

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	2	0	0	2	11	4.33	902/1670	4.52	4.36	4.31	4.23	4.33
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	1	13	4.80	259/1666	4.65	4.31	4.27	4.30	4.80
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	14	4.93	134/1406	4.77	4.48	4.32	4.31	4.93
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	13	4.87	203/1615	4.71	4.34	4.24	4.17	4.87
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	13	4.87	154/1566	4.71	4.26	4.07	4.03	4.87
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	13	4.87	141/1528	4.66	4.23	4.12	4.00	4.87
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	4	11	4.73	289/1650	4.59	4.16	4.22	4.28	4.73
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	10	4	4.29	1347/1667	4.21	4.47	4.67	4.61	4.29
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	116/1626	4.57	4.08	4.11	4.07	4.90
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	1	14	4.93	193/1559	4.80	4.38	4.46	4.47	4.93
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	15	5.00	1/1560	5.00	4.75	4.72	4.68	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	0	15	5.00	1/1549	4.89	4.34	4.31	4.32	5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	14	5.00	1/1546	5.00	4.40	4.32	4.32	5.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	0	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	107/1323	4.90	3.96	4.00	3.91	4.92
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	1	1	6	4.63	356/1384	4.53	4.29	4.10	3.92	4.63
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	0	0	1	1	6	4.63	510/1378	4.74	4.56	4.29	4.09	4.63
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	0	0	1	2	5	4.50	653/1378	4.39	4.45	4.31	4.08	4.50
4. Were special techniques successful	7	2	2	1	0	0	3	3.17	808/ 904	3.58	4.11	4.03	3.94	3.17
Laboratory														
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 239	****	****	4.21	4.35	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 230	****	****	4.44	4.58	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 231	****	****	4.31	4.45	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 218	****	****	4.18	4.47	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 87	****	5.00	4.65	4.67	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 79	****	4.63	4.64	4.72	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 75	****	5.00	4.57	4.46	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 79	****	4.88	4.45	4.59	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 80	****	4.13	3.97	3.99	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 41	****	****	4.50	3.91	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 38	****	****	4.19	4.07	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.27	4.42	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.47	4.28	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 28	****	****	4.64	4.59	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 16	****	****	4.67	4.83	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 27	****	****	4.54	4.46	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 10	****	****	4.84	4.75	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 6	****	****	4.92	4.83	****

Course-Section: ARBC 102 0101
 Title ELEMENTARY ARABIC II
 Instructor: EL OMARI, SAMIR
 Enrollment: 24
 Questionnaires: 15

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2008

Page 81
 AUG 6, 2008
 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	5	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	3						
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	0	C	2	General	0	Under-grad	15	Non-major	14
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	4	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	5				
				?	1						

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	0	0	0	3	7	4.70	440/1670	4.52	4.36	4.31	4.23	4.70
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	3	6	4.50	622/1666	4.65	4.31	4.27	4.30	4.50
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	1	0	1	8	4.60	495/1406	4.77	4.48	4.32	4.31	4.60
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	1	0	0	1	2	6	4.56	499/1615	4.71	4.34	4.24	4.17	4.56
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	1	2	6	4.56	364/1566	4.71	4.26	4.07	4.03	4.56
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	1	3	5	4.44	504/1528	4.66	4.23	4.12	4.00	4.44
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	0	2	1	6	4.44	660/1650	4.59	4.16	4.22	4.28	4.44
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	0	0	0	0	7	1	4.13	1458/1667	4.21	4.47	4.67	4.61	4.13
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	1	0	0	2	5	4.25	728/1626	4.57	4.08	4.11	4.07	4.25
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	0	3	6	4.67	673/1559	4.80	4.38	4.46	4.47	4.67
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1560	5.00	4.75	4.72	4.68	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	337/1549	4.89	4.34	4.31	4.32	4.78
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1546	5.00	4.40	4.32	4.32	5.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	126/1323	4.90	3.96	4.00	3.91	4.89
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	1	0	1	5	4.43	519/1384	4.53	4.29	4.10	3.92	4.43
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	295/1378	4.74	4.56	4.29	4.09	4.86
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	0	1	3	3	4.29	850/1378	4.39	4.45	4.31	4.08	4.29
4. Were special techniques successful	4	2	0	0	2	1	2	4.00	461/ 904	3.58	4.11	4.03	3.94	4.00
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	9	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 232	****	****	4.19	4.25	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	9	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 239	****	****	4.21	4.35	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	9	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 230	****	****	4.44	4.58	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	9	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 231	****	****	4.31	4.45	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	9	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 218	****	****	4.18	4.47	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	9	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 87	****	5.00	4.65	4.67	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	9	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 79	****	4.63	4.64	4.72	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 75	****	5.00	4.57	4.46	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 79	****	4.88	4.45	4.59	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	9	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 80	****	4.13	3.97	3.99	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 41	****	****	4.50	3.91	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	9	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 38	****	****	4.19	4.07	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	9	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 38	****	****	4.62	4.63	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	9	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.27	4.42	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	9	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.47	4.28	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 28	****	****	4.64	4.59	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	9	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 16	****	****	4.67	4.83	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	9	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 27	****	****	4.54	4.46	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	9	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 10	****	****	4.84	4.75	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	9	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 6	****	****	4.92	4.83	****

Course-Section: ARBC 102 0102
 Title ELEMENTARY ARABIC II
 Instructor: EL OMARI, SAMIR
 Enrollment: 25
 Questionnaires: 11

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2008

Page 82
 AUG 6, 2008
 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	7	Required for Majors	3	Graduate	1	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	2						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	2	Under-grad	10	Non-major	11
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	1	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						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					5	Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	Mean		Rank						
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1670	5.00	4.36	4.31	4.32	5.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	259/1666	4.80	4.31	4.27	4.27	4.80	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	191/1406	4.90	4.48	4.32	4.39	4.90	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	189/1615	4.89	4.34	4.24	4.29	4.89	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1566	5.00	4.26	4.07	4.00	5.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	173/1528	4.80	4.23	4.12	4.11	4.80	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	159/1650	4.90	4.16	4.22	4.20	4.90	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	3	7	4.70	992/1667	4.70	4.47	4.67	4.64	4.70	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	1	0	0	2	5	4.25	728/1626	4.25	4.08	4.11	4.06	4.25	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	276/1559	4.90	4.38	4.46	4.40	4.90	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1560	5.00	4.75	4.72	4.73	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	202/1549	4.90	4.34	4.31	4.25	4.90	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	345/1546	4.80	4.40	4.32	4.30	4.80	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1323	5.00	3.96	4.00	4.08	5.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	1	0	0	0	6	4.43	519/1384	4.43	4.29	4.10	4.07	4.43	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	316/1378	4.83	4.56	4.29	4.25	4.83	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1378	5.00	4.45	4.31	4.26	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	4	0	2	0	0	0	4	3.67	671/ 904	3.67	4.11	4.03	4.01	3.67	
Laboratory															
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 239	****	****	4.21	4.33	****	
Seminar															
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 80	****	4.13	3.97	4.30	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 41	****	****	4.50	2.00	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 38	****	****	4.19	2.50	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 38	****	****	4.62	4.50	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	9	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.27	4.00	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.47	4.00	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 28	****	****	4.64	****	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 16	****	****	4.67	****	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 27	****	****	4.54	****	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 10	****	****	4.84	****	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 6	****	****	4.92	****	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors		
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 7	Required for Majors 1	Graduate 0	Major 0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B 3			
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	1	C 0	General 6	Under-grad 10	Non-major 10
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	3	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	2
?	0		