

Course-Section: FREN 101 0101  
 Title ELEMENTARY FRENCH I  
 Instructor: ZAIRI, MOHAMMED  
 Enrollment: 22  
 Questionnaires: 18

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2005

Page 751  
 JUN 14, 2005  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect		
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean		
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	0	0	1	7	9	4.47	594/1504	3.98	4.24	4.27	4.13	4.47
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	6	10	4.53	472/1503	3.81	4.22	4.20	4.16	4.53
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	3	14	4.82	187/1290	4.29	4.32	4.28	4.19	4.82
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	2	0	1	1	6	7	4.27	764/1453	3.83	4.22	4.21	4.11	4.27
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	2	0	0	4	6	5	4.07	705/1421	3.80	4.08	4.00	3.91	4.07
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	0	6	5	5	3.76	996/1365	3.54	4.11	4.08	3.96	3.76
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	3	6	8	4.29	716/1485	3.54	4.20	4.16	4.13	4.29
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	10	7	4.41	1164/1504	4.75	4.68	4.69	4.66	4.41
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	1	0	0	1	10	3	4.14	751/1483	3.32	4.07	4.06	3.97	4.14
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	1	1	4	9	4.40	900/1425	3.74	4.41	4.41	4.36	4.40
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	0	3	12	4.80	738/1426	4.32	4.72	4.69	4.56	4.80
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	2	5	8	4.40	709/1418	3.56	4.29	4.25	4.20	4.40
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	1	1	13	4.80	255/1416	4.01	4.34	4.26	4.21	4.80
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	3	0	1	3	3	5	4.00	636/1199	3.06	3.95	3.97	3.82	4.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	255/1312	3.87	4.12	4.00	3.69	4.67
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	12	0	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	563/1303	4.31	4.39	4.24	3.93	4.50
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	12	0	0	1	0	2	3	4.17	855/1299	3.56	4.34	4.25	3.94	4.17
4. Were special techniques successful	12	3	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 758	3.12	4.05	4.01	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	8	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	1	B	7						
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	2	C	2	General	6	Under-grad	18	Non-major	4
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	3				
				?	0						

Course-Section: FREN 101 0201  
 Title ELEMENTARY FRENCH I  
 Instructor: DIALLO, MAMADOU  
 Enrollment: 23  
 Questionnaires: 15

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2005

Page 752  
 JUN 14, 2005  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	1	2	3	4	5	3.67	1302/1504	3.98	4.24	4.27	4.13	3.67
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	2	2	8	2	3.53	1294/1503	3.81	4.22	4.20	4.16	3.53
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	3	2	5	5	3.80	1062/1290	4.29	4.32	4.28	4.19	3.80
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	1	6	4	3	3.64	1237/1453	3.83	4.22	4.21	4.11	3.64
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	3	4	5	2	3.27	1235/1421	3.80	4.08	4.00	3.91	3.27
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	1	3	2	7	1	3.29	1241/1365	3.54	4.11	4.08	3.96	3.29
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	4	5	3	2	3.07	1381/1485	3.54	4.20	4.16	4.13	3.07
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	15	5.00	1/1504	4.75	4.68	4.69	4.66	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	1	1	2	3	7	0	3.23	1332/1483	3.32	4.07	4.06	3.97	3.23
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	4	4	4	1	3.15	1360/1425	3.74	4.41	4.41	4.36	3.15
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	1	1	6	5	4.15	1298/1426	4.32	4.72	4.69	4.56	4.15
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	5	5	2	1	2.92	1349/1418	3.56	4.29	4.25	4.20	2.92
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	1	4	3	4	3.62	1213/1416	4.01	4.34	4.26	4.21	3.62
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	2	3	2	5	1	0	2.36	1158/1199	3.06	3.95	3.97	3.82	2.36
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	2	1	1	3.75	902/1312	3.87	4.12	4.00	3.69	3.75
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	10	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	675/1303	4.31	4.39	4.24	3.93	4.40
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	10	0	1	0	2	1	1	3.20	1174/1299	3.56	4.34	4.25	3.94	3.20
4. Were special techniques successful	10	1	2	0	1	1	0	2.25	749/ 758	3.12	4.05	4.01	3.80	2.25

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	7	Required for Majors	8	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	0	B	5						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	1	C	1	General	4	Under-grad	15	Non-major	2
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	6	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	3				
				?	0						

Course-Section: FREN 101 0301  
 Title ELEMENTARY FRENCH I  
 Instructor: MBAIRESSEM, LAO  
 Enrollment: 25  
 Questionnaires: 17

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2005

Page 753  
 JUN 14, 2005  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	2	0	2	0	6	2	5	3.53	1343/1504	3.98	4.24	4.27	4.13	3.53
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	3	3	3	3	3	3.00	1419/1503	3.81	4.22	4.20	4.16	3.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	0	2	0	4	2	7	3.80	1062/1290	4.29	4.32	4.28	4.19	3.80
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	5	2	1	2	1	4	3.40	1333/1453	3.83	4.22	4.21	4.11	3.40
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	1	2	1	2	4	5	3.64	1030/1421	3.80	4.08	4.00	3.91	3.64
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	4	3	1	2	3	2	3.00	1296/1365	3.54	4.11	4.08	3.96	3.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	3	0	3	3	4	2	2	2.79	1422/1485	3.54	4.20	4.16	4.13	2.79
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	2	13	4.87	726/1504	4.75	4.68	4.69	4.66	4.87
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	0	4	1	5	0	1	2.36	1453/1483	3.32	4.07	4.06	3.97	2.36
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	2	2	3	3	3	3.23	1350/1425	3.74	4.41	4.41	4.36	3.23
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	2	0	3	1	7	3.85	1354/1426	4.32	4.72	4.69	4.56	3.85
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	4	0	3	3	3	3.08	1325/1418	3.56	4.29	4.25	4.20	3.08
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	4	0	1	3	5	3.38	1271/1416	4.01	4.34	4.26	4.21	3.38
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	4	2	1	1	3	2	3.22	1013/1199	3.06	3.95	3.97	3.82	3.22
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	1	2	4	0	3	3.20	1108/1312	3.87	4.12	4.00	3.69	3.20
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	1	0	2	1	6	4.10	887/1303	4.31	4.39	4.24	3.93	4.10
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	2	0	3	1	4	3.50	1106/1299	3.56	4.34	4.25	3.94	3.50
4. Were special techniques successful	7	3	1	1	2	0	3	3.43	607/ 758	3.12	4.05	4.01	3.80	3.43

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	4	0.00-0.99	0	A	7	Required for Majors	8	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	0	B	7						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	2	C	0	General	4	Under-grad	17	Non-major	6
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	6	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F	0	Electives	3	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	1				
				?	1						

Course-Section: FREN 101 0401  
 Title ELEMENTARY FRENCH I  
 Instructor: BADAGBO, YAWO  
 Enrollment: 22  
 Questionnaires: 12

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2005

Page 754  
 JUN 14, 2005  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies		Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean					
	NR	NA	1	2						3	4	5	Mean	Rank
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	2	0	3	7	4.25	889/1504	3.98	4.24	4.27	4.13	4.25
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	5	5	4.17	937/1503	3.81	4.22	4.20	4.16	4.17
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	9	4.75	250/1290	4.29	4.32	4.28	4.19	4.75
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	3	4	3	4.00	1001/1453	3.83	4.22	4.21	4.11	4.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	2	0	1	1	2	5	4.22	571/1421	3.80	4.08	4.00	3.91	4.22
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	2	0	0	2	4	3	4.11	717/1365	3.54	4.11	4.08	3.96	4.11
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	2	7	2	4.00	990/1485	3.54	4.20	4.16	4.13	4.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	3	8	4.73	928/1504	4.75	4.68	4.69	4.66	4.73
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	2	0	2	4	3	3.55	1218/1483	3.32	4.07	4.06	3.97	3.55
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	3	4	5	4.17	1094/1425	3.74	4.41	4.41	4.36	4.17
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	1	0	3	8	4.50	1128/1426	4.32	4.72	4.69	4.56	4.50
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	2	1	6	3	3.83	1128/1418	3.56	4.29	4.25	4.20	3.83
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	1	4	6	4.25	871/1416	4.01	4.34	4.26	4.21	4.25
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	5	1	1	3	1	0	2.67	1125/1199	3.06	3.95	3.97	3.82	2.67
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	1	2	2	3	3.88	832/1312	3.87	4.12	4.00	3.69	3.88
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	0	0	6	2	4.25	796/1303	4.31	4.39	4.24	3.93	4.25
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	2	3	1	2	3.38	1145/1299	3.56	4.34	4.25	3.94	3.38
4. Were special techniques successful	4	2	0	1	2	1	2	3.67	535/ 758	3.12	4.05	4.01	3.80	3.67
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	10	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 233	****	4.07	4.09	3.90	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	10	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/ 244	****	4.12	4.09	4.07	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	10	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 227	****	4.49	4.40	4.24	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	10	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 225	****	4.40	4.23	4.01	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	10	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/ 207	****	4.22	4.09	4.01	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 76	****	4.60	4.61	4.64	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 70	****	4.54	4.35	4.43	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 67	****	4.32	4.34	3.88	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 76	****	4.41	4.44	4.51	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 73	****	4.17	4.17	3.83	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 58	****	3.98	4.43	3.63	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 56	****	4.12	4.23	4.11	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 44	****	4.68	4.65	4.60	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 47	****	4.32	4.29	4.00	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 39	****	4.61	4.44	5.00	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 40	****	4.28	4.53	4.52	****

2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/	35	****	4.43	4.49	4.65	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/	36	****	4.38	4.60	4.48	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/	20	****	5.00	4.24	4.92	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/	16	****	5.00	4.51	5.00	****

Course-Section: FREN 101 0401  
 Title ELEMENTARY FRENCH I  
 Instructor: BADAGBO, YAWO  
 Enrollment: 22  
 Questionnaires: 12

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2005

Page 754  
 JUN 14, 2005  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: FREN 102 0101  
 Title ELEMENTARY FRENCH II  
 Instructor: Fatih, Zakaria  
 Enrollment: 25  
 Questionnaires: 19

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2005

Page 755  
 JUN 14, 2005  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	2	0	0	0	1	5	11	4.59	442/1504	4.76	4.24	4.27	4.13	4.59
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	0	0	1	1	15	4.82	158/1503	4.91	4.22	4.20	4.16	4.82
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	3	0	0	0	1	1	14	4.81	194/1290	4.86	4.32	4.28	4.19	4.81
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	3	2	0	1	1	2	10	4.50	440/1453	4.39	4.22	4.21	4.11	4.50
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	3	1	1	0	2	2	10	4.33	479/1421	4.60	4.08	4.00	3.91	4.33
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	3	2	0	1	1	1	11	4.57	245/1365	4.41	4.11	4.08	3.96	4.57
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	3	0	0	0	2	4	10	4.50	455/1485	4.66	4.20	4.16	4.13	4.50
8. How many times was class cancelled	4	0	0	0	0	2	13	4.87	726/1504	4.75	4.68	4.69	4.66	4.87
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	0	0	0	1	5	7	4.46	385/1483	4.50	4.07	4.06	3.97	4.46
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	1	3	12	4.69	541/1425	4.75	4.41	4.41	4.36	4.69
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	1	3	12	4.69	940/1426	4.92	4.72	4.69	4.56	4.69
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	1	3	12	4.69	354/1418	4.77	4.29	4.25	4.20	4.69
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	1	3	12	4.69	420/1416	4.85	4.34	4.26	4.21	4.69
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	4	3	0	3	1	5	3.42	959/1199	3.29	3.95	3.97	3.82	3.42
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	2	2	10	4.57	317/1312	4.51	4.12	4.00	3.69	4.57
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	0	0	1	13	4.93	157/1303	4.89	4.39	4.24	3.93	4.93
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	0	0	3	2	8	4.38	696/1299	4.51	4.34	4.25	3.94	4.38
4. Were special techniques successful	6	6	0	0	1	2	4	4.43	231/ 758	4.02	4.05	4.01	3.80	4.43
Laboratory														
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 244	****	4.12	4.09	4.07	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	18	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 58	****	3.98	4.43	3.63	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	18	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 56	****	4.12	4.23	4.11	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 40	****	4.28	4.53	4.52	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 35	****	4.43	4.49	4.65	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 36	****	4.38	4.60	4.48	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	4	0.00-0.99	0	A	6	Required for Majors	11	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	7						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	5	C	2	General	0	Under-grad	19	Non-major	13
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	1						
				I	0	Other	5				





Course-Section: FREN 102 0201  
 Title ELEMENTARY FRENCH II  
 Instructor: Fatih, Zakaria  
 Enrollment: 7  
 Questionnaires: 4

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2005

Page 756  
 JUN 14, 2005  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies						Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect	
	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	0	0	4	5.00	1/1504	4.76	4.24	4.27	4.13	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1503	4.91	4.22	4.20	4.16	5.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1290	4.86	4.32	4.28	4.19	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	270/1453	4.39	4.22	4.21	4.11	4.67
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1421	4.60	4.08	4.00	3.91	5.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	139/1365	4.41	4.11	4.08	3.96	4.75
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1485	4.66	4.20	4.16	4.13	5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1504	4.75	4.68	4.69	4.66	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	1	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	338/1483	4.50	4.07	4.06	3.97	4.50
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	572/1425	4.75	4.41	4.41	4.36	4.67
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1426	4.92	4.72	4.69	4.56	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	261/1418	4.77	4.29	4.25	4.20	4.75
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1416	4.85	4.34	4.26	4.21	5.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	1	2	0	0	1	0	2.00	1181/1199	3.29	3.95	3.97	3.82	2.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	255/1312	4.51	4.12	4.00	3.69	4.67
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1303	4.89	4.39	4.24	3.93	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	570/1299	4.51	4.34	4.25	3.94	4.50
4. Were special techniques successful	1	0	0	0	2	1	0	3.33	630/ 758	4.02	4.05	4.01	3.80	3.33

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: FREN 102 0301  
 Title ELEMENTARY FRENCH II  
 Instructor: MBAYE, ABDOULAY  
 Enrollment: 30  
 Questionnaires: 16

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2005

Page 757  
 JUN 14, 2005  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies		Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	3	12	4.69	337/1504	4.76	4.24	4.27	4.13	4.69
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	14	4.88	125/1503	4.91	4.22	4.20	4.16	4.88
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	0	15	4.88	152/1290	4.86	4.32	4.28	4.19	4.88
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	1	0	2	4	7	4.14	901/1453	4.39	4.22	4.21	4.11	4.14
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	0	0	7	7	4.50	320/1421	4.60	4.08	4.00	3.91	4.50
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	3	0	2	1	4	6	4.08	742/1365	4.41	4.11	4.08	3.96	4.08
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	6	10	4.63	329/1485	4.66	4.20	4.16	4.13	4.63
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	1	0	0	0	11	4	4.27	1268/1504	4.75	4.68	4.69	4.66	4.27
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	0	7	6	4.46	385/1483	4.50	4.07	4.06	3.97	4.46
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	4	11	4.73	456/1425	4.75	4.41	4.41	4.36	4.73
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	15	5.00	1/1426	4.92	4.72	4.69	4.56	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	3	12	4.80	191/1418	4.77	4.29	4.25	4.20	4.80
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	1	0	0	1	2	11	4.71	380/1416	4.85	4.34	4.26	4.21	4.71
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	4	2	1	2	3	2	3.20	1018/1199	3.29	3.95	3.97	3.82	3.20
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	2	4	9	4.47	404/1312	4.51	4.12	4.00	3.69	4.47
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	0	3	12	4.80	299/1303	4.89	4.39	4.24	3.93	4.80
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	1	3	11	4.67	445/1299	4.51	4.34	4.25	3.94	4.67
4. Were special techniques successful	1	3	0	2	2	5	3	3.75	508/ 758	4.02	4.05	4.01	3.80	3.75
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	15	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 233	****	4.07	4.09	3.90	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	15	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 244	****	4.12	4.09	4.07	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	15	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 227	****	4.49	4.40	4.24	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	15	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 225	****	4.40	4.23	4.01	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	15	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 207	****	4.22	4.09	4.01	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	15	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 76	****	4.60	4.61	4.64	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	15	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 70	****	4.54	4.35	4.43	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 67	****	4.32	4.34	3.88	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 76	****	4.41	4.44	4.51	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	15	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 73	****	4.17	4.17	3.83	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 58	****	3.98	4.43	3.63	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	15	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 56	****	4.12	4.23	4.11	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	15	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 44	****	4.68	4.65	4.60	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	15	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 47	****	4.32	4.29	4.00	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	15	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 39	****	4.61	4.44	5.00	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 40	****	4.28	4.53	4.52	****

2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	15	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/	35	****	4.43	4.49	4.65	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	15	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/	36	****	4.38	4.60	4.48	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	15	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/	20	****	5.00	4.24	4.92	****

Course-Section: FREN 102 0301  
 Title ELEMENTARY FRENCH II  
 Instructor: MBAYE, ABDOULAY  
 Enrollment: 30  
 Questionnaires: 16

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2005

Page 757  
 JUN 14, 2005  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	6	Required for Majors	7	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	B	6						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	1	C	1	General	0	Under-grad	16	Non-major	9
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	5	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	4				
				?	0						

Course-Section: FREN 102 0401  
 Title ELEMENTARY FRENCH II  
 Instructor: ROSENTHAL, ALAN  
 Enrollment: 26  
 Questionnaires: 17

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2005

Page 758  
 JUN 14, 2005  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies		Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean					
	NR	NA	1	2						3	4	5	Mean	Rank
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	2	14	4.76	250/1504	4.76	4.24	4.27	4.13	4.76
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	16	4.94	64/1503	4.91	4.22	4.20	4.16	4.94
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	2	14	4.76	240/1290	4.86	4.32	4.28	4.19	4.76
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	5	1	0	1	3	7	4.25	775/1453	4.39	4.22	4.21	4.11	4.25
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	3	0	0	1	4	9	4.57	268/1421	4.60	4.08	4.00	3.91	4.57
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	5	0	1	1	4	6	4.25	581/1365	4.41	4.11	4.08	3.96	4.25
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	6	10	4.53	433/1485	4.66	4.20	4.16	4.13	4.53
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	1	0	16	4.88	691/1504	4.75	4.68	4.69	4.66	4.88
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	1	0	0	0	5	7	4.58	274/1483	4.50	4.07	4.06	3.97	4.58
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	0	1	13	4.93	143/1425	4.75	4.41	4.41	4.36	4.93
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	0	0	14	5.00	1/1426	4.92	4.72	4.69	4.56	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	1	0	13	4.86	158/1418	4.77	4.29	4.25	4.20	4.86
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	0	13	5.00	1/1416	4.85	4.34	4.26	4.21	5.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	0	0	0	2	2	9	4.54	253/1199	3.29	3.95	3.97	3.82	4.54
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	1	0	0	4	7	4.33	530/1312	4.51	4.12	4.00	3.69	4.33
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	0	0	2	9	4.82	288/1303	4.89	4.39	4.24	3.93	4.82
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	0	0	1	3	6	4.50	570/1299	4.51	4.34	4.25	3.94	4.50
4. Were special techniques successful	7	1	0	0	0	4	5	4.56	169/ 758	4.02	4.05	4.01	3.80	4.56
Laboratory														
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 244	****	4.12	4.09	4.07	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 227	****	4.49	4.40	4.24	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 225	****	4.40	4.23	4.01	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 207	****	4.22	4.09	4.01	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 76	****	4.60	4.61	4.64	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 70	****	4.54	4.35	4.43	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 67	****	4.32	4.34	3.88	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 76	****	4.41	4.44	4.51	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 73	****	4.17	4.17	3.83	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 58	****	3.98	4.43	3.63	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 56	****	4.12	4.23	4.11	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 44	****	4.68	4.65	4.60	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 47	****	4.32	4.29	4.00	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 39	****	4.61	4.44	5.00	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	15	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 40	****	4.28	4.53	4.52	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	15	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 35	****	4.43	4.49	4.65	****

3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	15	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/	36	****	4.38	4.60	4.48	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	15	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/	20	****	5.00	4.24	4.92	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	15	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/	16	****	5.00	4.51	5.00	****

Course-Section: FREN 102 0401  
 Title ELEMENTARY FRENCH II  
 Instructor: ROSENTHAL, ALAN  
 Enrollment: 26  
 Questionnaires: 17

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2005

Page 758  
 JUN 14, 2005  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	0	A	5	Required for Majors	13	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	1	B	8						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	4	C	1	General	1	Under-grad	17	Non-major	4
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	5	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	4				
				?	1						

Course-Section: FREN 103 0101  
 Title INT REV ELEM FRENCH  
 Instructor: EL OMARI, SAMIR  
 Enrollment: 23  
 Questionnaires: 14

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2005

Page 759  
 JUN 14, 2005  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Dept	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	6	4.21	940/1504	4.21	4.24	4.27	4.13	4.21
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	6	6	4.21	891/1503	4.21	4.22	4.20	4.16	4.21
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	4	8	4.43	615/1290	4.43	4.32	4.28	4.19	4.43
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	5	6	4.14	901/1453	4.14	4.22	4.21	4.11	4.14
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	1	2	3	7	4.23	563/1421	4.23	4.08	4.00	3.91	4.23
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	1	2	5	4	4.00	782/1365	4.00	4.11	4.08	3.96	4.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	7	7	4.50	455/1485	4.50	4.20	4.16	4.13	4.50
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	14	5.00	1/1504	5.00	4.68	4.69	4.66	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	1	0	0	1	6	5	4.33	543/1483	4.33	4.07	4.06	3.97	4.33
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	2	5	7	4.36	951/1425	4.36	4.41	4.41	4.36	4.36
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	4	10	4.71	895/1426	4.71	4.72	4.69	4.56	4.71
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	7	6	4.36	754/1418	4.36	4.29	4.25	4.20	4.36
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	5	8	4.50	623/1416	4.50	4.34	4.26	4.21	4.50
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	2	1	3	4	4	3.50	919/1199	3.50	3.95	3.97	3.82	3.50
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	1	2	2	2	3.71	922/1312	3.71	4.12	4.00	3.69	3.71
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	0	0	1	2	4	4.43	652/1303	4.43	4.39	4.24	3.93	4.43
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	0	0	2	3	2	4.00	922/1299	4.00	4.34	4.25	3.94	4.00
4. Were special techniques successful	7	3	1	0	1	2	0	3.00	680/ 758	3.00	4.05	4.01	3.80	3.00
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	13	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 233	****	4.07	4.09	3.90	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	13	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 244	****	4.12	4.09	4.07	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 58	****	3.98	4.43	3.63	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 56	****	4.12	4.23	4.11	****
Self Paced														
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 36	****	4.38	4.60	4.48	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors		
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	0	A 8	Required for Majors 9	Graduate 0	Major 0
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B 6			
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	1	C 0	General 1	Under-grad 14	Non-major 2
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	2	D 0			
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5	F 0	Electives 0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	
				P 0			
				I 0	Other 4		
				? 0			



Course-Section: FREN 201 0101  
 Title INTERMEDIATE FRENCH I  
 Instructor: TADE, SOPHIA  
 Enrollment: 26  
 Questionnaires: 14

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2005

Page 760  
 JUN 14, 2005  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Dept	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	3	5	4	3.71	1285/1504	3.71	4.24	4.27	4.26	3.71
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	6	6	4.21	891/1503	4.02	4.22	4.20	4.18	4.21
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	2	3	8	4.46	561/1290	4.34	4.32	4.28	4.27	4.46
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	2	1	1	1	4	4	3.82	1161/1453	3.87	4.22	4.21	4.20	3.82
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	1	2	0	5	3	2	3.25	1239/1421	3.95	4.08	4.00	3.90	3.25
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	1	0	1	3	6	2	3.75	1003/1365	3.78	4.11	4.08	4.00	3.75
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	2	1	2	5	3	3.46	1295/1485	3.72	4.20	4.16	4.15	3.46
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	1	0	0	1	11	4.62	1022/1504	4.67	4.68	4.69	4.68	4.62
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	1	0	2	9	0	3.58	1204/1483	3.58	4.07	4.06	4.02	3.58
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	4	5	5	4.07	1139/1425	3.97	4.41	4.41	4.40	4.07
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	4	10	4.71	895/1426	4.47	4.72	4.69	4.71	4.71
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	1	0	2	7	4	3.93	1081/1418	3.92	4.29	4.25	4.22	3.93
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	1	5	7	4.21	904/1416	4.05	4.34	4.26	4.24	4.21
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	3	0	1	3	5	2	3.73	835/1199	3.49	3.95	3.97	3.95	3.73
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	465/1312	3.96	4.12	4.00	3.98	4.40
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	563/1303	4.14	4.39	4.24	4.23	4.50
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	678/1299	4.07	4.34	4.25	4.21	4.40
4. Were special techniques successful	9	1	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	185/ 758	3.78	4.05	4.01	3.89	4.50

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	1	A	9	Required for Majors	9	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B	2						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	1	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	14	Non-major	5
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	4				
				?	1						

Course-Section: FREN 201 0201  
 Title INTERMEDIATE FRENCH I  
 Instructor: DIALLO, MAMADOU  
 Enrollment: 22  
 Questionnaires: 13

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2005

Page 761  
 JUN 14, 2005  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	3	2	5	3	0	2.62	1490/1504	3.71	4.24	4.27	4.26	2.62
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	2	1	6	4	0	2.92	1434/1503	4.02	4.22	4.20	4.18	2.92
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	1	4	5	2	3.46	1163/1290	4.34	4.32	4.28	4.27	3.46
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	2	2	5	2	1	2.83	1432/1453	3.87	4.22	4.21	4.20	2.83
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	3	2	0	2	4	2	3.40	1175/1421	3.95	4.08	4.00	3.90	3.40
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	5	0	2	3	2	2.75	1329/1365	3.78	4.11	4.08	4.00	2.75
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	3	1	6	2	1	2.77	1425/1485	3.72	4.20	4.16	4.15	2.77
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	1	4	8	4.54	1069/1504	4.67	4.68	4.69	4.68	4.54
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	1	0	3	4	1	0	2.75	1423/1483	3.58	4.07	4.06	4.02	2.75
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	3	2	5	0	2	2.67	1404/1425	3.97	4.41	4.41	4.40	2.67
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	2	2	3	3	2	3.08	1403/1426	4.47	4.72	4.69	4.71	3.08
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	3	4	3	0	2	2.50	1393/1418	3.92	4.29	4.25	4.22	2.50
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	4	2	3	1	2	2.58	1370/1416	4.05	4.34	4.26	4.24	2.58
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	5	0	4	2	0	0	2.33	1162/1199	3.49	3.95	3.97	3.95	2.33
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	1	0	3	1	2	3.43	1043/1312	3.96	4.12	4.00	3.98	3.43
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	1	1	2	3	0	3.00	1195/1303	4.14	4.39	4.24	4.23	3.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	1	2	3	1	0	2.57	1245/1299	4.07	4.34	4.25	4.21	2.57
4. Were special techniques successful	6	2	1	2	1	1	0	2.40	742/ 758	3.78	4.05	4.01	3.89	2.40

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	A	5	Required for Majors	7	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	1	Under-grad	13	Non-major	2
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	1				
				?	0						

Course-Section: FREN 201 0301  
 Title INTERMEDIATE FRENCH I  
 Instructor: MBAYE, ABDOULAY  
 Enrollment: 34  
 Questionnaires: 14

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2005

Page 762  
 JUN 14, 2005  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	3	4	7	4.29	851/1504	3.71	4.24	4.27	4.26	4.29
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	3	10	4.64	335/1503	4.02	4.22	4.20	4.18	4.64
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	3	10	4.64	367/1290	4.34	4.32	4.28	4.27	4.64
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	2	2	9	4.54	407/1453	3.87	4.22	4.21	4.20	4.54
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	6	8	4.57	268/1421	3.95	4.08	4.00	3.90	4.57
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	4	3	6	4.15	681/1365	3.78	4.11	4.08	4.00	4.15
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	3	10	4.64	309/1485	3.72	4.20	4.16	4.15	4.64
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	11	3	4.21	1300/1504	4.67	4.68	4.69	4.68	4.21
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	2	5	5	4.25	635/1483	3.58	4.07	4.06	4.02	4.25
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	0	3	9	4.75	420/1425	3.97	4.41	4.41	4.40	4.75
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	451/1426	4.47	4.72	4.69	4.71	4.92
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	0	3	8	4.73	303/1418	3.92	4.29	4.25	4.22	4.73
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	1	2	9	4.67	446/1416	4.05	4.34	4.26	4.24	4.67
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	6	1	0	1	1	3	3.83	780/1199	3.49	3.95	3.97	3.95	3.83
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	1	0	1	2	4	4.00	716/1312	3.96	4.12	4.00	3.98	4.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	1	0	0	3	4	4.13	875/1303	4.14	4.39	4.24	4.23	4.13
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	1	0	0	2	5	4.25	798/1299	4.07	4.34	4.25	4.21	4.25
4. Were special techniques successful	6	1	0	1	1	2	3	4.00	387/ 758	3.78	4.05	4.01	3.89	4.00

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	3	Required for Majors	6	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	5						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	1	C	3	General	1	Under-grad	14	Non-major	5
84-150	6	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	4				
				?	0						

Course-Section: FREN 201 0401  
 Title INTERMEDIATE FRENCH I  
 Instructor: EL OMARI, SAMIR  
 Enrollment: 25  
 Questionnaires: 16

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2005

Page 763  
 JUN 14, 2005  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	1	0	4	6	5	3.88	1209/1504	3.71	4.24	4.27	4.26	3.88
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	1	0	2	6	6	4.07	1014/1503	4.02	4.22	4.20	4.18	4.07
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	1	1	3	10	4.47	561/1290	4.34	4.32	4.28	4.27	4.47
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	1	1	3	4	6	3.87	1129/1453	3.87	4.22	4.21	4.20	3.87
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	1	0	0	4	3	7	4.21	579/1421	3.95	4.08	4.00	3.90	4.21
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	2	0	0	5	2	6	4.08	742/1365	3.78	4.11	4.08	4.00	4.08
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	0	2	3	9	4.27	750/1485	3.72	4.20	4.16	4.15	4.27
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	15	5.00	1/1504	4.67	4.68	4.69	4.68	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	3	9	0	3.75	1123/1483	3.58	4.07	4.06	4.02	3.75
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	1	0	1	7	6	4.13	1111/1425	3.97	4.41	4.41	4.40	4.13
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	2	14	4.88	572/1426	4.47	4.72	4.69	4.71	4.88
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	1	2	6	6	4.13	955/1418	3.92	4.29	4.25	4.22	4.13
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	1	5	9	4.53	593/1416	4.05	4.34	4.26	4.24	4.53
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	1	2	0	4	4	4	3.57	894/1199	3.49	3.95	3.97	3.95	3.57
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	2	0	1	7	5	3.87	839/1312	3.96	4.12	4.00	3.98	3.87
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	1	1	5	8	4.33	737/1303	4.14	4.39	4.24	4.23	4.33
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	2	7	6	4.27	792/1299	4.07	4.34	4.25	4.21	4.27
4. Were special techniques successful	2	6	0	1	2	1	4	4.00	387/ 758	3.78	4.05	4.01	3.89	4.00
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	14	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 233	****	4.07	4.09	4.30	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	14	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 244	****	4.12	4.09	4.24	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	14	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 227	****	4.49	4.40	4.58	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	14	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 225	****	4.40	4.23	4.52	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	14	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 207	****	4.22	4.09	4.22	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 40	****	4.28	4.53	4.44	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	15	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 35	****	4.43	4.49	4.50	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	15	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 36	****	4.38	4.60	4.13	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 20	****	5.00	4.24	5.00	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors		
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	A 6	Required for Majors 13	Graduate 0	Major 0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B 6			
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	3	C 2	General 1	Under-grad 16	Non-major 5
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	2	D 0			
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5	F 0	Electives 0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	
				P 1			

I 0  
? 0

Other

3

Course-Section: FREN 201 0501  
 Title INTERMEDIATE FRENCH I  
 Instructor: REZVANI, MARJAN  
 Enrollment: 23  
 Questionnaires: 14

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2005

Page 764  
 JUN 14, 2005  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	1	0	1	6	5	4.08	1061/1504	3.71	4.24	4.27	4.26	4.08
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	4	2	7	4.23	869/1503	4.02	4.22	4.20	4.18	4.23
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	4	9	4.69	311/1290	4.34	4.32	4.28	4.27	4.69
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	3	0	0	3	1	6	4.30	718/1453	3.87	4.22	4.21	4.20	4.30
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	4	1	0	0	2	6	4.33	479/1421	3.95	4.08	4.00	3.90	4.33
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	1	0	0	3	4	5	4.17	672/1365	3.78	4.11	4.08	4.00	4.17
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	3	5	1	4	3.46	1295/1485	3.72	4.20	4.16	4.15	3.46
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	1	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/1504	4.67	4.68	4.69	4.68	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	7	0	0	0	4	2	1	3.57	1207/1483	3.58	4.07	4.06	4.02	3.57
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	3	4	6	4.23	1050/1425	3.97	4.41	4.41	4.40	4.23
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	1	1	11	4.77	808/1426	4.47	4.72	4.69	4.71	4.77
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	3	2	7	4.33	772/1418	3.92	4.29	4.25	4.22	4.33
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	3	4	6	4.23	887/1416	4.05	4.34	4.26	4.24	4.23
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	1	0	1	2	5	4	4.00	636/1199	3.49	3.95	3.97	3.95	4.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	1	1	2	4	4.13	676/1312	3.96	4.12	4.00	3.98	4.13
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	356/1303	4.14	4.39	4.24	4.23	4.75
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	233/1299	4.07	4.34	4.25	4.21	4.88
4. Were special techniques successful	6	1	1	0	1	1	4	4.00	387/ 758	3.78	4.05	4.01	3.89	4.00
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	13	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 233	****	4.07	4.09	4.30	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	13	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 244	****	4.12	4.09	4.24	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	13	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 227	****	4.49	4.40	4.58	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	13	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 58	****	3.98	4.43	4.41	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	13	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 56	****	4.12	4.23	4.24	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 40	****	4.28	4.53	4.44	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	13	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 35	****	4.43	4.49	4.50	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	13	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 36	****	4.38	4.60	4.13	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	13	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 20	****	5.00	4.24	5.00	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	13	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 16	****	5.00	4.51	5.00	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors		
-----												
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	4	Required for Majors		6	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	B	3							
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	1	C	1	General		0	Under-grad	14	Non-major	8

84-150	2	3.00-3.49	0	D	0		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	0
				P	0		
				I	0	Other	4
				?	0		

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

Course-Section: FREN 202 0101  
 Title INTERMEDIATE FRENCH II  
 Instructor: REZVANI, MARJAN  
 Enrollment: 14  
 Questionnaires: 9

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2005

Page 765  
 JUN 14, 2005  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	1	2	3	3	3.89	1204/1504	3.89	4.24	4.27	4.26	3.89
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	1	5	4.11	981/1503	4.11	4.22	4.20	4.18	4.11
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	2	0	2	5	4.11	887/1290	4.11	4.32	4.28	4.27	4.11
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	1	1	1	5	3.89	1116/1453	3.89	4.22	4.21	4.20	3.89
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	3	0	3	3	3.67	1017/1421	3.67	4.08	4.00	3.90	3.67
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	2	0	1	5	3.78	988/1365	3.78	4.11	4.08	4.00	3.78
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	0	2	2	4	3.89	1098/1485	3.89	4.20	4.16	4.15	3.89
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1504	5.00	4.68	4.69	4.68	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	2	2	4	4.25	635/1483	4.25	4.07	4.06	4.02	4.25
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	1	1	6	4.63	634/1425	4.63	4.41	4.41	4.40	4.63
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	1	1	6	4.63	1022/1426	4.63	4.72	4.69	4.71	4.63
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	2	0	0	2	4	3.75	1163/1418	3.75	4.29	4.25	4.22	3.75
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	0	0	3	4	4.13	977/1416	4.13	4.34	4.26	4.24	4.13
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	1	2	0	1	0	4	3.57	894/1199	3.57	3.95	3.97	3.95	3.57
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	1	1	0	3	4.00	716/1312	4.00	4.12	4.00	3.98	4.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	1	1	0	4	4.17	851/1303	4.17	4.39	4.24	4.23	4.17
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	1	3	2	4.17	855/1299	4.17	4.34	4.25	4.21	4.17
4. Were special techniques successful	3	3	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/ 758	5.00	4.05	4.01	3.89	5.00

Frequency Distribution

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



Course-Section: FREN 301 0101  
 Title ADVANCED FRENCH I  
 Instructor: DE VERNEIL, MAR  
 Enrollment: 14  
 Questionnaires: 10

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2005

Page 766  
 JUN 14, 2005  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	1	1	0	8	4.50	549/1504	4.50	4.24	4.27	4.27	4.50
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	0	1	8	4.60	380/1503	4.60	4.22	4.20	4.22	4.60
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	0	0	0	9	4.60	412/1290	4.60	4.32	4.28	4.31	4.60
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	0	0	2	7	4.40	594/1453	4.40	4.22	4.21	4.23	4.40
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	2	1	6	4.20	596/1421	4.20	4.08	4.00	4.01	4.20
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	0	1	8	4.60	223/1365	4.60	4.11	4.08	4.08	4.60
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	0	2	7	4.50	455/1485	4.50	4.20	4.16	4.17	4.50
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	1	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1504	5.00	4.68	4.69	4.65	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	1	2	5	4.50	338/1483	4.50	4.07	4.06	4.08	4.50
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	3	7	4.70	525/1425	4.70	4.41	4.41	4.43	4.70
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	502/1426	4.90	4.72	4.69	4.71	4.90
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	1	0	8	4.78	233/1418	4.78	4.29	4.25	4.26	4.78
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	1	8	4.70	407/1416	4.70	4.34	4.26	4.27	4.70
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	1	2	7	4.60	213/1199	4.60	3.95	3.97	4.02	4.60
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	2	0	3	4.20	632/1312	4.20	4.12	4.00	4.09	4.20
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	507/1303	4.60	4.39	4.24	4.27	4.60
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	1	0	1	1	2	3.60	1092/1299	3.60	4.34	4.25	4.30	3.60
4. Were special techniques successful	5	1	0	0	2	0	2	4.00	387/ 758	4.00	4.05	4.01	4.00	4.00

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	3	1.00-1.99	0	B	4						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	1	C	1	General	3	Under-grad	10	Non-major	0
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	5				
				?	0						

Course-Section: FREN 302 0101  
 Title ADVANCED FRENCH II  
 Instructor: REZVANI, MARJAN  
 Enrollment: 17  
 Questionnaires: 13

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2005

Page 767  
 JUN 14, 2005  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	1	0	5	1	6	3.85	1224/1504	3.85	4.24	4.27	4.27	3.85
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	3	1	2	7	4.00	1052/1503	4.00	4.22	4.20	4.22	4.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	3	8	4.46	561/1290	4.46	4.32	4.28	4.31	4.46
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	6	7	4.54	407/1453	4.54	4.22	4.21	4.23	4.54
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	1	5	2	3	3.64	1036/1421	3.64	4.08	4.00	4.01	3.64
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	5	2	6	4.08	742/1365	4.08	4.11	4.08	4.08	4.08
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	3	4	5	4.00	990/1485	4.00	4.20	4.16	4.17	4.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	13	5.00	1/1504	5.00	4.68	4.69	4.65	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	1	3	3	4	2	3.23	1332/1483	3.23	4.07	4.06	4.08	3.23
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	1	0	7	5	4.23	1050/1425	4.23	4.41	4.41	4.43	4.23
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	3	9	4.62	1036/1426	4.62	4.72	4.69	4.71	4.62
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	1	2	4	3	3	3.38	1285/1418	3.38	4.29	4.25	4.26	3.38
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	2	4	5	1	3.23	1298/1416	3.23	4.34	4.26	4.27	3.23
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	2	0	0	1	3	7	4.55	247/1199	4.55	3.95	3.97	4.02	4.55
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	1	4	4	4.33	530/1312	4.33	4.12	4.00	4.09	4.33
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1303	5.00	4.39	4.24	4.27	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	0	1	2	6	4.56	537/1299	4.56	4.34	4.25	4.30	4.56
4. Were special techniques successful	4	0	0	0	4	4	1	3.67	535/ 758	3.67	4.05	4.01	4.00	3.67
Laboratory														
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 244	****	4.12	4.09	4.20	****
Seminar														
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 76	****	4.41	4.44	4.51	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 73	****	4.17	4.17	4.25	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	12	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 58	****	3.98	4.43	4.52	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 56	****	4.12	4.23	4.13	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 39	****	4.61	4.44	4.47	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 40	****	4.28	4.53	4.74	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 35	****	4.43	4.49	4.36	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 36	****	4.38	4.60	4.63	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 20	****	5.00	4.24	5.00	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	12	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 16	****	5.00	4.51	3.95	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned      Cum. GPA      Expected Grades      Reasons      Type      Majors

-----

00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	A	8	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	0	B	2						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	0	C	3	General	3	Under-grad	13	Non-major	2
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	6	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	9				
				?	0						

Course-Section: FREN 320 0101  
 Title INTERCONNECTIONS:TRADE  
 Instructor: DE VERNEIL, MAR  
 Enrollment: 15  
 Questionnaires: 10

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2005

Page 768  
 JUN 14, 2005  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies		Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	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	2	8	4.80	206/1504	4.80	4.24	4.27	4.27	4.80
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	2	7	4.60	380/1503	4.60	4.22	4.20	4.22	4.60
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	6	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1290	5.00	4.32	4.28	4.31	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	158/1453	4.80	4.22	4.21	4.23	4.80
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	2	7	4.60	247/1421	4.60	4.08	4.00	4.01	4.60
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	2	7	4.60	223/1365	4.60	4.11	4.08	4.08	4.60
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	2	0	7	4.30	705/1485	4.30	4.20	4.16	4.17	4.30
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	1	0	0	0	9	4.60	1030/1504	4.60	4.68	4.69	4.65	4.60
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	1	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	149/1483	4.75	4.07	4.06	4.08	4.75
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	179/1425	4.90	4.41	4.41	4.43	4.90
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1426	5.00	4.72	4.69	4.71	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	191/1418	4.80	4.29	4.25	4.26	4.80
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	142/1416	4.90	4.34	4.26	4.27	4.90
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	77/1199	4.90	3.95	3.97	4.02	4.90
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	164/1312	4.80	4.12	4.00	4.09	4.80
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1303	5.00	4.39	4.24	4.27	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1299	5.00	4.34	4.25	4.30	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	5	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	84/ 758	4.80	4.05	4.01	4.00	4.80
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	8	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 233	****	4.07	4.09	4.12	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	8	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 244	****	4.12	4.09	4.20	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	8	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 227	****	4.49	4.40	4.46	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	8	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 225	****	4.40	4.23	4.29	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	8	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 207	****	4.22	4.09	4.14	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	8	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 76	****	4.60	4.61	4.84	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	8	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 70	****	4.54	4.35	4.24	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 67	****	4.32	4.34	3.98	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 76	****	4.41	4.44	4.51	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	8	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 73	****	4.17	4.17	4.25	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 58	****	3.98	4.43	4.52	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	8	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 56	****	4.12	4.23	4.13	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 44	****	4.68	4.65	4.77	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	8	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 47	****	4.32	4.29	4.14	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	8	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 39	****	4.61	4.44	4.47	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 40	****	4.28	4.53	4.74	****

2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	8	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/	35	****	4.43	4.49	4.36	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	8	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/	36	****	4.38	4.60	4.63	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	8	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/	20	****	5.00	4.24	5.00	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	8	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/	16	****	5.00	4.51	3.95	****

Course-Section: FREN 320 0101  
 Title INTERCONNECTIONS:TRADE  
 Instructor: DE VERNEIL, MAR  
 Enrollment: 15  
 Questionnaires: 10

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2005

Page 768  
 JUN 14, 2005  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: FREN 330 0101  
 Title INTERCONNECTIONS:IDEAS  
 Instructor: Fatih, Zakaria  
 Enrollment: 8  
 Questionnaires: 8

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2005

Page 769  
 JUN 14, 2005  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1504	5.00	4.24	4.27	4.27	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	138/1503	4.86	4.22	4.20	4.22	4.86
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	1	6	4.63	389/1290	4.63	4.32	4.28	4.31	4.63
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	118/1453	4.88	4.22	4.21	4.23	4.88
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	2	5	4.50	320/1421	4.50	4.08	4.00	4.01	4.50
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	1	5	4.38	451/1365	4.38	4.11	4.08	4.08	4.38
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	2	5	4.50	455/1485	4.50	4.20	4.16	4.17	4.50
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1504	5.00	4.68	4.69	4.65	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	108/1483	4.83	4.07	4.06	4.08	4.83
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	2	5	4.50	784/1425	4.50	4.41	4.41	4.43	4.50
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1426	5.00	4.72	4.69	4.71	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	317/1418	4.71	4.29	4.25	4.26	4.71
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1416	5.00	4.34	4.26	4.27	5.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	2	0	0	1	2	3	4.33	429/1199	4.33	3.95	3.97	4.02	4.33
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	3	3	4.50	364/1312	4.50	4.12	4.00	4.09	4.50
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1303	5.00	4.39	4.24	4.27	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	273/1299	4.83	4.34	4.25	4.30	4.83
4. Were special techniques successful	2	2	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	387/ 758	4.00	4.05	4.01	4.00	4.00

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	6	Required for Majors	0	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	1	Under-grad	8	Non-major	2
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	0	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	6				
				?	0						

Course-Section: FREN 640 0101  
 Title STUDY IN FREN CULT & S  
 Instructor: FIELD, THOMAS T  
 Enrollment: 14  
 Questionnaires: 11

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2005

Page 770  
 JUN 14, 2005  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	3	8	4.73	295/1504	4.73	4.24	4.27	4.44	4.73
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	8	4.73	248/1503	4.73	4.22	4.20	4.28	4.73
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	7	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1290	5.00	4.32	4.28	4.36	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	4	6	4.60	331/1453	4.60	4.22	4.21	4.34	4.60
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	3	8	4.73	176/1421	4.73	4.08	4.00	4.27	4.73
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	6	5	4.45	358/1365	4.45	4.11	4.08	4.35	4.45
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	0	0	1	3	6	4.50	455/1485	4.50	4.20	4.16	4.24	4.50
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	657/1504	4.90	4.68	4.69	4.79	4.90
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	137/1483	4.78	4.07	4.06	4.20	4.78
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	179/1425	4.91	4.41	4.41	4.51	4.91
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1426	5.00	4.72	4.69	4.80	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1418	5.00	4.29	4.25	4.36	5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1416	5.00	4.34	4.26	4.38	5.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	2	2	7	4.45	320/1199	4.45	3.95	3.97	4.04	4.45
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	3	7	4.70	234/1312	4.70	4.12	4.00	4.31	4.70
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	197/1303	4.90	4.39	4.24	4.58	4.90
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1299	5.00	4.34	4.25	4.56	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	1	0	0	0	0	4	6	4.60	154/ 758	4.60	4.05	4.01	4.24	4.60

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	4	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	2	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	3						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	1	Under-grad	9	Non-major	2
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	2	3.50-4.00	5	F	0	Electives	2	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	6				
				?	1						