Course Section: GERM 101 0101
Title ELEMENTARY GERMAN I

Instructor: ELEMENTARY GERMAN SUSANNE

Enrollment: 23
Questionnaires: 11

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2006

Page 948 JAN 18, 2007 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionna:	re
---------------------------------------	----

	3.00					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	2	8	4.64	433/1669	4.77	4.33	4.23	4.02	4.64
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	0	4	6	4.36	740/1666	4.48	4.28	4.19	4.11	4.36
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	4	7	4.64	429/1421	4.61	4.36	4.24	4.11	4.64
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	1	2	2	5	4.10	970/1617	4.34	4.27	4.15	3.99	4.10
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	1	0	3	6	4.09	715/1555	4.30	4.17	4.00	3.92	4.09
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	2	5	3	4.10	832/1543	4.07	4.19	4.06	3.86	4.10
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	4	7	4.64	334/1647	4.52	4.18	4.12	4.06	4.64
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1668	4.89	4.60	4.67	4.62	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	7	3	4.30	631/1605	4.34	4.13	4.07	3.96	4.30
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	4.73	489/1514	4.70	4.39	4.39	4.32	4.73
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1551	5.00	4.39	4.39	4.55	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	1	0	5	5	4.27	861/1503	4.32	4.72	4.24	4.33	4.27
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	1	9	4.73	394/1506	4.73	4.40	4.24	4.17	4.27
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	2	0	0	2	T	4		464/1311	4.73	3.78	3.85	3.68	4.73
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	U	۷	U	U	2	3	4	4.22	404/1311	4.04	3.70	3.05	3.00	4.22
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	5	4	4.30	650/1490	4.40	4.26	4.05	3.85	4.30
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1502	4.97	4.54	4.26	4.06	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	2	1	6	4.44	753/1489	4.39	4.43	4.29	4.07	4.44
4. Were special techniques successful	1	4	0	0	3	0	3	4.00	479/1006	4.33	4.14	4.00	3.81	4.00
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	10	0	0	Λ	0	Λ	1	5.00	****/ 226	****	****	4.20	3.98	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	10	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 233			4.19	4.09	****
2. Note for provided with adequate background information	10	0	J	J	J	_	J	1.00	, 255			1.17	1.00	
Frequency Distribution														

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	l Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	4	Required for Majors	7	Graduate	1	Major	0
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	В	2						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	С	3	General	2	Under-grad	10	Non-major	11
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	0	D	0						
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means	there	are not enough	n
				P	1			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	0				
				2	0						

Course Section: GERM 101 0201

ELEMENTARY GERMAN I

Title SUTTON, SUSANNE

Instructor:

Enrollment: 26 Questionnaires: 22

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2006

Page 949 JAN 18, 2007 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

			Frequencies			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	2	20	4.91	128/1669	4.77	4.33	4.23	4.02	4.91
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	7	14	4.59	450/1666	4.48	4.28	4.19	4.11	4.59
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	7	14	4.59	475/1421	4.61	4.36	4.24	4.11	4.59
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	2	0	0	0	8	11	4.58	424/1617	4.34	4.27	4.15	3.99	4.58
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	1	0	1	1	5	13	4.50	340/1555	4.30	4.17	4.00	3.92	4.50
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	4	12	5	4.05	869/1543	4.07	4.19	4.06	3.86	4.05
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	2	9	11	4.41	651/1647	4.52	4.18	4.12	4.06	4.41
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	5	17	4.77	939/1668	4.89	4.60	4.67	4.62	4.77
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	1	0	0	1	9	8	4.39	525/1605	4.34	4.13	4.07	3.96	4.39
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	5	16	4.68	553/1514	4.70	4.39	4.39	4.32	4.68
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	22	5.00	1/1551	5.00	4.72	4.66	4.55	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	2	10	10	4.36	765/1503	4.32	4.31	4.24	4.17	4.36
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	6	16	4.73	394/1506				4.17	4.73
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	1	0	1	8	5	7	3.86	731/1311			3.85	3.68	
_, ,														
Discussion	_	_	_	_	_	_								
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	2	5	11	4.50	445/1490	4.40	4.26	4.05	3.85	4.50
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	0	0		17	4.94	142/1502		4.54	4.26	4.06	4.94
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	1	0	2	4	11	4.33	865/1489	4.39	4.43	4.29	4.07	4.33
4. Were special techniques successful	5	2	0	0	0	5	10	4.67	178/1006	4.33	4.14	4.00	3.81	4.67
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	20	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 226	****	****	4.20	3.98	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	21	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 233	****	****	4.19	4.09	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	20	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 225	****	****	4.50	4.42	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	20	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 223	****	****	4.35	4.19	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	21	0	0	0	1	0	0	2 00	****/ 58	****	4.33	4.22	4.00	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	21	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 52	****	4.33	4.22	3.81	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	21	0	0	0	0	1	0			****				****
		0	0	0	1	0	0		****/ 39 ****/ 40	****	5.00	4.39	4.30	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	21	0		0	1	0	0		,	****	4.00	3.97	4.00	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	21	U	0	U	Τ	U	0	3.00	****/ 30	* * * *	5.00	4.33	4.30	* * * *
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	20	0	1	0	1	0	0		****/ 55	****	4.42	4.34	4.17	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	21	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 42	****	****	4.31	4.08	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	21	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 46	****	4.33	4.45	4.26	****
Frequ	iencv	Dist	trib	ution	า									

Credits Ea					Reasons		Type		Majors		
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	 А	2	Required for Majors	15	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	0	В	11						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	2	C	3	General	1	Under-grad	22	Non-major	21
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means	there	are not enough	n
				P	1			responses to	be sig	nificant	
				I	0	Other	5	_			
				?	3						

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

Title ELEMENTARY GERMAN II Baltimore Count Instructor: KWIATKOWSKI, SA Fall 2006

Enrollment: 26
Ouestionnaires: 18

Student Course Evaluation Ouestionnaire

Page 950

JAN 18, 2007

Job IRBR3029

Frequencies Instructor Course Dept UMBC Level Sect Ouestions NR NA 1 2 3 4 5 Mean Rank Mean Mean Mean Mean Mean 1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course 0 0 0 0 4 1 13 4.50 590/1669 4.54 4.33 4.23 4.02 4.50 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals 0 0 0 0 2 6 10 4.44 634/1666 4.58 4.28 4.19 4.11 4.44 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals 0 0 0 0 2 4 12 4.56 511/1421 4.71 4.36 4.24 4.11 4.56 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals 0 1 0 0 1 6 10 4.53 475/1617 4.55 4.27 4.15 3.99 4.53 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0 0 0 1 3 6 8 4.17 644/1555 4.23 4.17 4.00 3.92 4.17 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 0 0 1 4 6 7 4.06 863/1543 4.38 4.19 4.06 3.86 4.06 7. Was the grading system clearly explained 0 0 0 0 2 7 9 4.39 682/1647 4.48 4.18 4.12 4.06 4.39 8. How many times was class cancelled 0 0 0 0 17 1 4.06 1503/1668 4.10 4.60 4.67 4.62 4.06 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 0 1 0 0 3 7 7 4.24 713/1605 4.26 4.13 4.07 3.96 4.24Lecture 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 2 0 Ω Ω 2 4 10 4.50 799/1514 4.68 4.39 4.39 4.32 4.50 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 3 0 0 0 2 2 11 4.60 1111/1551 4.73 4.72 4.66 4.55 4.60 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 4 0 0 0 4 4 6 4.14 978/1503 4.36 4.31 4.24 4.17 4.14 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 3 1 0 0 3 5 6 4.21 942/1506 4.54 4.40 4.26 4.17 4.21 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 3 1 0 1 2 7 4 4.00 587/1311 3.93 3.78 3.85 3.68 4.00 Discussion 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 3 0 1 0 1 6 7 4.20 742/1490 4.60 4.26 4.05 3.85 4.20 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 3 0 0 1 1 3 10 4.47 680/1502 4.73 4.54 4.26 4.06 4.47 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 4 0 0 0 2 5 7 4.36 846/1489 4.68 4.43 4.29 4.07 4.36

Laboratory

4. Were special techniques successful

Laboratory													
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	16	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00 ****/ 226	****	****	4.20	3.98	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	16	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50 ****/ 233	****	****	4.19	4.09	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00 ****/ 225	****	****	4.50	4.42	****

3 1 1 1 4 4 4 3.64 706/1006 3.95 4.14 4.00 3.81 3.64

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	A	2	Required for Majors	10	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	В	8						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	3	C	3	General	0	Under-grad	18	Non-major	18
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	1	Electives	2	#### - Means	there	are not enough	ı
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	2				
				?	2						

Course Section: GERM 102 0201 University of Maryla Title ELEMENTARY GERMAN II Baltimore County Instructor: KWIATKOWSKI, SA Fall 2006

Enrollment:

14

University of Maryland Page 951
Baltimore County JAN 18, 2007
Fall 2006 Job IRBR3029

Questionnaires:	7	Student	Course	Evaluation	Questionnaire

I

?

0

0

					Frequencies				Ins	tructor	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 yo	ou gain n	ew insights,ski	- lls fro	om this course	0	0	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	511/1669	4.54	4.33	4.23	4.02	4.57
		ctor make clear			0	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	293/1666	4.58	4.28	4.19	4.11	4.71
		uestions reflec		_	0	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	184/1421	4.71	4.36	4.24	4.11	4.86
4. Did ot	ther eval	uations reflect	the ex	spected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	424/1617	4.55	4.27	4.15	3.99	4.57
5. Did as	ssigned r	eadings contrib	ute to	what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	3	3	4.29	533/1555	4.23	4.17	4.00	3.92	4.29
6. Did wr	ritten as	signments contr	ibute t	to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	210/1543	4.38	4.19	4.06	3.86	4.71
7. Was th	ne gradin	g system clearl	y expla	ained	0	0	0	0	1	1	5	4.57	401/1647	4.48	4.18	4.12	4.06	4.57
8. How ma	any times	was class canc	elled		0	0	0	0	0	6	1	4.14	1451/1668	4.10	4.60	4.67	4.62	4.14
9. How wo	w would you grade the overall teaching effectiver					0	0	0	0	5	2	4.29	654/1605	4.26	4.13	4.07	3.96	4.29
		Lectur	e															
1 Were t	the instr	uctor's lecture		prepared	Ο	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	274/1514	4.68	4.39	4.39	4.32	4.86
	the instructor seem interested in the subject					0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	650/1551	4.73	4.72	4.66	4.55	4.86
	. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly						0	0	0	3	4		491/1503		4.31	4.24	4.17	4.57
	 was recture material presented and explained clearly Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 						0	0	0	1	6	4.86	225/1506		4.40	4.26	4.17	4.86
				your understanding	0	0	0	0	3	2	2	3.86	731/1311		3.78	3.85		3.86
		Discus																
1 154 41	laaa diaa			what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1490	4.60	4.26	4.05	3.85	5.00
				ed to participate	3	0	0	0	0	0	4		1/1490		4.54	4.05	4.06	5.00
				nd open discussion	3	0	0	0	0	0	4		1/1489		4.43	4.29	4.00	5.00
		echniques succe		id open discussion	3	0	0	0	1	1	2		381/1006		4.14	4.29	3.81	
	_	-		_														
				Frequ	iency	Dis	trıb	utio	n									
Credits E	Earned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	asons	3			Ту	pe			Majors	;
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 3	Required for Majors					4	Graduat	 e	0	Majo	 or	1		
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	в 4	Required for hajors													
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C 0	General					1	Under-g	rad	7	Non-	-major	6		
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	3	D 0											-			
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F 0	Electives				1	#### - 1				_	ŗh			
				P 0									respons	es to b	e sign	nificar	ıt	

Other

Course Section: GERM 201 0101 University of Maryland Title INTERMEDIATE GERMAN I Baltimore County

Instructor: WOLFF, XENIA

Enrollment: 9 Questionnaires: 9

Fall 2006 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Page 952

JAN 18, 2007

Job IRBR3029

	Frequencies							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	2	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	318/1669	4.44	4.33	4.23	4.34	4.71
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1666	4.83	4.28	4.19	4.29	5.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	184/1421	4.72	4.36	4.24	4.35	4.86
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	137/1617	4.64	4.27	4.15	4.24	4.86
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	120/1555	4.76	4.17	4.00	3.96	4.86
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	210/1543	4.48	4.19	4.06	4.10	4.71
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	0	1	0	6	4.71	250/1647	4.61	4.18	4.12	4.19	4.71
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	1	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1668	5.00	4.60	4.67	4.59	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	239/1605	4.44	4.13	4.07	4.15	4.67
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1514	4.95	4.39	4.39	4.39	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1551	4.95	4.72	4.66	4.72	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1503	4.77	4.31	4.24	4.29	5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1506	4.68	4.40	4.26	4.33	5.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	1	0	0	1	2	3	4.33	389/1311	3.85	3.78	3.85	3.96	4.33
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	Λ	0	1	_	4.83	192/1490	4.63	4.26	4.05	4.11	4.83
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	306/1502	4.85	4.54	4.05	4.11	4.83
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1489	4.86	4.43	4.29	4.36	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	3	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	178/1006	4.19	4.14	4.00	3.99	4.67
1. Mere apectar recimitates auccessian	3	U	J	J	J	2	-	1.07	1,0,1000	1.10	1.11	1.00	3.99	1.07

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	d Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	А	3	Required for Majors	4	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	В	3						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	2	Under-grad	9	Non-major	8
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	2	D	1						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	ı
				P	0			responses to	be sig	mificant	
				I	0	Other	2	-	_		
				?	0						

Course Section: GERM 201 0201

Title INTERMEDIATE GERMAN I

Instructor: WOLFF, XENIA

Enrollment: 21
Questionnaires: 12

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2006

Page 953 JAN 18, 2007 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

			Frequencies			Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect		
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank		Mean			Mean
General				_	_	_	_							
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	1	1	5	5		1026/1669		4.33	4.23	4.34	4.17
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	4	8	4.67	359/1666	4.83	4.28	4.19	4.29	4.67
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	5	7	4.58	484/1421	4.72			4.35	4.58
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	5	6	4.42	626/1617	4.64	4.27	4.15	4.24	4.42
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	4	8	4.67	225/1555	4.76	4.17	4.00	3.96	4.67
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	7	4	4.25	659/1543	4.48	4.19	4.06	4.10	4.25
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	2	2	8	4.50	481/1647	4.61	4.18	4.12	4.19	4.50
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/1668	5.00	4.60	4.67	4.59	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	0	7	2	4.22	725/1605	4.44	4.13	4.07	4.15	4.22
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	189/1514	4.95	4.39	4.39	4.39	4.91
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	512/1551	4.95	4.72	4.66	4.72	4.91
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	5	6	4.55	519/1503	4.77	4.31	4.24	4.29	4.55
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	5	5	4.36	809/1506	4.68	4.40	4.26	4.33	4.36
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	1	2	3	2	3		1013/1311			3.85	3.96	
5. Did addiovisual techniques enhance your understanding		U		2	3	4	3	3.30	1013/1311	3.65	3.70	3.05	3.90	3.30
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	4	3	4.43	535/1490	4.63	4.26	4.05	4.11	4.43
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	286/1502	4.85	4.54	4.26	4.31	4.86
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	478/1489	4.86	4.43	4.29	4.36	4.71
4. Were special techniques successful	5	0	0	1	1	4	1	3.71	669/1006	4.19	4.14	4.00	3.99	3.71
Laboratory														
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	11	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 233	****	****	4.19	4.36	***
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 112	****	4.00	4.38	4.59	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 97	****	3.00	4.36	4.60	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 92	****	3.50	4.22	4.50	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 105	****	4.00	4.22	4.63	****
	11	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 98	****				****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	TT	U	U	U	U	U	1	5.00	****/ 98	* * * *	4.00	3.95	4.20	^^^
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 58	****	4.33	4.22	4.20	***
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 55	****	4.42	4.34	4.67	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 42	****	****	4.31	5.00	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 46	****	4.33	4.45	5.00	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 33	****	****	4.25	5.00	***
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 29	****	5.00	4.34	5.00	****
									,					

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	d Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors	
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	A	2	Required for Majors	8	 Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	3						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	1	C	6	General	0	Under-grad	12	Non-major	12
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F	0	Electives	0			are not enough	n.
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	

I 0 Other 6 ? 1

Course Section: GERM 202 0101

Title INTERMEDIATE GERMAN II

Instructor: WOLFF, XENIA

Enrollment: 11
Questionnaires: 9

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2006

Page 954 JAN 18, 2007 Job IRBR3029

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

Questions			Fre	eauer	ncies			Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank		Mean			Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	1	7	4.67	389/1669	4.67	4.33	4.23	4.34	4.67
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	0	0	8	4.67	359/1666	4.67	4.28	4.19	4.29	4.67
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	164/1421	4.89	4.36	4.24	4.35	4.89
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	0	8	4.78	195/1617	4.78	4.27	4.15	4.24	4.78
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	0	2	6	4.44	398/1555	4.44	4.17	4.00	3.96	4.44
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	3	6	4.67	250/1543	4.67	4.19	4.06	4.10	4.67
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	0	1	7	4.56	424/1647	4.56	4.18	4.12	4.19	4.56
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	939/1668	4.78	4.60	4.67	4.59	4.78
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	170/1605	4.75	4.13	4.07	4.15	4.75
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1514	5.00	4.39	4.39	4.39	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	650/1551	4.86	4.72	4.66	4.72	4.86
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1503	5.00	4.31	4.24	4.29	5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1506	5.00	4.40	4.26	4.33	5.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	163/1311			3.85		4.71
J. Did addiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	U	U	U	U	2	J	T./I	103/1311	1./1	3.70	3.03	3.90	1./1
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	214/1490	4.80	4.26	4.05	4.11	4.80
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1502	5.00	4.54	4.26	4.31	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1489	5.00	4.43	4.29	4.36	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	4	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	123/1006	4.80	4.14	4.00	3.99	4.80
- 1														
Laboratory	-	1	0	0	0	^	1	F 00	**** / 006			4 00	4 40	****
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	7	1 0	0	0 1	0	0	1		****/ 226 ****/ 233	++++	****	4.20 4.19	4.42	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information 3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	7 8	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 225	++++	****	4.19	4.36	****
-			0	0		0	1		,	****	****		4.74	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance 5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	8 8	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 223 ****/ 206	****	****	4.35 4.15	4.71	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	8	U	U	U	U	U	Т	5.00	~~~/ 206			4.15	4.59	
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 112	****	4.00	4.38	4.59	***
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 97	****	3.00	4.36	4.60	***
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 92	****	3.50	4.22	4.50	***
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 105	****	4.00	4.20	4.63	***
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 98	****	4.00	3.95	4.20	****
Field Work	0	0	0	0	0	0	-	F 00		de de de d	4 22	4 00	4 00	****
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	0	0	Τ		****/ 58	****	4.33	4.22	4.20	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	8	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 52	****	4.00	4.06	5.00	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	8	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 39	****	5.00	4.39	5.00	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 40	****	4.00	3.97	5.00	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 30	****	5.00	4.33	5.00	

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors		
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	 А	5	Required for Majors	2	Graduate	0	Major	3	
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	В	3							
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	2	C	1	General	2	Under-grad	9	Non-major	6	
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	2	D	0							
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means	there	are not enough		

P 0 responses to be significant I 0 Other 4 .

Course Section: GERM 301 0101 University of Maryland ADVANCED GERMAN I Instructor: SUTTON, SUSANNE

Title

Baltimore County Fall 2006

Page 955

JAN 18, 2007

Job IRBR3029

Enrollment:	11	
Questionnaires:	9	Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

	Questions					Fre	equei	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 s	vou gain n	ew insights,ski	_	m this course	0	0	0	0	0	4	5	4.56	534/1669	4.56	4.33	4.23	4.28	4.56
_		ctor make clear			0	0	0	0	1	3	5	4.44	634/1666		4.28	4.19	4.20	4.44
		uestions reflec			0	0	0	0	1	0	8	4.78	255/1421	4.78	4.36	4.24	4.25	4.78
	_	uations reflect		-	0	0	0	0	0	3	6	4.67	323/1617	4.67	4.27	4.15	4.22	4.67
				what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	3	5	4.44	398/1555		4.17	4.00	4.03	4.44
				o what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	2	6	4.56	344/1543		4.19	4.06	4.14	4.56
		g system clearl			0	0	1	0	1	0	7		759/1647		4.18	4.12	4.14	4.33
	_	was class canc		ilica	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1668		4.60	4.67	4.68	5.00
	-			hing effectiveness	1	0	0	0	2	3	3		830/1605		4.13	4.07	4.09	4.13
J. 110W V	would you	grade the overa	II CEAC	ning effectiveness		U	U	U	2	J	5	4.13	030/1003	4.13	1.13	1.07	4.05	1.13
		Lectur	е															
1. Were	the instr	uctor's lecture	s well	prepared	1	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	441/1514	4.75	4.39	4.39	4.46	4.75
2. Did t	the instru	ctor seem inter	ested i	n the subject	1	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	594/1551	4.88	4.72	4.66	4.70	4.88
3. Was l	lecture ma	terial presente	d and e	xplained clearly	1	0	0	0	1	3	4	4.38	753/1503	4.38	4.31	4.24	4.28	4.38
4. Did t	the lectur	es contribute t	o what	you learned	1	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	353/1506	4.75	4.40	4.26	4.30	4.75
5. Did a	audiovisua	l techniques en	hance y	our understanding	1	0	1	1	0	3	3	3.75	791/1311	3.75	3.78	3.85	3.97	3.75
		Discus						_		_	_							
				what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	192/1490		4.26	4.05	4.11	4.83
		-	_	d to participate	3	0	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	632/1502		4.54	4.26	4.28	4.50
		_		d open discussion	3	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1489	5.00	4.43	4.29	4.35	5.00
4. Were	special t	echniques succe	ssiul		3	0	0	0	2	2	2	4.00	479/1006	4.00	4.14	4.00	4.10	4.00
				Freq	uency	/ Dis	trib	ution	n									
Credits	dits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Gra							Rea	asons	3			Ту	pe			Majors	3
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A 3		Re	quir	ed fo	or Ma	ajors	3	2	Graduat	е	0	Majo	or	3
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В 3				_				_	_		_			_
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	1	C 2		Ge	nera	T				3	Under-g	rad	9	Non-	-major	6
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	1	D 0		_						_						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5	F 0		El	ecti	ves				0	#### - 1					jh
				P 0									respons	es to b	e sign	ificar	ıt	
				I 0		Ot1	her					4						
				? 1														

Course Section: GERM 303 0101 University of Maryland Title TOPICS IN GERMAN

Baltimore County Fall 2006

MAY, BRIGITTE Instructor:

Enrollment: 17 Questionnaires: 15

Page 956 JAN 18, 2007 Job IRBR3029

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

			Fre	eque	ncies	3		Ins	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	0	0	1	0	2	2	10	4.33	816/1669	4.33	4.33	4.23	4.28	4.33
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	6	4	5	3.93	1192/1666	3.93	4.28	4.19	4.20	3.93
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	2	3	9	4.50	557/1421	4.50	4.36	4.24	4.25	4.50
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	3	3	8	4.36	695/1617	4.36	4.27	4.15	4.22	4.36
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	4	2	8	4.29	533/1555	4.29	4.17	4.00	4.03	4.29
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	4	3	7	4.21	700/1543	4.21	4.19	4.06	4.14	4.21
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	4	4	6	4.00	1043/1647	4.00	4.18	4.12	4.14	4.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	8	7	4.47	1223/1668	4.47	4.60	4.67	4.68	4.47
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	1	0	0	4	8	4.38	525/1605	4.38	4.13	4.07	4.09	4.38
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	Ω	0	0	1	1	4	9	4.40	955/1514	4.40	4.39	4.39	4.46	4.40
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	14	4.93	358/1551		4.72	4.66	4.70	4.93
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	2	3	10		,		4.31	4.24	4.28	4.53
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	2	1		4.64			4.40	4.26	4.30	4.64
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	2	0	2	3	4	2		919/1311					3.55
Diament of														
Discussion	_	0	0	0	_	_	_	4 00	040/1400	4 00	1 00	4 05	4 11	4 00
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	2	6	2		849/1490		4.26	4.05	4.11	4.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	0	0	1	9		237/1502		4.54	4.26	4.28	4.90
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	0	Ţ	Ţ	8	4.70	500/1489	4.70	4.43	4.29	4.35	4.70
4. Were special techniques successful	4	Τ	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	123/1006	4.80	4.14	4.00	4.10	4.80
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	14	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 58	****	4.33	4.22	4.29	****
Freq	uency	Dist	trib	utio	n									
Credits Earned Cum GPA Expected Grades				Re:	agons	=			Туг	ne			Maiors	ı

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expecte	d Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	 А	9	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	1	Major	10
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	1						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	1	General	2	Under-grad	14	Non-major	5
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00	6	F	0	Electives	2	#### - Means	there	are not enough	h
				P	0			responses to	be sign	nificant	
				I	0	Other	10	-	_		
				?	2						

Course Section: GERM 401 0101 University of Maryland STUDIES IN GERMAN LANG Baltimore County

Page 957 Title JAN 18, 2007 Fall 2006 Instructor: MAY, BRIGITTE (Instr. A) Job IRBR3029

Enrollment: 10 Questionnaires: 8

a. 1 .	~		
Student	Course	Evaluation	Questionnaire

~								~										
		0						_	ncies	3	_		ructor	Course	-	-	Level	Sect
		Questions	S 		NR	NA	1	2	3 	4	5 	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		Genera	1															
1. Did yo	u gain n	ew insights,ski	lls fro	m this course	0	0	0	0	0	3	5	4.63	448/1669	4.63	4.33	4.23	4.39	4.63
2. Did th	e instru	ctor make clear	the ex	pected goals	1	0	0	0	0	4	3	4.43	662/1666	4.43	4.28	4.19	4.22	4.43
3. Did th	ne exam q	uestions reflect	t the e	xpected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	170/1421	4.88	4.36	4.24	4.38	4.88
4. Did ot	her eval	uations reflect	the ex	pected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	5	4.63	370/1617	4.63	4.27	4.15	4.22	4.63
5. Did as	signed r	eadings contrib	ute to	what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	1	6	4.63	249/1555	4.63	4.17	4.00	4.08	4.63
6. Did wr	itten as	signments contr	ibute t	o what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	4	4	4.50	390/1543	4.50	4.19	4.06	4.18	4.50
7. Was th	e gradin	g system clearly	y expla	ined	0	0	0	0	1	2	5	4.50	481/1647	4.50	4.18	4.12	4.14	4.50
8. How ma	ny times	was class cance	elled		0	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1668	5.00	4.60	4.67	4.70	5.00
9. How wo	ould you	grade the overa	ll teac	hing effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	170/1605	3.88	4.13	4.07	4.16	3.88
		Lecture	e															
1. Were t	he instr	uctor's lectures	s well	prepared	1	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	274/1514	4.86	4.39	4.39	4.45	4.86
2. Did th	e instru	ctor seem inter	ested i	n the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1551	5.00	4.72	4.66	4.73	5.00
3. Was le	cture ma	terial presented	d and e	xplained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	323/1503	4.71	4.31	4.24	4.27	4.71
		es contribute to			1	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1506	5.00	4.40	4.26	4.29	5.00
		Discus	sion															
1. Did cl	ass disc	ussions contrib	ute to	what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	298/1490	4.71	4.26	4.05	4.26	4.71
2. Were a	ill stude	nts actively end	courage	d to participate	1	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	286/1502	4.86	4.54	4.26	4.46	4.86
3. Did th	e instru	ctor encourage :	fair an	d open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	329/1489	4.86	4.43	4.29	4.52	4.86
4. Were s	special t	echniques succes	ssful		1	1	0	0	0	3	3	4.50	235/1006	4.50	4.14	4.00	4.21	4.50
				Frequ	iency	/ Dis	trib	utio	n									
Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Re	asons	5			Ту	pe			Majors	;
00-27		0 00 0 00		~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~									Cwadaat		0			7
00-27 28-55	0	0.00-0.99 1.00-1.99	0	A 2		ке	quir	ea I	or Ma	ı jor:	5	0	Graduat	е	U	Majo	ΣĽ	7
28-55 56-83	0	2.00-2.99	1	В 4 С 0		a	2000	1				1	IIndox ~		0	Morr	ma i a	1
56-83 84-150	1 1		1	C 0		Ge	nera	Т				Τ.	Under-g	ıau	8	Non-	-major	1
	· -	3.00-3.49	_	= -		17.7	ecti					0	шшшш -	Maana +	homo -	20 20 to 1		.h
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F 0 P 0		БŢ	ectl	ves				U	#### - respons				_	İTT

Other

I 0

Course Section: GERM 401 0101 University of Maryland Page 958 Title STUDIES IN GERMAN LANG Baltimore County JAN 18, 2007 Fall 2006 Job IRBR3029

Instructor: (Instr. C)

Enrollment: 10 Questionnaires: 8

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

			Fre	equer	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	3	5	4.63	448/1669	4.63	4.33	4.23	4.39	4.63
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	4	3	4.43	662/1666	4.43	4.28	4.19	4.22	4.43
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	170/1421	4.88	4.36	4.24	4.38	4.88
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	5	4.63	370/1617	4.63	4.27	4.15	4.22	4.63
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	1	6	4.63	249/1555	4.63	4.17	4.00	4.08	4.63
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	4	4	4.50	390/1543	4.50	4.19	4.06	4.18	4.50
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	2	5	4.50	481/1647	4.50	4.18	4.12	4.14	4.50
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1668	5.00	4.60	4.67	4.70	5.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	298/1490	4.71	4.26	4.05	4.26	4.71
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	286/1502	4.86	4.54	4.26	4.46	4.86
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	329/1489	4.86	4.43	4.29	4.52	4.86
4. Were special techniques successful	1	1	0	0	0	3	3	4.50	235/1006	4.50	4.14	4.00	4.21	4.50

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	l Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0		2	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	7
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	4						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	1	C	0	General	1	Under-grad	8	Non-major	1
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	5				
				2	1						