

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	3	6	4.27	849/1447	4.40	4.31	4.31	4.18	4.27
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	5	5	4.36	728/1447	4.48	4.34	4.27	4.30	4.36
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	3	7	4.55	505/1241	4.64	4.48	4.33	4.25	4.55
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	2	4	4	4.20	827/1402	4.47	4.36	4.24	4.15	4.20
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	5	5	4.36	496/1358	4.38	4.26	4.11	4.03	4.36
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	1	5	4	4.09	763/1316	4.28	4.27	4.14	3.99	4.09
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	4	1	5	3.91	1077/1427	4.19	4.21	4.19	4.24	3.91
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	2	6	2	4.00	1361/1447	4.25	4.66	4.69	4.68	4.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	1	0	0	2	3	1	3.83	1031/1434	4.07	4.12	4.10	4.10	3.83
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	0	4	5	4.56	727/1387	4.58	4.45	4.46	4.46	4.56
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	579/1387	4.91	4.78	4.73	4.71	4.89
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	1	1	7	4.67	431/1386	4.63	4.35	4.32	4.32	4.67
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	3	5	4.63	520/1380	4.68	4.43	4.32	4.31	4.63
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	0	0	1	2	1	5	4.11	602/1193	4.39	4.02	4.02	3.99	4.11
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	181/1172	4.57	4.26	4.15	3.95	4.80
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	490/1182	4.58	4.56	4.35	4.18	4.60
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	522/1170	4.58	4.41	4.38	4.17	4.60
4. Were special techniques successful	6	1	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	103/ 800	4.56	4.17	4.06	3.95	4.75
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 189	****	3.00	4.34	4.18	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 192	****	4.00	4.34	4.31	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 186	****	****	4.48	4.46	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 187	****	3.67	4.33	4.37	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 168	****	3.67	4.20	4.29	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 66	****	3.99	4.58	3.95	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 62	****	4.90	4.56	4.08	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 58	****	4.80	4.41	3.88	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 65	****	4.55	4.42	3.78	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	10	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 64	****	4.45	4.09	3.75	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 38	****	5.00	4.49	3.83	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 36	****	4.70	4.25	4.26	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 28	****	****	4.52	3.84	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 30	****	4.00	4.30	3.64	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 27	****	4.50	4.43	3.73	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 31	****	5.00	4.72	4.50	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 21	****	5.00	4.57	4.38	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 31	****	5.00	4.64	4.65	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 20	****	****	4.60	4.49	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 15	****	****	4.61	4.31	****

Course-Section: ARBC 102 01
 Title Elementary Arabic II
 Instructor: El Omari, Samir
 Enrollment: 25
 Questionnaires: 11

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 71
 JUN 28, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	4	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	0	C	1	General	4	Under-grad	11	Non-major	11
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 to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	0						

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	2	11	4.53	551/1447	4.40	4.31	4.31	4.18	4.53
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	4	10	4.60	426/1447	4.48	4.34	4.27	4.30	4.60
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	2	12	4.73	303/1241	4.64	4.48	4.33	4.25	4.73
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	4	11	4.73	238/1402	4.47	4.36	4.24	4.15	4.73
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	3	3	9	4.40	452/1358	4.38	4.26	4.11	4.03	4.40
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	4	9	4.47	434/1316	4.28	4.27	4.14	3.99	4.47
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	3	2	10	4.47	513/1427	4.19	4.21	4.19	4.24	4.47
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	1	5	8	4.50	1079/1447	4.25	4.66	4.69	4.68	4.50
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	0	9	4	4.31	578/1434	4.07	4.12	4.10	4.10	4.31
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	2	2	11	4.60	656/1387	4.58	4.45	4.46	4.46	4.60
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	14	4.93	369/1387	4.91	4.78	4.73	4.71	4.93
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	2	2	11	4.60	510/1386	4.63	4.35	4.32	4.32	4.60
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	0	1	13	4.73	366/1380	4.68	4.43	4.32	4.31	4.73
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	0	5	10	4.67	186/1193	4.39	4.02	4.02	3.99	4.67
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	3	0	6	4.33	521/1172	4.57	4.26	4.15	3.95	4.33
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	0	1	2	6	4.56	521/1182	4.58	4.56	4.35	4.18	4.56
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	0	0	1	2	6	4.56	549/1170	4.58	4.41	4.38	4.17	4.56
4. Were special techniques successful	6	1	0	0	2	1	5	4.38	267/ 800	4.56	4.17	4.06	3.95	4.38
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 189	****	3.00	4.34	4.18	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 192	****	4.00	4.34	4.31	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 186	****	****	4.48	4.46	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 187	****	3.67	4.33	4.37	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 168	****	3.67	4.20	4.29	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 66	****	3.99	4.58	3.95	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 62	****	4.90	4.56	4.08	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 58	****	4.80	4.41	3.88	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 65	****	4.55	4.42	3.78	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 64	****	4.45	4.09	3.75	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 38	****	5.00	4.49	3.83	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 36	****	4.70	4.25	4.26	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 28	****	****	4.52	3.84	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 30	****	4.00	4.30	3.64	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 27	****	4.50	4.43	3.73	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 31	****	5.00	4.72	4.50	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 21	****	5.00	4.57	4.38	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 31	****	5.00	4.64	4.65	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 20	****	****	4.60	4.49	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 15	****	****	4.61	4.31	****

Course-Section: ARBC 102 02
 Title Elementary Arabic II
 Instructor: El Omari, Samir
 Enrollment: 25
 Questionnaires: 15

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 72
 JUN 28, 2010
 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	5	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	4						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	1	C	0	General	5	Under-grad	15	Non-major	15
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	1						
				I	0	Other	2				
				?	0						