

Course Section: WOL 101 0101
 Title ELEMENTARY WOLOF I
 Instructor: MBAYE, ABDOULAY
 Enrollment: 7
 Questionnaires: 7

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2006

Page 1671
 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	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	389/1669	4.67	4.33	4.23	4.02	4.67	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	359/1666	4.67	4.28	4.19	4.11	4.67	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	197/1421	4.83	4.36	4.24	4.11	4.83	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	0	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	394/1617	4.60	4.27	4.15	3.99	4.60	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	2	0	4	4.33	492/1555	4.33	4.17	4.00	3.92	4.33	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	1	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	516/1543	4.40	4.19	4.06	3.86	4.40	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	1	1	0	4	4.17	948/1647	4.17	4.18	4.12	4.06	4.17	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	844/1668	4.83	4.60	4.67	4.62	4.83	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	239/1605	4.67	4.13	4.07	3.96	4.67	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	2	1	3	4.17	1136/1514	4.17	4.39	4.39	4.32	4.17	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	3	3	4.50	1193/1551	4.50	4.72	4.66	4.55	4.50	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	556/1503	4.50	4.31	4.24	4.17	4.50	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	249/1506	4.83	4.40	4.26	4.17	4.83	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	1	1	0	0	2	1	3.50	939/1311	3.50	3.78	3.85	3.68	3.50	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	340/1490	4.67	4.26	4.05	3.85	4.67	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	486/1502	4.67	4.54	4.26	4.06	4.67	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	532/1489	4.67	4.43	4.29	4.07	4.67	
4. Were special techniques successful	4	1	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	235/1006	4.50	4.14	4.00	3.81	4.50	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course Section: WOL 201 0101
 Title INTERMEDIATE WOLOF I
 Instructor: KA, OMAR
 Enrollment: 3
 Questionnaires: 3

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2006

Page 1672
 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	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1669	5.00	4.33	4.23	4.34	5.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1666	5.00	4.28	4.19	4.29	5.00	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1421	5.00	4.36	4.24	4.35	5.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1617	5.00	4.27	4.15	4.24	5.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1555	5.00	4.17	4.00	3.96	5.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1543	5.00	4.19	4.06	4.10	5.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1647	5.00	4.18	4.12	4.19	5.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	1068/1668	4.67	4.60	4.67	4.59	4.67	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1605	5.00	4.13	4.07	4.15	5.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1514	5.00	4.39	4.39	4.39	5.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	2	0	0	0	1	2.33	1551/1551	2.33	4.72	4.66	4.72	2.33	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1503	5.00	4.31	4.24	4.29	5.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1506	5.00	4.40	4.26	4.33	5.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1311	5.00	3.78	3.85	3.96	5.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1490	5.00	4.26	4.05	4.11	5.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1502	5.00	4.54	4.26	4.31	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1489	5.00	4.43	4.29	4.36	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1006	5.00	4.14	4.00	3.99	5.00	

Frequency Distribution

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

- Means there are not enough responses to be significant