

Course-Section: WOL 101 0101  
 Title ELEMENTARY WOLOF I  
 Instructor: MBAYE, ABDOULAY  
 Enrollment: 9  
 Questionnaires: 8

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2005

Page 1685  
 JAN 21, 2006  
 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	4	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1674	5.00	4.23	4.27	4.07	5.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	4	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	578/1674	4.50	4.26	4.23	4.16	4.50	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	4	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1423	5.00	4.36	4.27	4.16	5.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	4	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	222/1609	4.75	4.23	4.22	4.05	4.75	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	4	1	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1585	5.00	4.04	3.96	3.88	5.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1535	5.00	4.08	4.08	3.89	5.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	4	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	231/1651	4.75	4.20	4.18	4.10	4.75	
8. How many times was class cancelled	4	0	0	0	0	0	3	1	4.25	1420/1673	4.25	4.65	4.69	4.67	4.25
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1656	5.00	4.06	4.07	3.96	5.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1586	5.00	4.43	4.43	4.37	5.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1585	5.00	4.72	4.69	4.60	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1582	5.00	4.30	4.26	4.17	5.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1575	5.00	4.32	4.27	4.17	5.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	1	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	426/1380	4.33	3.94	3.94	3.78	4.33	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1520	5.00	4.14	4.01	3.76	5.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1515	5.00	4.37	4.24	3.97	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1511	5.00	4.37	4.27	4.00	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	5	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/ 994	5.00	3.97	3.94	3.73	5.00	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	5	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 265	****	4.06	4.23	3.97	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 278	****	4.21	4.19	3.97	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 260	****	4.43	4.46	4.41	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 259	****	4.21	4.33	4.19	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 233	****	4.36	4.20	4.00	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	4	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/ 103	5.00	4.39	4.41	4.33	5.00	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	4	1	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/ 101	5.00	4.33	4.48	4.18	5.00	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	4	2	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 95	5.00	4.15	4.31	3.99	5.00	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/ 99	5.00	4.36	4.39	4.10	5.00	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	4	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/ 97	5.00	3.76	4.14	3.69	5.00	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 76	****	3.36	3.98	3.32	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 77	****	3.65	3.93	3.42	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 53	****	4.19	4.45	4.34	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 48	****	3.86	4.12	4.00	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 49	****	3.74	4.27	4.30	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 61	5.00	4.03	4.09	3.87	5.00	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	6	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 52	5.00	4.21	4.26	3.91	5.00	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	6	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 50	5.00	4.23	4.44	4.39	5.00	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	6	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 35	5.00	4.22	4.36	3.92	5.00	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	6	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 31	5.00	4.25	4.34	3.88	5.00	

Course-Section: WOL 101 0101  
 Title ELEMENTARY WOLOF I  
 Instructor: MBAYE, ABDOULAY  
 Enrollment: 9  
 Questionnaires: 8

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2005

Page 1685  
 JAN 21, 2006  
 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	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	2	Under-grad	8	Non-major	5
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	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	0				
				?	0						

Course-Section: WOL 201 0101  
 Title INTERMEDIATE WOLOF I  
 Instructor: MBAYE, ABDOULAY (Instr. A)  
 Enrollment: 1  
 Questionnaires: 1

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2005

Page 1686  
 JAN 21, 2006  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1196/1674	4.00	4.23	4.27	4.32	4.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1674	5.00	4.26	4.23	4.26	5.00	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1423	5.00	4.36	4.27	4.36	5.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1609	5.00	4.23	4.22	4.23	5.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	769/1585	4.00	4.04	3.96	3.91	4.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	870/1535	4.00	4.08	4.08	4.03	4.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1651	5.00	4.20	4.18	4.20	5.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	1663/1673	3.00	4.65	4.69	4.67	3.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	955/1656	2.00	4.06	4.07	4.10	2.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1300/1586	4.00	4.43	4.43	4.48	4.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1585	5.00	4.72	4.69	4.76	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1582	5.00	4.30	4.26	4.35	5.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1575	5.00	4.32	4.27	4.39	5.00	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 61	5.00	4.03	4.09	4.23	5.00	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 52	5.00	4.21	4.26	4.53	5.00	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 50	5.00	4.23	4.44	4.42	5.00	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 35	5.00	4.22	4.36	4.63	5.00	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: WOL 201 0101  
 Title INTERMEDIATE WOLOF I  
 Instructor: (Instr. C)  
 Enrollment: 1  
 Questionnaires: 1

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2005

Page 1687  
 JAN 21, 2006  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1196/1674	4.00	4.23	4.27	4.32	4.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1674	5.00	4.26	4.23	4.26	5.00	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1423	5.00	4.36	4.27	4.36	5.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1609	5.00	4.23	4.22	4.23	5.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	769/1585	4.00	4.04	3.96	3.91	4.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	870/1535	4.00	4.08	4.08	4.03	4.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1651	5.00	4.20	4.18	4.20	5.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	1663/1673	3.00	4.65	4.69	4.67	3.00	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 61	5.00	4.03	4.09	4.23	5.00	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 52	5.00	4.21	4.26	4.53	5.00	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 50	5.00	4.23	4.44	4.42	5.00	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 35	5.00	4.22	4.36	4.63	5.00	

Frequency Distribution

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

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

Course-Section: WOL 201 0101  
 Title INTERMEDIATE WOLOF I  
 Instructor: (Instr. D)  
 Enrollment: 1  
 Questionnaires: 1

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2005

Page 1688  
 JAN 21, 2006  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1196/1674	4.00	4.23	4.27	4.32	4.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1674	5.00	4.26	4.23	4.26	5.00	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1423	5.00	4.36	4.27	4.36	5.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1609	5.00	4.23	4.22	4.23	5.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	769/1585	4.00	4.04	3.96	3.91	4.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	870/1535	4.00	4.08	4.08	4.03	4.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1651	5.00	4.20	4.18	4.20	5.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	1663/1673	3.00	4.65	4.69	4.67	3.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	1651/1656	2.00	4.06	4.07	4.10	2.00	

Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 61	5.00	4.03	4.09	4.23	5.00	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 52	5.00	4.21	4.26	4.53	5.00	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 50	5.00	4.23	4.44	4.42	5.00	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 35	5.00	4.22	4.36	4.63	5.00	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors		
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 1	Required for Majors 0	Graduate 1	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 0	Non-major 1
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D 0			
Grad.	1	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			