

Course-Section: FREN 101 0101
 Title ELEMENTARY FRENCH I
 Instructor: APPADOO, YOGEND
 Enrollment: 26
 Questionnaires: 16

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 784
 JUN 26, 2007
 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	Mean	

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	1	2	6	7	4.19	970/1522	4.16	4.36	4.30	4.14	4.19	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	4	7	5	4.06	1048/1522	4.28	4.33	4.26	4.18	4.06	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	4	10	4.50	531/1285	4.70	4.45	4.30	4.22	4.50	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	1	2	6	6	4.13	924/1476	4.26	4.33	4.22	4.09	4.13	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	1	3	10	4.47	375/1412	4.31	4.26	4.06	4.01	4.47	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	0	10	4	4.13	723/1381	4.12	4.19	4.08	3.93	4.13	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	1	2	3	9	4.33	700/1500	4.21	4.14	4.18	4.16	4.33	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	1	5	8	1	3.60	1486/1517	3.57	4.56	4.65	4.62	3.60	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	4	7	2	3.85	1081/1497	4.15	4.21	4.11	4.02	3.85	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	0	6	8	4.57	716/1440	4.62	4.45	4.45	4.40	4.57	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	1	3	9	4.62	1060/1448	4.85	4.79	4.71	4.63	4.62	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	1	5	7	4.46	648/1436	4.67	4.39	4.29	4.24	4.46	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	4	10	4.71	394/1432	4.53	4.47	4.29	4.23	4.71	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	0	1	0	2	7	3	3.85	733/1221	3.83	3.91	3.93	3.86	3.85	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	1	4	3	5	3.92	803/1280	4.08	4.28	4.10	3.92	3.92	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	0	4	9	4.69	442/1277	4.52	4.60	4.34	4.13	4.69	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	3	3	7	4.31	743/1269	4.23	4.47	4.31	4.04	4.31	
4. Were special techniques successful	3	1	1	0	1	8	2	3.83	555/ 854	4.13	4.16	4.02	3.87	3.83	
Laboratory															
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	15	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 228	****	4.50	4.35	4.33	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	15	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 79	****	5.00	4.58	4.13	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	15	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 80	****	4.83	4.11	3.79	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	15	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 47	****	3.60	4.41	3.90	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	15	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 45	****	4.00	4.30	3.90	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	15	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 39	****	3.00	4.40	3.99	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	15	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 35	****	3.00	4.31	4.00	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	15	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 37	****	4.33	4.63	4.53	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	15	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 23	****	****	4.41	4.19	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	15	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 33	****	****	4.69	4.57	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	6	0.00-0.99	0	A 10	Required for Majors 6
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B 3	
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	1	C 1	General 1
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	4	D 0	Under-grad 16
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F 0	Non-major 15
				P 0	
				I 0	
				? 0	Electives 2
					Other 5

- Means there are not enough responses to be significant

Course-Section: FREN 101 0201
 Title ELEMENTARY FRENCH I
 Instructor: MBAYE, ABDOULAY
 Enrollment: 24
 Questionnaires: 16

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 785
 JUN 26, 2007
 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	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	4	2	4	1	5	3.06	1484/1522	4.16	4.36	4.30	4.14	3.06	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	1	2	3	2	7	3.80	1244/1522	4.28	4.33	4.26	4.18	3.80	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	4	11	4.73	298/1285	4.70	4.45	4.30	4.22	4.73	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	8	0	2	1	1	3	3.71	1217/1476	4.26	4.33	4.22	4.09	3.71	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	7	0	1	1	3	2	3.86	932/1412	4.31	4.26	4.06	4.01	3.86	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	9	1	0	0	3	1	3.60	1130/1381	4.12	4.19	4.08	3.93	3.60	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	1	1	2	5	1	4	3.38	1363/1500	4.21	4.14	4.18	4.16	3.38	
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	2	6	5	1	0	2.36	1515/1517	3.57	4.56	4.65	4.62	2.36	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	2	5	3	3	3.54	1265/1497	4.15	4.21	4.11	4.02	3.54	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	1	0	1	3	8	4.31	1007/1440	4.62	4.45	4.45	4.40	4.31	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	0	1	12	4.92	395/1448	4.85	4.79	4.71	4.63	4.92	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	1	3	9	4.62	467/1436	4.67	4.39	4.29	4.24	4.62	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	2	0	2	2	7	3.92	1108/1432	4.53	4.47	4.29	4.23	3.92	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	9	1	0	2	0	1	3.00	1064/1221	3.83	3.91	3.93	3.86	3.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	2	0	1	1	4	3.63	978/1280	4.08	4.28	4.10	3.92	3.63	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	1	0	1	0	6	4.25	804/1277	4.52	4.60	4.34	4.13	4.25	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	1	0	3	0	4	3.75	1030/1269	4.23	4.47	4.31	4.04	3.75	
4. Were special techniques successful	9	6	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 854	4.13	4.16	4.02	3.87	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	1	0.00-0.99 0	A 7	Required for Majors 7	Graduate 0 Major 2
28-55	3	1.00-1.99 0	B 3		
56-83	2	2.00-2.99 1	C 1	General 1	Under-grad 16 Non-major 14
84-150	3	3.00-3.49 3	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 2	
			? 1		

Course-Section: FREN 101 0301
 Title ELEMENTARY FRENCH I
 Instructor: DE VERNEIL, MAR
 Enrollment: 21
 Questionnaires: 15

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 786
 JUN 26, 2007
 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	Mean	

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	4	11	4.73	350/1522	4.16	4.36	4.30	4.14	4.73	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	5	10	4.67	358/1522	4.28	4.33	4.26	4.18	4.67	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	12	4.80	228/1285	4.70	4.45	4.30	4.22	4.80	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	1	0	0	1	2	10	4.69	285/1476	4.26	4.33	4.22	4.09	4.69	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	3	2	9	4.43	411/1412	4.31	4.26	4.06	4.01	4.43	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	0	2	2	9	4.54	305/1381	4.12	4.19	4.08	3.93	4.54	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	2	12	4.73	232/1500	4.21	4.14	4.18	4.16	4.73	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	5	10	4.67	932/1517	3.57	4.56	4.65	4.62	4.67	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	1	2	8	4.64	288/1497	4.15	4.21	4.11	4.02	4.64	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	1	1	12	4.79	392/1440	4.62	4.45	4.45	4.40	4.79	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	1	0	13	4.86	629/1448	4.85	4.79	4.71	4.63	4.86	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	1	1	12	4.79	248/1436	4.67	4.39	4.29	4.24	4.79	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	2	1	11	4.64	478/1432	4.53	4.47	4.29	4.23	4.64	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	0	0	0	6	0	7	4.08	582/1221	3.83	3.91	3.93	3.86	4.08	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	2	2	6	4.40	477/1280	4.08	4.28	4.10	3.92	4.40	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	0	1	1	8	4.70	442/1277	4.52	4.60	4.34	4.13	4.70	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	0	1	2	7	4.60	509/1269	4.23	4.47	4.31	4.04	4.60	
4. Were special techniques successful	5	3	0	0	2	0	5	4.43	240/ 854	4.13	4.16	4.02	3.87	4.43	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	2	0.00-0.99 0	A 5	Required for Majors 9	Graduate 0 Major 0
28-55	3	1.00-1.99 0	B 5		
56-83	3	2.00-2.99 2	C 3	General 1	Under-grad 15 Non-major 15
84-150	1	3.00-3.49 3	D 0		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 1	F 0	Electives 0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 3	
			? 0		

Course-Section: FREN 101 0401
 Title ELEMENTARY FRENCH I
 Instructor: TADE, SOPHIA
 Enrollment: 25
 Questionnaires: 22

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 787
 JUN 26, 2007
 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	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	0	0	1	5	15	4.67	433/1522	4.16	4.36	4.30	4.14	4.67	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	2	5	14	4.57	465/1522	4.28	4.33	4.26	4.18	4.57	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	5	16	4.76	268/1285	4.70	4.45	4.30	4.22	4.76	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	3	0	0	1	7	10	4.50	473/1476	4.26	4.33	4.22	4.09	4.50	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	1	0	0	1	8	11	4.50	339/1412	4.31	4.26	4.06	4.01	4.50	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	3	0	0	5	4	9	4.22	633/1381	4.12	4.19	4.08	3.93	4.22	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	1	0	10	10	4.38	650/1500	4.21	4.14	4.18	4.16	4.38	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	7	14	0	3.67	1479/1517	3.57	4.56	4.65	4.62	3.67	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	0	2	3	12	4.59	326/1497	4.15	4.21	4.11	4.02	4.59	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	0	4	16	4.80	353/1440	4.62	4.45	4.45	4.40	4.80	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	0	20	5.00	1/1448	4.85	4.79	4.71	4.63	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	0	4	16	4.80	217/1436	4.67	4.39	4.29	4.24	4.80	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	3	17	4.85	227/1432	4.53	4.47	4.29	4.23	4.85	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	2	0	0	2	7	9	4.39	373/1221	3.83	3.91	3.93	3.86	4.39	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	1	5	5	4.36	507/1280	4.08	4.28	4.10	3.92	4.36	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	11	0	0	1	0	3	7	4.45	643/1277	4.52	4.60	4.34	4.13	4.45	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	11	0	1	0	0	4	6	4.27	763/1269	4.23	4.47	4.31	4.04	4.27	
4. Were special techniques successful	11	4	0	0	1	4	2	4.14	391/ 854	4.13	4.16	4.02	3.87	4.14	
Laboratory															
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	21	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 228	****	4.50	4.35	4.33	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	21	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 47	****	3.60	4.41	3.90	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	21	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 45	****	4.00	4.30	3.90	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 39	****	3.00	4.40	3.99	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	21	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 35	****	3.00	4.31	4.00	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	21	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 34	****	2.75	4.30	4.11	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	20	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 37	****	4.33	4.63	4.53	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	20	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 23	****	****	4.41	4.19	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	20	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 33	****	****	4.69	4.57	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	20	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 22	****	****	4.54	4.31	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	20	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 18	****	****	4.49	4.11	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors		
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	1	A 12	Required for Majors 10	Graduate 0	Major 0
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B 6			
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	1	C 1	General 2	Under-grad 22	Non-major 22
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	0	D 0			
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5	F 0	Electives 3	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	
				P 0			
				I 0	Other 4		
				? 0			

Course-Section: FREN 102 0101
 Title ELEMENTARY FRENCH II
 Instructor: ZAIRI, MOHAMMED
 Enrollment: 21
 Questionnaires: 12

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 788
 JUN 26, 2007
 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	Mean	

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	3	6	3	4.00	1122/1522	3.99	4.36	4.30	4.14	4.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	6	3	3	3.75	1267/1522	3.80	4.33	4.26	4.18	3.75	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	0	4	2	5	3.83	1053/1285	3.92	4.45	4.30	4.22	3.83	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	1	0	4	3	2	3.50	1324/1476	3.64	4.33	4.22	4.09	3.50	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	1	0	2	4	4	3.91	892/1412	3.77	4.26	4.06	4.01	3.91	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	2	0	4	3	2	3.27	1244/1381	3.58	4.19	4.08	3.93	3.27	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	5	4	2	3.58	1269/1500	3.65	4.14	4.18	4.16	3.58	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/1517	4.38	4.56	4.65	4.62	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	5	1	2	3.63	1227/1497	3.59	4.21	4.11	4.02	3.63	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	1	1	3	6	4.27	1031/1440	4.10	4.45	4.45	4.40	4.27	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	1	2	8	4.64	1036/1448	4.46	4.79	4.71	4.63	4.64	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	3	4	4	4.09	1008/1436	3.95	4.39	4.29	4.24	4.09	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	0	1	5	4	4.00	1036/1432	4.28	4.47	4.29	4.23	4.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	1	0	1	2	3	4	4.00	606/1221	3.28	3.91	3.93	3.86	4.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	2	1	2	3	3.75	907/1280	3.94	4.28	4.10	3.92	3.75	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	0	1	1	6	4.63	508/1277	4.49	4.60	4.34	4.13	4.63	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	0	2	2	4	4.25	777/1269	4.19	4.47	4.31	4.04	4.25	
4. Were special techniques successful	4	1	1	1	0	3	2	3.57	658/ 854	3.85	4.16	4.02	3.87	3.57	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	10	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 215	****	****	4.36	4.31	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	10	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 228	****	4.50	4.35	4.33	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	10	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/ 217	****	4.50	4.51	4.51	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	10	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 216	****	****	4.42	4.41	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	11	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 205	****	5.00	4.23	4.28	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	11	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 79	****	5.00	4.58	4.13	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	11	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 77	****	5.00	4.52	4.03	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 65	****	5.00	4.49	3.85	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 78	****	4.83	4.45	3.88	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	11	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 80	****	4.83	4.11	3.79	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 47	****	3.60	4.41	3.90	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	11	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 45	****	4.00	4.30	3.90	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	11	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 39	****	3.00	4.40	3.99	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	11	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 35	****	3.00	4.31	4.00	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	11	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 34	****	2.75	4.30	4.11	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	10	0	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/ 37	4.33	4.33	4.63	4.53	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	11	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 23	****	****	4.41	4.19	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	11	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 33	****	****	4.69	4.57	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	11	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 22	****	****	4.54	4.31	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	11	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 18	****	****	4.49	4.11	****	

Course-Section: FREN 102 0101
 Title ELEMENTARY FRENCH II
 Instructor: ZAIRI, MOHAMMED
 Enrollment: 21
 Questionnaires: 12

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 788
 JUN 26, 2007
 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	3	Required for Majors	8	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	6						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	1	C	3	General	1	Under-grad	12	Non-major	11
84-150	1	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	1				
				?	0						

Course-Section: FREN 102 0201
 Title ELEMENTARY FRENCH II
 Instructor: MCCRAY, STANLEY
 Enrollment: 26
 Questionnaires: 12

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 789
 JUN 26, 2007
 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	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	4	3	5	4.08	1067/1522	3.99	4.36	4.30	4.14	4.08	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	3	6	4.17	965/1522	3.80	4.33	4.26	4.18	4.17	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	4	1	7	4.25	766/1285	3.92	4.45	4.30	4.22	4.25	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	1	0	2	1	7	4.18	871/1476	3.64	4.33	4.22	4.09	4.18	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	1	1	0	3	2	4	3.80	973/1412	3.77	4.26	4.06	4.01	3.80	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	1	0	0	0	4	6	4.60	247/1381	3.58	4.19	4.08	3.93	4.60	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	1	1	1	1	3	4	3.80	1147/1500	3.65	4.14	4.18	4.16	3.80	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	3	8	0	3.73	1473/1517	4.38	4.56	4.65	4.62	3.73	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	1	1	5	2	3.89	1049/1497	3.59	4.21	4.11	4.02	3.89	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	1	3	5	3	3.83	1276/1440	4.10	4.45	4.45	4.40	3.83	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	5	7	4.58	1089/1448	4.46	4.79	4.71	4.63	4.58	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	1	3	4	4	3.92	1147/1436	3.95	4.39	4.29	4.24	3.92	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	6	6	4.50	632/1432	4.28	4.47	4.29	4.23	4.50	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	1	0	1	2	6	2	3.82	752/1221	3.28	3.91	3.93	3.86	3.82	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	1	4	5	4.40	477/1280	3.94	4.28	4.10	3.92	4.40	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	0	3	7	4.70	442/1277	4.49	4.60	4.34	4.13	4.70	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	332/1269	4.19	4.47	4.31	4.04	4.80	
4. Were special techniques successful	2	1	0	0	2	2	5	4.33	287/ 854	3.85	4.16	4.02	3.87	4.33	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	10	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 215	****	****	4.36	4.31	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 228	****	4.50	4.35	4.33	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	11	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 217	****	4.50	4.51	4.51	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 216	****	****	4.42	4.41	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 205	****	5.00	4.23	4.28	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	29/ 37	4.33	4.33	4.63	4.53	4.33	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	9	1	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 23	****	****	4.41	4.19	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	9	1	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 33	****	****	4.69	4.57	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	9	1	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 22	****	****	4.54	4.31	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	9	1	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 18	****	****	4.49	4.11	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	A 5	Required for Majors	7
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	B 3		Graduate 0
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	C 1	General	1
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad 12
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	2
			? 0		

Course-Section: FREN 102 0301
 Title ELEMENTARY FRENCH II
 Instructor: FATIH, ZAKARIA
 Enrollment: 14
 Questionnaires: 13

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 790
 JUN 26, 2007
 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	2	0	2	1	8	4.00	1122/1522	3.99	4.36	4.30	4.14	4.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	0	1	6	5	4.08	1042/1522	3.80	4.33	4.26	4.18	4.08	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	6	5	4.15	841/1285	3.92	4.45	4.30	4.22	4.15	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	4	1	0	1	3	4	4.00	1009/1476	3.64	4.33	4.22	4.09	4.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	1	0	1	1	5	4	4.09	703/1412	3.77	4.26	4.06	4.01	4.09	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	4	0	3	2	2	1	3.13	1275/1381	3.58	4.19	4.08	3.93	3.13	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	0	2	3	6	4.08	945/1500	3.65	4.14	4.18	4.16	4.08	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	12	0	4.00	1389/1517	4.38	4.56	4.65	4.62	4.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	2	7	2	4.00	898/1497	3.59	4.21	4.11	4.02	4.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	1	3	7	4.55	751/1440	4.10	4.45	4.45	4.40	4.55	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	1	2	8	4.64	1036/1448	4.46	4.79	4.71	4.63	4.64	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	1	4	6	4.45	660/1436	3.95	4.39	4.29	4.24	4.45	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	1	2	8	4.64	490/1432	4.28	4.47	4.29	4.23	4.64	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	3	3	2	1	0	2	2.50	1165/1221	3.28	3.91	3.93	3.86	2.50	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	1	1	1	4	4.14	657/1280	3.94	4.28	4.10	3.92	4.14	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	0	1	0	6	4.71	421/1277	4.49	4.60	4.34	4.13	4.71	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	0	0	0	4	3	4.43	654/1269	4.19	4.47	4.31	4.04	4.43	
4. Were special techniques successful	6	2	0	0	0	4	1	4.20	363/ 854	3.85	4.16	4.02	3.87	4.20	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	12	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 37	4.33	4.33	4.63	4.53	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	12	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 33	****	****	4.69	4.57	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	A	3	Required for Majors	10	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	5						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	1	C	3	General	1	Under-grad	13	Non-major	13
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	1	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	1				
				?	0						

Course-Section: FREN 102 0401
 Title ELEMENTARY FRENCH II
 Instructor: ZAIRI, MOHAMMED
 Enrollment: 20
 Questionnaires: 14

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 791
 JUN 26, 2007
 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	Mean	

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	1	3	7	3	3.86	1244/1522	3.99	4.36	4.30	4.14	3.86	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	3	5	2	3	3.21	1454/1522	3.80	4.33	4.26	4.18	3.21	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	1	4	7	1	3.43	1193/1285	3.92	4.45	4.30	4.22	3.43	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	5	1	2	3	3	0	2.89	1435/1476	3.64	4.33	4.22	4.09	2.89	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	5	0	5	3	3.29	1278/1412	3.77	4.26	4.06	4.01	3.29	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	2	1	2	2	6	1	3.33	1227/1381	3.58	4.19	4.08	3.93	3.33	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	3	0	5	4	2	3.14	1415/1500	3.65	4.14	4.18	4.16	3.14	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	1	0	0	13	4.79	749/1517	4.38	4.56	4.65	4.62	4.79	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	7	0	1	2	1	3	0	2.86	1444/1497	3.59	4.21	4.11	4.02	2.86	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	1	2	8	1	3.75	1304/1440	4.10	4.45	4.45	4.40	3.75	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	1	0	8	2	4.00	1353/1448	4.46	4.79	4.71	4.63	4.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	2	0	2	8	0	3.33	1334/1436	3.95	4.39	4.29	4.24	3.33	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	1	1	6	3	4.00	1036/1432	4.28	4.47	4.29	4.23	4.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	1	2	1	5	1	1	2.80	1121/1221	3.28	3.91	3.93	3.86	2.80	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	1	2	0	7	1	3.45	1056/1280	3.94	4.28	4.10	3.92	3.45	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	4	4	3	3.91	1013/1277	4.49	4.60	4.34	4.13	3.91	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	1	1	3	4	1	3.30	1162/1269	4.19	4.47	4.31	4.04	3.30	
4. Were special techniques successful	3	4	1	1	1	3	1	3.29	737/ 854	3.85	4.16	4.02	3.87	3.29	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	3	Required for Majors	7	Graduate	0	Major	2
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B	5						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	4	C	2	General	0	Under-grad	14	Non-major	12
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	2	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	4				
				?	0						

Course-Section: FREN 103 0101
 Title INT REV ELEM FRENCH
 Instructor: EL OMARI, SAMIR
 Enrollment: 21
 Questionnaires: 14

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 792
 JUN 26, 2007
 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	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	1	6	4	3	3.64	1347/1522	3.64	4.36	4.30	4.14	3.64	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	4	7	2	3.71	1285/1522	3.71	4.33	4.26	4.18	3.71	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	4	9	4.57	456/1285	4.57	4.45	4.30	4.22	4.57	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	4	2	2	1	2	3	3.20	1391/1476	3.20	4.33	4.22	4.09	3.20	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	1	4	6	2	3.50	1165/1412	3.50	4.26	4.06	4.01	3.50	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	3	2	2	3	2	1	2.80	1331/1381	2.80	4.19	4.08	3.93	2.80	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	5	4	2	2	2.93	1445/1500	2.93	4.14	4.18	4.16	2.93	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	1	12	4.92	389/1517	4.92	4.56	4.65	4.62	4.92	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	1	0	0	6	7	0	3.54	1265/1497	3.54	4.21	4.11	4.02	3.54	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	5	4	5	4.00	1186/1440	4.00	4.45	4.45	4.40	4.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	2	1	11	4.64	1024/1448	4.64	4.79	4.71	4.63	4.64	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	4	5	5	4.07	1018/1436	4.07	4.39	4.29	4.24	4.07	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	1	6	6	4.21	914/1432	4.21	4.47	4.29	4.23	4.21	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	1	1	2	8	2	3.64	841/1221	3.64	3.91	3.93	3.86	3.64	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	2	0	5	1	2	3.10	1178/1280	3.10	4.28	4.10	3.92	3.10	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	0	4	2	3	3.89	1020/1277	3.89	4.60	4.34	4.13	3.89	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	2	0	4	2	1	3.00	1207/1269	3.00	4.47	4.31	4.04	3.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	4	3	1	0	3	3	0	3.14	761/ 854	3.14	4.16	4.02	3.87	3.14	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	11	1	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/ 215	****	****	4.36	4.31	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	13	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 228	****	4.50	4.35	4.33	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	13	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 217	****	4.50	4.51	4.51	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	13	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 216	****	****	4.42	4.41	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	13	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 205	****	5.00	4.23	4.28	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	13	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 79	****	5.00	4.58	4.13	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	13	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 77	****	5.00	4.52	4.03	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 65	****	5.00	4.49	3.85	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 78	****	4.83	4.45	3.88	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	13	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 80	****	4.83	4.11	3.79	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 47	****	3.60	4.41	3.90	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	13	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 45	****	4.00	4.30	3.90	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	13	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 39	****	3.00	4.40	3.99	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	13	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 35	****	3.00	4.31	4.00	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	13	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 34	****	2.75	4.30	4.11	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 37	****	4.33	4.63	4.53	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	12	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 23	****	****	4.41	4.19	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	12	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 33	****	****	4.69	4.57	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	12	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 22	****	****	4.54	4.31	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	12	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 18	****	****	4.49	4.11	****	

Course-Section: FREN 103 0101
 Title INT REV ELEM FRENCH
 Instructor: EL OMARI, SAMIR
 Enrollment: 21
 Questionnaires: 14

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 792
 JUN 26, 2007
 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	10	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	8						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	5	C	2	General	0	Under-grad	14	Non-major	14
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	1	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: 21
 Questionnaires: 15

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 793
 JUN 26, 2007
 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	Mean	

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	1	0	1	6	6	4.14	1012/1522	3.99	4.36	4.30	4.34	4.14	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	5	8	4.50	545/1522	4.06	4.33	4.26	4.29	4.50	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	2	11	4.71	318/1285	4.16	4.45	4.30	4.36	4.71	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	1	1	0	3	4	5	3.92	1103/1476	3.57	4.33	4.22	4.20	3.92	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	2	3	4	4	3.57	1127/1412	4.03	4.26	4.06	4.00	3.57	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	1	2	1	3	2	4	3.42	1193/1381	3.62	4.19	4.08	3.97	3.42	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	1	1	1	4	6	4.00	988/1500	4.06	4.14	4.18	4.20	4.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	7	6	0	3.46	1493/1517	3.87	4.56	4.65	4.63	3.46	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	2	5	4	4.18	731/1497	3.90	4.21	4.11	4.11	4.18	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	1	6	6	4.38	946/1440	3.99	4.45	4.45	4.42	4.38	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	1	2	10	4.69	965/1448	4.66	4.79	4.71	4.78	4.69	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	2	4	7	4.38	741/1436	3.97	4.39	4.29	4.29	4.38	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	1	2	4	6	4.15	956/1432	4.06	4.47	4.29	4.31	4.15	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	4	2	0	2	2	2	3.25	1011/1221	3.33	3.91	3.93	4.02	3.25	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	222/1280	3.95	4.28	4.10	4.08	4.75	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	11	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	375/1277	4.46	4.60	4.34	4.33	4.75	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	11	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	586/1269	4.20	4.47	4.31	4.33	4.50	
4. Were special techniques successful	11	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	330/ 854	3.79	4.16	4.02	4.00	4.25	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 215	****	****	4.36	4.62	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 228	****	4.50	4.35	4.56	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 217	****	4.50	4.51	4.57	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 216	****	****	4.42	4.72	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 205	****	5.00	4.23	4.37	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 79	****	5.00	4.58	4.58	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 77	****	5.00	4.52	5.00	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 65	****	5.00	4.49	5.00	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 78	****	4.83	4.45	5.00	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 80	****	4.83	4.11	4.00	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 47	****	3.60	4.41	4.83	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 45	****	4.00	4.30	4.58	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 39	****	3.00	4.40	4.75	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 35	****	3.00	4.31	4.75	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 34	****	2.75	4.30	4.17	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 37	****	4.33	4.63	****	****	

Course-Section: FREN 201 0101
 Title INTERMEDIATE FRENCH I
 Instructor: TADE, SOPHIA
 Enrollment: 21
 Questionnaires: 15

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 793
 JUN 26, 2007
 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	8	Required for Majors	9	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	2						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	15	Non-major	15
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	7	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	2						

Course-Section: FREN 201 0201
 Title INTERMEDIATE FRENCH I
 Instructor: TADE, SOPHIA
 Enrollment: 20
 Questionnaires: 8

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 794
 JUN 26, 2007
 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	Mean	

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1522	3.99	4.36	4.30	4.34	5.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	255/1522	4.06	4.33	4.26	4.29	4.75	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	173/1285	4.16	4.45	4.30	4.36	4.88	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	1	0	6	4.71	265/1476	3.57	4.33	4.22	4.20	4.71	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1412	4.03	4.26	4.06	4.00	5.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	0	7	4.75	149/1381	3.62	4.19	4.08	3.97	4.75	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	415/1500	4.06	4.14	4.18	4.20	4.57	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	3	5	0	3.63	1483/1517	3.87	4.56	4.65	4.63	3.63	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	125/1497	3.90	4.21	4.11	4.11	4.86	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	240/1440	3.99	4.45	4.45	4.42	4.88	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1448	4.66	4.79	4.71	4.78	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	151/1436	3.97	4.39	4.29	4.29	4.88	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1432	4.06	4.47	4.29	4.31	5.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	1	1	0	0	3	3	4.00	606/1221	3.33	3.91	3.93	4.02	4.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1280	3.95	4.28	4.10	4.08	5.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1277	4.46	4.60	4.34	4.33	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	299/1269	4.20	4.47	4.31	4.33	4.83	
4. Were special techniques successful	3	3	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	194/ 854	3.79	4.16	4.02	4.00	4.50	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 215	****	****	4.36	4.62	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 228	****	4.50	4.35	4.56	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 217	****	4.50	4.51	4.57	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 216	****	****	4.42	4.72	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 205	****	5.00	4.23	4.37	****	
Seminar															
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 77	****	5.00	4.52	5.00	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 78	****	4.83	4.45	5.00	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	7	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 80	****	4.83	4.11	4.00	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 47	****	3.60	4.41	4.83	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 45	****	4.00	4.30	4.58	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	7	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 35	****	3.00	4.31	4.75	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 34	****	2.75	4.30	4.17	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 37	****	4.33	4.63	****	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 23	****	****	4.41	****	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 33	****	****	4.69	****	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 22	****	****	4.54	****	****	

Course-Section: FREN 201 0201
 Title INTERMEDIATE FRENCH I
 Instructor: TADE, SOPHIA
 Enrollment: 20
 Questionnaires: 8

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 794
 JUN 26, 2007
 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	3	Required for Majors	7	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	5						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	2	C	0	General	1	Under-grad	8	Non-major	8
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	1	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	1				
				?	0						

Course-Section: FREN 201 0301
 Title INTERMEDIATE FRENCH I
 Instructor: DIALLO, MAMADOU
 Enrollment: 21
 Questionnaires: 13

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 795
 JUN 26, 2007
 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	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	2	3	3	5	0	2.85	1499/1522	3.99	4.36	4.30	4.34	2.85	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	2	2	4	5	0	2.92	1491/1522	4.06	4.33	4.26	4.29	2.92	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	2	3	1	7	0	3.00	1248/1285	4.16	4.45	4.30	4.36	3.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	4	2	2	3	2	0	2.56	1461/1476	3.57	4.33	4.22	4.20	2.56	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	1	3	5	3	3.83	948/1412	4.03	4.26	4.06	4.00	3.83	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	3	0	1	3	4	2	3.70	1076/1381	3.62	4.19	4.08	3.97	3.70	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	1	0	7	4	3.92	1068/1500	4.06	4.14	4.18	4.20	3.92	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	1	0	1	0	9	1	3.91	1450/1517	3.87	4.56	4.65	4.63	3.91	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	1	1	1	4	3	0	3.00	1418/1497	3.90	4.21	4.11	4.11	3.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	3	2	3	4	1	2.85	1420/1440	3.99	4.45	4.45	4.42	2.85	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	1	3	6	3	3.85	1392/1448	4.66	4.79	4.71	4.78	3.85	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	3	2	4	3	1	2.77	1405/1436	3.97	4.39	4.29	4.29	2.77	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	2	5	1	3	3.08	1357/1432	4.06	4.47	4.29	4.31	3.08	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	7	1	0	1	2	1	3.40	956/1221	3.33	3.91	3.93	4.02	3.40	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	1	1	3	1	1	3.00	1187/1280	3.95	4.28	4.10	4.08	3.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	1	3	3	1	3.50	1136/1277	4.46	4.60	4.34	4.33	3.50	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	1	1	2	2	2	3.38	1149/1269	4.20	4.47	4.31	4.33	3.38	
4. Were special techniques successful	5	1	0	1	1	4	1	3.71	604/ 854	3.79	4.16	4.02	4.00	3.71	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 37	****	4.33	4.63	****	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	12	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 23	****	****	4.41	****	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	12	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 33	****	****	4.69	****	****	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: FREN 201 0401
 Title INTERMEDIATE FRENCH I
 Instructor: DIALLO, MAMADOU
 Enrollment: 20
 Questionnaires: 8

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 796
 JUN 26, 2007
 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	Mean	

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	1	2	2	3	3.88	1234/1522	3.99	4.36	4.30	4.34	3.88	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	2	2	1	3	3.63	1316/1522	4.06	4.33	4.26	4.29	3.63	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	1	1	3	2	3.50	1160/1285	4.16	4.45	4.30	4.36	3.50	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	6	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	1467/1476	3.57	4.33	4.22	4.20	2.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	4	1	2	3.38	1239/1412	4.03	4.26	4.06	4.00	3.38	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	4	1	1	1	0	1	2.75	1338/1381	3.62	4.19	4.08	3.97	2.75	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	0	1	1	5	4.13	913/1500	4.06	4.14	4.18	4.20	4.13	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	1	0	7	4.75	802/1517	3.87	4.56	4.65	4.63	4.75	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	2	2	3	0	3.14	1400/1497	3.90	4.21	4.11	4.11	3.14	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	3	1	2	1	3.14	1400/1440	3.99	4.45	4.45	4.42	3.14	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	1097/1448	4.66	4.79	4.71	4.78	4.57	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	2	1	1	1	2	3.00	1378/1436	3.97	4.39	4.29	4.29	3.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	1	1	3	1	3.29	1330/1432	4.06	4.47	4.29	4.31	3.29	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	6	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/1221	3.33	3.91	3.93	4.02	****	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	1	0	0	2	1	3.50	1031/1280	3.95	4.28	4.10	4.08	3.50	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	1	0	0	3	4.25	804/1277	4.46	4.60	4.34	4.33	4.25	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	1	1	0	2	3.75	1030/1269	4.20	4.47	4.31	4.33	3.75	
4. Were special techniques successful	4	0	0	1	0	3	0	3.50	673/ 854	3.79	4.16	4.02	4.00	3.50	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: FREN 201 0501
 Title INTERMEDIATE FRENCH I
 Instructor: EL OMARI, SAMIR
 Enrollment: 15
 Questionnaires: 13

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 797
 JUN 26, 2007
 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	Mean	

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	3	1	1	8	4.08	1074/1522	3.99	4.36	4.30	4.34	4.08	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	2	10	4.69	322/1522	4.06	4.33	4.26	4.29	4.69	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	3	8	4.38	666/1285	4.16	4.45	4.30	4.36	4.38	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	4	6	4.15	903/1476	3.57	4.33	4.22	4.20	4.15	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	1	0	1	10	4.38	448/1412	4.03	4.26	4.06	4.00	4.38	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	1	2	3	5	4.09	758/1381	3.62	4.19	4.08	3.97	4.09	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	0	3	9	4.54	454/1500	4.06	4.14	4.18	4.20	4.54	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	3	10	4.77	784/1517	3.87	4.56	4.65	4.63	4.77	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	0	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	333/1497	3.90	4.21	4.11	4.11	4.57	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	172/1440	3.99	4.45	4.45	4.42	4.92	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	444/1448	4.66	4.79	4.71	4.78	4.92	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	1	3	8	4.58	502/1436	3.97	4.39	4.29	4.29	4.58	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	3	8	4.58	548/1432	4.06	4.47	4.29	4.31	4.58	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	1	0	2	1	8	4.25	461/1221	3.33	3.91	3.93	4.02	4.25	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	1	0	2	0	4	3.86	849/1280	3.95	4.28	4.10	4.08	3.86	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	0	0	4	3	4.43	672/1277	4.46	4.60	4.34	4.33	4.43	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	0	0	1	3	3	4.29	756/1269	4.20	4.47	4.31	4.33	4.29	
4. Were special techniques successful	6	3	0	2	1	0	1	3.00	779/ 854	3.79	4.16	4.02	4.00	3.00	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 215	****	****	4.36	4.62	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 228	****	4.50	4.35	4.56	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 217	****	4.50	4.51	4.57	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 216	****	****	4.42	4.72	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 205	****	5.00	4.23	4.37	****	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: FREN 201 0601
 Title INTERMEDIATE FRENCH I
 Instructor: MBAYE, ABDOULAY
 Enrollment: 26
 Questionnaires: 13

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 798
 JUN 26, 2007
 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	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	1	1	0	5	5	4.00	1122/1522	3.99	4.36	4.30	4.34	4.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	2	4	1	6	3.85	1222/1522	4.06	4.33	4.26	4.29	3.85	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	2	3	8	8	4.46	578/1285	4.16	4.45	4.30	4.36	4.46	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	1	2	3	5	4.09	961/1476	3.57	4.33	4.22	4.20	4.09	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	7	0	1	1	1	3	4.00	760/1412	4.03	4.26	4.06	4.00	4.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	4	1	3	1	1	2	3.00	1286/1381	3.62	4.19	4.08	3.97	3.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	2	2	2	2	3	3.18	1408/1500	4.06	4.14	4.18	4.20	3.18	
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	5	4	2	0	2.73	1512/1517	3.87	4.56	4.65	4.63	2.73	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	1	0	1	3	7	1	3.67	1204/1497	3.90	4.21	4.11	4.11	3.67	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	1	1	2	4	4	3.75	1304/1440	3.99	4.45	4.45	4.42	3.75	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	494/1448	4.66	4.79	4.71	4.78	4.91	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	1	2	2	6	4.18	942/1436	3.97	4.39	4.29	4.29	4.18	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	2	1	0	8	4.27	869/1432	4.06	4.47	4.29	4.31	4.27	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	8	2	1	1	0	0	1.75	1208/1221	3.33	3.91	3.93	4.02	1.75	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	1	1	1	1	3	3.57	1000/1280	3.95	4.28	4.10	4.08	3.57	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	272/1277	4.46	4.60	4.34	4.33	4.86	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	0	0	1	2	4	4.43	654/1269	4.20	4.47	4.31	4.33	4.43	
4. Were special techniques successful	6	6	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 854	3.79	4.16	4.02	4.00	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	12	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 37	****	4.33	4.63	****	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 33	****	****	4.69	****	****	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: FREN 202 0101
 Title INTERMEDIATE FRENCH II
 Instructor: EL OMARI, SAMIR
 Enrollment: 24
 Questionnaires: 13

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 799
 JUN 26, 2007
 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	Mean	

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	1	0	3	6	3	3.77	1289/1522	3.77	4.36	4.30	4.34	3.77	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	2	0	0	11	4.54	511/1522	4.54	4.33	4.26	4.29	4.54	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	12	4.92	120/1285	4.92	4.45	4.30	4.36	4.92	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	1	0	3	6	4.40	629/1476	4.40	4.33	4.22	4.20	4.40	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	3	8	4.46	375/1412	4.46	4.26	4.06	4.00	4.46	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	3	0	1	3	1	5	4.00	806/1381	4.00	4.19	4.08	3.97	4.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	2	4	7	4.38	650/1500	4.38	4.14	4.18	4.20	4.38	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	3	9	4.75	802/1517	4.75	4.56	4.65	4.63	4.75	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	1	0	1	3	5	2	3.73	1167/1497	3.73	4.21	4.11	4.11	3.73	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	5	7	4.46	851/1440	4.46	4.45	4.45	4.42	4.46	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	1	1	1	10	4.54	1131/1448	4.54	4.79	4.71	4.78	4.54	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	1	1	3	6	4.27	855/1436	4.27	4.39	4.29	4.29	4.27	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	4	2	7	4.23	899/1432	4.23	4.47	4.29	4.31	4.23	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	1	0	12	4.85	90/1221	4.85	3.91	3.93	4.02	4.85	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	2	0	2	2	3	3.44	1061/1280	3.44	4.28	4.10	4.08	3.44	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	0	2	2	5	4.33	743/1277	4.33	4.60	4.34	4.33	4.33	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	0	2	1	6	4.44	637/1269	4.44	4.47	4.31	4.33	4.44	
4. Were special techniques successful	4	5	1	0	0	1	2	3.75	588/ 854	3.75	4.16	4.02	4.00	3.75	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	11	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 215	****	****	4.36	4.62	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	11	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 228	****	4.50	4.35	4.56	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	11	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 217	****	4.50	4.51	4.57	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	11	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 216	****	****	4.42	4.72	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	11	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 205	****	5.00	4.23	4.37	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	10	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 79	****	5.00	4.58	4.58	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	10	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 77	****	5.00	4.52	5.00	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	10	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 65	****	5.00	4.49	5.00	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	10	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 78	****	4.83	4.45	5.00	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	10	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 80	****	4.83	4.11	4.00	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 47	****	3.60	4.41	4.83	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	11	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 45	****	4.00	4.30	4.58	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	11	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 39	****	3.00	4.40	4.75	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	11	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 35	****	3.00	4.31	4.75	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	11	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 34	****	2.75	4.30	4.17	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 37	****	4.33	4.63	****	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	11	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 23	****	****	4.41	****	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	11	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 33	****	****	4.69	****	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	11	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 22	****	****	4.54	****	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	11	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 18	****	****	4.49	****	****	

Course-Section: FREN 202 0101
 Title INTERMEDIATE FRENCH II
 Instructor: EL OMARI, SAMIR
 Enrollment: 24
 Questionnaires: 13

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 799
 JUN 26, 2007
 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	6	Required for Majors	2	Graduate	0	Major	2
28-55	6	1.00-1.99	0	B	5						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	3	C	1	General	3	Under-grad	13	Non-major	11
84-150	0	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	6				
				?	0						

Course-Section: FREN 301 0101
 Title ADVANCED FRENCH I
 Instructor: DE VERNEIL, MAR
 Enrollment: 11
 Questionnaires: 9

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 800
 JUN 26, 2007
 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	Mean	

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	5	4	4.44	681/1522	4.44	4.36	4.30	4.34	4.44	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	233/1522	4.78	4.33	4.26	4.25	4.78	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	258/1285	4.78	4.45	4.30	4.30	4.78	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	207/1476	4.78	4.33	4.22	4.26	4.78	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	1	2	5	4.50	339/1412	4.50	4.26	4.06	4.03	4.50	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	1	7	4.67	207/1381	4.67	4.19	4.08	4.13	4.67	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	3	5	4.44	571/1500	4.44	4.14	4.18	4.13	4.44	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	767/1517	4.78	4.56	4.65	4.62	4.78	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	4	4	4.50	385/1497	4.50	4.21	4.11	4.13	4.50	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	452/1440	4.75	4.45	4.45	4.46	4.75	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1448	5.00	4.79	4.71	4.71	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	3	5	4.63	457/1436	4.63	4.39	4.29	4.30	4.63	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	350/1432	4.75	4.47	4.29	4.29	4.75	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	2	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1221	5.00	3.91	3.93	3.94	5.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	390/1280	4.50	4.28	4.10	4.14	4.50	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1277	5.00	4.60	4.34	4.38	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	381/1269	4.75	4.47	4.31	4.39	4.75	
4. Were special techniques successful	5	1	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	426/ 854	4.00	4.16	4.02	4.00	4.00	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: FREN 301H 0101
 Title ADV FRENCH I - HONORS
 Instructor: DE VERNEIL, MAR
 Enrollment: 1
 Questionnaires: 1

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 801
 JUN 26, 2007
 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	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	1489/1522	3.00	4.36	4.30	4.34	3.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	1481/1522	3.00	4.33	4.26	4.25	3.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	938/1285	4.00	4.45	4.30	4.30	4.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1476	5.00	4.33	4.22	4.26	5.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	760/1412	4.00	4.26	4.06	4.03	4.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	806/1381	4.00	4.19	4.08	4.13	4.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	1430/1500	3.00	4.14	4.18	4.13	3.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1517	5.00	4.56	4.65	4.62	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	898/1497	4.00	4.21	4.11	4.13	4.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1186/1440	4.00	4.45	4.45	4.46	4.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1448	5.00	4.79	4.71	4.71	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1056/1436	4.00	4.39	4.29	4.30	4.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1036/1432	4.00	4.47	4.29	4.29	4.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	606/1221	4.00	3.91	3.93	3.94	4.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	1187/1280	3.00	4.28	4.10	4.14	3.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1277	5.00	4.60	4.34	4.38	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	875/1269	4.00	4.47	4.31	4.39	4.00
4. Were special techniques successful	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	847/ 854	2.00	4.16	4.02	4.00	2.00

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: FREN 302 0101
 Title ADVANCED FRENCH II
 Instructor: MCCRAY, STANLEY
 Enrollment: 23
 Questionnaires: 9

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 802
 JUN 26, 2007
 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	Mean	

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	1	1	1	6	4.33	814/1522	4.33	4.36	4.30	4.34	4.33	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	1	7	4.67	358/1522	4.67	4.33	4.26	4.25	4.67	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	165/1285	4.89	4.45	4.30	4.30	4.89	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	140/1476	4.88	4.33	4.22	4.26	4.88	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	1	0	1	6	4.50	339/1412	4.50	4.26	4.06	4.03	4.50	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	2	5	4.50	331/1381	4.50	4.19	4.08	4.13	4.50	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	1	0	0	1	2	4	4.43	600/1500	4.43	4.14	4.18	4.13	4.43	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	8	1	4.11	1349/1517	4.11	4.56	4.65	4.62	4.11	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	223/1497	4.71	4.21	4.11	4.13	4.71	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	1	0	2	6	4.44	877/1440	4.44	4.45	4.45	4.46	4.44	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	821/1448	4.78	4.79	4.71	4.71	4.78	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	2	6	4.56	539/1436	4.56	4.39	4.29	4.30	4.56	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	2	6	4.56	579/1432	4.56	4.47	4.29	4.29	4.56	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	1	0	1	0	0	7	4.63	200/1221	4.63	3.91	3.93	3.94	4.63	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1280	5.00	4.28	4.10	4.14	5.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1277	5.00	4.60	4.34	4.38	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1269	5.00	4.47	4.31	4.39	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	3	1	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/ 854	5.00	4.16	4.02	4.00	5.00	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	A 6	Required for Majors	0
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	B 0		Graduate
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	C 0	General	0
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	9
			P 0		
			I 0		
			? 0		
					0

- Means there are not enough responses to be significant

Course-Section: FREN 330 0101
 Title INTERCONNECTIONS:IDEAS
 Instructor: FATIH, ZAKARIA
 Enrollment: 18
 Questionnaires: 14

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 803
 JUN 26, 2007
 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	Mean	

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	2	4	8	4.43	707/1522	4.43	4.36	4.30	4.34	4.43	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	4	8	4.36	763/1522	4.36	4.33	4.26	4.25	4.36	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	0	6	7	4.36	690/1285	4.36	4.45	4.30	4.30	4.36	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	1	3	9	4.62	367/1476	4.62	4.33	4.22	4.26	4.62	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	5	8	4.50	339/1412	4.50	4.26	4.06	4.03	4.50	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	1	0	3	2	7	4.08	768/1381	4.08	4.19	4.08	4.13	4.08	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	4	6	3	3.79	1161/1500	3.79	4.14	4.18	4.13	3.79	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	11	3	4.21	1289/1517	4.21	4.56	4.65	4.62	4.21	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	1	8	4	4.23	674/1497	4.23	4.21	4.11	4.13	4.23	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	4	10	4.71	532/1440	4.71	4.45	4.45	4.46	4.71	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	13	4.93	395/1448	4.93	4.79	4.71	4.71	4.93	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	1	4	8	4.54	564/1436	4.54	4.39	4.29	4.30	4.54	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	2	10	4.57	558/1432	4.57	4.47	4.29	4.29	4.57	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	7	1	0	4	1	1	3.14	1043/1221	3.14	3.91	3.93	3.94	3.14	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	1	2	2	3	3.88	839/1280	3.88	4.28	4.10	4.14	3.88	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	0	2	1	5	4.38	714/1277	4.38	4.60	4.34	4.38	4.38	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	0	0	1	0	7	4.75	381/1269	4.75	4.47	4.31	4.39	4.75	
4. Were special techniques successful	6	6	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 854	****	4.16	4.02	4.00	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	2	0.00-0.99 0	A 7	Required for Majors	0
28-55	2	1.00-1.99 0	B 6		Graduate 1
56-83	0	2.00-2.99 3	C 1	General	2
84-150	5	3.00-3.49 3	D 0		13
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00 3	F 0	Electives	1
			P 0		
			I 0	Other	11
			? 0		

- Means there are not enough responses to be significant

Course-Section: FREN 340 0101
 Title INTERCONNECTIONS: SOCI
 Instructor: FIELD, THOMAS T
 Enrollment: 11
 Questionnaires: 10

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 804
 JUN 26, 2007
 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	Mean	

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1522	5.00	4.36	4.30	4.34	5.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	128/1522	4.90	4.33	4.26	4.25	4.90	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	0	9	4.80	228/1285	4.80	4.45	4.30	4.30	4.80	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1476	5.00	4.33	4.22	4.26	5.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	137/1412	4.80	4.26	4.06	4.03	4.80	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	0	9	4.80	118/1381	4.80	4.19	4.08	4.13	4.80	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	0	2	2	5	4.00	988/1500	4.00	4.14	4.18	4.13	4.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	6	4	4.40	1161/1517	4.40	4.56	4.65	4.62	4.40	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	1	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	125/1497	4.86	4.21	4.11	4.13	4.86	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1440	5.00	4.45	4.45	4.46	5.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1448	5.00	4.79	4.71	4.71	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	123/1436	4.90	4.39	4.29	4.30	4.90	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	161/1432	4.90	4.47	4.29	4.29	4.90	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1221	5.00	3.91	3.93	3.94	5.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1280	5.00	4.28	4.10	4.14	5.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1277	5.00	4.60	4.34	4.38	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	277/1269	4.86	4.47	4.31	4.39	4.86	
4. Were special techniques successful	4	2	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	330/ 854	4.25	4.16	4.02	4.00	4.25	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 8	Required for Majors	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	B 0		Graduate
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	C 1	General	2
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad 10
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	1
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	7
			? 0		

Course-Section: FREN 349 0101
 Title MOD FRENCH CIVILIZATIO
 Instructor: SCHNEIDER, JUDI
 Enrollment: 6
 Questionnaires: 4

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 805
 JUN 26, 2007
 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	Mean	

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1522	5.00	4.36	4.30	4.34	5.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	0	3	0	3.50	1365/1522	3.50	4.33	4.26	4.25	3.50	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	1	4.25	766/1285	4.25	4.45	4.30	4.30	4.25	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	473/1476	4.50	4.33	4.22	4.26	4.50	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	167/1412	4.75	4.26	4.06	4.03	4.75	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	0	3	0	3.50	1152/1381	3.50	4.19	4.08	4.13	3.50	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	0	1	2	0	3.00	1430/1500	3.00	4.14	4.18	4.13	3.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	1	3	0	3.75	1471/1517	3.75	4.56	4.65	4.62	3.75	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	1	0	1	2	4.00	898/1497	4.00	4.21	4.11	4.13	4.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	1	0	0	2	1	3.50	1359/1440	3.50	4.45	4.45	4.46	3.50	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1448	5.00	4.79	4.71	4.71	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	1	0	1	1	3.67	1241/1436	3.67	4.39	4.29	4.30	3.67	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	350/1432	4.75	4.47	4.29	4.29	4.75	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	1	1	2	0	3.25	1011/1221	3.25	3.91	3.93	3.94	3.25	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	286/1280	4.67	4.28	4.10	4.14	4.67	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1277	5.00	4.60	4.34	4.38	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	721/1269	4.33	4.47	4.31	4.39	4.33	
4. Were special techniques successful	1	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	287/ 854	4.33	4.16	4.02	4.00	4.33	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: FREN 450 0101
 Title SEMINAR IN FRENCH
 Instructor: PROVENCHER, DEN
 Enrollment: 8
 Questionnaires: 5

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 806
 JUN 26, 2007
 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	Mean	

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	2	0	0	1	2	3.20	1472/1522	3.20	4.36	4.30	4.42	3.20	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	432/1522	4.60	4.33	4.26	4.34	4.60	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	366/1285	4.67	4.45	4.30	4.42	4.67	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	378/1476	4.60	4.33	4.22	4.31	4.60	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	0	1	3	4.20	621/1412	4.20	4.26	4.06	4.11	4.20	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	118/1381	4.80	4.19	4.08	4.21	4.80	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	160/1500	4.80	4.14	4.18	4.25	4.80	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	994/1517	4.60	4.56	4.65	4.71	4.60	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	898/1497	4.00	4.21	4.11	4.21	4.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	353/1440	4.80	4.45	4.45	4.52	4.80	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1448	5.00	4.79	4.71	4.75	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	217/1436	4.80	4.39	4.29	4.32	4.80	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	0	0	4	4.40	758/1432	4.40	4.47	4.29	4.34	4.40	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	213/1221	4.60	3.91	3.93	4.04	4.60	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	0	0	4	4.40	477/1280	4.40	4.28	4.10	4.28	4.40	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1277	5.00	4.60	4.34	4.50	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	1	0	0	4	4.40	671/1269	4.40	4.47	4.31	4.49	4.40	
4. Were special techniques successful	0	0	0	0	2	0	3	4.20	363/ 854	4.20	4.16	4.02	4.31	4.20	

Frequency Distribution

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