

Course-Section: GERM 101 0101
 Title ELEMENTARY GERMAN I
 Instructor: SUTTON, SUSANNE
 Enrollment: 22
 Questionnaires: 18

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2008

Page 863
 AUG 6, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	2	0	16	4.78	338/1670	4.78	4.36	4.31	4.23	4.78
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	2	14	4.67	415/1666	4.67	4.31	4.27	4.30	4.67
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	3	13	4.61	483/1406	4.61	4.48	4.32	4.31	4.61
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	3	12	4.50	552/1615	4.50	4.34	4.24	4.17	4.50
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	0	4	1	11	4.44	460/1566	4.44	4.26	4.07	4.03	4.44
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	3	2	13	4.56	383/1528	4.56	4.23	4.12	4.00	4.56
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	3	2	13	4.56	499/1650	4.56	4.16	4.22	4.28	4.56
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	1	11	6	4.28	1354/1667	4.28	4.47	4.67	4.61	4.28
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	1	5	8	4.50	403/1626	4.50	4.08	4.11	4.07	4.50
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	2	2	14	4.67	673/1559	4.67	4.38	4.46	4.47	4.67
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	1	16	4.83	777/1560	4.83	4.75	4.72	4.68	4.83
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	4	13	4.67	488/1549	4.67	4.34	4.31	4.32	4.67
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	0	16	4.78	382/1546	4.78	4.40	4.32	4.32	4.78
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	2	0	0	4	3	9	4.31	498/1323	4.31	3.96	4.00	3.91	4.31
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	5	2	9	4.25	670/1384	4.25	4.29	4.10	3.92	4.25
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	2	2	12	4.63	510/1378	4.63	4.56	4.29	4.09	4.63
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	1	0	4	1	10	4.19	904/1378	4.19	4.45	4.31	4.08	4.19
4. Were special techniques successful	2	3	0	0	2	2	9	4.54	230/ 904	4.54	4.11	4.03	3.94	4.54

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors		
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	0	A 9	Required for Majors 8	Graduate 1	Major 1
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	1	B 2			
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C 2	General 2	Under-grad 17	Non-major 17
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	0	D 0			
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00	4	F 1	Electives 4	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	
				P 0			
				I 0	Other 1		
				? 1			

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	3	3	7	4.31	943/1670	4.63	4.36	4.31	4.23	4.31
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	4	7	4.38	808/1666	4.66	4.31	4.27	4.30	4.38
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	2	8	4.31	836/1406	4.60	4.48	4.32	4.31	4.31
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	5	5	4.15	981/1615	4.19	4.34	4.24	4.17	4.15
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	3	6	3	3.85	1068/1566	4.26	4.26	4.07	4.03	3.85
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	7	4	1	3.50	1274/1528	4.03	4.23	4.12	4.00	3.50
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	1	1	2	8	4.15	1020/1650	4.52	4.16	4.22	4.28	4.15
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	1	7	2	3	0	2.54	1667/1667	3.35	4.47	4.67	4.61	2.54
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	3	3	3	4.00	953/1626	4.29	4.08	4.11	4.07	4.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	3	4	6	4.23	1171/1559	4.56	4.38	4.46	4.47	4.23
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	2	1	10	4.62	1150/1560	4.78	4.75	4.72	4.68	4.62
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	4	4	5	4.08	1116/1549	4.42	4.34	4.31	4.32	4.08
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	3	3	7	4.31	949/1546	4.60	4.40	4.32	4.32	4.31
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	5	0	2	1	2	3	3.75	917/1323	3.95	3.96	4.00	3.91	3.75
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	3	2	1	5	3.73	1009/1384	4.24	4.29	4.10	3.92	3.73
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	1	3	2	5	4.00	970/1378	4.42	4.56	4.29	4.09	4.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	3	4	4	4.09	950/1378	4.30	4.45	4.31	4.08	4.09
4. Were special techniques successful	2	1	0	0	5	2	3	3.80	605/ 904	4.22	4.11	4.03	3.94	3.80
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	12	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 232	****	****	4.19	4.25	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	12	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 239	****	****	4.21	4.35	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 230	****	****	4.44	4.58	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 231	****	****	4.31	4.45	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 218	****	****	4.18	4.47	****
Seminar														
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	12	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 79	****	4.63	4.64	4.72	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	12	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 75	****	5.00	4.57	4.46	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 79	****	4.88	4.45	4.59	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 80	****	4.13	3.97	3.99	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 41	****	****	4.50	3.91	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 38	****	****	4.19	4.07	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors		
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A 6	Required for Majors 4	Graduate 0	Major 1
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	B 3			
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	1	C 1	General 4	Under-grad 13	Non-major 12
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	2	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 3		
				? 0			

Course-Section: GERM 102 0201
 Title ELEMENTARY GERMAN II
 Instructor: HENDRICHS, ANJA
 Enrollment: 25
 Questionnaires: 18

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2008

Page 865
 AUG 6, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	1	17	4.94	124/1670	4.63	4.36	4.31	4.23	4.94
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	17	4.94	104/1666	4.66	4.31	4.27	4.30	4.94
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	16	4.89	205/1406	4.60	4.48	4.32	4.31	4.89
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	1	0	1	7	8	4.24	898/1615	4.19	4.34	4.24	4.17	4.24
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	4	13	4.67	295/1566	4.26	4.26	4.07	4.03	4.67
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	6	11	4.56	383/1528	4.03	4.23	4.12	4.00	4.56
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	2	16	4.89	173/1650	4.52	4.16	4.22	4.28	4.89
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	15	3	4.17	1430/1667	3.35	4.47	4.67	4.61	4.17
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	7	10	4.59	339/1626	4.29	4.08	4.11	4.07	4.59
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	2	15	4.88	307/1559	4.56	4.38	4.46	4.47	4.88
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	1	16	4.94	358/1560	4.78	4.75	4.72	4.68	4.94
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	4	13	4.76	352/1549	4.42	4.34	4.31	4.32	4.76
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	0	16	4.88	253/1546	4.60	4.40	4.32	4.32	4.88
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	2	0	1	2	5	6	4.14	626/1323	3.95	3.96	4.00	3.91	4.14
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	3	9	4.75	257/1384	4.24	4.29	4.10	3.92	4.75
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	0	0	2	10	4.83	316/1378	4.42	4.56	4.29	4.09	4.83
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	0	0	2	2	8	4.50	653/1378	4.30	4.45	4.31	4.08	4.50
4. Were special techniques successful	6	1	0	0	0	4	7	4.64	190/ 904	4.22	4.11	4.03	3.94	4.64

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors		
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 11	Required for Majors 4	Graduate 0	Major 3
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	1	B 5			
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	0	C 1	General 2	Under-grad 18	Non-major 15
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	2	D 0			
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5	F 0	Electives 2	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	
				P 0			
				I 0	Other 9		
				? 0			

Course-Section: GERM 201 0101
 Title INTERMEDIATE GERMAN I
 Instructor: SUTTON, SUSANNE
 Enrollment: 12
 Questionnaires: 10

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2008

Page 866
 AUG 6, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	4	5	4.40	809/1670	4.45	4.36	4.31	4.32	4.40
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	3	6	4.50	622/1666	4.50	4.31	4.27	4.27	4.50
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	4	5	4.40	715/1406	4.57	4.48	4.32	4.39	4.40
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	3	6	4.50	552/1615	4.75	4.34	4.24	4.29	4.50
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	3	5	1	3.78	1129/1566	3.89	4.26	4.07	4.00	3.78
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	1	6	2	3.90	1039/1528	3.95	4.23	4.12	4.11	3.90
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	0	5	4	4.20	973/1650	4.48	4.16	4.22	4.20	4.20
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	8	2	4.20	1409/1667	4.35	4.47	4.67	4.64	4.20
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	1	0	1	4	3	3.89	1143/1626	4.07	4.08	4.11	4.06	3.89
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	2	3	5	4.30	1122/1559	4.40	4.38	4.46	4.40	4.30
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	855/1560	4.90	4.75	4.72	4.73	4.80
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	3	6	4.50	683/1549	4.63	4.34	4.31	4.25	4.50
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	3	6	4.50	715/1546	4.75	4.40	4.32	4.30	4.50
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	1	0	0	3	2	4	4.11	648/1323	4.31	3.96	4.00	4.08	4.11
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	1	0	4	2	3.63	1049/1384	3.69	4.29	4.10	4.07	3.63
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	1	1	6	4.63	510/1378	4.31	4.56	4.29	4.25	4.63
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	2	2	4	4.25	867/1378	4.50	4.45	4.31	4.26	4.25
4. Were special techniques successful	2	0	0	0	4	1	3	3.88	580/ 904	3.94	4.11	4.03	4.01	3.88
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	9	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 232	****	****	4.19	4.35	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors		

00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	2	Required for Majors		6	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	1							
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	7	General		2	Under-grad	10	Non-major	9
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	0	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		2				
				?	0							

Course-Section: GERM 201 0201
 Title INTERMEDIATE GERMAN I
 Instructor: SUTTON, SUSANNE
 Enrollment: 4
 Questionnaires: 4

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2008

Page 867
 AUG 6, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	665/1670	4.45	4.36	4.31	4.32	4.50
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	622/1666	4.50	4.31	4.27	4.27	4.50
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	318/1406	4.57	4.48	4.32	4.39	4.75
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1615	4.75	4.34	4.24	4.29	5.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	851/1566	3.89	4.26	4.07	4.00	4.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	899/1528	3.95	4.23	4.12	4.11	4.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	272/1650	4.48	4.16	4.22	4.20	4.75
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	1157/1667	4.35	4.47	4.67	4.64	4.50
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	3	1	4.25	728/1626	4.07	4.08	4.11	4.06	4.25
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	896/1559	4.40	4.38	4.46	4.40	4.50
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1560	4.90	4.75	4.72	4.73	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	366/1549	4.63	4.34	4.31	4.25	4.75
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1546	4.75	4.40	4.32	4.30	5.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	326/1323	4.31	3.96	4.00	4.08	4.50
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	1	1	3.75	996/1384	3.69	4.29	4.10	4.07	3.75
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	2	0	2	4.00	970/1378	4.31	4.56	4.29	4.25	4.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	439/1378	4.50	4.45	4.31	4.26	4.75
4. Were special techniques successful	0	2	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	461/ 904	3.94	4.11	4.03	4.01	4.00

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: GERM 202 0101
 Title INTERMEDIATE GERMAN II
 Instructor: WOLFF, XENIA
 Enrollment: 10
 Questionnaires: 9

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2008

Page 868
 AUG 6, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	338/1670	4.78	4.36	4.31	4.32	4.78
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	190/1666	4.89	4.31	4.27	4.27	4.89
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1406	5.00	4.48	4.32	4.39	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	272/1615	4.78	4.34	4.24	4.29	4.78
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	1	7	4.67	295/1566	4.67	4.26	4.07	4.00	4.67
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1528	5.00	4.23	4.12	4.11	5.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	255/1650	4.78	4.16	4.22	4.20	4.78
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1667	5.00	4.47	4.67	4.64	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	1	0	0	1	6	4.38	595/1626	4.38	4.08	4.11	4.06	4.38
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1559	5.00	4.38	4.46	4.40	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1560	5.00	4.75	4.72	4.73	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1549	5.00	4.34	4.31	4.25	5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1546	5.00	4.40	4.32	4.30	5.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	1	1	7	4.67	235/1323	4.67	3.96	4.00	4.08	4.67
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	324/1384	4.67	4.29	4.10	4.07	4.67
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1378	5.00	4.56	4.29	4.25	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1378	5.00	4.45	4.31	4.26	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	3	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	123/ 904	4.83	4.11	4.03	4.01	4.83

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 1
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B 5			
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	0	C 0	General 4	Under-grad 9	Non-major 8
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	0	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 4		
				? 0			

Course-Section: GERM 302 0101
 Title ADVANCED GERMAN II
 Instructor: SUTTON, SUSANNE
 Enrollment: 8
 Questionnaires: 7

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2008

Page 869
 AUG 6, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	1	1	2	3	4.00	1216/1670	4.00	4.36	4.31	4.24	4.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	0	1	5	4.43	751/1666	4.43	4.31	4.27	4.18	4.43
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	0	2	4	4.29	852/1406	4.29	4.48	4.32	4.22	4.29
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	1	5	4.57	477/1615	4.57	4.34	4.24	4.18	4.57
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	5	1	4.00	851/1566	4.00	4.26	4.07	4.04	4.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	2	3	4.14	805/1528	4.14	4.23	4.12	4.07	4.14
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	471/1650	4.57	4.16	4.22	4.12	4.57
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1667	5.00	4.47	4.67	4.67	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	1	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	797/1626	4.20	4.08	4.11	4.06	4.20
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	355/1559	4.86	4.38	4.46	4.40	4.86
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	725/1560	4.86	4.75	4.72	4.67	4.86
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	4	3	4.43	789/1549	4.43	4.34	4.31	4.25	4.43
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	2	4	4.43	822/1546	4.43	4.40	4.32	4.24	4.43
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	2	0	1	0	2	2	4.00	692/1323	4.00	3.96	4.00	3.99	4.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1384	****	4.29	4.10	4.12	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1378	****	4.56	4.29	4.30	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1378	****	4.45	4.31	4.33	****
4. Were special techniques successful	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 904	****	4.11	4.03	4.03	****

Frequency Distribution

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

- Means there are not enough responses to be significant

Course-Section: GERM 312 0101
 Title INTRO GERM LIT/CULT II
 Instructor: MAY, BRIGITTE
 Enrollment: 3
 Questionnaires: 3

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2008

Page 870
 AUG 6, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1670	5.00	4.36	4.31	4.24	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	415/1666	4.67	4.31	4.27	4.18	4.67
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	423/1406	4.67	4.48	4.32	4.22	4.67
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	379/1615	4.67	4.34	4.24	4.18	4.67
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1566	5.00	4.26	4.07	4.04	5.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	300/1528	4.67	4.23	4.12	4.07	4.67
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	361/1650	4.67	4.16	4.22	4.12	4.67
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	3	0	4.00	1524/1667	4.00	4.47	4.67	4.67	4.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1626	5.00	4.08	4.11	4.06	5.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1559	5.00	4.38	4.46	4.40	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1560	5.00	4.75	4.72	4.67	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	488/1549	4.67	4.34	4.31	4.25	4.67
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1546	5.00	4.40	4.32	4.24	5.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	1	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	326/1323	4.50	3.96	4.00	3.99	4.50

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: GERM 319 0101
 Title GERMAN TRANSLATION
 Instructor: LARKEY, EDWARD
 Enrollment: 9
 Questionnaires: 9

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2008

Page 871
 AUG 6, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	338/1670	4.78	4.36	4.31	4.24	4.78
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	2	5	4.33	870/1666	4.33	4.31	4.27	4.18	4.33
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	1	0	0	5	4.50	597/1406	4.50	4.48	4.32	4.22	4.50
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	3	5	4.44	633/1615	4.44	4.34	4.24	4.18	4.44
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	0	4	4	4.50	389/1566	4.50	4.26	4.07	4.04	4.50
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	3	6	4.67	300/1528	4.67	4.23	4.12	4.07	4.67
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	3	3	2	3.67	1404/1650	3.67	4.16	4.22	4.12	3.67
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	4	5	4.56	1119/1667	4.56	4.47	4.67	4.67	4.56
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	2	2	4	4.25	728/1626	4.25	4.08	4.11	4.06	4.25
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	0	3	3	4.50	896/1559	4.50	4.38	4.46	4.40	4.50
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	0	3	3	4.50	1248/1560	4.50	4.75	4.72	4.67	4.50
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	0	3	3	4.50	683/1549	4.50	4.34	4.31	4.25	4.50
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	1	2	3	4.33	919/1546	4.33	4.40	4.32	4.24	4.33
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	1	0	0	2	3	0	3.60	990/1323	3.60	3.96	4.00	3.99	3.60
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	2	1	2	4.00	820/1384	4.00	4.29	4.10	4.12	4.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	0	2	0	3	4.20	894/1378	4.20	4.56	4.29	4.30	4.20
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	590/1378	4.60	4.45	4.31	4.33	4.60
4. Were special techniques successful	4	0	0	1	1	1	2	3.80	605/ 904	3.80	4.11	4.03	4.03	3.80

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 2	Required for Majors	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	B 6		Graduate
56-83	5	2.00-2.99	C 1	General	0
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	9
			P 0		Non-major
			I 0		3
			? 0		
				Other	7

- Means there are not enough responses to be significant

Course-Section: GERM 481 0101
 Title SEMINAR IN GERMAN
 Instructor: MAY, BRIGITTE
 Enrollment: 7
 Questionnaires: 7

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2008

Page 872
 AUG 6, 2008
 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	7	5.00	1/1670	5.00	4.36	4.31	4.45	5.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	216/1666	4.86	4.31	4.27	4.35	4.86	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	1	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	261/1406	4.80	4.48	4.32	4.48	4.80	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	210/1615	4.86	4.34	4.24	4.37	4.86	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	258/1566	4.71	4.26	4.07	4.17	4.71	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	0	6	4.71	260/1528	4.71	4.23	4.12	4.26	4.71	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	0	1	0	5	4.14	1032/1650	4.14	4.16	4.22	4.28	4.14	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	768/1667	4.86	4.47	4.67	4.73	4.86	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	151/1626	4.83	4.08	4.11	4.28	4.83	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	355/1559	4.86	4.38	4.46	4.58	4.86	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1560	5.00	4.75	4.72	4.80	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	598/1549	4.57	4.34	4.31	4.43	4.57	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	288/1546	4.86	4.40	4.32	4.43	4.86	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	2	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	273/1323	4.60	3.96	4.00	4.10	4.60	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1384	5.00	4.29	4.10	4.32	5.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1378	5.00	4.56	4.29	4.55	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1378	5.00	4.45	4.31	4.60	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	2	1	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	243/ 904	4.50	4.11	4.03	4.22	4.50	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	3	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/ 87	5.00	5.00	4.65	4.80	5.00	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	3	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	47/ 79	4.75	4.63	4.64	4.60	4.75	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/ 75	5.00	5.00	4.57	4.56	5.00	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	36/ 79	4.75	4.88	4.45	4.53	4.75	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	3	0	0	0	2	1	1	3.75	51/ 80	3.75	4.13	3.97	3.67	3.75	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: GERM 681 0101
 Title SEMINAR IN GERMAN
 Instructor: MAY, BRIGITTE
 Enrollment: 4
 Questionnaires: 3

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2008

Page 873
 AUG 6, 2008
 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		

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1670	5.00	4.36	4.31	4.46	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1666	5.00	4.31	4.27	4.34	5.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1406	5.00	4.48	4.32	4.36	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1615	5.00	4.34	4.24	4.33	5.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1566	5.00	4.26	4.07	4.20	5.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1528	5.00	4.23	4.12	4.33	5.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1650	5.00	4.16	4.22	4.30	5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1667	5.00	4.47	4.67	4.74	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	1626/1626	1.00	4.08	4.11	4.20	1.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1559	5.00	4.38	4.46	4.49	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1560	5.00	4.75	4.72	4.81	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1549	5.00	4.34	4.31	4.37	5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1546	5.00	4.40	4.32	4.40	5.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	2	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	692/1323	4.00	3.96	4.00	4.03	4.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1384	5.00	4.29	4.10	4.21	5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1378	5.00	4.56	4.29	4.42	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1378	5.00	4.45	4.31	4.51	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	0	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	328/ 904	4.33	4.11	4.03	4.04	4.33
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 87	5.00	5.00	4.65	4.61	5.00
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	53/ 79	4.50	4.63	4.64	4.67	4.50
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 75	5.00	5.00	4.57	4.66	5.00
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 79	5.00	4.88	4.45	4.58	5.00
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	30/ 80	4.50	4.13	3.97	4.32	4.50

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	2	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	1	Non-major	3
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D	0						
Grad.	2	3.50-4.00	1	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	1				
				?	0						