

Course-Section: GERM 101 0101
 Title ELEMENTARY GERMAN I
 Instructor: SUTTON, SUSANNE
 Enrollment: 29
 Questionnaires: 23

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 891
 FEB 11, 2009
 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	1	3	1	18	4.57	563/1649	4.60	4.34	4.28	4.11	4.57	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	2	20	4.83	202/1648	4.78	4.31	4.23	4.16	4.83	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	3	19	4.78	258/1375	4.78	4.42	4.27	4.10	4.78	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	6	16	4.73	263/1595	4.59	4.29	4.20	4.03	4.73	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	2	2	18	4.73	198/1533	4.60	4.16	4.04	3.87	4.73	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	2	4	16	4.64	286/1512	4.39	4.19	4.10	3.86	4.64	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	1	3	2	16	4.50	502/1623	4.49	4.08	4.16	4.08	4.50	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	1	0	21	4.91	664/1646	4.93	4.59	4.69	4.67	4.91	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	1	0	0	0	9	9	4.50	374/1621	4.50	4.14	4.06	3.96	4.50	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	4	19	4.83	358/1568	4.78	4.39	4.43	4.39	4.83	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	23	5.00	1/1572	4.98	4.79	4.70	4.64	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	4	18	4.74	374/1564	4.66	4.28	4.28	4.20	4.74	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	2	20	4.83	295/1559	4.82	4.43	4.29	4.20	4.83	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	1	0	1	2	6	13	4.41	399/1352	4.18	3.97	3.98	3.86	4.41	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	2	3	4	4	8	3.62	1034/1384	4.02	4.28	4.08	3.86	3.62	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	2	3	16	4.67	483/1382	4.65	4.57	4.29	4.03	4.67	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	0	3	3	13	4.53	639/1368	4.46	4.42	4.30	4.01	4.53	
4. Were special techniques successful	3	2	1	0	3	7	7	4.06	420/ 948	4.15	4.10	3.95	3.75	4.06	
Laboratory															
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	21	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 555	****	2.56	4.29	4.14	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	4	0.00-0.99	0	A	10	Required for Majors	13	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	5						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	5	C	3	General	3	Under-grad	23	Non-major	22
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	2	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	3				
				?	0						

Course-Section: GERM 101 0201
 Title ELEMENTARY GERMAN I
 Instructor: SUTTON, SUSANNE
 Enrollment: 29
 Questionnaires: 22

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 892
 FEB 11, 2009
 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	2	4	16	4.64	471/1649	4.60	4.34	4.28	4.11	4.64	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	4	17	4.73	291/1648	4.78	4.31	4.23	4.16	4.73	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	5	17	4.77	271/1375	4.78	4.42	4.27	4.10	4.77	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	6	13	4.45	566/1595	4.59	4.29	4.20	4.03	4.45	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	1	1	6	13	4.48	399/1533	4.60	4.16	4.04	3.87	4.48	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	4	8	9	4.14	808/1512	4.39	4.19	4.10	3.86	4.14	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	2	7	12	4.48	541/1623	4.49	4.08	4.16	4.08	4.48	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	21	4.95	332/1646	4.93	4.59	4.69	4.67	4.95	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	1	8	11	4.50	374/1621	4.50	4.14	4.06	3.96	4.50	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	6	16	4.73	535/1568	4.78	4.39	4.43	4.39	4.73	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	21	4.95	296/1572	4.98	4.79	4.70	4.64	4.95	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	1	7	13	4.57	580/1564	4.66	4.28	4.28	4.20	4.57	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	4	17	4.81	318/1559	4.82	4.43	4.29	4.20	4.81	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	2	0	1	6	4	7	3.94	766/1352	4.18	3.97	3.98	3.86	3.94	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	1	0	0	7	11	4.42	520/1384	4.02	4.28	4.08	3.86	4.42	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	0	7	12	4.63	511/1382	4.65	4.57	4.29	4.03	4.63	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	0	3	5	10	4.39	764/1368	4.46	4.42	4.30	4.01	4.39	
4. Were special techniques successful	3	2	0	0	4	5	8	4.24	349/ 948	4.15	4.10	3.95	3.75	4.24	
Laboratory															
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	21	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 243	****	4.69	4.12	4.08	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	20	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 555	****	2.56	4.29	4.14	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	3	0.00-0.99 0	A 8	Required for Majors	13
28-55	2	1.00-1.99 0	B 6		Graduate 0
56-83	2	2.00-2.99 1	C 5	General	2
84-150	1	3.00-3.49 2	D 0		Under-grad 22
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 4	F 1	Electives	2
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	4
			? 0		

Course-Section: GERM 102 0101
 Title ELEMENTARY GERMAN II
 Instructor: HENDRICH, ANJA
 Enrollment: 21
 Questionnaires: 11

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 893
 FEB 11, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	0	1	1	4	4	4.10	1116/1649	4.11	4.34	4.28	4.11	4.10	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	1	1	3	5	4.20	966/1648	4.35	4.31	4.23	4.16	4.20	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	2	1	7	4.50	546/1375	4.44	4.42	4.27	4.10	4.50	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	6	4	4.40	636/1595	4.45	4.29	4.20	4.03	4.40	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	4	2	3	3.70	1113/1533	3.85	4.16	4.04	3.87	3.70	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	5	4	4.30	627/1512	4.15	4.19	4.10	3.86	4.30	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	1	1	3	5	4.20	883/1623	4.16	4.08	4.16	4.08	4.20	
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	1	8	0	3.89	1607/1646	3.63	4.59	4.69	4.67	3.89	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	2	1	1	3	3.71	1225/1621	3.98	4.14	4.06	3.96	3.71	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	2	2	5	4.33	1050/1568	4.24	4.39	4.43	4.39	4.33	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	4	5	4.56	1193/1572	4.53	4.79	4.70	4.64	4.56	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	1	1	3	4	4.11	1073/1564	4.27	4.28	4.28	4.20	4.11	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	1	4	3	4.25	966/1559	4.34	4.43	4.29	4.20	4.25	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	5	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	515/1352	3.83	3.97	3.98	3.86	4.25	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	1	4	4	4.33	613/1384	4.29	4.28	4.08	3.86	4.33	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	0	5	4	4.44	676/1382	4.65	4.57	4.29	4.03	4.44	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	1	0	2	3	3	3.78	1085/1368	4.10	4.42	4.30	4.01	3.78	
4. Were special techniques successful	2	2	0	0	1	1	5	4.57	179/ 948	4.37	4.10	3.95	3.75	4.57	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	9	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 221	****	4.38	4.16	4.05	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	9	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 243	****	4.69	4.12	4.08	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	9	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 212	****	5.00	4.40	4.43	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	9	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 209	****	****	4.35	4.38	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	6	0	0	2	1	1	1	3.20	487/ 555	2.43	2.56	4.29	4.14	3.20	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	9	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 88	****	4.39	4.54	4.31	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	9	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 85	****	4.20	4.47	4.30	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 81	****	4.23	4.43	4.39	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 92	****	4.32	4.35	4.01	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	9	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 288	****	2.95	3.68	3.54	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 52	****	5.00	4.06	3.72	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	9	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 48	****	5.00	4.09	3.65	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	9	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 39	****	4.67	4.47	4.36	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	9	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 39	****	4.67	4.38	4.37	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	7	0	1	0	0	2	1	3.50	217/ 312	2.63	2.48	3.68	3.51	3.50	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 53	****	5.00	4.30	4.17	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	9	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 30	****	****	4.16	4.06	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	9	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 41	****	****	4.43	4.27	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	9	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 24	****	****	4.42	4.24	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	9	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 110	****	4.13	3.99	3.83	****	

Course-Section: GERM 102 0101
 Title ELEMENTARY GERMAN II
 Instructor: HENDRICHS, ANJA
 Enrollment: 21
 Questionnaires: 11

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 893
 FEB 11, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	1	A	2	Required for Majors	7	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	5						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	0	C	3	General	1	Under-grad	11	Non-major	11
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	0	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						

Course-Section: GERM 102 0201
 Title ELEMENTARY GERMAN II
 Instructor: HENDRICH, ANJA
 Enrollment: 12
 Questionnaires: 8

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 894
 FEB 11, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor Mean	Instructor Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5								
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	2	3	3	4.13	1096/1649	4.11	4.34	4.28	4.11	4.13	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	2	5	4.50	556/1648	4.35	4.31	4.23	4.16	4.50	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	0	0	1	6	4.38	694/1375	4.44	4.42	4.27	4.10	4.38	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	2	5	4.50	497/1595	4.45	4.29	4.20	4.03	4.50	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	1	1	2	3	4.00	815/1533	3.85	4.16	4.04	3.87	4.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	1	0	1	5	4.00	883/1512	4.15	4.19	4.10	3.86	4.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	1	2	4	4.13	957/1623	4.16	4.08	4.16	4.08	4.13	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	5	3	0	3.38	1639/1646	3.63	4.59	4.69	4.67	3.38	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	2	2	4	4.25	687/1621	3.98	4.14	4.06	3.96	4.25	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	1	1	1	4	4.14	1205/1568	4.24	4.39	4.43	4.39	4.14	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	1	0	0	5	4.50	1241/1572	4.53	4.79	4.70	4.64	4.50	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	4	3	4.43	754/1564	4.27	4.28	4.28	4.20	4.43	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	0	1	5	4.43	804/1559	4.34	4.43	4.29	4.20	4.43	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	2	1	1	0	1	2	3.40	1101/1352	3.83	3.97	3.98	3.86	3.40	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	1	0	6	4.25	673/1384	4.29	4.28	4.08	3.86	4.25	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	292/1382	4.65	4.57	4.29	4.03	4.86	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	1	2	4	4.43	732/1368	4.10	4.42	4.30	4.01	4.43	
4. Were special techniques successful	1	1	1	0	0	1	4	4.17	380/ 948	4.37	4.10	3.95	3.75	4.17	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 221	****	4.38	4.16	4.05	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 243	****	4.69	4.12	4.08	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	7	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 212	****	5.00	4.40	4.43	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	5	0	1	2	0	0	0	1.67	539/ 555	2.43	2.56	4.29	4.14	1.67	
Field Work															
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	3	1	3	0	0	1	0	1.75	301/ 312	2.63	2.48	3.68	3.51	1.75	
Self Paced															
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	6	1	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 110	****	4.13	3.99	3.83	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors		
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	A 3	Required for Majors 6	Graduate 0	Major 0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B 3			
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	1	C 2	General 0	Under-grad 8	Non-major 8
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	1	D 0			
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F 0	Electives 0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	
				P 0			
				I 0	Other 2		
				? 0			

Course-Section: GERM 201 0101
 Title INTERMEDIATE GERMAN I
 Instructor: WOLFF, XENIA
 Enrollment: 21
 Questionnaires: 15

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 895
 FEB 11, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor Mean	Instructor Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5								
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	6	9	4.60	510/1649	4.68	4.34	4.28	4.29	4.60	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	1	12	4.67	362/1648	4.80	4.31	4.23	4.25	4.67	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	4	10	4.60	464/1375	4.64	4.42	4.27	4.37	4.60	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	1	5	8	4.50	497/1595	4.59	4.29	4.20	4.22	4.50	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	2	4	8	4.27	614/1533	4.32	4.16	4.04	4.04	4.27	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	1	6	7	4.43	493/1512	4.40	4.19	4.10	4.14	4.43	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	1	3	2	8	4.00	1029/1623	4.22	4.08	4.16	4.21	4.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	15	5.00	1/1646	5.00	4.59	4.69	4.63	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	1	0	8	6	4.27	676/1621	4.35	4.14	4.06	4.01	4.27	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	2	12	4.73	517/1568	4.87	4.39	4.43	4.39	4.73	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	0	14	4.87	690/1572	4.89	4.79	4.70	4.73	4.87	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	1	1	3	10	4.47	702/1564	4.73	4.28	4.28	4.27	4.47	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	1	2	11	4.53	662/1559	4.73	4.43	4.29	4.33	4.53	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	4	3	0	4	2	2	3.00	1219/1352	3.44	3.97	3.98	4.07	3.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	1	2	3	6	3.92	867/1384	4.05	4.28	4.08	3.99	3.92	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	0	3	9	4.75	394/1382	4.69	4.57	4.29	4.19	4.75	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	0	0	4	7	4.64	550/1368	4.55	4.42	4.30	4.21	4.64	
4. Were special techniques successful	3	1	0	0	3	5	3	4.00	431/ 948	4.15	4.10	3.95	3.89	4.00	
Laboratory															
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	14	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 555	****	2.56	4.29	4.33	****	
Seminar															
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	12	1	1	1	0	0	0	1.50	****/ 288	****	2.95	3.68	3.65	****	
Field Work															
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	12	0	3	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 312	****	2.48	3.68	3.59	****	
Self Paced															
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	14	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 110	****	4.13	3.99	3.72	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	1	A	3	Required for Majors	6	Graduate	0	Major	3
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	3						
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	3	C	6	General	2	Under-grad	15	Non-major	12
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	1	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	5				
				?	1						

Course-Section: GERM 201 0201
 Title INTERMEDIATE GERMAN I
 Instructor: WOLFF, XENIA
 Enrollment: 24
 Questionnaires: 17

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 896
 FEB 11, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor Mean	Instructor Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5								
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	0	0	0	4	12	4.75	328/1649	4.68	4.34	4.28	4.29	4.75	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	1	15	4.94	103/1648	4.80	4.31	4.23	4.25	4.94	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	3	12	4.69	380/1375	4.64	4.42	4.27	4.37	4.69	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	5	11	4.69	301/1595	4.59	4.29	4.20	4.22	4.69	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	2	3	10	4.38	505/1533	4.32	4.16	4.04	4.04	4.38	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	8	7	4.38	553/1512	4.40	4.19	4.10	4.14	4.38	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	2	5	9	4.44	595/1623	4.22	4.08	4.16	4.21	4.44	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	16	5.00	1/1646	5.00	4.59	4.69	4.63	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	0	8	6	4.43	483/1621	4.35	4.14	4.06	4.01	4.43	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	0	0	0	0	13	5.00	1/1568	4.87	4.39	4.43	4.39	5.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	0	0	1	12	4.92	473/1572	4.89	4.79	4.70	4.73	4.92	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	0	0	0	0	13	5.00	1/1564	4.73	4.28	4.28	4.27	5.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	1	12	4.92	164/1559	4.73	4.43	4.29	4.33	4.92	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	5	0	2	1	1	4	3.88	836/1352	3.44	3.97	3.98	4.07	3.88	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	1	2	2	6	4.18	714/1384	4.05	4.28	4.08	3.99	4.18	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	0	0	4	7	4.64	511/1382	4.69	4.57	4.29	4.19	4.64	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	0	0	2	2	7	4.45	703/1368	4.55	4.42	4.30	4.21	4.45	
4. Were special techniques successful	6	1	0	0	1	5	4	4.30	323/ 948	4.15	4.10	3.95	3.89	4.30	
Laboratory															
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	16	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 555	****	2.56	4.29	4.33	****	
Seminar															
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	15	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 288	****	2.95	3.68	3.65	****	
Field Work															
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	15	0	1	1	0	0	0	1.50	****/ 312	****	2.48	3.68	3.59	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	1	A	5	Required for Majors	9	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	4						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	0	C	2	General	2	Under-grad	17	Non-major	17
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	1	D	1						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	6	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	5				
				?	2						

Course-Section: GERM 202 0101
 Title INTERMEDIATE GERMAN II
 Instructor: MAY, BRIGITTE
 Enrollment: 8
 Questionnaires: 5

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 897
 FEB 11, 2009
 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	4	4.80	274/1649	4.80	4.34	4.28	4.29	4.80
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1648	5.00	4.31	4.23	4.25	5.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1375	5.00	4.42	4.27	4.37	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	192/1595	4.80	4.29	4.20	4.22	4.80
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	288/1533	4.60	4.16	4.04	4.04	4.60
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	156/1512	4.80	4.19	4.10	4.14	4.80
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	169/1623	4.80	4.08	4.16	4.21	4.80
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	1103/1646	4.60	4.59	4.69	4.63	4.60
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	165/1621	4.75	4.14	4.06	4.01	4.75
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1568	5.00	4.39	4.43	4.39	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1572	5.00	4.79	4.70	4.73	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	263/1564	4.80	4.28	4.28	4.27	4.80
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1559	5.00	4.43	4.29	4.33	5.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	4	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/1352	****	3.97	3.98	4.07	****
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1384	5.00	4.28	4.08	3.99	5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1382	5.00	4.57	4.29	4.19	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	369/1368	4.80	4.42	4.30	4.21	4.80
4. Were special techniques successful	0	1	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	203/ 948	4.50	4.10	3.95	3.89	4.50
Laboratory														
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	3	0	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	511/ 555	2.50	2.56	4.29	4.33	2.50

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 1		Graduate
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	C 2	General	0
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	D 0		5
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	Non-major
			P 0		5
			I 0		
			? 0		

- Means there are not enough responses to be significant

Course-Section: GERM 301 0101
 Title ADVANCED GERMAN I
 Instructor: SUTTON, SUSANNE
 Enrollment: 14
 Questionnaires: 11

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 898
 FEB 11, 2009
 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	1	0	10	4.82	265/1649	4.82	4.34	4.28	4.27	4.82	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	148/1648	4.91	4.31	4.23	4.18	4.91	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	166/1375	4.91	4.42	4.27	4.22	4.91	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	9	4.82	186/1595	4.82	4.29	4.20	4.21	4.82	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	2	8	4.64	264/1533	4.64	4.16	4.04	4.05	4.64	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	1	9	4.73	217/1512	4.73	4.19	4.10	4.11	4.73	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	0	3	7	4.45	568/1623	4.45	4.08	4.16	4.08	4.45	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	4	7	4.64	1070/1646	4.64	4.59	4.69	4.67	4.64	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	4	6	4.60	288/1621	4.60	4.14	4.06	4.02	4.60	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	245/1568	4.91	4.39	4.43	4.39	4.91	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1572	5.00	4.79	4.70	4.64	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	3	8	4.73	390/1564	4.73	4.28	4.28	4.25	4.73	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	1	8	4.70	475/1559	4.70	4.43	4.29	4.23	4.70	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	3	1	7	4.36	432/1352	4.36	3.97	3.98	3.97	4.36	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1384	5.00	4.28	4.08	4.11	5.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1382	5.00	4.57	4.29	4.37	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1368	5.00	4.42	4.30	4.39	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	6	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	104/ 948	4.80	4.10	3.95	4.00	4.80	
Laboratory															
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	9	0	1	1	0	0	0	1.50	****/ 555	****	2.56	4.29	4.22	****	
Seminar															
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	9	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 288	****	2.95	3.68	3.58	****	
Field Work															
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	8	0	2	1	0	0	0	1.33	307/ 312	1.33	2.48	3.68	3.60	1.33	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	3	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	2
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	6						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	3	Under-grad	11	Non-major	9
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	2	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	5				
				?	0						

Course-Section: GERM 303 0101
 Title TOPICS IN GERMAN
 Instructor: MAY, BRIGITTE
 Enrollment: 7
 Questionnaires: 7

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 899
 FEB 11, 2009
 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	1	6	4.86	230/1649	4.86	4.34	4.28	4.27	4.86	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	182/1648	4.86	4.31	4.23	4.18	4.86	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	6	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1375	****	4.42	4.27	4.22	****	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	162/1595	4.86	4.29	4.20	4.21	4.86	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1533	5.00	4.16	4.04	4.05	5.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1512	5.00	4.19	4.10	4.11	5.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	154/1623	4.83	4.08	4.16	4.08	4.83	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	748/1646	4.86	4.59	4.69	4.67	4.86	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	313/1621	4.57	4.14	4.06	4.02	4.57	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	316/1568	4.86	4.39	4.43	4.39	4.86	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	715/1572	4.86	4.79	4.70	4.64	4.86	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	216/1564	4.86	4.28	4.28	4.25	4.86	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1559	5.00	4.43	4.29	4.23	5.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	1	0	0	1	0	5	4.67	208/1352	4.67	3.97	3.98	3.97	4.67	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1384	5.00	4.28	4.08	4.11	5.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1382	5.00	4.57	4.29	4.37	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1368	5.00	4.42	4.30	4.39	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	5	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	431/ 948	4.00	4.10	3.95	4.00	4.00	
Laboratory															
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	5	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	388/ 555	4.00	2.56	4.29	4.22	4.00	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 88	****	4.39	4.54	4.63	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 85	****	4.20	4.47	4.55	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 81	****	4.23	4.43	4.30	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 92	****	4.32	4.35	4.46	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	5	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 288	****	2.95	3.68	3.58	****	
Field Work															
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	6	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 312	****	2.48	3.68	3.60	****	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: GERM 401 0101
 Title STUDIES IN GERMAN LANG
 Instructor: SUTTON, SUSANNE
 Enrollment: 10
 Questionnaires: 8

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 900
 FEB 11, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	328/1649	4.75	4.34	4.28	4.50	4.75	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	263/1648	4.75	4.31	4.23	4.36	4.75	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	296/1375	4.75	4.42	4.27	4.48	4.75	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	236/1595	4.75	4.29	4.20	4.36	4.75	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1533	5.00	4.16	4.04	4.14	5.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	123/1512	4.88	4.19	4.10	4.26	4.88	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	1	6	4.63	370/1623	4.63	4.08	4.16	4.27	4.63	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	913/1646	4.75	4.59	4.69	4.71	4.75	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	234/1621	4.67	4.14	4.06	4.24	4.67	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1568	5.00	4.39	4.43	4.54	5.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1572	5.00	4.79	4.70	4.79	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	0	7	4.75	342/1564	4.75	4.28	4.28	4.40	4.75	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1559	5.00	4.43	4.29	4.41	5.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	0	3	5	4.63	234/1352	4.63	3.97	3.98	4.07	4.63	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1384	5.00	4.28	4.08	4.35	5.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1382	5.00	4.57	4.29	4.56	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1368	5.00	4.42	4.30	4.58	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	4	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	122/ 948	4.75	4.10	3.95	4.31	4.75	
Laboratory															
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	6	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	470/ 555	3.50	2.56	4.29	4.41	3.50	
Seminar															
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	7	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 288	****	2.95	3.68	3.71	****	
Field Work															
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	7	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 312	****	2.48	3.68	3.95	****	

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 4		Graduate 1
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	C 1	General	1
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad 7
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00	F 0		Non-major 5
			P 0		
			I 0		
			? 0		
				Electives	0
				Other	8

- Means there are not enough responses to be significant