

Course-Section: GERM 101 0101
 Title ELEMENTARY GERMAN I
 Instructor: XIE, WEI
 Enrollment: 24
 Questionnaires: 11

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 801
 JUN 14, 2005
 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 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 7 | 4.36 | 750/1504 | 4.36 | 4.24 | 4.27 | 4.13 | 4.36 |
| 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 3 | 4 | 4.00 | 1052/1503 | 4.00 | 4.22 | 4.20 | 4.16 | 4.00 |
| 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 10 | 4.91 | 131/1290 | 4.91 | 4.32 | 4.28 | 4.19 | 4.91 |
| 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals | 0 | 5 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 4 | 4.17 | 878/1453 | 4.17 | 4.22 | 4.21 | 4.11 | 4.17 |
| 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 7 | 4.75 | 158/1421 | 4.75 | 4.08 | 4.00 | 3.91 | 4.75 |
| 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned | 0 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 4 | 3.80 | 967/1365 | 3.80 | 4.11 | 4.08 | 3.96 | 3.80 |
| 7. Was the grading system clearly explained | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 7 | 4.55 | 412/1485 | 4.55 | 4.20 | 4.16 | 4.13 | 4.55 |
| 8. How many times was class cancelled | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 8 | 2 | 4.09 | 1386/1504 | 4.09 | 4.68 | 4.69 | 4.66 | 4.09 |
| 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness | 5 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 0 | 3.33 | 1302/1483 | 3.33 | 4.07 | 4.06 | 3.97 | 3.33 |
| ----- | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Lecture | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 7 | 4.64 | 618/1425 | 4.64 | 4.41 | 4.41 | 4.36 | 4.64 |
| 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 7 | 4.55 | 1096/1426 | 4.55 | 4.72 | 4.69 | 4.56 | 4.55 |
| 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 6 | 4.27 | 828/1418 | 4.27 | 4.29 | 4.25 | 4.20 | 4.27 |
| 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 7 | 4.55 | 583/1416 | 4.55 | 4.34 | 4.26 | 4.21 | 4.55 |
| 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding | 2 | 4 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 3.00 | 1050/1199 | 3.00 | 3.95 | 3.97 | 3.82 | 3.00 |
| ----- | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Discussion | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned | 5 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 2.83 | 1195/1312 | 2.83 | 4.12 | 4.00 | 3.69 | 2.83 |
| 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 6 | 4.86 | 248/1303 | 4.86 | 4.39 | 4.24 | 3.93 | 4.86 |
| 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion | 5 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 4.17 | 855/1299 | 4.17 | 4.34 | 4.25 | 3.94 | 4.17 |
| 4. Were special techniques successful | 4 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 4.80 | 84/ 758 | 4.80 | 4.05 | 4.01 | 3.80 | 4.80 |

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: GERM 102 0101
 Title ELEMENTARY GERMAN II
 Instructor: SUTTON, SUSANNE
 Enrollment: 25
 Questionnaires: 19

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 802
 JUN 14, 2005
 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 | |
| ----- | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| General | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 5 | 11 | 4.42 | 669/1504 | 4.40 | 4.24 | 4.27 | 4.13 | 4.42 |
| 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 15 | 4.74 | 238/1503 | 4.48 | 4.22 | 4.20 | 4.16 | 4.74 |
| 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5 | 13 | 4.63 | 378/1290 | 4.57 | 4.32 | 4.28 | 4.19 | 4.63 |
| 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 5 | 11 | 4.32 | 705/1453 | 4.27 | 4.22 | 4.21 | 4.11 | 4.32 |
| 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 3 | 7 | 7 | 4.06 | 712/1421 | 4.08 | 4.08 | 4.00 | 3.91 | 4.06 |
| 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 9 | 6 | 4.11 | 726/1365 | 4.16 | 4.11 | 4.08 | 3.96 | 4.11 |
| 7. Was the grading system clearly explained | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 5 | 10 | 4.32 | 693/1485 | 4.30 | 4.20 | 4.16 | 4.13 | 4.32 |
| 8. How many times was class cancelled | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 16 | 4.84 | 760/1504 | 4.92 | 4.68 | 4.69 | 4.66 | 4.84 |
| 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness | 3 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 5 | 8 | 4.25 | 635/1483 | 4.26 | 4.07 | 4.06 | 3.97 | 4.25 |
| Lecture | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 16 | 4.79 | 366/1425 | 4.72 | 4.41 | 4.41 | 4.36 | 4.79 |
| 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 15 | 4.79 | 773/1426 | 4.78 | 4.72 | 4.69 | 4.56 | 4.79 |
| 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 3 | 13 | 4.53 | 552/1418 | 4.48 | 4.29 | 4.25 | 4.20 | 4.53 |
| 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 14 | 4.68 | 420/1416 | 4.53 | 4.34 | 4.26 | 4.21 | 4.68 |
| 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding | 1 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 4 | 8 | 3.94 | 703/1199 | 3.80 | 3.95 | 3.97 | 3.82 | 3.94 |
| Discussion | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned | 3 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 6 | 2 | 6 | 3.69 | 937/1312 | 3.93 | 4.12 | 4.00 | 3.69 | 3.69 |
| 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 12 | 4.69 | 431/1303 | 4.55 | 4.39 | 4.24 | 3.93 | 4.69 |
| 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 4 | 9 | 4.47 | 613/1299 | 4.44 | 4.34 | 4.25 | 3.94 | 4.47 |
| 4. Were special techniques successful | 3 | 1 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 7 | 3.53 | 573/ 758 | 3.73 | 4.05 | 4.01 | 3.80 | 3.53 |

Frequency Distribution

| Credits Earned | Cum. GPA | Expected Grades | Reasons | Type | Majors | | | | | | |
|----------------|----------|-----------------|---------|------|--------|---------------------|----|---|----|-----------|---|
| 00-27 | 5 | 0.00-0.99 | 0 | A | 6 | Required for Majors | 13 | Graduate | 0 | Major | 0 |
| 28-55 | 1 | 1.00-1.99 | 1 | B | 8 | | | | | | |
| 56-83 | 5 | 2.00-2.99 | 1 | C | 3 | General | 1 | Under-grad | 19 | Non-major | 1 |
| 84-150 | 3 | 3.00-3.49 | 8 | D | 0 | | | | | | |
| Grad. | 0 | 3.50-4.00 | 4 | F | 1 | Electives | 3 | #### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant | | | |
| | | | | P | 0 | | | | | | |
| | | | | I | 0 | Other | 1 | | | | |
| | | | | ? | 0 | | | | | | |

Course-Section: GERM 102 0201
 Title ELEMENTARY GERMAN II
 Instructor: SUTTON, SUSANNE
 Enrollment: 24
 Questionnaires: 18

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 803
 JUN 14, 2005
 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 | 7 | 9 | 4.39 | 725/1504 | 4.40 | 4.24 | 4.27 | 4.13 | 4.39 |
| 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 9 | 7 | 4.22 | 880/1503 | 4.48 | 4.22 | 4.20 | 4.16 | 4.22 |
| 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 3 | 12 | 4.50 | 507/1290 | 4.57 | 4.32 | 4.28 | 4.19 | 4.50 |
| 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 7 | 8 | 4.22 | 810/1453 | 4.27 | 4.22 | 4.21 | 4.11 | 4.22 |
| 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 5 | 8 | 4.11 | 669/1421 | 4.08 | 4.08 | 4.00 | 3.91 | 4.11 |
| 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 7 | 8 | 4.22 | 614/1365 | 4.16 | 4.11 | 4.08 | 3.96 | 4.22 |
| 7. Was the grading system clearly explained | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 5 | 9 | 4.29 | 716/1485 | 4.30 | 4.20 | 4.16 | 4.13 | 4.29 |
| 8. How many times was class cancelled | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 18 | 5.00 | 1/1504 | 4.92 | 4.68 | 4.69 | 4.66 | 5.00 |
| 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 7 | 6 | 4.27 | 624/1483 | 4.26 | 4.07 | 4.06 | 3.97 | 4.27 |
| Lecture | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 12 | 4.65 | 603/1425 | 4.72 | 4.41 | 4.41 | 4.36 | 4.65 |
| 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 13 | 4.76 | 808/1426 | 4.78 | 4.72 | 4.69 | 4.56 | 4.76 |
| 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 3 | 10 | 4.44 | 669/1418 | 4.48 | 4.29 | 4.25 | 4.20 | 4.44 |
| 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned | 2 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 5 | 9 | 4.38 | 776/1416 | 4.53 | 4.34 | 4.26 | 4.21 | 4.38 |
| 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding | 1 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 7 | 3 | 3.67 | 860/1199 | 3.80 | 3.95 | 3.97 | 3.82 | 3.67 |
| Discussion | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 4.17 | 651/1312 | 3.93 | 4.12 | 4.00 | 3.69 | 4.17 |
| 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate | 6 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 8 | 4.42 | 663/1303 | 4.55 | 4.39 | 4.24 | 3.93 | 4.42 |
| 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 3 | 7 | 4.42 | 667/1299 | 4.44 | 4.34 | 4.25 | 3.94 | 4.42 |
| 4. Were special techniques successful | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 5 | 3 | 3.92 | 462/ 758 | 3.73 | 4.05 | 4.01 | 3.80 | 3.92 |

Frequency Distribution

| Credits Earned | Cum. GPA | Expected Grades | Reasons | Type | Majors | | | | | | |
|----------------|----------|-----------------|---------|------|--------|---------------------|----|---|----|-----------|---|
| 00-27 | 4 | 0.00-0.99 | 0 | A | 5 | Required for Majors | 10 | Graduate | 0 | Major | 0 |
| 28-55 | 3 | 1.00-1.99 | 2 | B | 4 | | | | | | |
| 56-83 | 6 | 2.00-2.99 | 2 | C | 7 | General | 3 | Under-grad | 18 | Non-major | 4 |
| 84-150 | 0 | 3.00-3.49 | 7 | D | 2 | | | | | | |
| 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 | 3 | | | | |
| | | | | ? | 0 | | | | | | |

Course-Section: GERM 201 0101
 Title INTERMEDIATE GERMAN I
 Instructor: SUTTON, SUSANNE
 Enrollment: 18
 Questionnaires: 15

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 804
 JUN 14, 2005
 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 | 0 | 2 | 12 | 4.67 | 357/1504 | 4.83 | 4.24 | 4.27 | 4.26 | 4.67 |
| 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 8 | 4.53 | 460/1503 | 4.77 | 4.22 | 4.20 | 4.18 | 4.53 |
| 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 10 | 4.67 | 344/1290 | 4.83 | 4.32 | 4.28 | 4.27 | 4.67 |
| 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5 | 9 | 4.53 | 407/1453 | 4.65 | 4.22 | 4.21 | 4.20 | 4.53 |
| 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 3 | 8 | 4.20 | 596/1421 | 4.52 | 4.08 | 4.00 | 3.90 | 4.20 |
| 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 3 | 9 | 4.27 | 569/1365 | 4.52 | 4.11 | 4.08 | 4.00 | 4.27 |
| 7. Was the grading system clearly explained | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 5 | 8 | 4.40 | 591/1485 | 4.66 | 4.20 | 4.16 | 4.15 | 4.40 |
| 8. How many times was class cancelled | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 15 | 5.00 | 1/1504 | 5.00 | 4.68 | 4.69 | 4.68 | 5.00 |
| 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness | 2 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5 | 5 | 4.36 | 506/1483 | 4.64 | 4.07 | 4.06 | 4.02 | 4.36 |
| Lecture | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 11 | 4.79 | 366/1425 | 4.85 | 4.41 | 4.41 | 4.40 | 4.79 |
| 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 13 | 4.93 | 401/1426 | 4.93 | 4.72 | 4.69 | 4.71 | 4.93 |
| 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 10 | 4.64 | 402/1418 | 4.82 | 4.29 | 4.25 | 4.22 | 4.64 |
| 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 12 | 4.86 | 198/1416 | 4.93 | 4.34 | 4.26 | 4.24 | 4.86 |
| 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding | 2 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 3 | 6 | 4.25 | 495/1199 | 4.40 | 3.95 | 3.97 | 3.95 | 4.25 |
| Discussion | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned | 3 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 6 | 4.00 | 716/1312 | 4.25 | 4.12 | 4.00 | 3.98 | 4.00 |
| 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate | 3 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 6 | 4.00 | 910/1303 | 4.50 | 4.39 | 4.24 | 4.23 | 4.00 |
| 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 3 | 7 | 4.42 | 667/1299 | 4.61 | 4.34 | 4.25 | 4.21 | 4.42 |
| 4. Were special techniques successful | 3 | 3 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 6 | 4.11 | 369/ 758 | 4.31 | 4.05 | 4.01 | 3.89 | 4.11 |
| Laboratory | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material | 13 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 4.50 | ****/ 233 | **** | 4.07 | 4.09 | 4.30 | **** |
| 2. Were you provided with adequate background information | 14 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/ 244 | **** | 4.12 | 4.09 | 4.24 | **** |
| 3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities | 14 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/ 227 | **** | 4.49 | 4.40 | 4.58 | **** |
| 4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance | 14 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/ 225 | **** | 4.40 | 4.23 | 4.52 | **** |
| 5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified | 14 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/ 207 | **** | 4.22 | 4.09 | 4.22 | **** |
| Seminar | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme | 14 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/ 76 | **** | 4.60 | 4.61 | 4.22 | **** |
| 2. Was the instructor available for individual attention | 14 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/ 70 | **** | 4.54 | 4.35 | 4.30 | **** |
| 3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned | 14 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/ 67 | **** | 4.32 | 4.34 | 4.50 | **** |
| 4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned | 14 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/ 76 | **** | 4.41 | 4.44 | 4.21 | **** |
| 5. Were criteria for grading made clear | 14 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/ 73 | **** | 4.17 | 4.17 | 4.24 | **** |
| Field Work | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned | 14 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/ 58 | **** | 3.98 | 4.43 | 4.41 | **** |
| 2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria | 14 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/ 56 | **** | 4.12 | 4.23 | 4.24 | **** |
| 3. Was the instructor available for consultation | 14 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/ 44 | **** | 4.68 | 4.65 | 4.51 | **** |
| 4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations | 14 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/ 47 | **** | 4.32 | 4.29 | 4.65 | **** |
| 5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities | 14 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/ 39 | **** | 4.61 | 4.44 | 4.28 | **** |
| Self Paced | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned | 14 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/ 40 | **** | 4.28 | 4.53 | 4.44 | **** |

| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|----|---|---|---|---|---|---|------|-------|----|------|------|------|------|------|
| 2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal | 14 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/ | 35 | **** | 4.43 | 4.49 | 4.50 | **** |
| 3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful | 14 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/ | 36 | **** | 4.38 | 4.60 | 4.13 | **** |
| 4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful | 14 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/ | 20 | **** | 5.00 | 4.24 | 5.00 | **** |
| 5. Were there enough proctors for all the students | 14 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/ | 16 | **** | 5.00 | 4.51 | 5.00 | **** |

Course-Section: GERM 201 0101
 Title INTERMEDIATE GERMAN I
 Instructor: SUTTON, SUSANNE
 Enrollment: 18
 Questionnaires: 15

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 804
 JUN 14, 2005
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

| Credits Earned | | Cum. GPA | | Expected Grades | | Reasons | Type | Majors | | | |
|----------------|---|-----------|---|-----------------|---|---------------------|------|---|----|-----------|---|
| 00-27 | 2 | 0.00-0.99 | 0 | A | 3 | Required for Majors | 9 | Graduate | 0 | Major | 0 |
| 28-55 | 1 | 1.00-1.99 | 0 | B | 5 | | | | | | |
| 56-83 | 3 | 2.00-2.99 | 3 | C | 5 | General | 2 | Under-grad | 15 | Non-major | 3 |
| 84-150 | 3 | 3.00-3.49 | 2 | 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 | 3 | | | | |
| | | | | ? | 0 | | | | | | |

Course-Section: GERM 201 0201
 Title INTERMEDIATE GERMAN I
 Instructor: WOLFF, XENIA
 Enrollment: 19
 Questionnaires: 13

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 805
 JUN 14, 2005
 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 | 13 | 5.00 | 1/1504 | 4.83 | 4.24 | 4.27 | 4.26 | 5.00 |
| 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 13 | 5.00 | 1/1503 | 4.77 | 4.22 | 4.20 | 4.18 | 5.00 |
| 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 13 | 5.00 | 1/1290 | 4.83 | 4.32 | 4.28 | 4.27 | 5.00 |
| 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 10 | 4.77 | 186/1453 | 4.65 | 4.22 | 4.21 | 4.20 | 4.77 |
| 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 11 | 4.85 | 112/1421 | 4.52 | 4.08 | 4.00 | 3.90 | 4.85 |
| 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 10 | 4.77 | 134/1365 | 4.52 | 4.11 | 4.08 | 4.00 | 4.77 |
| 7. Was the grading system clearly explained | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 12 | 4.92 | 78/1485 | 4.66 | 4.20 | 4.16 | 4.15 | 4.92 |
| 8. How many times was class cancelled | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 13 | 5.00 | 1/1504 | 5.00 | 4.68 | 4.69 | 4.68 | 5.00 |
| 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 11 | 4.92 | 75/1483 | 4.64 | 4.07 | 4.06 | 4.02 | 4.92 |
| Lecture | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 12 | 4.92 | 143/1425 | 4.85 | 4.41 | 4.41 | 4.40 | 4.92 |
| 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 12 | 4.92 | 401/1426 | 4.93 | 4.72 | 4.69 | 4.71 | 4.92 |
| 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 13 | 5.00 | 1/1418 | 4.82 | 4.29 | 4.25 | 4.22 | 5.00 |
| 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 13 | 5.00 | 1/1416 | 4.93 | 4.34 | 4.26 | 4.24 | 5.00 |
| 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 7 | 4.55 | 247/1199 | 4.40 | 3.95 | 3.97 | 3.95 | 4.55 |
| Discussion | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 5 | 4.50 | 364/1312 | 4.25 | 4.12 | 4.00 | 3.98 | 4.50 |
| 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 10 | 5.00 | 1/1303 | 4.50 | 4.39 | 4.24 | 4.23 | 5.00 |
| 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 8 | 4.80 | 303/1299 | 4.61 | 4.34 | 4.25 | 4.21 | 4.80 |
| 4. Were special techniques successful | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 7 | 4.50 | 185/ 758 | 4.31 | 4.05 | 4.01 | 3.89 | 4.50 |

Frequency Distribution

| Credits Earned | Cum. GPA | Expected Grades | Reasons | Type | Majors | | | | | | |
|----------------|----------|-----------------|---------|------|--------|---------------------|---|--|----|-----------|---|
| 00-27 | 2 | 0.00-0.99 | 0 | A | 10 | Required for Majors | 8 | Graduate | 1 | Major | 0 |
| 28-55 | 1 | 1.00-1.99 | 0 | B | 3 | | | | | | |
| 56-83 | 0 | 2.00-2.99 | 1 | C | 0 | General | 0 | Under-grad | 12 | Non-major | 1 |
| 84-150 | 5 | 3.00-3.49 | 2 | D | 0 | | | | | | |
| Grad. | 1 | 3.50-4.00 | 6 | F | 0 | Electives | 2 | # - 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: 11
 Questionnaires: 11

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 806
 JUN 14, 2005
 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 | 2 | 9 | 4.82 | 198/1504 | 4.82 | 4.24 | 4.27 | 4.26 | 4.82 |
| 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 9 | 4.82 | 164/1503 | 4.82 | 4.22 | 4.20 | 4.18 | 4.82 |
| 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 7 | 4.45 | 574/1290 | 4.45 | 4.32 | 4.28 | 4.27 | 4.45 |
| 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 7 | 4.60 | 331/1453 | 4.60 | 4.22 | 4.21 | 4.20 | 4.60 |
| 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 7 | 4.64 | 229/1421 | 4.64 | 4.08 | 4.00 | 3.90 | 4.64 |
| 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 7 | 4.55 | 267/1365 | 4.55 | 4.11 | 4.08 | 4.00 | 4.55 |
| 7. Was the grading system clearly explained | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 3 | 6 | 4.36 | 636/1485 | 4.36 | 4.20 | 4.16 | 4.15 | 4.36 |
| 8. How many times was class cancelled | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 11 | 5.00 | 1/1504 | 5.00 | 4.68 | 4.69 | 4.68 | 5.00 |
| 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 3 | 4.38 | 493/1483 | 4.38 | 4.07 | 4.06 | 4.02 | 4.38 |
| Lecture | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 10 | 5.00 | 1/1425 | 5.00 | 4.41 | 4.41 | 4.40 | 5.00 |
| 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 9 | 4.80 | 738/1426 | 4.80 | 4.72 | 4.69 | 4.71 | 4.80 |
| 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 9 | 4.80 | 191/1418 | 4.80 | 4.29 | 4.25 | 4.22 | 4.80 |
| 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 7 | 4.60 | 525/1416 | 4.60 | 4.34 | 4.26 | 4.24 | 4.60 |
| 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding | 2 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 1 | 3 | 3.75 | 820/1199 | 3.75 | 3.95 | 3.97 | 3.95 | 3.75 |
| Discussion | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned | 7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 3 | 4.50 | 364/1312 | 4.50 | 4.12 | 4.00 | 3.98 | 4.50 |
| 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate | 7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 4.75 | 356/1303 | 4.75 | 4.39 | 4.24 | 4.23 | 4.75 |
| 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion | 7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 3 | 4.50 | 570/1299 | 4.50 | 4.34 | 4.25 | 4.21 | 4.50 |
| 4. Were special techniques successful | 7 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 3.00 | ****/ 758 | **** | 4.05 | 4.01 | 3.89 | **** |

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: GERM 302 0101
 Title ADVANCED GERMAN II
 Instructor: MAY, BRIGITTE
 Enrollment: 17
 Questionnaires: 16

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 807
 JUN 14, 2005
 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 | 3 | 6 | 7 | 4.25 | 889/1504 | 4.25 | 4.24 | 4.27 | 4.27 | 4.25 |
| 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 8 | 7 | 4.38 | 692/1503 | 4.38 | 4.22 | 4.20 | 4.22 | 4.38 |
| 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 6 | 9 | 4.50 | 507/1290 | 4.50 | 4.32 | 4.28 | 4.31 | 4.50 |
| 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 7 | 8 | 4.44 | 547/1453 | 4.44 | 4.22 | 4.21 | 4.23 | 4.44 |
| 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 6 | 5 | 3.94 | 827/1421 | 3.94 | 4.08 | 4.00 | 4.01 | 3.94 |
| 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 6 | 6 | 4.06 | 748/1365 | 4.06 | 4.11 | 4.08 | 4.08 | 4.06 |
| 7. Was the grading system clearly explained | 0 | 2 | 0 | 3 | 1 | 6 | 4 | 3.79 | 1158/1485 | 3.79 | 4.20 | 4.16 | 4.17 | 3.79 |
| 8. How many times was class cancelled | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 11 | 4 | 4.19 | 1322/1504 | 4.19 | 4.68 | 4.69 | 4.65 | 4.19 |
| 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 10 | 4.60 | 258/1483 | 4.60 | 4.07 | 4.06 | 4.08 | 4.60 |
| Lecture | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 5 | 8 | 4.40 | 900/1425 | 4.40 | 4.41 | 4.41 | 4.43 | 4.40 |
| 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 10 | 4.67 | 967/1426 | 4.67 | 4.72 | 4.69 | 4.71 | 4.67 |
| 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 7 | 6 | 4.27 | 838/1418 | 4.27 | 4.29 | 4.25 | 4.26 | 4.27 |
| 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 8 | 4.53 | 593/1416 | 4.53 | 4.34 | 4.26 | 4.27 | 4.53 |
| 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding | 1 | 11 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 3.50 | 919/1199 | 3.50 | 3.95 | 3.97 | 4.02 | 3.50 |
| Discussion | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 6 | 3 | 4.20 | 632/1312 | 4.20 | 4.12 | 4.00 | 4.09 | 4.20 |
| 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 7 | 4.60 | 507/1303 | 4.60 | 4.39 | 4.24 | 4.27 | 4.60 |
| 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5 | 4 | 4.30 | 768/1299 | 4.30 | 4.34 | 4.25 | 4.30 | 4.30 |
| 4. Were special techniques successful | 7 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 4.00 | 387/ 758 | 4.00 | 4.05 | 4.01 | 4.00 | 4.00 |

Frequency Distribution

| Credits Earned | Cum. GPA | Expected Grades | Reasons | Type | Majors | | | | | | |
|----------------|----------|-----------------|---------|------|--------|---------------------|---|---|----|-----------|---|
| 00-27 | 1 | 0.00-0.99 | 0 | A | 7 | Required for Majors | 0 | Graduate | 0 | Major | 0 |
| 28-55 | 2 | 1.00-1.99 | 0 | B | 4 | | | | | | |
| 56-83 | 2 | 2.00-2.99 | 4 | C | 2 | General | 4 | Under-grad | 16 | Non-major | 2 |
| 84-150 | 6 | 3.00-3.49 | 2 | D | 0 | | | | | | |
| Grad. | 0 | 3.50-4.00 | 4 | F | 0 | Electives | 2 | #### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant | | | |
| | | | | P | 0 | | | | | | |
| | | | | I | 1 | Other | 8 | | | | |
| | | | | ? | 2 | | | | | | |

Course-Section: GERM 311 0101
 Title INTRO GERM LIT/CULT I
 Instructor: MAY, BRIGITTE
 Enrollment: 11
 Questionnaires: 9

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 808
 JUN 14, 2005
 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 | 4 | 5 | 4.56 | 482/1504 | 4.56 | 4.24 | 4.27 | 4.27 | 4.56 |
| 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 7 | 4.78 | 200/1503 | 4.78 | 4.22 | 4.20 | 4.22 | 4.78 |
| 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 5 | 4.56 | 459/1290 | 4.56 | 4.32 | 4.28 | 4.31 | 4.56 |
| 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 4 | 4.50 | 440/1453 | 4.50 | 4.22 | 4.21 | 4.23 | 4.50 |
| 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 7 | 4.78 | 145/1421 | 4.78 | 4.08 | 4.00 | 4.01 | 4.78 |
| 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 5 | 4.50 | 297/1365 | 4.50 | 4.11 | 4.08 | 4.08 | 4.50 |
| 7. Was the grading system clearly explained | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 7 | 4.78 | 180/1485 | 4.78 | 4.20 | 4.16 | 4.17 | 4.78 |
| 8. How many times was class cancelled | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 9 | 0 | 4.00 | 1411/1504 | 4.00 | 4.68 | 4.69 | 4.65 | 4.00 |
| 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness | 2 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5 | 4.83 | 108/1483 | 4.83 | 4.07 | 4.06 | 4.08 | 4.83 |
| Lecture | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 4.80 | 331/1425 | 4.80 | 4.41 | 4.41 | 4.43 | 4.80 |
| 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 4.80 | 738/1426 | 4.80 | 4.72 | 4.69 | 4.71 | 4.80 |
| 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 4.50 | 578/1418 | 4.50 | 4.29 | 4.25 | 4.26 | 4.50 |
| 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 3 | 4.60 | 525/1416 | 4.60 | 4.34 | 4.26 | 4.27 | 4.60 |
| 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding | 4 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 4.00 | 636/1199 | 4.00 | 3.95 | 3.97 | 4.02 | 4.00 |
| Discussion | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 4.33 | 530/1312 | 4.33 | 4.12 | 4.00 | 4.09 | 4.33 |
| 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 4.67 | 450/1303 | 4.67 | 4.39 | 4.24 | 4.27 | 4.67 |
| 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 4.67 | 445/1299 | 4.67 | 4.34 | 4.25 | 4.30 | 4.67 |
| 4. Were special techniques successful | 6 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 3.33 | 630/ 758 | 3.33 | 4.05 | 4.01 | 4.00 | 3.33 |

Frequency Distribution

| Credits Earned | Cum. GPA | Expected Grades | Reasons | Type | Majors | | | | | | |
|----------------|----------|-----------------|---------|------|--------|---------------------|---|---|---|-----------|---|
| 00-27 | 1 | 0.00-0.99 | 0 | A | 4 | Required for Majors | 0 | Graduate | 0 | Major | 0 |
| 28-55 | 0 | 1.00-1.99 | 0 | B | 3 | | | | | | |
| 56-83 | 0 | 2.00-2.99 | 0 | C | 2 | General | 0 | Under-grad | 9 | Non-major | 1 |
| 84-150 | 3 | 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 | 9 | | | | |
| | | | | ? | 0 | | | | | | |

Course-Section: GERM 319 0101
 Title GERMAN TRANSLATION
 Instructor: MAY, BRIGITTE
 Enrollment: 12
 Questionnaires: 11

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 809
 JUN 14, 2005
 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 | 1 | 9 | 4.73 | 295/1504 | 4.73 | 4.24 | 4.27 | 4.27 | 4.73 |
| 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 8 | 4.73 | 248/1503 | 4.73 | 4.22 | 4.20 | 4.22 | 4.73 |
| 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 11 | 5.00 | 1/1290 | 5.00 | 4.32 | 4.28 | 4.31 | 5.00 |
| 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 10 | 4.91 | 101/1453 | 4.91 | 4.22 | 4.21 | 4.23 | 4.91 |
| 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 11 | 5.00 | 1/1421 | 5.00 | 4.08 | 4.00 | 4.01 | 5.00 |
| 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 10 | 4.91 | 86/1365 | 4.91 | 4.11 | 4.08 | 4.08 | 4.91 |
| 7. Was the grading system clearly explained | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 5 | 4.33 | 670/1485 | 4.33 | 4.20 | 4.16 | 4.17 | 4.33 |
| 8. How many times was class cancelled | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 4 | 4.36 | 1200/1504 | 4.36 | 4.68 | 4.69 | 4.65 | 4.36 |
| 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 9 | 4.90 | 84/1483 | 4.90 | 4.07 | 4.06 | 4.08 | 4.90 |
| Lecture | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 9 | 4.90 | 179/1425 | 4.90 | 4.41 | 4.41 | 4.43 | 4.90 |
| 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 9 | 4.90 | 502/1426 | 4.90 | 4.72 | 4.69 | 4.71 | 4.90 |
| 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 7 | 4.60 | 450/1418 | 4.60 | 4.29 | 4.25 | 4.26 | 4.60 |
| 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 9 | 4.80 | 255/1416 | 4.80 | 4.34 | 4.26 | 4.27 | 4.80 |
| 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding | 1 | 5 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 2.40 | 1153/1199 | 2.40 | 3.95 | 3.97 | 4.02 | 2.40 |
| Discussion | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5 | 4.83 | 148/1312 | 4.83 | 4.12 | 4.00 | 4.09 | 4.83 |
| 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 5.00 | 1/1303 | 5.00 | 4.39 | 4.24 | 4.27 | 5.00 |
| 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 5.00 | 1/1299 | 5.00 | 4.34 | 4.25 | 4.30 | 5.00 |
| 4. Were special techniques successful | 5 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 4.80 | 84/ 758 | 4.80 | 4.05 | 4.01 | 4.00 | 4.80 |

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: GERM 401 0101
 Title STUDIES IN GERMAN LANG
 Instructor: MAY, BRIGITTE
 Enrollment: 4
 Questionnaires: 4

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 810
 JUN 14, 2005
 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 | 1 | 3 | 4.75 | 262/1504 | 4.75 | 4.24 | 4.27 | 4.33 | 4.75 |
| 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 5.00 | 1/1503 | 5.00 | 4.22 | 4.20 | 4.18 | 5.00 |
| 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 4.75 | 250/1290 | 4.75 | 4.32 | 4.28 | 4.32 | 4.75 |
| 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 5.00 | 1/1453 | 5.00 | 4.22 | 4.21 | 4.22 | 5.00 |
| 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 4.75 | 158/1421 | 4.75 | 4.08 | 4.00 | 4.02 | 4.75 |
| 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 4.75 | 139/1365 | 4.75 | 4.11 | 4.08 | 4.09 | 4.75 |
| 7. Was the grading system clearly explained | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 5.00 | 1/1485 | 5.00 | 4.20 | 4.16 | 4.14 | 5.00 |
| 8. How many times was class cancelled | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 4.50 | 1087/1504 | 4.50 | 4.68 | 4.69 | 4.73 | 4.50 |
| 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 5.00 | 1/1483 | 5.00 | 4.07 | 4.06 | 4.11 | 5.00 |
| Lecture | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 4.75 | 420/1425 | 4.75 | 4.41 | 4.41 | 4.38 | 4.75 |
| 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 4.75 | 825/1426 | 4.75 | 4.72 | 4.69 | 4.72 | 4.75 |
| 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 5.00 | 1/1418 | 5.00 | 4.29 | 4.25 | 4.25 | 5.00 |
| 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 5.00 | 1/1416 | 5.00 | 4.34 | 4.26 | 4.26 | 5.00 |
| 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 4.67 | 177/1199 | 4.67 | 3.95 | 3.97 | 4.05 | 4.67 |
| Discussion | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 5.00 | 1/1312 | 5.00 | 4.12 | 4.00 | 4.07 | 5.00 |
| 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 4.75 | 356/1303 | 4.75 | 4.39 | 4.24 | 4.34 | 4.75 |
| 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 4.75 | 354/1299 | 4.75 | 4.34 | 4.25 | 4.38 | 4.75 |
| 4. Were special techniques successful | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 4.75 | 101/ 758 | 4.75 | 4.05 | 4.01 | 4.17 | 4.75 |
| Seminar | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | 1/ 76 | 5.00 | 4.60 | 4.61 | 4.63 | 5.00 |
| 2. Was the instructor available for individual attention | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | 1/ 70 | 5.00 | 4.54 | 4.35 | 4.63 | 5.00 |
| 3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 3.00 | 60/ 67 | 3.00 | 4.32 | 4.34 | 4.34 | 3.00 |
| 4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | 1/ 76 | 5.00 | 4.41 | 4.44 | 4.51 | 5.00 |
| 5. Were criteria for grading made clear | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | 1/ 73 | 5.00 | 4.17 | 4.17 | 4.29 | 5.00 |

Frequency Distribution

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