Course-Section: GERM 101 1 University of Maryland Title Elementary German I

Sutton, Susanne

Instructor:

Baltimore County Fall 2009

Page 799

MAR 22, 2010

Job IRBR3029

Enrollment: 29 Questionnaires: 22 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

			Fr	equer	ncie	S		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sec
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mea
General														
. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	5	17	4.77	279/1509	4.73	4.42	4.31	4.18	4.7
. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	11	11	4.50	543/1509	4.54	4.39	4.26	4.25	4.
. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	7	14	4.67	359/1287	4.62	4.48	4.30	4.24	4.
. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	9	12	4.50	454/1459	4.53	4.32	4.22	4.11	4.
. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	3	4	15	4.55	306/1406	4.44	4.19	4.09	4.02	4.
. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	1	9	11	4.36	492/1384	4.18	4.17	4.11	3.98	4.
. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	4	7	10	4.29	728/1489	4.27	4.07	4.17	4.20	4.
How many times was class cancelled	0	1	0	0	0	0	21	5.00	1/1506	4.94	4.55	4.67	4.66	5.
How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	0	12	7	4.37	511/1463	4.51	4.16	4.09	4.02	4.
Lecture														
. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	8	14	4.64	631/1438	4.65	4.48	4.46	4.44	4.
Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	2	20	4.91	537/1421	4.87	4.75	4.73	4.66	4.
Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	2	8	12	4.45	677/1411	4.55	4.39	4.31	4.27	4.
Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	4	18	4.82	273/1405	4.79	4.45	4.32	4.27	4
Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	1	0	0	4	8	9	4.24	504/1236	4.21	3.92	4.00	3.87	4
Discussion														
. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	1	2	4	6	4	3.59	1017/1260	3.93	4.32	4.14	3.95	3.
Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	1	0	0	4	12	4.53	561/1255	4.40	4.53	4.33	4.15	4
Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	0	3	6	8	4.29	797/1258	4.26	4.46	4.38	4.18	4.
. Were special techniques successful	5	4	1	0	3	5	4	3.85	565/ 873	4.02	4.14	4.03	3.89	3.
Frequ	ency	Dist	trib	ution	ı									
redits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades				Rea	ason	.s			Туј	pe			Majors	3

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	1	A	8	Required for Majors	3	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55 56-83	5 1	1.00-1.99 2.00-2.99	⊥ 4	B C	5	General	12	Under-grad	22	Non-major	22
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	2	D	1			3		J	
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F P	0	Electives	4	#### - Means responses to		are not enough	1
				I	0	Other	1	responses to	DC DIS	giirradiic	
				?	1						

Course-Section: GERM 101 2

University of Maryland

Elementary German I Baltimore County

Baltimore Count Fall 2009

Instructor: Sutton,Susanne
Enrollment: 29
Questionnaires: 19

Title

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Page 800 MAR 22, 2010 Job IRBR3029

Questions	NR	NA	Fre	equer 2	ncies 3	4	5	Inst Mean	ructor Rank	Course Mean	_	UMBC Mean		Sect Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	1	1	1	16	4.68	386/1509	4.73	4.42	4.31	4.18	4.68
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	3	14	4.58	459/1509	4.54	4.39	4.26	4.25	4.58
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	2	0	2	15	4.58	453/1287	4.62	4.48	4.30	4.24	4.58
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	1	1	3	13	4.56	400/1459	4.53	4.32	4.22	4.11	4.56
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	1	1	0	5	11	4.33	502/1406	4.44	4.19	4.09	4.02	4.33
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	0	2	7	8	4.00	807/1384	4.18	4.17	4.11	3.98	4.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	2	1	2	13	4.26	749/1489	4.27	4.07	4.17	4.20	4.26
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	2	0	0	0	2	15	4.88	622/1506	4.94	4.55	4.67	4.66	4.88
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	1	0	0	0	5	9	4.64	222/1463	4.51	4.16	4.09	4.02	4.64
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	1	1	1	15	4.67	588/1438	4.65	4.48	4.46	4.44	4.67
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	1	0	0	17	4.83	716/1421		4.75	4.73	4.66	4.83
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	1	4		4.65	442/1411	4.55	4.39	4.31	4.27	4.65
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	1	0	0	1	2	14	4.76	333/1405	4.79	4.45	4.32	4.27	4.76
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	1	0	1	3	5	8	4.18	554/1236	4.21	3.92	4.00	3.87	4.18
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	2	2	4		4.26	613/1260		4.32	4.14	3.95	4.26
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	1	1	1	5	11	4.26	776/1255	4.40	4.53	4.33	4.15	4.26
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	1	1	1	5	10	4.22	834/1258		4.46	4.38	4.18	4.22
4. Were special techniques successful	0	4	1	0	3	2	9	4.20	366/ 873	4.02	4.14	4.03	3.89	4.20
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	17	0	0	2	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 184	****	****	4.16	4.06	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	17	0	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/ 198	****	****	4.22	4.14	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	17	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 184	****	****	4.48	4.48	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	17	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 177	****	****	4.36	4.29	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	17	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 165	***	****	4.18	4.15	***
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	17	0	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/ 89	****	5.00	4.49	4.31	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	17	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/ 92	****	4.93	4.54	4.16	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	****/ 90	****	4.62	4.50	4.21	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/ 92		4.93	4.38	4.21	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	17	0	1	1	0	0	0	1.50	****/ 93	****	4.86	4.06	3.92	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	17	0	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.39	3.75	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	17	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 48	****	****	4.41	4.29	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	17	0	1	1	0	0	0	1.50	****/ 47	****	****	4.51	4.53	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	17	0	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/ 47	****	****	4.18	4.26	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	17	0	0	2	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 44	****	****	4.32	4.12	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	1	1	0		****/ 49	****	****	4.26	4.28	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	17	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 41	****	****	4.14	4.13	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	17	0	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/ 46	****	****	4.31	4.52	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	17	0	1	1	0	0	0	1.50	****/ 37	****	****	4.05	4.47	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	17	0	0	2	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.27	4.21	****

Course-Section: GERM 101 2

Title Elementary German I

Instructor: Sutton, Susanne

Enrollment: 29
Questionnaires: 19

## University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2009

Page 800 MAR 22, 2010 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

# Frequency Distribution

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	0	 А	8	Required for Majors	3	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	В	8						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	1	C	1	General	6	Under-grad	19	Non-major	18
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	2	D	1						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	4	#### - Means	there	are not enough	n
				P	0			responses to	be sig	nificant	
				I	0	Other	5	-			
				?	1						

Course-Section: GERM 102 1 University of Maryland Page 801 Title Baltimore County MAR 22, 2010 Elementary German II

Instructor: Jones,Romy

Enrollment: 19 Questionnaires: 16

Fall 2009 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire Job IRBR3029

			Fre	equer	ncies	5		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	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	4	11	4.63	458/1509	4.75	4.42	4.31	4.18	4.63
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	5	10	4.67	356/1509	4.71	4.39	4.26	4.25	4.67
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	7	8	4.44	602/1287	4.59	4.48	4.30	4.24	4.44
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	7	7	4.40	619/1459	4.57	4.32	4.22	4.11	4.40
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	0	4	3	7	4.21	635/1406	4.36	4.19	4.09	4.02	4.21
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	1	6	8	4.47	385/1384	4.55	4.17	4.11	3.98	4.47
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	3	4	9	4.38	630/1489	4.44	4.07	4.17	4.20	4.38
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	15	4.94	408/1506	4.97	4.55	4.67	4.66	4.94
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	1	4	10	4.60	248/1463	4.66	4.16	4.09	4.02	4.60
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	1	0	4	11	4.56	725/1438	4.53	4.48	4.46	4.44	4.56
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	15	4.94	376/1421	4.91	4.75	4.73	4.66	4.94
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	5	10	4.56	544/1411	4.66	4.39	4.31	4.27	4.56
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	2	13	4.75	345/1405	4.75	4.45	4.32	4.27	4.75
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	1	3	5	7	4.13	598/1236	4.00	3.92	4.00	3.87	4.13
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	Λ	Λ	3	6	7	4.25	621/1260	4.04	4.32	4.14	3.95	4.25
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	2	6	8	4.38	690/1255	4.44	4.53	4.33	4.15	4.38
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	1	5	9	4.53	598/1258	4.52	4.46	4.38	4.18	4.53
4. Were special techniques successful	0	0	0	1	4	7	4	3.88	550/ 873		4.14	4.03	3.89	3.88
i. Were special teemingaes successian	Ü	Ü	Ü	_	•	,	-	3.00	3307 073	3.71		1.03	3.05	3.00
Frequ	ency	Dist	crib	ution	ı									
Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades				Rea	asons	; 			Ту:	pe 			Majors	

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	d Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	 А	7	Required for Majors	5	Graduate	0	Major	2
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	В	6						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	2	C	3	General	11	Under-grad	16	Non-major	14
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	n
				P	0			responses to	be sig	nificant	
				I	0	Other	0	_			
				?	0						

Course-Section: GERM 102 2 University of Maryland Title

Baltimore County Elementary German II Fall 2009

Instructor: Wolff,Xenia Y. Enrollment: 10

Questionnaires: 8

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Page 802 MAR 22, 2010 Job IRBR3029

			Fre	aner	ncies	3		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	TIMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General				•	•	_	_	4 00				4 04	4 40	4 00
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	Τ	-/	4.88	184/1509		4.42	4.31	4.18	4.88
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	256/1509	4.71	4.39	4.26	4.25	4.75
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	Ι	0	-/	4.75	261/1287	4.59	4.48	4.30	4.24	4.75
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	191/1459	4.57	4.32	4.22	4.11	4.75
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	0	6	4.50	332/1406	4.36	4.19	4.09	4.02	4.50
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	1	6	4.63	260/1384	4.55	4.17	4.11	3.98	4.63
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	2	5	4.50	458/1489	4.44	4.07	4.17	4.20	4.50
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1506	4.97	4.55	4.67	4.66	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	177/1463	4.66	4.16	4.09	4.02	4.71
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	1	0	0	0	7	4.50	800/1438	4.53	4.48	4.46	4.44	4.50
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	614/1421	4.91	4.40	4.73	4.44	4.88
g and a second and		-	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	303/1411	4.66	4.75	4.73	4.00	4.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	0	7		,	4.00		4.31	4.27	4.75
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	1	0	•	1	4.75 3.88	345/1405		4.45			
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	U	Τ	Τ	U	2	4	3.88	789/1236	4.00	3.92	4.00	3.87	3.88
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	Ο	1	1	3	3.83	896/1260	4.04	4.32	4.14	3.95	3.83
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	575/1255	4.44	4.53	4.33	4.15	4.50
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	620/1258	4.52	4.46	4.38	4.18	4.50
4. Were special techniques successful	2	0	1	0	0	2	3	4.00	442/ 873	3.94	4.14	4.03	3.89	4.00
i. Mere special econityues successiui	2	U	_	J	J	2	J	1.00	112/ 0/3	3.71	1.11	1.03	5.05	1.00
Frequ	ency	Dist	cribu	ation	ı									

#### Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: GERM 201 1 University of Maryland

Title Intermediate German I Baltimore County Fall 2009 Instructor: Wolff,Xenia Y.

Page 803

MAR 22, 2010

Job IRBR3029

Enrollment: 14

FIII OI I III EII C •	14			
Questionnaires:	12	Student Cours	e Evaluation	Questionnaire

Quebelomialieb 12		beddelle cot	AL DC	DVa.	auc I v	J11 Q.	2000	. 01111	ulle							
					Fre	equei	ncies	3		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Qu	estions		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean		Mean
	General															
<ol> <li>Did you gain new insigh</li> </ol>	ts,skills from	m this course	0	0	0	0	1	3	8	4.58	505/1509	4.61	4.42	4.31	4.34	4.58
2. Did the instructor make	clear the exp	pected goals	0	0	0	0	1	2	9	4.67	356/1509	4.73	4.39	4.26	4.32	4.67
3. Did the exam questions	reflect the ex	xpected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	10	4.83	183/1287	4.84	4.48	4.30	4.35	4.83
4. Did other evaluations r	eflect the exp	pected goals	0	1	0	0	0	4	7	4.64	313/1459	4.66	4.32	4.22	4.30	4.64
5. Did assigned readings of	ontribute to w	what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	4	6	4.33	502/1406	4.43	4.19	4.09	4.09	4.33
6. Did written assignments	contribute to	what you learned	0	0	0	1	2	4	5	4.08	762/1384	4.33	4.17	4.11	4.09	4.08
7. Was the grading system	clearly explai	ined	0	0	0	0	0	6	6	4.50	458/1489	4.51	4.07	4.17	4.19	4.50
8. How many times was clas	s cancelled		0	0	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/1506	5.00	4.55	4.67	4.61	5.00
9. How would you grade the	overall teach	ning effectiveness	2	1	0	0	0	4	5	4.56	286/1463	4.53	4.16	4.09	4.08	4.56
	Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's l	ectures well r	prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/1438	4.97	4.48	4.46	4.48	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem	-	· -	0	0	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/1421	5.00	4.75	4.73	4.76	5.00
3. Was lecture material pr		_	0	0	0	0	1	1	10	4.75	303/1411	4.79	4.39	4.31	4.37	4.75
4. Did the lectures contri			0	0	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	154/1405		4.45	4.32	4.39	4.92
5. Did audiovisual techniq	-		0	4	0	0	1	2	5	4.50	274/1236		3.92	4.00		4.50
5. Dia addiovidual cooming	ace cimanoc 7	our under bedinging	Ü	-	ŭ	ŭ	_	_		1.50	27171230	1.20	3.72	1.00		1.50
	Discussion															
1. Did class discussions c	ontribute to w	what you learned	4	0	1	0	2	4	1	3.50	1045/1260	3.68	4.32	4.14	4.19	3.50
2. Were all students activ	ely encouraged	d to participate	4	0	0	0	1	1	6	4.63	484/1255	4.51	4.53	4.33	4.37	4.63
3. Did the instructor enco	urage fair and	d open discussion	5	0	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	570/1258	4.39	4.46	4.38	4.44	4.57
4. Were special techniques	successful		4	2	0	0	3	2	1	3.67	650/ 873	3.74	4.14	4.03	4.04	3.67
		Frequ	ıency	Dis	rib	ution	n									
		-	-													
Credits Earned Cu	m. GPA	Expected Grades				Rea	sons	3			Ty	pe			Majors	3

Credits E	arned	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	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	3						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	5	General	8	Under-grad	12	Non-major	12
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	0	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means	there	are not enough	n
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	0						

Course-Section: GERM 201 2 University of Maryland
Title Intermediate German I Baltimore County

Instructor:

Wolff, Xenia Y.

Baltimore County
Fall 2009

Page 804

MAR 22, 2010

Job IRBR3029

Enrollment: 20
Questionnaires: 19
Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

		Question	3		NR	NA	Fre	eque: 2	ncies 3	5 4	5	Inst Mean	ructor Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
1 Did 1101	. anin na	Genera w insights,ski		m this source	0	0	0	1	1	2	15	4.63	446/1509	4.61	4.42	4.31	4.34	4.63
		ctor make clear			0	0	0	0	1	2	16	4.79	223/1509	4.73	4.42	4.26	4.34	4.03
		estions reflec			0	0	0	0	1	1	17	4.84	175/1287	4.84	4.48	4.30	4.35	4.79
		ations reflect			0	0	0	0	1	4	14	4.68	258/1459	4.66	4.32	4.22	4.30	4.68
				what you learned	0	0	0	1	1	4	13	4.53	319/1406	4.43	4.19	4.09	4.09	4.53
	_	-		o what you learned	0	0	0	0	3	2	14	4.58	299/1384	4.33	4.17	4.11	4.09	4.58
		g system clearly			0	0	0	0	2	5	12	4.53	434/1489	4.51	4.07	4.17	4.19	4.53
		was class cance		IIICa	0	0	0	0	0	0	19	5.00	1/1506		4.55	4.67	4.61	5.00
				hing effectiveness	3	0	0	0	2	4	10	4.50	325/1463		4.16	4.09	4.08	4.50
J. 110W WOO	aid you s	grade the overa	II ccac	illig cliccelveness	J	O	U	O	2	-	10	1.50	323/1103	1.55	1.10	1.00	1.00	1.50
		Lecture	_															
1. Were th	ne instri	actor's lecture	_	prepared	1	0	0	0	0	1	17	4.94	131/1438	4.97	4.48	4.46	4.48	4.94
		ctor seem inter			1	0	0	0	0	0	18	5.00	1/1421	5.00	4.75	4.73	4.76	5.00
				xplained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	3	15	4.83	211/1411	4.79	4.39	4.31	4.37	4.83
		es contribute to			1	0	0	0	0	2	16	4.89	194/1405	4.90	4.45	4.32	4.39	4.89
				our understanding	1	3	0	2	2	4	7	4.07	635/1236		3.92	4.00		4.07
		1																
		Discus	sion															
1. Did cla	ass discu	assions contrib	ute to	what you learned	4	0	1	1	4	2	7	3.87	884/1260	3.68	4.32	4.14	4.19	3.87
2. Were al	ll studer	nts actively en	courage	d to participate	4	0	0	0	3	3	9	4.40	665/1255	4.51	4.53	4.33	4.37	4.40
				d open discussion	4	0	0	0	3	6	6	4.20	850/1258	4.39	4.46	4.38	4.44	4.20
4. Were sp	pecial te	echniques succe	ssful	-	5	3	0	2	2	3	4	3.82	580/ 873	3.74	4.14	4.03	4.04	3.82
_		-																
				Frequ	ency	/ Dist	tribu	utio	n									
Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	asons	5			Туј	ре			Majors	3
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A 4		Red	 quire	ed f	or Ma	 ajor	`s	5	Graduat	 e	0	Majo	 r	3
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	в 9			-			-						_		
56-83	5	2.00-2.99	3	C 4		Ger	nera:	L			1	.3	Under-g	rad 1	.9	Non-	major	16
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	4	D 2									_				-	
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F 0		Ele	ectiv	<i>r</i> es				0	#### - 1	Means t	here a	re not	enoug	jh
				P 0									respons	es to b	e sign	ifican	ıt	
				I 0		Oth	ner					0	_		_			
				? 0														

Course-Section: GERM 202 1 University of Maryland Title MAR 22, 2010 Intermediate German II Baltimore County Fall 2009 Job IRBR3029

Sutton, Susanne

Instructor: Enrollment: 12

Questionnaires: 9

Grad.

3.50-4.00 3

Р 0

I

0

1

#### Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Page 805

								_	ncies	5			tructor	Course	_	-	Level	Sect
		Questions	5		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		Genera	 L															
1. Did y	you gain ne	ew insights,ski	lls fro	om this course	0	0	1	0	2	2	4	3.89	1228/1509	3.89	4.42	4.31	4.34	3.89
2. Did t	the instru	ctor make clear	the ex	spected goals	0	0	1	0	0	3	5	4.22	891/1509	4.22	4.39	4.26	4.32	4.22
3. Did t	3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals							1	0	1	7	4.56	472/1287	4.56	4.48	4.30	4.35	4.56
4. Did d	other evalu	uations reflect	the ex	spected goals	0	0	0	1	3	2	3	3.78	1182/1459	3.78	4.32	4.22	4.30	3.78
5. Did a	assigned re	eadings contrib	ite to	what you learned	0	0	0	0	3	2	4	4.11	729/1406	4.11	4.19	4.09	4.09	4.11
6. Did v	written as:	signments contr	ibute t	to what you learned	0	0	1	0	2	3	3	3.78	1036/1384	3.78	4.17	4.11	4.09	3.78
7. Was t	the grading	g system clearly	expla	ained	0	0	0	0	1	2	6	4.56	399/1489	4.56	4.07	4.17	4.19	4.56
8. How r	many times	was class cance	elled		0	0	0	0	0	9	0	4.00	1383/1506	4.00	4.55	4.67	4.61	4.00
9. How v	would you	grade the overa	ll tead	ching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	2	5	2	4.00	853/1463	4.00	4.16	4.09	4.08	4.00
1. Were	1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared						0	1	1	2	5	4.22	1094/1438	4.22	4.48	4.46	4.48	4.22
		ctor seem inter			0	0	0	0	1	0	8	4.78	846/1421	4.78	4.75	4.73	4.76	4.78
3. Was 1	lecture mat	terial presented	d and e	explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	4	5	4.56	556/1411	4.56	4.39	4.31	4.37	4.56
4. Did t	the lecture	es contribute to	what	you learned	0	0	0	0	2	4	3	4.11	994/1405	4.11	4.45	4.32	4.39	4.11
				our understanding	0	3	1	1	1	1	2	3.33	1056/1236	3.33	3.92	4.00	4.11	3.33
		Discus	sion															
1. Did o	class disc			what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	272/1260	4.71	4.32	4.14	4.19	4.71
				ed to participate	2	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	246/1255	4.86	4.53	4.33	4.37	4.86
		-	_	nd open discussion	2	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1258	5.00	4.46	4.38	4.44	5.00
4. Were	special te	echniques succes	ssful	-	2	1	0	1	0	1	4	4.33	292/ 873	4.33	4.14	4.03	4.04	4.33
				Frequ	iencv	Dist	trib	utio	n									
				11040	.01107	225	0110		-									
Credits	Earned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	asons	3			Ту	pe			Majors	
00-27	 1	0.00-0.99	0	A 4		Red	 guir	ed f	or Ma	ijors	 3	3	Graduat	 e	0	Majo	 r	1
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	В 2			-									3 -		
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	0	C 2		Ger	nera	1				1	Under-g	rad	9	Non-	major	8
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	0	D 0													-	

Electives

Other

3

1

#### - Means there are not enough

responses to be significant

Course-Section: GERM 301 1 University of I Title Advanced German I Baltimore Co Instructor: May, Brigitte Z Fall 20

Enrollment:

84-150

Grad.

3

3.00-3.49

3.50-4.00

1

D 1

Ρ

Ι

0

0

0

Questionnaires: 12

13

University of Maryland Page 806
Baltimore County MAR 22, 2010
Fall 2009 Job IRBR3029

Instructor

Course Dept UMBC Level Sect

#### - Means there are not enough

responses to be significant

Student	Course	Evaluation	Questionnaire
---------	--------	------------	---------------

Frequencies

	Questions					NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		General	 L															
1. Did you	u gain n	ew insights,skil	lls fro	m this course	0	0	0	0	0	4	8	4.67	410/1509	4.67	4.42	4.31	4.32	4.67
2. Did the	e instru	ctor make clear	the ex	pected goals	0	0	0	0	1	4	7	4.50	543/1509	4.50	4.39	4.26	4.25	4.50
3. Did the	e exam q	uestions reflect	the e	xpected goals	0	0	0	0	0	5	7	4.58	444/1287	4.58	4.48	4.30	4.33	4.58
4. Did oth	4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals							0	0	4	8	4.67	280/1459	4.67	4.32	4.22	4.26	4.67
5. Did ass	signed r	eadings contribu	ite to	what you learned	0	0	0	1	0	3	8	4.50	332/1406	4.50	4.19	4.09	4.12	4.50
6. Did wr	itten as:	signments contri	bute t	o what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	4	8	4.67	225/1384	4.67	4.17	4.11	4.15	4.67
7. Was the	e gradin	g system clearly	expla	ined	0	0	0	0	1	3	8	4.58	364/1489	4.58	4.07	4.17	4.14	4.58
8. How man	ny times	was class cance	elled		0	0	0	0	0	5	7	4.58	1006/1506	4.58	4.55	4.67	4.67	4.58
9. How wor	uld you	grade the overal	ll teac	hing effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	4	8	4.67	209/1463	4.67	4.16	4.09	4.08	4.67
1. Were th	Lecture  1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared						0	0	0	3	7	4.70	545/1438	4.70	4.48	4.46	4.43	4.70
		ctor seem intere			2	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1421	5.00	4.75	4.73	4.73	5.00
3. Was led	cture ma	terial presented	d and e	xplained clearly	2	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	243/1411	4.80	4.39	4.31	4.29	4.80
		es contribute to			2	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1405	5.00	4.45	4.32	4.32	5.00
5. Did aud	diovisua	l techniques enh	nance y	our understanding	2	1	0	0	1	3	5	4.44	322/1236	4.44	3.92	4.00	4.07	4.44
		Discuss	sion															
1. Did cla	ass disc			what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	172/1260	4.86	4.32	4.14	4.22	4.86
				d to participate	5	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	246/1255	4.86	4.53	4.33	4.37	4.86
		_	_	d open discussion	5	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1258	5.00	4.46	4.38	4.42	5.00
4. Were sp	pecial to	echniques succes	ssful	-	5	0	0	0	1	2	4	4.43	250/ 873	4.43	4.14	4.03	4.08	4.43
				Frequ	iency	/ Dist	trib	utio	n									
Guadita B		Character CD3		Towns at ad Consider				Da		_				_			Ma	
creaits Ea	redits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades							ке:	ason	s 			Тур				Majors	; 
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A 4		Red	quir	ed f	or Ma	ajor	`s	8	Graduate	2	0	Majo	r	6
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	в 6														6
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	3	C 0	General						0	Under-gr	rad 1	.2	Non-	Non-major		

Electives

Other

1

3

University of Maryland Baltimore County

Fall 2009

Page 807 MAR 22, 2010 Job IRBR3029

Questionnaires:	7	Student Course	Evaluation	Questionnaire

Course-Section: GERM 303 1

Topics In German

Sutton, Susanne

8

Title

Instructor:

Enrollment:

Ouestions						NA	Fre	_	ncies	5 4	5	Inst Mean	ructor Rank	Course	-	-	Level Mean	
			- 															
		Genera	1															
1. Did yo	ou gain ne	ew insights,ski	lls fro	m this course	0	0	0	0	2	1	4	4.29	852/1509	4.29	4.42	4.31	4.32	4.29
2. Did th	e instru	ctor make clear	the ex	pected goals	0	0	0	1	0	4	2	4.00	1086/1509	4.00	4.39	4.26	4.25	4.00
3. Did th	ıe exam qı	uestions reflec	t the e	xpected goals	0	0	0	0	2	2	3	4.14	857/1287	4.14	4.48	4.30	4.33	4.14
4. Did ot	her evalu	uations reflect	the ex	pected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	378/1459	4.57	4.32	4.22	4.26	4.57
5. Did as	signed re	eadings contrib	ute to	what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	112/1406	4.86	4.19	4.09	4.12	4.86
6. Did wr	itten ass	signments contr	ibute t	o what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	4	3	4.43	421/1384	4.43	4.17	4.11	4.15	4.43
7. Was th	e grading	g system clearl	y expla	ined	0	0	0	1	0	3	3	4.14	875/1489	4.14	4.07	4.17	4.14	4.14
8. How ma	ny times	was class canc	elled		0	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	682/1506	4.86	4.55	4.67	4.67	4.86
9. How wo	uld you	grade the overa	ll teac	hing effectiveness	1	0	0	0	1	0	5	4.67	209/1463	4.67	4.16	4.09	4.08	4.67
		Lectur	е															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared						0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	291/1438	4.86	4.48	4.46	4.43	4.86
2. Did th	e instru	ctor seem inter	ested i	n the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1421	5.00	4.75	4.73	4.73	5.00
3. Was le	cture mat	terial presente	d and e	xplained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	416/1411	4.67	4.39	4.31	4.29	4.67
4. Did th	e lecture	es contribute t	o what	you learned	1	0	0	0	1	0	5	4.67	459/1405	4.67	4.45	4.32	4.32	4.67
5. Did au	diovisua	l techniques en	hance y	our understanding	0	0	0	1	0	3	3	4.14	580/1236	4.14	3.92	4.00	4.07	4.14
		Discus	sion															
1. Did cl	ass disc	ussions contrib	ute to	what you learned	3	0	0	1	1	0	2	3.75	936/1260	3.75	4.32	4.14	4.22	3.75
2. Were a	ıll studer	nts actively en	courage	d to participate	3	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	344/1255	4.75	4.53	4.33	4.37	4.75
3. Did th	e instru	ctor encourage	fair an	d open discussion	3	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	421/1258	4.75	4.46	4.38	4.42	4.75
4. Were s	special te	echniques succe	ssful		3	1	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	292/ 873	4.33	4.14	4.03	4.08	4.33
				Frequ	ency	7 Dist	tribu	utio:	n									
Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	asons	3			Туј	pe			Majors	}
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 3		Red	quire	ed f	or Ma	jors	 3	6	Graduat	 e	0	Majo	or	5
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	в 2			-			,						3		
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C 1		Gei	nera	l				0	Under-g	rad	7	Non-	-major	2
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	0	D 0													-	
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F 0		Ele	ecti	ves				1	#### - 1	Means t	here a	re not	enou	ıh
	P 0												respons				_	
				I O		Ot1	her					0	-		5			
				? 0														

Course-Section: GERM 401 1

Title Studies In German Lang

Instructor: May, Brigitte Z

Enrollment: 5
Questionnaires: 5

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2009 Page 808 MAR 22, 2010 Job IRBR3029

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Fre 1	equei 2	ncies 3	s 4	5	Inst Mean	ructor Rank	Course Mean	_	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
General 1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1509	5.00	4.42	4.31	4.39	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	201/1509	4.80	4.39	4.26	4.26	4.80
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1287	5.00	4.48	4.30	4.38	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	146/1459	4.80	4.32	4.22	4.32	4.80
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	269/1406	4.60	4.19	4.09	4.11	4.60
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1384	5.00	4.17	4.11	4.23	5.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1489	5.00	4.07	4.17	4.18	5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1506	5.00	4.55	4.67	4.67	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	118/1463	4.80	4.16	4.09	4.18	4.80
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1438	5.00	4.48	4.46	4.50	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1421	5.00	4.75	4.73	4.76	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1411	5.00	4.39	4.31	4.35	5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1405	5.00	4.45	4.32	4.34	5.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	2	0	0	2	0	1	3.67	904/1236	3.67	3.92	4.00	4.03	3.67
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1260	5.00	4.32	4.14	4.25	5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1255	5.00	4.53	4.33	4.46	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1258	5.00	4.46	4.38	4.51	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	3	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	442/ 873	4.00	4.14	4.03	4.26	4.00
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	2	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/ 89	5.00	5.00	4.49	4.71	5.00
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	2	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/ 92	5.00	4.93	4.54	4.83	5.00
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	41/ 90	4.67	4.62	4.50	4.69	4.67
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/ 92	5.00	4.93	4.38	4.64	5.00
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	2	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/ 93	5.00	4.86	4.06	4.32	5.00

## Frequency Distribution

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