Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section: FREN 101 01	Term - Spring 2011	Enrollment: 29
Title: Elementary French I		Questionnaires: 14
Instructor: Badagbo,Yawo		

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	2	2	4	6	4.00	1106/1449	4.40	4.45	4.33	4.14	4.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	2	2	4	5	3.71	1252/1446	4.19	4.47	4.29	4.20	3.71
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	6	7	4.43	619/1256	4.68	4.56	4.34	4.21	4.43
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	1	0	4	3	4	3.75	1171/1402	4.25	4.50	4.27	4.10	3.75
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	1	1	5	6	4.00	827/1358	4.43	4.40	4.13	4.04	4.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	2	2	2	2	2	4	3.33	1196/1327	4.13	4.35	4.16	3.92	3.33
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	1	3	3	3	3	3.31	1329/1435	3.86	4.33	4.20	4.11	3.31
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	5	9	4.64	908/1446	4.44	4.68	4.67	4.57	4.64
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	1	1	3	4	2	3.45	1266/1437	3.98	4.26	4.12	4.04	3.45
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	2	0	2	6	4	3.71	1285/1386	4.39	4.58	4.48	4.40	3.71
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	4	10	4.71	940/1390	4.77	4.83	4.74	4.67	4.71
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	1	1	3	3	6	3.86	1148/1379	4.28	4.47	4.34	4.28	3.86
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	2	2	8	4.31	858/1379	4.50	4.58	4.36	4.26	4.31
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	3	1	4	1	4	3.15	1127/1236	3.87	4.17	4.08	3.93	3.15
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	9	0	1	1	1	0	2	3.20	1023/1121	4.05	4.38	4.18	3.89	3.20
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	1	1	0	0	4	3.83	940/1122	4.62	4.64	4.36	4.09	3.83
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	1	1	0	2	2	3.50	1013/1121	4.25	4.58	4.40	4.08	3.50
4. Were special techniques successful	8	1	1	1	1	1	1	3.00	731/790	4.11	4.26	4.06	3.89	3.00

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	FREN 101 01		Term - Spring 2011			Enrollment: 29
Title:	Elementary French I					Questionnaires: 14
Instructor:	Badagbo,Yawo					

					Frequencies				Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Discussion														

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	8	Required for Majors	3	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	4						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	0	C	1	General	6	Under-grad	14	Non-major	14
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	0	F	0	Electives	2	**** - Means there are not enough responses			
				P	0			to be significant			
				I	0	Other	1				
				?	1						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	FREN 101 02	Term - Spring 2011		Enrollment:	30
Title:	Elementary French I			Questionnaires:	15
Instructor:	Gueye,Sokhna Fa				

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	6	9	4.60	460/1449	4.40	4.45	4.33	4.14	4.60
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	4	4	7	4.20	918/1446	4.19	4.47	4.29	4.20	4.20
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	3	11	4.67	367/1256	4.68	4.56	4.34	4.21	4.67
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	1	2	3	8	4.29	781/1402	4.25	4.50	4.27	4.10	4.29
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	7	0	0	2	0	6	4.50	371/1358	4.43	4.40	4.13	4.04	4.50
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	5	4	6	4.07	814/1327	4.13	4.35	4.16	3.92	4.07
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	2	6	6	4.13	888/1435	3.86	4.33	4.20	4.11	4.13
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	11	4	4.27	1204/1446	4.44	4.68	4.67	4.57	4.27
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	1	8	2	4.09	809/1437	3.98	4.26	4.12	4.04	4.09
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	1	1	4	9	4.40	929/1386	4.39	4.58	4.48	4.40	4.40
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	1	1	1	12	4.60	1070/1390	4.77	4.83	4.74	4.67	4.60
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	1	2	4	8	4.27	893/1379	4.28	4.47	4.34	4.28	4.27
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	3	2	10	4.47	727/1379	4.50	4.58	4.36	4.26	4.47
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	3	1	2	2	0	7	3.83	864/1236	3.87	4.17	4.08	3.93	3.83
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	1	2	0	4	4.00	727/1121	4.05	4.38	4.18	3.89	4.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	222/1122	4.62	4.64	4.36	4.09	4.86
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	0	0	1	0	6	4.71	427/1121	4.25	4.58	4.40	4.08	4.71
4. Were special techniques successful	8	1	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	200/790	4.11	4.26	4.06	3.89	4.50

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	FREN 101 02	Term - Spring 2011		Enrollment:	30
Title:	Elementary French I			Questionnaires:	15
Instructor:	Gueye,Sokhna Fa				

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	13	1	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/200	****	****	4.28	4.19	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	14	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/205	****	****	4.29	4.37	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	14	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/201	****	****	4.51	4.57	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	14	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/202	****	****	4.42	4.55	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	14	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/196	****	****	4.25	4.42	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	13	1	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/67	****	5.00	4.58	4.48	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	14	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/66	****	5.00	4.36	4.35	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/64	****	5.00	4.25	4.01	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	14	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/75	****	5.00	4.32	3.95	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	14	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/73	****	3.75	4.00	3.44	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/34	****	****	4.33	2.63	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/35	****	****	4.15	5.00	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/30	****	****	4.09	5.00	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/30	****	****	4.04	4.75	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/27	****	****	4.13	****	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/31	****	****	4.34	4.82	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/18	****	****	4.13	4.88	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/24	****	****	4.34	4.64	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	FREN 101 02
Title:	Elementary French I
Instructor:	Gueye,Sokhna Fa

Term - Spring 2011

Enrollment:	30
Questionnaires:	15

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Self Paced														
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/15	****	****	4.18	4.50	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/13	****	****	4.07	4.63	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	9	Required for Majors	4	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B	4						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	2	C	0	General	8	Under-grad	15	Non-major	15
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	4	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	0	F	0	Electives	1				
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	1				
				?	1						

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

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	FREN 101 03		Term - Spring 2011			Enrollment:	31
Title:	Elementary French I					Questionnaires:	13
Instructor:	Gueye,Sokhna Fa						

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	2	11	4.85	184/1449	4.40	4.45	4.33	4.14	4.85
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	3	9	4.62	425/1446	4.19	4.47	4.29	4.20	4.62
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	13	5.00	1/1256	4.68	4.56	4.34	4.21	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	1	11	4.77	224/1402	4.25	4.50	4.27	4.10	4.77
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	3	9	4.75	163/1358	4.43	4.40	4.13	4.04	4.75
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	0	2	9	4.58	328/1327	4.13	4.35	4.16	3.92	4.58
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	0	1	2	9	4.38	633/1435	3.86	4.33	4.20	4.11	4.38
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	8	5	4.38	1111/1446	4.44	4.68	4.67	4.57	4.38
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	0	4	5	4.56	321/1437	3.98	4.26	4.12	4.04	4.56
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	2	11	4.85	304/1386	4.39	4.58	4.48	4.40	4.85
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	2	11	4.85	684/1390	4.77	4.83	4.74	4.67	4.85
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	3	10	4.77	302/1379	4.28	4.47	4.34	4.28	4.77
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	12	4.92	135/1379	4.50	4.58	4.36	4.26	4.92
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	1	0	1	0	2	7	4.50	331/1236	3.87	4.17	4.08	3.93	4.50
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	190/1121	4.05	4.38	4.18	3.89	4.78
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	191/1122	4.62	4.64	4.36	4.09	4.89
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	0	1	0	8	4.78	361/1121	4.25	4.58	4.40	4.08	4.78
4. Were special techniques successful	4	1	0	0	1	1	6	4.63	150/790	4.11	4.26	4.06	3.89	4.63

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section: FREN 101 03	Term - Spring 2011	Enrollment: 31
Title: Elementary French I		Questionnaires: 13
Instructor: Gueye,Sokhna Fa		

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Discussion														

Frequency Distribution

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

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	FREN 101 04		Term - Spring 2011		Enrollment:	26
Title:	Elementary French I				Questionnaires:	13
Instructor:	Badagbo,Yawo					

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	1	1	6	5	4.15	997/1449	4.40	4.45	4.33	4.14	4.15
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	6	5	4.23	885/1446	4.19	4.47	4.29	4.20	4.23
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	5	8	4.62	422/1256	4.68	4.56	4.34	4.21	4.62
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	2	5	4	4.18	878/1402	4.25	4.50	4.27	4.10	4.18
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	0	1	4	6	4.45	427/1358	4.43	4.40	4.13	4.04	4.45
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	1	0	0	1	3	7	4.55	366/1327	4.13	4.35	4.16	3.92	4.55
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	3	4	1	5	3.62	1236/1435	3.86	4.33	4.20	4.11	3.62
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	6	5	4.45	1057/1446	4.44	4.68	4.67	4.57	4.45
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	1	0	0	3	6	1	3.80	1082/1437	3.98	4.26	4.12	4.04	3.80
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	5	8	4.62	691/1386	4.39	4.58	4.48	4.40	4.62
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	12	4.92	425/1390	4.77	4.83	4.74	4.67	4.92
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	2	6	5	4.23	919/1379	4.28	4.47	4.34	4.28	4.23
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	0	6	6	4.31	858/1379	4.50	4.58	4.36	4.26	4.31
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	1	2	5	4	4.00	709/1236	3.87	4.17	4.08	3.93	4.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	1	0	0	3	5	4.22	624/1121	4.05	4.38	4.18	3.89	4.22
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	191/1122	4.62	4.64	4.36	4.09	4.89
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	1	2	2	4	4.00	855/1121	4.25	4.58	4.40	4.08	4.00
4. Were special techniques successful	4	0	0	0	2	2	5	4.33	287/790	4.11	4.26	4.06	3.89	4.33

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	FREN 101 04
Title:	Elementary French I
Instructor:	Badagbo,Yawo

| Term - Spring 2011 |

| Enrollment: | 26 |
| Questionnaires: | 13 |

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies 1	2	3	4	5	Instructor Mean	Rank	Course Mean	Org Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/200	****	****	4.28	4.19	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/205	****	****	4.29	4.37	****

Frequency Distribution

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

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	FREN 102 01
Title:	Elementary French II
Instructor:	Fatih,Zakaria

Term - Spring 2011

Enrollment:	23
Questionnaires:	15

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies 1	2	3	4	5	Instructor Mean	Rank	Course Mean	Org Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	2	0	0	0	3	2	8	4.38	758/1449	4.34	4.45	4.33	4.14	4.38
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	0	0	1	6	6	4.38	724/1446	4.22	4.47	4.29	4.20	4.38
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	0	0	0	0	4	9	4.69	334/1256	4.44	4.56	4.34	4.21	4.69
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	2	0	0	2	4	5	4.27	791/1402	4.33	4.50	4.27	4.10	4.27
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	3	4	0	0	3	2	3	4.00	827/1358	4.18	4.40	4.13	4.04	4.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	3	6	1	0	1	3	1	3.50	1127/1327	3.86	4.35	4.16	3.92	3.50
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	3	0	0	1	1	5	5	4.17	858/1435	3.97	4.33	4.20	4.11	4.17
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	0	0	0	2	10	0	3.83	1408/1446	4.40	4.68	4.67	4.57	3.83
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	3	6	3	4.00	868/1437	4.05	4.26	4.12	4.04	4.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	2	2	2	7	4.08	1154/1386	4.46	4.58	4.48	4.40	4.08
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	6	7	4.54	1134/1390	4.66	4.83	4.74	4.67	4.54
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	2	4	7	4.38	787/1379	4.22	4.47	4.34	4.28	4.38
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	2	1	9	4.58	600/1379	4.51	4.58	4.36	4.26	4.58
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	10	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/1236	3.53	4.17	4.08	3.93	****
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	2	1	3	4.17	662/1121	4.03	4.38	4.18	3.89	4.17
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	9	0	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	537/1122	4.53	4.64	4.36	4.09	4.50
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	473/1121	4.49	4.58	4.40	4.08	4.67
4. Were special techniques successful	9	4	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	****/790	4.07	4.26	4.06	3.89	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	FREN 102 01	Term - Spring 2011	Enrollment:	23
Title:	Elementary French II		Questionnaires:	15
Instructor:	Fatih,Zakaria			

Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Instructor Mean	Instructor Rank	Course Mean	Org Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	14	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/200	****	****	4.28	4.19	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	14	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/205	****	****	4.29	4.37	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	14	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/201	****	****	4.51	4.57	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/202	****	****	4.42	4.55	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	14	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/196	****	****	4.25	4.42	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	14	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/67	****	5.00	4.58	4.48	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	14	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/66	****	5.00	4.36	4.35	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/64	****	5.00	4.25	4.01	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/75	****	5.00	4.32	3.95	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/34	****	****	4.33	2.63	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	14	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/35	****	****	4.15	5.00	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	14	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/30	****	****	4.09	5.00	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	14	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/30	****	****	4.04	4.75	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	14	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/27	****	****	4.13	****	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/31	****	****	4.34	4.82	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	14	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/18	****	****	4.13	4.88	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	14	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/24	****	****	4.34	4.64	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	14	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/15	****	****	4.18	4.50	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	FREN 102 01	Term - Spring 2011		Enrollment:	23
Title:	Elementary French II			Questionnaires:	15
Instructor:	Fatih,Zakaria				

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Self Paced														
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	14	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/13	****	****	4.07	4.63	****

Frequency Distribution

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

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	FREN 102 02
Title:	Elementary French II
Instructor:	Gueye,Sokhna Fa

Term - Spring 2011

Enrollment: 29
Questionnaires: 14

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	0	0	1	9	3	4.15	997/1449	4.34	4.45	4.33	4.14	4.15
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	1	1	7	4	4.08	1022/1446	4.22	4.47	4.29	4.20	4.08
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	1	1	1	10	4.54	493/1256	4.44	4.56	4.34	4.21	4.54
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	1	0	7	5	4.23	829/1402	4.33	4.50	4.27	4.10	4.23
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	0	2	0	2	2	6	3.83	994/1358	4.18	4.40	4.13	4.04	3.83
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	1	4	0	6	3.75	1017/1327	3.86	4.35	4.16	3.92	3.75
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	4	1	3	4	3.38	1301/1435	3.97	4.33	4.20	4.11	3.38
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	12	1	4.08	1328/1446	4.40	4.68	4.67	4.57	4.08
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	0	3	3	3	4.00	868/1437	4.05	4.26	4.12	4.04	4.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	371/1386	4.46	4.58	4.48	4.40	4.80
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	0	1	3	6	4.50	1162/1390	4.66	4.83	4.74	4.67	4.50
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	0	1	2	3	4	4.00	1058/1379	4.22	4.47	4.34	4.28	4.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	1	0	2	7	4.50	688/1379	4.51	4.58	4.36	4.26	4.50
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	5	2	3	1	1	1	1	2.43	1213/1236	3.53	4.17	4.08	3.93	2.43
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	9	0	1	0	2	0	2	3.40	971/1121	4.03	4.38	4.18	3.89	3.40
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	9	0	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	455/1122	4.53	4.64	4.36	4.09	4.60
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	524/1121	4.49	4.58	4.40	4.08	4.60
4. Were special techniques successful	9	0	0	1	2	2	0	3.20	706/790	4.07	4.26	4.06	3.89	3.20

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	FREN 102 02	Term - Spring 2011		Enrollment: 29
Title:	Elementary French II			Questionnaires: 14
Instructor:	Gueye,Sokhna Fa			

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Discussion														

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	3	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B	7						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	1	C	0	General	8	Under-grad	14	Non-major	14
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	0	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	2	**** - Means there are not enough responses			
				P	0			to be significant			
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	3						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section: FREN 102 03	Term - Spring 2011	Enrollment: 29
Title: Elementary French II		Questionnaires: 14
Instructor: Wecker,Donna L.		

| Questions | NR | NA | Frequencies | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Org | UMBC | Level | Sect |
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	2	1	11	4.64	404/1449	4.34	4.45	4.33	4.14	4.64
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	3	9	4.43	677/1446	4.22	4.47	4.29	4.20	4.43
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	4	8	4.36	696/1256	4.44	4.56	4.34	4.21	4.36
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	1	1	2	7	4.36	706/1402	4.33	4.50	4.27	4.10	4.36
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	1	0	3	8	4.50	371/1358	4.18	4.40	4.13	4.04	4.50
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	2	6	5	4.07	808/1327	3.86	4.35	4.16	3.92	4.07
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	2	1	4	7	4.14	878/1435	3.97	4.33	4.20	4.11	4.14
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	2	12	4.86	627/1446	4.40	4.68	4.67	4.57	4.86
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	1	6	3	4.20	691/1437	4.05	4.26	4.12	4.04	4.20
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	1	0	12	4.85	304/1386	4.46	4.58	4.48	4.40	4.85
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	13	5.00	1/1390	4.66	4.83	4.74	4.67	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	1	1	3	8	4.38	787/1379	4.22	4.47	4.34	4.28	4.38
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	1	2	9	4.46	727/1379	4.51	4.58	4.36	4.26	4.46
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	1	0	2	1	9	4.31	516/1236	3.53	4.17	4.08	3.93	4.31
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	1	1	5	4.57	353/1121	4.03	4.38	4.18	3.89	4.57
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1122	4.53	4.64	4.36	4.09	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	246/1121	4.49	4.58	4.40	4.08	4.88
4. Were special techniques successful	6	1	0	0	2	3	2	4.00	425/790	4.07	4.26	4.06	3.89	4.00

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	FREN 102 03		Term - Spring 2011		Enrollment:	29
Title:	Elementary French II				Questionnaires:	14
Instructor:	Wecker,Donna L.					

Questions		NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
				1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Discussion															

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	5	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	B	4						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	1	C	2	General	5	Under-grad	14	Non-major	14
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F	0	Electives	2	**** - Means there are not enough responses			
				P	0			to be significant			
				I	0	Other	1				
				?	3						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	FREN 102 04			Term - Spring 2011						Enrollment:		16		
Title:	Elementary French II									Questionnaires:		11		
Instructor:	Badagbo-Adzra,L													

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	3	3	5	4.18	967/1449	4.34	4.45	4.33	4.14	4.18
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	5	1	5	4.00	1061/1446	4.22	4.47	4.29	4.20	4.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	0	2	1	7	4.18	834/1256	4.44	4.56	4.34	4.21	4.18
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	1	0	1	0	2	6	4.44	613/1402	4.33	4.50	4.27	4.10	4.44
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	1	0	3	6	4.40	483/1358	4.18	4.40	4.13	4.04	4.40
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	3	3	4	4.10	792/1327	3.86	4.35	4.16	3.92	4.10
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	4	1	6	4.18	838/1435	3.97	4.33	4.20	4.11	4.18
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	2	9	4.82	707/1446	4.40	4.68	4.67	4.57	4.82
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	2	5	2	4.00	868/1437	4.05	4.26	4.12	4.04	4.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	1	3	0	6	4.10	1145/1386	4.46	4.58	4.48	4.40	4.10
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	1	2	7	4.60	1070/1390	4.66	4.83	4.74	4.67	4.60
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	1	2	2	5	4.10	1018/1379	4.22	4.47	4.34	4.28	4.10
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	1	0	8	4.50	688/1379	4.51	4.58	4.36	4.26	4.50
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	2	2	0	0	0	5	3.86	852/1236	3.53	4.17	4.08	3.93	3.86
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	1	0	1	0	4	4.00	727/1121	4.03	4.38	4.18	3.89	4.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	2	0	0	4	4.00	857/1122	4.53	4.64	4.36	4.09	4.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	1	1	0	0	4	3.83	940/1121	4.49	4.58	4.40	4.08	3.83
4. Were special techniques successful	5	3	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/790	4.07	4.26	4.06	3.89	5.00

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	FREN 102 04	Term - Spring 2011	Enrollment:	16
Title:	Elementary French II		Questionnaires:	11
Instructor:	Badagbo-Adzra,L			

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Discussion														

Frequency Distribution

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

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	FREN 103 01		Term - Spring 2011			Enrollment:	25
Title:	Int Rev Elem French					Questionnaires:	17
Instructor:	El Omari,Samir						

| Questions | NR | NA | Frequencies | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Org | UMBC | Level | Sect |
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	1	0	7	9	4.41	719/1449	4.41	4.45	4.33	4.14	4.41
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	0	5	11	4.53	544/1446	4.53	4.47	4.29	4.20	4.53
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	3	13	4.71	324/1256	4.71	4.56	4.34	4.21	4.71
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	5	11	4.69	316/1402	4.69	4.50	4.27	4.10	4.69
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	1	0	0	0	5	10	4.67	232/1358	4.67	4.40	4.13	4.04	4.67
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	1	1	1	0	3	9	4.29	637/1327	4.29	4.35	4.16	3.92	4.29
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	1	4	3	8	3.94	1024/1435	3.94	4.33	4.20	4.11	3.94
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	1	10	6	4.29	1183/1446	4.29	4.68	4.67	4.57	4.29
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	1	0	2	5	7	4.13	769/1437	4.13	4.26	4.12	4.04	4.13
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	1	0	4	12	4.59	726/1386	4.59	4.58	4.48	4.40	4.59
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	1	15	4.82	735/1390	4.82	4.83	4.74	4.67	4.82
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	5	12	4.71	384/1379	4.71	4.47	4.34	4.28	4.71
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	3	13	4.71	461/1379	4.71	4.58	4.36	4.26	4.71
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	2	0	0	1	4	10	4.60	264/1236	4.60	4.17	4.08	3.93	4.60
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	1	1	5	4.57	353/1121	4.57	4.38	4.18	3.89	4.57
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	10	0	0	1	1	0	5	4.29	728/1122	4.29	4.64	4.36	4.09	4.29
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	10	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	427/1121	4.71	4.58	4.40	4.08	4.71
4. Were special techniques successful	10	0	1	1	0	1	4	3.86	522/790	3.86	4.26	4.06	3.89	3.86

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	FREN 103 01	Term - Spring 2011	Enrollment: 25
Title:	Int Rev Elem French		Questionnaires: 17
Instructor:	El Omari,Samir		

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/31	****	****	4.34	4.82	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/18	****	****	4.13	4.88	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	16	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/24	****	****	4.34	4.64	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	16	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/15	****	****	4.18	4.50	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/13	****	****	4.07	4.63	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	4	0.00-0.99	1	A	4	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	9						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	2	C	0	General	13	Under-grad	17	Non-major	16
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	0	**** - Means there are not enough responses			
				P	0			to be significant			
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	4						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	FREN 201 01		Term - Spring 2011		Enrollment:	25
Title:	Intermediate French I				Questionnaires:	9
Instructor:	Badagbo-Adzra,L					

| Questions | NR | NA | Frequencies | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Org | UMBC | Level | Sect |
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	2	3	4	4.22	929/1449	4.08	4.45	4.33	4.32	4.22
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	3	5	4.44	650/1446	4.29	4.47	4.29	4.27	4.44
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	2	5	4.50	519/1256	4.46	4.56	4.34	4.36	4.50
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	1	1	1	3	2	3.50	1274/1402	4.21	4.50	4.27	4.28	3.50
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	0	5	3	4.11	766/1358	4.28	4.40	4.13	4.13	4.11
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	2	1	4	2	3.67	1061/1327	4.11	4.35	4.16	4.12	3.67
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	2	6	4.56	430/1435	4.44	4.33	4.20	4.17	4.56
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	566/1446	4.78	4.68	4.67	4.63	4.89
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	3	3	1	3.71	1145/1437	4.04	4.26	4.12	4.10	3.71
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	3	5	4.44	878/1386	4.59	4.58	4.48	4.46	4.44
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	3	5	4.44	1198/1390	4.59	4.83	4.74	4.76	4.44
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	1	0	3	5	4.33	832/1379	4.31	4.47	4.34	4.31	4.33
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	2	6	4.56	633/1379	4.54	4.58	4.36	4.37	4.56
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	1	2	2	4	4.00	709/1236	4.20	4.17	4.08	4.16	4.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	606/1121	4.30	4.38	4.18	4.11	4.25
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	275/1122	4.56	4.64	4.36	4.34	4.80
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	694/1121	4.41	4.58	4.40	4.39	4.40
4. Were special techniques successful	4	1	0	1	0	2	1	3.75	562/790	4.32	4.26	4.06	4.01	3.75

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	FREN 201 01		Term - Spring 2011				Enrollment: 25
Title:	Intermediate French I						Questionnaires: 9
Instructor:	Badagbo-Adzra,L						

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Org Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/200	****	****	4.28	4.35	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/205	****	****	4.29	4.10	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/201	****	****	4.51	4.42	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/202	****	****	4.42	4.32	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/196	****	****	4.25	4.10	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/67	****	5.00	4.58	4.48	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/66	****	5.00	4.36	4.17	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/64	****	5.00	4.25	3.96	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/75	****	5.00	4.32	4.48	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/73	****	3.75	4.00	4.04	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/34	****	****	4.33	3.66	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/35	****	****	4.15	3.19	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/30	****	****	4.09	3.74	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/30	****	****	4.04	3.67	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/27	****	****	4.13	3.33	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/31	****	****	4.34	2.63	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/18	****	****	4.13	3.50	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/24	****	****	4.34	3.75	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section: FREN 201 01	Term - Spring 2011	Enrollment: 25
Title: Intermediate French I		Questionnaires: 9
Instructor: Badagbo-Adzra,L		

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Self Paced														
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/15	****	****	4.18	3.75	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/13	****	****	4.07	3.25	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	1	A	5	Required for Majors	3	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	2						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	3	C	0	General	4	Under-grad	9	Non-major	9
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	0	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	0	F	0	Electives	0	**** - Means there are not enough responses			
				P	0			to be significant			
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	2						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	FREN 201 02		Term - Spring 2011			Enrollment:	25
Title:	Intermediate French I					Questionnaires:	18
Instructor:	Badagbo-Adzra,L						

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	1	1	4	4	7	3.88	1197/1449	4.08	4.45	4.33	4.32	3.88
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	1	2	5	9	4.29	819/1446	4.29	4.47	4.29	4.27	4.29
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	1	0	6	10	4.47	556/1256	4.46	4.56	4.34	4.36	4.47
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	2	0	0	3	1	10	4.50	528/1402	4.21	4.50	4.27	4.28	4.50
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	3	0	1	1	5	6	4.23	648/1358	4.28	4.40	4.13	4.13	4.23
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	3	1	1	1	2	8	4.15	748/1327	4.11	4.35	4.16	4.12	4.15
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	0	3	2	11	4.50	479/1435	4.44	4.33	4.20	4.17	4.50
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	1	0	15	4.88	586/1446	4.78	4.68	4.67	4.63	4.88
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	3	5	7	4.27	627/1437	4.04	4.26	4.12	4.10	4.27
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	1	4	11	4.63	676/1386	4.59	4.58	4.48	4.46	4.63
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	1	1	2	3	9	4.13	1311/1390	4.59	4.83	4.74	4.76	4.13
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	4	4	8	4.25	902/1379	4.31	4.47	4.34	4.31	4.25
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	1	5	10	4.56	622/1379	4.54	4.58	4.36	4.37	4.56
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	1	0	0	5	2	7	4.14	641/1236	4.20	4.17	4.08	4.16	4.14
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	240/1121	4.30	4.38	4.18	4.11	4.71
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	11	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	360/1122	4.56	4.64	4.36	4.34	4.71
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	11	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	427/1121	4.41	4.58	4.40	4.39	4.71
4. Were special techniques successful	11	0	0	0	1	2	4	4.43	247/790	4.32	4.26	4.06	4.01	4.43

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	FREN 201 02		Term - Spring 2011		Enrollment:	25
Title:	Intermediate French I				Questionnaires:	18
Instructor:	Badagbo-Adzra,L					

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Discussion														

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	10	Required for Majors	3	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	4						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	1	C	0	General	10	Under-grad	18	Non-major	18
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F	0	Electives	1				
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	4						

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

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	FREN 201 03		Term - Spring 2011				Enrollment:	25
Title:	Intermediate French I						Questionnaires:	19
Instructor:	Wecker,Donna L.							

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	1	1	1	6	10	4.21	938/1449	4.08	4.45	4.33	4.32	4.21
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	3	4	11	4.44	650/1446	4.29	4.47	4.29	4.27	4.44
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	2	5	11	4.50	519/1256	4.46	4.56	4.34	4.36	4.50
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	1	0	0	2	6	8	4.38	697/1402	4.21	4.50	4.27	4.28	4.38
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	3	2	13	4.56	328/1358	4.28	4.40	4.13	4.13	4.56
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	4	0	0	3	6	6	4.20	704/1327	4.11	4.35	4.16	4.12	4.20
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	2	4	13	4.58	411/1435	4.44	4.33	4.20	4.17	4.58
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	18	4.95	316/1446	4.78	4.68	4.67	4.63	4.95
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	1	11	5	4.24	659/1437	4.04	4.26	4.12	4.10	4.24
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	1	17	4.94	122/1386	4.59	4.58	4.48	4.46	4.94
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	18	5.00	1/1390	4.59	4.83	4.74	4.76	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	1	5	12	4.61	504/1379	4.31	4.47	4.34	4.31	4.61
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	3	14	4.72	430/1379	4.54	4.58	4.36	4.37	4.72
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	1	0	1	2	14	4.56	297/1236	4.20	4.17	4.08	4.16	4.56
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	1	1	1	4	4.14	674/1121	4.30	4.38	4.18	4.11	4.14
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	12	0	0	1	0	0	6	4.57	479/1122	4.56	4.64	4.36	4.34	4.57
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	12	0	0	0	2	1	4	4.29	757/1121	4.41	4.58	4.40	4.39	4.29
4. Were special techniques successful	12	0	0	0	1	3	3	4.29	311/790	4.32	4.26	4.06	4.01	4.29

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	FREN 201 03	Term - Spring 2011	Enrollment:	25
Title:	Intermediate French I		Questionnaires:	19
Instructor:	Wecker,Donna L.			

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies 1	2	3	4	5	Instructor Mean	Rank	Course Mean	Org Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	17	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/200	****	****	4.28	4.35	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/205	****	****	4.29	4.10	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	17	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/201	****	****	4.51	4.42	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	17	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/202	****	****	4.42	4.32	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	17	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/196	****	****	4.25	4.10	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	17	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/67	****	5.00	4.58	4.48	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	17	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/66	****	5.00	4.36	4.17	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	17	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/64	****	5.00	4.25	3.96	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/75	****	5.00	4.32	4.48	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	17	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/73	****	3.75	4.00	4.04	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/34	****	****	4.33	3.66	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	17	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/35	****	****	4.15	3.19	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	17	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/30	****	****	4.09	3.74	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	17	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/30	****	****	4.04	3.67	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	17	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/27	****	****	4.13	3.33	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/31	****	****	4.34	2.63	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	17	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/18	****	****	4.13	3.50	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	17	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/24	****	****	4.34	3.75	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	FREN 201 03		Term - Spring 2011		Enrollment:	25
Title:	Intermediate French I				Questionnaires:	19
Instructor:	Wecker,Donna L.					

Questions			Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Self Paced														
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	17	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/15	****	****	4.18	3.75	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	17	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/13	****	****	4.07	3.25	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	4	Required for Majors	4	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	1	B	5						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	1	C	4	General	12	Under-grad	19	Non-major	19
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F	1	Electives	1	**** - Means there are not enough responses			
				P	0			to be significant			
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	4						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	FREN 201 04			Term - Spring 2011							Enrollment:	25
Title:	Intermediate French I										Questionnaires:	19
Instructor:	Wecker,Donna L.											

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	11	7	4.32	847/1449	4.08	4.45	4.33	4.32	4.32
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	7	10	4.37	745/1446	4.29	4.47	4.29	4.27	4.37
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	6	13	4.68	345/1256	4.46	4.56	4.34	4.36	4.68
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	1	6	11	4.56	468/1402	4.21	4.50	4.27	4.28	4.56
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	5	0	0	1	6	7	4.43	460/1358	4.28	4.40	4.13	4.13	4.43
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	0	2	7	8	4.35	572/1327	4.11	4.35	4.16	4.12	4.35
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	2	3	14	4.63	347/1435	4.44	4.33	4.20	4.17	4.63
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	19	5.00	1/1446	4.78	4.68	4.67	4.63	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	2	7	7	4.31	573/1437	4.04	4.26	4.12	4.10	4.31
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	2	16	4.79	407/1386	4.59	4.58	4.48	4.46	4.79
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	2	17	4.89	556/1390	4.59	4.83	4.74	4.76	4.89
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	1	2	4	10	4.35	814/1379	4.31	4.47	4.34	4.31	4.35
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	2	3	12	4.59	600/1379	4.54	4.58	4.36	4.37	4.59
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	1	6	12	4.58	284/1236	4.20	4.17	4.08	4.16	4.58
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	2	2	4	4.25	606/1121	4.30	4.38	4.18	4.11	4.25
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	12	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	222/1122	4.56	4.64	4.36	4.34	4.86
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	13	0	0	0	0	3	3	4.50	591/1121	4.41	4.58	4.40	4.39	4.50
4. Were special techniques successful	11	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	102/790	4.32	4.26	4.06	4.01	4.75

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	FREN 201 04	Term - Spring 2011		Enrollment:	25
Title:	Intermediate French I			Questionnaires:	19
Instructor:	Wecker,Donna L.				

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Discussion														

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	9	Required for Majors	4	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	8	1.00-1.99	0	B	5						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	2	C	4	General	12	Under-grad	19	Non-major	18
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	6	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	8	F	0	Electives	1				
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	1						

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

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	FREN 201 05		Term - Spring 2011			Enrollment: 22
Title:	Intermediate French I					Questionnaires: 12
Instructor:	El Omari,Samir					

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	3	2	2	5	3.75	1262/1449	4.08	4.45	4.33	4.32	3.75
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	3	4	4	3.92	1142/1446	4.29	4.47	4.29	4.27	3.92
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	2	1	2	7	4.17	849/1256	4.46	4.56	4.34	4.36	4.17
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	1	2	2	5	4.10	957/1402	4.21	4.50	4.27	4.28	4.10
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	3	4	4	4.09	781/1358	4.28	4.40	4.13	4.13	4.09
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	3	3	5	4.18	721/1327	4.11	4.35	4.16	4.12	4.18
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	2	2	3	5	3.92	1051/1435	4.44	4.33	4.20	4.17	3.92
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	1	0	7	4	4.17	1275/1446	4.78	4.68	4.67	4.63	4.17
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	1	1	0	3	2	3	3.67	1172/1437	4.04	4.26	4.12	4.10	3.67
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	3	4	5	4.17	1112/1386	4.59	4.58	4.48	4.46	4.17
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	2	2	8	4.50	1162/1390	4.59	4.83	4.74	4.76	4.50
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	1	0	3	2	6	4.00	1058/1379	4.31	4.47	4.34	4.31	4.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	3	0	8	4.25	900/1379	4.54	4.58	4.36	4.37	4.25
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	2	0	2	3	1	4	3.70	938/1236	4.20	4.17	4.08	4.16	3.70
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	1	0	1	0	5	4.14	674/1121	4.30	4.38	4.18	4.11	4.14
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	1	2	1	3	3.86	935/1122	4.56	4.64	4.36	4.34	3.86
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	1	1	1	4	4.14	817/1121	4.41	4.58	4.40	4.39	4.14
4. Were special techniques successful	5	2	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	259/790	4.32	4.26	4.06	4.01	4.40

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	FREN 201 05		Term - Spring 2011			Enrollment:	22
Title:	Intermediate French I					Questionnaires:	12
Instructor:	El Omari,Samir						

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	10	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/200	****	****	4.28	4.35	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	10	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/205	****	****	4.29	4.10	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	10	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/201	****	****	4.51	4.42	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	10	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/202	****	****	4.42	4.32	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	10	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/196	****	****	4.25	4.10	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/67	****	5.00	4.58	4.48	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/66	****	5.00	4.36	4.17	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/64	****	5.00	4.25	3.96	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/75	****	5.00	4.32	4.48	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/73	****	3.75	4.00	4.04	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/34	****	****	4.33	3.66	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/35	****	****	4.15	3.19	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/30	****	****	4.09	3.74	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/30	****	****	4.04	3.67	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/27	****	****	4.13	3.33	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/31	****	****	4.34	2.63	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/18	****	****	4.13	3.50	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/24	****	****	4.34	3.75	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	FREN 201 05		Term - Spring 2011		Enrollment:	22
Title:	Intermediate French I				Questionnaires:	12
Instructor:	El Omari,Samir					

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Self Paced														
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/15	****	****	4.18	3.75	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/13	****	****	4.07	3.25	****

Frequency Distribution

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

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	FREN 202 01	Term - Spring 2011	Enrollment:	16
Title:	Intermediate French II		Questionnaires:	8
Instructor:	Fatih,Zakaria			

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies 1	2	3	4	5	Instructor Mean	Rank	Course Mean	Org Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	3	4	4.38	771/1449	4.38	4.45	4.33	4.32	4.38
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	1	5	4.38	735/1446	4.38	4.47	4.29	4.27	4.38
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	269/1256	4.75	4.56	4.34	4.36	4.75
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	1	0	0	1	0	5	4.67	339/1402	4.67	4.50	4.27	4.28	4.67
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	0	2	4	4.29	598/1358	4.29	4.40	4.13	4.13	4.29
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	0	1	5	4.43	500/1327	4.43	4.35	4.16	4.12	4.43
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	2	0	5	4.13	898/1435	4.13	4.33	4.20	4.17	4.13
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	6	2	4.25	1212/1446	4.25	4.68	4.67	4.63	4.25
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	1	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	638/1437	4.25	4.26	4.12	4.10	4.25
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	3	4	4.38	954/1386	4.38	4.58	4.48	4.46	4.38
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	607/1390	4.88	4.83	4.74	4.76	4.88
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	1	6	4.63	491/1379	4.63	4.47	4.34	4.31	4.63
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	211/1379	4.88	4.58	4.36	4.37	4.88
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	1	0	0	1	0	5	4.67	220/1236	4.67	4.17	4.08	4.16	4.67
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	484/1121	4.40	4.38	4.18	4.11	4.40
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	275/1122	4.80	4.64	4.36	4.34	4.80
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1121	5.00	4.58	4.40	4.39	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	3	2	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	287/790	4.33	4.26	4.06	4.01	4.33

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	FREN 202 01		Term - Spring 2011		Enrollment:	16
Title:	Intermediate French II				Questionnaires:	8
Instructor:	Fatih,Zakaria					

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Discussion														

Frequency Distribution

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

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	FREN 301 01		Term - Spring 2011		Enrollment:	8
Title:	Advanced French I				Questionnaires:	5
Instructor:	Deverneil,Marie					

| Questions | NR | NA | Frequencies | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Org | UMBC | Level | Sect |
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	947/1449	4.20	4.45	4.33	4.38	4.20
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	918/1446	4.20	4.47	4.29	4.33	4.20
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1256	5.00	4.56	4.34	4.39	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	859/1402	4.20	4.50	4.27	4.37	4.20
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	0	2	2	4.00	827/1358	4.00	4.40	4.13	4.14	4.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	1	1	2	3.80	992/1327	3.80	4.35	4.16	4.23	3.80
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	2	0	1	2	3.60	1242/1435	3.60	4.33	4.20	4.25	3.60
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	949/1446	4.60	4.68	4.67	4.68	4.60
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	4	1	4.20	691/1437	4.20	4.26	4.12	4.14	4.20
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	3	2	4.40	929/1386	4.40	4.58	4.48	4.53	4.40
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1390	5.00	4.83	4.74	4.76	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	3	2	4.40	770/1379	4.40	4.47	4.34	4.38	4.40
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	310/1379	4.80	4.58	4.36	4.40	4.80
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	0	3	2	4.40	436/1236	4.40	4.17	4.08	4.18	4.40
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1121	****	4.38	4.18	4.31	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1122	****	4.64	4.36	4.46	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/1121	****	4.58	4.40	4.53	****
4. Were special techniques successful	4	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/790	****	4.26	4.06	4.11	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	FREN 301 01		Term - Spring 2011			Enrollment:	8
Title:	Advanced French I					Questionnaires:	5
Instructor:	Deverneil,Marie						

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Discussion														

Frequency Distribution

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

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	FREN 302 01		Term - Spring 2011							Enrollment:	12			
Title:	Advanced French II									Questionnaires:	10			
Instructor:	Bazgan,Nicoleta													

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	1	0	1	3	5	4.10	1048/1449	4.10	4.45	4.33	4.38	4.10
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	1	0	3	5	4.33	776/1446	4.33	4.47	4.29	4.33	4.33
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	4	5	4.40	644/1256	4.40	4.56	4.34	4.39	4.40
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	4	6	4.60	408/1402	4.60	4.50	4.27	4.37	4.60
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	1	0	4	3	4.13	756/1358	4.13	4.40	4.13	4.14	4.13
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	1	2	6	4.20	704/1327	4.20	4.35	4.16	4.23	4.20
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	0	4	5	4.30	720/1435	4.30	4.33	4.20	4.25	4.30
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	526/1446	4.90	4.68	4.67	4.68	4.90
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	2	2	3	4.14	758/1437	4.14	4.26	4.12	4.14	4.14
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	1	0	0	1	8	4.50	803/1386	4.50	4.58	4.48	4.53	4.50
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	1	0	0	2	7	4.40	1223/1390	4.40	4.83	4.74	4.76	4.40
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	1	0	0	4	5	4.20	946/1379	4.20	4.47	4.34	4.38	4.20
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	1	1	7	4.40	786/1379	4.40	4.58	4.36	4.40	4.40
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	1	1	1	2	5	3.90	823/1236	3.90	4.17	4.08	4.18	3.90
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	1	2	0	1	3.25	1012/1121	3.25	4.38	4.18	4.31	3.25
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	1	0	1	2	4.00	857/1122	4.00	4.64	4.36	4.46	4.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	1	0	0	1	2	3.75	959/1121	3.75	4.58	4.40	4.53	3.75
4. Were special techniques successful	6	1	1	0	1	0	1	3.00	731/790	3.00	4.26	4.06	4.11	3.00

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	FREN 302 01	Term - Spring 2011	Enrollment:	12
Title:	Advanced French II		Questionnaires:	10
Instructor:	Bazgan,Nicoleta			

| Questions | NR | NA | Frequencies | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Org | UMBC | Level | Sect |
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Discussion														

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	5	Required for Majors	4	Graduate	0	Major	2
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	1	B	4						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	1	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	10	Non-major	8
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	1				
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	3				
				?	1						

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

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	FREN 310 01	Term - Spring 2011		Enrollment:	10
Title:	Interconnections: Lang			Questionnaires:	9
Instructor:	McCray,Stanley				

| Questions | NR | NA | Frequencies | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Org | UMBC | Level | Sect |
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	3	6	4.67	376/1449	4.67	4.45	4.33	4.38	4.67
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	0	8	4.78	219/1446	4.78	4.47	4.29	4.33	4.78
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	1	2	5	4.50	519/1256	4.50	4.56	4.34	4.39	4.50
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	1	6	4.44	613/1402	4.44	4.50	4.27	4.37	4.44
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	0	2	6	4.44	438/1358	4.44	4.40	4.13	4.14	4.44
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	1	2	5	4.22	687/1327	4.22	4.35	4.16	4.23	4.22
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	1	0	0	1	6	4.38	644/1435	4.38	4.33	4.20	4.25	4.38
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	8	1	4.11	1310/1446	4.11	4.68	4.67	4.68	4.11
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	2	5	1	3.88	1035/1437	3.88	4.26	4.12	4.14	3.88
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	2	0	1	6	4.22	1075/1386	4.22	4.58	4.48	4.53	4.22
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1390	5.00	4.83	4.74	4.76	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	2	2	5	4.33	832/1379	4.33	4.47	4.34	4.38	4.33
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	0	1	7	4.56	633/1379	4.56	4.58	4.36	4.40	4.56
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	1	0	2	6	4.44	394/1236	4.44	4.17	4.08	4.18	4.44
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	1	0	6	4.71	240/1121	4.71	4.38	4.18	4.31	4.71
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	1	0	0	6	4.57	479/1122	4.57	4.64	4.36	4.46	4.57
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	269/1121	4.86	4.58	4.40	4.53	4.86
4. Were special techniques successful	2	2	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	359/790	4.20	4.26	4.06	4.11	4.20

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section: FREN 310 01	Term - Spring 2011	Enrollment: 10
Title: Interconnections: Lang		Questionnaires: 9
Instructor: McCray,Stanley		

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies 1	2	3	4	5	Instructor Mean	Rank	Course Mean	Org Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	7	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/200	****	****	4.28	4.44	****

Frequency Distribution

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

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	FREN 320 01	Term - Spring 2011		Enrollment:	14
Title:	Interconnections:Trade			Questionnaires:	8
Instructor:	Deverneil,Marie				

| Questions | NR | NA | Frequencies | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Org | UMBC | Level | Sect |
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	1	0	0	1	5	4.29	877/1449	4.29	4.45	4.33	4.38	4.29
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	354/1446	4.67	4.47	4.29	4.33	4.67
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	2	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1256	5.00	4.56	4.34	4.39	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	157/1402	4.83	4.50	4.27	4.37	4.83
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	2	1	4	4.29	598/1358	4.29	4.40	4.13	4.14	4.29
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	253/1327	4.67	4.35	4.16	4.23	4.67
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	257/1435	4.71	4.33	4.20	4.25	4.71
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	888/1446	4.67	4.68	4.67	4.68	4.67
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	0	3	3	4.50	364/1437	4.50	4.26	4.12	4.14	4.50
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	320/1386	4.83	4.58	4.48	4.53	4.83
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1390	5.00	4.83	4.74	4.76	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	211/1379	4.83	4.47	4.34	4.38	4.83
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1379	5.00	4.58	4.36	4.40	5.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1236	5.00	4.17	4.08	4.18	5.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1121	5.00	4.38	4.18	4.31	5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1122	5.00	4.64	4.36	4.46	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1121	5.00	4.58	4.40	4.53	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	5	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	287/790	4.33	4.26	4.06	4.11	4.33

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	FREN 320 01		Term - Spring 2011			Enrollment:	14
Title:	Interconnections:Trade					Questionnaires:	8
Instructor:	Deverneil,Marie						

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Discussion														

Frequency Distribution

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

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	FREN 440 01	Term - Spring 2011	Enrollment:	12
Title:	Study In French Culture		Questionnaires:	9
Instructor:	Bazgan,Nicoleta			

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	1	1	1	6	4.33	821/1449	4.33	4.45	4.33	4.46	4.33
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	5	4	4.44	650/1446	4.44	4.47	4.29	4.34	4.44
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	2	5	4.50	519/1256	4.50	4.56	4.34	4.43	4.50
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	1	0	1	6	4.50	528/1402	4.50	4.50	4.27	4.35	4.50
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	1	6	4.63	267/1358	4.63	4.40	4.13	4.21	4.63
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	2	2	4	4.25	662/1327	4.25	4.35	4.16	4.28	4.25
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	2	0	1	6	4.22	798/1435	4.22	4.33	4.20	4.27	4.22
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	1	1	7	4.67	888/1446	4.67	4.68	4.67	4.71	4.67
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	1	4	3	4.25	638/1437	4.25	4.26	4.12	4.20	4.25
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	1	7	4.67	614/1386	4.67	4.58	4.48	4.55	4.67
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	582/1390	4.89	4.83	4.74	4.78	4.89
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	1	0	1	7	4.56	576/1379	4.56	4.47	4.34	4.40	4.56
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	0	7	4.56	633/1379	4.56	4.58	4.36	4.44	4.56
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	1	1	0	7	4.44	394/1236	4.44	4.17	4.08	4.13	4.44
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	0	1	0	5	4.14	674/1121	4.14	4.38	4.18	4.39	4.14
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	222/1122	4.86	4.64	4.36	4.54	4.86
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	1	2	4	4.43	673/1121	4.43	4.58	4.40	4.60	4.43
4. Were special techniques successful	2	2	1	0	0	1	3	4.00	425/790	4.00	4.26	4.06	4.27	4.00

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	FREN 440 01	Term - Spring 2011		Enrollment:	12
Title:	Study In French Culture			Questionnaires:	9
Instructor:	Bazgan,Nicoleta				

| Questions | NR | NA | Frequencies | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Org | UMBC | Level | Sect |
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	8	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/200	****	****	4.28	4.11	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	8	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/205	****	****	4.29	3.91	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	8	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/201	****	****	4.51	4.19	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	8	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/202	****	****	4.42	3.90	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	8	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/196	****	****	4.25	3.43	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	8	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/67	****	5.00	4.58	4.47	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	8	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/66	****	5.00	4.36	4.33	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/64	****	5.00	4.25	4.24	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/75	****	5.00	4.32	4.27	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	8	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/73	****	3.75	4.00	4.09	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/34	****	****	4.33	4.42	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	8	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/35	****	****	4.15	4.16	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	8	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/30	****	****	4.09	4.08	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	8	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/30	****	****	4.04	3.96	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/27	****	****	4.13	4.20	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/31	****	****	4.34	4.17	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/18	****	****	4.13	4.00	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/24	****	****	4.34	3.98	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	FREN 440 01		Term - Spring 2011		Enrollment:	12
Title:	Study In French Culture				Questionnaires:	9
Instructor:	Bazgan,Nicoleta					

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Org Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
Self Paced														
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/15	****	****	4.18	3.94	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/13	****	****	4.07	3.80	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	6	Required for Majors	4	Graduate	0	Major	5
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	1						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	1	C	0	General	1	Under-grad	9	Non-major	4
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F	0	Electives	1	**** - Means there are not enough responses			
				P	0			to be significant			
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	1						