

Course-Section: GERM 101 01
 Title Elementary German I
 Instructor: Jones,Romy
 Enrollment: 32
 Questionnaires: 24

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 765
 JUN 28, 2010
 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	2	0	0	0	0	5	17	4.77	287/1447	4.77	4.31	4.31	4.18	4.77
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	3	0	0	0	0	2	19	4.90	112/1447	4.90	4.34	4.27	4.30	4.90
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	0	0	0	0	2	20	4.91	141/1241	4.91	4.48	4.33	4.25	4.91
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	0	0	0	0	6	16	4.73	249/1402	4.73	4.36	4.24	4.15	4.73
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	3	6	0	1	1	2	11	4.53	325/1358	4.53	4.26	4.11	4.03	4.53
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	1	1	6	13	4.48	423/1316	4.48	4.27	4.14	3.99	4.48
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	0	4	3	15	4.50	459/1427	4.50	4.21	4.19	4.24	4.50
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	1	13	8	4.32	1216/1447	4.32	4.66	4.69	4.68	4.32
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	7	0	0	0	0	11	6	4.35	516/1434	4.35	4.12	4.10	4.10	4.35
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	0	4	17	4.81	353/1387	4.81	4.45	4.46	4.46	4.81
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	0	3	18	4.86	656/1387	4.86	4.78	4.73	4.71	4.86
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	0	4	17	4.81	253/1386	4.81	4.35	4.32	4.32	4.81
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	4	17	4.81	273/1380	4.81	4.43	4.32	4.31	4.81
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	1	1	1	2	3	12	4.26	470/1193	4.26	4.02	4.02	3.99	4.26
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	2	2	3	7	4.07	683/1172	4.07	4.26	4.15	3.95	4.07
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	10	0	0	0	1	3	10	4.64	450/1182	4.64	4.56	4.35	4.18	4.64
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	11	0	0	1	1	4	7	4.31	733/1170	4.31	4.41	4.38	4.17	4.31
4. Were special techniques successful	10	2	0	0	1	5	6	4.42	244/ 800	4.42	4.17	4.06	3.95	4.42

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	2	0.00-0.99 0	A 13	Required for Majors 5	Graduate 1 Major 3
28-55	0	1.00-1.99 1	B 5		
56-83	3	2.00-2.99 1	C 2	General 3	Under-grad 23 Non-major 21
84-150	6	3.00-3.49 7	D 0		
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00 3	F 0	Electives 6	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 4	
			? 0		

Course-Section: GERM 102 01
 Title Elementary German II
 Instructor: Sutton,Susanne
 Enrollment: 14
 Questionnaires: 12

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 766
 JUN 28, 2010
 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	2	4	6	4.33	790/1447	4.52	4.31	4.31	4.18	4.33
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	5	6	4.42	662/1447	4.43	4.34	4.27	4.30	4.42
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	1	10	4.75	282/1241	4.70	4.48	4.33	4.25	4.75
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	0	3	8	4.50	494/1402	4.50	4.36	4.24	4.15	4.50
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	4	6	4.33	529/1358	4.23	4.26	4.11	4.03	4.33
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	5	5	4.25	617/1316	4.26	4.27	4.14	3.99	4.25
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	2	4	6	4.33	680/1427	4.32	4.21	4.19	4.24	4.33
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/1447	5.00	4.66	4.69	4.68	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	1	4	5	4.40	454/1434	4.37	4.12	4.10	4.10	4.40
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	5	6	4.42	891/1387	4.55	4.45	4.46	4.46	4.42
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	475/1387	4.93	4.78	4.73	4.71	4.92
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	1	0	5	6	4.33	811/1386	4.32	4.35	4.32	4.32	4.33
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	4	8	4.67	463/1380	4.65	4.43	4.32	4.31	4.67
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	1	0	0	2	5	4	4.18	536/1193	4.20	4.02	4.02	3.99	4.18
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	1	4	1	4	3.55	982/1172	3.68	4.26	4.15	3.95	3.55
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	2	2	7	4.45	595/1182	4.46	4.56	4.35	4.18	4.45
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	2	0	5	4	4.00	864/1170	3.97	4.41	4.38	4.17	4.00
4. Were special techniques successful	1	4	0	1	1	1	4	4.14	389/ 800	4.37	4.17	4.06	3.95	4.14

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors		
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A 3	Required for Majors 2	Graduate 0	Major 0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B 5			
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	1	C 4	General 7	Under-grad 12	Non-major 12
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	4	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 2		
				? 0			

Course-Section: GERM 102 02
 Title Elementary German II
 Instructor: Sutton,Susanne
 Enrollment: 26
 Questionnaires: 20

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 767
 JUN 28, 2010
 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	15	4.70	375/1447	4.52	4.31	4.31	4.18	4.70
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	0	1	5	13	4.45	619/1447	4.43	4.34	4.27	4.30	4.45
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	5	14	4.65	392/1241	4.70	4.48	4.33	4.25	4.65
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	4	13	4.50	494/1402	4.50	4.36	4.24	4.15	4.50
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	2	0	0	6	3	8	4.12	736/1358	4.23	4.26	4.11	4.03	4.12
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	2	7	9	4.26	608/1316	4.26	4.27	4.14	3.99	4.26
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	2	2	3	12	4.32	704/1427	4.32	4.21	4.19	4.24	4.32
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	20	5.00	1/1447	5.00	4.66	4.69	4.68	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	1	2	5	10	4.33	540/1434	4.37	4.12	4.10	4.10	4.33
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	6	13	4.68	536/1387	4.55	4.45	4.46	4.46	4.68
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	1	18	4.95	317/1387	4.93	4.78	4.73	4.71	4.95
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	1	1	8	9	4.32	829/1386	4.32	4.35	4.32	4.32	4.32
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	0	4	14	4.63	506/1380	4.65	4.43	4.32	4.31	4.63
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	1	0	0	2	10	6	4.22	501/1193	4.20	4.02	4.02	3.99	4.22
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	1	1	3	7	5	3.82	847/1172	3.68	4.26	4.15	3.95	3.82
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	2	0	3	12	4.47	578/1182	4.46	4.56	4.35	4.18	4.47
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	1	1	4	3	8	3.94	910/1170	3.97	4.41	4.38	4.17	3.94
4. Were special techniques successful	3	2	0	0	1	4	10	4.60	159/ 800	4.37	4.17	4.06	3.95	4.60

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	A	7	Required for Majors	2	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	2	B	6						
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	0	C	4	General	11	Under-grad	20	Non-major	19
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	5	D	1						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	5	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	1						
				I	0	Other	1				
				?	0						

Course-Section: GERM 201 01
 Title Intermediate German I
 Instructor: Larkey, Edward
 Enrollment: 18
 Questionnaires: 14

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 768
 JUN 28, 2010
 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	1	4	3	6	4.00	1058/1447	4.14	4.31	4.31	4.31	4.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	5	4	5	4.00	1053/1447	4.32	4.34	4.27	4.23	4.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	6	5	4.07	891/1241	4.26	4.48	4.33	4.35	4.07
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	3	1	5	2	3.55	1249/1402	3.99	4.36	4.24	4.24	3.55
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	1	0	8	3	4.08	756/1358	4.00	4.26	4.11	4.12	4.08
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	1	5	1	6	3.71	1020/1316	4.04	4.27	4.14	4.08	3.71
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	3	3	6	2	3.50	1259/1427	3.93	4.21	4.19	4.14	3.50
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	2	12	4.86	619/1447	4.93	4.66	4.69	4.70	4.86
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	1	0	2	7	2	3.75	1088/1434	4.04	4.12	4.10	3.97	3.75
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	1	0	3	4	5	3.92	1217/1387	4.14	4.45	4.46	4.42	3.92
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	1	2	0	10	4.46	1167/1387	4.69	4.78	4.73	4.71	4.46
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	2	2	4	5	3.92	1111/1386	4.19	4.35	4.32	4.24	3.92
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	3	3	6	4.08	1006/1380	4.31	4.43	4.32	4.30	4.08
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	3	1	2	2	2	3	3.40	999/1193	3.53	4.02	4.02	4.04	3.40
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	1	1	4	1	3	3.40	1024/1172	3.25	4.26	4.15	4.12	3.40
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	1	3	1	5	4.00	856/1182	4.05	4.56	4.35	4.30	4.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	1	2	2	5	4.10	851/1170	4.19	4.41	4.38	4.32	4.10
4. Were special techniques successful	4	3	0	1	4	2	0	3.14	735/ 800	3.57	4.17	4.06	4.01	3.14

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	4	0.00-0.99	0	A	1	Required for Majors	3	Graduate	0	Major	2
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	9						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	2	C	4	General	8	Under-grad	14	Non-major	12
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	2	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	1				
				?	0						

Course-Section: GERM 201 02
 Title Intermediate German I
 Instructor: Sutton,Susanne
 Enrollment: 15
 Questionnaires: 11

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 769
 JUN 28, 2010
 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	1	1	3	6	4.27	849/1447	4.14	4.31	4.31	4.31	4.27
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	2	8	4.64	389/1447	4.32	4.34	4.27	4.23	4.64
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	2	7	4.45	599/1241	4.26	4.48	4.33	4.35	4.45
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	1	3	5	4.44	567/1402	3.99	4.36	4.24	4.24	4.44
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	2	2	2	5	3.91	917/1358	4.00	4.26	4.11	4.12	3.91
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	3	6	4.36	527/1316	4.04	4.27	4.14	4.08	4.36
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	2	3	6	4.36	644/1427	3.93	4.21	4.19	4.14	4.36
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1447	4.93	4.66	4.69	4.70	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	0	6	3	4.33	540/1434	4.04	4.12	4.10	3.97	4.33
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	7	4	4.36	941/1387	4.14	4.45	4.46	4.42	4.36
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	528/1387	4.69	4.78	4.73	4.71	4.91
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	6	5	4.45	677/1386	4.19	4.35	4.32	4.24	4.45
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	3	7	4.55	615/1380	4.31	4.43	4.32	4.30	4.55
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	2	0	1	2	5	1	3.67	895/1193	3.53	4.02	4.02	4.04	3.67
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	3	3	2	2	3.09	1083/1172	3.25	4.26	4.15	4.12	3.09
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	1	2	3	5	4.09	834/1182	4.05	4.56	4.35	4.30	4.09
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	2	4	5	4.27	751/1170	4.19	4.41	4.38	4.32	4.27
4. Were special techniques successful	0	1	0	1	0	7	2	4.00	423/ 800	3.57	4.17	4.06	4.01	4.00
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 31	****	5.00	4.72	****	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	9	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 21	****	5.00	4.57	****	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	9	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 31	****	5.00	4.64	****	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	9	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 20	****	****	4.60	****	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	9	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 15	****	****	4.61	****	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors				
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	A 1	Required for Majors	2	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	B 9						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	C 0	General	6	Under-grad	11	Non-major	11
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	D 0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
			P 0						
			I 0	Other	1				
			? 1						

Course-Section: GERM 202 01
 Title Intermediate German II
 Instructor: May, Brigitte Z
 Enrollment: 9
 Questionnaires: 8

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 770
 JUN 28, 2010
 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	1	1	1	5	4.25	869/1447	4.25	4.31	4.31	4.31	4.25
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	1	5	4.38	715/1447	4.38	4.34	4.27	4.23	4.38
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	0	7	4.75	282/1241	4.75	4.48	4.33	4.35	4.75
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	5	4.63	358/1402	4.63	4.36	4.24	4.24	4.63
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	2	4	4.25	608/1358	4.25	4.26	4.11	4.12	4.25
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	1	1	5	4.25	617/1316	4.25	4.27	4.14	4.08	4.25
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	3	4	4.38	632/1427	4.38	4.21	4.19	4.14	4.38
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	565/1447	4.88	4.66	4.69	4.70	4.88
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	1	2	4	4.43	431/1434	4.43	4.12	4.10	3.97	4.43
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	1	1	5	4.57	698/1387	4.57	4.45	4.46	4.42	4.57
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1387	5.00	4.78	4.73	4.71	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	1	1	5	4.57	539/1386	4.57	4.35	4.32	4.24	4.57
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	0	6	4.71	392/1380	4.71	4.43	4.32	4.30	4.71
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	1	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	288/1193	4.50	4.02	4.02	4.04	4.50
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	1	0	0	3	4.25	580/1172	4.25	4.26	4.15	4.12	4.25
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	553/1182	4.50	4.56	4.35	4.30	4.50
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	576/1170	4.50	4.41	4.38	4.32	4.50
4. Were special techniques successful	4	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	103/ 800	4.75	4.17	4.06	4.01	4.75

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: GERM 302 01
 Title Advanced German II
 Instructor: Sutton, Susanne
 Enrollment: 13
 Questionnaires: 8

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 771
 JUN 28, 2010
 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	3	5	4.63	452/1447	4.63	4.31	4.31	4.32	4.63
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	2	5	4.50	532/1447	4.50	4.34	4.27	4.23	4.50
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	168/1241	4.88	4.48	4.33	4.33	4.88
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	114/1402	4.88	4.36	4.24	4.24	4.88
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	4	3	4.25	608/1358	4.25	4.26	4.11	4.10	4.25
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	3	5	4.63	274/1316	4.63	4.27	4.14	4.13	4.63
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	200/1427	4.75	4.21	4.19	4.15	4.75
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1447	5.00	4.66	4.69	4.65	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	1	3	4	4.38	491/1434	4.38	4.12	4.10	4.09	4.38
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	4	3	4.25	1039/1387	4.25	4.45	4.46	4.44	4.25
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1387	5.00	4.78	4.73	4.71	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	4	4	4.50	607/1386	4.50	4.35	4.32	4.30	4.50
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	3	5	4.63	520/1380	4.63	4.43	4.32	4.32	4.63
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	3	0	0	3	1	1	3.60	927/1193	3.60	4.02	4.02	4.05	3.60
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	377/1172	4.50	4.26	4.15	4.24	4.50
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	347/1182	4.75	4.56	4.35	4.42	4.75
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1170	5.00	4.41	4.38	4.49	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	4	0	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	423/ 800	4.00	4.17	4.06	4.12	4.00

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors		
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A 3	Required for Majors 7	Graduate 0	Major 3
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B 2			
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	1	C 1	General 0	Under-grad 8	Non-major 5
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	2	D 0			
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F 0	Electives 1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	
				P 0			
				I 0	Other 0		
				? 2			

Course-Section: GERM 312 1
 Title Intro Germ Lit/Cult II
 Instructor: May, Brigitte Z
 Enrollment: 11
 Questionnaires: 10

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 772
 JUN 28, 2010
 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	1	9	4.90	148/1447	4.90	4.31	4.31	4.32	4.90
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	3	6	4.50	532/1447	4.50	4.34	4.27	4.23	4.50
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	7	4.70	345/1241	4.70	4.48	4.33	4.33	4.70
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	7	4.70	281/1402	4.70	4.36	4.24	4.24	4.70
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	137/1358	4.80	4.26	4.11	4.10	4.80
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	3	7	4.70	212/1316	4.70	4.27	4.14	4.13	4.70
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	0	0	0	5	4	4.44	541/1427	4.44	4.21	4.19	4.15	4.44
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	1	3	6	4.50	1079/1447	4.50	4.66	4.69	4.65	4.50
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	4	6	4.60	278/1434	4.60	4.12	4.10	4.09	4.60
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	3	7	4.70	521/1387	4.70	4.45	4.46	4.44	4.70
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1387	5.00	4.78	4.73	4.71	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	3	7	4.70	392/1386	4.70	4.35	4.32	4.30	4.70
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	273/1380	4.80	4.43	4.32	4.32	4.80
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	3	1	0	1	2	3	3.86	786/1193	3.86	4.02	4.02	4.05	3.86
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	135/1172	4.89	4.26	4.15	4.24	4.89
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	1	2	6	4.56	521/1182	4.56	4.56	4.35	4.42	4.56
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	243/1170	4.89	4.41	4.38	4.49	4.89
4. Were special techniques successful	1	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	81/ 800	4.89	4.17	4.06	4.12	4.89

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 6	Required for Majors 7	Graduate 0	Major 5	
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B 3				
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C 0	General	0	Under-grad 10	Non-major 5
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	4	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	1		
				? 0				

Course-Section: GERM 319 01
 Title German Translation
 Instructor: May, Brigitte Z
 Enrollment: 8
 Questionnaires: 6

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 773
 JUN 28, 2010
 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	1	0	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	927/1447	4.20	4.31	4.31	4.32	4.20
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	1	2	3.83	1189/1447	3.83	4.34	4.27	4.23	3.83
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	2	1	2	4.00	923/1241	4.00	4.48	4.33	4.33	4.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	4	1	4.20	827/1402	4.20	4.36	4.24	4.24	4.20
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	3	2	4.17	690/1358	4.17	4.26	4.11	4.10	4.17
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	112/1316	4.83	4.27	4.14	4.13	4.83
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	2	1	2	1	3.33	1312/1427	3.33	4.21	4.19	4.15	3.33
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	1018/1447	4.60	4.66	4.69	4.65	4.60
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	1	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	849/1434	4.00	4.12	4.10	4.09	4.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	656/1387	4.60	4.45	4.46	4.44	4.60
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1387	5.00	4.78	4.73	4.71	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	1	3	1	4.00	1047/1386	4.00	4.35	4.32	4.30	4.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	659/1380	4.50	4.43	4.32	4.32	4.50
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	2	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	960/1193	3.50	4.02	4.02	4.05	3.50
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	377/1172	4.50	4.26	4.15	4.24	4.50
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1182	5.00	4.56	4.35	4.42	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	576/1170	4.50	4.41	4.38	4.49	4.50
4. Were special techniques successful	4	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	195/ 800	4.50	4.17	4.06	4.12	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 5	Graduate 0	Major 3
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B 2			
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C 2	General 0	Under-grad 6	Non-major 3
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	1	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		
				? 0			

Course-Section: GERM 481 01
 Title Seminar In German
 Instructor: Larkey,Edward
 Enrollment: 6
 Questionnaires: 6

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 774
 JUN 28, 2010
 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	1	0	0	4	1	3.67	1290/1447	3.67	4.31	4.31	4.43	3.67
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	3	0	3.33	1361/1447	3.33	4.34	4.27	4.31	3.33
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	717/1241	4.33	4.48	4.33	4.41	4.33
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	1	3	1	4.00	976/1402	4.00	4.36	4.24	4.34	4.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	1	0	3	0	1	3.00	1291/1358	3.00	4.26	4.11	4.15	3.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	3	2	1	3.67	1050/1316	3.67	4.27	4.14	4.27	3.67
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	2	2	2	0	3.00	1359/1427	3.00	4.21	4.19	4.20	3.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	1079/1447	4.50	4.66	4.69	4.72	4.50
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	2	3	0	3.60	1188/1434	3.60	4.12	4.10	4.17	3.60
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	6	0	4.00	1176/1387	4.00	4.45	4.46	4.48	4.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	982/1387	4.67	4.78	4.73	4.76	4.67
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	4	1	4.00	1047/1386	4.00	4.35	4.32	4.34	4.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	0	3	2	4.00	1030/1380	4.00	4.43	4.32	4.34	4.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	0	3	3	4.50	288/1193	4.50	4.02	4.02	4.00	4.50
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	2	2	1	3.80	859/1172	3.80	4.26	4.15	4.25	3.80
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	490/1182	4.60	4.56	4.35	4.49	4.60
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	522/1170	4.60	4.41	4.38	4.51	4.60
4. Were special techniques successful	1	4	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 800	****	4.17	4.06	4.19	****

Frequency Distribution

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