Penn

University of Pennsylvania - Instructor and Course Evaluation Report

Term	Summer, 2013 (2013B)	Enrollment	6	Sc	hool	ARTS	& SCIEN	ICES			
Activity Type	SEM	Eligible	6	Div	vision	SUMM	ER SES	SIONS			
Cross Listed Sections	-	Responses	s 5	De	epartment	ROMA	NCE LA	NGUAGE	S		
		Response	Rate 83	% Su	ıbject	FREN	СН				
			Ave	erage Ratings	S			Instructo		ıg	Responses
Question and Se	cale	Instru	ictor Sectio	n Cours	е -	0	1	2	3	4	
1 Overall quality of Scale: 0 to 4: Poo	of the instructor. br, Fair, Good, Very good, Excellent	4.00	4.00	4.00	-	0% 0	0% 0	0% 0	0% 0	100% 5	5
2 Overall quality of Scale: 0 to 4: Poo	of the course. or, Fair, Good, Very good, Excellent	3.40	3.40	3.40	-	0% 0	0% 0	20% 1	20% 1	60% 3	5
	learly presented and explained course mat ongly disagree, Disagree, Neither agree or d agree		3.67	3.67	-	0% 0	0% 0	0% 0	33% 1	67% 2	3
	ffectively stimulated my interest. ongly disagree, Disagree, Neither agree nor o agree	3.67 lisagree,	3.67	3.67	-	0% 0	0% 0	0% 0	33% 1	67% 2	3
time.	was appropriately accessible outside of ongly disagree, Disagree, Neither agree nor of agree		3.67	3.67	-	0% 0	0% 0	0% 0	33% 1	67% 2	3
writing, speakin	ongly disagree, Disagree, Neither agree nor o		4.00	4.00	-	0% 0	0% 0	0% 0	0% 0	100% 3	3
reinforcement o	rcises and/or compositions provided v f classroom work. ongly disagree, Disagree, Neither agree nor a agree		3.67	3.67	-	0% 0	0% 0	0% 0	33% 1	67% 2	3
language skills.	nd/or cultural materials helped me to improportion of the second se	-	3.67	3.67	-	0% 0	0% 0	0% 0	33% 1	67% 2	3
language enviro	ongly disagree, Disagree, Neither agree nor o		3.67	3.67	-	0% 0	0% 0	0% 0	33% 1	67% 2	3
											_



University of Pennsylvania · Instructor and Course Evaluation Report

FREN140910, INTERMEDIATE FRENCH II, Summer, 2013

		Average	Ratings				nstructo tingBe	r Only est Ratin	g	Responses
Question and Scale	Instructor	Section	Course	-	0	1	2	3	4	
11 This course helped me to understand not only language, but also the culture associated with that language. Scale: 0 to 4: Strongly disagree, Disagree, Neither agree nor disagree, Agree, Strongly Agree	3.67	3.67	3.67	-	0% 0	0% 0	0% 0	33% 1	67% 2	3
12 As a result of taking this course, I am excited to continue learning this language. Scale: 0 to 4: Strongly disagree, Disagree, Neither agree nor disagree, Agree, Strongly agree	3.33	3.33	3.33	-	0% 0	0% 0	0% 0	67% 2	33% 1	3
13 How many hours did you spend out of class per week on this course? Scale: 0 to 4: 2 or less, 3-4, 5-6, 7-8, more than 8	2.00	2.00	2.00	-	33% 1	0% 0	33% 1	0% 0	33% 1	3
14 To your knowledge, has there been cheating in this course? Scale: 0 to 1: Yes, No	1.00	-	-	-	0% 0	100% 3	-	-	-	3

REN230403, RECITATION, Fall, 2011

University of Pennsylvania · Instructor and Course Evaluation Report

Terr	n	Fall, 2011 (2011C)	Enrollment	7	Sch	ool	ARTS		CES			
	vity Type	REC	Eligible	7	Divis		-					
	ss Listed Sections	CINE245403	Responses	7	Dep	artment	ROMA		GUAGE	S		
			Response Rate	100	% Sub	ject	FRENC	H				
				Ave	rage Ratings			This I Worst Ra	Instructo		ıg	Responses
	Question and Sca	le	Instructor	Section	Course	-	0	1	2	3	4	
1	Overall quality of the Scale: 0 to 4: P, F, C		3.14	3.14	2.54	-	0% 0	0% 0	0% 0	86% 6	14% 1	7
2	Overall quality of the Scale: 0 to 4: P, F, C		2.86	2.86	2.57	-	0% 0	0% 0	14% 1	86% 6	0% 0	7
3	Instructor's ability Scale: 0 to 4: P, F, 0	to communicate the subject matter. 6, VG, E	3.14	3.14	2.60	-	0% 0	0% 0	14% 1	57% 4	29% 2	7
4	Instructor's ability Scale: 0 to 4: P, F, C	to stimulate student interest. 6, VG, E	3.14	3.14	2.47	-	0% 0	0% 0	0% 0	86% 6	14% 1	7
5	Instructor's acce content and any p Scale: 0 to 4: P, F, G		se 3.43	3.43	3.13	-	0% 0	0% 0	0% 0	57% 4	43% 3	7
6	Value of assigned Scale: 0 to 4: P, F, C		2.43	2.43	2.45	-	0% 0	0% 0	57% 4	43% 3	0% 0	7
7	Amount learned concepts, skills ar Scale: 0 to 4: P, F, G		je, 2.57	2.57	2.68	-	0% 0	0% 0	43% 3	57% 4	0% 0	7
8	Please rate the dif Scale: 0 to 4: Easy	ficulty of the course. 0, 1, 2, 3, Difficult 4	1.57	1.57	1.59	-	0% 0	57% 4	29% 2	14% 1	0% 0	7
9		Nount of work required for this course. Little 0, 1, 2, 3, Very Much 4	1.86	1.86	2.05	-	0% 0	29% 2	57% 4	14% 1	0% 0	7
10	Would you recommendation Scale: 0 to 4: No 0,	nend this course to a major? 1, 2, 3, Strongly 4	3.14	3.14	2.96	-	0% 0	14% 1	14% 1	14% 1	57% 4	7
11	Would you recommendation Scale: 0 to 4: No 0,	nend this course to a non-major? 1, 2, 3, Strongly 4	2.71	2.71	2.68	-	0% 0	14% 1	29% 2	29% 2	29% 2	7
12	To your knowledge Scale: 0 to 1: Y, N	e, has there been cheating in this course?	1.00	-	-	-	0% 0	100% 7	-	-	-	7

Penn

University of Pennsylvania - Instructor and Course Evaluation Report

	EN140910, INTE	RMEDIATE FRENCH II, Summer, 201	1										SWANS	SON, LI	JCY VIKING
Term	1	Summer, 2011 (2011B)	Enr	ollment	9		Sch	nool		ARTS 8		CES			
Activ	vity Type	SEM	Elig	ible	9		Div	rision		SUMME	ER SESS	IONS			
Cros	s Listed Sections	-	Res	sponses	7		De	partme	nt	ROMAN		IGUAGE	S		
			Res	sponse Rate	7	8%	Sul	bject		FRENC	н				
					A١	verage R	Ratings	5				Instructo atingBe	or Only est Rating	g	Responses
	Question and Sca	le		Instructor	Section	on	Course	e ·	-	0	1	2	3	4	
1	Were the goals of Scale: 0 to 4: 0, 1, 2	the course clearly articulated? 2, 3, 4		3.86	3.86	:	3.86		-	0% 0	0% 0	0% 0	14% 1	86% 6	7
				3.71	3.71	:	3.71		-	0% 0	0% 0	0% 0	29% 2	71% 5	7
	Were the readings acquisition? Scale: 0 to 4: 0, 1, 2	s and/or cultural materials useful for langu 2, 3, 4	lage	3.14	3.14	:	3.14		-	0% 0	14% 1	14% 1	14% 1	57% 4	7
		xercises (and compositions, where appropri ment of classroom work? 2, 3, 4	iate)	3.14	3.14	:	3.14		-	0% 0	14% 1	0% 0	43% 3	43% 3	7
	Were the exams method of instruc Scale: 0 to 4: 0, 1, 2		and	3.43	3.43	:	3.43		-	0% 0	0% 0	14% 1	29% 2	57% 4	7
	Were your linguis listening sufficien Scale: 0 to 4: 0, 1, 2		and	3.00	3.00	:	3.00		-	14% 1	0% 0	14% 1	14% 1	57% 4	7
		te the pace of the course? In to slow 0, Too Slow 1, Just right 2, Too fa	st 3,	2.57	2.57	:	2.57		-	0% 0	0% 0	43% 3	57% 4	0% 0	7
	course?	did you spend out of class per week on ess , 3-4, 5-6, 7-8, more than 8	this	2.71	2.71	2	2.71		-	0% 0	14% 1	29% 2	29% 2	29% 2	7
9	Please rate the ov Scale: 0 to 4: 0, 1, 2	erall quality of the course. 2, 3, 4		3.14	3.14	:	3.14		-	14% 1	0% 0	0% 0	29% 2	57% 4	7
10	Was the instructor Scale: 0 to 4: 0, 1, 2	r able to stimulate your interest in the mater 2, 3, 4	ial?	3.71	3.71		3.71		-	0% 0	0% 0	14% 1	0% 0	86% 6	7

Page 4 of 17



University of Pennsylvania · Instructor and Course Evaluation Report

FREN140910, INTERMEDIATE FRENCH II, Summer, 2011

		Average	Ratings			This I Worst Ra	nstructo atingBe		g	Responses
Question and Scale	Instructor	Section	Course	-	0	1	2	3	4	
11 Did the instructor organize appropriate activities in class to encourage the use of oral skills? <i>Scale: 0 to 4: 0, 1, 2, 3, 4</i>	3.57	3.57	3.57	-	0% 0	0% 0	14% 1	14% 1	71% 5	7
12 Was the instructor concerned that students learn the materials? <i>Scale: 0 to 4: 0, 1, 2, 3, 4</i>	3.71	3.71	3.71	-	0% 0	0% 0	14% 1	0% 0	86% 6	7
13 Please evaluate the rapport between the class and the instructor. Scale: 0 to 4: Bad 0, 1, 2, 3, Excellent 4	3.57	3.57	3.57	-	0% 0	0% 0	14% 1	14% 1	71% 5	7
14 Please rate the instructor's attitude towards the course. Scale: 0 to 4: 0, 1, 2, 3, 4	3.71	3.71	3.71	-	0% 0	0% 0	0% 0	29% 2	71% 5	7
15 Please rate the instructor's effectiveness in presenting and explaining course materials. <i>Scale: 0 to 4: 0, 1, 2, 3, 4</i>	3.57	3.57	3.57	-	0% 0	0% 0	0% 0	43% 3	57% 4	7
16 How available was the instructor outside of class? <i>Scale: 0 to 4: 0, 1, 2, 3, 4</i>	3.57	3.57	3.57	-	0% 0	0% 0	14% 1	14% 1	71% 5	7
17 Please rate the fairness of the grading process in the course. Scale: 0 to 4: 0, 1, 2, 3, 4	3.71	3.71	3.71	-	0% 0	0% 0	14% 1	0% 0	86% 6	7
18 Please rate the overall quality of the instructor/teacher in charge of the course. Scale: 0 to 4: 0, 1, 2, 3, 4	3.86	3.86	3.86	-	0% 0	0% 0	0% 0	14% 1	86% 6	7
19 Do you feel that the skills learned in this course would help you survive in a native environment? Scale: 0 to 4: 0, 1, 2, 3, 4	2.57	2.57	2.57	-	14% 1	0% 0	29% 2	29% 2	29% 2	7
20 Please evaluate the overall quality of the teaching assistant/drill instructor in the course. <i>Scale: 0 to 4: 0, 1, 2, 3, 4</i>	3.50	3.50	3.50	-	0% 0	0% 0	0% 0	50% 1	50% 1	2

FREN140910, INTERMEDIATE FRENCH II, Summer, 2011

SWANSON, LUCY VIKING

Comment Suggestion

This course, like all the other courses in French, did little to teach me how speak French. I learned far more from Fluenz, and each semester I lost a little more of my ability to speak. The rules were not reinforced. The gramar was almost and aside. There is a way to teach grammar and culture together, but this was not it. I can scarcely think of a less effective way to teach a language. Luckily we were given specific subjects to learn that we could talk about in a "fluent" way. But, the truth is, I am not even close to being fluent. Granted, I am on the very low end of the fluent spectrum. Still, even the people who were the best students in class were unable to understand most of what was said (despite the outstanding instructor). When we whisper, "What are supposed to be doing?", we try our best to figure it out, but almost everyone, without exception, seems to be confused much of the time, and they just do their best to find clues. The immersion method is not optimal. Reinforcing things in English and speaking mostly in French, ensures that you actually understand the rule. If you never speak English, then you cannot understand, and you are at a deficit from the start. There is so little to build upon that you are always at a loss. I am now happy to be done and will find an alternative way to learn this language that I so much was hoping to master.

I found the class very helpful for learning not just another language, but also the history of French colonies. Highly recommended.

Lucy Swanson was EXCELLENT! She was engaging, helpful, kind, fluent and challenged students with positive energy and appropriate assistance. She was wonderful to be in class with and a natural teacher and leader. The coursework in the workbook was not particularly helpful and finding a physical textbook and new workbook (with correct answers and strong examples) would do a world of difference in the course.

Very good class and very good instructor. For me, a little more emphasis on listening comprehension and pronunciation of the language would have been useful, as this is where I feel my major challenges lie, but this is relatively minor thing.

REN382403, RECITATION, Fall, 2010

University of Pennsylvania · Instructor and Course Evaluation Report

Terr	n	Fall, 2010 (2010C)	Enrollment	14	Scho	ol	ARTS 8		CES			
Acti	vity Type	REC	Eligible	14	Divisi	ion	-					
Cro	ss Listed Sections	CINE382403, COML372403	Responses	14	Depa	irtment	ROMAN		IGUAGE	S		
			Response Rate	100%	subje	ect	FRENC	Н				
				Avera	ge Ratings				Instructo atingB	or Only est Ratin	g	Responses
	Question and Scal	e	Instructor	Section	Course	-	0	1	2	3	4	
1	Overall quality of t Scale: 0 to 4: P, F, G		2.93	2.93	3.36	-	0% 0	14% 2	7% 1	50% 7	29% 4	14
2	Overall quality of t Scale: 0 to 4: P, F, G		2.50	2.50	2.82	-	7% 1	14% 2	7% 1	64% 9	7% 1	14
3	Instructor's ability Scale: 0 to 4: P, F, G	to communicate the subject matter. <i>G, VG, E</i>	2.92	2.92	3.19	-	0% 0	17% 2	17% 2	25% 3	42% 5	12
4	Instructor's ability Scale: 0 to 4: P, F, G	to stimulate student interest. 6, VG, E	3.08	3.08	3.39	-	0% 0	17% 2	0% 0	42% 5	42% 5	12
5	Instructor's acce content and any p Scale: 0 to 4: P, F, G		r se 3.45	3.45	3.42	-	0% 0	0% 0	18% 2	18% 2	64% 7	11
6	Value of assigned Scale: 0 to 4: P, F, G		2.33	2.33	2.63	-	8% 1	17% 2	1 7% 2	50% 6	8% 1	12
7	Amount learned concepts, skills ar Scale: 0 to 4: P, F, G		ge, 2.33	2.33	2.60	-	8% 1	8% 1	25% 3	58% 7	0% 0	12
8	Please rate the dif Scale: 0 to 4: Easy	ficulty of the course. 0, 1, 2, 3, Difficult 4	2.25	2.25	1.99	-	0% 0	8% 1	58% 7	33% 4	0% 0	12
9		ount of work required for this course. Little 0, 1, 2, 3, Very Much 4	2.25	2.25	2.25	-	0% 0	8% 1	58% 7	33% 4	0% 0	12
10	Would you recommoder Scale: 0 to 4: No 0,	nend this course to a major? 1, 2, 3, Strongly 4	3.00	3.00	3.30	-	17% 2	0% 0	0% 0	33% 4	50% 6	12
11	Would you recommoder Scale: 0 to 4: No 0,	nend this course to a non-major? 1, 2, 3, Strongly 4	2.83	2.83	3.21	-	17% 2	0% 0	8% 1	33% 4	42% 5	12
12	To your knowledge Scale: 0 to 1: Y, N	e, has there been cheating in this course?	1.00	-	-	-	0% 0	100% 12	-	-	-	12

SWANSON, LUCY VIKING

Comment Suggestion

Fun class with exposure to "not run-of-the-mill" cinema. One night, 3 hour course would be preferable.

Lucy was a very nice TA, but I found recitations to become very repetitive and unproductive. I believe that this is more a function of the course itself then Lucy's role, but it was something that I thought could be improved for future recitations. I did think grading could have been done more fairly, it seemed as though papers were being graded on a different criteria than was expressed. One consistent thing that posed a problem was that graded papers were not examined for context but merely broken down into individual sentences and then criticized without considering the paper as a whole. Overall, assignment feedback was not very helpful in improving for future assignments or developing the skills that were outlined as part of the course.

Lucy was great! She respected the students and the material and definitely added to the course as a whole. I would prefer more emphasis on lecture and group discussion than on discussion in small groups. Students approach class, especially upper level courses such as this, with a more business-like mentality rather than social. If you want to make the class more casual, then perhaps you could bring in food each recitation (or ask students to do so). A persistent problem was getting the class to speak, especially during lecture. Part of this was because we didn't want to give up the questions we had to post on blackboard the next day. Possible solutions to this are to simply call on people for their opinion rather than wait for someone to speak up, as the diffusion of responsibility in a large group is very powerful. Another more subtle technique that instructors develop over time is knowing how long to wait after asking a question. Waiting too long lets the students get comfortable with the uncomfortable silence, and not waiting at all does not give students the opportunity to participate. However, only allowing a small window to answer may encourage students to more aggressively raise their hands, as chances to participate appear would appear rare (and we would be scrambling to get participation points unless we really do not know the answer). Simply calling on people whether they have their hands up or not is still probably the best way. Just some helpful tips from my own experiences. Again, Lucy was great, and she showed exceptional commitment towards the material and the students. Grading may be a little tough, but not unfair.

Penn FREN140303, INTERMEDIATE FRENCH II, Spring, 2009

Term

1

4

5

6

8

Spring, 2009 (2009A) Enrollment 15 School **ARTS & SCIENCES** Activity Type SEM Eligible 15 Division Cross Listed Sections 15 **ROMANCE LANGUAGES** Responses Department **Response Rate** 100% Subject FRENCH This Instructor Only **Average Ratings** Worst Rating...Best Rating Responses **Question and Scale** Instructor Section Course 0 1 2 3 4 Were the goals of the course clearly articulated? 3.50 3.50 3.45 0% 7% 0% 29% 64% -Scale: 0 to 4: 0, 1, 2, 3, 4 0 1 0 4 9 14 2 Was the emphasis placed on the language skills (speaking, 3.43 3.43 3.41 0% 0% 14% 29% 57% listening, reading, writing) appropriate in terms of the defined 0 0 2 4 8 14 goals of the course? Scale: 0 to 4: 0, 1, 2, 3, 4 3 Were the readings and/or cultural materials useful for language 3.00 3.00 3.19 0% 0% 36% 29% 36% acquisition? 0 0 5 4 5 14 Scale: 0 to 4: 0, 1, 2, 3, 4 Were homework exercises (and compositions, where appropriate) 3.14 3.14 3.07 0% 0% 14% 57% 29% valuable reinforcement of classroom work? 0 0 2 8 4 14 Scale: 0 to 4: 0, 1, 2, 3, 4 Were the exams consistent with assignments, materials, and 3.50 3.50 3.49 0% 7% 0% 29% 64% method of instruction? 0 1 0 4 9 14 Scale: 0 to 4: 0, 1, 2, 3, 4 Were your linguistic abilities in reading, writing, speaking, and 3.43 3.51 0% 7% 43% 50% 3.43 0% 6 listening sufficiently challenged? 0 0 1 7 14 Scale: 0 to 4: 0, 1, 2, 3, 4 2.32 7 How would you rate the pace of the course? 2.07 2.07 0% 0% 93% 7% 0% Scale: 0 to 4: Much to slow 0, Too Slow 1, Just right 2, Too fast 3, 14 0 0 13 1 0 Much too fast 4 How many hours did you spend out of class per week on this 1.86 1.86 1.76 0% 21% 71% 7% 0% 14 course? 0 3 10 1 0 Scale: 0 to 4: 2 or less , 3-4, 5-6, 7-8, more than 8 47% 27% 9 Please rate the overall guality of the course. 3.00 3.00 3.17 0% 0% 27% 15 Scale: 0 to 4: 0, 1, 2, 3, 4 0 7 4 0 4

3.65

3.64

0%

0

0%

0

0%

0

14

64%

9

36%

5



University of Pennsylvania · Instructor and Course Evaluation Report

FREN140303, INTERMEDIATE FRENCH II, Spring, 2009

		Average	e Ratings			This I Worst Ra	nstructo atingBe		g	Responses
Question and Scale	Instructor	Section	Course	-	0	1	2	3	4	
11 Did the instructor organize appropriate activities in class to encourage the use of oral skills? Scale: 0 to 4: 0, 1, 2, 3, 4	3.50	3.50	3.59	-	0% 0	0% 0	7% 1	36% 5	57% 8	14
12 Was the instructor concerned that students learn the materials? <i>Scale: 0 to 4: 0, 1, 2, 3, 4</i>	3.93	3.93	3.63	-	0% 0	0% 0	0% 0	7% 1	93% 13	14
13 Please evaluate the rapport between the class and the instructor. Scale: 0 to 4: Bad 0, 1, 2, 3, Excellent 4	3.86	3.86	3.60	-	0% 0	0% 0	0% 0	14% 2	86% 12	14
14 Please rate the instructor's attitude towards the course. Scale: 0 to 4: 0, 1, 2, 3, 4	3.93	3.93	3.73	-	0% 0	0% 0	0% 0	7% 1	93% 13	14
15 Please rate the instructor's effectiveness in presenting and explaining course materials. <i>Scale: 0 to 4: 0, 1, 2, 3, 4</i>	3.57	3.57	3.45	-	0% 0	0% 0	0% 0	43% 6	57% 8	14
16 How available was the instructor outside of class? Scale: 0 to 4: 0, 1, 2, 3, 4	4.00	4.00	3.60	-	0% 0	0% 0	0% 0	0% 0	100% 14	14
17 Please rate the fairness of the grading process in the course. Scale: 0 to 4: 0, 1, 2, 3, 4	3.64	3.64	3.21	-	0% 0	7% 1	0% 0	14% 2	79% 11	14
18 Please rate the overall quality of the instructor/teacher in charge of the course. Scale: 0 to 4: 0, 1, 2, 3, 4	3.67	3.67	3.62	-	0% 0	0% 0	0% 0	33% 5	67% 10	15
19 Do you feel that the skills learned in this course would help you survive in a native environment? <i>Scale: 0 to 4: 0, 1, 2, 3, 4</i>	3.14	3.14	3.06	-	0% 0	0% 0	21% 3	43% 6	36% 5	14
20 Please evaluate the overall quality of the teaching assistant/drill instructor in the course. Scale: 0 to 4: 0, 1, 2, 3, 4	3.22	3.22	3.11	-	11% 1	0% 0	0% 0	33% 3	56% 5	9

SWANSON, LUCY VIKING

FREN140303, INTERMEDIATE FRENCH II, Spring, 2009

Comment Suggestion

French 140 was a great class and i met a lot of cool people. I really appreciate all the hard work Lucy put into the class because it made a difference.

The instructor for the course was brilliant and was very good at what she does. However, she was severely limited by the curriculum. I also do not like the curriculum because it does not focus on the development of grammar and writing skills. The course just assumes that students know grammar well and that they can immediately translate most of their thoughts from English to French. This is a crucial gap that no one addresses. The Fren140 course assumes that the student knows more than the he/ she does and just jumps into discussion of cultural materials as opposed to focusing on language acquisition -- grammar, vocabulary, and writing skills. As much as I like my instructor and appreciates her willingness to help me outside of the classroom to develop better grammar, vocabulary, and writing skills, I felt like the class never reinforced those skills in the first place. Furthermore, the materials chosen for reading and discussion in class were not interesting and do not have sufficient depth.

Wiversity of FREN130304, INTERMEDIATE FRENCH I, Fall, 2008

University of Pennsylvania - Instructor and Course Evaluation Report

											50N, L	
Ter	m	Fall, 2008 (2008C)	Enrollment	1	1	School	ARTS 8		CES			
Act	ivity Type	SEM	Eligible	1	1	Division						
Cro	ss Listed Sections	-	Responses	1	1	Department	ROMAN		IGUAGE	S		
			Response Rate	1	00%	Subject	FRENC	H				
				A	verage Rati	ngs			Instructo atingB	or Only est Ratin	g	Responses
	Question and Sca	le	Instructor	Secti	on Co	urse -	0	1	2	3	4	
1	Were the goals of	the course clearly articulated?	3.64	3.64	3.3	9 -	0% 0	0% 0	9% 1	18% 2	73% 8	11
2		sis placed on the language skills (speaki g writing) appropriate in terms of the defir se?		3.73	3.4	9 -	0% 0	0% 0	0% 0	27% 3	73% 8	11
3	Were the reading acquisition?	s and/or cultural materials useful for langua	age 3.45	3.45	3.1	7 -	0% 0	0% 0	0% 0	55% 6	45% 5	11
4		xercises (and compositions, where appropria ment of classroom work?	ate) 3.27	3.27	3.2	7 -	0% 0	0% 0	9% 1	55% 6	36% 4	11
5	Were the exams method of instruct	consistent with assignments, materials, a tion?	and 3.73	3.73	3.5	7 -	0% 0	0% 0	0% 0	27% 3	73% 8	11
6	Were your linguis	stic abilities in reading, writing, speaking, a ntly challenged?	and 3.55	3.55	3.4	5 -	0% 0	0% 0	9% 1	27% 3	64% 7	11
7		ate the pace of the course? (0=much to slo t right; 3=too fast; 4=much too fast)	ow; 2.40	2.40	2.4	3 -	0% 0	10% 1	60% 6	10% 1	20% 2	10
8		did you spend out of class per week on t ess; 1=3-4; 2=5-6; 3=7-8; 4=more than 8)	his 2.00	2.00	1.8	3 -	0% 0	45% 5	18% 2	27% 3	9% 1	11
9	Please rate the ov	rerall quality of the course.	3.64	3.64	3.2	1 -	0% 0	0% 0	0% 0	36% 4	64% 7	11
10	Was the instructo	r able to stimulate your interest in the materia	al? 3.64	3.64	3.3	5 -	0% 0	0% 0	0% 0	36% 4	64% 7	11
11	Did the instructor encourage the us	or organize appropriate activities in class e of oral skills?	to 3.55	3.55	3.3	3 -	0% 0	0% 0	9% 1	27% 3	64% 7	11
12	Was the instructo	r concerned that students learn the materials	? 3.82	3.82	3.5	5 -	0% 0	0% 0	0% 0	18% 2	82% 9	11
13	Please evaluate the comparison of the comparison	ne rapport between the class and the instruc nt)	tor. 3.82	3.82	3.5) -	0% 0	0% 0	0% 0	18% 2	82% 9	11

FREN130304, INTERMEDIATE FRENCH I, Fall, 2008

		Average	Ratings				Instructo atingBe	or Only est Ratin	g	Responses
Question and Scale	Instructor	Section	Course	-	0	1	2	3	4	
14 Please rate the instructor's attitude towards the course.	3.82	3.82	3.69	-	0% 0	0% 0	0% 0	18% 2	82% 9	11
15 Please rate the instructor's effectiveness in presenting and explaining course matericals.	3.36	3.36	3.24	-	0% 0	0% 0	18% 2	27% 3	55% 6	11
16 How available was the instructor outside of class?	3.73	3.73	3.36	-	0% 0	0% 0	0% 0	27% 3	73% 8	11
17 Please rate the fairness of the grading process in the course.	3.80	3.80	3.62	-	0% 0	0% 0	0% 0	20% 2	80% 8	10
18 Please rate the overall quality of the instructor/teacher in charge of the course.	3.91	3.91	3.46	-	0% 0	0% 0	0% 0	9% 1	91% 10	11
19 Do you feel that the skills learned in this course would help you survive in a native environment?	3.50	3.50	3.64	-	0% 0	0% 0	0% 0	50% 1	50% 1	2
20 Please evaluate the overall quality of the teaching assistant/drill instructor in the course.	0.00	0.00	1.37	-	100% 5	0% 0	0% 0	0% 0	0% 0	5

University of F

University of Pennsylvania - Instructor and Course Evaluation Report

	CENTZUSUT, ELEI	VIENTART FRENCH, Sphing, 2008									SVANC	SON, LU	
Te	rm	Spring, 2008 (2008A)	Enrollment		11	School		ARTS &	SCIENC	ES			
Ac	tivity Type	SEM	Eligible		11	Division		-					
Cr	oss Listed Sections	-	Responses		11	Departmen	t	ROMAN	ICE LAN	GUAGES	6		
			Response Rate		100%	Subject		FRENC					
				Å	Average Rat	ings		١		nstructo tingBe	r Only est Rating	9	Responses
	Question and Sca	le	Instructor	Sec		ourse -		0	1	2	3	4	
1	Were the goals of	the course clearly articulated?	3.55	3.55	3.7	- 22		0% 0	0% 0	9% 1	27% 3	64% 7	11
2		is placed on the language skills (speakin writing) appropriate in terms of the definer?		3.64	3.8	- 35		0% 0	0% 0	0% 0	36% 4	64% 7	11
3	Were the reading acquisition?	s and/or cultural materials useful for langua	ge 3.36	3.36	3.5	- 57		0% 0	0% 0	0% 0	64% 7	36% 4	11
4		xercises (and compositions, where appropria nent of classroom work?	te) 3.27	3.27	3.6	64 -		0% 0	0% 0	18% 2	36% 4	45% 5	11
5	Were the exams method of instruc	consistent with assignments, materials, a tion?	n d 3.64	3.64	3.7	'3 -		0% 0	0% 0	0% 0	36% 4	64% 7	11
6	Were your linguis liste ning sufficier	stic abilities in reading, writing, speaking, a htly challenged?	nd 3.18	3.18	3.6	- 62		0% 0	0% 0	27% 3	27% 3	45% 5	11
7		ate the pace of the course? (0=much to slo t right; 3=too fast; 4=much too fast)	w; 1.70	1.70	2.1	5 -		0% 0	30% 3	70% 7	0% 0	0% 0	10
8		did you spend out of class per week on th ss; 1=3-4; 2=5-6; 3=7-8; 4=more than 8)	nis 1.27	1.27	1.4	- 15		9% 1	55% 6	36% 4	0% 0	0% 0	11
9	Please rate the ov	erall quality of the course.	3.55	3.55	3.6	- 88		0% 0	0% 0	9% 1	27% 3	64% 7	11
10) Was the instructo	r able to stimulate your interest in the materia	I? 3.55	3.55	3.7	′2 -		0% 0	0% 0	0% 0	45% 5	55% 6	11
1	I Did the instructo encourage the use	or organize appropriate activities in class e of oral skills?	to 3.36	3.36	3.7	- 0		0% 0	0% 0	9% 1	45% 5	45% 5	11
1:	2 Was the instructo	r concerned that students learn the materials	? 3.64	3.64	3.7	- 77		0% 0	0% 0	0% 0	36% 4	64% 7	11
1;	B Please evaluate the optimized of the o	ne rapport between the class and the instruct nt)	or. 3.55	3.55	3.7	′8 -		0% 0	0% 0	9% 1	27% 3	64% 7	11

FREN120301, ELEMENTARY FRENCH, Spring, 2008

		Average	e Ratings				Instructo atingBo	or Only est Ratin	g	Responses
Question and Scale	Instructor	Section	Course	-	0	1	2	3	4	
14 Please rate the instructor's attitude towards the course.	3.91	3.91	3.90	-	0% 0	0% 0	0% 0	9% 1	91% 10	11
15 Please rate the instructor's effectiveness in presenting and explaining course matericals.	3.18	3.18	3.65	-	0% 0	0% 0	9% 1	64% 7	27% 3	11
16 How available was the instructor outside of class?	3.55	3.55	3.65	-	0% 0	0% 0	9% 1	27% 3	64% 7	11
17 Please rate the fairness of the grading process in the course.	3.82	3.82	3.85	-	0% 0	0% 0	0% 0	18% 2	82% 9	11
18 Please rate the overall quality of the instructor/teacher in charge of the course.	3.64	3.64	3.81	-	0% 0	0% 0	0% 0	36% 4	64% 7	11
19 Do you feel that the skills learned in this course would help you survive in a native environment?	3.89	3.89	3.76	-	0% 0	0% 0	0% 0	11% 1	89% 8	9
20 Please evaluate the overall quality of the teaching assistant/drill instructor in the course.	1.00	1.00	0.59	-	75% 6	0% 0	0% 0	0% 0	25% 2	8

0303 ELEMENTARY FRENCH, Fall, 2007

FR

University of Pennsylvania · Instructor and Course Evaluation Report

Question and Scale Instructor Section Course - 0 1 2 3 4 1 Were the goals of the course clearly articulated? 3.39 3.39 3.61 - 0% 6% 6% 1 6 10 18 2 Was the emphasis placed on the language skills (speaking, listening, reading writing) appropriate in terms of the defined goals of the course? 3.67 3.81 - 0% 0% 0% 6% 12 18 3 Were the readings and/or cultural materials useful for language acquisition? 3.78 3.78 3.68 - 0% 6% 28% 39% 28% 4 Were homework exercises (and compositions, where appropriate) valuablereinforcement of classroom work? 3.78 3.78 3.68 - 0% 0% 11 2 8% 1 5 Were the exams consistent with assignments, materials, and method of instruction? 3.50 3.67 3.63 - 0% 0% 11 2 8 11 18 6 Were the	FRENITI0303, ELE	MENTARY FRENCH, Fall, 2007									SWAN	50N, L					
Cross Listed Sections - Responses Rate 18 Department ROMANCE LANGUAGES Response Rate 100% Subject FRENCH FRENCH FRENCH Response	Term	Fall, 2007 (2007C)	Enrollment		18	School		ARTS 8		CES							
Response Rate100%SubjectFRENCHCluestion and ScaleInstructorSectionCourse01234Percent and the section of the course clearly articulated?3.393.37Course01234This Instructor Only Worst RatingBest RatingResponse RateQuestion and ScaleInstructorSectionCourse01234Was the emphasis placed on the language skills (speaking, listening, reading writing) appropriate in terms of the defined acquisition?3.673.783.783.783.783.783.783.673.673.673.673.673.673.673.673.673.673.673.673.673.673.673.670%6%6%118Were the readings and/or cultural materials useful for language skills (speaking, adding acquisition?3.783.783.680% <th <="" colspan="4" th=""><th>Activity Type</th><th>SEM</th><th>Eligible</th><th></th><th>18</th><th>Division</th><th></th><th>-</th><th></th><th></th><th></th><th></th><th></th></th>	<th>Activity Type</th> <th>SEM</th> <th>Eligible</th> <th></th> <th>18</th> <th>Division</th> <th></th> <th>-</th> <th></th> <th></th> <th></th> <th></th> <th></th>				Activity Type	SEM	Eligible		18	Division		-					
Average Ratings This Instructor Only Worst RatingBest Rating Resp. Question and Scale Instructor Section Course 0 1 2 3 4 1 Were the goals of the course clearly articulated? 3.39 3.39 3.61 - 0% 6% 6% 33% 56% 2 Was the emphasis placed on the language skills (speaking, listening, reading writing) appropriate in terms of the defined goals of the course? 3.67 3.81 - 0% 6% 6% 1 8 7 18 3 Were the readings and/or cultural materials useful for language acquisition? 2.89 2.89 3.29 - 0% 6% 6% 11% 83% 18 4 Were the memork exercises (and compositions, where appropriate) valuablereinforcement of classroom work? 3.78 3.68 - 0% 0% 01 2 15 18 5 Were the readings and/or cultural materials, and method of instruction? 3.50 3.68 - 0% 0% 0% 0% 0% 11	Cross Listed Sections	-	Responses		18	Department	t	ROMAN	ICE LAN	GUAGE	S						
Average Ratings Worst RatingBest Rating Respondence Question and Scale Instructor Section Course - 0 1 2 3 4 Were the goals of the course clearly articulated? 3.39 3.39 3.61 - 0% 6% 6% 1 6 10 18 2 Was the emphasis placed on the language skills (speaking, goals of the course? 3.67 3.81 - 0% 0% 0% 0% 0% 0% 18 3 Were the readings and/or cultural materials useful for language acquisition? 3.67 3.81 - 0% 0% 0% 0% 1% 28% 18 4 Were the readings and/or cultural materials useful for language acquisition? 3.78 3.68 - 0% 0% 0% 0% 1% 28% 18 5 Were the readings and/or cultural materials, and method of instruction? 3.78 3.68 - 0% 0% 0% 0% 1% 28% 11 <th></th> <th></th> <th>Response Rate</th> <th></th> <th>100%</th> <th>Subject</th> <th></th> <th>FRENC</th> <th>H</th> <th></th> <th></th> <th></th> <th></th>			Response Rate		100%	Subject		FRENC	H								
1 Were the goals of the course clearly articulated? 3.39 3.39 3.61 - 0% 6% 6% 10 18 2 Was the emphasis placed on the language skills (speaking, listening), reading writing) appropriate in terms of the defined goals of the course? 3.67 3.81 - 0% 0% 0% 0% 12 18 3 Were the readings and/or cultural materials useful for language acquisition? 2.89 3.29 - 0% 6% 28% 3% 58% 18 4 Were homework exercises (and compositions, where appropriate) are the readings and/or cultural materials useful for language valuablereinforcement of classroom work? 3.78 3.68 - 0% 6% 28% 7 5 18 5 Were the exams consistent with assignments, materials, and liste ning sufficiently challenged? 3.67 3.67 3.68 - 0% 0% 11% 28% 61% 18 6 Were your linguistic abilities in reading, writing, speaking, and liste ning sufficiently challenged? 3.67 3.67 3.63 - 0% 0% 0% 11% 18 7 How would you rate the pace of the cour				Å	Average Rati	ings		١				g	Responses				
Was the emphasis placed on the language skills (speaking, got the course? 3.67 3.81 - 0% 0% 0% 0% 11 6 10 18 Was the emphasis placed on the language skills (speaking, got the course? 3.67 3.81 - 0% 0% 0% 0% 0% 12 18 Was the emphasis placed on the language shills (speaking, got the course? 3.67 3.81 - 0%			Instructor	Sect				0	1	2	3	4					
listening, reading writing) appropriate in terms of the defined 0 0 0 0 12 18 3 Were the course? 3.00 2.89 2.89 3.29 - 0% 6% 28% 39% 28% 18 4 Were homework exercises (and compositions, where appropriate) 3.78 3.78 3.68 - 0% 0% 6% 11% 83% 15 5 Were the exams consistent with assignments, materials, and method of instruction? 3.50 3.60 3.68 - 0% 0% 1% 28% 31% 18 6 Were your linguistic abilities in reading, writing, speaking, and liste ning sufficiently challenged? 3.67 3.63 - 0% 0% 0% 6% 11% 18 7 How would you rate the pace of the course? (0=much to slow; 2.17 2.17 2.17 2.22 - 0% 0% 0% 6% 1% 0% 18 8 How would you spend out of class per week on this course? (0=2 or less; 1=3-4; 2=5-6; 3=7-8; 4=more than 8) 1.47 1.47 1.44 - 6% 47% 1% 6%	1 Were the goals of	f the course clearly articulated?	3.39	3.39	3.6	1 -							18				
acquisition? 0 1 5 7 5 18 4 Were homework exercises (and compositions, where appropriate) valuablereinforcement of classroom work? 3.78 3.78 3.68 - 0% 0% 11 2 15 18 5 Were the exams consistent with assignments, materials, and method of instruction? 3.50 3.60 3.68 - 0% 0% 11% 28% 61% 18 6 Were your linguistic abilities in reading, writing, speaking, and liste ning sufficiently challenged? 3.67 3.67 3.63 - 0% 0% 0% 11% 28% 61% 18 7 How would you rate the pace of the course? (0=much to slow; 2.17 2.17 2.22 0% 0% 0% 83% 18 8 How many hours did you spend out of class per week on this course? (0=2 or less; 1=3-4; 2=5-6; 3=7-8; 4=more than 8) 1.47 1.47 1.44 - 6% 47% 41% 0% 0% 17 1 17 9 Please rate the overall quality of the course. 3.67 3.67 3.67 3.75 - 0% 0	listening, reading	g writing) appropriate in terms of the defin		3.67	3.8	1 -							18				
valuablereinforcement of classroom work? 0 0 1 2 15 18 5 Were the exams consistent with assignments, materials, and method of instruction? 3.50 3.68 - 0% 0% 11% 28% 61% 18 6 Were your linguistic abilities in reading, writing, speaking, and liste ning sufficiently challenged? 3.67 3.67 3.63 - 0% 0% 0% 61% 12 18 7 How would you rate the pace of the course? (0=much to slow; 1=to slow; 2=just right; 3=too fast; 4=much too fast) 2.17 2.17 2.22 - 0% 0% 0% 6% 12 18 8 How many hours did you spend out of class per week on this course? (0=2 or less; 1=3-4; 2=5-6; 3=7-8; 4=more than 8) 1.47 1.47 1.44 - 6% 47% 41% 0% 17 0 17 9 Please rate the overall quality of the course. 3.67 3.67 3.75 - 0% 0% 0% 33% 67% 12 18 10 Was the instructor able to stimulate your interest in the material? 3.61 3.61 3.77 -		gs and/or cultural materials useful for langua	ge 2.89	2.89	3.2	9 -							18				
method of instruction? 0 0 2 5 11 18 6 Were your linguistic abilities in reading, writing, speaking, and liste ning sufficiently challenged? 3.67 3.67 3.63 - 0% 0% 0% 6 12 18 7 How would you rate the pace of the course? (0=much to slow; 2=just right; 3=too fast; 4=much too fast) 2.17 2.17 2.22 - 0% 0% 15 3 0% 18 8 How many hours did you spend out of class per week on this course? (0=2 or less; 1=3-4; 2=5-6; 3=7-8; 4=more than 8) 1.47 1.47 1.44 - 6% 41% 6% 0% 0% 12 18 9 Please rate the overall quality of the course. 3.67 3.67 3.75 - 0% 0% 0% 12 18 10 Was the instructor able to stimulate your interest in the material? 3.61 3.67 3.75 - 0% 0% 0% 12 18 10 Was the instructor able to stimulate your interest in the material? 3.61 3.67 3.77 - 0% 0% 0% 12 18 <td></td> <th></th> <td>te) 3.78</td> <td>3.78</td> <td>3.6</td> <td>8 -</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td>18</td>			te) 3.78	3.78	3.6	8 -							18				
liste ning sufficiently challenged? 0 0 0 6 12 18 7 How would you rate the pace of the course? (0=much to slow; 2.17 2.17 2.22 - 0% 0% 15% 3% 0% 18 8 How many hours did you spend out of class per week on this course? (0=2 or less; 1=3-4; 2=5-6; 3=7-8; 4=more than 8) 1.47 1.47 1.44 - 6% 47% 41% 0% 0% 17% 0% 17% 14 19 Please rate the overall quality of the course. 3.67 3.67 3.75 - 0% 0% 0% 33% 67% 18 10 Was the instructor able to stimulate your interest in the material? 3.61 3.61 3.77 - 0% 0% 0% 12 18			nd 3.50	3.50	3.6	8 -							18				
1=too slow; 2=just right; 3=too fast; 4=much too fast) 0 15 3 0 18 8 How many hours did you spend out of class per week on this course? (0=2 or less; 1=3-4; 2=5-6; 3=7-8; 4=more than 8) 1.47 1.47 1.44 - 6% 47% 41% 6% 0% 17 9 Please rate the overall quality of the course. 3.67 3.67 3.75 - 0% 0% 0% 12 18 10 Was the instructor able to stimulate your interest in the material? 3.61 3.61 3.77 - 0% 0% 0% 12 18			nd 3.67	3.67	3.6	3 -							18				
course? (0=2 or less; 1=3-4; 2=5-6; 3=7-8; 4=more than 8) 1 8 7 1 0 17 9 Please rate the overall quality of the course. 3.67 3.67 3.75 - 0% 0% 0% 6% 12 18 10 Was the instructor able to stimulate your interest in the material? 3.61 3.61 3.77 - 0% 0% 0% 39% 61% 18			w; 2.17	2.17	2.2	2 -							18				
10 Was the instructor able to stimulate your interest in the material? 3.61 3.61 3.77 - 0% 0% 0% 39% 61% 10 Was the instructor able to stimulate your interest in the material? 3.61 3.61 3.77 - 0% 0% 0% 7 11 18			nis 1.47	1.47	⁷ 1.4	4 -							17				
0 0 0 7 11 18	9 Please rate the ov	verall quality of the course.	3.67	3.67	3.7	5 -							18				
	10 Was the instructo	or able to stimulate your interest in the materia	I? 3.61	3.61	3.7	7 -							18				
11 Did the instructor organize appropriate activities in class to encourage the use of oral skills?3.673.673.82-0%0%6%22%72%00141318			to 3.67	3.67	3.8	2 -					22% 4		18				
12 Was the instructor concerned that students learn the materials? 3.94 3.94 3.88 - 0% 0% 6% 94% 0 0 0 1 17 18	12 Was the instructo	or concerned that students learn the materials?	? 3.94	3.94	3.8	8 -							18				
13 Please evaluate the rapport between the class and the instructor. 3.33 3.33 3.73 - 0% 0% 6% 56% 39% (0=bad, 4=excellent) 0 0 1 10 7 18			or. 3.33	3.33	3.7	3 -							18				

FREN110303, ELEMENTARY FRENCH, Fall, 2007

	Average Ratings					This Instructor Only Worst RatingBest Rating				Responses
Question and Scale	Instructor	Section	Course	-	0	1	2	3	4	
14 Please rate the instructor's attitude towards the course.	3.89	3.89	3.94	-	0% 0	0% 0	0% 0	11% 2	89% 16	18
15 Please rate the instructor's effectiveness in presenting and explaining course matericals.	3.28	3.28	3.65	-	0% 0	0% 0	11% 2	50% 9	39% 7	18
16 How available was the instructor outside of class?	3.72	3.72	3.68	-	0% 0	0% 0	0% 0	28% 5	72% 13	18
17 Please rate the fairness of the grading process in the course.	3.67	3.67	3.71	-	0% 0	0% 0	0% 0	33% 6	67% 12	18
18 Please rate the overall quality of the instructor/teacher in charge of the course.	3.72	3.72	3.84	-	0% 0	0% 0	0% 0	28% 5	72% 13	18
19 Do you feel that the skills learned in this course would help you survive in a native environment?	3.55	3.55	3.33	-	0% 0	0% 0	0% 0	45% 5	55% 6	11
20 Please evaluate the overall quality of the teaching assistant/drill instructor in the course.	0.80	0.80	0.39	-	80% 8	0% 0	0% 0	0% 0	20% 2	10