

Course Section: ARBC 101 0101
 Title ELEMENTARY ARABIC I
 Instructor: EL OMARI, SAMIR
 Enrollment: 27
 Questionnaires: 18

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2006

Page 60
 JAN 18, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Questions	Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire								Instructor Mean Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Frequencies						
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	5	13	4.72	306/1669	4.63	4.33	4.23	4.02	4.72
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	1	16	4.83	157/1666	4.67	4.28	4.19	4.11	4.83
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	3	14	4.72	318/1421	4.71	4.36	4.24	4.11	4.72
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	3	14	4.72	253/1617	4.63	4.27	4.15	3.99	4.72
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	3	14	4.72	189/1555	4.67	4.17	4.00	3.92	4.72
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	3	3	11	4.33	580/1543	4.28	4.19	4.06	3.86	4.33
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	2	3	13	4.61	356/1647	4.61	4.18	4.12	4.06	4.61
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	17	5.00	1/1668	5.00	4.60	4.67	4.62	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	2	3	9	4.50	373/1605	4.64	4.13	4.07	3.96	4.50
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	2	15	4.78	408/1514	4.80	4.39	4.39	4.32	4.78
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	18	5.00	1/1551	5.00	4.72	4.66	4.55	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	3	3	12	4.50	556/1503	4.48	4.31	4.24	4.17	4.50
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	1	2	14	4.76	340/1506	4.66	4.40	4.26	4.17	4.76
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	0	0	0	0	2	14	4.88	90/1311	4.85	3.78	3.85	3.68	4.88
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	3	1	8	4.42	546/1490	4.38	4.26	4.05	3.85	4.42
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	0	0	2	10	4.83	306/1502	4.69	4.54	4.26	4.06	4.83
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	1	0	0	1	9	4.55	648/1489	4.55	4.43	4.29	4.07	4.55
4. Were special techniques successful	6	2	2	0	2	2	4	3.60	729/1006	3.13	4.14	4.00	3.81	3.60
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	15	1	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 226	****	****	4.20	3.98	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	15	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 233	****	****	4.19	4.09	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	15	1	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 225	****	****	4.50	4.42	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	15	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 223	****	****	4.35	4.19	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	15	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 206	****	****	4.15	4.01	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	15	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 112	****	4.00	4.38	4.04	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	15	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 97	****	3.00	4.36	4.19	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	15	2	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 92	****	3.50	4.22	3.79	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	15	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 105	****	4.00	4.20	3.94	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	15	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 98	****	4.00	3.95	3.90	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	16	0	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/ 58	****	4.33	4.22	4.00	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	16	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 52	****	4.00	4.06	3.81	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	15	1	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 39	****	5.00	4.39	4.30	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	16	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 40	****	4.00	3.97	4.00	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	15	2	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 30	****	5.00	4.33	4.30	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 55	****	4.42	4.34	4.17	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	15	1	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 42	****	****	4.31	4.08	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	16	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 46	****	4.33	4.45	4.26	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	16	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 33	****	****	4.25	4.25	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	16	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 29	****	5.00	4.34	4.22	****

Course Section: ARBC 101 0101
 Title ELEMENTARY ARABIC I
 Instructor: EL OMARI, SAMIR
 Enrollment: 27
 Questionnaires: 18

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2006

Page 60
 JAN 18, 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	1	A	10	Required for Majors	4	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B	4						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	0	C	1	General	8	Under-grad	18	Non-major	17
84-150	3	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	5				
				?	1						

Course Section: ARBC 101 0102
 Title: ELEMENTARY ARABIC I
 Instructor: EL OMARI, SAMIR
 Enrollment: 26
 Questionnaires: 14

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2006

Page 61
 JAN 18, 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	0	2	10	4.54	556/1669	4.63	4.33	4.23	4.02	4.54	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	0	0	2	2	8	4.50	549/1666	4.67	4.28	4.19	4.11	4.50	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	4	9	4.69	356/1421	4.71	4.36	4.24	4.11	4.69	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	1	0	0	2	10	4.54	465/1617	4.63	4.27	4.15	3.99	4.54	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	5	8	4.62	255/1555	4.67	4.17	4.00	3.92	4.62	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	0	2	2	8	4.23	680/1543	4.28	4.19	4.06	3.86	4.23	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	1	0	2	10	4.62	356/1647	4.61	4.18	4.12	4.06	4.62	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	13	5.00	1/1668	5.00	4.60	4.67	4.62	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	157/1605	4.64	4.13	4.07	3.96	4.78	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	0	2	9	4.82	342/1514	4.80	4.39	4.39	4.32	4.82	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1551	5.00	4.72	4.66	4.55	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	1	4	6	4.45	637/1503	4.48	4.31	4.24	4.17	4.45	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	1	0	0	1	9	4.55	604/1506	4.66	4.40	4.26	4.17	4.55	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	0	0	0	0	2	9	4.82	112/1311	4.85	3.78	3.85	3.68	4.82	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	1	4	4	4.33	622/1490	4.38	4.26	4.05	3.85	4.33	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	0	0	4	5	4.56	586/1502	4.69	4.54	4.26	4.06	4.56	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	0	1	2	6	4.56	640/1489	4.55	4.43	4.29	4.07	4.56	
4. Were special techniques successful	5	3	2	1	1	1	1	2.67	962/1006	3.13	4.14	4.00	3.81	2.67	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	12	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 226	****	****	4.20	3.98	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 233	****	****	4.19	4.09	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	13	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 225	****	****	4.50	4.42	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 223	****	****	4.35	4.19	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 206	****	****	4.15	4.01	****	
Seminar															
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 105	****	4.00	4.20	3.94	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 98	****	4.00	3.95	3.90	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	12	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 58	****	4.33	4.22	4.00	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 52	****	4.00	4.06	3.81	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 39	****	5.00	4.39	4.30	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	13	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 40	****	4.00	3.97	4.00	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 55	****	4.42	4.34	4.17	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	11	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 42	****	****	4.31	4.08	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	12	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 46	****	4.33	4.45	4.26	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	12	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 33	****	****	4.25	4.25	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	12	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 29	****	5.00	4.34	4.22	****	

Course Section: ARBC 101 0102
 Title ELEMENTARY ARABIC I
 Instructor: EL OMARI, SAMIR
 Enrollment: 26
 Questionnaires: 14

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2006

Page 61
 JAN 18, 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	1	Graduate	0	Major	3
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B	3						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	5	Under-grad	14	Non-major	11
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	2	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	0						