Course-Section: FREN 101 01

Elementary French I

Title Instructor: Badagbo,Ama

Enrollment: 30 Questionnaires: 19

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2010

Page 738 JUN 28, 2010 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Scheman Sche		Questions						Fre	equer 2	ncies 3	4	5	Inst Mean	tructor Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean		Level Mean	Sect Mean
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course 2 0 0 1 0 5 11 4.53 \$62,1447 4.33 4.31 4.31 4.18 4.52 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals 3 0 0 0 0 0 5 8 8 4.81 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals 3 0 0 0 0 0 5 5 11 4.81 2. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals 3 0 0 0 0 0 5 5 11 4.81 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals 3 0 0 0 0 0 5 5 11 4.81 3. Did the revaluations reflect the expected goals 3 0 0 0 0 0 5 5 11 4.81 4. Did dassigned readings contribute to what you learned 3 1 0 0 0 1 1 2 12 4.73 4. Did the classing this property of the property of th			Genera	 l															
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals 3 0 0 0 0 0 3 13 4.81 222/1241 4.84 4.48 4.38 4.25 4.15 4.69 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 3 1 0 0 1 2 12 4.73 187/1358 4.54 4.26 4.11 4.03 4.73 4.75	1. Did you	ı gain new			n this course	2	0	0	1	0	5	11	4.53	562/1447	4.43	4.31	4.31	4.18	4.53
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 7. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 8. Did assigned reading system clearly explained 8. How many times was class cancelled 8. How many times was class cla	2. Did the	instruct	or make clear	the exp	pected goals	6	0	0	0	0	5	8	4.62	413/1447	4.69	4.34	4.27	4.30	4.62
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 5 d. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 7 d. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 8 d.	3. Did the	e exam que	stions reflect	the ex	spected goals	3	0	0	0	0	3	13	4.81	222/1241	4.84	4.48	4.33	4.25	4.81
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 7. Was the grading system clearly explained 8. How many times was class cancelled 5. 0 0 0 0 1 3 1 10 4.50 392/1316 4.44 4.77 4.14 3.99 4.50 8. How many times was class cancelled 5. 0 0 0 0 0 1 3 6 4.50 1189/1447 4.62 4.66 4.69 4.68 4.36 8. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 8. 0 0 0 0 0 2 2 4 5 4.26 1189/1447 4.62 4.66 4.69 4.68 4.36 8. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 8. 0 0 0 0 2 2 3 10 4.53 755/1387 4.68 4.45 4.66 4.66 4.65 2. Did the instructor's lectures well prepared 8. 0 0 0 0 1 2 3 10 4.53 755/1387 4.68 4.45 4.46 4.46 4.53 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 8. 0 0 0 1 2 3 10 4.53 755/1387 4.68 4.45 4.46 4.46 4.53 2. Did the instructor seem interested and explained clearly 4. 0 0 0 0 2 2 1 13 4.75 855/1387 4.68 4.45 4.74 4.75 4.75 4.75 4.75 4.75 4.75	4. Did oth	er evalua	tions reflect	the exp	pected goals	3	0	0	0	0	5	11	4.69	292/1402	4.78	4.36	4.24	4.15	4.69
7. Was the grading system clearly explained 8. How many times was class cancelled 8. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 8. 0 0 0 0 2 4 5 4.26 611/1434 4.28 4.12 4.00 4.10 4.27 4.00 4.27 4.00 4.00 4.00 4.00 4.00 4.00 4.00 4.0	5. Did ass	signed rea	dings contrib	ite to v	what you learned	3	1	0	0	1	2	12	4.73	187/1358	4.54	4.26	4.11	4.03	4.73
8. How many times was class cancelled How mould you grade the overall teaching effectiveness S								-	-		_		4.50	392/1316	4.44		4.14	3.99	4.50
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 8 8 0 0 0 0 2 4 5 5 4.27 611/1434 4.28 4.12 4.10 4.00 4.07 1.20 1.20 1.20 1.20 1.20 1.20 1.20 1.20					ined		-	-	-	_	-								
Lecture 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 2. Did the instructor's seem interested in the subject 3 0 0 0 1 2 13 4.75 859/1387 4.68 4.45 4.46 4.46 4.51 2. Did the instructor's committeested and explained clearly 4 0 0 0 2 2 4 9 4.47 663/1386 4.59 4.38 4.73 4.71 4.75 2. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 4 0 0 0 2 2 4 9 4.47 663/1386 4.59 4.35 4.32 4.47 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 4 0 0 0 2 2 11 4.60 549/1380 4.63 4.33 4.32 4.31 4.60 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 2 0 1 0 2 4 10 4.29 447/1193 4.38 4.02 4.02 3.99 4.29 Discussion 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 2. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 3. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 4. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 5. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 6. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 7. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 8. Were special techniques successful 8. Laboratory 1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material 9. Did the lab increase understanding of the material 18 0 0 0 0 1 1 5.00 ***/ 189 *** 3.00 4.34 4.18 *** 2. Were you provided with adequate background information 18 0 0 0 0 1 1 0 4.00 ***/ 180 *** 4.00 4.34 4.11 *** 3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 18 0 0 0 0 1 1 0 4.00 ***/ 180 *** 4.70 4.25 4.26 *** Field Work 9. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 18 0 0 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0		-				_													
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	9. How wou	ıld you gr	ade the overa	ll teach	ning effectiveness	8	0	0	0	2	4	5	4.27	611/1434	4.28	4.12	4.10	4.10	4.27
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 3 0 0 0 0 1 2 13 4.75 859/1387 4.86 4.78 4.73 4.71 4.75 1.83 1.84s lecture material presented and explained clearly 4 0 0 0 0 2 2 11 4.60 65. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 4 0 0 0 0 2 2 11 4.60 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 2 0 1 0 2 4 10 4.29 447/1193 4.38 4.02 4.03 3.99 4.29 Discussion 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 11 0 0 0 1 3 4 4.38 487/1172 4.15 4.26 4.15 3.95 4.38 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 10 0 0 0 0 1 3 4 4.38 679/1170 4.39 4.17 4.35 4.18 4.67 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 11 0 0 0 1 3 4 4.38 679/1170 4.39 4.17 4.38 4.17 4.38 4. Were special techniques successful 12 0 0 0 1 3 4 4.31 867/1170 4.39 4.17 4.39 4.17 4.38 4. Were special techniques successful 12 0 0 0 1 3 4 4.31 867/1170 4.39 4.17 4.38 4.17 4.38 4. Were pour provided with adequate background information 18 0 0 0 0 0 1 5 0.0 ***/ 189 **** 3.00 4.34 4.18 **** 2. Were you provided with adequate background information 18 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0			Lecture	9															
1. Nas lecture material presented and explained clearly 4 0 0 0 0 2 4 9 4.47 663/1386 4.59 4.35 4.32 4.32 4.31 4.60 5.0 Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 2 0 1 0 0 2 4 10 4.29 447/1193 4.36 4.32 4.32 4.31 4.60 5.0 Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 2 0 1 0 0 2 4 10 4.29 447/1193 4.38 4.02 4.02 3.99 4.29 Discussion Discuss	1. Were th	ne instruc	tor's lectures	s well p	prepared	4	0	0	0	2	3	10	4.53	755/1387	4.68	4.45	4.46	4.46	4.53
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 7. Discussion 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 2. O 1 0 0 0 1 3 4 4.39 447/1193 4.38 4.02 4.02 3.99 4.29 Discussion 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 4. Were special techniques successful 4. O 0 0 0 1 3 4 4.38 679/1170 4.39 4.41 4.38 4.71 4.66 4. Were special techniques successful 5. Did the lab increase understanding of the material 6. Did the lab increase understanding of the material 7. Did the lab increase understanding of the material 7. Did the lab increase understanding of the material 7. Did the lab increase understanding of the material 7. Did the lab increase understanding of the material 7. Did the lab increase understanding of the material 7. Did the lab increase understanding of the material 7. Did general 1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material 8. O 0 0 0 0 1 5 5.00 ****/ 189 **** 3.00 4.34 4.18 **** Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 8. O 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 180 **** 4.70 4.25 4.26 **** Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 8. O 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 180 **** 4.70 4.25 4.26 **** Every Distribution Field Work Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 1. Did study questions make clear the expected goal 1. Did study questions make clear the expected Grades Frequency Distribution Frequency Distribution Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades Reasons Type Majors O-27 2 0.00-0.99 1 A 9 9 8 1	2. Did the	e instruct	or seem inter	ested ir	n the subject	3	0	0	0	1	2	13	4.75	859/1387	4.86	4.78	4.73	4.71	4.75
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 2 0 1 0 2 4 10 4.29 447/1193 4.38 4.02 4.02 3.99 4.29 Discussion Did the discussions contribute to what you learned to participate to partici	3. Was lec	ture mate	rial presented	d and ex	xplained clearly	4	0	0	0	2	4	9	4.47	663/1386	4.59	4.35	4.32	4.32	4.47
Discussion Did class discussions contribute to what you learned Discussion	4. Did the	lectures	contribute to	what y	you learned	4	0	0	0	2	2	11	4.60	549/1380	4.63	4.43	4.32	4.31	4.60
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 1	5. Did aud	Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding						1	0	2	4	10	4.29	447/1193	4.38	4.02	4.02	3.99	4.29
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 1			Discus	sion															
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 10 0 0 0 0 3 6 4.67 430/1182 4.72 4.56 4.35 4.18 4.67 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 11 0 0 0 1 3 4 4.38 679/1170 4.39 4.41 4.38 4.17	1. Did cla	ss discus			what you learned	11	0	0	0	1	3	4	4.38	487/1172	4.15	4.26	4.15	3.95	4.38
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 11 0 0 0 1 3 4 4.38 679/1170 4.39 4.11 4.38 4.17 4.08 3.95 4.17 Laboratory 1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material 18 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 189 **** 3.00 4.34 4.18 **** 2. Were you provided with adequate background information 18 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 189 **** 4.00 4.34 4.18 **** 2. Were you provided with adequate background information 18 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 189 **** 4.00 4.34 4.18 **** 3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 18 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 186 **** **** 4.48 4.46 **** 5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 18 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 168 **** 4.70 4.25 4.26 **** Field Work 2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 18 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 18 **** 5.00 4.72 4.26 **** 1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 18 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 21 **** 5.00 4.72 4.50 **** 2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal 18 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 21 **** 5.00 4.72 4.50 **** 2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal 18 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 21 **** 5.00 4.72 4.50 **** 3. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 18 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0					-														
Laboratory 1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material 2. Were you provided with adequate background information 3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 18. 0 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 189 **** 3.00 4.34 4.18 **** Field Work 2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 18. 0 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 186 **** 4.70 4.25 4.26 **** Field Work 2. Did you glearly understand your evaluation criteria 18. 0 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 180 **** 4.70 4.25 4.26 **** Field Work 2. Did you glearly understand your evaluation criteria 18. 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 180 **** 4.70 4.25 4.26 **** Self Paced 1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal 18. 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 31 **** 5.00 4.72 4.50 **** 2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal 18. 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 21 **** 5.00 4.57 4.38 **** Frequency Distribution Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades Reasons Reasons Type Majors O0-27 2 0.00-0.99 1 A 9 9 Required for Majors 2 Graduate 0 Major 0 Major 0 Grad. 0 3.50-4.00 0 F 0 Electives 1 #### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant Frequency Distribution Other Other																			
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material 18 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 189 **** 3.00 4.34 4.18 **** 2. Were you provided with adequate background information 18 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 192 **** 4.00 4.34 4.31 **** 5.00 **** 5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 18 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 186 **** **** 4.48 4.46 **** 5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 18 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 186 **** 3.67 4.20 4.29 **** 5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 18 0 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 168 **** 3.67 4.20 4.29 **** 5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 18 0 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 168 **** 3.67 4.20 4.29 **** 5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 18 0 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 36 **** 4.70 4.25 4.26 **** 5. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 18 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 31 **** 5.00 4.72 4.50 **** 5. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 18 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 31 **** 5.00 4.72 4.50 **** 5. Did study questions make clear the expected goal 18 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 21 **** 5.00 4.57 4.38									0		1	4							
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material 18 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 189 **** 3.00 4.34 4.18 **** 2. Were you provided with adequate background information 18 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 192 **** 4.00 4.34 4.31 **** 5.00 **** 5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 18 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 186 **** **** 4.48 4.46 **** 5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 18 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 186 **** 3.67 4.20 4.29 **** 5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 18 0 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 168 **** 3.67 4.20 4.29 **** 5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 18 0 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 168 **** 3.67 4.20 4.29 **** 5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 18 0 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 36 **** 4.70 4.25 4.26 **** 5. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 18 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 31 **** 5.00 4.72 4.50 **** 5. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 18 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 31 **** 5.00 4.72 4.50 **** 5. Did study questions make clear the expected goal 18 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 21 **** 5.00 4.57 4.38			Laborat	ory															
2. Were you provided with adequate background information 18 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 192 **** 4.00 4.34 4.31 **** 3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 18 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 186 **** **** 4.48 4.46 **** 5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 18 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 168 **** 3.67 4.20 4.29 **** Field Work 2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 18 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 36 **** 4.70 4.25 4.26 **** Self Paced 1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 18 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 31 **** 5.00 4.72 4.50 **** 2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal 18 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 21 **** 5.00 4.72 4.50 **** Frequency Distribution Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades Reasons Type Majors O0-27 2 0.00-0.99 1 A 9 Required for Majors 2 Graduate 0 Major 0 28-55 1 1.00-1.99 0 B 1 56-83 0 2.00-2.99 1 C 0 General 5 Under-grad 19 Non-major 19 84-150 1 3.00-3.49 1 D 0 Grad. 0 3.50-4.00 0 F 0 Electives 1 #### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant P 0 responses to be significant	1 Did the	lah incr		_	the material	1.8	Ω	Λ	Λ	Ω	Ω	1	5 00	****/ 189	****	3 00	4 34	4 18	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 18 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 186 **** **** 4.48 4.46 **** 5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 18 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 168 **** 3.67 4.20 4.29 **** Field Work 2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 18 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 36 **** 4.70 4.25 4.26 **** Self Paced 1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 18 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 31 **** 5.00 4.72 4.50 **** 2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal 18 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 21 **** 5.00 4.57 4.38 **** Frequency Distribution Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades Reasons Type Majors O0-27 2 0.00-0.99 1 A 9 Required for Majors 2 Graduate 0 Major 0 28-55 1 1.00-1.99 0 B 1 56-83 0 2.00-2.99 1 C 0 General 5 Under-grad 19 Non-major 19 84-150 1 3.00-3.49 1 D 0 Grad. 0 3.50-4.00 0 F 0 Electives 1 #### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant				_								_		,					****
Field Work 2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 18 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 168 **** 3.67 4.20 4.29 **** Self Paced 1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal 18 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 36 **** 4.70 4.25 4.26 **** Self Paced 1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 18 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 31 **** 5.00 4.72 4.50 **** 2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal 18 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 21 **** 5.00 4.57 4.38 **** Frequency Distribution Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades Reasons Type Majors O0-27 2 0.00-0.99 1 A 9 Required for Majors 2 Graduate 0 Major 0 8-56-83 0 2.00-2.99 1 C 0 General 5 Under-grad 19 Non-major 19 84-150 1 3.00-3.49 1 D 0 Grad. Grad. 0 3.50-4.00 0 F 0 Electives 1 #### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	_	_	_	_	-									,	****				****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 18 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 **** 4.70 4.25 4.26 **** Self Paced 1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 18 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 **** 31 **** 5.00 4.72 4.50 **** 2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal 18 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 **** 21 **** 5.00 4.57 4.38 **** Frequency Distribution Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades Reasons Type Majors O0-27 2 0.00-0.99 1 A 9 Required for Majors 2 Graduate 0 Major 0 28-55 1 1.00-1.99 0 B 1 56-83 0 2.00-2.99 1 C 0 General 5 Under-grad 19 Non-major 19 84-150 1 3.00-3.49 1 D 0 Grad. 0 3.50-4.00 0 F 0 Electives 1 #### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant I 0 Other 2		_					-			-		-		,	****	3.67			****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 18 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 **** 4.70 4.25 4.26 **** Self Paced 1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 18 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 **** 31 **** 5.00 4.72 4.50 **** 2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal 18 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 **** 21 **** 5.00 4.57 4.38 **** Frequency Distribution Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades Reasons Type Majors O0-27 2 0.00-0.99 1 A 9 Required for Majors 2 Graduate 0 Major 0 28-55 1 1.00-1.99 0 B 1 56-83 0 2.00-2.99 1 C 0 General 5 Under-grad 19 Non-major 19 84-150 1 3.00-3.49 1 D 0 Grad. 0 3.50-4.00 0 F 0 Electives 1 #### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant I 0 Other 2			Eiold 1	vio wie															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 18 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 31 **** 5.00 4.72 4.50 **** 2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal 18 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 21 **** 5.00 4.57 4.38 **** Frequency Distribution Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades Reasons Type Majors 00-27 2 0.00-0.99 1 A 9 Required for Majors 2 Graduate 0 Major 0 28-55 1 1.00-1.99 0 B 1 56-83 0 2.00-2.99 1 C 0 General 5 Under-grad 19 Non-major 19 84-150 1 3.00-3.49 1 D 0 Grad. 0 3.50-4.00 0 F 0 Electives 1 #### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	2. Did you	clearly			ation criteria	18	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 36	****	4.70	4.25	4.26	****
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 18 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 31 **** 5.00 4.72 4.50 **** 2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal 18 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 21 **** 5.00 4.57 4.38 **** Frequency Distribution Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades Reasons Type Majors 00-27 2 0.00-0.99 1 A 9 Required for Majors 2 Graduate 0 Major 0 28-55 1 1.00-1.99 0 B 1 56-83 0 2.00-2.99 1 C 0 General 5 Under-grad 19 Non-major 19 84-150 1 3.00-3.49 1 D 0 Grad. 0 3.50-4.00 0 F 0 Electives 1 #### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	-	-	_																
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal 18 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 21 **** 5.00 4.57 4.38 **** Frequency Distribution Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades Reasons Type Majors 00-27 2 0.00-0.99 1 A 9 Required for Majors 2 Graduate 0 Major 0 28-55 1 1.00-1.99 0 B 1 56-83 0 2.00-2.99 1 C 0 General 5 Under-grad 19 Non-major 19 84-150 1 3.00-3.49 1 D 0 Grad. 0 3.50-4.00 0 F 0 Electives 1 #### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant P 0 responses to be significant	1 Did and	f nagad a			shat was laamad	10	0	0	٥	0	0	1	E 00	****/ 21	****	E 00	4 72	4 50	****
Frequency Distribution Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades Reasons Type Majors 00-27 2 0.00-0.99 1 A 9 Required for Majors 2 Graduate 0 Major 0 28-55 1 1.00-1.99 0 B 1 56-83 0 2.00-2.99 1 C 0 General 5 Under-grad 19 Non-major 19 84-150 1 3.00-3.49 1 D 0 Grad. 0 3.50-4.00 0 F 0 Electives 1 #### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant I 0 Other 2								-			•	1		, -	****				****
Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades Reasons Type Majors 00-27 2 0.00-0.99 1 A 9 Required for Majors 2 Graduate 0 Major 0 28-55 1 1.00-1.99 0 B 1 1 1 1 Non-major 19 19 19 19 Non-major 19 19 19 19 19 19 10 10 1 1 #### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant 1 #### - Means there are not be significant 1 1 #### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant 1 <td></td> <td>10.000</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td>-</td> <td>-</td> <td>_</td> <td></td> <td>,</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td>		10.000								-	-	_		,					
00-27					Frequ	lency	Dist	ribu	ution	ı									
28-55	Credits Ea	Expected Grades				Rea	asons				Туј	pe			Majors	;			
28-55	00-27	2	0 00-0 99	 1	 Д 9		Rec	nnire	 ed fo	or Ma	 ior		2	Graduat		0	Maic	 r	0
56-83 0 2.00-2.99 1 C 0 General 5 Under-grad 19 Non-major 19 84-150 1 3.00-3.49 1 D 0 Grad. 0 3.50-4.00 0 F 0 Electives 1 #### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant I 0 Other 2							1/6/	14116	-u = (JI MA	⊥∪ر	S	_	Graduate	_	-	r-ia JC	-	J
84-150 1 3.00-3.49 1 D 0 Grad. 0 3.50-4.00 0 F 0 Electives 1 #### - Means there are not enough P 0 I 0 Other 2							Ger	nera]	1				5	Under-g	rad 1	9	Non-	-maior	19
Grad. 0 3.50-4.00 0 F 0 Electives 1 #### - Means there are not enough P 0 responses to be significant I 0 Other 2		-		_			001						-			-		(
P 0 responses to be significant I 0 Other 2				_			$El\epsilon$	ectiv	ves				1	#### - 1	Means t	here a	re not	enoue	rh
I 0 Other 2		-		-														_	•
		I 0						ıer					2		~				

Course-Section: FREN 101 02
Title Elementary French I

Elementary French I
Wecker,Donna L.

Instructor: Weck Enrollment: 28 Questionnaires: 20 University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2010 Page 739 JUN 28, 2010 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

			Fre	equer	ncies	3		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	2	0	0	0	0	5	13	4.72	342/1447	4.43	4.31	4.31	4.18	4.72
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	0	0	0	3	15	4.83	170/1447	4.69	4.34	4.27	4.30	4.83
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	0	0	0	0	3	15	4.83	204/1241	4.84	4.48	4.33	4.25	4.83
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	2	0	0	0	4	12	4.75	217/1402	4.78	4.36	4.24	4.15	4.75
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	3	1	0	0	1	5	10	4.56	306/1358	4.54	4.26	4.11	4.03	4.56
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	3	7	0	2	0	4	4	4.00	812/1316	4.44	4.27	4.14	3.99	4.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	3	0	0	0	2	2	13	4.65	301/1427	4.55	4.21	4.19	4.24	4.65
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	0	0	0	0	1	16	4.94	291/1447	4.62	4.66	4.69	4.68	4.94
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	1	0	0	0	5	8	4.62	270/1434	4.28	4.12	4.10	4.10	4.62
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	0	0	18	5.00	1/1387	4.68	4.45	4.46	4.46	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	1	17	4.94	317/1387	4.86	4.78	4.73	4.71	4.94
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	0	5	13	4.72	353/1386	4.59	4.35	4.32	4.32	4.72
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	1	3	14	4.72	379/1380	4.63	4.43	4.32	4.31	4.72
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	0	0	0	1	6	11	4.56	256/1193	4.38	4.02	4.02	3.99	4.56
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	2	5	7	4.36	504/1172	4.15	4.26	4.15	3.95	4.36
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	0	0	2	12	4.86	250/1182	4.72	4.56	4.35	4.18	4.86
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	0	0	3	5		4.21	787/1170	4.39	4.41	4.38	4.17	4.21
4. Were special techniques successful	6	0	0	0	0	5	9	4.64	142/ 800	4.00	4.17	4.06	3.95	4.64

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	l Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	0	 А	9	Required for Majors	2	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	В	5						
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	5	C	2	General	9	Under-grad	20	Non-major	20
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5	F	0	Electives	4	#### - Means	there	are not enough	n
				P	1			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	2	_			
				?	0						

Course-Section: FREN 101 03

Elementary French I

Title Elementary Frence Instructor: Wecker, Donna L.

Enrollment: 30
Questionnaires: 15

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2010

Page 740 JUN 28, 2010 Job IRBR3029

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

			Fre	equer	ncies	3		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	2	1	4	8	4.20	927/1447	4.43	4.31	4.31	4.18	4.20
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	5	10	4.67	352/1447	4.69	4.34	4.27	4.30	4.67
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	12	4.80	231/1241	4.84	4.48	4.33	4.25	4.80
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	0	4	9	4.69	281/1402	4.78	4.36	4.24	4.15	4.69
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	2	1	4	8	4.20	663/1358	4.54	4.26	4.11	4.03	4.20
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	3	0	1	1	2	8	4.42	486/1316	4.44	4.27	4.14	3.99	4.42
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	2	3	9	4.33	680/1427	4.55	4.21	4.19	4.24	4.33
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	3	12	4.80	754/1447	4.62	4.66	4.69	4.68	4.80
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	2	7	5	4.21	679/1434	4.28	4.12	4.10	4.10	4.21
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	1	3	10	4.64	596/1387	4.68	4.45	4.46	4.46	4.64
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	1	13	4.93	422/1387	4.86	4.78	4.73	4.71	4.93
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	4	10	4.71	366/1386	4.59	4.35	4.32	4.32	4.71
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	2	2	10	4.57	582/1380	4.63	4.43	4.32	4.31	4.57
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	0	1	4	9	4.57	243/1193	4.38	4.02	4.02	3.99	4.57
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	2	2	4	4.25	580/1172	4.15	4.26	4.15	3.95	4.25
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	0	0	2	1	5	4.38	660/1182	4.72	4.56	4.35	4.18	4.38
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	1	0	1	1	5	4.13	839/1170	4.39	4.41	4.38	4.17	4.13
4. Were special techniques successful	7	1	0	0	1	2	4	4.43	239/ 800	4.00	4.17	4.06	3.95	4.43
	-	=	_		=	_	_		,					

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	l Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	5	0.00-0.99	0	 А	7	Required for Majors	2	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	В	6						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	3	C	1	General	5	Under-grad	15	Non-major	15
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	3	#### - Means	there	are not enough	h
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	3	_			
				?	0						

Course-Section: FREN 101 04 Title

Elementary French I

Badagbo,Ama Instructor:

Enrollment: 25 Questionnaires: 11

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2010

Page 741 JUN 28, 2010 Job IRBR3029

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

				equer		5	-		ructor	Course	_	UMBC		Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	1	0	1	2	7	4.27	849/1447	4.43	4.31	4.31	4.18	4.27
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	2	8	4.64	389/1447	4.69	4.34	4.27	4.30	4.64
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	141/1241	4.84	4.48	4.33	4.25	4.91
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	4	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1402	4.78	4.36	4.24	4.15	5.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	0	1	1	7	4.67	237/1358	4.54	4.26	4.11	4.03	4.67
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	5	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	112/1316	4.44	4.27	4.14	3.99	4.83
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	3	7	4.55	410/1427	4.55	4.21	4.19	4.24	4.55
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	6	4	4.40	1155/1447	4.62	4.66	4.69	4.68	4.40
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	2	5	2	4.00	849/1434	4.28	4.12	4.10	4.10	4.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	3	7	4.55	741/1387	4.68	4.45	4.46	4.46	4.55
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	0	10	4.82	758/1387	4.86	4.78	4.73	4.71	4.82
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	4	6	4.45	677/1386		4.35	4.32	4.32	4.45
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	2	8	4.64	506/1380	4.63	4.43	4.32	4.31	4.64
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	4	2	5	4.09	616/1193	4.38		4.02	3.99	4.09
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	2	0	1	2	3.60	958/1172	4.15	4.26	4.15	3.95	3.60
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1182		4.56	4.15	4.18	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	295/1170		4.41	4.38	4.17	4.83
4. Were special techniques successful	5	2	1	1	1	0	1	2.75	774/ 800			4.06	3.95	
i. Were special ecomiques successful	3	_	_	_	_	Ü	_	2.75	,,1, 000	1.00	1.1/	1.00	3.75	2.75
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 31	****	5.00	4.72	4.50	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	10	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 21	****	5.00	4.57	4.38	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	10	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 31	****	5.00	4.64	4.65	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 20	****	****	4.60	4.49	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 15	****	****	4.61	4.31	****
_		<u> </u>	1											

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

Course-Section: FREN 102 01 University of Maryland Page 742 JUN 28, 2010 Title Elementary French II Baltimore County

Badagbo, Ama Instructor:

Enrollment: 16 Questionnaires: 11

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequencies

Instructor

Job IRBR3029

Course Dept UMBC Level Sect

Spring 2010

							FIG	eque.	пстег	5		Inst	ructor	Course	: рерг	UMBC	телет	Sect
		Question	s		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		 Genera	 1															
1. Did yo	u gain ne	ew insights,ski	lls fro	m this course	2	0	0	0	1	0	8	4.78	287/1447	4.16	4.31	4.31	4.18	4.78
		ctor make clear			2	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1447	4.34	4.34	4.27	4.30	5.00
3. Did the	e exam qu	uestions reflec	t the e	xpected goals	2	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1241	4.62	4.48	4.33	4.25	5.00
4. Did ot	her evalu	uations reflect	the ex	pected goals	2	0	0	0	1	0	8	4.78	196/1402	4.37	4.36	4.24	4.15	4.78
5. Did as	signed re	eadings contrib	ute to	what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	158/1358	4.34	4.26	4.11	4.03	4.78
6. Did wr	itten ass	signments contr	ibute t	o what you learned	2	0	0	1	2	0	6	4.22	644/1316	4.03	4.27	4.14	3.99	4.22
7. Was the	e grading	g system clearl	y expla	ined	2	0	0	0	1	0	8	4.78	181/1427	4.34	4.21	4.19	4.24	4.78
8. How man	ny times	was class canc	elled		2	0	0	0	0	5	4	4.44	1124/1447	4.69	4.66	4.69	4.68	4.44
9. How wo	uld you g	grade the overa	ll teac	hing effectiveness	4	0	0	0	0	5	2	4.29	600/1434	4.04	4.12	4.10	4.10	4.29
		Lectur	e															
1. Were the	he instru	uctor's lecture	s well	prepared	2	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	398/1387	4.50	4.45	4.46	4.46	4.78
2. Did the	e instruc	ctor seem inter	ested i	n the subject	2	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1387	4.74	4.78	4.73	4.71	5.00
3. Was le	Was lecture material presented and explained clearl						0	0	0	2	7	4.78	290/1386	4.44	4.35	4.32	4.32	4.78
		es contribute t			2	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	181/1380	4.55	4.43	4.32	4.31	4.89
5. Did au	diovisual	l techniques en	hance y	our understanding	2	1	0	0	1	2	5	4.50	288/1193	4.09	4.02	4.02	3.99	4.50
		Discus	sion															
1. Did cla	ass discu			what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1172	4.42	4.26	4.15	3.95	5.00
				d to participate	6	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1182	4.66	4.56	4.35	4.18	5.00
				d open discussion	6	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1170	4.58	4.41	4.38	4.17	5.00
4. Were s	pecial te	echniques succe	ssful	-	6	1	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/ 800	4.60	4.17	4.06	3.95	5.00
				Frequ	iency	/ Dis	trib	utio	n									
Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Re	asons	:			Ту	ne			Majors	3
														- 				
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 5		Re	quire	ed f	or Ma	jors	3	1	Graduat	е	0	Majo	r	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B 3		~						_	1	, ,	-			11
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	3	C 0		Ge	nera	L				5	Under-g	rad 1	.1	Non-	-major	11
84-150 3 3.00-3.49 1 D 0												0			,			,
Grad.						El	ectiv	<i>r</i> es				0	#### - 1				_	jn
P 0					0.1	1					1	respons	es to b	e sign	niican	IT		
I 0						Ut.	her					1						

? 0

Course-Section: FREN 102 02 University of Maryland Title Elementary French II

Baltimore County Spring 2010

Instructor: Gueye, Sokhna Fa Enrollment: 16

Questionnaires: 7

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Page 743 JUN 28, 2010 Job IRBR3029

			Fr	eque		5			ructor	Course	_		Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	2	0	5	4.43	695/1447	4.16	4.31	4.31	4.18	4.43
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	2	4	4.43	648/1447	4.34	4.34	4.27	4.30	4.43
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	323/1241	4.62	4.48	4.33	4.25	4.71
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	314/1402	4.37	4.36	4.24	4.15	4.67
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	0	5	4.67	237/1358	4.34	4.26	4.11	4.03	4.67
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	2	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	812/1316	4.03	4.27	4.14	3.99	4.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	459/1427	4.34	4.21	4.19	4.24	4.50
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1447	4.69	4.66	4.69	4.68	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	1	3	3	4.29	600/1434	4.04	4.12	4.10	4.10	4.29
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1387	4.50	4.45	4.46	4.46	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1387	4.74	4.78	4.73	4.71	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	217/1386	4.44	4.35	4.32	4.32	4.83
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	238/1380	4.55	4.43	4.32	4.31	4.83
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	1	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	224/1193	4.09	4.02	4.02	3.99	4.60
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	181/1172	4.42	4.26	4.15	3.95	4.80
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1182	4.66	4.56	4.35	4.18	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1170	4.58	4.41	4.38	4.17	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	2	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	159/ 800	4.60	4.17	4.06	3.95	4.60
Freq	uency	Dis	trib	utio	n									
Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades				Rea	ason	3			ТУ	pe			Majors	
00-27 0 0.00-0.99 0 A 5		Re	 quir	ed f	or Ma	ajor:	 S	1	Graduat	 e	0	Majo	or	0

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

Course-Section: FREN 102 03 University of Maryland Title Elementary French II

Baltimore County Spring 2010

Gueye, Sokhna Fa Instructor: 30 Enrollment:

Questionnaires: 16

Page 744 JUN 28, 2010 Job IRBR3029

	Evaluation	

			Fre	equer	ncies	3		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General		_	_		_	_								
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	1	3	6	2	3		1389/1447					3.20
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	3	4	4	4		1286/1447		4.34	4.27	4.30	3.60
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	1	1	6	7		774/1241	4.62	4.48	4.33	4.25	4.27
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	5	1	1	1	3	4		1139/1402		4.36	4.24	4.15	3.80
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	4	1	1	3	2	4		1104/1358		4.26	4.11	4.03	3.64
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	5	1	1	2	3	3		1088/1316		4.27	4.14	3.99	3.60
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	3	0	6	0	6		1291/1427		4.21	4.19	4.24	3.40
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	2	12		619/1447		4.66	4.69	4.68	4.86
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	0	0	0	3	6	1	3.80	1052/1434	4.04	4.12	4.10	4.10	3.80
<u>.</u> .														
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	1	2	4	5	3		1309/1387		4.45	4.46	4.46	3.47
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	2	5	7		1222/1387		4.78	4.73	4.71	4.36
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	1	1	3	7	2		1243/1386		4.35	4.32	4.32	3.57
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	1	2	8			1204/1380		4.43	4.32	4.31	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	0	2	2	3	6	1	3.14	1065/1193	4.09	4.02	4.02	3.99	3.14
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	9	Ο	1	1	Ο	2	3	3.71	899/1172	4.42	4.26	4.15	3.95	3.71
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	9	0	0	1	1	1	4	4.14	803/1182	4.66	4.56	4.35	4.18	4.14
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	1	0	1	1	4	4.00	864/1170		4.41	4.38	4.17	4.00
4. Were special techniques successful	9	2	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	159/ 800		4.17	4.06	3.95	
1. Hold Special Countings Successful		_	J	3	3	_	5	1.00	2337 000	1.00	/	1.00	5.75	1.00
Frequ	ency	Dist	ribu	ıtior	ı									

Credits E	Earned	Cum. GPA		Expected	d Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	А	10	Required for Majors	3	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	В	3						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	2	C	0	General	9	Under-grad	16	Non-major	16
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	n
				P	0			responses to	be sig	nificant	
				I	0	Other	1	-			
				?	0						

Course-Section: FREN 102 04 Title

Elementary French II

Badagbo,Ama Instructor:

Enrollment: 25 Questionnaires: 16

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2010

Page 745 JUN 28, 2010 Job IRBR3029

Student	Course	Eval	nation	Ouestion	nnaire

			Fre	equei	ncies	3		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	4	4	8	4.25	869/1447	4.16	4.31	4.31	4.18	4.25
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	4	3	9	4.31	792/1447	4.34	4.34	4.27	4.30	4.31
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	3	11	4.50	541/1241	4.62	4.48	4.33	4.25	4.50
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	2	1	2	8	4.23	787/1402	4.37	4.36	4.24	4.15	4.23
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	0	3	4	7	4.29	581/1358	4.34	4.26	4.11	4.03	4.29
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	3	0	0	3	3	7	4.31	572/1316	4.03	4.27	4.14	3.99	4.31
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	3	12	4.69	265/1427	4.34	4.21	4.19	4.24	4.69
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	8	7	4.47	1109/1447	4.69	4.66	4.69	4.68	4.47
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	1	0	1	3	2	3	3.78	1073/1434	4.04	4.12	4.10	4.10	3.78
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	0	0	0	3	9	4.75	429/1387	4.50	4.45	4.46	4.46	4.75
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	0	0	5	7		1072/1387	4.74	4.78	4.73	4.71	4.58
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	0	0	0	5	7	4.58	529/1386	4.44	4.35	4.32	4.32	4.58
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	2	10	4.83	238/1380	4.55	4.43	4.32	4.31	4.83
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	5	3	0	0	3	1	4	4.13	593/1193	4.09	4.02	4.02		4.13
Discussion														
	1.0	0	0	0	2	1	2	1 17	637/1172	4 40	1 26	4.15	3.95	4.17
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	2 0	7	3	4.17	553/1182	4.42 4.66	4.26 4.56	4.15	4.18	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	10 10	0	0	0	1	2	3	4.33	710/1170	4.58	4.56	4.35		4.50 4.33
4. Were special techniques successful	10	1	0	0	1	2	2	4.33	366/ 800	4.58	4.41	4.38	4.17 3.95	4.33
4. Were special techniques successful	10	Τ	U	U	1	4	2	4.20	366/ 800	4.60	4.17	4.06	3.95	4.20
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 31	****	5.00	4.72	4.50	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	15	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 21	****	5.00	4.57	4.38	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	15	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 31	****	5.00	4.64	4.65	***
Frem	ien av	. Diet	-rih	ut i ou	2									

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	 А	10	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	В	2						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	2	C	0	General	9	Under-grad	16	Non-major	16
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	4	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	0	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	n
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	0	_			
				2	Λ						

Course-Section: FREN 103 01 University of Maryla
Title Int Rev Elem French Baltimore County
Instructor: El Omari, Samir Spring 2010

Enrollment:

15

University of Maryland Page 746
Baltimore County JUN 28, 2010
Spring 2010 Job IRBR3029

0

responses to be significant

Questionnaires: 7	Student Course Eva	aluation Questionnaire
-------------------	--------------------	------------------------

Ρ

I ? 0

0

0

	Questions						Fre	-	ncies	s 4	5	Inst Mean	ructor Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean		Level Mean	Sect Mean
		General																
		ew insights,skil			0	0	0	0	1	2	4	4.43	695/1447			4.31	4.18	4.43
		ctor make clear		1 5	0	0	0	0	1	1	5	4.57	457/1447	4.57	4.34	4.27	4.30	4.57
		estions reflect			0	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	186/1241	4.86	4.48	4.33	4.25	4.86
		ations reflect			0	2	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	616/1402	4.40	4.36	4.24	4.15	4.40
	_	-		what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	1	4	4.29	581/1358	4.29	4.26	4.11	4.03	4.29
				to what you learned	0	2	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	292/1316	4.60	4.27	4.14	3.99	4.60
		g system clearly		ined	0	0	0	1	0	0	6	4.57	373/1427	4.57	4.21	4.19	4.24	4.57
		was class cance			0	0	0	0	0	6	1		1311/1447	4.14	4.66	4.69	4.68	4.14
9. How wou	ıld you 🤉	grade the overal	l teac	ching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	341/1434	4.50	4.12	4.10	4.10	4.50
		- .																
		Lecture	1	•	0	0	0	-	_		4 42	001/1005	4 42	4 45	1 16	1 16	4 42	
1. Were th			0	0	0	0	Ţ	2	4		881/1387		4.45	4.46	4.46	4.43		
		ctor seem intere			0	0	0	0	0	0	7		1/1387		4.78	4.73	4.71	
		-		explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	1	5		539/1386		4.35	4.32	4.32	4.57
		es contribute to		-	0	0	0	0	0 1	3 3	4		582/1380		4.43	4.32		4.57
5. Did aud	ilovisual	tecnniques enn	ance y	our understanding	0	0	U	U	Τ	3	3	4.29	455/1193	4.29	4.02	4.02	3.99	4.29
		Discuss	d on															
1 Did ala	ee diea			what you learned	4	0	1	0	0	0	2	3.67	925/1172	3.67	4.26	4.15	3.95	3.67
				ed to participate	4	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1182		4.56	4.35	4.18	5.00
				nd open discussion	4	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	710/1170		4.41	4.38	4.17	4.33
		chniques succes		d open discussion	4	0	0	0	1	0	2		290/ 800		4.17	4.06	3.95	4.33
i. Were be	occiai cc	ciniiques succes	blui		-	O	U	U	_	U		1.33	2507 000	1.55	1.1/	1.00	3.75	1.55
				Frequ	lency	Dist	rib	utio	n									
Credits Ea	rned	Expected Grades				Do:	asons	-			Туј	ne.			Majors	•		
credits Ea	Expected Grades					250118	> 											
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A 3		Red	quir	ed f	or Ma	ajors	3	2	Graduate	e	0	Majo	r	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	в 0														
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C 1	General						1	Under-g	rad	7	Non-	major	7	
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	2	D 0														
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F 0		Ele	ecti	ves				0	#### - 1	Means t	here a	re not	enoug	jh

Other

Course-Section: FREN 201 01 University of Maryland Title

Baltimore County Intermediate French I Instructor: Badagbo, Yawo Spring 2010

Enrollment: 12 Questionnaires: 9

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Page 747

JUN 28, 2010

Job IRBR3029

	Questions						Fre 1	_	ncies 3	4	5	Inst Mean	tructor Rank		Dept Mean		Level Mean	Sect Mean
1 Did 1101	. aain na	Genera w insights,skil	=	m this source	0	0	1	0	1	_	2	2 70	1249/1447	4.10	4.31	4.31	4.31	3.78
		tor make clear			0	0	1	0	2	5 4	2		1249/1447	4.10	4.31	4.31	4.31	3.78
		estions reflect			0	0	0	2	0	5	2		1062/1241	4.29	4.48	4.33	4.35	3.78
		ations reflect			0	5	0	0	2	1	1		1163/1402		4.46	4.33	4.24	3.76
				what you learned	0	1	0	0	3	3	7	3.88			4.26	4.11	4.12	3.88
	_	_		what you learned what you learned	0	4	0	1	1	1	2		968/1316		4.27	4.14	4.08	3.80
		signments contr. s system clearly			0	0	0	4	1	2	_		1337/1427		4.21	4.19	4.14	3.22
		was class cance		rnea	0	0	0	0	0	5			1124/1447		4.66	4.19	4.70	4.44
	-			ning effectiveness	3	0	1	0	4	0	1		1349/1434			4.10		3.00
9. HOW WOL	uiu you g	frade the overa.	LI LEAC	iing effectiveness	3	U	1	U	-1	U	Т	3.00	1349/1434	3.74	4.12	4.10	3.31	3.00
		Lecture																
1 Wara +1	ho inatri	ctor's lecture:		aranarad	2	0	1	0	4	0	2	2 20	1330/1387	4.25	4.45	4.46	4.42	3.29
		tor seem inter			2	0	0	1	0	3	3		1293/1387		4.78	4.73	4.71	4.14
		xplained clearly	2	0	1	0	2	2	2		1243/1386		4.35	4.32	4.24	3.57		
		you learned	2	0	0	1	3	0	_		1181/1380			4.32		3.71		
				our understanding	3	1	2	1	0	2	0		1166/1193					2.40
J. Dia au	alovisuai	. teciniiques em	lance y	our understanding	3		2	Т	U	2	U	2.40	1100/1193	3.00	4.02	4.02	4.04	2.40
		Discus	ni on															
1 Did ala	aga digan			what you learned	7	0	0	0	1	Λ	1	4 00	****/1172	4.16	4.26	4.15	4.12	****
				d to participate	7	0	0	0	0	1	1		****/1182		4.56	4.35	4.30	****
				d open discussion	7	0	0	0	1	0	1		****/1170		4.41	4.38	4.32	****
		chniques succes		d open discussion	7	0	0	0	1	0	1		****/ 800		4.17	4.06	4.01	****
4. Were S	peciai te	cimiques succes	SSLUL		/	U	U	U	1	U	Т	4.00	/ 800	4.30	4.17	4.00	4.01	
				Frequ	ency	Dist	cribu	ıtioı	n									
Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	asons	;			Ту	ре			Majors	3
00-27	00-27 0 0.00-0.99 0 A 3							ed fo	or Ma	jors	 5	2	Graduat	 e	0	Majo	r r	0
28-55																		
56-83	6-83 3 2.00-2.99 0 C 0					Ger	neral	L				4	Under-g	rad	9	Non-	major	9
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D 0													-	
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F 0	Electives						0	#### - 1	Means t	here a	re not	enoug	jh	
				P 0	Hiccorves							respons	es to b	e sign	ifican	ıt		
				I 0	Other						0	-						
				? 0														

Course-Section: FREN 201 02 University of Maryland Title Baltimore County

Intermediate French I Instructor: Badagbo, Yawo Spring 2010

Enrollment: 21 Questionnaires: 18

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Page 748

JUN 28, 2010

Job IRBR3029

responses to be significant

		Questions	3		NR	NA	Fre	-	ncies 3	4	5	Ins Mean	tructor Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean		Level Mean	Sect Mean
1 Did	ou coin n	General ew insights,skil		m this source	0	0	2	2	7	4	2	2 22	1385/1447	4 10	1 21	4.31	4.31	3.22
		ew insignes,skii ctor make clear			0	0	2	1	6	4	5		1323/1447	4.10	4.31		4.23	3.50
		uestions reflect			0	0	0	1	6	5	6		1002/1241	4.29	4.48	4.33	4.35	3.89
		uations reflect			0	6	0	2	3	2	5		1120/1402		4.36	4.24	4.24	3.83
				what you learned	1	3	1	1	1	8	3		1001/1358	4.03	4.26	4.11		3.79
	_	_		to what you learned	1	7	0	2		3	3		1001/1336		4.27	4.14	4.08	3.70
		g system clearly		-	1	0	3	2	3	3	<i>5</i>		1287/1427	4.03	4.21		4.14	
		was class cance	_	ainea	2	0	0	0	0	9	7		1132/1447	4.52	4.66	4.69	4.70	4.44
				ching effectiveness	6	0	3	2	3	4	0		1395/1434		4.12		3.97	
J. 110W WC	Jara you	grade the overal	ii cca	silling clicectveness	Ŭ	Ü	5	_	3	-	O	2.07	1373/1131	3.71	1.12	1.10	3.77	2.07
		Lecture																
1. Were t	the instr	uctor's lectures	prepared	3	0	1	1	4	4	5	3.73	1266/1387	4.25	4.45	4.46	4.42	3.73	
2. Did th	ne instru	ctor seem intere	in the subject	3	0	0	0	0	2	13	4.87	630/1387	4.71	4.78	4.73	4.71	4.87	
3. Was le	ecture ma	terial presented	and e	explained clearly	3	0	1	2	3	7	2	3.47	1268/1386	4.13	4.35	4.32	4.24	3.47
4. Did th	ne lectur	es contribute to	what	you learned	3	0	2	1	1	5	6	3.80	1153/1380	4.24	4.43	4.32	4.30	3.80
5. Did au	udiovisua	l techniques enh	nance y	your understanding	4	1	1	1	3	4	4	3.69	879/1193	3.88	4.02	4.02	4.04	3.69
		Discuss																
				what you learned	10	0	1	2	0	2	3		999/1172		4.26			3.50
				ed to participate	10	0	0	1	2	2	3	3.88	,		4.56		4.30	3.88
		_		nd open discussion	10	0	2	0	0	3	3		1025/1170		4.41		4.32	3.63
4. Were s	special to	echniques succes	sful		10	4	0	1	0	2	1	3.75	****/ 800	4.38	4.17	4.06	4.01	****
				Frequ	lency	Dist	trib	ution	n									
Credits E	Earned	Expected Grades				Rea	asons	3			Ту	pe			Majors			
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	A 7		Red	quir	ed fo	or Ma	ajor	s	1	Graduat	е	0	Majo	r	0
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	1	В 6	Garage 1						-	-	1		0			1.0
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	1	C 3	General						1	5	Under-g	rad 1	.8	Non-	major	18
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	3	D 0								•						,
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F 0	Electives							0	#### - 1	Means t	here a	re not	enoug	h

Other

0

Ρ

Ι

0

0

0

Course-Section: FREN 201 03 University of Maryland Title Intermediate French I

Questionnaires: 17

Baltimore County

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Page 749

JUN 28, 2010

Job IRBR3029

Instructor: Wecker,Donna L. Spring 2010 Enrollment: 23

			E			_		T		G	Damb	IIMDG	T 1	0
Ouestions	NR	NA	1	equer 2	3	5 4	5	Mean	ructor Rank	Course	Mean	Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
Questions														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	2	0	0	0	3	4	8	4.33	790/1447	4.10	4.31	4.31	4.31	4.33
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	0	0	0	4	11	4.73	270/1447	4.23	4.34	4.27	4.23	4.73
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	0	0	1	0	2	12	4.67	380/1241	4.29	4.48	4.33	4.35	4.67
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	1	1	2	3	0	8	3.86	1107/1402	4.12	4.36	4.24	4.24	3.86
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	3	3	1	0	1	2	7	4.27	590/1358	4.03	4.26	4.11	4.12	4.27
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	4	0	0	2	3	6	4.36	527/1316	3.94	4.27	4.14	4.08	4.36
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	0	1	3	11	4.67	283/1427	4.03	4.21	4.19	4.14	4.67
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	1	0	14	4.87	592/1447	4.52	4.66	4.69	4.70	4.87
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	2	5	7	4.36	516/1434	3.74	4.12	4.10	3.97	4.36
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	0	0	0	1	12	4.92	160/1387	4.25	4.45	4.46	4.42	4.92
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	0	0	0	13	5.00	1/1387	4.71	4.78	4.73	4.71	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	0	0	1	4	8	4.54	577/1386	4.13	4.35	4.32	4.24	4.54
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	1	1	1	10	4.54	626/1380	4.24	4.43	4.32	4.30	4.54
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	0	0	0	1	4	8	4.54	268/1193	3.88	4.02	4.02	4.04	4.54
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	Ο	3	1	3	4.00	710/1172	4.16	4.26	4.15	4.12	4.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	10	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	250/1182	4.51	4.56	4.35	4.30	4.86
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	10	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1170	4.25	4.41	4.38	4.32	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	10	0	0	0	2	2	3	4.14	389/ 800	4.38	4.17	4.06	4.01	4.14
Frequ	ency	Dis	trib	utior	1									
Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades				Rea	sons	3			Туј	pe			Majors	

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	l Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	А	5	Required for Majors	6	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	В	6						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	1	C	3	General	9	Under-grad	17	Non-major	17
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	6	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	ı
				P	0			responses to	be sig	nificant	
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	1						

Course-Section: FREN 201 04 University of Maryland
Title Intermediate French I Baltimore County

I

0

0

Baltimore County Spring 2010 Page 750

JUN 28, 2010

Job IRBR3029

Enrollment: 24
Questionnaires: 16 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Wecker, Donna L.

Instructor:

							Frequencies			Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect		
		Question	s		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
1 543		Genera	_	1.1.1	0	0	0	^	2	2	1.0	4 44	601/1445	4 10	4 21	4 21	4 21	4 44
_	_	ew insights,ski			0	0	•	0	3	3 6	10	4.44	681/1447	4.10	4.31	4.31	4.31	4.44
		ctor make clear			0	0	0	0	2	9	8	4.38	715/1447	4.23	4.34	4.27	4.23	4.38
	_	uestions reflec		1 5	0	0 2	0 1	0	3	3	10	4.44	622/1241	4.29	4.48	4.33	4.35	4.44
		uations reflect			0	0	1	1	4	4	7	4.07	929/1402		4.36	4.24	4.24	4.07
	_	-		what you learned	0	•	_	-	_	4	7	4.00	799/1358		4.26	4.11	4.12	4.00
		_		o what you learned	0	4	2	0	3	2	5		1050/1316		4.27	4.14	4.08	3.67
		g system clearl		ained	0	0	0	0	3	4	9	4.38	632/1427	4.03	4.21	4.19	4.14	4.38
		was class canc			0	0	0	0	0	0	16	5.00	1/1447	4.52	4.66	4.69	4.70	5.00
9. How wo	ould you	grade the overa	II tead	ching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	2	6	5	4.23	657/1434	3.74	4.12	4.10	3.97	4.23
		Lectur	е															
1. Were t	the instr	uctor's lecture	s well	prepared	1	0	0	0	2	2	11	4.60	656/1387	4.25	4.45	4.46	4.42	4.60
2. Did th	Did the instructor seem interested in the subject						0	0	1	0	14	4.87	630/1387	4.71	4.78	4.73	4.71	4.87
3. Was le	ecture ma	terial presente	d and e	explained clearly	1	0	0	0	1	7	7	4.40	748/1386	4.13	4.35	4.32	4.24	4.40
		es contribute t			1	0	0	1	4	2	8	4.13	978/1380	4.24	4.43	4.32	4.30	4.13
				our understanding	1	0	0	1	3	4	7	4.13	583/1193	3.88	4.02	4.02	4.04	4.13
		Discus	aion															
1 Did al	laga diga			what you learned	7	0	0	0	2	1	5	4.22	600/1172	4.16	4.26	4.15	4.12	4.22
				ed to participate	7	0	0	0	0	3	6	4.67	430/1182		4.56	4.15	4.12	4.67
				nd open discussion	7	0	0	1	1	2	5	4.07	781/1170		4.41	4.38	4.32	4.22
		echniques succe		id open discussion	7	1	1	0	0	0	5 7	4.50	195/ 800			4.36		4.50
	-F				•	_	_	_	-	-	•							
				Frequ	ıency	/ Dis	trib	utio	n									
Credits E	Earned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	asons	5			Ту	pe			Majors	3
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	 A 5					or Ma			1	Graduat		0	Majo		1
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	A 5 B 9		ке	quir	ea I	OT Mg	ıjor	`S	т	Graduat	E	U	Ma JC	JΤ	1
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	3	C 0	General						1	.1	Under-g	rad 1	.6	Non-	-major	15
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	3	D 0													-	
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F 0	Electives							1	#### - 1	Means t	here a	re not	enou	_j h
P 0													respons				_	
						0.1						_						

Other

1

Course-Section: FREN 201 05

Title Intermediate French I

Instructor: El Omari,Samir

Enrollment: 23 Questionnaires: 17

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2010

Page 751 JUN 28, 2010 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

			Fre	eauer	ncies	3		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank		Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	8	8	4.41	709/1447	4.10	4.31	4.31	4.31	4.41
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	0	5	11	4.53	510/1447	4.23	4.34	4.27	4.23	4.53
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	5	9	4.35	700/1241	4.29	4.48	4.33	4.35	4.35
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	0	2	4	8	4.43	591/1402	4.12	4.36	4.24	4.24	4.43
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	1	0	0	4	3	8	4.27	599/1358	4.03	4.26	4.11	4.12	4.27
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	0	0	6	9	4.60	292/1316	3.94	4.27	4.14	4.08	4.60
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	2	4	11	4.53	434/1427	4.03	4.21	4.19	4.14	4.53
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	1	9	7	4.35	1189/1447	4.52	4.66	4.69	4.70	4.35
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	0	0	0	1	4	6	4.45	397/1434	3.74	4.12	4.10	3.97	4.45
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	2	4	11	4.53	769/1387	4.25	4.45	4.46	4.42	4.53
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	3	13	4.81	758/1387	4.71	4.78	4.73	4.71	4.81
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	1	4	11	4.63	483/1386	4.13	4.35	4.32	4.24	4.63
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	6	10	4.53	637/1380	4.24	4.43	4.32	4.30	4.53
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	2	0	0	1	8	6	4.33	420/1193	3.88	4.02	4.02	4.04	4.33
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	1	1	10	4.75	218/1172	4.16	4.26	4.15	4.12	4.75
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	0	0	2	10	4.83	271/1182	4.51	4.56	4.35	4.30	4.83
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	0	0	3	9	4.75	390/1170	4.25	4.41	4.38	4.32	4.75
4. Were special techniques successful	5	3	0	0	2	3	4	4.22	351/ 800	4.38	4.17	4.06	4.01	4.22
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	16	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 189	***	3.00	4.34	4.47	***
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 192	***	4.00	4.34	4.38	***
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 186	***	****	4.48	4.57	***
•														
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 66	****	3.99	4.58	4.43	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 65	****	4.55	4.42	4.36	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 64	****	4.45	4.09	3.70	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 38	****	5.00	4.49	2.25	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 36	***	4.70	4.25	3.25	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 28	****	****	4.52	***	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 30	***	4.00	4.30	****	***
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 27	***	4.50	4.43	****	***
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 31	****	5.00	4.72	****	***
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 21	****	5.00	4.57	****	***
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 31	****	5.00	4.64	****	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 20	****	***	4.60	****	***
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 15	****	****	4.61	****	****

Course-Section: FREN 201 05

Title Intermediate French I

Instructor: El Omari, Samir

Enrollment: 23
Questionnaires: 17

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2010 Page 751 JUN 28, 2010 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expecte	d Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	 А	3	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	10						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	0	С	4	General	13	Under-grad	17	Non-major	17
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	4	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	n
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	1	-			
				2	0						

Course-Section: FREN 201 06 University of Maryland Intermediate French I

Ρ

I ?

0

0

0

Title Baltimore County JUN 28, 2010 Spring 2010 Instructor: Diallo,Mamadou Job IRBR3029

Page 752

Enrollment:	6
0	

Grad.

3.50-4.00

FIII OI I III EII C .	O .			
Ouestionnaires:	5	Student Course	Evaluation	Ouestionnair

				Frequencies					Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect		
	Question	ıs		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
	Genera	 .1															
1. Did you g	ain new insights,ski	.lls fro	om this course	0	0	0	1	0	0	4	4.40	723/1447	4.10	4.31	4.31	4.31	4.40
1 0	nstructor make clear			0	0	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	426/1447	4.23	4.34	4.27	4.23	4.60
3. Did the ex	xam questions reflec	t the e	expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	451/1241	4.29	4.48	4.33	4.35	4.60
4. Did other	evaluations reflect	the ex	spected goals	0	1	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	217/1402	4.12	4.36	4.24	4.24	4.75
5. Did assign	ned readings contrik	oute to	what you learned	0	0	1	0	0	1	3	4.00	799/1358	4.03	4.26	4.11	4.12	4.00
6. Did writt	en assignments contr	ribute t	to what you learned	0	1	1	0	1	0	2	3.50	1134/1316	3.94	4.27	4.14	4.08	3.50
7. Was the g	rading system clearl	y expla	ained	0	0	0	1	0	2	2	4.00	971/1427	4.03	4.21	4.19	4.14	4.00
8. How many	times was class cand	elled		0	0	0	0	0	5	0	4.00	1361/1447	4.52	4.66	4.69	4.70	4.00
9. How would	you grade the overa	ll tead	ching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	1	3	0	3.75	1088/1434	3.74	4.12	4.10	3.97	3.75
	Lectur	·e															
1 Were the	instructor's lecture	prepared	0	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	902/1387	4.25	4.45	4.46	4.42	4.40	
	nstructor seem inter		0	0	0	0	0	2	3		1055/1387	4.71	4.78	4.73	4.71	4.60	
	re material presente		_	0	0	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	927/1386	4.13	4.35	4.32	4.24	4.20
	ectures contribute t		1	1	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75		4.24	4.43	4.32	4.30	4.75
	visual techniques er		2	0	0	0	1	0	1	3	4.20	526/1193		4.02	4.02	4.04	
	- '																
1 54 -1	Discus		b]	2	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	521/1172	4.16	4.26	4.15	4.12	4.33
	discussions contrik students actively er		-	2	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	,		4.26	4.15	4.12	4.33
	nstructor encourage	_		2	0	1	0	0	0	2		1013/1170	4.25	4.41	4.38	4.32	3.67
	ial techniques succe		id open discussion	2	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67			4.17	4.06	4.01	
-																	
		Frequ	lency	Dist	trib	utio	n										
Credits Earn	Expected Grades				Rea	asons	3			Ту	pe			Majors			
00-27	0.00-0.99	0	A 1		Red	nuir		 or Ma	ior		1	 Graduat	 e	0	Majo	 r	0
28-55	1 1.00-1.99	0	В 2	Required for Majors						_	_	Gradac	_	•	114)	-	J
56-83	1 2.00-2.99	0	C 1		Gei	nera	1				1	Under-q	rad	5	Non-	major	5
	1 3.00-3.49	2	D 0													3	-

Electives

Other

2

0

- Means there are not enough

responses to be significant

Course-Section: FREN 202 01

Intermediate French II

Title

Instructor: El Omari,Samir

Enrollment: 11 Questionnaires: 7

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2010

Page 753 JUN 28, 2010 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

			Fre	equer	ncies	3		Inst	tructor	Course	Dept.	UMBC:	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank		_		Mean	
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	0	6	4.71	353/1447	4.71	4.31	4.31	4.31	4.71
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	0	6	4.71	292/1447	4.71	4.34	4.27	4.23	4.71
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	186/1241	4.86	4.48	4.33	4.35	4.86
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	259/1402	4.71	4.36	4.24	4.24	4.71
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	0	1	5	4.43	430/1358	4.43	4.26	4.11	4.12	4.43
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	196/1316	4.71	4.27	4.14	4.08	4.71
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	373/1427	4.57	4.21	4.19	4.14	4.57
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	901/1447	4.71	4.66	4.69	4.70	4.71
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	1	0	1	1	3	3.83	1031/1434	3.83	4.12	4.10	3.97	3.83
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	276/1387	4.86	4.45	4.46	4.42	4.86
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1387	5.00	4.78	4.73	4.71	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	194/1386	4.86		4.32	4.24	4.86
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1380	5.00	4.43	4.32	4.30	5.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	1	0	6	4.71	155/1193	4.71	4.02	4.02	4.04	4.71
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	323/1172	4.60	4.26	4.15	4.12	4.60
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1182	5.00		4.35	4.30	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1170	5.00	4.41	4.38	4.32	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	2	3	0	0	0	1		4.50	195/ 800	4.50	4.17			4.50
i. Here special committees successful	_		Ü	Ü	Ū	_	_	1.50	133, 333	1.50		1.00	1.01	1.50
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	5	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 189	****	3.00	4.34	4.47	***
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	6	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 192	****	4.00	4.34	4.38	***
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	6	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 186	****	****	4.48	4.57	***
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	6	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 187	****	3.67	4.33	4.46	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	6	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 168	****	3.67	4.20	4.15	****
Seminar	_	_		_		_								
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	5	1	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 66	****	3.99	4.58	4.43	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 62	****	4.90	4.56	4.28	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 58	****	4.80	4.41	3.79	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 65	****	4.55	4.42	4.36	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 64	****	4.45	4.09	3.70	***
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5 00	****/ 38	****	5.00	4.49	2.25	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 36	****	4.70	4.25	3.25	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	6	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 28	****	****	4.52	****	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	6	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 30	****	4.00	4.30	****	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	6	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 27	****	4.50	4.43	****	****
5. 214 conferences help you carry out freta activities	J	U	5	J	5	_	U	1.00	, 21		1.50	1.15		
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 31	****	5.00	4.72	****	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 21	****	5.00	4.57	****	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 31	****	5.00	4.64	****	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 20	****	****	4.60	****	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 15	****	****	4.61	****	****

Course-Section: FREN 202 01

Title Intermediate French II

Instructor: El Omari, Samir

Enrollment: 11
Questionnaires: 7

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2010 Page 753 JUN 28, 2010 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

Course-Section: FREN 301 01 University of Maryland Page 754 Title Advanced French I Baltimore County JUN 28, 2010 Instructor: Deverneil, Marie Spring 2010 Job IRBR3029 Enrollment: 14

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questionnaires: 10

	Frequencies					Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect		
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank		Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	0	9	4.80	254/1447	4.80	4.31	4.31	4.32	4.80
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	112/1447	4.90	4.34	4.27	4.23	4.90
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1241	5.00	4.48	4.33	4.33	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	0	1	0	8	4.40	616/1402	4.40	4.36	4.24	4.24	4.40
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	1	1	7	4.67	237/1358	4.67	4.26	4.11	4.10	4.67
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	76/1316	4.90	4.27	4.14	4.13	4.90
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1427	5.00	4.21	4.19	4.15	5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	1	0	9	4.80	754/1447	4.80	4.66	4.69	4.65	4.80
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	141/1434	4.78	4.12	4.10	4.09	4.78
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1387	5.00	4.45	4.46	4.44	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1387	5.00	4.78	4.73	4.71	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1386	5.00	4.35	4.32	4.30	5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1380	5.00	4.43	4.32	4.32	5.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	1	1	0	0	0	7	4.50	288/1193		4.02	4.02	4.05	4.50
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1172	5.00	4.26	4.15	4.24	5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/11/2		4.56	4.15	4.42	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1170	5.00	4.41	4.38	4.42	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	3	0	0	1	1	0	5	4.29	318/ 800		4.17	4.06	4.12	4.29
4. Were special deciminates successful	3	U	U	Τ	Т	U	5	4.29	310/ 600	4.49	±.1/	4.00	4.12	4.29
Frequ	ency	Dist	cribu	ation	n									

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	l Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	 А	5	Required for Majors	8	Graduate	0	Major	2
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	В	4						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	0	C	1	General	1	Under-grad	10	Non-major	8
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means	there	are not enough	
				P	0			responses to	be sig	nificant	
				I	0	Other	0	_			
				2	0						

Course-Section: FREN 302 01 University of Maryland Title Advanced French II Baltimore County Spring 2010

Instructor: Ka,Omar

Enrollment: 16 Questionnaires: 11

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Page 755

JUN 28, 2010

Job IRBR3029

	Frequencies							Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	2	2	2	5	3.91	1159/1447	3.91	4.31	4.31	4.32	3.91
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	0	3	2	5	3.91	1141/1447	3.91	4.34	4.27	4.23	3.91
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	5	5	4.36	692/1241	4.36	4.48	4.33	4.33	4.36
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	0	3	7	4.45	555/1402	4.45	4.36	4.24	4.24	4.45
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	3	0	0	2	3	3	4.13	727/1358	4.13	4.26	4.11	4.10	4.13
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	2	1	7	4.27	599/1316	4.27	4.27	4.14	4.13	4.27
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	2	1	2	1	5	3.55	1246/1427	3.55	4.21	4.19	4.15	3.55
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	7	4	4.36	1182/1447	4.36	4.66	4.69	4.65	4.36
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	1	3	2	3	3.78	1073/1434	3.78	4.12	4.10	4.09	3.78
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	1	3	2	4	3.90	1228/1387	3.90	4.45	4.46	4.44	3.90
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1387	5.00	4.78	4.73	4.71	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	2	2	2	4	3.80	1174/1386	3.80	4.35	4.32	4.30	3.80
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	2	3	4	4.00	1030/1380	4.00	4.43	4.32	4.32	4.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	1	0	1	1	3	4	4.11	602/1193	4.11	4.02	4.02	4.05	4.11
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	3	0	0	3	3.50	999/1172	3.50	4.26	4.15	4.24	3.50
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	1	0	0	1	4	4.17	788/1182	4.17	4.56	4.35	4.42	4.17
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	0	1	2	3	4.33	710/1170	4.33	4.41	4.38	4.49	4.33
4. Were special techniques successful	6	4	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 800	****	4.17	4.06	4.12	****

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	d Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors	
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	0	 А	4	Required for Majors	9	Graduate	0	Major	4
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	В	6						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	1	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	11	Non-major	7
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	6	F	0	Electives	2	#### - Means	there a	re not enough	
				P	0			responses to	be sign	ificant	
				I	0	Other	0	-	_		
				?	1						

Course-Section: FREN 310 01 University of Maryland Page 756 Title Baltimore County JUN 28, 2010 Interconnections: Lang

Instructor: McCray,Stanley

Enrollment: 15 Questionnaires: 10

Spring 2010 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Job IRBR3029

		Ezo		ncies			Tnat	ructor	Course Dept		UMBC Level		Coat	
Ouestions	NR	NA	1	equei 2	3	5 1	5	Mean	Rank		Mean	Mean	Mean	Sect Mean
Quescions		11/24						Mean			Mean		Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	4	3	3	3.90	1159/1447	3.90	4.31	4.31	4.32	3.90
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	3	4	4.00	1053/1447	4.00	4.34	4.27	4.23	4.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	3	6	4.50	541/1241	4.50	4.48	4.33	4.33	4.50
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	3	5	4.20	827/1402	4.20	4.36	4.24	4.24	4.20
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	2	2	4	4.00	799/1358	4.00	4.26	4.11	4.10	4.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	5	4	4.44	455/1316	4.44	4.27	4.14	4.13	4.44
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	3	1	5	4.22	811/1427	4.22	4.21	4.19	4.15	4.22
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	8	1	4.11	1326/1447	4.11	4.66	4.69	4.65	4.11
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	1	5	2	4.13	775/1434	4.13	4.12	4.10	4.09	4.13
Lecture														
	2	0	0	0	2	2	2	2 00	1235/1387	3.88	4.45	4.46	4.44	3.88
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	_ ∠	0	0	0	3	1	2		579/1387	4.89	4.45	4.46	4.44	4.89
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	Τ	-	-	0	0	1	8	4.89						
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	2	4	2		1047/1386		4.35	4.32	4.30	4.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	Ţ	4	4	4.33	815/1380		4.43	4.32	4.32	4.33
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	Τ	2	U	Т	U	Τ	5	4.43	358/1193	4.43	4.02	4.02	4.05	4.43
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	3	2	4.40	463/1172	4.40	4.26	4.15	4.24	4.40
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	490/1182	4.60	4.56	4.35	4.42	4.60
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	657/1170	4.40	4.41	4.38	4.49	4.40
4. Were special techniques successful	5	2	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	423/ 800	4.00	4.17	4.06	4.12	4.00
Frequency Distribution														
riequ	ieilcy	ופדע	- I I DI	ucloi	.1									

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	Grades	Reasons		Туре	Majors		
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	 А	7	Required for Majors	7	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	В	0						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	10	Non-major	10
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means	there	are not enough	n
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	0	_			
				?	0						

Course-Section: FREN 320 01 University of Maryland Title Baltimore County Interconnections:Trade

Instructor: Deverneil, Marie

Enrollment: 15 Questionnaires: 11

Spring 2010 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire Page 757

JUN 28, 2010

Job IRBR3029

		Frequencies						Inst	ructor	Course Dept		pt UMBC Leve		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	0	3	8	4.73	342/1447	4.73	4.31	4.31	4.32	4.73
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	9	4.82	187/1447	4.82	4.34	4.27	4.23	4.82
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	4	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	186/1241	4.86	4.48	4.33	4.33	4.86
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	1	9	4.73	249/1402	4.73	4.36	4.24	4.24	4.73
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	87/1358	4.91	4.26	4.11	4.10	4.91
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	9	4.82	122/1316	4.82	4.27	4.14	4.13	4.82
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	2	9	4.82	147/1427	4.82	4.21	4.19	4.15	4.82
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1447	5.00	4.66	4.69	4.65	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	141/1434	4.78	4.12	4.10	4.09	4.78
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1387	5.00	4.45	4.46	4.44	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1387	5.00	4.78	4.73	4.71	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	2	9	4.82	241/1386	4.82	4.35	4.32	4.30	4.82
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	9	4.82	261/1380	4.82	4.43	4.32	4.32	4.82
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	65/1193	4.91	4.02	4.02	4.05	4.91
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1172	5.00	4.26	4.15	4.24	5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	229/1182	4.88	4.56	4.35	4.42	4.88
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1170	5.00	4.41	4.38	4.49	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	3	0	0	0	1	0	7	4.75	103/ 800	4.75	4.17	4.06	4.12	4.75

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected	d Grades	Reasons		Type	Majors		
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	10	Required for Majors	9	Graduate	0	Major	3
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	1						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	11	Non-major	8
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means	there	are not enough	
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	0	_			
				?	0						

Course-Section: FREN 349 1 University of Maryland Title Mod French Civilizatio

Baltimore County Spring 2010

Page 758

JUN 28, 2010

Job IRBR3029

Instructor: Field, Thomas T

4. Were special techniques successful

Enrollment: 1.0 Ouestionnaires: 6

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequencies Instructor Course Dept UMBC Level Sect Ouestions NR NA 1 2 3 4 5 Mean Rank Mean Mean Mean Mean Mean General 1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course 0 0 0 0 0 1 5 4.83 222/1447 4.83 4.31 4.31 4.32 4.83 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals 0 0 0 0 0 2 4 4.67 352/1447 4.67 4.34 4.27 4.23 4.67 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals 0 0 0 0 1 5 4.83 204/1241 4.83 4.48 4.33 4.33 4.83 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals 0 0 0 0 1 5 4.83 143/1402 4.83 4.36 4.24 4.24 4.83 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 2 0 0 0 0 0 4 5.00 1/1358 5.00 4.26 4.11 4.10 5.00 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 1 0 0 0 0 1 4 4.80 128/1316 4.80 4.27 4.14 4.13 4.80 7. Was the grading system clearly explained 1 0 0 0 1 2 2 4.20 842/1427 4.20 4.21 4.19 4.15 4.20 8. How many times was class cancelled 1 0 0 0 0 2 3 4.60 1018/1447 4.60 4.66 4.69 4.65 4.60 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 0 0 1 0 0 5 4.33 540/1434 4.33 4.12 4.10 4.09 4.33 Lecture 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 0 0 0 0 0 0 6 5.00 1/1387 5.00 4.45 4.46 4.44 5.00 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 0 0 0 0 0 0 6 5.00 1/1387 5.00 4.78 4.73 4.71 5.00 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0 0 0 0 0 0 6 5.00 1/1386 5.00 4.35 4.32 4.30 5.00 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 0 0 0 0 0 0 6 5.00 1/1380 5.00 4.43 4.32 4.32 5.00 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 0 0 0 0 0 6 5.00 1/1193 5.00 4.02 4.02 4.05 5.00 Discussion 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 2 0 0 0 2 2 4.50 377/1172 4.50 4.26 4.15 4.24 4.50 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 2 0 0 0 0 1 3 4.75 347/1182 4.75 4.56 4.35 4.42 4.75 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 2 0 0 0 0 4 5.00 1/1170 5.00 4.41 4.38 4.49 5.00

Frequency Distribution

2 3 1 0 0 0 1.00 ****/ 800 **** 4.17 4.06 4.12 ****

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

Course-Section: FREN 440 01

Title Study In French Cultur

Instructor: Schneider, Judit

Enrollment: 16
Questionnaires: 11

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2010

Page 759 JUN 28, 2010 Job IRBR3029

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

Questions	NR	NA	Fre 1	equer 2	ncies 3	s 4	5	Ins Mean	tructor Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean		Sect Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	Λ	Λ	0	1	2	4	2	3 82	1230/1447	3.82	4.31	4.31	4.43	3.82
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	2	1	3	4		1274/1447	3.64	4.34	4.27	4.31	3.64
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	5	4		,	4.09	4.48	4.33	4.41	4.09
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	1	3	2	4		1215/1402	3.64	4.36	4.24	4.34	3.64
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	5	0	0	5		1246/1358	3.27	4.26	4.11	4.15	3.27
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	0	2	3	4		1069/1316	3.64	4.27	4.14	4.27	3.64
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	1	4	2	3	3.45	1275/1427	3.45	4.21	4.19	4.20	3.45
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1447	5.00	4.66	4.69	4.72	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	1	0	1	2	2	2	3.71	1117/1434	3.71	4.12	4.10	4.17	3.71
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	1	2	3	5	4.09	1147/1387	4.09	4.45	4.46	4.48	4.09
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	10		528/1387	4.91	4.78	4.73	4.76	4.91
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	2	3	2	3		1237/1386	3.60	4.35	4.32	4.34	3.60
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	3	2	5	4.00	1030/1380	4.00	4.43	4.32	4.34	4.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	1	4	6	4.45	332/1193	4.45	4.02	4.02	4.00	4.45
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	5	2	2	3.67	925/1172	3.67	4.26	4.15	4.25	3.67
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	1	4	4	4.33	691/1182	4.33	4.56	4.35	4.49	4.33
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	1	3	5	4.44	624/1170	4.44	4.41	4.38	4.51	4.44
4. Were special techniques successful	2	1	0	1	2	0	5	4.13	398/ 800	4.13	4.17	4.06	4.19	4.13
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	10	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 66	****	3.99	4.58	4.87	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	10	0	0	0	1	0	0		****/ 62	****	4.90	4.56	4.80	***
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 58	****	4.80	4.41	4.59	***
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 65	****	4.55	4.42	4.55	***
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	10	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 64	***	4.45	4.09	4.43	***

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected	d Grades	Reasons		Type	Majors		
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	А	4	Required for Majors	8	Graduate	2	Major	4
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	3						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	1	General	0	Under-grad	9	Non-major	7
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	0	D	0						
Grad.	2	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means	there	are not enough	1
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	0	-			
				2	1						