

Course-Section: WOL 101C 0101
 Title WOLOF I CONVERSATION
 Instructor: MBAYE, ABDOULAY
 Enrollment: 6
 Questionnaires: 6

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 1643
 FEB 13, 2008
 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	1	5	4.83	231/1639	4.83	4.22	4.27	4.08	4.83	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	3	4.50	517/1639	4.50	4.15	4.22	4.17	4.50	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	209/1397	4.83	4.37	4.28	4.18	4.83	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	2	3	4.33	697/1583	4.33	4.18	4.19	4.01	4.33	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	276/1532	4.60	4.10	4.01	3.88	4.60	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	1	1	0	0	1	2	3.75	1051/1504	3.75	4.04	4.05	3.78	3.75	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	3	1	2	3.83	1229/1612	3.83	4.02	4.16	4.10	3.83	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	1	5	0	3.83	1579/1635	3.83	4.38	4.65	4.56	3.83	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	657/1579	4.25	4.00	4.08	3.95	4.25	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	807/1518	4.50	4.23	4.43	4.38	4.50	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1520	5.00	4.67	4.70	4.61	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	214/1517	4.83	4.15	4.27	4.20	4.83	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	253/1550	4.83	4.27	4.22	4.17	4.83	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	1	1	2	2	3.83	783/1295	3.83	3.77	3.94	3.84	3.83	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1398	5.00	4.18	4.07	3.85	5.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1391	5.00	4.51	4.30	4.07	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	1	0	1	2	2	3.67	1130/1388	3.67	4.35	4.28	4.01	3.67	
4. Were special techniques successful	0	4	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	725/ 958	3.50	4.02	3.93	3.71	3.50	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	4	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	129/ 224	4.00	4.00	4.10	3.90	4.00	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	4	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	80/ 240	4.50	4.75	4.11	4.01	4.50	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	4	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 219	****	****	4.44	4.44	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 215	****	****	4.35	4.43	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 198	****	****	4.18	4.25	****	
Seminar															
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 82	****	3.00	4.16	3.90	****	

Frequency Distribution

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