

Course-Section: GERM 101 0101
 Title ELEMENTARY GERMAN I
 Instructor: HENDRICH, ANJA
 Enrollment: 26
 Questionnaires: 18

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 862
 JUL 2, 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	1	0	1	2	14	4.56	568/1576	4.56	4.34	4.30	4.11	4.56	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	0	1	3	13	4.50	608/1576	4.50	4.32	4.27	4.18	4.50	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	3	14	4.72	333/1342	4.72	4.48	4.32	4.19	4.72	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	2	5	9	4.44	631/1520	4.44	4.30	4.25	4.09	4.44	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	0	3	3	10	4.44	468/1465	4.44	4.26	4.12	4.02	4.44	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	5	0	0	1	2	9	4.67	270/1434	4.67	4.22	4.14	3.94	4.67	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	1	6	10	4.53	503/1547	4.53	4.12	4.19	4.10	4.53	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	16	2	0	3.11	1565/1574	3.11	4.55	4.64	4.59	3.11	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	3	9	5	4.12	860/1554	4.12	4.13	4.10	4.01	4.12	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	3	3	11	4.47	907/1488	4.47	4.39	4.47	4.41	4.47	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	3	14	4.82	759/1493	4.82	4.78	4.73	4.65	4.82	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	2	3	12	4.59	584/1486	4.59	4.33	4.32	4.26	4.59	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	2	3	12	4.59	602/1489	4.59	4.40	4.32	4.22	4.59	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	3	0	1	2	3	9	4.33	463/1277	4.33	3.99	4.03	3.91	4.33	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	2	2	1	10	4.27	657/1279	4.27	4.30	4.17	3.96	4.27	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	1	2	2	10	4.40	736/1270	4.40	4.57	4.35	4.09	4.40	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	1	0	3	0	11	4.33	773/1269	4.33	4.38	4.35	4.09	4.33	
4. Were special techniques successful	3	2	0	3	1	2	7	4.00	464/ 878	4.00	4.19	4.05	3.91	4.00	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	3	0.00-0.99 0	A 4	Required for Majors 9	Graduate 0 Major 0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99 0	B 4		
56-83	3	2.00-2.99 3	C 6	General 3	Under-grad 18 Non-major 18
84-150	3	3.00-3.49 2	D 1		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 6	F 0	Electives 2	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 3	
			? 2		

Course-Section: GERM 102 0101
 Title ELEMENTARY GERMAN II
 Instructor: SUTTON, SUSANNE
 Enrollment: 19
 Questionnaires: 14

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 863
 JUL 2, 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	1	12	4.79	266/1576	4.68	4.34	4.30	4.11	4.79	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	13	4.93	121/1576	4.78	4.32	4.27	4.18	4.93	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	0	13	4.86	209/1342	4.78	4.48	4.32	4.19	4.86	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	3	10	4.64	357/1520	4.65	4.30	4.25	4.09	4.64	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	4	8	4.43	483/1465	4.41	4.26	4.12	4.02	4.43	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	3	9	4.50	398/1434	4.29	4.22	4.14	3.94	4.50	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	4	10	4.71	280/1547	4.75	4.12	4.19	4.10	4.71	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	1	0	0	0	0	13	5.00	1/1574	4.96	4.55	4.64	4.59	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	0	3	7	4.70	237/1554	4.57	4.13	4.10	4.01	4.70	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	1	0	1	12	4.71	589/1488	4.78	4.39	4.47	4.41	4.71	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	2	12	4.86	683/1493	4.93	4.78	4.73	4.65	4.86	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	2	12	4.86	221/1486	4.73	4.33	4.32	4.26	4.86	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	12	4.86	251/1489	4.80	4.40	4.32	4.22	4.86	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	1	0	0	1	2	10	4.69	194/1277	4.61	3.99	4.03	3.91	4.69	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	2	2	9	4.54	425/1279	4.35	4.30	4.17	3.96	4.54	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	0	1	12	4.92	208/1270	4.84	4.57	4.35	4.09	4.92	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	1	1	11	4.77	432/1269	4.47	4.38	4.35	4.09	4.77	
4. Were special techniques successful	1	0	0	0	0	6	7	4.54	210/ 878	4.45	4.19	4.05	3.91	4.54	

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	4						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	4	C	4	General	0	Under-grad	14	Non-major	14
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	0	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	1	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	4				
				?	0						

Course-Section: GERM 102 0201
 Title ELEMENTARY GERMAN II
 Instructor: SUTTON, SUSANNE
 Enrollment: 26
 Questionnaires: 23

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 864
 JUL 2, 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	2	0	4	17	4.57	554/1576	4.68	4.34	4.30	4.11	4.57	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	6	15	4.64	434/1576	4.78	4.32	4.27	4.18	4.64	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	5	17	4.70	369/1342	4.78	4.48	4.32	4.19	4.70	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	4	17	4.65	348/1520	4.65	4.30	4.25	4.09	4.65	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	5	0	0	2	7	9	4.39	529/1465	4.41	4.26	4.12	4.02	4.39	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	7	3	12	4.09	844/1434	4.29	4.22	4.14	3.94	4.09	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	5	18	4.78	207/1547	4.75	4.12	4.19	4.10	4.78	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	2	21	4.91	422/1574	4.96	4.55	4.64	4.59	4.91	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	0	1	8	9	4.44	477/1554	4.57	4.13	4.10	4.01	4.44	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	0	3	17	4.85	324/1488	4.78	4.39	4.47	4.41	4.85	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	0	0	20	5.00	1/1493	4.93	4.78	4.73	4.65	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	2	4	14	4.60	561/1486	4.73	4.33	4.32	4.26	4.60	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	1	3	16	4.75	378/1489	4.80	4.40	4.32	4.22	4.75	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	1	0	0	2	5	12	4.53	298/1277	4.61	3.99	4.03	3.91	4.53	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	11	0	1	0	2	2	7	4.17	732/1279	4.35	4.30	4.17	3.96	4.17	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	11	0	0	0	0	3	9	4.75	412/1270	4.84	4.57	4.35	4.09	4.75	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	11	0	0	0	5	0	7	4.17	870/1269	4.47	4.38	4.35	4.09	4.17	
4. Were special techniques successful	11	1	0	0	2	3	6	4.36	305/ 878	4.45	4.19	4.05	3.91	4.36	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	1	0.00-0.99 0	A 6	Required for Majors 13	Graduate 0 Major 2
28-55	3	1.00-1.99 0	B 10		
56-83	4	2.00-2.99 1	C 4	General 2	Under-grad 23 Non-major 21
84-150	5	3.00-3.49 6	D 0		
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	
			? 0		

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

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 865
 JUL 2, 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	5	9	4.53	595/1576	4.62	4.34	4.30	4.35	4.53	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	3	11	4.67	392/1576	4.60	4.32	4.27	4.32	4.67	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	5	9	4.53	552/1342	4.65	4.48	4.32	4.41	4.53	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	1	7	6	4.36	744/1520	4.44	4.30	4.25	4.26	4.36	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	2	5	7	4.36	554/1465	4.44	4.26	4.12	4.09	4.36	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	1	1	1	4	7	4.07	848/1434	4.30	4.22	4.14	4.06	4.07	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	2	5	8	4.40	690/1547	4.44	4.12	4.19	4.22	4.40	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	1	0	0	0	1	13	4.93	375/1574	4.96	4.55	4.64	4.62	4.93	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	1	10	3	4.14	827/1554	4.24	4.13	4.10	4.05	4.14	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	0	0	13	5.00	1/1488	4.97	4.39	4.47	4.44	5.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	1	12	4.92	445/1493	4.93	4.78	4.73	4.75	4.92	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	0	4	8	4.67	468/1486	4.73	4.33	4.32	4.29	4.67	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	0	13	5.00	1/1489	4.86	4.40	4.32	4.31	5.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	6	0	0	2	0	4	4.33	463/1277	3.67	3.99	4.03	4.01	4.33	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	1	0	2	4	3	3.80	938/1279	4.08	4.30	4.17	4.14	3.80	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	0	1	1	7	4.67	505/1270	4.76	4.57	4.35	4.30	4.67	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	0	0	1	1	7	4.67	535/1269	4.51	4.38	4.35	4.29	4.67	
4. Were special techniques successful	5	5	0	0	3	1	1	3.60	688/ 878	3.80	4.19	4.05	3.92	3.60	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	2	0.00-0.99 0	A 5	Required for Majors 11	Graduate 0 Major 0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99 0	B 3		
56-83	2	2.00-2.99 3	C 7	General 1	Under-grad 15 Non-major 15
84-150	3	3.00-3.49 0	D 0		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 5	F 0	Electives 1	#### - 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: 17

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 866
 JUL 2, 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	3	13	4.71	359/1576	4.62	4.34	4.30	4.35	4.71	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	3	12	4.53	581/1576	4.60	4.32	4.27	4.32	4.53	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	2	14	4.76	286/1342	4.65	4.48	4.32	4.41	4.76	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	4	11	4.53	487/1520	4.44	4.30	4.25	4.26	4.53	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	8	9	4.53	353/1465	4.44	4.26	4.12	4.09	4.53	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	6	10	4.53	383/1434	4.30	4.22	4.14	4.06	4.53	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	1	4	11	4.47	575/1547	4.44	4.12	4.19	4.22	4.47	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	17	5.00	1/1574	4.96	4.55	4.64	4.62	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	0	1	6	5	4.33	623/1554	4.24	4.13	4.10	4.05	4.33	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	0	1	14	4.93	173/1488	4.97	4.39	4.47	4.44	4.93	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	1	14	4.93	390/1493	4.93	4.78	4.73	4.75	4.93	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	0	3	11	4.79	298/1486	4.73	4.33	4.32	4.29	4.79	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	1	2	11	4.71	434/1489	4.86	4.40	4.32	4.31	4.71	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	4	1	2	3	2	1	3.00	1149/1277	3.67	3.99	4.03	4.01	3.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	1	1	4	8	4.36	589/1279	4.08	4.30	4.17	4.14	4.36	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	0	2	12	4.86	307/1270	4.76	4.57	4.35	4.30	4.86	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	1	0	1	3	9	4.36	760/1269	4.51	4.38	4.35	4.29	4.36	
4. Were special techniques successful	3	2	0	1	3	3	5	4.00	464/ 878	3.80	4.19	4.05	3.92	4.00	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 6	Required for Majors	9
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	B 4		Graduate 0
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	C 6	General	17
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	D 0		Non-major 14
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	6
			? 0		

Course-Section: GERM 202 0101
 Title INTERMEDIATE GERMAN II
 Instructor: MAY, BRIGITTE
 Enrollment: 12
 Questionnaires: 8

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 867
 JUL 2, 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	7	4.88	187/1576	4.88	4.34	4.30	4.35	4.88	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	173/1576	4.88	4.32	4.27	4.32	4.88	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1342	5.00	4.48	4.32	4.41	5.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	249/1520	4.75	4.30	4.25	4.26	4.75	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	1	4	2	3.88	1012/1465	3.88	4.26	4.12	4.09	3.88	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	4	3	4.25	682/1434	4.25	4.22	4.14	4.06	4.25	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	6	2	4.25	838/1547	4.25	4.12	4.19	4.22	4.25	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	527/1574	4.88	4.55	4.64	4.62	4.88	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	129/1554	4.88	4.13	4.10	4.05	4.88	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	666/1488	4.67	4.39	4.47	4.44	4.67	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1493	5.00	4.78	4.73	4.75	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	468/1486	4.67	4.33	4.32	4.29	4.67	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	274/1489	4.83	4.40	4.32	4.31	4.83	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	3	1	1	0	0	1	2.67	1219/1277	2.67	3.99	4.03	4.01	2.67	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	381/1279	4.60	4.30	4.17	4.14	4.60	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	559/1270	4.60	4.57	4.35	4.30	4.60	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	386/1269	4.80	4.38	4.35	4.29	4.80	
4. Were special techniques successful	3	2	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/ 878	5.00	4.19	4.05	3.92	5.00	
Seminar															
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 375	****	4.97	4.01	4.21	****	
Field Work															
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	5	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/ 326	5.00	4.99	4.03	4.43	5.00	
Self Paced															
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 382	****	4.99	4.08	4.39	****	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: GERM 302 0101
 Title ADVANCED GERMAN II
 Instructor: LARKEY, EDWARD
 Enrollment: 15
 Questionnaires: 11

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 868
 JUL 2, 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	3	3	5	4.18	1027/1576	4.18	4.34	4.30	4.30	4.18	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	3	6	4.36	811/1576	4.36	4.32	4.27	4.28	4.36	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	1	8	4.45	646/1342	4.45	4.48	4.32	4.30	4.45	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	4	4	4.09	998/1520	4.09	4.30	4.25	4.25	4.09	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	0	4	6	4.27	626/1465	4.27	4.26	4.12	4.09	4.27	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	3	2	5	4.00	878/1434	4.00	4.22	4.14	4.15	4.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	0	3	1	6	4.00	1041/1547	4.00	4.12	4.19	4.21	4.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1574	5.00	4.55	4.64	4.61	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	2	4	4	4.20	772/1554	4.20	4.13	4.10	4.09	4.20	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	1	0	4	6	4.36	1025/1488	4.36	4.39	4.47	4.47	4.36	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	557/1493	4.91	4.78	4.73	4.70	4.91	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	1	0	3	7	4.45	749/1486	4.45	4.33	4.32	4.32	4.45	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	1	1	8	4.45	754/1489	4.45	4.40	4.32	4.34	4.45	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	6	0	1	0	0	2	4.00	692/1277	4.00	3.99	4.03	4.11	4.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	1	0	1	1	3.67	1000/1279	3.67	4.30	4.17	4.20	3.67	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	784/1270	4.33	4.57	4.35	4.42	4.33	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	0	1	0	1	1	3.67	1067/1269	3.67	4.38	4.35	4.41	3.67	
4. Were special techniques successful	8	1	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 878	****	4.19	4.05	4.09	****	
Laboratory															
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 240	****	5.00	4.35	4.32	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 229	****	5.00	4.51	4.48	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 232	****	5.00	4.29	4.16	****	
Seminar															
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 72	****	5.00	4.64	4.53	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 80	****	5.00	4.61	4.22	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	0	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/ 375	5.00	4.97	4.01	4.12	5.00	
Field Work															
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 48	****	5.00	4.40	3.92	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 44	****	5.00	4.73	4.63	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 45	****	5.00	4.57	4.50	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	1	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/ 326	5.00	4.99	4.03	4.23	5.00	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 40	****	5.00	4.60	4.83	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 35	****	5.00	4.67	5.00	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 28	****	5.00	4.78	5.00	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	0	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/ 382	5.00	4.99	4.08	4.24	5.00	

Course-Section: GERM 302 0101
 Title ADVANCED GERMAN II
 Instructor: LARKEY, EDWARD
 Enrollment: 15
 Questionnaires: 11

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 868
 JUL 2, 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	0	A	4	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	4
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	5						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	1	C	2	General	2	Under-grad	11	Non-major	7
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	4	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	8				
				?	0						

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

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 869
 JUL 2, 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	3	8	4.73	335/1576	4.73	4.34	4.30	4.30	4.73	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	4	5	4.27	920/1576	4.27	4.32	4.27	4.28	4.27	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	3	7	4.55	541/1342	4.55	4.48	4.32	4.30	4.55	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	4	5	4.27	837/1520	4.27	4.30	4.25	4.25	4.27	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	1	8	4.55	341/1465	4.55	4.26	4.12	4.09	4.55	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	4	5	4.27	659/1434	4.27	4.22	4.14	4.15	4.27	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	1	4	5	4.18	908/1547	4.18	4.12	4.19	4.21	4.18	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	4	7	4.64	957/1574	4.64	4.55	4.64	4.61	4.64	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	4	6	4.60	316/1554	4.60	4.13	4.10	4.09	4.60	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	401/1488	4.80	4.39	4.47	4.47	4.80	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	810/1493	4.80	4.78	4.73	4.70	4.80	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	3	4	3	4.00	1101/1486	4.00	4.33	4.32	4.32	4.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	2	7	4.60	579/1489	4.60	4.40	4.32	4.34	4.60	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	7	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	215/1277	4.67	3.99	4.03	4.11	4.67	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	1	2	4	4.43	532/1279	4.43	4.30	4.17	4.20	4.43	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	307/1270	4.86	4.57	4.35	4.42	4.86	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	332/1269	4.86	4.38	4.35	4.41	4.86	
4. Were special techniques successful	4	0	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	197/ 878	4.57	4.19	4.05	4.09	4.57	

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	7
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	5						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	1	C	3	General	0	Under-grad	11	Non-major	4
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	5	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	10				
				?	0						

Course-Section: GERM 319 0101
 Title GERMAN TRANSLATION
 Instructor: LARKEY, EDWARD
 Enrollment: 7
 Questionnaires: 5

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 870
 JUL 2, 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	2	3	4.60	500/1576	4.60	4.34	4.30	4.30	4.60	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	222/1576	4.80	4.32	4.27	4.28	4.80	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	406/1342	4.67	4.48	4.32	4.30	4.67	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	859/1520	4.25	4.30	4.25	4.25	4.25	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	304/1465	4.60	4.26	4.12	4.09	4.60	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1434	5.00	4.22	4.14	4.15	5.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	2	0	1	2	0	0	2.67	1506/1547	2.67	4.12	4.19	4.21	2.67	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	4	1	4.20	1367/1574	4.20	4.55	4.64	4.61	4.20	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1554	5.00	4.13	4.10	4.09	5.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1488	5.00	4.39	4.47	4.47	5.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	810/1493	4.80	4.78	4.73	4.70	4.80	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1486	5.00	4.33	4.32	4.32	5.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1489	5.00	4.40	4.32	4.34	5.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	258/1277	4.60	3.99	4.03	4.11	4.60	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1279	****	4.30	4.17	4.20	****	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1270	****	4.57	4.35	4.42	****	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1269	****	4.38	4.35	4.41	****	
Field Work															
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 326	****	4.99	4.03	4.23	****	
Self Paced															
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	2	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/ 382	5.00	4.99	4.08	4.24	5.00	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: GERM 481 0101
 Title SEMINAR IN GERMAN
 Instructor: SUTTON, SUSANNE
 Enrollment: 5
 Questionnaires: 4

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 871
 JUL 2, 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	2	2	4.50	637/1576	4.50	4.34	4.30	4.46	4.50
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	608/1576	4.50	4.32	4.27	4.35	4.50
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	583/1342	4.50	4.48	4.32	4.46	4.50
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	511/1520	4.50	4.30	4.25	4.38	4.50
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	206/1465	4.75	4.26	4.12	4.22	4.75
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	3	1	4.25	682/1434	4.25	4.22	4.14	4.30	4.25
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	238/1547	4.75	4.12	4.19	4.24	4.75
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	758/1574	4.75	4.55	4.64	4.69	4.75
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	395/1554	4.50	4.13	4.10	4.24	4.50
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	505/1488	4.75	4.39	4.47	4.55	4.75
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	908/1493	4.75	4.78	4.73	4.80	4.75
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	339/1486	4.75	4.33	4.32	4.41	4.75
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	696/1489	4.50	4.40	4.32	4.38	4.50
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	309/1277	4.50	3.99	4.03	4.04	4.50
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	445/1279	4.50	4.30	4.17	4.31	4.50
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1270	5.00	4.57	4.35	4.53	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1269	5.00	4.38	4.35	4.55	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	2	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 878	5.00	4.19	4.05	4.33	5.00
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 85	5.00	4.67	4.72	4.77	5.00
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 79	5.00	4.67	4.69	4.69	5.00
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 72	5.00	5.00	4.64	4.64	5.00
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 80	5.00	5.00	4.61	4.52	5.00
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 375	5.00	4.97	4.01	3.90	5.00

Frequency Distribution

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