.03	4.11	4.25
		Discus	sion															
1. Did cl	lass discu	ussions contrib	ute to	what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1279	5.00	4.30	4.17	4.20	5.00
2. Were a	all studer	nts actively en	courage	d to participate	6	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1270	5.00	4.57	4.35	4.42	5.00
3. Did th	ne instruc	ctor encourage	fair an	d open discussion	6	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1269	5.00	4.38	4.35	4.41	5.00
4. Were s	special te	echniques succe	ssful		6	1	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	139/ 878	4.75	4.19	4.05	4.09	4.75
				Frequ	iency	7 Dist	trib	utio	n									
				1														
Credits E	Earned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	asons	3			Ту	pe			Majors	3
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	0	A 10		Re	guir	ed f	or Ma	ajor		1	Graduat	 e	0	Majo	or	4
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	В 0			-			-						,		
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	1	C 0		Gei	nera	1				2	Under-g	rad 1	11	Non-	-major	7
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	0	D 0									J				-	
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	00 5 F 0 Electives 0 $\#\#\#$ - Means there are not					enou	<sub>j</sub> h									
				P 0									respons				_	
				I 0		Ot1	her					7	-		3			
				? 1														

Course-Section: FREN 320 0101 University of Maryland Title INTERCONNECTIONS: TRADE

Baltimore County Spring 2009

Page 851

JUL 2, 2009

Job IRBR3029

Instructor: DE VERNEIL, MAR

Enrollment: 15 Questionnaires: 12

Student Course Evaluation Que	stionnaire
-------------------------------	------------

	į		Fre	Frequencies					ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC Level		Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	1	10	4.75	301/1576	4.75	4.34	4.30	4.30	4.75
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	9	4.75	279/1576	4.75	4.32	4.27	4.28	4.75
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	8	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	298/1342	4.75	4.48	4.32	4.30	4.75
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	0	1	3	7	4.25	859/1520	4.25	4.30	4.25	4.25	4.25
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	122/1465	4.91	4.26	4.12	4.09	4.91
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	3	9	4.75	193/1434	4.75	4.22	4.14	4.15	4.75
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	1	1	9	4.50	527/1547	4.50	4.12	4.19	4.21	4.50
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	3	7	4.70	866/1574	4.70	4.55	4.64	4.61	4.70
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	1	0	0	4	5	4.20	772/1554	4.20	4.13	4.10	4.09	4.20
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	248/1488	4.90	4.39	4.47	4.47	4.90
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	557/1493	4.90	4.78	4.73	4.70	4.90
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	172/1486	4.90	4.33	4.32	4.32	4.90
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	1	0	9	4.80	309/1489	4.80	4.40	4.32	4.34	4.80
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	0	0	0	1	0	9	4.80	132/1277	4.80	3.99	4.03	4.11	4.80
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	1	1	6	4.63	365/1279	4.63	4.30	4.17	4.20	4.63
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	0	2	1	5	4.38	756/1270	4.38	4.57	4.35	4.42	4.38
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	0	1	0	7	4.75	444/1269	4.75	4.38	4.35	4.41	4.75
4. Were special techniques successful	4	1	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	147/ 878	4.71	4.19	4.05	4.09	4.71

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA	Expected	l Grades	Reasons		Type	Majors			
00-27	 5	0.00-0.99	1	 А	8	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	4
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	2						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	1	С	0	General	0	Under-grad	12	Non-major	8
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	3	#### - Means	there	are not enough	
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	7				
				2	0						

Course-Section: FREN 339 0101 University of Maryland Title EXPLORATION IN IDEAS

FATIH, ZAKARIA

Instructor:

Baltimore County Spring 2009

Page 852

JUL 2, 2009

Job IRBR3029

Enrollment: 10 Questionnaires: 8 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

? 0

								~										
						Frequencies				Inst	tructor	Course	e Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect		
		Question	ıS		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		Genera	.1															
1. Did vo	u gain ne	ew insights,ski		om this course	0	0	0	0	1	4	3	4.25	952/1576	4.25	4.34	4.30	4.30	4.25
		ctor make clear			0	0	0	1	3	4	0		1448/1576		4.32	4.27	4.28	3.38
		uestions reflec			0	0	0	2	1	5	0		1252/1342		4.48	4.32	4.30	3.38
		uations reflect			0	0	1	1	0	4	2		1320/1520		4.30	4.25	4.25	3.63
				what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	0	7	4.75	206/1465		4.26	4.12	4.09	4.75
				o what you learned	0	1	1	1	1	3	1		1305/1434		4.22	4.14	4.15	3.29
		g system clearl			0	0	1	1	4	0	2		1443/1547		4.12	4.19	4.21	3.13
		was class cand			0	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1574		4.55	4.64	4.61	5.00
	-			hing effectiveness	1	0	0	0	2	4	1		1096/1554			4.10		3.86
		Lectur	·e															
1. Were t	he instru	actor's lecture		prepared	1	0	0	0	1	3	3	4.29	1087/1488	4.29	4.39	4.47	4.47	4.29
		ctor seem inter			1	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1493		4.78	4.73	4.70	5.00
				explained clearly	1	0	0	0	1	5	1		1101/1486		4.33	4.32	4.32	4.00
		es contribute t			1	0	0	0	1	1			614/1489		4.40	4.32	4.34	4.57
				your understanding	1	6	1	0	0	0			****/1277		3.99	4.03	4.11	***
		•		3														
		Discus																
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned				4	0	1	0	2	1	0		1229/1279		4.30	4.17	4.20	2.75	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate			4	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	827/1270		4.57	4.35	4.42	4.25		
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion			4	0	0	1	0	1	2	4.00	928/1269	4.00	4.38	4.35	4.41	4.00		
		Field																
				hat you learned	7	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 52	***	5.00	4.48	4.37	****
				uation criteria	7	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 48	***	5.00	4.40	3.92	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations			7	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 45	****	5.00	4.57	4.50	****		
		Self																
				what you learned	7	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 40		5.00	4.60	4.83	****
		tions make clea			7	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 24		5.00	4.83	4.89	****
3. Were y	our conta	acts with the i	.nstruct	or helpful	7	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 35	****	5.00	4.67	5.00	****
				Frequ	iency	Dist	trib	utio	n									
Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA	7	Expected Grades				Rea	asons	5			Ту	pe			Majors	3
00-27	0	 0.00-0.99	 0	A 4									Mo do					
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	A 4 B 3	Required for Majors 0 Graduate 0							Majo	JΤ	3				
26-33 56-83	1	2.00-2.99	1	в 3 С 1		Cer	nera	1				3	Under-g	rad	8	Non-	-major	5
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	1	D 0		Gel	лета.	_				J	onder-g	ı au	U	NOII-	ilia JUL	3
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F 0		₽1∠	ecti	7760				0	#### -	Meane +	here =	re not	enouc	rh
craa.	0	3.30 1.00	۵	P 0		11.7	CI	v CD				0	respons				_	7
			I 0 Other 5		5191	Cai.												
				± 0		001						_						

Course-Section: FREN 410 0101

STUDIES FRENCH LANG LI

Title STUDIES F Instructor: KA, OMAR

Enrollment: 12
Questionnaires: 9

## University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2009

Page 853 JUL 2, 2009 Job IRBR3029

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

Questions		N	ΙA	Fre	quer 2	ncies 3	4	5	Inst Mean	ructor Rank	Course Mean	_	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean	
General																
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1		0	0	0	0	3	5	4.63	471/1576	4.63	4.34	4.30	4.46	4.63	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1		0	0	0	2	1	5	4.38	798/1576	4.38	4.32	4.27	4.35	4.38	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1		6	0	0	0	0	2		****/1342	****	4.48	4.32	4.46	****	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1		0	0	0	1	1	6	4.63	376/1520	4.63	4.30	4.25	4.38	4.63	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1		1	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1465	5.00	4.26	4.12	4.22	5.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned			0	0	1	0	2	4	4.29	647/1434	4.29	4.22	4.14	4.30	4.29	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1		0	0	1	1	2	4	4.13		4.13	4.12	4.19	4.24	4.13	
8. How many times was class cancelled	2		0	0	0	0	6			1398/1574		4.55	4.64	4.69	4.14	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness			1	0	0	1	2	3	4.33	623/1554	4.33	4.13	4.10	4.24	4.33	
Lecture																
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1		0	0	0	2	2	4	4.25	1111/1488	4.25	4.39	4.47	4.55	4.25	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1		0	0	0	1	1	6	4.63	1101/1493	4.63	4.78	4.73	4.80	4.63	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1		0	0	0	2	1	5	4.38	851/1486	4.38	4.33	4.32	4.41	4.38	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1		0	0	1	1	1	5	4.25	955/1489	4.25	4.40	4.32	4.38	4.25	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1		3	1	1	0	1	2	3.40	1066/1277	3.40	3.99	4.03	4.04	3.40	
Discussion																
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2		0	0	1	1	0	5	4.29	641/1279	4.29	4.30	4.17	4.31	4.29	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2		0	0	0	1	1	5	4.57	582/1270	4.57	4.57	4.35	4.53	4.57	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2		0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	332/1269	4.86	4.38	4.35	4.55	4.86	
4. Were special techniques successful			2	0	1	0	0	4	4.40	283/ 878	4.40	4.19	4.05	4.33	4.40	
Laboratory																
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	. 8		0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 240	***	5.00	4.35	4.45	****	
Seminar																
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	8		0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 80	****	5.00	4.61	4.52	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	8		0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 375	***	4.97	4.01	3.90	****	
Field Work																
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	8		0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 52	****	5.00	4.48	4.70	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	8		0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 48	****	5.00	4.40	4.30	****	
Self Paced																
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	8		0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 40	****	5.00	4.60	5.00	****	
Freq	uency	/ D	)ist	ribu	tior	1										
Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades					Pos	asons				Тът	no.			Majors		
Expected Glades							, 			Ту]						
00-27 2 0.00-0.99 0 A 4 28-55 0 1.00-1.99 0 B 1			Req	uire	d fo	or Ma	jors	3	0	Graduat	te 1		Majo	r	3	
56-83 0 2.00-2.99 0 C 1			Gen	eral					0	Under-g	rad	8	Non-	major	6	
84-150 2 3.00-3.49 1 D 0 Grad. 1 3.50-4.00 2 F 0			בות	a+ i					0	шшт ,	Moona +	homo -	no+	0001-0	·h	
Grad. 1 3.50-4.00 2 F 0 P 0			тте	ctiv	es				U	#### - 1 respons				_	11	
I 0			Other						6	-1		J				

? 0