Course-Section: GERM 101 0101 University of Maryland Title ELEMENTARY GERMAN I

Instructor: KWIATKOWSKI, SA Enrollment: 24

Questionnaires: 14

Baltimore County	JAN 21, 2006
Fall 2005	Job IRBR3029
Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire	

Page 933

General 1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course 0 0 0 0 0 4 5 5 4.07 1139/1674 4.41 4.23 4.27 4.07 4.07 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals 0 0 0 0 1 3 7 3 3.86 1305/1674 4.27 4.26 4.23 4.16 3.86 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals 0 0 0 0 3 5 6 4.21 878/1423 4.36 4.27 4.16 4.21 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals 0 5 1 0 1 3 4 4.00 1094/1609 4.11 4.23 4.27 4.16 4.21 5. Did their evaluations reflect the expected goals 0 5 1 0 1 3 4 4.00 1094/1609 4.11 4.23 4.22 4.05 4.00 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0 1 1 1 2 6 3 3.69 1100/1585 4.06 4.04 1.96 3.88 3.69 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 1 1 1 2 6 3 3.69 1100/1585 4.06 4.04 1.96 3.88 3.69 7. Was the grading system clearly explained 0 0 0 0 1 2 10 1 3.79 1303/1651 4.08 4.20 4.18 4.10 3.79 8. How many times was class cancelled 0 0 0 0 1 2 10 1 3.79 1303/1651 4.08 4.20 4.18 4.10 3.79 8. How many times was class cancelled 0 0 0 0 0 1 2 10 1 3.79 1303/1651 4.08 4.20 4.18 4.10 3.79 8. How many times was class cancelled 0 0 0 0 0 8 6 4.43 1289/1673 4.59 4.65 4.69 4.67 4.43 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 4 0 1 0 4 5 0 3.30 1455/1656 3.86 4.06 4.07 3.96 3.30 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 1 0 0 0 4 4 5 4.08 1265/1586 4.47 4.43 4.43 4.37 4.08 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 0 0 0 0 0 0 7 7 4.50 1225/1585 4.72 4.72 4.69 4.60 4.50 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 1 0 0 1 4 6 2 3.69 1336/1582 4.15 4.30 4.26 4.17 3.92 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 1 1 1 2 4 4 1 3.17 1190/1380 3.72 3.94 3.94 3.78 3.75 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 2 0 1 1 3 2 5 3.75 1027/1520 3.98 4.14 4.01 3.76 3.75 2. Were special techniques successful Frequency Distribution Frequency Distribution Frequency Distribution Frequency Distribution Frequency Distribution Grad. 0 3.50-4.00 5 F 0 Electives 3 Highly Control of the significant 1 1 0 0 0 0 0			Question	S		NR	NA	Fre	_	ncie 3	s 4	5	Inst Mean	tructor Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
1. pid you gain new insights, skills from this course																			
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals 0 0 0 1 3 3 7 3 3.86 1305/1674 4.27 4.26 4.23 4.16 3.86 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals 0 0 0 0 3 5 6 6.21 878/1423 4.36 4.36 4.27 4.16 3.86 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals 0 5 1 0 1 3 5 4 4.00 1094/1609 4.11 4.23 4.22 4.05 4.00 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0 1 1 1 2 6 3 3.69 1100/1805 4.06 4.04 3.96 3.88 3.69 5. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 2 1 0 2 6 3 3.83 1083/1535 3.92 4.08 4.08 3.89 3.83 7. Was the grading system clearly explained 0 0 0 0 1 2 10 1 3.79 1303/1651 4.08 4.02 4.18 4.10 3.79 8. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 4 0 1 0 4 5 0 3.30 1455/1656 3.86 4.06 4.07 3.96 3.30 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 4 0 1 0 4 5 0 3.30 1455/1656 3.86 4.06 4.07 3.96 3.30 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 4 0 1 0 4 5 0 3.30 1455/1656 3.86 4.06 4.07 3.96 3.30 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 4 0 1 0 4 5 0 3.30 1455/1656 3.86 4.06 4.07 3.96 3.30 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 4 0 1 0 4 5 0 3.30 1455/1656 3.86 4.06 4.07 3.96 3.30 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 4 0 1 0 4 5 0 3.30 1455/1656 3.86 4.06 4.07 3.96 3.30 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 4 0 1 0 4 5 0 3.30 1455/1656 3.86 4.07 4.43 4.37 4.08 3.00 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 4 0 1 0 0 0 4 4 5 0 3.30 1455/1656 3.86 4.07 4.43 4.37 4.08 3.00 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 4 0 1 0 0 0 0 7 7 7 4.50 1225/1585 4.72 4.72 4.69 4.60 4.50 9. How would you grade the overall year year year year year year year year				_															
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals 0 0 0 0 0 3 5 6 4.21 878/1423 4.36 4.36 4.27 4.16 4.21 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals 0 5 1 0 1 3 4 4.00 109/1609 4.11 4.23 4.22 4.05 4.00 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0 1 1 1 1 2 6 3 3.69 1100/1585 4.06 4.04 3.96 3.88 3.69 101 written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 2 1 0 2 6 3 3.69 1100/1585 3.92 4.08 4.08 3.89 3.83 7. Was the grading system clearly explained 0 0 0 0 1 2 10 1 3.79 1303/1651 4.08 4.20 4.18 4.10 3.79 8. How many times was class cancelled 0 0 0 0 0 0 8 6 4.43 1289/1673 4.59 4.65 4.69 4.67 4.43 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 4 0 1 0 4 5 0 3.30 1455/1656 3.86 4.06 4.07 3.96 3.30 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 4 0 1 0 0 0 0 4 4 5 4.08 1265/1586 4.47 4.43 4.43 4.37 4.08 9. How has clearly 10 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0						-	-	-	0	_	5	5		,					
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals 0 5 1 0 1 3 4 4.00 1094/1609 4.11 4.23 4.22 4.05 4.00 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0 1 1 1 1 2 6 3 3.69 1100/1895 4.06 4.04 3.06 3.88 3.69 3.83 7. Was the grading system clearly explained 0 0 0 1 1 2 10 1 3.79 1303/1651 4.08 4.20 4.18 4.10 3.79 8. How many times was class cancelled 0 0 0 0 0 1 2 10 1 1 3.79 1303/1651 4.08 4.20 4.18 4.10 3.79 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 4 0 1 0 4 5 0 3.30 1455/1656 3.86 4.06 4.07 3.96 3.30 1.00 1.00 1.00 1.00 1.00 1.00 1.00								-	1		7	3							
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0 1 1 1 2 6 3 3.69 1100/1585 4.06 4.04 3.96 3.88 3.69 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 2 1 0 2 6 3 3.83 1083/1535 3.92 4.08 4.08 3.89 3.83 7. Was the grading system clearly explained 0 0 0 1 2 10 1 3.79 1303/1651 4.08 4.20 4.18 4.10 3.79 8. How many times was class cancelled 0 0 0 0 0 0 8 6 4.43 1289/1673 4.59 4.65 4.69 4.67 4.43 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 4 0 1 0 4 5 0 3.30 1455/1656 3.86 4.06 4.07 3.96 3.30 1455/1656 3.86 4.07 4.43 9.6 3.89 3.89 3.89 3.89 3.89 3.89 3.89 3.89		_			_		-	-	-			6		,					
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 7. Was the grading system clearly explained 0 2 1 0 2 6 3 3.83 1083/1535 3.92 4.08 4.08 3.89 3.83 7. Was the grading system clearly explained 0 0 0 0 1 2 10 1 3.79 1303/1651 4.08 4.20 4.18 4.10 3.79 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 4 0 1 0 4 5 0 3.30 1455/1656 3.86 4.06 4.07 3.96 3.30 Lecture								_	-			_							
7. Was the grading system clearly explained 0 0 0 1 2 10 1 3.79 1303/1651 4.08 4.20 4.18 4.10 3.79 8. How many times was class cancelled 0 0 0 0 0 0 8 6 4.43 1289/1673 4.59 4.65 4.69 4.67 4.43 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 4 0 1 0 4 5 0 3.30 1455/1656 3.86 4.06 4.07 3.96 3.30 Lecture 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 1 0 0 0 0 4 4 5 4.08 1265/1586 4.47 4.43 4.37 4.08 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 0 0 0 0 0 7 7 4.50 1225/1585 4.72 4.72 4.69 4.60 4.50 4.01 did the lectures contribute to what you learned 1 0 1 0 4 2 6 3.99 1336/1582 4.15 4.03 4.26 4.17 3.69 4.01 did the lectures contribute to what you learned 1 0 1 0 4 2 6 3.92 1200/1575 4.36 4.32 4.27 4.17 3.92 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 1 1 1 2 4 4 1 3.17 190/1380 3.72 3.94 3.94 3.78 3.17 Discussion 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 2 0 1 1 3 2 5 3.75 1027/1520 3.98 4.14 4.01 3.76 3.75 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 2 0 0 2 1 3 6 4.08 999/1515 4.28 4.37 4.24 3.97 4.08 3.94 3.94 3.99 3.90 568/994 3.88 3.97 3.94 3.73 3.90 Frequency Distribution Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades Reasons Type Majors O0-27 1 0.00-0.99 0 A 3 Required for Majors 3 Graduate 0 Major 0 28-55 3 1.00-1.99 0 B 6 56-83 1 2.00-2.99 1 C 3 General 5 Under-grad 14 Non-major 7 84-15 0 0 3.00-3.99 1 D 0 Grad. 0 3.50-4.00 5 F 0 Electives 3 #### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant 1 I 0 Other 1								_	_	_	-	_							
8. How many times was class cancelled 0 0 0 0 0 8 6 4.43 1289/1673 4.59 4.65 4.69 4.67 4.43 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 4 0 1 0 4 5 0 3.30 1455/1656 3.86 4.06 4.07 3.96 3.30 Lecture 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 1 0 0 0 0 4 4 5 4.08 1265/1586 4.47 4.43 4.43 4.37 4.08 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 0 0 0 0 0 7 7 4.50 1225/1585 4.72 4.72 4.69 4.60 4.50 3.86 alole ture material presented and explained clearly 1 0 0 1 4 6 2 3.69 1336/1582 4.15 4.30 4.26 4.17 3.69 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 1 0 1 0 4 2 6 3.92 1200/1575 4.36 4.32 4.27 4.17 3.92 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 1 1 1 2 4 4 1 3.17 1190/1380 3.72 3.94 3.94 3.78 3.17 Discussion 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 2 0 1 1 3 2 5 3.75 1027/1520 3.98 4.14 4.01 3.76 3.75 4. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 2 0 0 2 1 3 6 4.08 999/1515 4.28 4.37 4.24 3.97 4.08 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 2 0 1 1 3 2 5 3.75 1027/1520 3.98 4.14 4.01 3.76 3.75 4. Were special techniques successful 2 2 0 1 1 3 2 4 3.90 568/994 3.88 3.97 3.94 3.73 3.90 Frequency Distribution Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades Reasons Type Majors Frequency Distribution Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades Reasons Type Majors 0 28-55 3 1.00-1.99 0 B 6 6 6 6 6 6 6 6 6 6 6 6 6 6 6 6 6 6						-		_	-	_	-	-							
Lecture Lect					ined	_	-	-	_	_		_							
Lecture 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 7. Discussion 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 4. Were special techniques successful Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades Reasons Required for Majors Type Majors Frequency Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades Reasons Required for Majors Type Majors Frequency General 5. Under-grad 14 Non-major 7 84-150 0 3.00-0.99 0 B 6 56-83 1 2.00-2.99 1 C 3 84-150 0 3.00-3.49 1 D 0 Grad. 0 3.50-4.00 5 F 0 Electives 1 0 0 0 4 4 5 4.08 1265/1586 4.47 4.43 4.43 4.43 4.37 4.08 1 0 0 0 0 0 0 7 7 7 4.50 1225/1585 4.72 4.72 4.69 4.60 4.50 2 0 1 1 3 2 5 3.75 1027/1520 3.98 4.14 4.01 3.76 3.75 3. 75 1027/1520 3.98 4.14 4.01 3.76 3.75 3. 75 1027/1520 3.98 4.14 4.01 3.76 3.75 4. Were special techniques successful Frequency Distribution Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades Reasons Type Majors Frequency One-grad 14 Non-major 7 84-150 0 3.00-3.99 1 D 0 Grad. 0 3.50-4.00 5 F 0 Electives 3 #### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant		-				-	•	-	-	•	-			,					
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 1 0 0 0 4 4 5 4.08 1265/1586 4.47 4.43 4.43 4.37 4.08 2.0 Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 0 0 0 0 0 7 7 4.50 1225/1585 4.72 4.72 4.69 4.60 4.50 3.0 Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 1 0 0 1 4 6 2 3.69 1336/1582 4.15 4.30 4.26 4.17 3.69 4.01 the lectures contribute to what you learned 1 0 1 0 4 2 6 3.92 1200/1575 4.36 4.32 4.27 4.17 3.92 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 1 1 1 2 4 4 1 3.17 1190/1380 3.72 3.94 3.94 3.78 3.17 Discussion Discussion 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 2 0 1 1 3 2 5 3.75 1027/1520 3.98 4.14 4.01 3.76 3.75 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 2 0 0 2 1 3 6 4.08 999/1515 4.28 4.37 4.24 3.97 4.08 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 2 0 1 1 3 2 5 3.75 1027/1520 3.98 4.14 4.01 3.76 3.75 4. Were special techniques successful 2 2 0 1 1 3 2 5 3.75 1027/1520 3.98 4.14 4.01 3.76 3.75 4. Were special techniques successful 2 2 0 1 1 3 2 5 3.75 1027/1520 3.98 4.14 4.01 3.76 3.75 4. Were special techniques successful 2 2 0 1 1 3 2 5 3.75 1027/1520 3.98 4.37 4.27 4.00 3.75 4. Were special techniques successful 2 2 0 1 3 2 5 3.75 1027/1520 3.98 4.37 4.27 4.00 3.75 4. Were special techniques successful 2 2 0 1 3 2 5 3.75 1027/1520 3.98 4.37 4.27 4.00 3.75 4. Were special techniques successful 3 5 0.00-0.99 0 B 6 6 5.00 B 6 6 5.0	9. How wou	uld you g	rade the overa	ll teacl	ning effectiveness	4	0	1	0	4	5	0	3.30	1455/1656	3.86	4.06	4.07	3.96	3.30
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 1 0 0 0 4 4 5 4.08 1265/1586 4.47 4.43 4.43 4.37 4.08 2.0 Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 0 0 0 0 0 7 7 4.50 1225/1585 4.72 4.72 4.69 4.60 4.50 3.0 Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 1 0 0 1 4 6 2 3.69 1336/1582 4.15 4.30 4.26 4.17 3.69 4.01 the lectures contribute to what you learned 1 0 1 0 4 2 6 3.92 1200/1575 4.36 4.32 4.27 4.17 3.92 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 1 1 1 2 4 4 1 3.17 1190/1380 3.72 3.94 3.94 3.78 3.17 Discussion Discussion 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 2 0 1 1 3 2 5 3.75 1027/1520 3.98 4.14 4.01 3.76 3.75 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 2 0 0 2 1 3 6 4.08 999/1515 4.28 4.37 4.24 3.97 4.08 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 2 0 1 1 3 2 5 3.75 1027/1520 3.98 4.14 4.01 3.76 3.75 4. Were special techniques successful 2 2 0 1 1 3 2 5 3.75 1027/1520 3.98 4.14 4.01 3.76 3.75 4. Were special techniques successful 2 2 0 1 1 3 2 5 3.75 1027/1520 3.98 4.14 4.01 3.76 3.75 4. Were special techniques successful 2 2 0 1 1 3 2 5 3.75 1027/1520 3.98 4.37 4.27 4.00 3.75 4. Were special techniques successful 2 2 0 1 3 2 5 3.75 1027/1520 3.98 4.37 4.27 4.00 3.75 4. Were special techniques successful 2 2 0 1 3 2 5 3.75 1027/1520 3.98 4.37 4.27 4.00 3.75 4. Were special techniques successful 3 5 0.00-0.99 0 B 6 6 5.00 B 6 6 5.0			T	_															
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 0 0 0 0 0 7 7 4 4.50 1225/1585 4.72 4.72 4.69 4.60 4.50 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 1 0 0 1 4 6 2 3.69 1336/1582 4.15 4.30 4.26 4.17 3.69 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 1 0 1 0 4 2 6 3.92 1200/1575 4.36 4.32 4.27 4.17 3.92 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 1 1 1 2 4 4 1 3.17 1190/1380 3.72 3.94 3.94 3.78 3.17 Discussion 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 2 0 1 1 3 2 5 3.75 1027/1520 3.98 4.14 4.01 3.76 3.75 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 2 0 0 2 1 3 6 4.08 999/1515 4.28 4.37 4.24 3.97 4.08 3.75 4. Were special techniques successful 2 0 1 1 3 2 5 3.75 1227/1510 3.98 4.14 4.01 3.76 3.75 4. Were special techniques successful 2 2 0 1 1 3 2 5 3.75 1027/1520 3.98 4.14 4.01 3.76 3.75 4. Were special techniques successful 2 2 0 1 1 3 2 5 3.75 1227/1511 3.94 4.37 4.27 4.00 3.75 4. Were special techniques successful 2 2 0 1 3 2 4 3.90 568/ 994 3.88 3.97 3.94 3.73 3.90 **Frequency Distribution** **Type** **Majors** **On-27 1 0.00-0.99 0 A 3 3 Required for Majors 3 Graduate 0 Major 0 28-55 3 1.00-1.99 0 B 6 56-83 1 0.00-1.99 0 B 6 6 56-83 1 0.00-2.99 1 C 3 General 5 Under-grad 14 Non-major 7 84-150 0 3.00-3.49 1 D 0 Grad. 0 3.50-4.00 5 F 0 Electives 3 #### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant **I Did Class discussions contribute to what you learned 2 0 T a 4 4 4 1 3.17 1190/1380 3.72 3.94 3.78 3.17 1190/1380 3.72 3.94 3.78 3.17 1190/1380 3.72 3.94 3.78 3.17 1190/1380 3.72 3.94 3.78 3.17 1190/1380 3.72 3.94 3.78 3.17 1190/1380 3.72 3.94 3.78 3.17 1190/1380 3.72 3.94 3.78 3.17 1190/1380 3.72 3.94 3.78 3.17 1190/1380 3.72 3.94 3.78 3.17 1190/1380 3.72 3.94 3.78 3.17 1190/1380 3.72 3.94 3.78 3.17 1190/1380 3.72 3.94 3.78 3.17 1190/1380 3.72 3.94 3.78 3.17 1190/1380 3.72 3.94 3.78 3.17 1190/1380 3.72 3.94 3.78 3.17 1190/1380 3.72 3.94 3.78 3.17 1190/1380 3.72 3.94 3.78 3.17 1190/1380 3.72 3.94 3.78 3.17 1190/1380 3.72 3.94 3.78 3.17	1 Works +h	ho inatan		_	- vonovod	1	0	0	0	1	1	_	4 00	1065/1506	1 17	1 12	1 12	1 27	4 00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 1 0 0 1 4 6 2 3.69 1336/1582 4.15 4.30 4.26 4.17 3.69 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 1 0 1 0 4 2 6 3.92 1200/1575 4.36 4.32 4.27 4.17 3.92 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 1 1 1 1 2 4 4 1 3.17 1190/1380 3.72 3.94 3.94 3.78 3.17 Discussion 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 2 0 1 1 3 2 5 3.75 1027/1520 3.98 4.14 4.01 3.76 3.75 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 2 0 0 2 1 3 6 4.08 999/1515 4.28 4.37 4.24 3.97 4.08 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 2 0 1 1 3 2 5 3.75 1221/1511 3.94 4.37 4.27 4.00 3.75 4. Were special techniques successful 2 2 0 1 3 2 4 3.90 568/ 994 3.88 3.97 3.94 3.73 3.90 Frequency Distribution Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades Reasons Type Majors Frequency Distribution Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades Reasons Type Majors 0 28-55 3 1.00-1.99 0 B 6 56-83 1 2.00-2.99 1 C 3 General 5 Under-grad 14 Non-major 7 84-150 0 3.00-3.49 1 D 0 0 Grad. 0 3.50-4.00 5 F 0 Electives 3 #### - Means there are not enough Grad. 0 3.50-4.00 5 F 0 Electives 3 #### - Means there are not enough F 1 0 Other 1										4	4 7								
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 1 0 1 0 4 2 6 3.92 1200/1575 4.36 4.32 4.27 4.17 3.92 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 1 1 1 1 2 4 4 1 3.17 1190/1380 3.72 3.94 3.94 3.78 3.17 Discussion					3						,								
Discussion 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 2 0 1 1 3 2 5 3.75 1027/1520 3.98 4.14 4.01 3.76 3.75 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 2 0 0 2 1 3 6 4.08 999/1515 4.28 4.37 4.24 3.97 4.08 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 2 0 1 1 3 2 5 3.75 1221/1511 3.94 4.37 4.27 4.00 3.75 4. Were special techniques successful 2 2 0 1 3 2 4 3.90 568/994 3.88 3.97 3.94 3.73 3.90 Frequency Distribution Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades Reasons Type Majors												_							
Discussion 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 2 0 1 1 3 2 5 3.75 1027/1520 3.98 4.14 4.01 3.76 3.75 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 2 0 0 2 1 3 6 4.08 999/1515 4.28 4.37 4.24 3.97 4.08 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 2 0 1 1 3 2 5 3.75 1221/1511 3.94 4.37 4.27 4.00 3.75 4. Were special techniques successful 2 2 0 1 3 2 4 3.90 568/994 3.88 3.97 3.94 3.73 3.90 Frequency Distribution Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades Reasons Type Majors 00-27 1 0.00-0.99 0 A 3 Required for Majors 3 Graduate 0 Major 0 28-55 3 1.00-1.99 0 B 6 56-83 1 2.00-2.99 1 C 3 General 5 Under-grad 14 Non-major 7 84-150 0 3.00-3.49 1 D 0 Grad. 0 3.50-4.00 5 F 0 Electives 3 #### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant I 0 Other 1				-				_	-	_									
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 2 0 1 1 3 2 5 3.75 1027/1520 3.98 4.14 4.01 3.76 3.75 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 2 0 0 2 1 3 6 4.08 999/1515 4.28 4.37 4.24 3.97 4.08 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 2 0 1 1 3 2 5 3.75 1221/1511 3.94 4.37 4.27 4.00 3.75 4. Were special techniques successful 2 2 0 1 3 2 4 3.90 568/994 3.88 3.97 3.94 3.73 3.90 Frequency Distribution Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades Reasons Type Majors 00-27 1 0.00-0.99 0 A 3 Required for Majors 3 Graduate 0 Major 0 28-55 3 1.00-1.99 0 B 6 56-83 1 2.00-2.99 1 C 3 General 5 Under-grad 14 Non-major 7 84-150 0 3.00-3.49 1 D 0 Grad. 0 3.50-4.00 5 F 0 Electives 3 #### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant I 0 Other	5. Did aud	alovisual	. tecnniques en	nance yo	our understanding	1	Τ	Τ	2	4	4	Τ	3.1/	1190/1380	3.72	3.94	3.94	3.78	3.1/
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 2 0 1 1 3 2 5 3.75 1027/1520 3.98 4.14 4.01 3.76 3.75 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 2 0 0 2 1 3 6 4.08 999/1515 4.28 4.37 4.24 3.97 4.08 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 2 0 1 1 3 2 5 3.75 1221/1511 3.94 4.37 4.27 4.00 3.75 4. Were special techniques successful 2 2 0 1 3 2 4 3.90 568/994 3.88 3.97 3.94 3.73 3.90 Frequency Distribution Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades Reasons Type Majors 00-27 1 0.00-0.99 0 A 3 Required for Majors 3 Graduate 0 Major 0 28-55 3 1.00-1.99 0 B 6 56-83 1 2.00-2.99 1 C 3 General 5 Under-grad 14 Non-major 7 84-150 0 3.00-3.49 1 D 0 Grad. 0 3.50-4.00 5 F 0 Electives 3 #### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant I 0 Other			Discus	sion															
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 2 0 0 2 1 3 6 4.08 999/1515 4.28 4.37 4.24 3.97 4.08 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 2 0 1 1 3 2 5 3.75 1221/1511 3.94 4.37 4.27 4.00 3.75 4. Were special techniques successful 2 0 1 1 3 2 4 3.90 568/994 3.88 3.97 3.94 3.73 3.90 Frequency Distribution Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades Reasons Type Majors	1. Did cla	ass discu			what you learned	2	0	1	1	3	2	5	3.75	1027/1520	3.98	4.14	4.01	3.76	3.75
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 2 0 1 1 3 2 5 3.75 1221/1511 3.94 4.37 4.27 4.00 3.75 4. Were special techniques successful					-				2		3	6							
4. Were special techniques successful 2 2 0 1 3 2 4 3.90 568/994 3.88 3.97 3.94 3.73 3.90 Frequency Distribution Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades Reasons Type Majors 00-27 1 0.00-0.99 0 A 3 Required for Majors 3 Graduate 0 Major 0 28-55 3 1.00-1.99 0 B 6 56-83 1 2.00-2.99 1 C 3 General 5 Under-grad 14 Non-major 7 84-150 0 3.00-3.49 1 D 0 Grad. 0 3.50-4.00 5 F 0 Electives 3 #### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant I 0 Other 1			_	_							2							4.00	
Frequency Distribution Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades Reasons Type Majors 00-27 1 0.00-0.99 0 A 3 Required for Majors 3 Graduate 0 Major 0 28-55 3 1.00-1.99 0 B 6 56-83 1 2.00-2.99 1 C 3 General 5 Under-grad 14 Non-major 7 84-150 0 3.00-3.49 1 D 0 Grad. 0 3.50-4.00 5 F 0 Electives 3 #### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant I 0 Other 1			_											, -					
Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades Reasons Type Majors 00-27 1 0.00-0.99 0 A 3 Required for Majors 3 Graduate 0 Major 0 28-55 3 1.00-1.99 0 B 6 56-83 1 2.00-2.99 1 C 3 General 5 Under-grad 14 Non-major 7 84-150 0 3.00-3.49 1 D 0 Grad. 0 3.50-4.00 5 F 0 Electives 3 #### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant I 0 Other 1			1																
00-27					Frequ	lency	7 Dist	tribu	utio:	n									
28-55 3 1.00-1.99 0 B 6 56-83 1 2.00-2.99 1 C 3 General 5 Under-grad 14 Non-major 7 84-150 0 3.00-3.49 1 D 0 Grad. 0 3.50-4.00 5 F 0 Electives 3 #### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant I 0 Other 1	Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Re	ason	s			Ту	pe			Majors	3
56-83 1 2.00-2.99 1 C 3 General 5 Under-grad 14 Non-major 7 84-150 0 3.00-3.49 1 D 0 Grad. 0 3.50-4.00 5 F 0 Electives 3 #### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant I 0 Other 1	00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A 3		Red	quire	ed f	or M	ajors	3	3	Graduat	e	0	Majo	r	0
84-150 0 3.00-3.49 1 D 0 Grad. 0 3.50-4.00 5 F 0 Electives 3 #### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant I 0 Other 1	28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	в 6	nequired for hajors													
Grad. 0 3.50-4.00 5 F 0 Electives 3 #### - Means there are not enough P 1 responses to be significant I 0 Other 1	56-83	1	2.00-2.99	1	C 3	General					5	Under-g	rad 1	.4	Non-	major	7		
P 1 responses to be significant I 0 Other 1	84-150	0	3.00-3.49	1	D 0														
I 0 Other 1	Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5	F 0		Electives						3	#### - :	Means t	here a	re not	enoug	jh
					P 1		220001.00							respons	es to b	e sign	nifican	ıt	
? 0					I O		Other					1	_		_				
					? 0		Octiet												

Course-Section: GERM 101 0201

ELEMENTARY GERMAN I

Title Instructor: SUTTON, SUSANNE

Enrollment:

27 Questionnaires: 16 University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2005

Page 934 JAN 21, 2006 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

			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	0	4	12	4.75	298/1674	4.41	4.23	4.27	4.07	4.75
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	3	12	4.69	352/1674	4.27	4.26	4.23	4.16	4.69
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	4	10	4.50	575/1423	4.36	4.36	4.27	4.16	4.50
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	1	9	4	4.21	905/1609	4.11	4.23	4.22	4.05	4.21
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	7	8	4.44	386/1585	4.06	4.04	3.96	3.88	4.44
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	5	6	5	4.00	870/1535	3.92	4.08	4.08	3.89	4.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	2	6	8	4.38	713/1651	4.08	4.20	4.18	4.10	4.38
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	4	12	4.75	958/1673	4.59	4.65	4.69	4.67	4.75
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	0	8	6	4.43	493/1656	3.86	4.06	4.07	3.96	4.43
Lecture	_				•	_			004/4506				4 0.5	
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	2	13	4.87	284/1586	4.47	4.43	4.43	4.37	4.87
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	1	14	4.93	397/1585	4.72	4.72	4.69	4.60	4.93
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	1	4	10	4.60	525/1582	4.15	4.30	4.26	4.17	4.60
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	3	12	4.80	279/1575	4.36		4.27	4.17	4.80
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	0	3	5	7	4.27	480/1380	3.72	3.94	3.94	3.78	4.27
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	0	1	6	7	4.20	700/1520	3.98	4.14	4.01	3.76	4.20
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	3	2	10	4.47	681/1515	4.28	4.37	4.24	3.97	4.47
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	1	3	4	7	4.13	997/1511	3.94	4.37	4.27	4.00	4.13
4. Were special techniques successful	1	0	1	0	3	7		3.87	586/ 994		3.97		3.73	3.87
ware afterna treemantane and the same	_		_	-	-	-	_		,					
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	15	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 265	****	4.06	4.23	3.97	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	15	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 278	****	4.21	4.19	3.97	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	15	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 260	****	4.43	4.46	4.41	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 259	****	4.21	4.33	4.19	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	15	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 233	****	4.36	4.20	4.00	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	15	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 103	++++	4 20	1 11	4 22	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 99	****	4.39 4.36	4.41 4.39	4.33	****
		0	0	0	0	1	-		****/ 97	****				****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	15	U	U	U	U	Т	0	4.00	***/ 9/		3.76	4.14	3.69	* * * *
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 76	****	3.36	3.98	3.32	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	15	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 77	****	3.65	3.93	3.42	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 53	****	4.19	4.45	4.34	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 48	****	3.86	4.12	4.00	***
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	15	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 49	****	3.74	4.27	4.30	***
- 10 - 1														
Self Paced	15	0	0	0	1	0	0	2 00	****/ 61	****	4 02	4 00	3.87	****
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	т2	U	U	U	Т	0	U	3.00	/ 01		4.03	4.09	3.8/	

Course-Section: GERM 101 0201

Title ELEMENTARY GERMAN I

Instructor: SUTTON, SUSANNE

Enrollment: 27
Questionnaires: 16

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2005 Page 934 JAN 21, 2006 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits E	redits Earned			Expected	l Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	 А	4	Required for Majors	11	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	В	8						
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	1	C	3	General	2	Under-grad	16	Non-major	6
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	1	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	i
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	2				
				?	0						

Course-Section: GERM 102 0101 University of Maryland ELEMENTARY GERMAN II Baltimore County

I

?

0

0

Page 935 Title JAN 21, 2006 Instructor: SUTTON, SUSANNE Fall 2005 Job IRBR3029

(Duestionnaires:	13	Student Co	nirse Et	raluation (Duestionnaire
_	Juco cilliaires.	13	Diddelli CC	JULDE EV	/aruatron (Juescrommarre

Enrollment:

19

					Frequencies I			Inst	cructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect				
		Question	S		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		 Genera	 1															
1. Did vo	nı gain ne	ew insights,ski	_	m this course	0	0	0	1	2	4	6	4.15	1066/1674	4.08	4.23	4.27	4.07	4.15
		ctor make clear			0	0	0	0	3	4	6	4.23	956/1674		4.26	4.23	4.16	4.23
		uestions reflec			0	0	0	0	3	3	7	4.31	803/1423		4.36	4.27	4.16	4.31
	_	uations reflect		_	0	0	0	0	3	6	4		1048/1609		4.23	4.22	4.05	4.08
				what you learned	0	1	0	1	3	4	4	3.92	893/1585		4.04	3.96	3.88	3.92
				o what you learned	0	0	1	0	2	7	3		1074/1535		4.08	4.08	3.89	3.85
		g system clearl		_	0	0	0	1	2	2	8	4.31	. ,		4.20	4.18	4.10	4.31
	-	was class canc			0	0	0	0	0	6	7		1182/1673		4.65	4.69	4.67	4.54
				hing effectiveness	0	1	0	0	3	7	2		1107/1656			4.07		3.92
	9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectivenes																	
		Lectur	е															
1. Were t	he instru	uctor's lecture	s well	prepared	1	0	0	0	0	6	6	4.50	858/1586	4.50	4.43	4.43	4.37	4.50
2. Did th	. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject					0	0	0	0	2	10	4.83	737/1585	4.87	4.72	4.69	4.60	4.83
3. Was le	ecture mat	terial presente	d and e	xplained clearly	1	0	0	1	1	4	6	4.25	935/1582	4.28	4.30	4.26	4.17	4.25
4. Did th	ne lecture	es contribute t	o what	you learned	1	0	1	0	1	4	6	4.17	1040/1575	4.13	4.32	4.27	4.17	4.17
5. Did au	diovisua	l techniques en	hance y	our understanding	1	1	0	0	5	4	2	3.73	923/1380	3.80	3.94	3.94	3.78	3.73
		Discus																
				what you learned	0	0	3	1	0	4	5		1157/1520		4.14	4.01	3.76	3.54
				d to participate	0	0	0	0	3	0	10	4.54	603/1515		4.37	4.24	3.97	4.54
		_		d open discussion	0	0	0	1	2	1	9	4.38	769/1511		4.37	4.27	4.00	4.38
4. Were s	special te	echniques succe	ssful		0	1	0	1	1	6	4	4.08	450/ 994	3.92	3.97	3.94	3.73	4.08
				Frequ	iency	Dis	trib	utior	n									
Credits E	Carned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	asons	3			Ту	pe			Majors	;
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	0	A 2		Red	quir	ed fo	or Ma	ajor	s	9	Graduat	 е	0	Majo	r or	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В 2			-			-						3		
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	0	C 4		Gei	nera	1				1	Under-g	rad 1	.3	Non-	major	5
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	1	D 3														
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F 0		Ele	ecti	ves				0	#### - 1	Means t	here a	re not	enoug	ıh
	P 1												respons	es to b	e sign	ificar	ıt	
				_								_						

Other

2

Course-Section: GERM 102 0201

Title ELEMENTARY GERMAN II

Instructor: SUTTON, SUSANNE

Enrollment: 17 Questionnaires: 10

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2005

Page 936 JAN 21, 2006 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Fre	equer 2	ncies 3	4	5	Inst Mean	ructor Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean		Level Mean	Sect Mean
General 1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	1	2	3	4	4 00	1196/1674	4.08	4.23	4.27	4.07	4.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	4	5	4.40	737/1674		4.26	4.23	4.16	4.40
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	0	8	4.60	459/1423	4.45	4.36	4.27	4.16	4.60
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	3	5	4.20	930/1609	4.14	4.23	4.22	4.05	4.20
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	1	0	1	2	5	4.11		4.01	4.04	3.96	3.88	4.11
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	1	3	5	4.20	737/1535	4.02	4.08	4.08	3.89	4.20
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	0	1	8	4.60	393/1651	4.45	4.20	4.18	4.10	4.60
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	706/1673	4.72	4.65	4.69	4.67	4.90
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	0	2	1	2	4.00	955/1656	3.96	4.06	4.07	3.96	4.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	1	0	2	7	4.50	858/1586	4.50	4.43	4.43	4.37	4.50
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	567/1585	4.87	4.72	4.69	4.60	4.90
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	1	1	2		4.30	882/1582	4.28	4.30	4.26	4.17	4.30
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	1	4			1100/1575	4.13	4.32	4.27	4.17	4.10
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	1	0	1	2	2	3	3.88	817/1380	3.80	3.94	3.94	3.78	3.88
Discussion	_	_	_		_	_								
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	0	2	2	4	3.89	936/1520	3.71	4.14	4.01	3.76	3.89
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	3	0	6	4.33	827/1515	4.44	4.37	4.24	3.97	4.33
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	3	0	5	4.25	896/1511	4.32	4.37	4.27		4.25
4. Were special techniques successful	1	1	2	U	0	2	4	3.75	638/ 994	3.92	3.97	3.94	3.73	3.75
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 265	****	4.06	4.23	3.97	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 278	****	4.21	4.19	3.97	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	9	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 260	****	4.43	4.46	4.41	***
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	9	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 259	****	4.21	4.33	4.19	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 233	****	4.36	4.20	4.00	****
Seminar					_									
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	9	0	0	0	1	0	0		****/ 103	***	4.39	4.41	4.33	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	9	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 101	****	4.33	4.48	4.18	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	9 9	0	0	0	1	0	0		****/ 95 ****/ 99	****	4.15	4.31	3.99 4.10	****
 Did presentations contribute to what you learned Were criteria for grading made clear 	9	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 97	****	4.36 3.76	4.39 4.14	3.69	****
	,	O	U	U	U	1	U	1.00	, ,,		3.70	1,11	3.05	
Field Work		_		_										
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 76	****	3.36	3.98	3.32	***
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	9	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 77	****	3.65	3.93	3.42	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	9	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 53	****	4.19	4.45	4.34	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	9	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 48	***	3.86	4.12	4.00	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	9	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 49	****	3.74	4.27	4.30	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 61	****	4.03	4.09	3.87	***
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	9	0	0	0	1	0	0		****/ 52	****	4.21	4.26	3.91	***
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	9	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 50	****	4.23	4.44	4.39	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	9 9	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 35	****	4.22	4.36	3.92	* * * *
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students			0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 31	****	4.25	4.34	3.88	****

Course-Section: GERM 102 0201

Title ELEMENTARY GERMAN II

Instructor: SUTTON, SUSANNE

Enrollment: 17
Questionnaires: 10

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2005 Page 936 JAN 21, 2006 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA	· 					Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	 А	1	Required for Majors	6	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	1	В	4						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	0	C	2	General		Under-grad	10	Non-major	3
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means	there	are not enough	
				P	1			responses to	be sig	mificant	
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	1						

Course-Section: GERM 201 0101 Univ

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2005

Instructor: XIE, WEI

Enrollment: 21
Questionnaires: 13

Page 937 JAN 21, 2006 Job IRBR3029

Student	Course	Evaluation	Questionnaire
00000110			

				Frequencies						Inst	tructor	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		rom this course	0	0	0	1	3	5	4	3.92	1296/1674	4.27	4.23	4.27	4.32	3.92
2. Did the instruct			0	0	1	1	3	3	5		1364/1674	4.20	4.26	4.23		3.77
3. Did the exam que		_	0	0	0	0	1	3	9	4.62	445/1423	4.61	4.36	4.27		4.62
4. Did other evalua		_	0	2	0	0	3	2	6	4.27	825/1609	4.36	4.23	4.22	4.23	4.27
5. Did assigned read			0	3	0	0	1	3	6	4.50	326/1585	4.44	4.04	3.96	3.91	4.50
		to what you learned	0	1	0	0	4	1	7	4.25	667/1535	4.06	4.08	4.08	4.03	4.25
7. Was the grading			0	0	0	0	2	4	7	4.38	700/1651	4.47	4.20	4.18	4.20	4.38
8. How many times w	as class cancelled		0	0	0	0	2	9	2	4.00	1566/1673	4.47	4.65	4.69	4.67	4.00
9. How would you gra	ade the overall tea	aching effectiveness	4	0	0	1	2	4	2	3.78	1222/1656	4.03	4.06	4.07	4.10	3.78
	Lecture		0	0	0				_							
	1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared						3	4	5		1300/1586	4.32	4.43	4.43	4.48	4.00
	 Did the instructor seem interested in the subject Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 						1	5	./		1258/1585	4.62	4.72	4.69	4.76	4.46
	_		0	0	0	0	3	4	6		956/1582	4.44	4.30	4.26	4.35	4.23
4. Did the lectures		-	0	0	0	2	1	4	6		1111/1575	4.35	4.32	4.27	4.39	4.08
5. Did audiovisual	techniques enhance	your understanding	0	4	0	0	1	3	5	4.44	348/1380	4.22	3.94	3.94	4.03	4.44
	Discussion															
1. Did class discus	sions contribute to	what you learned	2	0	1	0	2	4	4	3.91	924/1520	3.83	4.14	4.01	4.03	3.91
2. Were all student	s actively encourag	red to participate	2	0	0	0	1	3	7	4.55	594/1515	4.40	4.37	4.24	4.28	4.55
3. Did the instruct	or encourage fair a	and open discussion	3	0	0	0	2	3	5	4.30	845/1511	4.15	4.37	4.27	4.28	4.30
4. Were special tec	hniques successful	_	3	2	1	0	0	3	4	4.13	432/ 994	3.92	3.97	3.94	3.98	4.13
	Laboratory															
1. Did the lab incr	_		12	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 265	****	4.06	4.23	4.34	****
	ekground information	12	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 278	****	4.21	4.19	4.36	****	
3. Were necessary m	12	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 260	****	4.43	4.46	4.51	****		
4. Did the lab inst	-		12	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 259	****	4.21	4.33	4.42	****
5. Were requirement	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 233	****	4.36	4.20	4.48	***		
		Frequ	ency	Dist	rib	ution	n									
Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades		Reasons							Tvi	ne			Majors	

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expecte	d Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0		10	Required for Majors	7	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	В	0						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	0	C	1	General	2	Under-grad	13	Non-major	1
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	2	D	1						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	
				P	0			responses to	be sig	mificant	
				I	0	Other	3	-			
				2	0						

Course-Section: GERM 201 0201 University of Maryland Title INTERMEDIATE GERMAN I Baltimore County JAN 21, 2006

Instructor: WOLFF, XENIA

Enrollment: 19 Questionnaires: 18

Fall 2005 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire Page 938

Job IRBR3029

	1					Inst	tructor	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	2	Ω	Λ	Λ	2	2	12	4.63	458/1674	4.27	4.23	4.27	4.32	4.63
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	0	0	1	4	11	4.63	433/1674	4.20	4.26	4.23	4.26	4.63
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	3	0	0	n	2	2	11	4.60	459/1423	4.61	4.36	4.27	4.36	4.60
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	0	0	n	2	5	9	4.44	598/1609	4.36	4.23	4.22	4.23	4.44
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	3	4	9	4.38	442/1585	4.44	4.04	3.96	3.91	4.38
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	1	4	3	7		1048/1535	4.06	4.08	4.08	4.03	3.88
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	0	2	3	11	4.56	445/1651	4.47	4.20	4.18	4.20	4.56
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	1	15	4.94	494/1673	4.47	4.65	4.69	4.67	4.94
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	2	6	6	4.29	680/1656		4.06	4.07		4.29
J. now would jou grade the overall teaching critetiveness	-	Ü	Ü	O	_	Ü	Ü	1.20	000/1030	1.05	1.00	1.07	1.10	1.27
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	0	0	0	5	9	4.64	693/1586	4.32	4.43	4.43	4.48	4.64
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	0	0	3	11	4.79	853/1585	4.62	4.72	4.69	4.76	4.79
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	0	0	0	5	9	4.64	467/1582	4.44	4.30	4.26	4.35	4.64
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	5	8	4.62	565/1575	4.35	4.32	4.27	4.39	4.62
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	6	0	0	3	2	3	4.00	666/1380	4.22	3.94	3.94	4.03	4.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	10	0	1	0	2	2	3	3.75	1027/1520	3.83	4.14	4.01	4.03	3.75
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	10	0	1	0	1	0	6	4.25	898/1515	4.40	4.37	4.24	4.28	4.25
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	10	0	1	0	1	2	4	4.00	1050/1511	4.15	4.37	4.27	4.28	4.00
4. Were special techniques successful	10	1	1	0	2	1	3	3.71	657/ 994	3.92	3.97	3.94	3.98	3.71

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected	l Grades	Reasons		Туре	Majors		
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	1	 А	6	Required for Majors	9	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	В	3						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	2	C	7	General	3	Under-grad	18	Non-major	3
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	5	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	0	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means	there	are not enough	ı
				P	0			responses to	be sig	nificant	
				I	0	Other	3	-			
				?	0						

Course-Section: GERM 202 0101 University of Maryland Page 939 Title INTERMEDIATE GERMAN II Baltimore County JAN 21, 2006

Instructor: WOLFF, XENIA

Enrollment: 12 Questionnaires: 12

Fall 2005 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Job IRBR3029

	Questions						Fre	equer	ncies	3		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
		Question	s		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		Genera	 1															
1. Did vo	nı gain n	ew insights,ski	_	m this course	0	0	0	0	0	2	10	4.83	214/1674	4.83	4.23	4.27	4.32	4.83
_	_	ctor make clear			0	0	0	0	0	3	9	4.75	270/1674		4.26	4.23	4.26	4.75
		uestions reflec			0	0	0	0	0	3	9	4.75	262/1423		4.36	4.27	4.36	4.75
	_	uations reflect			0	0	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/1609	5.00	4.23	4.22	4.23	5.00
				what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	2	9	4.67	224/1585	4.67	4.04	3.96	3.91	4.67
				o what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	0	11	4.83	119/1535	4.83	4.08	4.08	4.03	4.83
7. Was th	ne gradin	g system clearl	y expla	ined	0	0	0	1	1	1	9	4.50	524/1651	4.50	4.20	4.18	4.20	4.50
		was class canc			0	0	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/1673	5.00	4.65	4.69	4.67	5.00
9. How wo	ould you	grade the overa	ll teac	hing effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	4	8	4.67	257/1656	4.67	4.06	4.07	4.10	4.67
	Lecture																	
1 Were t	he instr		_	prepared	1	0	0	0	Ο	1	10	4.91	214/1586	4.91	4.43	4.43	4.48	4.91
	 Were the instructor's lectures well prepared Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 					0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1585	5.00	4.72	4.69	4.76	5.00
				xplained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1582		4.30	4.26	4.35	5.00
		es contribute t			1	0	0	0	1	3	7	4.55	646/1575		4.32	4.27	4.39	4.55
				our understanding	1	0	0	0	1	3	7	4.55	278/1380			3.94		4.55
		Discus	gion															
1 Did al	lace died			what you learned	1	0	0	0	2	0	9	4.64	316/1520	4.64	4.14	4.01	4.03	4.64
				d to participate	1	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1515	5.00	4.37	4.24	4.28	5.00
				d open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	2	9	4.82	346/1511	4.82	4.37	4.27	4.28	4.82
		echniques succe		a open arbeassion	1	1	0	1	0	4	5	4.30	337/ 994		3.97		3.98	4.30
				P		- 5 -2												
				Frequ	lency	DIST	trib	ıtıoı	n									
Credits E	Earned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	asons	3			Ту	pe			Majors	3
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	0	A 7		Red	 quire	ed fo	or Ma	ior	s	0	Graduat	 e	1	Majo	 r	0
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	В 3								-		-		5		-
56-83						Ger	nera:	L				3	Under-g	rad 1	.1	Non-	major	2
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	1	D 0									J				3	
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00	6	F 0		Ele	ectiv	<i>r</i> es				2	#### - 1				_	jh
				P 0									respons	es to b	e sign	ıiıcar	ıt	

Other

0

1

I ? Course-Section: GERM 301 0101

ADVANCED GERMAN I

Title Instructor: MAY, BRIGITTE

Enrollment: 19 Questionnaires: 14 Baltimore County Fall 2005

Page 940 JAN 21, 2006 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

University of Maryland

			Fre	equei	ncies	3		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	0	5	9	4.64	432/1674	4.64	4.23	4.27	4.26	4.64
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	4	10	4.71	314/1674	4.71	4.26	4.23	4.21	4.71
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	4	8	4.43	672/1423	4.43	4.36	4.27	4.27	4.43
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	6	8	4.57	408/1609	4.57	4.23	4.22	4.27	4.57
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	1	6	5	4.33	482/1585	4.33	4.04	3.96	3.95	4.33
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	3	9	4.75	169/1535	4.75	4.08	4.08	4.15	4.75
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	0	3	1	8	4.42	658/1651	4.42	4.20	4.18	4.16	4.42
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	7	5	4.42	1300/1673	4.42	4.65	4.69	4.68	4.42
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	3	10	4.77	178/1656	4.77	4.06	4.07	4.07	4.77
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	4	9	4.57	784/1586	4.57	4.43	4.43	4.42	4.57
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	14	5.00	1/1585	5.00	4.72	4.69	4.66	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	5	9	4.64	467/1582	4.64	4.30	4.26	4.26	4.64
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	13	4.93	137/1575	4.93	4.32	4.27	4.25	4.93
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	8	0	1	1	3	1	3.67	962/1380	3.67	3.94	3.94	4.01	3.67
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.63	323/1520	4.63	4.14	4.01	4.09	4.63
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1515	5.00	4.37	4.24	4.32	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	278/1511	4.88	4.37	4.27	4.34	4.88
4. Were special techniques successful	6	1	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	178/ 994		3.97	3.94		4.57
1. Were apecial econniques adocessial	O	_	U	U	U	5	_	1.57	1707 331	1.57	3.57	3.71	3.50	1.57
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 103	****	4.39	4.41	4.10	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 101	****	4.33	4.48	4.30	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 95	****	4.15	4.31	3.91	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 99	****	4.36	4.39	4.29	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 97	****	3.76	4.14	3.48	****
				_										

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA	Expected	l Grades	Reasons		Туре	Majors			
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	 А	7	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	В	7						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	2	C	0	General	5	Under-grad	14	Non-major	1
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means	there	are not enough	ı
				P	0			responses to	be sig	nificant	
				I	0	Other	5	-			
				2	^						

Baltimore County

I ? 1

Course-Section: GERM 303 0101

16

TOPICS IN GERMAN

MAY, BRIGITTE

Title

Instructor:

Enrollment:

Questionnaires: 13

University of Maryland Page 941 JAN 21, 2006 Fall 2005 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation C	

	Questions							-	ncies		_		ructor	Course	_			
		Question	.S		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		Genera	1															
1. Did vo	u gain n	ew insights,ski	lls fro	m this course	0	0	0	0	1	4	8	4.54	570/1674	4.54	4.23	4.27	4.26	4.54
		ctor make clear			0	0	0	0	0	3	10	4.77	259/1674	4.77	4.26	4.23	4.21	4.77
		uestions reflec			0	0	0	0	0	1	12	4.92	105/1423	4.92	4.36	4.27	4.27	4.92
	_	uations reflect		_	0	0	0	0	0	3	10	4.77	212/1609	4.77	4.23	4.22	4.27	4.77
				what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	11	4.85	116/1585	4.85	4.04	3.96	3.95	4.85
				o what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	3	8	4.46	427/1535	4.46	4.08	4.08	4.15	4.46
7. Was th	e gradin	g system clearl	y expla	ined	0	0	0	0	0	2	11	4.85	151/1651	4.85	4.20	4.18	4.16	4.85
		was class canc			0	1	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	635/1673	4.92	4.65	4.69	4.68	4.92
9. How wo	uld you	grade the overa	ll teac	hing effectiveness	1	1	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1656	5.00	4.06	4.07	4.07	5.00
	Lecture																	
1. Were t	he instr	uctor's lecture	_	prepared	0	0	0	0	1	1	11	4.77	474/1586	4.77	4.43	4.43	4.42	4.77
					0	0	0	0	0	2	11		713/1585	4.85	4.72	4.69	4.66	4.85
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly				0	0	0	0	0		10		299/1582	4.77	4.30	4.26	4.26	4.77	
		es contribute t			0	0	0	0	0		11		235/1575	4.85	4.32	4.27		4.85
				our understanding	0	2	0	0	2	0	9	4.64			3.94			4.64
		Discus	gion															
1 Did al	agg digo			what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	213/1520	4.78	4 14	4.01	4.09	4.78
				d to participate	4	0	0	0	0	1		4.89	230/1515	4.89	4.37	4.24	4.32	4.89
				d open discussion	4	0	0	0	0	1	8		266/1511	4.89	4.37	4.27	4.34	
		echniques succe			4	0	0	0	1	0	8		107/ 994		3.97		3.96	4.78
				Frequ	encv	Dist	trib	ıt.i.or	n									
				_	2													
Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	asons	3			Ту:	pe 			Majors	;
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 4		Red	quir	ed fo	or Ma	ajor	s	0	Graduat	e	0	Majo	or	0
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	В 5														
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	2	C 3		Gei	nera	l				2	Under-g	rad 1	.3	Non-	major	1
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	2	D 0														
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F 0		Ele	ecti	ves				1	#### - 1				_	ιh
				P 0									respons	es to b	e sign	ifican	ıt	
				Ι 0		Other						7						

University of Maryland Baltimore County

Course-Section: GERM 481 0101

7

SEMINAR IN GERMAN

MAY, BRIGITTE

Title

Instructor:

Enrollment:

Questionnaires: 6

Page 942 JAN 21, 2006 Fall 2005 Job IRBR3029

3

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

							Fre	eque	ncies	3		Inst	ructor	Course	e Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
		Question	s		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		Genera	 1															
1. Did yo	ou gain n	ew insights,ski	lls fro	m this course	0	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	214/1674	4.83	4.23	4.27	4.42	4.83
2. Did th	ne instru	ctor make clear	the ex	pected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1674	5.00	4.26	4.23	4.31	5.00
3. Did th	ne exam q	uestions reflec	t the e	xpected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1423	5.00	4.36	4.27	4.34	5.00
4. Did ot	ther eval	uations reflect	the ex	pected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1609	5.00	4.23	4.22	4.30	5.00
5. Did as	ssigned r	eadings contrib	ute to	what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	121/1585	4.83	4.04	3.96	4.01	4.83
6. Did wr	ritten as	signments contr	ibute t	o what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1535	5.00	4.08	4.08	4.18	5.00
7. Was th	ne gradin	g system clearl	y expla	ined	0	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	157/1651	4.83	4.20	4.18	4.23	4.83
8. How ma	any times	was class canc	elled		0	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	832/1673	4.83	4.65	4.69	4.67	4.83
9. How wo	ould you	grade the overa	ll teac	hing effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1656	5.00	4.06	4.07	4.19	5.00
	Lecture																	
1. Were t	prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1586	5.00	4.43	4.43	4.46	5.00			
2. Did th	 Were the instructor's lectures well prepared Did the instructor seem interested in the subject Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 					0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1585	5.00	4.72	4.69	4.76	5.00
3. Was le	ecture ma	terial presente	d and e	xplained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1582	5.00	4.30	4.26	4.31	5.00
4. Did th	ne lectur	es contribute t	o what	you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1575	5.00	4.32	4.27	4.35	5.00
5. Did au	4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding				1	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1380	5.00	3.94	3.94	4.04	5.00
		Discus	sion															
1. Did cl	lass disc	ussions contrib	ute to	what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1520	5.00	4.14	4.01	4.18	5.00
2. Were a	all stude	nts actively en	courage	d to participate	1	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1515	5.00	4.37	4.24	4.40	5.00
3. Did th	ne instru	ctor encourage	fair an	d open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	358/1511	4.80	4.37	4.27	4.45	4.80
4. Were s	special t	echniques succe	ssful		1	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/ 994	5.00	3.97	3.94	4.19	5.00
				Frequ	lency	Dist	trib	utio	n									
Credits E	Carned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	asons	:			Ту	ne			Majors	ı
										- – – –								
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 2		Red	quir	ed f	or Ma	jors	\$	0	Graduat	e	0	Majo	r	0
	28-55 0 1.00-1.99 0 B 1							_				_	_	_	_			_
	56-83 0 2.00-2.99 0 C 0					Ger	nera	T				2	Under-g	rad	6	Non-	major	0
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	1	D 0														
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	0	F 0		Ele	ecti	ves				0	#### - 1				_	n
				P 0									respons	es to k	oe sign	nifican	ıt	

Other

I

?

0

2