

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	FREN 101 01
Title:	Elementary French I
Instructor:	Gueye,Sokhna Fa

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	30
Questionnaires:	16

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	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	0	0	4	5	7	4.19	994/1528	4.16	4.38	4.31	4.16	4.19
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	4	4	8	4.25	902/1527	4.07	4.37	4.28	4.23	4.25
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	2	11	4.50	564/1333	4.31	4.55	4.34	4.26	4.50
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	1	0	1	5	8	4.27	832/1495	4.05	4.36	4.25	4.11	4.27
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	2	1	1	2	5	3	3.67	1126/1439	3.94	4.38	4.11	3.97	3.67
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	3	2	1	0	3	3	4	3.82	1048/1425	3.55	4.23	4.12	3.93	3.82
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	3	0	2	0	1	4	6	3.92	1118/1508	3.83	4.16	4.18	4.11	3.92
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	14	0	4.00	1421/1526	3.14	4.63	4.66	4.57	4.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	5	7	1	3.69	1185/1490	3.82	4.13	4.11	4.02	3.69
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	1	4	10	4.60	735/1428	4.32	4.50	4.49	4.43	4.60
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	2	13	4.87	645/1436	4.84	4.82	4.74	4.70	4.87
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	2	2	10	4.57	541/1427	4.41	4.39	4.32	4.27	4.57
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	3	11	4.67	475/1425	4.44	4.50	4.34	4.31	4.67
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	3	0	3	4	0	3	3.30	1126/1291	3.41	4.11	4.05	3.97	3.30
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	3	1	4	4.13	733/1271	3.98	4.36	4.16	3.98	4.13
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	0	0	0	4	4	4.50	591/1276	4.53	4.62	4.33	4.14	4.50
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	0	1	0	2	5	4.38	746/1273	4.37	4.55	4.38	4.18	4.38
4. Were special techniques successful	8	1	0	1	2	1	3	3.86	573/922	4.13	4.27	4.02	3.87	3.86

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section: FREN 101 01	Term - Fall 2010	Enrollment: 30
Title: Elementary French I		Questionnaires: 16
Instructor: Gueye,Sokhna Fa		

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

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	0	A	6	Required for Majors	2	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	1	B	7						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	0	C	1	General	10	Under-grad	16	Non-major	16
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	4	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	1						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	FREN 101 02
Title:	Elementary French I
Instructor:	Kourouma,Michel

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	28
Questionnaires:	14

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	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	0	2	3	8	4.21	962/1528	4.16	4.38	4.31	4.16	4.21
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	0	4	3	6	3.93	1202/1527	4.07	4.37	4.28	4.23	3.93
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	4	7	4.21	856/1333	4.31	4.55	4.34	4.26	4.21
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	1	3	3	5	4.00	1047/1495	4.05	4.36	4.25	4.11	4.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	3	7	3	4.00	851/1439	3.94	4.38	4.11	3.97	4.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	1	2	2	5	3	3.54	1197/1425	3.55	4.23	4.12	3.93	3.54
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	4	0	1	8	3.79	1216/1508	3.83	4.16	4.18	4.11	3.79
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	5	8	1	0	2.71	1523/1526	3.14	4.63	4.66	4.57	2.71
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	2	7	1	3.90	1046/1490	3.82	4.13	4.11	4.02	3.90
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	2	1	4	7	4.14	1151/1428	4.32	4.50	4.49	4.43	4.14
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	14	5.00	1/1436	4.84	4.82	4.74	4.70	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	3	4	7	4.29	891/1427	4.41	4.39	4.32	4.27	4.29
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	2	10	4.57	589/1425	4.44	4.50	4.34	4.31	4.57
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	2	2	1	3	2	3	3.27	1136/1291	3.41	4.11	4.05	3.97	3.27
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	1	2	3	3	3.89	880/1271	3.98	4.36	4.16	3.98	3.89
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	0	1	2	6	4.56	548/1276	4.53	4.62	4.33	4.14	4.56
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	0	3	3	3	4.00	947/1273	4.37	4.55	4.38	4.18	4.00
4. Were special techniques successful	5	0	0	1	1	4	3	4.00	467/922	4.13	4.27	4.02	3.87	4.00

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	FREN 101 02
Title:	Elementary French I
Instructor:	Kourouma,Michel

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	28
Questionnaires:	14

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	11	1	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/198	****	4.40	4.16	3.90	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	12	0	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/208	****	4.80	4.27	4.23	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	11	1	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/194	****	5.00	4.56	4.54	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	12	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/194	****	4.60	4.37	4.30	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	11	1	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/176	****	****	4.23	4.19	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	11	1	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/76	****	4.63	4.51	4.44	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	11	1	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/74	****	4.86	4.31	4.43	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	11	1	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/66	****	4.70	4.27	4.15	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	11	1	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/76	****	4.71	4.27	4.21	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	11	1	0	2	0	0	0	2.00	****/73	****	3.74	3.94	3.82	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	11	0	1	1	0	1	0	2.33	****/42	****	****	4.00	4.08	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	11	0	1	1	0	1	0	2.33	****/41	****	****	4.06	4.10	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	11	1	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/30	****	****	4.74	5.00	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	11	2	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/32	****	****	4.20	4.09	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	11	1	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/29	****	****	4.34	4.87	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	11	0	1	0	1	1	0	2.67	****/43	****	****	4.43	4.68	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	11	2	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/31	****	****	4.53	4.51	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	11	1	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/36	****	****	4.43	4.33	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	FREN 101 02
Title:	Elementary French I
Instructor:	Kourouma,Michel

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	28
Questionnaires:	14

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Self Paced														
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	11	1	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/21	****	****	4.54	4.63	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	11	1	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/20	****	****	4.45	4.39	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	8	Required for Majors	2	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	4						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	1	C	0	General	8	Under-grad	14	Non-major	14
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	1	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	1				
				?	2						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	FREN 101 03
Title:	Elementary French I
Instructor:	Field,Thomas T

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	29
Questionnaires:	18

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	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	0	1	5	2	10	4.17	1015/1528	4.16	4.38	4.31	4.16	4.17
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	3	12	4.44	672/1527	4.07	4.37	4.28	4.23	4.44
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	2	1	4	11	4.33	769/1333	4.31	4.55	4.34	4.26	4.33
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	2	1	5	8	4.19	922/1495	4.05	4.36	4.25	4.11	4.19
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	1	1	3	12	4.53	352/1439	3.94	4.38	4.11	3.97	4.53
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	1	4	0	6	6	3.71	1121/1425	3.55	4.23	4.12	3.93	3.71
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	2	6	9	4.28	758/1508	3.83	4.16	4.18	4.11	4.28
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	1	0	0	17	4.83	689/1526	3.14	4.63	4.66	4.57	4.83
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	3	7	6	4.19	756/1490	3.82	4.13	4.11	4.02	4.19
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	1	16	4.83	335/1428	4.32	4.50	4.49	4.43	4.83
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	2	16	4.89	580/1436	4.84	4.82	4.74	4.70	4.89
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	2	15	4.78	270/1427	4.41	4.39	4.32	4.27	4.78
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	0	2	15	4.67	475/1425	4.44	4.50	4.34	4.31	4.67
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	1	0	1	3	13	4.50	327/1291	3.41	4.11	4.05	3.97	4.50
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	1	1	1	7	4.40	549/1271	3.98	4.36	4.16	3.98	4.40
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	0	0	2	0	8	4.60	506/1276	4.53	4.62	4.33	4.14	4.60
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	235/1273	4.37	4.55	4.38	4.18	4.90
4. Were special techniques successful	8	1	0	0	2	1	6	4.44	250/922	4.13	4.27	4.02	3.87	4.44

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	FREN 101 03
Title:	Elementary French I
Instructor:	Field,Thomas T

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	29
Questionnaires:	18

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/198	****	4.40	4.16	3.90	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/208	****	4.80	4.27	4.23	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/194	****	5.00	4.56	4.54	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/194	****	4.60	4.37	4.30	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/176	****	****	4.23	4.19	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/76	****	4.63	4.51	4.44	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/74	****	4.86	4.31	4.43	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/66	****	4.70	4.27	4.15	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/76	****	4.71	4.27	4.21	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/73	****	3.74	3.94	3.82	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/42	****	****	4.00	4.08	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	17	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/41	****	****	4.06	4.10	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	17	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/30	****	****	4.74	5.00	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	17	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/32	****	****	4.20	4.09	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/29	****	****	4.34	4.87	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/43	****	****	4.43	4.68	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	17	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/31	****	****	4.53	4.51	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	17	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/36	****	****	4.43	4.33	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	FREN 101 03
Title:	Elementary French I
Instructor:	Field,Thomas T

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	29
Questionnaires:	18

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Self Paced														
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/21	****	****	4.54	4.63	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/20	****	****	4.45	4.39	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	2	A	5	Required for Majors	4	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	B	5						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	1	C	4	General	9	Under-grad	18	Non-major	17
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	3	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	3						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	FREN 101 04
Title:	Elementary French I
Instructor:	Kourouma,Michel

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	28
Questionnaires:	18

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	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	2	0	1	0	4	3	8	4.06	1102/1528	4.16	4.38	4.31	4.16	4.06
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	3	0	1	2	1	8	3	3.67	1352/1527	4.07	4.37	4.28	4.23	3.67
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	0	0	2	0	7	7	4.19	880/1333	4.31	4.55	4.34	4.26	4.19
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	4	0	1	4	4	3	3.75	1247/1495	4.05	4.36	4.25	4.11	3.75
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	3	1	1	2	3	4	4	3.57	1171/1439	3.94	4.38	4.11	3.97	3.57
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	4	0	1	3	3	7	0	3.14	1329/1425	3.55	4.23	4.12	3.93	3.14
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	3	0	2	2	3	5	3	3.33	1374/1508	3.83	4.16	4.18	4.11	3.33
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	0	15	0	0	0	0	1.00	1526/1526	3.14	4.63	4.66	4.57	1.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	7	1	1	0	4	3	2	3.50	1269/1490	3.82	4.13	4.11	4.02	3.50
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	5	0	0	1	4	6	2	3.69	1329/1428	4.32	4.50	4.49	4.43	3.69
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	5	0	0	0	1	3	9	4.62	1102/1436	4.84	4.82	4.74	4.70	4.62
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	5	0	0	1	2	6	4	4.00	1080/1427	4.41	4.39	4.32	4.27	4.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	5	0	1	1	3	2	6	3.85	1188/1425	4.44	4.50	4.34	4.31	3.85
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	5	4	3	2	1	2	1	2.56	1254/1291	3.41	4.11	4.05	3.97	2.56
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	2	3	3	2	3.50	1077/1271	3.98	4.36	4.16	3.98	3.50
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	9	0	0	0	1	3	5	4.44	654/1276	4.53	4.62	4.33	4.14	4.44
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	0	0	3	2	5	4.20	857/1273	4.37	4.55	4.38	4.18	4.20
4. Were special techniques successful	8	1	0	0	1	5	3	4.22	375/922	4.13	4.27	4.02	3.87	4.22

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	FREN 101 04
Title:	Elementary French I
Instructor:	Kourouma,Michel

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	28
Questionnaires:	18

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

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	2	0.00-0.99 0	A 6 Required for Majors	5 Graduate	0 Major
28-55	1	1.00-1.99 0	B 4		
56-83	0	2.00-2.99 1	C 3 General	6	18 Non-major
84-150	0	3.00-3.49 0	D 0		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 3	F 0 Electives	3	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 0		
			I 0 Other	1	
			? 4		

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	FREN 102 01
Title:	Elementary French II
Instructor:	Badagbo-Adzra,L

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	25
Questionnaires:	14

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	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	0	0	3	5	6	4.21	962/1528	4.29	4.38	4.31	4.16	4.21
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	0	5	8	4.43	704/1527	4.26	4.37	4.28	4.23	4.43
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	3	9	4.62	447/1333	4.57	4.55	4.34	4.26	4.62
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	1	0	0	1	2	9	4.67	313/1495	4.21	4.36	4.25	4.11	4.67
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	3	0	1	1	4	5	4.18	727/1439	3.98	4.38	4.11	3.97	4.18
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	0	1	5	6	4.42	501/1425	4.06	4.23	4.12	3.93	4.42
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	4	5	5	4.07	995/1508	3.91	4.16	4.18	4.11	4.07
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	13	4.93	453/1526	4.70	4.63	4.66	4.57	4.93
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	7	0	0	0	2	2	3	4.14	800/1490	3.88	4.13	4.11	4.02	4.14
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	4	9	4.57	770/1428	4.35	4.50	4.49	4.43	4.57
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	3	3	8	4.36	1282/1436	4.52	4.82	4.74	4.70	4.36
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	1	0	2	4	7	4.14	1008/1427	4.22	4.39	4.32	4.27	4.14
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	2	0	4	8	4.29	908/1425	4.38	4.50	4.34	4.31	4.29
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	1	1	6	6	4.21	567/1291	3.78	4.11	4.05	3.97	4.21
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	2	4	4	4.20	669/1271	4.03	4.36	4.16	3.98	4.20
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	0	1	3	6	4.50	591/1276	4.47	4.62	4.33	4.14	4.50
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	1	1	2	6	4.30	799/1273	4.15	4.55	4.38	4.18	4.30
4. Were special techniques successful	4	2	0	1	2	1	4	4.00	467/922	3.75	4.27	4.02	3.87	4.00

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	FREN 102 01
Title:	Elementary French II
Instructor:	Badagbo-Adzra,L

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	25
Questionnaires:	14

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	10	1	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/198	****	4.40	4.16	3.90	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	12	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/208	****	4.80	4.27	4.23	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	12	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/194	****	5.00	4.56	4.54	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	11	1	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/194	****	4.60	4.37	4.30	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	11	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/176	****	****	4.23	4.19	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	10	3	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/76	****	4.63	4.51	4.44	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	11	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/74	****	4.86	4.31	4.43	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	11	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/66	****	4.70	4.27	4.15	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/76	****	4.71	4.27	4.21	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	11	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/73	****	3.74	3.94	3.82	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/42	****	****	4.00	4.08	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	12	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/41	****	****	4.06	4.10	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	12	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/30	****	****	4.74	5.00	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	12	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/32	****	****	4.20	4.09	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	12	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/29	****	****	4.34	4.87	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/43	****	****	4.43	4.68	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	11	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/31	****	****	4.53	4.51	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	11	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/36	****	****	4.43	4.33	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	FREN 102 01
Title:	Elementary French II
Instructor:	Badagbo-Adzra,L

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	25
Questionnaires:	14

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Self Paced														
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	11	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/21	****	****	4.54	4.63	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	11	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/20	****	****	4.45	4.39	****

Frequency Distribution

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

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	FREN 102 02
Title:	Elementary French II
Instructor:	Badagbo-Adzra,L

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	27
Questionnaires:	18

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	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	0	2	2	13	4.44	713/1528	4.29	4.38	4.31	4.16	4.44
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	1	0	4	12	4.39	760/1527	4.26	4.37	4.28	4.23	4.39
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	1	2	0	14	4.59	479/1333	4.57	4.55	4.34	4.26	4.59
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	1	0	2	2	11	4.38	695/1495	4.21	4.36	4.25	4.11	4.38
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	1	0	0	3	13	4.59	307/1439	3.98	4.38	4.11	3.97	4.59
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	4	2	0	1	1	10	4.21	714/1425	4.06	4.23	4.12	3.93	4.21
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	2	1	1	3	11	4.11	959/1508	3.91	4.16	4.18	4.11	4.11
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	17	4.94	340/1526	4.70	4.63	4.66	4.57	4.94
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	2	1	2	5	5	3.67	1203/1490	3.88	4.13	4.11	4.02	3.67
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	1	1	1	0	14	4.47	887/1428	4.35	4.50	4.49	4.43	4.47
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	2	2	13	4.65	1066/1436	4.52	4.82	4.74	4.70	4.65
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	1	1	1	2	12	4.35	823/1427	4.22	4.39	4.32	4.27	4.35
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	2	0	0	3	12	4.35	854/1425	4.38	4.50	4.34	4.31	4.35
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	0	1	1	3	2	9	4.06	695/1291	3.78	4.11	4.05	3.97	4.06
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	9	0	2	0	0	1	6	4.00	780/1271	4.03	4.36	4.16	3.98	4.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	0	2	0	0	8	4.40	696/1276	4.47	4.62	4.33	4.14	4.40
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	1	0	1	0	8	4.40	724/1273	4.15	4.55	4.38	4.18	4.40
4. Were special techniques successful	8	7	1	0	0	0	2	3.67	****/922	3.75	4.27	4.02	3.87	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	FREN 102 02
Title:	Elementary French II
Instructor:	Badagbo-Adzra,L

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	27
Questionnaires:	18

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/198	****	4.40	4.16	3.90	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/208	****	4.80	4.27	4.23	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/194	****	5.00	4.56	4.54	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/194	****	4.60	4.37	4.30	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/176	****	****	4.23	4.19	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/76	****	4.63	4.51	4.44	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/74	****	4.86	4.31	4.43	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/66	****	4.70	4.27	4.15	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/76	****	4.71	4.27	4.21	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/73	****	3.74	3.94	3.82	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/42	****	****	4.00	4.08	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/41	****	****	4.06	4.10	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/30	****	****	4.74	5.00	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/32	****	****	4.20	4.09	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/29	****	****	4.34	4.87	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/43	****	****	4.43	4.68	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/31	****	****	4.53	4.51	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/36	****	****	4.43	4.33	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section: FREN 102 02	Term - Fall 2010	Enrollment: 27
Title: Elementary French II		Questionnaires: 18
Instructor: Badagbo-Adzra,L		
	Frequencies	Instructor
Questions	NR	NA
Self Paced	1	2
	3	4
	5	Mean
	Mean	Rank
	Mean	Mean
	Mean	Mean
	Mean	Mean
	Mean	Mean

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	1	A	13	Required for Majors	2	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	2						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	2	C	0	General	10	Under-grad	18	Non-major	17
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	0	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	2						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	FREN 102 03
Title:	Elementary French II
Instructor:	Fatih,Zakaria

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	30
Questionnaires:	22

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	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	2	0	0	0	4	8	8	4.20	973/1528	4.29	4.38	4.31	4.16	4.20
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	0	1	7	4	8	3.95	1169/1527	4.26	4.37	4.28	4.23	3.95
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	0	0	0	1	8	11	4.50	564/1333	4.57	4.55	4.34	4.26	4.50
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	5	0	3	5	2	5	3.60	1331/1495	4.21	4.36	4.25	4.11	3.60
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	4	6	2	2	2	4	2	3.17	1338/1439	3.98	4.38	4.11	3.97	3.17
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	4	7	1	1	3	3	3	3.55	1193/1425	4.06	4.23	4.12	3.93	3.55
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	4	0	1	3	3	7	4	3.56	1305/1508	3.91	4.16	4.18	4.11	3.56
8. How many times was class cancelled	4	0	0	0	0	14	4	4.22	1313/1526	4.70	4.63	4.66	4.57	4.22
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	0	6	8	3	3.82	1103/1490	3.88	4.13	4.11	4.02	3.82
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	1	4	8	6	4.00	1202/1428	4.35	4.50	4.49	4.43	4.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	9	11	4.55	1148/1436	4.52	4.82	4.74	4.70	4.55
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	1	3	8	8	4.15	1000/1427	4.22	4.39	4.32	4.27	4.15
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	2	6	12	4.50	667/1425	4.38	4.50	4.34	4.31	4.50
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	7	3	3	1	2	4	3.08	1188/1291	3.78	4.11	4.05	3.97	3.08
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	14	0	1	0	2	1	4	3.88	887/1271	4.03	4.36	4.16	3.98	3.88
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	14	0	0	0	1	2	5	4.50	591/1276	4.47	4.62	4.33	4.14	4.50
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	14	0	0	1	2	3	2	3.75	1083/1273	4.15	4.55	4.38	4.18	3.75
4. Were special techniques successful	14	2	1	0	2	1	2	3.50	719/922	3.75	4.27	4.02	3.87	3.50

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	FREN 102 03
Title:	Elementary French II
Instructor:	Fatih,Zakaria

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	30
Questionnaires:	22

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/43	****	****	4.43	4.68	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/31	****	****	4.53	4.51	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/36	****	****	4.43	4.33	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/21	****	****	4.54	4.63	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/20	****	****	4.45	4.39	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	1 A 8	Required for Majors	2 Graduate 0 Major 0
28-55	6	1.00-1.99	1 B 9		
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	0 C 1	General	15 Under-grad 22 Non-major 22
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	4 D 1		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3 F 0	Electives	1 **** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 0		
			I 0	Other	1
			? 3		

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	FREN 103 01
Title:	Int Rev Elem French
Instructor:	El Omari,Samir

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	19
Questionnaires:	15

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	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	0	1	3	6	5	4.00	1140/1528	4.00	4.38	4.31	4.16	4.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	6	6	4.20	952/1527	4.20	4.37	4.28	4.23	4.20
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	4	9	4.47	620/1333	4.47	4.55	4.34	4.26	4.47
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	2	2	3	6	4.00	1047/1495	4.00	4.36	4.25	4.11	4.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	2	1	4	6	4.08	813/1439	4.08	4.38	4.11	3.97	4.08
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	4	1	1	1	4	4	3.82	1048/1425	3.82	4.23	4.12	3.93	3.82
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	4	2	3	6	3.73	1241/1508	3.73	4.16	4.18	4.11	3.73
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	6	9	4.60	978/1526	4.60	4.63	4.66	4.57	4.60
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	2	4	5	1	3.42	1308/1490	3.42	4.13	4.11	4.02	3.42
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	3	3	8	4.36	1005/1428	4.36	4.50	4.49	4.43	4.36
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	2	13	4.87	645/1436	4.87	4.82	4.74	4.70	4.87
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	1	3	7	3	3.86	1183/1427	3.86	4.39	4.32	4.27	3.86
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	2	6	6	4.07	1057/1425	4.07	4.50	4.34	4.31	4.07
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	1	2	0	4	2	6	3.71	965/1291	3.71	4.11	4.05	3.97	3.71
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	9	0	1	0	2	0	3	3.67	1007/1271	3.67	4.36	4.16	3.98	3.67
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	9	0	1	1	0	2	2	3.50	1152/1276	3.50	4.62	4.33	4.14	3.50
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	1	0	2	0	3	3.67	1122/1273	3.67	4.55	4.38	4.18	3.67
4. Were special techniques successful	9	4	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/922	****	4.27	4.02	3.87	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	FREN 103 01
Title:	Int Rev Elem French
Instructor:	El Omari,Samir

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	19
Questionnaires:	15

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	14	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/198	****	4.40	4.16	3.90	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/208	****	4.80	4.27	4.23	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	14	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/194	****	5.00	4.56	4.54	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/194	****	4.60	4.37	4.30	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	14	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/176	****	****	4.23	4.19	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/76	****	4.63	4.51	4.44	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/74	****	4.86	4.31	4.43	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/66	****	4.70	4.27	4.15	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/76	****	4.71	4.27	4.21	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/73	****	3.74	3.94	3.82	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/42	****	****	4.00	4.08	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	14	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/41	****	****	4.06	4.10	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/30	****	****	4.74	5.00	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	14	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/32	****	****	4.20	4.09	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/29	****	****	4.34	4.87	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/43	****	****	4.43	4.68	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/31	****	****	4.53	4.51	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	14	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/36	****	****	4.43	4.33	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	FREN 103 01
Title:	Int Rev Elem French
Instructor:	El Omari,Samir

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	19
Questionnaires:	15

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Self Paced														
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	14	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/21	****	****	4.54	4.63	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	14	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/20	****	****	4.45	4.39	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	2 A 9	Required for Majors	3 Graduate 0 Major 0
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0 B 6		
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	1 C 0	General	8 Under-grad 15 Non-major 15
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	2 D 0		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3 F 0	Electives	3 **** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 0		
			I 0	Other	0
			? 0		

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	FREN 201 01
Title:	Intermediate French I
Instructor:	Wecker, Donna L.

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	25
Questionnaires:	18

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	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	0	0	2	5	11	4.50	636/1528	4.41	4.38	4.31	4.34	4.50
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	6	11	4.56	514/1527	4.48	4.37	4.28	4.32	4.56
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	4	13	4.67	393/1333	4.72	4.55	4.34	4.40	4.67
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	2	5	10	4.47	544/1495	4.33	4.36	4.25	4.28	4.47
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	0	5	12	4.71	205/1439	4.56	4.38	4.11	4.12	4.71
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	3	0	0	0	6	9	4.60	301/1425	4.30	4.23	4.12	4.11	4.60
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	3	14	4.72	220/1508	4.33	4.16	4.18	4.19	4.72
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	18	5.00	1/1526	4.77	4.63	4.66	4.64	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	1	2	6	5	4.07	864/1490	4.03	4.13	4.11	4.11	4.07
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	1	16	4.94	133/1428	4.61	4.50	4.49	4.48	4.94
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	17	5.00	1/1436	4.82	4.82	4.74	4.76	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	2	4	11	4.53	601/1427	4.46	4.39	4.32	4.33	4.53
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	2	1	14	4.71	422/1425	4.55	4.50	4.34	4.37	4.71
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	0	0	0	3	3	10	4.44	395/1291	4.16	4.11	4.05	4.14	4.44
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	3	1	3	4.00	780/1271	4.23	4.36	4.16	4.21	4.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	10	0	0	0	2	0	6	4.50	591/1276	4.60	4.62	4.33	4.37	4.50
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	10	0	0	0	1	0	7	4.75	408/1273	4.39	4.55	4.38	4.43	4.75
4. Were special techniques successful	11	0	0	0	2	2	3	4.14	419/922	4.46	4.27	4.02	4.11	4.14

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	FREN 201 01
Title:	Intermediate French I
Instructor:	Wecker, Donna L.

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	25
Questionnaires:	18

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

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	4	0.00-0.99 3	A 5 Required for Majors 3	Graduate 0	Major 0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99 0	B 3		
56-83	2	2.00-2.99 1	C 6 General 9	Under-grad 18	Non-major 18
84-150	3	3.00-3.49 4	D 0		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 0	F 0 Electives 1 P 0 I 0 Other 1 ? 3	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	FREN 201 02
Title:	Intermediate French I
Instructor:	Wecker, Donna L.

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	24
Questionnaires:	18

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	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	0	0	0	4	14	4.78	279/1528	4.41	4.38	4.31	4.34	4.78
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	5	11	4.50	575/1527	4.48	4.37	4.28	4.32	4.50
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	5	12	4.61	447/1333	4.72	4.55	4.34	4.40	4.61
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	2	1	2	10	4.33	746/1495	4.33	4.36	4.25	4.28	4.33
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	3	0	0	1	2	11	4.71	197/1439	4.56	4.38	4.11	4.12	4.71
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	3	0	0	2	2	11	4.60	301/1425	4.30	4.23	4.12	4.11	4.60
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	6	12	4.67	284/1508	4.33	4.16	4.18	4.19	4.67
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	2	16	4.89	601/1526	4.77	4.63	4.66	4.64	4.89
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	2	7	5	4.21	722/1490	4.03	4.13	4.11	4.11	4.21
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	5	12	4.61	718/1428	4.61	4.50	4.49	4.48	4.61
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	3	14	4.82	774/1436	4.82	4.82	4.74	4.76	4.82
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	2	6	9	4.41	757/1427	4.46	4.39	4.32	4.33	4.41
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	3	13	4.61	542/1425	4.55	4.50	4.34	4.37	4.61
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	3	0	2	4	9	3.89	849/1291	4.16	4.11	4.05	4.14	3.89
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	11	0	1	0	1	1	4	4.00	780/1271	4.23	4.36	4.16	4.21	4.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	11	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	246/1276	4.60	4.62	4.33	4.37	4.86
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	11	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1273	4.39	4.55	4.38	4.43	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	11	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	141/922	4.46	4.27	4.02	4.11	4.71

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	FREN 201 02
Title:	Intermediate French I
Instructor:	Wecker, Donna L.

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	24
Questionnaires:	18

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/198	****	4.40	4.16	4.41	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/208	****	4.80	4.27	4.30	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/194	****	5.00	4.56	4.57	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/194	****	4.60	4.37	4.43	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/176	****	****	4.23	4.18	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/76	****	4.63	4.51	4.17	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/74	****	4.86	4.31	3.91	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/66	****	4.70	4.27	3.85	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/76	****	4.71	4.27	4.15	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/73	****	3.74	3.94	3.95	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/42	****	****	4.00	3.68	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/41	****	****	4.06	3.81	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/30	****	****	4.74	4.50	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/32	****	****	4.20	4.32	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/29	****	****	4.34	4.11	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/43	****	****	4.43	3.95	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/31	****	****	4.53	4.00	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/36	****	****	4.43	3.75	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	FREN 201 02
Title:	Intermediate French I
Instructor:	Wecker, Donna L.

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	24
Questionnaires:	18

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Self Paced														
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/21	****	****	4.54	3.63	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/20	****	****	4.45	3.77	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	A	7	Required for Majors	6	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	6						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	2	C	2	General	9	Under-grad	18	Non-major	18
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	1	D	1						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	8	F	0	Electives	0	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	1				
				?	2						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	FREN 201 03
Title:	Intermediate French I
Instructor:	Gueye,Sokhna Fa

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	25
Questionnaires:	16

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	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	0	3	1	2	10	4.19	994/1528	4.41	4.38	4.31	4.34	4.19
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	2	11	4.44	688/1527	4.48	4.37	4.28	4.32	4.44
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	1	0	2	12	4.67	393/1333	4.72	4.55	4.34	4.40	4.67
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	2	1	2	0	2	8	4.08	1015/1495	4.33	4.36	4.25	4.28	4.08
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	5	0	0	3	0	8	4.45	433/1439	4.56	4.38	4.11	4.12	4.45
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	2	1	2	2	8	3.87	1008/1425	4.30	4.23	4.12	4.11	3.87
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	3	2	1	0	10	3.75	1231/1508	4.33	4.16	4.18	4.19	3.75
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	9	7	4.44	1132/1526	4.77	4.63	4.66	4.64	4.44
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	2	1	3	5	4.00	911/1490	4.03	4.13	4.11	4.11	4.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	2	2	1	8	4.15	1145/1428	4.61	4.50	4.49	4.48	4.15
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	2	2	9	4.54	1162/1436	4.82	4.82	4.74	4.76	4.54
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	1	3	2	8	4.21	950/1427	4.46	4.39	4.32	4.33	4.21
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	1	0	1	1	10	4.46	726/1425	4.55	4.50	4.34	4.37	4.46
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	2	0	0	2	1	7	4.50	327/1291	4.16	4.11	4.05	4.14	4.50
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	11	0	1	0	0	0	4	4.20	669/1271	4.23	4.36	4.16	4.21	4.20
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	11	0	1	0	0	0	4	4.20	837/1276	4.60	4.62	4.33	4.37	4.20
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	11	0	1	0	1	0	3	3.80	1059/1273	4.39	4.55	4.38	4.43	3.80
4. Were special techniques successful	11	1	0	1	0	0	3	4.25	360/922	4.46	4.27	4.02	4.11	4.25

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	FREN 201 03
Title:	Intermediate French I
Instructor:	Gueye,Sokhna Fa

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	25
Questionnaires:	16

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

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	1	0.00-0.99 0	A 6 Required for Majors	0	Graduate 0 Major 1
28-55	1	1.00-1.99 0	B 5		
56-83	5	2.00-2.99 1	C 0	12	Under-grad 16 Non-major 15
84-150	0	3.00-3.49 3	D 0		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 3	F 0 Electives	0	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 0		
			I 0 Other	1	
			? 4		

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	FREN 201 04
Title:	Intermediate French I
Instructor:	Gueye,Sokhna Fa

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	23
Questionnaires:	13

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	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	1	0	0	0	3	4	5	4.17	1015/1528	4.41	4.38	4.31	4.34	4.17
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	5	6	4.42	720/1527	4.48	4.37	4.28	4.32	4.42
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	132/1333	4.72	4.55	4.34	4.40	4.92
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	1	0	0	2	2	7	4.45	576/1495	4.33	4.36	4.25	4.28	4.45
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	4	0	0	2	1	5	4.38	530/1439	4.56	4.38	4.11	4.12	4.38
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	3	0	0	3	1	4	4.13	806/1425	4.30	4.23	4.12	4.11	4.13
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	1	0	0	4	1	6	4.18	870/1508	4.33	4.16	4.18	4.19	4.18
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	3	9	4.75	811/1526	4.77	4.63	4.66	4.64	4.75
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	4	5	2	3.82	1110/1490	4.03	4.13	4.11	4.11	3.82
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	3	9	4.75	478/1428	4.61	4.50	4.49	4.48	4.75
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	464/1436	4.82	4.82	4.74	4.76	4.92
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	4	8	4.67	420/1427	4.46	4.39	4.32	4.33	4.67
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	2	3	7	4.42	800/1425	4.55	4.50	4.34	4.37	4.42
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	1	2	0	1	2	5	3.80	902/1291	4.16	4.11	4.05	4.14	3.80
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	280/1271	4.23	4.36	4.16	4.21	4.71
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	246/1276	4.60	4.62	4.33	4.37	4.86
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	1	0	1	1	4	4.00	947/1273	4.39	4.55	4.38	4.43	4.00
4. Were special techniques successful	6	3	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	124/922	4.46	4.27	4.02	4.11	4.75

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	FREN 201 04
Title:	Intermediate French I
Instructor:	Gueye,Sokhna Fa

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	23
Questionnaires:	13

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

Frequency Distribution

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

**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	FREN 202 01
Title:	Intermediate French II
Instructor:	Fatih,Zakaria

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	17
Questionnaires:	16

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	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	1	0	2	1	3	2	7	3.73	1317/1528	3.73	4.38	4.31	4.34	3.73
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	4	2	4	5	3.67	1352/1527	3.67	4.37	4.28	4.32	3.67
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	1	2	4	8	4.27	823/1333	4.27	4.55	4.34	4.40	4.27
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	4	1	0	2	2	6	4.09	1006/1495	4.09	4.36	4.25	4.28	4.09
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	2	4	2	7	3.93	929/1439	3.93	4.38	4.11	4.12	3.93
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	6	0	1	3	3	2	3.67	1139/1425	3.67	4.23	4.12	4.11	3.67
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	2	3	5	4	1	2.93	1439/1508	2.93	4.16	4.18	4.19	2.93
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	1	0	0	0	10	4	4.29	1257/1526	4.29	4.63	4.66	4.64	4.29
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	1	0	2	2	7	2	3.69	1185/1490	3.69	4.13	4.11	4.11	3.69
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	1	2	3	6	3	3.53	1358/1428	3.53	4.50	4.49	4.48	3.53
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	2	2	11	4.60	1114/1436	4.60	4.82	4.74	4.76	4.60
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	2	3	3	7	4.00	1080/1427	4.00	4.39	4.32	4.33	4.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	1	0	2	1	3	8	4.21	958/1425	4.21	4.50	4.34	4.37	4.21
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	1	0	2	3	5	4	3.79	916/1291	3.79	4.11	4.05	4.14	3.79
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	2	3	2	4.00	780/1271	4.00	4.36	4.16	4.21	4.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	9	0	0	0	1	1	5	4.57	531/1276	4.57	4.62	4.33	4.37	4.57
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	0	0	1	1	5	4.57	584/1273	4.57	4.55	4.38	4.43	4.57
4. Were special techniques successful	9	2	0	0	2	2	1	3.80	596/922	3.80	4.27	4.02	4.11	3.80

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	FREN 202 01
Title:	Intermediate French II
Instructor:	Fatih,Zakaria

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	17
Questionnaires:	16

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	15	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/208	****	4.80	4.27	4.30	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	15	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/42	****	****	4.00	3.68	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	15	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/41	****	****	4.06	3.81	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	15	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/43	****	****	4.43	3.95	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	1 A 4	Required for Majors	8 Graduate 0 Major 2
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0 B 8		
56-83	5	2.00-2.99	2 C 2	General	2 Under-grad 16 Non-major 14
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	3 D 0		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	0 F 0	Electives	1 **** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			0 P 0		
			0 I 0	Other	3
			2 ? 2		

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	FREN 301 01
Title:	Advanced French I
Instructor:	Deverneil,Marie

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	18
Questionnaires:	14

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	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	0	0	2	5	7	4.36	815/1528	4.36	4.38	4.31	4.34	4.36
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	5	8	4.50	575/1527	4.50	4.37	4.28	4.27	4.50
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	14	5.00	1/1333	5.00	4.55	4.34	4.34	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	4	10	4.71	267/1495	4.71	4.36	4.25	4.28	4.71
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	1	0	0	3	0	9	4.50	367/1439	4.50	4.38	4.11	4.13	4.50
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	2	3	8	4.46	442/1425	4.46	4.23	4.12	4.17	4.46
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	2	5	6	4.31	722/1508	4.31	4.16	4.18	4.17	4.31
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	13	5.00	1/1526	5.00	4.63	4.66	4.68	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	1	0	0	6	7	4.29	639/1490	4.29	4.13	4.11	4.11	4.29
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	4	9	4.57	770/1428	4.57	4.50	4.49	4.48	4.57
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	0	13	4.86	677/1436	4.86	4.82	4.74	4.74	4.86
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	6	8	4.57	541/1427	4.57	4.39	4.32	4.31	4.57
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	3	11	4.79	306/1425	4.79	4.50	4.34	4.34	4.79
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	1	0	0	2	0	11	4.69	181/1291	4.69	4.11	4.05	4.09	4.69
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	3	8	4.73	272/1271	4.73	4.36	4.16	4.19	4.73
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	1	3	7	4.55	557/1276	4.55	4.62	4.33	4.37	4.55
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1273	5.00	4.55	4.38	4.40	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	3	2	1	0	0	1	7	4.44	250/922	4.44	4.27	4.02	4.02	4.44

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section: FREN 301 01	Term - Fall 2010	Enrollment: 18
Title: Advanced French I		Questionnaires: 14
Instructor: Deverneil,Marie		

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Field Work														
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	13	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/32	****	****	4.20	3.38	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	1	A	8	Required for Majors	9	Graduate	0	Major	2
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	0	B	6						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	2	C	0	General	1	Under-grad	14	Non-major	12
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	3	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						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	FREN 302 01
Title:	Advanced French II
Instructor:	Bazgan,Nicoleta

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	11
Questionnaires:	7

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	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	0	0	2	4	4.14	1036/1528	4.14	4.38	4.31	4.34	4.14
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	161/1527	4.86	4.37	4.28	4.27	4.86
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	192/1333	4.86	4.55	4.34	4.34	4.86
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	139/1495	4.86	4.36	4.25	4.28	4.86
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	197/1439	4.71	4.38	4.11	4.13	4.71
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	111/1425	4.86	4.23	4.12	4.17	4.86
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1508	5.00	4.16	4.18	4.17	5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	1	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1526	5.00	4.63	4.66	4.68	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	3	3	4.50	344/1490	4.50	4.13	4.11	4.11	4.50
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	637/1428	4.67	4.50	4.49	4.48	4.67
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	1043/1436	4.67	4.82	4.74	4.74	4.67
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	420/1427	4.67	4.39	4.32	4.31	4.67
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	3	3	4.50	667/1425	4.50	4.50	4.34	4.34	4.50
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	0	1	2	3	4.33	480/1291	4.33	4.11	4.05	4.09	4.33
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	780/1271	4.00	4.36	4.16	4.19	4.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	591/1276	4.50	4.62	4.33	4.37	4.50
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	637/1273	4.50	4.55	4.38	4.40	4.50
4. Were special techniques successful	5	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	218/922	4.50	4.27	4.02	4.02	4.50

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	FREN 302 01
Title:	Advanced French II
Instructor:	Bazgan,Nicoleta

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	11
Questionnaires:	7

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

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99 0	A 4 Required for Majors	6 Graduate	0 Major
28-55	1	1.00-1.99 0	B 1		
56-83	2	2.00-2.99 0	C 2 General	0	Under-grad 7 Non-major
84-150	1	3.00-3.49 2	D 0		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 4	F 0 Electives	0	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 0		
			I 0 Other	0	
			? 0		

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	FREN 315 01
Title:	French Phonetics
Instructor:	Ka,Omar

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	16
Questionnaires:	15

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	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	1	0	0	0	2	1	11	4.64	463/1528	4.64	4.38	4.31	4.34	4.64
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	3	10	4.64	396/1527	4.64	4.37	4.28	4.27	4.64
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	2	11	4.71	339/1333	4.71	4.55	4.34	4.34	4.71
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	4	1	0	0	4	5	4.20	903/1495	4.20	4.36	4.25	4.28	4.20
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	1	0	0	0	6	7	4.54	344/1439	4.54	4.38	4.11	4.13	4.54
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	3	0	0	3	1	7	4.36	553/1425	4.36	4.23	4.12	4.17	4.36
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	1	0	2	11	4.64	306/1508	4.64	4.16	4.18	4.17	4.64
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	10	4	4.29	1257/1526	4.29	4.63	4.66	4.68	4.29
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	1	4	6	4.45	419/1490	4.45	4.13	4.11	4.11	4.45
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	3	11	4.79	422/1428	4.79	4.50	4.49	4.48	4.79
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	14	5.00	1/1436	5.00	4.82	4.74	4.74	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	2	2	10	4.57	541/1427	4.57	4.39	4.32	4.31	4.57
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	1	12	4.79	306/1425	4.79	4.50	4.34	4.34	4.79
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	6	2	0	0	1	5	3.88	855/1291	3.88	4.11	4.05	4.09	3.88
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	152/1271	4.89	4.36	4.16	4.19	4.89
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1276	5.00	4.62	4.33	4.37	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	257/1273	4.89	4.55	4.38	4.40	4.89
4. Were special techniques successful	6	7	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/922	****	4.27	4.02	4.02	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	FREN 315 01
Title:	French Phonetics
Instructor:	Ka,Omar

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	16
Questionnaires:	15

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

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	1	A	7	Required for Majors	9	Graduate	0	Major	7
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	2						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	0	C	4	General	0	Under-grad	15	Non-major	8
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	3	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	2				
				?	2						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	FREN 330 01
Title:	Interconnections: Ideas
Instructor:	Fatih, Zakaria

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	9
Questionnaires:	6

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	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	0	0	0	3	3	4.50	636/1528	4.50	4.38	4.31	4.34	4.50
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	2	2	4.00	1113/1527	4.00	4.37	4.28	4.27	4.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	564/1333	4.50	4.55	4.34	4.34	4.50
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	0	0	1	4	4.17	942/1495	4.17	4.36	4.25	4.28	4.17
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	122/1439	4.83	4.38	4.11	4.13	4.83
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	0	2	3	4.17	766/1425	4.17	4.23	4.12	4.17	4.17
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	0	1	4	4.33	681/1508	4.33	4.16	4.18	4.17	4.33
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	5	1	4.17	1356/1526	4.17	4.63	4.66	4.68	4.17
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	344/1490	4.50	4.13	4.11	4.11	4.50
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1428	5.00	4.50	4.49	4.48	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1436	5.00	4.82	4.74	4.74	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	202/1427	4.83	4.39	4.32	4.31	4.83
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	475/1425	4.67	4.50	4.34	4.34	4.67
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	2	1	0	0	2	1	3.50	1061/1291	3.50	4.11	4.05	4.09	3.50
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	3	2	4.17	701/1271	4.17	4.36	4.16	4.19	4.17
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	268/1276	4.83	4.62	4.33	4.37	4.83
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1273	5.00	4.55	4.38	4.40	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	0	4	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	719/922	3.50	4.27	4.02	4.02	3.50

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section: FREN 330 01	Term - Fall 2010	Enrollment: 9
Title: Interconnections: Ideas		Questionnaires: 6
Instructor: Fatih, Zakaria		

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

Frequency Distribution

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

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	FREN 340 01
Title:	Interconnections: Social
Instructor:	Provencher,Deni

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	18
Questionnaires:	15

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	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	1	0	0	0	0	3	11	4.79	265/1528	4.79	4.38	4.31	4.34	4.79
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	3	11	4.79	227/1527	4.79	4.37	4.28	4.27	4.79
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	2	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	147/1333	4.91	4.55	4.34	4.34	4.91
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	1	13	4.93	81/1495	4.93	4.36	4.25	4.28	4.93
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	2	2	10	4.57	314/1439	4.57	4.38	4.11	4.13	4.57
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	3	10	4.64	266/1425	4.64	4.23	4.12	4.17	4.64
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	1	1	12	4.79	163/1508	4.79	4.16	4.18	4.17	4.79
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	14	5.00	1/1526	5.00	4.63	4.66	4.68	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	1	1	0	1	1	8	4.36	542/1490	4.36	4.13	4.11	4.11	4.36
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	0	2	11	4.85	319/1428	4.85	4.50	4.49	4.48	4.85
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	1	12	4.92	413/1436	4.92	4.82	4.74	4.74	4.92
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	0	0	1	2	8	4.64	463/1427	4.64	4.39	4.32	4.31	4.64
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	1	1	11	4.77	335/1425	4.77	4.50	4.34	4.34	4.77
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	1	1	0	0	3	7	4.36	456/1291	4.36	4.11	4.05	4.09	4.36
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	159/1271	4.88	4.36	4.16	4.19	4.88
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	223/1276	4.88	4.62	4.33	4.37	4.88
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	268/1273	4.88	4.55	4.38	4.40	4.88
4. Were special techniques successful	7	1	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	141/922	4.71	4.27	4.02	4.02	4.71

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section: FREN 340 01	Term - Fall 2010	Enrollment: 18
Title: Interconnections: Social		Questionnaires: 15
Instructor: Provencher,Deni		

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

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	10	Required for Majors	9	Graduate	0	Major	5
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	3						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	1	C	0	General	1	Under-grad	15	Non-major	10
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	3	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	1				
				?	1						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	FREN 410 01
Title:	Studies French Lang Ling
Instructor:	McCray,Stanley

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	14
Questionnaires:	9

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	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	0	1	0	3	5	4.33	835/1528	4.33	4.38	4.31	4.39	4.33
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	2	5	4.33	818/1527	4.33	4.37	4.28	4.30	4.33
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	1	0	1	4	4.33	769/1333	4.33	4.55	4.34	4.37	4.33
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	0	0	2	6	4.33	746/1495	4.33	4.36	4.25	4.33	4.33
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	1	0	2	5	4.00	851/1439	4.00	4.38	4.11	4.20	4.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	1	2	5	4.11	816/1425	4.11	4.23	4.12	4.26	4.11
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	3	0	5	4.00	1050/1508	4.00	4.16	4.18	4.24	4.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	4	5	4.56	1019/1526	4.56	4.63	4.66	4.71	4.56
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	1	0	0	2	5	4.25	675/1490	4.25	4.13	4.11	4.19	4.25
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	1	0	1	6	4.50	854/1428	4.50	4.50	4.49	4.54	4.50
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	580/1436	4.89	4.82	4.74	4.75	4.89
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	0	8	4.78	270/1427	4.78	4.39	4.32	4.37	4.78
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	0	0	8	4.56	611/1425	4.56	4.50	4.34	4.37	4.56
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	7	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/1291	****	4.11	4.05	4.10	****
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	365/1271	4.60	4.36	4.16	4.33	4.60
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	302/1276	4.80	4.62	4.33	4.49	4.80
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1273	5.00	4.55	4.38	4.55	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	4	2	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	316/922	4.33	4.27	4.02	4.23	4.33

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	FREN 410 01
Title:	Studies French Lang Ling
Instructor:	McCray,Stanley

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	14
Questionnaires:	9

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/76	****	4.63	4.51	4.83	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/74	****	4.86	4.31	4.42	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/66	****	4.70	4.27	4.26	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/76	****	4.71	4.27	4.42	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	8	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/73	****	3.74	3.94	4.23	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	8	Required for Majors	7	Graduate	0	Major	3
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	0						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	1	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	9	Non-major	6
84-150	2	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	0				
				?	1						