```
Course-Section: FREN 101  0101                University of Maryland                          Page  833
Title      ELEMENTARY FRENCH I                  Baltimore County                              JUL  2, 2009
Instructor:   BADAGBO, AMA S                       Spring 2009                                Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:    28
Questionnaires: 21                      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  Mean
----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
                General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course    1  0  2  1  1  7  9  4.00 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  4.10 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  4.06 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   4.35  3.99  4.03 3.91  4.05

                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  4.00 ****/  35   ****  5.00  4.67 4.68  ****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful        20 0  0  0  0  1  0  4.00 ****/  28   ****  5.00  4.78 4.65  ****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students      20 0  0  0  0  1  0  4.00 ****/ 382   ****  4.99  4.08 3.86  ****
```

```
                                          Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned        Cum. GPA        Expected Grades       Reasons            Type              Majors
----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
 00-27     3       0.00-0.99    1       A   11        Required for Majors  9   Graduate     0     Major        0
 28-55     0       1.00-1.99    0       B    3
 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
                                        P    0                                responses to be significant
                                        I    0        Other                3
                                        ?    0
```

```
Course-Section: FREN 101  0201            University of Maryland                                    Page  834
Title      ELEMENTARY FRENCH I            Baltimore County                                         JUL  2, 2009
Instructor:   WECKER, DONNA L             Spring 2009                                              Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:    24
Questionnaires: 19                        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  Mean
----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
           General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course   0  0  1  0  0  1  17  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  11  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 2 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  4.78  4.73  4.65  4.94
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 2 0 0  1  2  3  11  4.41  806/1486  4.27  4.33  4.32  4.26  4.41
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     2  0  1  0  5  1  10  4.12 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


           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
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 6 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 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


           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  5.00 ****/  72  ****  5.00  4.64  4.43  ****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned    18  0  0  0  0  0   1  5.00 ****/  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
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 18 0 0  0  0  0   1  5.00 ****/  52  ****  5.00  4.48  4.20  ****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 18  0  0  0  0  0   1  5.00 ****/  48  ****  5.00  4.40  4.11  ****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation       18  0  0  0  0  0   1  5.00 ****/  44  ****  5.00  4.73  4.71  ****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations   18  0  0  0  0  0   1  5.00 ****/  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
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 18 0 0  0  0  0   1  5.00 ****/  40  ****  5.00  4.60  4.44  ****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal    18  0  0  0  0  0   1  5.00 ****/  24  ****  5.00  4.83  4.71  ****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful      18  0  0  0  0  0   1  5.00 ****/  35  ****  5.00  4.67  4.68  ****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful       18  0  0  0  0  0   1  5.00 ****/  28  ****  5.00  4.78  4.65  ****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students     18  0  0  0  0  0   1  5.00 ****/ 382  ****  4.99  4.08  3.86  ****
```

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	6	Required for Majors	5	Graduate	0	Major	2
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	B	3						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	2	C	3	General	4	Under-grad	19	Non-major	17
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	1	D	1						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F	0	Electives	2	#### - Means there are not enough			
				P	0			responses to be significant			
				I	0	Other	4				
				?	1						

```
Course-Section: FREN 101  0301          University of Maryland                           Page  835
Title       ELEMENTARY FRENCH I         Baltimore County                                 JUL  2, 2009
Instructor: WECKER, DONNA L             Spring 2009                                       Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:    29
Questionnaires: 17                      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  Mean
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
              General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course   0   0  1  0  2  5  9  4.24  976/1576  4.15  4.34  4.30  4.11  4.24
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    0   0  0  0  1  5 11  4.59  502/1576  4.24  4.32  4.27  4.18  4.59
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   0   0  1  0  0  5 11  4.47  620/1342  4.42  4.48  4.32  4.19  4.47
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    0   1  1  0  2  6  7  4.13  977/1520  4.10  4.30  4.25  4.09  4.13
5. Did assigned readings contribute 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
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 1  2  0  0  5  9  4.19  758/1434  4.19  4.22  4.14  3.94  4.19
7. Was the grading system clearly explained            0   0  1  1  4  4  7  3.88 1159/1547  4.03  4.12  4.19  4.10  3.88
8. How many times was class cancelled                  0   0  0  0  0  1 16  4.94  281/1574  4.87  4.55  4.64  4.59  4.94
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 0 0 0  0  4  7  6  4.12  860/1554  3.93  4.13  4.10  4.01  4.12


              Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        1   0  0  0  0  5 11  4.69  638/1488  4.41  4.39  4.47  4.41  4.69
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   1   0  0  0  0  0 16  5.00    1/1493  4.75  4.78  4.73  4.65  5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 1  0  0  0  3  2 11  4.50  678/1486  4.27  4.33  4.32  4.26  4.50
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     1   0  0  0  2  3 11  4.56  625/1489  4.23  4.40  4.32  4.22  4.56
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 1 0  0  0  2  3 11  4.56  278/1277  4.35  3.99  4.03  3.91  4.56


              Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 7  0  0  0  2  1  7  4.50  445/1279  4.14  4.30  4.17  3.96  4.50
2. Were all students actively encouraged 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 the instructor encourage fair and 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 techniques successful                  9   0  0  0  1  1  6  4.63  179/ 878  4.15  4.19  4.05  3.91  4.63


                               Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned        Cum. GPA        Expected Grades        Reasons              Type                 Majors
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
  00-27     1      0.00-0.99   0        A   6       Required for Majors  11    Graduate     0     Major       0
  28-55     1      1.00-1.99   0        B   7
  56-83     3      2.00-2.99   0        C   2       General               0    Under-grad  17     Non-major  17
  84-150    2      3.00-3.49   3        D   2
  Grad.     0      3.50-4.00   5        F   0       Electives             3    #### - Means there are not enough
                                        P   0                                  responses to be significant
                                        I   0       Other                 2
                                        ?   0
```

```
Course-Section: FREN 101  0401            University of Maryland                          Page  836
Title    ELEMENTARY FRENCH I               Baltimore County                               JUL  2, 2009
Instructor:   BADAGBO, AMA S               Spring 2009                                     Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:    29
Questionnaires: 16                  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  Mean
---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
                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  4.47 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  3.93 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  3.93 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  4.46  347/1277  4.35  3.99  4.03  3.91  4.46

                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   0   0   1   0  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  4.00 ****/  24  ****  5.00  4.83  4.71  ****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful      15  0   0   0   0   1   0  4.00 ****/  35  ****  5.00  4.67  4.68  ****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful       15  0   0   0   0   1   0  4.00 ****/  28  ****  5.00  4.78  4.65  ****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students     15  0   0   0   0   1   0  4.00 ****/ 382  ****  4.99  4.08  3.86  ****


                              Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned         Cum. GPA        Expected Grades        Reasons              Type                Majors
------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
 00-27      1      0.00-0.99    0        A    7        Required for Majors  8    Graduate     0      Major       0
 28-55      4      1.00-1.99    0        B    6
 56-83      1      2.00-2.99    0        C    2        General              4    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
                                         P    0                                 responses to be significant
                                         I    0        Other                4
                                         ?    0
```

```
Course-Section: FREN 102  0101                University of Maryland                              Page  837
Title      ELEMENTARY FRENCH II               Baltimore County                                   JUL  2, 2009
Instructor:   BAZGAN, NICOLET                 Spring 2009                                        Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:    26
Questionnaires: 15                     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  Mean
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
            General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course   1   0   0  1  1  4  8  4.36   840/1576  4.55  4.34  4.30  4.11  4.36
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    1   0   1  0  1  1 11  4.50   608/1576  4.57  4.32  4.27  4.18  4.50
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   1   0   0  1  1  1 11  4.57   510/1342  4.65  4.48  4.32  4.19  4.57
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    1   5   0  1  2  2  4  4.00  1041/1520  4.39  4.30  4.25  4.09  4.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0  2   0  1  1  2  9  4.46   424/1465  4.54  4.26  4.12  4.02  4.46
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 4  0  1  1  4  5  4.18   758/1434  4.32  4.22  4.14  3.94  4.18
7. Was the grading system clearly explained            1   0   1  0  1  2 10  4.43   657/1547  4.39  4.12  4.19  4.10  4.43
8. How many times was class cancelled                  0   0   0  0  1  8  6  4.33  1262/1574  4.23  4.55  4.64  4.59  4.33
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 1 0  1  0  0  9  4  4.07   886/1554  4.38  4.13  4.10  4.01  4.07


            Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        1   0   0  1  0  2 11  4.64   694/1488  4.72  4.39  4.47  4.41  4.64
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   1   0   0  0  0  2 12  4.86   683/1493  4.90  4.78  4.73  4.65  4.86
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 1  0   0  0  1  3 10  4.64   499/1486  4.74  4.33  4.32  4.26  4.64
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     2   0   1  0  1  2  9  4.38   834/1489  4.70  4.40  4.32  4.22  4.38
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 2 1  1  0  0  1 10  4.58   268/1277  4.34  3.99  4.03  3.91  4.58


            Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 4  0   0  0  2  2  7  4.45   499/1279  4.58  4.30  4.17  3.96  4.45
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 5  0   0  0  0  1  9  4.90   260/1270  4.76  4.57  4.35  4.09  4.90
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 4 0  0  0  0  2  9  4.82   375/1269  4.69  4.38  4.35  4.09  4.82
4. Were special techniques successful                  5   1   0  1  1  2  6  4.56   204/ 878  4.48  4.19  4.05  3.91  4.56


            Laboratory
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material  14  0   0  1  0  0  0  2.00  ****/ 234  ****  5.00  4.23  4.08  ****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information 14 0  0  1  0  0  0  2.00  ****/ 240  ****  5.00  4.35  4.29  ****


            Seminar
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 14  0   0  1  0  0  0  2.00  ****/  85  ****  4.67  4.72  4.52  ****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 14 0  0  1  0  0  0  2.00  ****/  79  ****  4.67  4.69  4.52  ****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned    14  0   1  0  0  0  0  1.00  ****/  80  ****  5.00  4.61  4.55  ****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear                14  0   0  1  0  0  0  2.00  ****/ 375  5.00  4.97  4.01  3.78  ****


            Field Work
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 14  0   0  1  0  0  0  2.00  ****/  52  ****  5.00  4.48  4.20  ****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria  14 0   0  1  0  0  0  2.00  ****/  48  ****  5.00  4.40  4.11  ****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation       14  0   0  1  0  0  0  2.00  ****/  44  ****  5.00  4.73  4.71  ****


            Self  Paced
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 14  0   0  1  0  0  0  2.00  ****/  40  ****  5.00  4.60  4.44  ****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal    14  0   1  0  0  0  0  1.00  ****/  24  ****  5.00  4.83  4.71  ****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful      14  0   0  1  0  0  0  2.00  ****/  35  ****  5.00  4.67  4.68  ****


                              Frequency Distribution


Credits Earned         Cum. GPA          Expected Grades          Reasons              Type              Majors
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
 00-27     3      0.00-0.99   0        A   8       Required for Majors  10      Graduate      0        Major       0
 28-55     4      1.00-1.99   0        B   3
 56-83     2      2.00-2.99   2        C   1       General               2      Under-grad   15        Non-major  15
 84-150    1      3.00-3.49   2        D   0
 Grad.     0      3.50-4.00   5        F   0       Electives             0      #### - Means there are not enough
                                       P   0                                          responses to be significant
```

```
I    0              Other                1
?    0
```

```
Course-Section: FREN 102  0201              University of Maryland                              Page  838
Title      ELEMENTARY FRENCH II              Baltimore County                                   JUL  2, 2009
Instructor:  BAZGAN, NICOLET                 Spring 2009                                        Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:     9
Questionnaires:  7                      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  Mean
-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
              General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course    1   0  0  0  0  1  5  4.83  219/1576  4.55  4.34  4.30  4.11  4.83
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals     2   0  0  0  0  1  4  4.80  222/1576  4.57  4.32  4.27  4.18  4.80
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals    1   0  0  0  0  1  5  4.83  221/1342  4.65  4.48  4.32  4.19  4.83
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals     1   2  0  0  0  2  2  4.50  511/1520  4.39  4.30  4.25  4.09  4.50
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 2   1  0  0  0  1  3  4.75  206/1465  4.54  4.26  4.12  4.02  4.75
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 1 1  0  0  0  1  4  4.80  151/1434  4.32  4.22  4.14  3.94  4.80
7. Was the grading system clearly explained             1   0  0  0  0  1  5  4.83  167/1547  4.39  4.12  4.19  4.10  4.83
8. How many times was class cancelled                   1   0  0  0  0  2  4  4.67  911/1574  4.23  4.55  4.64  4.59  4.67
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 3 0  0  0  0  1  3  4.75  194/1554  4.38  4.13  4.10  4.01  4.75


              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  5.00    1/1493  4.90  4.78  4.73  4.65  5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 2   0  0  0  0  0  5  5.00    1/1486  4.74  4.33  4.32  4.26  5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned      2   0  0  0  0  0  5  5.00    1/1489  4.70  4.40  4.32  4.22  5.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 2  1  0  0  0  1  3  4.75  159/1277  4.34  3.99  4.03  3.91  4.75


              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


                              Frequency Distribution

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

```
Course-Section: FREN 102  0301                University of Maryland                              Page  839
Title       ELEMENTARY FRENCH II               Baltimore County                                 JUL  2, 2009
Instructor:  DIGEON, LANDRY                      Spring 2009                                     Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:     22
Questionnaires:  12                     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  Mean
------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

               General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course   0   0  0  0  1  1 10  4.75   301/1576  4.55  4.34  4.30  4.11  4.75
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    0   0  0  0  1  2  9  4.67   392/1576  4.57  4.32  4.27  4.18  4.67
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   0   0  0  0  1  0 11  4.83   221/1342  4.65  4.48  4.32  4.19  4.83
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    1   0  0  0  0  3  8  4.73   281/1520  4.39  4.30  4.25  4.09  4.73
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0  2  0  0  1  1  8  4.70   244/1465  4.54  4.26  4.12  4.02  4.70
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 1  0  1  2  2  6  4.18   758/1434  4.32  4.22  4.14  3.94  4.18
7. Was the grading system clearly explained            0   0  0  1  1  4  6  4.25   838/1547  4.39  4.12  4.19  4.10  4.25
8. How many times was class cancelled                  0   0  0  0  5  5  2  3.75  1540/1574  4.23  4.55  4.64  4.59  3.75
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 3 0 0  0  0  5  4  4.44   477/1554  4.38  4.13  4.10  4.01  4.44


               Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures 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 the instructor seem interested in the subject   3   0  0  0  0  0  9  5.00     1/1493  4.90  4.78  4.73  4.65  5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 3  0  0  0  0  1  8  4.89   191/1486  4.74  4.33  4.32  4.26  4.89
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     3   0  0  0  0  1  8  4.89   217/1489  4.70  4.40  4.32  4.22  4.89
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 3 0 0  0  3  1  5  4.22   560/1277  4.34  3.99  4.03  3.91  4.22


               Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 5  0  0  0  0  3  4  4.57   400/1279  4.58  4.30  4.17  3.96  4.57
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 5  0  0  0  0  1  6  4.86   307/1270  4.76  4.57  4.35  4.09  4.86
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 5 0 0  0  0  1  6  4.86   332/1269  4.69  4.38  4.35  4.09  4.86
4. Were special techniques successful                  5   0  0  0  1  1  5  4.57   197/ 878  4.48  4.19  4.05  3.91  4.57


               Seminar
5. Were criteria for grading made clear                9   0  0  0  0  0  3  5.00     1/ 375  5.00  4.97  4.01  3.78  5.00


               Field Work
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 11  0  0  1  0  0  0  2.00  ****/  52  ****  5.00  4.48  4.20  ****


               Self  Paced
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students     9   0  0  0  0  0  3  5.00     1/ 382  5.00  4.99  4.08  3.86  5.00
```

Frequency Distribution

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

```
Course-Section: FREN 102  0401            University of Maryland                              Page  840
Title      ELEMENTARY FRENCH II            Baltimore County                                  JUL  2, 2009
Instructor:   GUEYE, SOKHNA F              Spring 2009                                       Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:    28
Questionnaires: 23                   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 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  4.90  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  4.74  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  4.70  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  4.34  3.99  4.03  3.91  3.79


          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


          Laboratory
 2. Were you provided with adequate background information 21  0   1   0   1   0   0  2.00 ****/ 240  ****  5.00  4.35  4.29  ****
 4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance            21  1   0   0   1   0   0  3.00 ****/ 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  4.00 ****/  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  4.50 ****/ 326  ****  4.99  4.03  3.64  ****


          Self  Paced
 1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned  20  0   1   0   1   0   1  3.00 ****/  40  ****  5.00  4.60  4.44  ****
 2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal       21  1   0   0   0   1   0  4.00 ****/  24  ****  5.00  4.83  4.71  ****
 3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful         21  1   0   0   1   0   0  3.00 ****/  35  ****  5.00  4.67  4.68  ****
 4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful          21  1   0   0   1   0   0  3.00 ****/  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                    University of Maryland                         Page  840
Title        ELEMENTARY FRENCH II                    Baltimore County                         JUL  2, 2009
Instructor:  GUEYE, SOKHNA F                          Spring 2009                             Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:      28
Questionnaires:  23                        Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire


                                             Frequency Distribution


Credits Earned          Cum. GPA          Expected Grades              Reasons                    Type                      Majors
-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
 00-27     0        0.00-0.99    0        A   12        Required for Majors  13     Graduate      0        Major        0
 28-55     1        1.00-1.99    0        B    3
 56-83     4        2.00-2.99    3        C    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
                                         P    0                                    responses to be significant
                                         I    0        Other                 3
                                         ?    1
```

```
Course-Section: FREN 103  0101            University of Maryland                         Page  841
Title       INT REV ELEM FRENCH           Baltimore County                           JUL  2, 2009
Instructor:  EL OMARI, SAMIR              Spring 2009                                 Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:     18
Questionnaires: 16                     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  Mean
-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
           General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course    0   0   0   1   2   5   8  4.25   952/1576  4.25  4.34  4.30  4.11  4.25
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals     0   0   1   0   5   6   4  3.75  1311/1576  3.75  4.32  4.27  4.18  3.75
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals    0   0   0   1   2   4   9  4.31   788/1342  4.31  4.48  4.32  4.19  4.31
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals     0   3   1   1   3   4   4  3.69  1285/1520  3.69  4.30  4.25  4.09  3.69
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0   1   0   1   1   9   4  4.07   818/1465  4.07  4.26  4.12  4.02  4.07
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 0   1   1   5   5   4  3.63  1162/1434  3.63  4.22  4.14  3.94  3.63
7. Was the grading system clearly explained             1   0   2   0   5   2   6  3.67  1276/1547  3.67  4.12  4.19  4.10  3.67
8. How many times was class cancelled                   0   0   0   0   0  11   5  4.31  1279/1574  4.31  4.55  4.64  4.59  4.31
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 1 0  1   0   2   6   6  4.07   892/1554  4.07  4.13  4.10  4.01  4.07

           Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared         0   0   0   1   3   4   8  4.19  1160/1488  4.19  4.39  4.47  4.41  4.19
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject    0   0   0   0   0   1  15  4.94   390/1493  4.94  4.78  4.73  4.65  4.94
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 1   0   1   0   5   2   7  3.93  1168/1486  3.93  4.33  4.32  4.26  3.93
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned      0   0   0   1   3   4   8  4.19  1005/1489  4.19  4.40  4.32  4.22  4.19
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 0  0   1   0   3   3   9  4.19   593/1277  4.19  3.99  4.03  3.91  4.19

           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 14   1   0   0   0   0   1  5.00  ****/  85  ****  4.67  4.72  4.52  ****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 15  0   0   0   0   0   1  5.00  ****/  79  ****  4.67  4.69  4.52  ****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear                 11   1   0   0   0   0   4  5.00     1/ 375  5.00  4.97  4.01  3.78  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
```

                                              Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned   Cum. GPA   Expected Grades   Reasons   Type   Majors
----
 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   B   5
 56-83   2   2.00-2.99   2   C   4   General   2   Under-grad   16   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 there are not enough
                                            P   0   responses to be significant
                                            I   0   Other   5
                                            ?   0

```
Course-Section: FREN 201  0101            University of Maryland                        Page  842
Title          INTERMEDIATE FRENCH I      Baltimore County                              JUL  2, 2009
Instructor:    BADAGBO, YAWO              Spring 2009                                   Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:     15
Questionnaires: 11                        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  Mean
--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
              General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course    1  0  2  1  3  2  2  3.10 1528/1576  3.07  4.34  4.30  4.35  3.10
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals     1  0  1  4  3  1  1  2.70 1555/1576  3.01  4.32  4.27  4.32  2.70
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals    1  0  0  2  4  2  2  3.40 1249/1342  3.60  4.48  4.32  4.41  3.40
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals     1  3  2  1  3  0  1  2.57 1507/1520  3.24  4.30  4.25  4.26  2.57
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 1  1  0  4  1  1  3  3.33 1317/1465  3.52  4.26  4.12  4.09  3.33
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 1 4 1  1  1  2  1  3.17 1339/1434  3.37  4.22  4.14  4.06  3.17
7. Was the grading system clearly explained             1  0  1  3  3  1  2  3.00 1459/1547  3.14  4.12  4.19  4.22  3.00
8. How many times was class cancelled                   1  0  0  0  0  3  7  4.70  866/1574  4.80  4.55  4.64  4.62  4.70
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 3 0 0  6  1  1  0  2.38 1534/1554  2.52  4.13  4.10  4.05  2.38


              Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared         1  0  4  2  2  1  1  2.30 1481/1488  2.90  4.39  4.47  4.44  2.30
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject    1  0  0  1  2  3  4  4.00 1411/1493  3.89  4.78  4.73  4.75  4.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 1  0  1  7  0  1  1  2.40 1477/1486  2.82  4.33  4.32  4.29  2.40
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned      1  0  3  2  3  0  2  2.60 1462/1489  3.02  4.40  4.32  4.31  2.60
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 1 3 2  3  1  1  0  2.14 1263/1277  2.40  3.99  4.03  4.01  2.14


              Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute 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
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 5  0  0  1  1  3  1  3.67 1091/1270  3.43  4.57  4.35  4.30  3.67
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 5 0 1  3  1  1  0  2.33 1253/1269  2.77  4.38  4.35  4.29  2.33
4. Were special techniques successful                   5  1  0  1  2  1  1  3.40  742/ 878  2.70  4.19  4.05  3.92  3.40


                              Frequency Distribution

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

```
Course-Section: FREN 201  0201            University of Maryland                          Page  843
Title        INTERMEDIATE FRENCH I           Baltimore County                           JUL  2, 2009
Instructor:  BADAGBO, YAWO                     Spring 2009                               Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:    22
Questionnaires: 11                    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  Mean
------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
             General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course   0   0   1   0   4   4   2  3.55 1431/1576  3.07  4.34  4.30  4.35  3.55
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    0   0   2   2   2   3   2  3.09 1515/1576  3.01  4.32  4.27  4.32  3.09
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   0   0   1   1   1   5   3  3.73 1146/1342  3.60  4.48  4.32  4.41  3.73
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    0   5   1   0   0   2   3  4.00 1041/1520  3.24  4.30  4.25  4.26  4.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to 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 written assignments contribute to what you learned 1 4   0   0   3   2   1  3.67 1142/1434  3.37  4.22  4.14  4.06  3.67
7. Was the grading system clearly explained            0   1   1   1   2   3   3  3.60 1303/1547  3.14  4.12  4.19  4.22  3.60
8. How many times was class cancelled                  0   0   0   1   0   0  10  4.73  813/1574  4.80  4.55  4.64  4.62  4.73
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 4 0  1   2   1   3   0  2.86 1493/1554  2.52  4.13  4.10  4.05  2.86

             Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures 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 the instructor seem interested in 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 lecture material presented and explained clearly 1  0   1   0   1   7   1  3.70 1273/1486  2.82  4.33  4.32  4.29  3.70
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     1   0   1   2   1   3   3  3.50 1313/1489  3.02  4.40  4.32  4.31  3.50
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 2 4  1   1   1   0   2  3.20 1119/1277  2.40  3.99  4.03  4.01  3.20

             Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute 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 all students actively encouraged to participate 8  0   0   0   0   3   0  4.00  928/1270  3.43  4.57  4.35  4.30  4.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and 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 special techniques successful                  8   1   0   0   2   0   0  3.00 ****/ 878  2.70  4.19  4.05  3.92  ****

             Field Work
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities 10  0   0   0   0   0   1  5.00 ****/ 326  5.00  4.99  4.03  4.43  ****

             Self  Paced
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students     10  0   0   0   0   0   1  5.00 ****/ 382  5.00  4.99  4.08  4.39  ****

                                 Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned        Cum. GPA        Expected Grades        Reasons              Type                Majors
------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
 00-27      2      0.00-0.99   0        A    3       Required for Majors  8    Graduate      0      Major        1
 28-55      0      1.00-1.99   0        B    3
 56-83      0      2.00-2.99   2        C    2       General              0    Under-grad   11      Non-major   10
 84-150     2      3.00-3.49   1        D    0
 Grad.      0      3.50-4.00   1        F    0       Electives            1    #### - Means there are not enough
                                        P    0                                responses to be significant
                                        I    0       Other                2
                                        ?    1
```

```
Course-Section: FREN 201  0301              University of Maryland                              Page  844
Title        INTERMEDIATE FRENCH I          Baltimore County                                   JUL  2, 2009
Instructor:  DIALLO, MAMADOU                Spring 2009                                         Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:     23
Questionnaires: 14                       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  Mean
----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
             General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course    2   0   2   3   3   3   1  2.83 1554/1576  3.07  4.34  4.30  4.35  2.83
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals     2   0   1   2   4   2   3  3.33 1463/1576  3.01  4.32  4.27  4.32  3.33
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals    3   0   1   1   3   3   3  3.55 1199/1342  3.60  4.48  4.32  4.41  3.55
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals     2   5   0   1   2   1   3  3.86 1199/1520  3.24  4.30  4.25  4.26  3.86
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 2   2   2   1   1   3   3  3.40 1292/1465  3.52  4.26  4.12  4.09  3.40
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 2 5   1   2   2   0   2  3.00 1380/1434  3.37  4.22  4.14  4.06  3.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained             2   0   4   0   1   5   2  3.08 1451/1547  3.14  4.12  4.19  4.22  3.08
8. How many times was class cancelled                   3   0   0   0   0   0  11  5.00    1/1574  4.80  4.55  4.64  4.62  5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 3 0  4   1   3   2   1  2.55 1522/1554  2.52  4.13  4.10  4.05  2.55


             Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared         3   0   3   2   2   3   1  2.73 1471/1488  2.90  4.39  4.47  4.44  2.73
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject    3   0   1   1   2   3   4  3.73 1457/1493  3.89  4.78  4.73  4.75  3.73
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 3   0   2   3   4   1   1  2.64 1463/1486  2.82  4.33  4.32  4.29  2.64
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned      3   0   3   1   3   2   2  2.91 1440/1489  3.02  4.40  4.32  4.31  2.91
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 3 2  6   0   2   1   0  1.78 1271/1277  2.40  3.99  4.03  4.01  1.78


             Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 6   0   3   1   2   1   1  2.50 1249/1279  2.44  4.30  4.17  4.14  2.50
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 6   0   2   1   3   1   1  2.75 1238/1270  3.43  4.57  4.35  4.30  2.75
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 6  0   0   3   2   3   0  3.00 1210/1269  2.77  4.38  4.35  4.29  3.00
4. Were special techniques successful                   6   2   3   1   1   1   0  2.00  862/ 878  2.70  4.19  4.05  3.92  2.00

             Seminar
5. Were criteria for grading made clear                12   0   0   0   0   0   2  5.00 ****/ 375  5.00  4.97  4.01  4.21  ****


             Field Work
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities 10   0   0   0   0   0   4  5.00    1/ 326  5.00  4.99  4.03  4.43  5.00


             Self  Paced
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students      8   0   0   0   0   0   6  5.00    1/ 382  5.00  4.99  4.08  4.39  5.00


                                       Frequency Distribution

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

| | | | Frequencies | | | | | Instructor | | 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	4	3	6	2	3.12	1526/1576	3.07	4.34	4.30	4.35	3.12
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	2	7	3	4	3.41	1433/1576	3.01	4.32	4.27	4.32	3.41
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	1	4	5	6	3.82	1101/1342	3.60	4.48	4.32	4.41	3.82
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	9	1	3	2	0	1	2.57	1507/1520	3.24	4.30	4.25	4.26	2.57
5. Did assigned readings contribute 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. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	10	1	0	1	1	3	3.83	1045/1434	3.37	4.22	4.14	4.06	3.83
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	1	1	1	7	1	5	3.53	1333/1547	3.14	4.12	4.19	4.22	3.53
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	1	15	4.94	328/1574	4.80	4.55	4.64	4.62	4.94
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	2	1	7	1	1	2.83	1496/1554	2.52	4.13	4.10	4.05	2.83
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	1	2	7	3	2	3.20	1433/1488	2.90	4.39	4.47	4.44	3.20
2. Did the instructor seem interested in 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 lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	2	3	6	2	2	2.93	1437/1486	2.82	4.33	4.32	4.29	2.93
4. Did the lectures 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 audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	2	4	1	4	1	1	2.45	1243/1277	2.40	3.99	4.03	4.01	2.45
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	12	0	3	1	1	0	0	1.60	1276/1279	2.44	4.30	4.17	4.14	1.60
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	12	0	0	3	0	1	1	3.00	1208/1270	3.43	4.57	4.35	4.30	3.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	12	0	3	0	2	0	0	1.80	1267/1269	2.77	4.38	4.35	4.29	1.80
Seminar														
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	0	0	0	0	0	0	17	5.00	1/ 375	5.00	4.97	4.01	4.21	5.00
Field Work														
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	1	0	0	0	0	0	16	5.00	1/ 326	5.00	4.99	4.03	4.43	5.00
Self Paced														
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	0	0	0	0	0	0	17	5.00	1/ 382	5.00	4.99	4.08	4.39	5.00

Frequency Distribution

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

```
Course-Section: FREN 201  0501            University of Maryland                        Page  846
Title      INTERMEDIATE FRENCH I          Baltimore County                             JUL  2, 2009
Instructor:    BADAGBO, YAWO              Spring 2009                                   Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:    24
Questionnaires: 19                  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  Mean
---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
            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 ****


                                   Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned        Cum. GPA      Expected Grades         Reasons               Type                 Majors
---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
 00-27     2       0.00-0.99  0       A   7      Required for Majors  12    Graduate      0    Major         1
 28-55     2       1.00-1.99  0       B   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
                                      P   0                                 responses to be significant
                                      I   0      Other                 4
                                      ?   0
```

```
Course-Section: FREN 202  0101             University of Maryland                              Page  847
Title        INTERMEDIATE FRENCH II          Baltimore County                              JUL  2, 2009
Instructor:  EL OMARI, SAMIR                 Spring 2009                                   Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:     12
Questionnaires:  8                       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  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  4.32  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  4.48  4.32  4.41  4.88
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals   0   2   1   0   0   2   3  4.00 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  3.00 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  3.63 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  4.63  387/1547  4.63  4.12  4.19  4.22  4.63
8. How many times was class cancelled                 0   0   0   0   0   7   1  4.13 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   2  4.13  849/1554  4.13  4.13  4.10  4.05  4.13

          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  4.03  4.01  4.00

          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  4.57  4.35  4.30  4.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 3 0  0   0   2   1   2  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   1  4.00  464/ 878  4.00  4.19  4.05  3.92  4.00

          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  3.00 ****/ 240  ****  5.00  4.35  4.47  ****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 7 0  0   0   1   0   0  3.00 ****/ 229  ****  5.00  4.51  4.65  ****

          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  3.00 ****/  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  4.33  4.97  4.01  4.21  4.33

          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  5.00 ****/  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

          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
```

```
                                        Frequency Distribution


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

```
Course-Section: FREN 301  0101            University of Maryland                         Page 848
Title       ADVANCED FRENCH I             Baltimore County                               JUL  2, 2009
Instructor: DE VERNEIL, MAR               Spring 2009                                     Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:    17
Questionnaires: 16                  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  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


                                    Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned        Cum. GPA         Expected 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        B    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
                                        P    0                                responses to be significant
                                        I    0       Other                8
                                        ?    0
```

```
Course-Section: FREN 302  0101                   University of Maryland                                      Page  849
Title      ADVANCED FRENCH II                      Baltimore County                                         JUL  2, 2009
Instructor:  BAZGAN, NICOLET                          Spring 2009                                           Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:     18
Questionnaires:  16                          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  Mean
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
                General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course   0   0   0   0   3   6   7  4.25  952/1576  4.25  4.34  4.30  4.30  4.25
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    0   0   0   1   3   8   4  3.94 1207/1576  3.94  4.32  4.27  4.28  3.94
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   0   0   0   1   1   8   6  4.19  886/1342  4.19  4.48  4.32  4.30  4.19
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    0   0   0   0   2   8   6  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   1   2   5   7  4.20  708/1465  4.20  4.26  4.12  4.09  4.20
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 1 0  0   0   1   7   7  4.40  524/1434  4.40  4.22  4.14  4.15  4.40
7. Was the grading system clearly explained            1   0   0   0   2   6   7  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   2  13  4.87  547/1574  4.87  4.55  4.64  4.61  4.87
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 0 0  0   1   2   9   4  4.00  924/1554  4.00  4.13  4.10  4.09  4.00


                Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        1   0   0   0   1   4  10  4.60  750/1488  4.60  4.39  4.47  4.47  4.60
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   1   0   0   0   0   2  13  4.87  658/1493  4.87  4.78  4.73  4.70  4.87
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 1  0   0   0   3   6   6  4.20 1003/1486  4.20  4.33  4.32  4.32  4.20
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     1   0   0   0   2   6   7  4.33  888/1489  4.33  4.40  4.32  4.34  4.33
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 1 0  0   1   0   6   8  4.40  404/1277  4.40  3.99  4.03  4.11  4.40


                Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 8  0   0   0   1   4   3  4.25  665/1279  4.25  4.30  4.17  4.20  4.25
2. Were all students actively encouraged 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 the instructor 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 special techniques successful                  8   1   0   1   0   3   3  4.14  425/ 878  4.14  4.19  4.05  4.09  4.14

                Seminar
5. Were criteria for grading made clear               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 conferences help you carry out field activities 9   0   0   0   0   0   7  5.00    1/ 326  5.00  4.99  4.03  4.23  5.00


                Self  Paced
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students     9   0   0   0   0   0   7  5.00    1/ 382  5.00  4.99  4.08  4.24  5.00


                                          Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned        Cum. GPA         Expected Grades          Reasons                  Type                 Majors
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
 00-27      4      0.00-0.99    0       A   10       Required for Majors   0      Graduate     1       Major       1
 28-55      2      1.00-1.99    0       B    4
 56-83      2      2.00-2.99    1       C    1       General               1      Under-grad  15       Non-major  15
 84-150     2      3.00-3.49    3       D    0
 Grad.      1      3.50-4.00    8       F    0       Electives             2      #### - Means there are not enough
                                        P    0                                    responses to be significant
                                        I    0       Other                11
                                        ?    0
```

```
Course-Section: FREN 310  0101            University of Maryland                                    Page  850
Title       INTERCONNECTIONS: LANG          Baltimore County                                       JUL  2, 2009
Instructor:  MCCRAY, STANLEY                   Spring 2009                                         Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:    19
Questionnaires:  11                     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  Mean
-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
             General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course    0   0  0  0  2  1  8  4.55  582/1576   4.55  4.34  4.30  4.30  4.55
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals     0   0  0  0  1  1  9  4.73  313/1576   4.73  4.32  4.27  4.28  4.73
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals    0   0  0  0  0  0 11  5.00    1/1342   5.00  4.48  4.32  4.30  5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals     0   0  0  0  0  2  9  4.82  191/1520   4.82  4.30  4.25  4.25  4.82
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0   0  0  0  2  1  8  4.55  341/1465   4.55  4.26  4.12  4.09  4.55
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 0  0  0  2  1  8  4.55  368/1434   4.55  4.22  4.14  4.15  4.55
7. Was the grading system clearly explained             0   0  0  1  1  1  8  4.45  608/1547   4.45  4.12  4.19  4.21  4.45
8. How many times was class cancelled                   0   0  0  0  0  8  3  4.27 1309/1574   4.27  4.55  4.64  4.61  4.27
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 1 1  0  0  1  3  5  4.44  477/1554   4.44  4.13  4.10  4.09  4.44


             Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared         1   0  0  0  2  3  5  4.30 1072/1488   4.30  4.39  4.47  4.47  4.30
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject    1   0  0  0  0  3  7  4.70 1017/1493   4.70  4.78  4.73  4.70  4.70
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 1   0  0  0  2  3  5  4.30  922/1486   4.30  4.33  4.32  4.32  4.30
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned      1   0  0  0  1  2  7  4.60  579/1489   4.60  4.40  4.32  4.34  4.60
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 2  1  0  0  1  4  3  4.25  533/1277   4.25  3.99  4.03  4.11  4.25


             Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute 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 all students actively encouraged 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 the instructor encourage fair and 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 special techniques successful                   6   1  0  0  0  1  3  4.75  139/ 878   4.75  4.19  4.05  4.09  4.75


                                  Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned        Cum. GPA         Expected Grades          Reasons              Type               Majors
-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
  00-27      3     0.00-0.99    0       A   10      Required for Majors  1      Graduate     0      Major       4
  28-55      1     1.00-1.99    0       B    0                                                       
  56-83      0     2.00-2.99    1       C    0      General              2      Under-grad  11      Non-major   7
  84-150     2     3.00-3.49    0       D    0
  Grad.      0     3.50-4.00    5       F    0      Electives            0      #### - Means there are not enough
                                        P    0                                 responses to be significant
                                        I    0      Other                7
                                        ?    1
```

```
Course-Section: FREN 320  0101            University of Maryland                              Page  851
Title       INTERCONNECTIONS:TRADE          Baltimore County                                JUL  2, 2009
Instructor:    DE VERNEIL, MAR              Spring 2009                                     Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:     15
Questionnaires:  12                    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  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


                              Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned        Cum. GPA         Expected Grades         Reasons                Type               Majors
-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
  00-27     5        0.00-0.99   1        A    8         Required for Majors   1    Graduate     0      Major       4
  28-55     0        1.00-1.99   0        B    2
  56-83     1        2.00-2.99   1        C    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 significant
                                          I    0         Other                 7
                                          ?    0
```

```
Course-Section: FREN 339  0101                University of Maryland                                    Page  852
Title      EXPLORATION IN IDEAS                Baltimore County                                         JUL  2, 2009
Instructor:   FATIH, ZAKARIA                   Spring 2009                                              Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:     10
Questionnaires:  8                        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  Mean
--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
               General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course   0   0  0  0  1  4  3  4.25  952/1576  4.25  4.34  4.30  4.30  4.25
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    0   0  0  1  3  4  0  3.38 1448/1576  3.38  4.32  4.27  4.28  3.38
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   0   0  0  2  1  5  0  3.38 1252/1342  3.38  4.48  4.32  4.30  3.38
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    0   0  1  1  0  4  2  3.63 1320/1520  3.63  4.30  4.25  4.25  3.63
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0   0  0  0  1  0  7  4.75  206/1465  4.75  4.26  4.12  4.09  4.75
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 1 1  1  1  3  1  3.29 1305/1434  3.29  4.22  4.14  4.15  3.29
7. Was the grading system clearly explained            0   0  1  1  4  0  2  3.13 1443/1547  3.13  4.12  4.19  4.21  3.13
8. How many times was class cancelled                  0   0  0  0  0  0  8  5.00    1/1574  5.00  4.55  4.64  4.61  5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 1 0 0  0  2  4  1  3.86 1096/1554  3.86  4.13  4.10  4.09  3.86

               Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        1   0  0  0  1  3  3  4.29 1087/1488  4.29  4.39  4.47  4.47  4.29
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   1   0  0  0  0  0  7  5.00    1/1493  5.00  4.78  4.73  4.70  5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 1  0  0  0  1  5  1  4.00 1101/1486  4.00  4.33  4.32  4.32  4.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     1   0  0  0  1  1  5  4.57  614/1489  4.57  4.40  4.32  4.34  4.57
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 1 6 1  0  0  0  0  1.00 ****/1277  ****  3.99  4.03  4.11  ****

               Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 4  0  1  0  2  1  0  2.75 1229/1279  2.75  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  4.25  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 Work
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned  7  0  1  0  0  0  0  1.00 ****/  52  ****  5.00  4.48  4.37  ****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation 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  Paced
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned  7  0  1  0  0  0  0  1.00 ****/  40  ****  5.00  4.60  4.83  ****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal      7  0  0  0  1  0  0  3.00 ****/  24  ****  5.00  4.83  4.89  ****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful        7  0  0  0  1  0  0  3.00 ****/  35  ****  5.00  4.67  5.00  ****
```

```
                              Frequency Distribution

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

```
Course-Section: FREN 410  0101              University of Maryland                              Page  853
Title     STUDIES FRENCH LANG LI             Baltimore County                               JUL  2, 2009
Instructor:   KA, OMAR                        Spring 2009                                    Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:    12
Questionnaires:  9                     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  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  5.00 ****/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 2  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  955/1547  4.13  4.12  4.19  4.24  4.13
8. How many times was class cancelled                 2   0  0  0  0  6  1  4.14 1398/1574  4.14  4.55  4.64  4.69  4.14
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 2  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   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  ****


                                    Frequency Distribution


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