

Course-Section: FREN 101 0101
 Title ELEMENTARY FRENCH I
 Instructor: DIALLO, MAMADOU
 Enrollment: 28
 Questionnaires: 15

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2004

Page 796
 JAN 19, 2005
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	6	0	2	4	3	2.87	1522/1556	3.59	4.23	4.25	4.06	2.87
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	5	6	1	1	2	2.27	1549/1557	3.14	4.23	4.21	4.13	2.27
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	3	5	3	1	3	2.73	1305/1335	3.69	4.32	4.24	4.13	2.73
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	9	1	2	0	0	2	3.00	1465/1510	3.31	4.18	4.19	4.07	3.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	5	2	2	0	2	4	3.40	1222/1479	3.81	4.08	3.97	3.90	3.40
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	5	1	2	3	1	3	3.30	1290/1424	3.61	4.08	4.08	3.91	3.30
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	2	4	0	5	4	3.33	1389/1537	3.53	4.18	4.15	4.12	3.33
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	2	11	2	4.00	1453/1553	4.63	4.69	4.69	4.66	4.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	2	4	5	2	0	2.54	1505/1536	3.15	4.05	4.07	3.91	2.54
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	4	2	5	2	1	2.57	1477/1487	3.30	4.41	4.44	4.37	2.57
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	1	1	2	6	4	3.79	1441/1491	4.31	4.71	4.70	4.61	3.79
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	1	4	4	2	2	3.00	1423/1489	3.44	4.28	4.27	4.18	3.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	2	2	5	1	3	3.08	1399/1481	3.66	4.30	4.28	4.18	3.08
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	3	5	2	0	3	1	2.36	1206/1246	2.86	3.87	3.93	3.78	2.36
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	3	1	6	3	1	2.86	1315/1411	3.28	4.13	4.00	3.78	2.86
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	2	1	5	3	3	3.29	1261/1413	3.70	4.38	4.23	3.96	3.29
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	4	1	4	2	3	2.93	1347/1408	3.47	4.37	4.27	4.03	2.93
4. Were special techniques successful	1	8	1	2	1	0	2	3.00	768/ 856	3.17	3.96	4.00	3.87	3.00
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	12	1	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 244	****	3.90	4.07	3.82	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	12	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	****/ 258	****	4.22	4.10	3.94	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	12	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	****/ 236	****	4.50	4.36	4.31	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	12	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	****/ 238	****	4.16	4.26	4.00	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	12	0	0	2	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 214	****	4.27	4.08	4.02	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	13	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 102	****	4.57	4.50	3.92	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	12	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 101	****	4.45	4.39	4.03	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	12	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 90	****	4.29	4.36	3.72	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	12	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 98	****	4.39	4.49	3.93	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	12	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 101	****	4.06	4.03	3.92	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 61	****	3.83	3.92	3.19	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	13	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 60	****	4.27	3.86	3.35	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 52	****	4.54	4.31	4.65	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 47	****	4.25	4.09	3.67	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 44	****	4.00	4.09	3.39	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 39	****	4.23	3.84	4.09	****

2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/	30	****	4.35	4.01	4.21	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/	32	****	4.15	4.18	4.51	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/	16	****	4.50	4.36	4.63	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/	16	****	4.45	4.51	4.57	****

Course-Section: FREN 101 0101
 Title ELEMENTARY FRENCH I
 Instructor: DIALLO, MAMADOU
 Enrollment: 28
 Questionnaires: 15

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2004

Page 796
 JAN 19, 2005
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	0	A	8	Required for Majors	9	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B	2						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	0	C	2	General	2	Under-grad	15	Non-major	3
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	5	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	0	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	3				
				?	3						

Course-Section: FREN 101 0201
 Title ELEMENTARY FRENCH I
 Instructor: DIALLO, MAMADOU
 Enrollment: 25
 Questionnaires: 14

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2004

Page 797
 JAN 19, 2005
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	1	2	1	6	4	3.71	1323/1556	3.59	4.23	4.25	4.06	3.71
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	2	2	2	5	3	3.36	1431/1557	3.14	4.23	4.21	4.13	3.36
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	1	0	1	11	4.43	598/1335	3.69	4.32	4.24	4.13	4.43
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	1	2	1	5	4	3.69	1254/1510	3.31	4.18	4.19	4.07	3.69
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	1	0	4	1	7	4.00	735/1479	3.81	4.08	3.97	3.90	4.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	2	1	1	4	1	5	3.67	1113/1424	3.61	4.08	4.08	3.91	3.67
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	2	2	1	2	7	3.71	1223/1537	3.53	4.18	4.15	4.12	3.71
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	13	4.93	544/1553	4.63	4.69	4.69	4.66	4.93
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	0	1	1	1	4	1	3.38	1345/1536	3.15	4.05	4.07	3.91	3.38
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	5	0	1	1	3	2	2	3.33	1413/1487	3.30	4.41	4.44	4.37	3.33
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	5	0	1	0	0	1	7	4.44	1233/1491	4.31	4.71	4.70	4.61	4.44
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	5	0	1	1	2	3	2	3.44	1335/1489	3.44	4.28	4.27	4.18	3.44
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	5	0	1	0	2	2	4	3.89	1169/1481	3.66	4.30	4.28	4.18	3.89
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	6	0	2	2	1	3	0	2.63	1184/1246	2.86	3.87	3.93	3.78	2.63
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	1	1	1	4	4	3.82	900/1411	3.28	4.13	4.00	3.78	3.82
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	1	0	3	3	4	3.82	1070/1413	3.70	4.38	4.23	3.96	3.82
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	1	0	1	3	6	4.18	876/1408	3.47	4.37	4.27	4.03	4.18
4. Were special techniques successful	3	0	3	2	3	2	1	2.64	826/ 856	3.17	3.96	4.00	3.87	2.64

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	2	A	7	Required for Majors	8	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	5						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	1	C	0	General	1	Under-grad	14	Non-major	11
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	2				
				?	0						

Course-Section: FREN 101 0301
 Title ELEMENTARY FRENCH I
 Instructor: MBAIRESSEM, LAO
 Enrollment: 31
 Questionnaires: 13

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2004

Page 798
 JAN 19, 2005
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies		Instructor		Course		Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect				
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	1	0	2	3	7	4.15	995/1556	3.59	4.23	4.25	4.06	4.15
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	3	0	5	5	3.92	1171/1557	3.14	4.23	4.21	4.13	3.92
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	5	5	4.08	930/1335	3.69	4.32	4.24	4.13	4.08
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	3	1	1	2	2	4	3.70	1249/1510	3.31	4.18	4.19	4.07	3.70
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	1	0	2	3	5	4.00	735/1479	3.81	4.08	3.97	3.90	4.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	3	1	0	2	3	4	3.90	916/1424	3.61	4.08	4.08	3.91	3.90
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	2	0	6	5	4.08	953/1537	3.53	4.18	4.15	4.12	4.08
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	12	4.92	544/1553	4.63	4.69	4.69	4.66	4.92
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	1	2	4	2	3.78	1118/1536	3.15	4.05	4.07	3.91	3.78
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	1	2	4	5	4.08	1208/1487	3.30	4.41	4.44	4.37	4.08
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	2	10	4.83	688/1491	4.31	4.71	4.70	4.61	4.83
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	1	2	5	4	4.00	1090/1489	3.44	4.28	4.27	4.18	4.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	3	5	4	4.08	1031/1481	3.66	4.30	4.28	4.18	4.08
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	1	1	2	2	3	3	3.45	968/1246	2.86	3.87	3.93	3.78	3.45
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	1	1	2	1	3	3.50	1065/1411	3.28	4.13	4.00	3.78	3.50
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	1	2	1	4	4.00	947/1413	3.70	4.38	4.23	3.96	4.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	2	1	2	3	3.75	1130/1408	3.47	4.37	4.27	4.03	3.75
4. Were special techniques successful	5	1	1	0	1	2	3	3.86	517/ 856	3.17	3.96	4.00	3.87	3.86
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	12	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 244	****	3.90	4.07	3.82	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	12	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 258	****	4.22	4.10	3.94	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	12	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 236	****	4.50	4.36	4.31	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	12	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 238	****	4.16	4.26	4.00	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	12	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 214	****	4.27	4.08	4.02	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	1	A	5	Required for Majors	7	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B	5						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	1	C	2	General	1	Under-grad	13	Non-major	2
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F	0	Electives	1	#### - 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: MBAIRESSEM, LAO
 Enrollment: 27
 Questionnaires: 20

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2004

Page 799
 JAN 19, 2005
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	1	1	5	9	3	3.63	1356/1556	3.59	4.23	4.25	4.06	3.63
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	3	3	7	3	3	3.00	1497/1557	3.14	4.23	4.21	4.13	3.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	3	1	2	9	4	3.53	1161/1335	3.69	4.32	4.24	4.13	3.53
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	5	2	3	4	5	0	2.86	1485/1510	3.31	4.18	4.19	4.07	2.86
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	7	0	1	5	1	5	3.83	920/1479	3.81	4.08	3.97	3.90	3.83
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	5	1	0	5	6	2	3.57	1169/1424	3.61	4.08	4.08	3.91	3.57
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	4	2	6	4	3	3.00	1444/1537	3.53	4.18	4.15	4.12	3.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	1	4	14	4.68	982/1553	4.63	4.69	4.69	4.66	4.68
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	9	0	1	3	4	2	1	2.91	1471/1536	3.15	4.05	4.07	3.91	2.91
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	1	3	7	5	2	3.22	1430/1487	3.30	4.41	4.44	4.37	3.22
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	2	4	1	11	4.17	1369/1491	4.31	4.71	4.70	4.61	4.17
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	2	1	6	7	2	3.33	1365/1489	3.44	4.28	4.27	4.18	3.33
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	1	2	1	4	5	5	3.59	1285/1481	3.66	4.30	4.28	4.18	3.59
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	3	2	2	7	2	2	3.00	1114/1246	2.86	3.87	3.93	3.78	3.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	3	1	7	4	1	2.94	1292/1411	3.28	4.13	4.00	3.78	2.94
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	1	5	8	2	3.69	1121/1413	3.70	4.38	4.23	3.96	3.69
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	4	3	3	1	5	3.00	1320/1408	3.47	4.37	4.27	4.03	3.00
4. Were special techniques successful	4	4	2	0	5	4	1	3.17	747/ 856	3.17	3.96	4.00	3.87	3.17
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	18	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 244	****	3.90	4.07	3.82	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	17	0	1	0	1	0	1	3.00	****/ 258	****	4.22	4.10	3.94	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	18	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 236	****	4.50	4.36	4.31	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	18	0	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/ 238	****	4.16	4.26	4.00	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	17	0	1	0	1	1	0	2.67	****/ 214	****	4.27	4.08	4.02	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	17	1	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/ 102	****	4.57	4.50	3.92	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	18	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 101	****	4.45	4.39	4.03	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	****/ 90	****	4.29	4.36	3.72	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/ 98	****	4.39	4.49	3.93	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	18	0	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	****/ 101	****	4.06	4.03	3.92	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 61	****	3.83	3.92	3.19	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	18	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 60	****	4.27	3.86	3.35	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	18	0	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	****/ 52	****	4.54	4.31	4.65	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	18	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 47	****	4.25	4.09	3.67	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	18	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 44	****	4.00	4.09	3.39	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	****/ 39	****	4.23	3.84	4.09	****

2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	17	0	0	0	1	2	0	3.67	****/	30	****	4.35	4.01	4.21	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	17	0	0	1	1	1	0	3.00	****/	32	****	4.15	4.18	4.51	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	17	1	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	****/	16	****	4.50	4.36	4.63	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	17	1	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	****/	16	****	4.45	4.51	4.57	****

Course-Section: FREN 101 0401
 Title ELEMENTARY FRENCH I
 Instructor: MBAIRESSEM, LAO
 Enrollment: 27
 Questionnaires: 20

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2004

Page 799
 JAN 19, 2005
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	A	5	Required for Majors	9	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	6						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	3	C	2	General	2	Under-grad	20	Non-major	5
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	4	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	4				
				?	1						

Course-Section: FREN 102 0101
 Title ELEMENTARY FRENCH II
 Instructor: ZAIRI, MOHAMMED
 Enrollment: 28
 Questionnaires: 20

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2004

Page 800
 JAN 19, 2005
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Mean	Instructor Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5							
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	0	0	1	10	8	4.37	759/1556	3.64	4.23	4.25	4.06	4.37
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	3	5	11	4.42	632/1557	3.75	4.23	4.21	4.13	4.42
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	6	12	4.58	403/1335	3.99	4.32	4.24	4.13	4.58
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	6	0	0	0	7	6	4.46	484/1510	3.75	4.18	4.19	4.07	4.46
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	3	8	8	4.26	516/1479	3.81	4.08	3.97	3.90	4.26
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	1	0	1	2	7	8	4.22	629/1424	3.84	4.08	4.08	3.91	4.22
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	4	8	7	4.16	884/1537	3.78	4.18	4.15	4.12	4.16
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	19	5.00	1/1553	4.44	4.69	4.69	4.66	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	7	0	0	1	2	7	3	3.92	992/1536	3.25	4.05	4.07	3.91	3.92
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	1	4	12	4.65	630/1487	3.85	4.41	4.44	4.37	4.65
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	7	11	4.61	1066/1491	4.09	4.71	4.70	4.61	4.61
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	2	9	7	4.28	875/1489	3.69	4.28	4.27	4.18	4.28
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	0	1	6	10	4.33	841/1481	3.69	4.30	4.28	4.18	4.33
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	4	0	1	7	3	3	3.57	905/1246	3.30	3.87	3.93	3.78	3.57
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	1	1	2	6	6	3.94	809/1411	3.62	4.13	4.00	3.78	3.94
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	0	3	3	10	4.44	647/1413	3.84	4.38	4.23	3.96	4.44
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	2	4	5	5	3.81	1107/1408	3.59	4.37	4.27	4.03	3.81
4. Were special techniques successful	4	9	2	0	1	2	2	3.29	722/ 856	3.52	3.96	4.00	3.87	3.29
Laboratory														
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	19	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 258	****	4.22	4.10	3.94	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	19	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 61	****	3.83	3.92	3.19	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	19	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 60	****	4.27	3.86	3.35	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	19	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 39	****	4.23	3.84	4.09	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	5	0.00-0.99	1	A	9	Required for Majors	11	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	B	4						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	1	C	3	General	1	Under-grad	20	Non-major	7
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5	F	0	Electives	2	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	1						
				I	0	Other	3				
				?	0						

Course-Section: FREN 102 0201
 Title ELEMENTARY FRENCH II
 Instructor: ZAIRI, MOHAMMED
 Enrollment: 23
 Questionnaires: 18

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2004

Page 801
 JAN 19, 2005
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	1	1	3	4	9	4.06	1083/1556	3.64	4.23	4.25	4.06	4.06
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	2	0	3	5	8	3.94	1144/1557	3.75	4.23	4.21	4.13	3.94
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	0	1	6	10	4.33	707/1335	3.99	4.32	4.24	4.13	4.33
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	5	2	0	3	4	4	3.62	1294/1510	3.75	4.18	4.19	4.07	3.62
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	3	0	1	4	5	5	3.93	823/1479	3.81	4.08	3.97	3.90	3.93
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	3	1	0	4	7	3	3.73	1056/1424	3.84	4.08	4.08	3.91	3.73
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	0	5	5	6	3.88	1123/1537	3.78	4.18	4.15	4.12	3.88
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	4	14	4.78	879/1553	4.44	4.69	4.69	4.66	4.78
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	1	2	1	3	6	2	3.36	1355/1536	3.25	4.05	4.07	3.91	3.36
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	2	1	0	7	8	4.00	1231/1487	3.85	4.41	4.44	4.37	4.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	1	2	0	5	10	4.17	1369/1491	4.09	4.71	4.70	4.61	4.17
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	3	0	2	5	8	3.83	1209/1489	3.69	4.28	4.27	4.18	3.83
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	0	2	6	8	4.00	1070/1481	3.69	4.30	4.28	4.18	4.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	2	2	1	4	2	6	3.60	891/1246	3.30	3.87	3.93	3.78	3.60
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	1	1	2	3	5	3.83	886/1411	3.62	4.13	4.00	3.78	3.83
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	1	1	1	4	5	3.92	1017/1413	3.84	4.38	4.23	3.96	3.92
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	0	1	2	4	5	4.08	950/1408	3.59	4.37	4.27	4.03	4.08
4. Were special techniques successful	6	8	1	0	1	0	2	3.50	****/ 856	3.52	3.96	4.00	3.87	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	A	7	Required for Majors	12	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B	8						
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	2	C	2	General	2	Under-grad	18	Non-major	3
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	4				
				?	0						

Course-Section: FREN 102 0301
 Title ELEMENTARY FRENCH II
 Instructor: MBAYE, ABDOULAY
 Enrollment: 26
 Questionnaires: 12

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2004

Page 802
 JAN 19, 2005
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor Mean	Instructor Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5							
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	0	0	2	3	6	4.36	759/1556	3.64	4.23	4.25	4.06	4.36
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	3	8	4.73	242/1557	3.75	4.23	4.21	4.13	4.73
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	2	9	4.82	172/1335	3.99	4.32	4.24	4.13	4.82
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	1	1	0	0	1	8	4.50	423/1510	3.75	4.18	4.19	4.07	4.50
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	2	0	0	1	2	6	4.56	269/1479	3.81	4.08	3.97	3.90	4.56
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	3	0	0	0	3	5	4.63	234/1424	3.84	4.08	4.08	3.91	4.63
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	1	4	6	4.45	546/1537	3.78	4.18	4.15	4.12	4.45
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	8	3	4.27	1296/1553	4.44	4.69	4.69	4.66	4.27
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	0	5	4	4.44	435/1536	3.25	4.05	4.07	3.91	4.44
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	211/1487	3.85	4.41	4.44	4.37	4.89
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1491	4.09	4.71	4.70	4.61	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1489	3.69	4.28	4.27	4.18	5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	1	0	8	4.78	291/1481	3.69	4.30	4.28	4.18	4.78
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	2	0	0	2	2	3	4.14	534/1246	3.30	3.87	3.93	3.78	4.14
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	229/1411	3.62	4.13	4.00	3.78	4.71
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1413	3.84	4.38	4.23	3.96	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	267/1408	3.59	4.37	4.27	4.03	4.86
4. Were special techniques successful	5	3	0	0	1	3	0	3.75	567/ 856	3.52	3.96	4.00	3.87	3.75

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	A	2	Required for Majors	8	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	3						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	3	C	2	General	0	Under-grad	12	Non-major	5
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	2	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	1				
				?	0						

Course-Section: FREN 102 0401
 Title ELEMENTARY FRENCH II
 Instructor: DIALLO, MAMADOU
 Enrollment: 17
 Questionnaires: 13

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2004

Page 803
 JAN 19, 2005
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies		Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	5	6	2	0	0	1.77	1554/1556	3.64	4.23	4.25	4.06	1.77
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	4	6	3	0	0	1.92	1554/1557	3.75	4.23	4.21	4.13	1.92
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	5	2	4	2	0	2.23	1331/1335	3.99	4.32	4.24	4.13	2.23
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	3	4	2	3	0	2.42	1503/1510	3.75	4.18	4.19	4.07	2.42
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	3	3	1	4	2	0	2.50	1436/1479	3.81	4.08	3.97	3.90	2.50
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	4	1	2	6	0	2.77	1392/1424	3.84	4.08	4.08	3.91	2.77
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	4	2	3	3	1	2.62	1506/1537	3.78	4.18	4.15	4.12	2.62
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	5	7	1	3.69	1528/1553	4.44	4.69	4.69	4.66	3.69
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	1	5	2	0	0	0	1.29	1532/1536	3.25	4.05	4.07	3.91	1.29
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	5	5	3	0	0	1.85	1485/1487	3.85	4.41	4.44	4.37	1.85
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	4	3	1	2	2	2.58	1489/1491	4.09	4.71	4.70	4.61	2.58
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	6	4	2	0	0	1.67	1486/1489	3.69	4.28	4.27	4.18	1.67
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	2	5	5	1	0	0	1.64	1477/1481	3.69	4.30	4.28	4.18	1.64
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	2	3	3	2	0	0	1.88	1231/1246	3.30	3.87	3.93	3.78	1.88
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	4	2	4	0	0	2.00	1389/1411	3.62	4.13	4.00	3.78	2.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	3	4	3	0	0	2.00	1405/1413	3.84	4.38	4.23	3.96	2.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	6	2	2	0	0	1.60	1406/1408	3.59	4.37	4.27	4.03	1.60
4. Were special techniques successful	4	6	3	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 856	3.52	3.96	4.00	3.87	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	12	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 244	****	3.90	4.07	3.82	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	12	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 258	****	4.22	4.10	3.94	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	12	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 236	****	4.50	4.36	4.31	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	12	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 238	****	4.16	4.26	4.00	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	12	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 214	****	4.27	4.08	4.02	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	12	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 39	****	4.23	3.84	4.09	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	12	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 30	****	4.35	4.01	4.21	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	12	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 32	****	4.15	4.18	4.51	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	12	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 16	****	4.50	4.36	4.63	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	12	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 16	****	4.45	4.51	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	6	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B	3						
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	2	C	5	General	0	Under-grad	13	Non-major	4
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			

P 0
I 0
? 0

Other

4

responses to be significant

Course-Section: FREN 103 0101
 Title INT REV ELEM FRENCH
 Instructor: EL OMARI, SAMIR
 Enrollment: 26
 Questionnaires: 2

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2004

Page 804
 JAN 19, 2005
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies						Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect	
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	1121/1556	4.00	4.23	4.25	4.06	4.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	1378/1557	3.50	4.23	4.21	4.13	3.50
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	484/1335	4.50	4.32	4.24	4.13	4.50
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	423/1510	4.50	4.18	4.19	4.07	4.50
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	735/1479	4.00	4.08	3.97	3.90	4.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	1199/1424	3.50	4.08	4.08	3.91	3.50
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	993/1537	4.00	4.18	4.15	4.12	4.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1553	5.00	4.69	4.69	4.66	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	359/1536	4.50	4.05	4.07	3.91	4.50
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	816/1487	4.50	4.41	4.44	4.37	4.50
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1491	5.00	4.71	4.70	4.61	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	598/1489	4.50	4.28	4.27	4.18	4.50
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	1070/1481	4.00	4.30	4.28	4.18	4.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	1.50	1237/1246	1.50	3.87	3.93	3.78	1.50
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	739/1411	4.00	4.13	4.00	3.78	4.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	947/1413	4.00	4.38	4.23	3.96	4.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	584/1408	4.50	4.37	4.27	4.03	4.50
4. Were special techniques successful	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	768/ 856	3.00	3.96	4.00	3.87	3.00

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: FREN 201 0101
 Title INTERMEDIATE FRENCH I
 Instructor: TADE, SOPHIA
 Enrollment: 25
 Questionnaires: 13

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2004

Page 805
 JAN 19, 2005
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	1	0	3	5	4	3.85	1246/1556	4.15	4.23	4.25	4.33	3.85
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	1	2	4	5	3.85	1240/1557	4.32	4.23	4.21	4.30	3.85
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	5	5	4.15	875/1335	4.62	4.32	4.24	4.37	4.15
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	1	7	3	4.18	823/1510	4.20	4.18	4.19	4.23	4.18
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	2	3	3	5	3.85	911/1479	4.23	4.08	3.97	3.88	3.85
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	3	5	1	3	3.33	1277/1424	3.91	4.08	4.08	4.04	3.33
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	3	1	3	6	3.92	1087/1537	4.27	4.18	4.15	4.17	3.92
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	7	6	4.46	1146/1553	4.85	4.69	4.69	4.69	4.46
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	1	1	1	2	2	1	3.14	1423/1536	3.97	4.05	4.07	4.13	3.14
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	2	0	2	5	4	3.69	1353/1487	4.38	4.41	4.44	4.47	3.69
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	1	3	4	5	4.00	1399/1491	4.73	4.71	4.70	4.75	4.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	1	0	6	2	4	3.62	1293/1489	4.31	4.28	4.27	4.32	3.62
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	1	4	4	3	3.54	1296/1481	4.23	4.30	4.28	4.37	3.54
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	4	1	3	2	3	2.92	1142/1246	3.58	3.87	3.93	4.02	2.92
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	4	3	1	3.63	1013/1411	3.92	4.13	4.00	4.05	3.63
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	1	0	1	1	6	4.22	823/1413	4.33	4.38	4.23	4.28	4.22
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	1	0	2	3	3	3.78	1122/1408	4.29	4.37	4.27	4.31	3.78
4. Were special techniques successful	5	1	0	1	2	3	1	3.57	638/ 856	3.86	3.96	4.00	3.92	3.57
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	12	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 244	****	3.90	4.07	4.30	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	12	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 258	****	4.22	4.10	4.32	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	12	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 236	****	4.50	4.36	4.53	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	12	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 238	****	4.16	4.26	4.59	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	12	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 214	****	4.27	4.08	4.45	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	12	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 102	****	4.57	4.50	3.88	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	12	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 101	****	4.45	4.39	3.00	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 90	****	4.29	4.36	3.60	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 98	****	4.39	4.49	4.29	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	12	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 101	****	4.06	4.03	4.14	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 61	****	3.83	3.92	3.31	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	12	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 60	****	4.27	3.86	3.96	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	12	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 52	****	4.54	4.31	3.97	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	12	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 47	****	4.25	4.09	3.69	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	12	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 44	****	4.00	4.09	3.93	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 39	****	4.23	3.84	3.19	****

2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	12	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/	30	****	4.35	4.01	4.07	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	12	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/	32	****	4.15	4.18	3.92	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	12	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/	16	****	4.50	4.36	4.15	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	12	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/	16	****	4.45	4.51	4.65	****

Course-Section: FREN 201 0101
 Title INTERMEDIATE FRENCH I
 Instructor: TADE, SOPHIA
 Enrollment: 25
 Questionnaires: 13

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2004

Page 805
 JAN 19, 2005
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	3	Required for Majors	9	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	4						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	0	C	2	General	0	Under-grad	13	Non-major	6
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	1	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	1				
				?	0						

Course-Section: FREN 201 0201
 Title INTERMEDIATE FRENCH I
 Instructor: ROSENTHAL, ALAN
 Enrollment: 28
 Questionnaires: 18

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2004

Page 806
 JAN 19, 2005
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	8	10	4.56	476/1556	4.15	4.23	4.25	4.33	4.56
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	4	14	4.78	197/1557	4.32	4.23	4.21	4.30	4.78
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	1	16	4.94	77/1335	4.62	4.32	4.24	4.37	4.94
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	5	0	1	2	3	6	4.17	847/1510	4.20	4.18	4.19	4.23	4.17
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	3	0	0	1	3	11	4.67	204/1479	4.23	4.08	3.97	3.88	4.67
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	1	3	13	4.71	172/1424	3.91	4.08	4.08	4.04	4.71
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	4	13	4.67	285/1537	4.27	4.18	4.15	4.17	4.67
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	18	5.00	1/1553	4.85	4.69	4.69	4.69	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	0	6	10	4.63	252/1536	3.97	4.05	4.07	4.13	4.63
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	0	2	13	4.87	241/1487	4.38	4.41	4.44	4.47	4.87
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	0	0	15	5.00	1/1491	4.73	4.71	4.70	4.75	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	0	2	13	4.87	180/1489	4.31	4.28	4.27	4.32	4.87
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	2	13	4.87	198/1481	4.23	4.30	4.28	4.37	4.87
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	0	0	0	5	6	4	3.93	677/1246	3.58	3.87	3.93	4.02	3.93
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	2	10	4.83	164/1411	3.92	4.13	4.00	4.05	4.83
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	0	0	2	10	4.83	262/1413	4.33	4.38	4.23	4.28	4.83
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	0	0	1	2	9	4.67	451/1408	4.29	4.37	4.27	4.31	4.67
4. Were special techniques successful	6	0	0	0	1	3	8	4.58	191/ 856	3.86	3.96	4.00	3.92	4.58

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	6	Required for Majors	15	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	B	8						
56-83	8	2.00-2.99	3	C	4	General	0	Under-grad	18	Non-major	1
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	6	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	5				
				?	0						

Course-Section: FREN 201 0301
 Title INTERMEDIATE FRENCH I
 Instructor: DE VERNEIL, MAR
 Enrollment: 25
 Questionnaires: 18

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2004

Page 807
 JAN 19, 2005
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies		Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	3	2	13	4.56	476/1556	4.15	4.23	4.25	4.33	4.56
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	2	15	4.88	131/1557	4.32	4.23	4.21	4.30	4.88
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	16	4.89	138/1335	4.62	4.32	4.24	4.37	4.89
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	1	4	11	4.63	322/1510	4.20	4.18	4.19	4.23	4.63
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	4	1	0	2	4	7	4.14	631/1479	4.23	4.08	3.97	3.88	4.14
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	2	6	9	4.41	444/1424	3.91	4.08	4.08	4.04	4.41
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	3	14	4.72	215/1537	4.27	4.18	4.15	4.17	4.72
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	18	5.00	1/1553	4.85	4.69	4.69	4.69	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	1	3	10	4.64	234/1536	3.97	4.05	4.07	4.13	4.64
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	1	0	0	3	13	4.59	723/1487	4.38	4.41	4.44	4.47	4.59
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	17	5.00	1/1491	4.73	4.71	4.70	4.75	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	4	13	4.76	270/1489	4.31	4.28	4.27	4.32	4.76
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	4	13	4.76	303/1481	4.23	4.30	4.28	4.37	4.76
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	0	0	0	4	4	6	4.14	534/1246	3.58	3.87	3.93	4.02	4.14
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	3	1	4	4.13	684/1411	3.92	4.13	4.00	4.05	4.13
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	10	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	225/1413	4.33	4.38	4.23	4.28	4.88
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	11	0	0	0	1	0	6	4.71	405/1408	4.29	4.37	4.27	4.31	4.71
4. Were special techniques successful	11	0	0	0	1	1	5	4.57	194/ 856	3.86	3.96	4.00	3.92	4.57

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	8	Required for Majors	15	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	B	6						
56-83	7	2.00-2.99	3	C	3	General	0	Under-grad	18	Non-major	7
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	5	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	4				
				?	0						

Course-Section: FREN 201 0401
 Title INTERMEDIATE FRENCH I
 Instructor: TADE, SOPHIA
 Enrollment: 22
 Questionnaires: 12

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2004

Page 808
 JAN 19, 2005
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	3	3	6	4.25	895/1556	4.15	4.23	4.25	4.33	4.25
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	2	1	2	7	4.17	940/1557	4.32	4.23	4.21	4.30	4.17
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	2	9	4.67	309/1335	4.62	4.32	4.24	4.37	4.67
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	1	1	2	6	4.30	694/1510	4.20	4.18	4.19	4.23	4.30
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	3	1	8	4.42	382/1479	4.23	4.08	3.97	3.88	4.42
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	2	4	5	4.00	806/1424	3.91	4.08	4.08	4.04	4.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	2	1	0	4	5	3.75	1200/1537	4.27	4.18	4.15	4.17	3.75
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	1	2	9	4.67	1000/1553	4.85	4.69	4.69	4.69	4.67
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	7	0	0	1	1	3	0	3.40	1330/1536	3.97	4.05	4.07	4.13	3.40
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	1	0	1	3	7	4.25	1092/1487	4.38	4.41	4.44	4.47	4.25
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	2	9	4.67	997/1491	4.73	4.71	4.70	4.75	4.67
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	2	1	5	4	3.92	1174/1489	4.31	4.28	4.27	4.32	3.92
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	1	1	3	6	4.00	1070/1481	4.23	4.30	4.28	4.37	4.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	1	2	2	1	1	4	3.30	1038/1246	3.58	3.87	3.93	4.02	3.30
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	2	3	0	1	3.00	1269/1411	3.92	4.13	4.00	4.05	3.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	0	1	1	2	1	3.60	1155/1413	4.33	4.38	4.23	4.28	3.60
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	584/1408	4.29	4.37	4.27	4.31	4.50
4. Were special techniques successful	6	2	1	0	0	0	3	4.00	414/ 856	3.86	3.96	4.00	3.92	4.00

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	4	Required for Majors	8	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B	3						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	2	C	1	General	0	Under-grad	12	Non-major	3
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 0501
 Title INTERMEDIATE FRENCH I
 Instructor: EL OMARI, SAMIR
 Enrollment: 27
 Questionnaires: 24

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2004

Page 809
 JAN 19, 2005
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies		Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean					
	NR	NA	1	2						3	4	5	Mean	Rank

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	7	8	9	4.08	1060/1556	4.15	4.23	4.25	4.33	4.08
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	7	14	4.46	588/1557	4.32	4.23	4.21	4.30	4.46
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	3	19	4.71	270/1335	4.62	4.32	4.24	4.37	4.71
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	2	4	6	11	4.13	883/1510	4.20	4.18	4.19	4.23	4.13
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	1	1	4	7	9	4.00	735/1479	4.23	4.08	3.97	3.88	4.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	5	2	4	4	3	6	3.37	1264/1424	3.91	4.08	4.08	4.04	3.37
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	1	1	7	14	4.48	518/1537	4.27	4.18	4.15	4.17	4.48
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	23	4.96	340/1553	4.85	4.69	4.69	4.69	4.96
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	4	11	7	4.14	778/1536	3.97	4.05	4.07	4.13	4.14
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	11	13	4.54	769/1487	4.38	4.41	4.44	4.47	4.54
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	4	19	4.83	713/1491	4.73	4.71	4.70	4.75	4.83
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	1	1	10	11	4.35	801/1489	4.31	4.28	4.27	4.32	4.35
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	4	8	11	4.30	871/1481	4.23	4.30	4.28	4.37	4.30
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	1	2	6	8	6	3.70	842/1246	3.58	3.87	3.93	4.02	3.70
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	3	3	4	8	3.94	799/1411	3.92	4.13	4.00	4.05	3.94
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	0	3	2	13	4.56	541/1413	4.33	4.38	4.23	4.28	4.56
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	1	1	1	3	12	4.33	763/1408	4.29	4.37	4.27	4.31	4.33
4. Were special techniques successful	6	4	1	3	3	3	4	3.43	679/ 856	3.86	3.96	4.00	3.92	3.43
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	20	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	****/ 244	****	3.90	4.07	4.30	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	20	0	1	0	0	2	1	3.50	****/ 258	****	4.22	4.10	4.32	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	20	1	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 236	****	4.50	4.36	4.53	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	20	1	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 238	****	4.16	4.26	4.59	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	20	1	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 214	****	4.27	4.08	4.45	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	20	1	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 102	****	4.57	4.50	3.88	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	20	3	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 101	****	4.45	4.39	3.00	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	21	1	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 98	****	4.39	4.49	4.29	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	20	2	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 101	****	4.06	4.03	4.14	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	20	0	1	0	1	1	1	3.25	****/ 61	****	3.83	3.92	3.31	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	20	0	1	0	1	1	1	3.25	****/ 60	****	4.27	3.86	3.96	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	20	2	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 52	****	4.54	4.31	3.97	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	20	2	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 47	****	4.25	4.09	3.69	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	20	3	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 44	****	4.00	4.09	3.93	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	19	0	1	0	2	1	1	3.20	****/ 39	****	4.23	3.84	3.19	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	19	1	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	****/ 30	****	4.35	4.01	4.07	****

3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	19	2	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	****/	32	****	4.15	4.18	3.92	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	19	3	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/	16	****	4.50	4.36	4.15	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	19	3	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/	16	****	4.45	4.51	4.65	****

Course-Section: FREN 201 0501
 Title INTERMEDIATE FRENCH I
 Instructor: EL OMARI, SAMIR
 Enrollment: 27
 Questionnaires: 24

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2004

Page 809
 JAN 19, 2005
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	6	0.00-0.99	3	A	12	Required for Majors	17	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B	7						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	0	C	3	General	0	Under-grad	24	Non-major	8
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	7	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	3	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	2				
				?	0						

Course-Section: FREN 201 0601
 Title INTERMEDIATE FRENCH I
 Instructor: EL OMARI, SAMIR
 Enrollment: 19
 Questionnaires: 11

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2004

Page 810
 JAN 19, 2005
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	1	3	6	1	3.64	1356/1556	4.15	4.23	4.25	4.33	3.64
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	0	3	3	4	3.82	1261/1557	4.32	4.23	4.21	4.30	3.82
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	3	6	4.36	673/1335	4.62	4.32	4.24	4.37	4.36
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	4	2	4	3.82	1171/1510	4.20	4.18	4.19	4.23	3.82
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	0	2	2	5	4.33	454/1479	4.23	4.08	3.97	3.88	4.33
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	1	3	3	2	3.67	1113/1424	3.91	4.08	4.08	4.04	3.67
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	4	2	5	4.09	941/1537	4.27	4.18	4.15	4.17	4.09
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1553	4.85	4.69	4.69	4.69	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	3	5	2	3.90	1024/1536	3.97	4.05	4.07	4.13	3.90
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	0	6	3	4.33	1024/1487	4.38	4.41	4.44	4.47	4.33
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	513/1491	4.73	4.71	4.70	4.75	4.90
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	1	4	4	4.33	811/1489	4.31	4.28	4.27	4.32	4.33
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	5	0	4	3.89	1169/1481	4.23	4.30	4.28	4.37	3.89
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	1	1	3	2	3	3.50	939/1246	3.58	3.87	3.93	4.02	3.50
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	3	2	3	4.00	739/1411	3.92	4.13	4.00	4.05	4.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	2	1	1	4	3.88	1040/1413	4.33	4.38	4.23	4.28	3.88
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	1	2	3	2	3.75	1130/1408	4.29	4.37	4.27	4.31	3.75
4. Were special techniques successful	3	3	1	1	1	1	1	3.00	768/ 856	3.86	3.96	4.00	3.92	3.00
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	10	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 244	****	3.90	4.07	4.30	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	10	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 258	****	4.22	4.10	4.32	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	10	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 236	****	4.50	4.36	4.53	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	10	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 238	****	4.16	4.26	4.59	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	10	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 214	****	4.27	4.08	4.45	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	10	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 102	****	4.57	4.50	3.88	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	10	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 101	****	4.45	4.39	3.00	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 90	****	4.29	4.36	3.60	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 98	****	4.39	4.49	4.29	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	10	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 101	****	4.06	4.03	4.14	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 61	****	3.83	3.92	3.31	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	10	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 60	****	4.27	3.86	3.96	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	10	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 52	****	4.54	4.31	3.97	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	10	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 47	****	4.25	4.09	3.69	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 39	****	4.23	3.84	3.19	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	10	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 30	****	4.35	4.01	4.07	****

3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	10	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/	32	****	4.15	4.18	3.92	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	10	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/	16	****	4.50	4.36	4.15	****

Course-Section: FREN 201 0601
 Title INTERMEDIATE FRENCH I
 Instructor: EL OMARI, SAMIR
 Enrollment: 19
 Questionnaires: 11

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2004

Page 810
 JAN 19, 2005
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: FREN 202 0101
 Title INTERMEDIATE FRENCH II
 Instructor: REZVANI, MARJAN
 Enrollment: 23
 Questionnaires: 20

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2004

Page 811
 JAN 19, 2005
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies		Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean					
	NR	NA	1	2						3	4	5	Mean	Rank

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	3	2	5	6	4	3.30	1458/1556	3.30	4.23	4.25	4.33	3.30
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	4	4	6	2	4	2.90	1510/1557	2.90	4.23	4.21	4.30	2.90
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	2	5	7	6	3.85	1053/1335	3.85	4.32	4.24	4.37	3.85
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	3	3	4	5	4	3.21	1438/1510	3.21	4.18	4.19	4.23	3.21
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	3	2	3	5	3	4	3.24	1282/1479	3.24	4.08	3.97	3.88	3.24
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	6	5	3	4	3.05	1339/1424	3.05	4.08	4.08	4.04	3.05
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	7	2	2	7	2	2.75	1488/1537	2.75	4.18	4.15	4.17	2.75
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	19	5.00	1/1553	5.00	4.69	4.69	4.69	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	3	2	7	4	2	3.00	1444/1536	3.00	4.05	4.07	4.13	3.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	2	1	8	5	4	3.40	1404/1487	3.40	4.41	4.44	4.47	3.40
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	1	3	6	10	4.25	1340/1491	4.25	4.71	4.70	4.75	4.25
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	7	4	2	5	2	2.55	1462/1489	2.55	4.28	4.27	4.32	2.55
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	4	4	4	5	3	2.95	1420/1481	2.95	4.30	4.28	4.37	2.95
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	1	2	2	7	2	6	3.42	986/1246	3.42	3.87	3.93	4.02	3.42
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	2	1	6	6	2	3.29	1175/1411	3.29	4.13	4.00	4.05	3.29
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	1	0	3	4	9	4.18	862/1413	4.18	4.38	4.23	4.28	4.18
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	1	2	5	9	4.29	797/1408	4.29	4.37	4.27	4.31	4.29
4. Were special techniques successful	3	6	2	1	2	5	1	3.18	743/ 856	3.18	3.96	4.00	3.92	3.18
Laboratory														
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 258	****	4.22	4.10	4.32	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	19	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 236	****	4.50	4.36	4.53	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	19	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 238	****	4.16	4.26	4.59	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	19	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 214	****	4.27	4.08	4.45	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	19	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 102	****	4.57	4.50	3.88	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	19	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 101	****	4.45	4.39	3.00	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 90	****	4.29	4.36	3.60	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 98	****	4.39	4.49	4.29	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	19	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 101	****	4.06	4.03	4.14	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 61	****	3.83	3.92	3.31	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	19	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 60	****	4.27	3.86	3.96	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	19	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 52	****	4.54	4.31	3.97	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	19	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 47	****	4.25	4.09	3.69	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	19	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 44	****	4.00	4.09	3.93	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 39	****	4.23	3.84	3.19	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	19	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 30	****	4.35	4.01	4.07	****

3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	19	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/	32	****	4.15	4.18	3.92	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	19	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/	16	****	4.50	4.36	4.15	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	19	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/	16	****	4.45	4.51	4.65	****

Course-Section: FREN 202 0101
 Title INTERMEDIATE FRENCH II
 Instructor: REZVANI, MARJAN
 Enrollment: 23
 Questionnaires: 20

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2004

Page 811
 JAN 19, 2005
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	5	0.00-0.99	0	A	6	Required for Majors	6	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	5	1.00-1.99	0	B	8						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	1	C	5	General	6	Under-grad	20	Non-major	0
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	2	D	1						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5	F	0	Electives	2	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	9				
				?	0						

Course-Section: FREN 301 0101
 Title ADVANCED FRENCH I
 Instructor: DE VERNEIL, MAR
 Enrollment: 24
 Questionnaires: 22

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2004

Page 812
 JAN 19, 2005
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	1	0	1	6	14	4.45	619/1556	4.45	4.23	4.25	4.27	4.45
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	3	4	14	4.41	662/1557	4.41	4.23	4.21	4.21	4.41
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	4	17	4.73	251/1335	4.73	4.32	4.24	4.21	4.73
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	5	16	4.68	269/1510	4.68	4.18	4.19	4.20	4.68
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	2	6	13	4.41	392/1479	4.41	4.08	3.97	3.95	4.41
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	2	6	13	4.41	458/1424	4.41	4.08	4.08	4.08	4.41
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	3	2	16	4.50	476/1537	4.50	4.18	4.15	4.13	4.50
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	22	5.00	1/1553	5.00	4.69	4.69	4.67	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	2	7	10	4.42	460/1536	4.42	4.05	4.07	4.07	4.42
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	5	16	4.76	409/1487	4.76	4.41	4.44	4.43	4.76
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	1	20	4.95	257/1491	4.95	4.71	4.70	4.69	4.95
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	9	12	4.57	506/1489	4.57	4.28	4.27	4.27	4.57
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	7	13	4.57	541/1481	4.57	4.30	4.28	4.25	4.57
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	1	1	0	1	3	15	4.55	222/1246	4.55	3.87	3.93	3.98	4.55
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	2	6	10	4.44	430/1411	4.44	4.13	4.00	3.98	4.44
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	0	1	0	17	4.89	216/1413	4.89	4.38	4.23	4.23	4.89
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	0	1	1	16	4.83	288/1408	4.83	4.37	4.27	4.28	4.83
4. Were special techniques successful	4	3	1	1	0	2	11	4.40	269/ 856	4.40	3.96	4.00	3.99	4.40
Seminar														
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 101	****	4.45	4.39	4.14	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 90	****	4.29	4.36	3.87	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 98	****	4.39	4.49	4.56	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 101	****	4.06	4.03	3.52	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	20	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 61	****	3.83	3.92	4.16	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 60	****	4.27	3.86	3.82	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 52	****	4.54	4.31	4.19	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 47	****	4.25	4.09	3.81	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 44	****	4.00	4.09	3.72	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	20	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 39	****	4.23	3.84	4.11	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 30	****	4.35	4.01	4.57	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 32	****	4.15	4.18	4.00	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 16	****	4.50	4.36	3.76	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 16	****	4.45	4.51	3.87	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades Reasons Type Majors

Grade	Count	Score Range	Count	Category	Count	Requirement	Count	Level	Count	Requirement	Count
00-27	6	0.00-0.99	1	A	10	Required for Majors	5	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B	10						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	0	C	1	General	7	Under-grad	22	Non-major	7
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	4	D	1						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5	F	0	Electives	2	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	9				
				?	0						

Course-Section: FREN 302 0101
 Title ADVANCED FRENCH II
 Instructor: REZVANI, MARJAN
 Enrollment: 8
 Questionnaires: 4

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2004

Page 813
 JAN 19, 2005
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1556	5.00	4.23	4.25	4.27	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	840/1557	4.25	4.23	4.21	4.21	4.25
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	223/1335	4.75	4.32	4.24	4.21	4.75
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1510	5.00	4.18	4.19	4.20	5.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	1	1	3.75	989/1479	3.75	4.08	3.97	3.95	3.75
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	806/1424	4.00	4.08	4.08	4.08	4.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	2	1	1	3.75	1200/1537	3.75	4.18	4.15	4.13	3.75
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1553	5.00	4.69	4.69	4.67	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	359/1536	4.50	4.05	4.07	4.07	4.50
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	1231/1487	4.00	4.41	4.44	4.43	4.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	852/1491	4.75	4.71	4.70	4.69	4.75
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	897/1489	4.25	4.28	4.27	4.27	4.25
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	638/1481	4.50	4.30	4.28	4.25	4.50
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	1	1	1	1	3.50	939/1246	3.50	3.87	3.93	3.98	3.50
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1411	5.00	4.13	4.00	3.98	5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1413	5.00	4.38	4.23	4.23	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	367/1408	4.75	4.37	4.27	4.28	4.75
4. Were special techniques successful	0	0	1	0	0	2	1	3.50	656/ 856	3.50	3.96	4.00	3.99	3.50

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: FREN 310 0101
 Title INTERCONNECTIONS: LANG
 Instructor: MCCRAY, STANLEY
 Enrollment: 26
 Questionnaires: 16

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2004

Page 814
 JAN 19, 2005
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	0	1	3	7	4	3.93	1189/1556	3.93	4.23	4.25	4.27	3.93
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	4	10	4.50	515/1557	4.50	4.23	4.21	4.21	4.50
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	10	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	162/1335	4.83	4.32	4.24	4.21	4.83
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	3	11	4.56	373/1510	4.56	4.18	4.19	4.20	4.56
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	2	12	4.63	227/1479	4.63	4.08	3.97	3.95	4.63
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	7	9	4.56	278/1424	4.56	4.08	4.08	4.08	4.56
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	3	13	4.81	141/1537	4.81	4.18	4.15	4.13	4.81
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	2	10	4	4.13	1389/1553	4.13	4.69	4.69	4.67	4.13
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	1	0	1	5	8	4.27	647/1536	4.27	4.05	4.07	4.07	4.27
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	5	2	9	4.25	1092/1487	4.25	4.41	4.44	4.43	4.25
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	2	14	4.88	588/1491	4.88	4.71	4.70	4.69	4.88
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	1	5	9	4.53	558/1489	4.53	4.28	4.27	4.27	4.53
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	2	5	8	4.25	913/1481	4.25	4.30	4.28	4.25	4.25
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	3	0	0	1	5	7	4.46	284/1246	4.46	3.87	3.93	3.98	4.46
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	1	3	8	4.58	312/1411	4.58	4.13	4.00	3.98	4.58
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	0	1	0	11	4.83	262/1413	4.83	4.38	4.23	4.23	4.83
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/1408	5.00	4.37	4.27	4.28	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	4	1	0	0	2	1	8	4.55	203/ 856	4.55	3.96	4.00	3.99	4.55

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: FREN 315 0101
 Title FRENCH PHONETICS
 Instructor: KA, OMAR
 Enrollment: 20
 Questionnaires: 13

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2004

Page 815
 JAN 19, 2005
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	6	7	4.54	500/1556	4.54	4.23	4.25	4.27	4.54
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	5	7	4.58	407/1557	4.58	4.23	4.21	4.21	4.58
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	5	8	4.62	359/1335	4.62	4.32	4.24	4.21	4.62
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	5	0	0	1	1	6	4.63	322/1510	4.63	4.18	4.19	4.20	4.63
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	0	1	3	7	4.55	275/1479	4.55	4.08	3.97	3.95	4.55
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	0	0	5	6	4.55	292/1424	4.55	4.08	4.08	4.08	4.55
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	4	9	4.69	246/1537	4.69	4.18	4.15	4.13	4.69
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	1	0	12	4.85	777/1553	4.85	4.69	4.69	4.67	4.85
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	1	4	7	4.50	359/1536	4.50	4.05	4.07	4.07	4.50
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	4	8	4.54	781/1487	4.54	4.41	4.44	4.43	4.54
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	13	5.00	1/1491	5.00	4.71	4.70	4.69	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	2	1	10	4.62	454/1489	4.62	4.28	4.27	4.27	4.62
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	3	10	4.77	303/1481	4.77	4.30	4.28	4.25	4.77
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	8	0	0	2	0	3	4.20	496/1246	4.20	3.87	3.93	3.98	4.20
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	153/1411	4.86	4.13	4.00	3.98	4.86
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1413	5.00	4.38	4.23	4.23	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1408	5.00	4.37	4.27	4.28	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	6	6	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 856	****	3.96	4.00	3.99	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	7	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B	6						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	2	C	0	General	1	Under-grad	13	Non-major	2
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	10				
				?	0						

Course-Section: FREN 319 0101
 Title FRENCH TRANSLATION
 Instructor: ZAKARIA, FATIH
 Enrollment: 4
 Questionnaires: 4

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2004

Page 816
 JAN 19, 2005
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1556	5.00	4.23	4.25	4.27	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1557	5.00	4.23	4.21	4.21	5.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1335	5.00	4.32	4.24	4.21	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1510	5.00	4.18	4.19	4.20	5.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1479	5.00	4.08	3.97	3.95	5.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1424	5.00	4.08	4.08	4.08	5.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1537	5.00	4.18	4.15	4.13	5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1553	5.00	4.69	4.69	4.67	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1536	5.00	4.05	4.07	4.07	5.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1487	5.00	4.41	4.44	4.43	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1491	5.00	4.71	4.70	4.69	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1489	5.00	4.28	4.27	4.27	5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1481	5.00	4.30	4.28	4.25	5.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	1	1	0	0	0	2	3.67	858/1246	3.67	3.87	3.93	3.98	3.67
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1411	5.00	4.13	4.00	3.98	5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1413	5.00	4.38	4.23	4.23	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1408	5.00	4.37	4.27	4.28	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	1	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/ 856	5.00	3.96	4.00	3.99	5.00

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	2	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
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	2
84-150	1	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	1				
				?	0						

Course-Section: FREN 430 0101
 Title STUDIES IN FRENCH LIT
 Instructor: ZAKARIA, FATIH
 Enrollment: 13
 Questionnaires: 11

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2004

Page 817
 JAN 19, 2005
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect		
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean		

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	0	0	1	2	7	4.60	415/1556	4.60	4.23	4.25	4.39	4.60
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	3	3	4	4.10	1005/1557	4.10	4.23	4.21	4.27	4.10
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	6	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1335	5.00	4.32	4.24	4.31	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	0	0	2	1	2	4	3.89	1122/1510	3.89	4.18	4.19	4.26	3.89
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	3	7	4.70	187/1479	4.70	4.08	3.97	4.05	4.70
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	2	0	2	6	4.20	657/1424	4.20	4.08	4.08	4.18	4.20
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	1	0	1	7	4.56	420/1537	4.56	4.18	4.15	4.22	4.56
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1553	5.00	4.69	4.69	4.71	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	1	0	0	1	3	4	4.38	520/1536	4.38	4.05	4.07	4.20	4.38
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	332/1487	4.80	4.41	4.44	4.52	4.80
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1491	5.00	4.71	4.70	4.79	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	2	1	7	4.50	598/1489	4.50	4.28	4.27	4.32	4.50
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	255/1481	4.80	4.30	4.28	4.38	4.80
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	1	1	4	1	3	3.40	998/1246	3.40	3.87	3.93	3.99	3.40
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	1	4	4	4.33	527/1411	4.33	4.13	4.00	4.14	4.33
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	328/1413	4.78	4.38	4.23	4.43	4.78
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	0	3	6	4.67	451/1408	4.67	4.37	4.27	4.41	4.67
4. Were special techniques successful	2	0	2	1	2	1	3	3.22	734/ 856	3.22	3.96	4.00	4.20	3.22
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	9	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 102	****	4.57	4.50	4.83	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	9	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 101	****	4.45	4.39	4.73	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/ 90	****	4.29	4.36	4.73	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 98	****	4.39	4.49	4.77	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	9	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 101	****	4.06	4.03	4.33	****
Field Work														
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	10	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 44	****	4.00	4.09	4.41	****

Frequency Distribution

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