Course-Section: GERM 101 0101 University of Mary Title ELEMENTARY GERMAN I Baltimore Count Instructor: SUTTON, SUSANNE Spring 2008

Questions

Enrollment:

22

University of Maryland Page 863
Baltimore County AUG 6, 2008
Spring 2008 Job IRBR3029

Instructor

Rank

Course Dept UMBC Level Sect

Mean Mean Mean Mean

0	1.0	04	a	T 1 +	0
Questionnaires:	10	Student	Course	Evaluation	Questionnaire

?

1

			 1															
1 Did 1701	u gain n	Genera ew insights,ski	_	this course	0	0	0	0	2	Λ	16	4.78	338/1670	4.78	4.36	4.31	4.23	4.78
_	_	ctor make clear			0 0 0 0 2 2							4.67	415/1666	4.67	4.31	4.27	4.30	4.78
		uestions reflec	-	_	0	0	0	0	2	3	14 13	4.61	-,	4.61	4.48	4.32	4.31	4.61
	_	uations reflect			0	0	0	0	3	3	12	4.50	552/1615	4.50	4.34	4.24	4.17	4.50
			-	hat you learned	0	2	0	0	4	1	11	4.44	460/1566	4.44	4.26	4.07	4.03	4.44
	_	_		what you learned	0	0	0	0	3	2	13	4.56	383/1528	4.56	4.23	4.12	4.00	4.56
		g system clearl		-	0	0	0	0	3	2	13	4.56	499/1650	4.56	4.16	4.22	4.28	4.56
	-	was class canc			0	0	0	0	1	11	6	4.28	1354/1667	4.28	4.47	4.67	4.61	4.28
9. How wor	uld you	grade the overa	ll teach	ning effectiveness	4	0	0	0	1	5	8	4.50	403/1626	4.50	4.08	4.11	4.07	4.50
		Lectur	e															
1. Were th	he instr	uctor's lecture	s well p	prepared	0	0	0	0	2	2	14	4.67	673/1559	4.67	4.38	4.46	4.47	4.67
2. Did the	e instru	ctor seem inter	ested in	n the subject	0	0	0	0	1	1	16	4.83	777/1560	4.83	4.75	4.72	4.68	4.83
3. Was le	cture ma	terial presente	d and ex	xplained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	4	13	4.67	488/1549	4.67	4.34	4.31	4.32	4.67
4. Did the	e lectur	es contribute t	o what y	ou learned	0	0	0	0	2	0	16	4.78	382/1546	4.78	4.40	4.32	4.32	4.78
5. Did au	diovisua	l techniques en	hance yo	our understanding	0							4.31	498/1323	4.31	3.96	4.00	3.91	4.31
		Discus	sion															
				what you learned	2	0	0	0	5	2	9	4.25	670/1384	4.25	4.29	4.10	3.92	4.25
2. Were a	ll stude	nts actively en	courage	l to participate	2	0	0	0	2	2	12	4.63	510/1378	4.63	4.56	4.29	4.09	4.63
		_		l open discussion	2	0	1	0	4	1	10	4.19	904/1378	4.19	4.45	4.31	4.08	4.19
4. Were s	pecial to	echniques succe	ssful		2	3	0	0	2	2	9	4.54	230/ 904	4.54	4.11	4.03	3.94	4.54
				Frequ	ency	Dist	cribu	utio	n									
Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades	Reasons Type										Majors	\$		
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	0	 A 9		Required for Majors							Graduate	:	1	Majo	or	1
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	1	В 2	Required for Majorb											J -		
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C 2	General						2	Under-gr	ad 1	.7	Non-	major	17	
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	0	D 0														
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00	4	F 1	Electives					4	#### - M	leans t	here a	re not	enoug	ſh		
				P 0								response	s to b	e sign	ificar	ıt		
				I 0		Other						1						

Frequencies

NR NA 1 2 3 4 5 Mean

Course-Section: GERM 102 0101

Title ELEMENTARY GERMAN II

Instructor: HENDRICHS, ANJA

Enrollment: 19 Questionnaires: 13

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2008

Page 864 AUG 6, 2008 Job IRBR3029

Ctudant	('Ollred	Evaluation	Ougetion	naira

Discription Commercial Co			Question	s		NR	NA	Fro	equei 2	ncies 3	4	5	Ins Mean	tructo: Rai		Course Mean	Dept Mean		Level Mean	
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course 2. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course 3. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals 5. Did written assignments orditibute to what you learned 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 7. Did on 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0			 Genera	1																
2. Did the instructors make clear the expected goals	1. Did yo	ou gain ne			m this course	0	0	0	0	3	3	7	4.31	943/	1670	4.63	4.36	4.31	4.23	4.31
1. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	_	-				0	0	0	0	2	4	7	4.38	808/	1666	4.66	4.31	4.27	4.30	4.38
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0 0 0 0 1 3 6 2 3.88 1068/1566 4.26 4.26 4.07 4.03 3.85 6.00 and the ten what you learned 1 0 0 0 0 7 4 1 3 6 3 3.88 1068/1566 4.26 4.26 4.07 4.03 3.85 6.00 and you times was class cancelled 0 0 1 1 1 1 2 8 8 4.15 1020/1565 4.52 4.16 4.22 4.28 4.15 8.00 wanty times was class cancelled 0 0 1 1 7 2 3 0 2 3 3 4.00 953/1626 4.29 4.08 4.17 4.07 4.00 1.00 1.00 1 2 3 3 3 4.00 953/1626 4.29 4.08 4.11 4.07 4.00 1.00 1.00 1.00 1.00 1.00 1.00 1.00	3. Did th	ıe exam qı	uestions reflec	t the ex	xpected goals	0	0	0	1	2	2	8	4.31	836/	1406	4.60	4.48	4.32	4.31	4.31
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 1 0 0 0 0 7 4 1 1 3.50 1274/1528 4.03 4.23 4.12 4.00 3.50 1.00 Was the grading system clearly explained 0 0 0 1 7 7 2 3 0 0 2.54 1667/1667 3.35 4.47 4.67 4.61 2.54 8.15 8.00 many times was class cancelled 0 0 0 1 7 7 2 3 0 0 2.54 1667/1667 3.35 4.47 4.67 4.61 2.54 8.15 8.00 many times was class cancelled 0 0 0 1 7 7 2 3 0 0 2.54 1667/1667 3.35 4.47 4.67 4.61 2.54 8.15 8.00 many times was class cancelled 0 0 0 0 0 3 3 4 6 6 4.23 1171/1559 4.56 4.29 4.08 4.11 4.07 4.00 1.00 1.00 1.00 1.00 1.00 1.00 1.00	4. Did ot	her evalu	uations reflect	the exp	pected goals	0	0	0	0	3	5	5	4.15	981/	1615	4.19	4.34	4.24	4.17	4.15
7. Mas the grading system clearly explained 8. How many times was class cancelled 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 4 0 0 0 1 7 2 3 0 8 4.15 1020/1650 4.52 4.16 4.22 4.28 4.15 8. How many times was class cancelled 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 4 0 0 0 0 3 3 3 0 3 0.00 953/1626 4.29 4.08 4.11 4.07 4.00 **Lecture*** Lecture*** Lecture** 1. Were the instructor seem interested in the subject 0 0 0 0 0 2 1 10 0 4.62 1150/1550 4.78 4.75 4.72 4.68 4.62 2.00 10 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0											-									
8. How many times was class cancelled 9. 0 0 1 7 2 2 3 0 2.54 1667/1667 3.35 4.47 4.67 4.61 2.54 How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 4 0 0 0 0 2 3 1 0 2.54 1667/1667 3.35 4.47 4.67 4.67 4.07 4.07 4.07 4.07 4.07 4.07 4.07 4.0			-		-			-												
How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness		-			ined															
1. New Figure 1. New Figure 2. 1. New Figure 3. 1. New Figure 3. 1. New Figure 3. New Figu		_			hing effectiveness															
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 0 0 0 0 0 2 1 1 10 4.62 1150/1560 4.78 4.75 4.72 4.68 4.62 3.08 as lecture material presented and explained clearly 0 0 0 0 0 4 5 4 5 4.08 116/1549 4.24 3.43 4.23 4.23 4.08 4.01 the lectures contribute to what you learned 0 5 0 2 1 2 1 2 3 3.75 917/1323 3.95 3.96 4.00 3.91 3.75 Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 0 5 0 2 1 2 1 2 3 3.75 917/1323 3.95 3.96 4.00 3.91 3.75 Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 0 5 0 2 1 5 3 3.73 1009/1384 4.24 4.29 4.10 3.92 3.73 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 2 0 0 0 3 2 2 1 5 5 3.73 1009/1384 4.24 4.29 4.10 3.92 3.73 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 2 0 0 0 3 4 4 4.09 970/1378 4.42 4.56 4.29 4.09 4.00 3.91 3.00 4.00 4.00 4.00 4.00 4.00 4.00 4.00			Lectur	e																
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0 0 0 0 0 4 4 5 4.08 116/1549 4.42 4.34 4.31 4.32 4.08 4.06 4.06 4.06 4.08 4.05 4.06 4.08 4.06 4.08	1. Were t	he instru	uctor's lecture	s well]	prepared	0	0	0	0	3	4	6	4.23	1171/	1559	4.56	4.38	4.46	4.47	4.23
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 0 0 0 0 0 3 3 7 4.31 949/1546 4.60 4.40 4.32 4.32 4.37 5 Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 0 5 0 2 1 2 3 3.75 917/1323 3.95 3.96 4.00 3.91 3.75 Discussion 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 2 0 0 0 3 2 1 5 3.73 1009/1384 4.24 4.29 4.10 3.92 3.73 2. Ware all students actively encouraged to participate 2 0 0 0 1 3 2 1 5 3.73 1009/1384 4.24 4.29 4.10 3.92 3.73 2. Ware all students actively encourage fair and open discussion 2 0 0 1 3 4 4 4.09 970/1378 4.20 4.56 4.29 4.09 4.09 4.00 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 2 1 0 0 5 2 3 3.80 605/904 4.22 4.11 4.03 3.94 3.06 4. Ware special techniques successful 2 0 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ***/232 **** **** 4.19 4.25 **** 2. Ware special techniques understanding of the material 12 0 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ***/232 **** **** 4.19 4.25 **** 2. Ware you provided with adequate background information 12 0 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ***/232 **** 4.11 4.03 3.94 3.06 3. Ware necessary materials available for lab activities 12 0 0 0 0 0 1 5 0.00 ***/239 **** 4.44 4.58 **** 4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance 12 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 5 0.00 ***/231 **** 4.31 4.45 **** 5. Ware requirements for lab reports clearly specified 12 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 5 0.00 ***/231 **** 4.63 4.64 4.72 **** 4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned 12 0 1 0 0 0 0 1 1.00 ***/75 *** 5.00 4.57 4.46 **** 5. Ware criteria for grading made clear 12 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0					_	0	0	0			1	10	4.62	1150/	1560	4.78	4.75	4.72	4.68	4.62
Discussion			_		=															
Discussion Discussion Discussion Discussion Discussion Discussion Discussion Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 2																				
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 2 0 0 0 3 2 1 1 5 3.73 1009/1384 4.24 4.29 4.10 3.92 3.73 2 2 2 4 400 970/1378 4.42 4.56 4.29 4.09 4.00 3.01 dithe instructor encourage fair and open discussion 2 0 0 0 3 4 4 4.09 950/1378 4.42 4.56 4.29 4.09 4.00 4.00 4.00 Were special techniques successful 2 1 0 0 5 2 3 3.80 605/904 4.22 4.11 4.03 3.94 3.80 4.89 4.00 4.00 4.00 4.00 4.00 4.00 4.00 4.0	5. Did au	diovisual	l techniques en	hance y	our understanding	0	5	0	2	1	2	3	3.75	917/	1323	3.95	3.96	4.00	3.91	3.75
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 2 0 0 1 1 3 2 5 4.00 970/1378 4.42 4.56 4.29 4.09 4.00 4.00 the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 2 0 0 0 3 4 4 4.09 950/1378 4.12 4.15 4.13 4.08 4.09 4.00 4.09 4.09 4.09 4.00 4.00 4.00	1 Did al	aga diga			what wou learned	2	0	0	2	2	1	E	2 72	1000/	1201	1 21	1 20	4 10	2 02	2 72
1. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 2 0 0 0 0 3 4 4 4 4.09 950/1378 4.30 4.45 4.31 4.08 4.09 4.09 4.09 4.09 4.09 4.09 4.09 4.09																				
Laboratory 1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material 2. 1 0 0 5 0 2 3 3.80 605/ 904 4.22 4.11 4.03 3.94 3.80 Laboratory 1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material 2. Were you provided with adequate background information 2. 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 232 **** **** 4.19 4.25 **** 3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 3. Did the lab instructor provide assistance 4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance 5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 12 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 230 **** **** 4.44 4.58 **** 4. Did the lab instructor available for individual attention 5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 12 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 218 **** **** 4.18 4.47 **** 2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned 4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned 5. Were criteria for grading made clear 12 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0							-	-	_			-								
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material 2. Were you provided with adequate background information 3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance 5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 6. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 7. We shall specified 7. We shall specified 7. We shall specifi		<u> </u>			a open arbeablion							_								
2. Were you provided with adequate background information 12 0 0 0 0 1 1 0 0 4.00 ****/ 239 **** **** 4.21 4.35 **** 3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 12 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 230 **** **** 4.44 4.58 **** 4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance 12 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 231 **** **** 4.14 4.45 **** 5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 12 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 231 **** **** 4.18 4.45 **** 5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 12 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 218 **** **** 4.18 4.47 **** Seminar 2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 12 0 1 0 0 0 0 1.00 ****/ 79 **** 4.63 4.64 4.72 **** 4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned 12 0 1 0 0 0 0 1.00 ****/ 79 **** 4.88 4.45 4.59 **** 5. Were criteria for grading made clear 12 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 80 **** 4.13 3.97 3.99 **** Field Work 1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 12 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 80 **** 4.13 3.97 3.99 **** Frequency Distribution Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades Reasons Type Majors Frequency Distribution Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades Reasons Type Majors 1 28-55 3 1.00-1.99 0 B 3 56-83 0 2.00-2.99 1 C 1 General 4 Under-grad 13 Non-major 12 84-150 1 3.00-3.49 2 D 0 0 Grad. 0 3.50-4.00 2 F 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0			Labora	tory																
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 12 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 **** 230 **** **** 4.44 4.58 **** 4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance 12 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 **** 231 **** **** 4.31 4.45 **** 5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 12 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 **** 218 **** **** 4.18 4.47 **** Seminar 2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 12 0 1 0 0 0 0 1.00 **** 79 **** 4.63 4.64 4.72 **** 3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 12 0 1 0 0 0 0 1.00 **** 75 **** 5.00 4.57 4.46 **** 4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned 12 0 0 1 0 0 0 0 2.00 **** 79 **** 4.88 4.45 4.59 **** 5. Were criteria for grading made clear 12 0 0 1 0 0 0 0 2.00 **** 79 **** 4.88 4.45 4.59 **** Field Work 1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 12 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 **** 41 **** 4.13 3.97 3.99 **** 2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 12 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 **** 41 **** 4.13 3.97 3.99 **** ******************************							-	-	-	-		-		,		****	****			
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance 5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 12 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 231 **** **** 4.31 4.45 **** 5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 12 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 218 **** **** 4.18 4.47 **** Seminar 2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 12 0 1 0 0 0 0 1.00 ****/ 79 **** 4.63 4.64 4.72 **** 3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 12 0 1 0 0 0 0 1.00 ****/ 79 **** 4.63 4.64 4.72 **** 4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned 12 0 0 1 0 0 0 0 2.00 ****/ 79 **** 4.88 4.45 4.59 **** 5. Were criteria for grading made clear 12 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 80 **** 4.13 3.97 3.99 **** Field Work 1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 12 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 80 **** 4.13 3.97 3.99 **** 2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 12 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 41 **** **** 4.50 3.91 **** 2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 12 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 38 **** **** 4.19 4.07 **** Prequency Distribution Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades Reasons Type Majors Type Majors 1 0.00-0.99 0 A 6 Required for Majors 4 Graduate 0 Major 1 28-55 3 1.00-1.99 0 B 3 56-83 0 2.00-2.99 1 C 1 General 4 Under-grad 13 Non-major 12 84-150 1 3.00-3.49 2 D 0 Grad. 0 3.50-4.00 2 F 0 Electives 0 #### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant							-			-		-				****	****			
Seminar 2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 12 0 1 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 218 **** **** 4.18 4.47 **** 3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 12 0 1 0 0 0 0 1.00 ****/ 79 **** 4.63 4.64 4.72 **** 4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned 12 0 1 0 0 0 0 1.00 ****/ 75 **** 5.00 4.57 4.46 **** 4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned 12 0 0 1 0 0 0 0 2.00 ****/ 80 **** 4.13 3.97 3.99 **** Field Work 1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 12 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 80 **** 4.13 3.97 3.99 **** 2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 12 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 81 **** 4.50 3.91 **** 2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 12 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 38 **** **** 4.19 4.07 **** Frequency Distribution Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades Reasons Type Majors Frequency Distribution Credits Earned 0 0.00-0.99 0 A 6 Required for Majors 4 Graduate 0 Major 1 28-55 3 1.00-1.99 0 B 3 56-83 0 2.00-2.99 1 C 1 General 4 Under-grad 13 Non-major 12 84-150 1 3.00-3.49 2 D 0 Grad. 0 3.50-4.00 2 F 0 0 Electives 0 #### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant		_									-	_		,						
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 12 0 1 0 0 0 0 1.00 ****/ 79 **** 4.63 4.64 4.72 **** 3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 12 0 1 0 0 0 0 1.00 ****/ 75 **** 5.00 4.57 4.46 **** 4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned 12 0 0 1 0 0 0 2.00 ****/ 79 **** 4.88 4.45 4.59 **** 5. Were criteria for grading made clear 12 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 80 **** 4.13 3.97 3.99 **** Field Work 1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 12 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 80 **** 4.13 3.97 3.99 **** 2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 12 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 38 **** **** 4.50 3.91 **** Frequency Distribution Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades Reasons Type Majors Frequency Distribution Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades Reasons Type Majors 1 28-55 3 1.00-1.99 0 B 3 56-83 0 2.00-2.99 1 C 1 General 4 Under-grad 13 Non-major 12 84-150 1 3.00-3.49 2 D 0 Grad. 0 3.50-4.00 2 F 0 Electives 0 #### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			_				-				-	_				****	****			
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned 12 0 1 0 0 0 1.00 ****/ 75 **** 5.00 4.57 4.46 **** 4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned 12 0 0 1 0 0 0 2.00 ****/ 79 **** 4.88 4.45 4.59 **** 5. Were criteria for grading made clear 12 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 80 **** 4.13 3.97 3.99 **** Field Work 1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 12 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 41 **** **** 4.50 3.91 **** 2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 12 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 38 **** **** 4.19 4.07 **** Frequency Distribution Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades Reasons Type Majors O0-27 1 0.00-0.99 0 B 3 3 1.00-1.99 0 B 3 3 56-83 0 2.00-2.99 1 C 1 General 4 Under-grad 13 Non-major 12 84-150 1 3.00-3.49 2 D 0 Grad. 0 3.50-4.00 2 F 0 Electives 0 #### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			Semina	r																
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned 12 0 0 1 0 0 0 2.00 ****/ 79 **** 4.88 4.45 4.59 **** 5. Were criteria for grading made clear 12 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 80 **** 4.13 3.97 3.99 **** Field Work 1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 12 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 41 **** **** 4.50 3.91 **** 2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 12 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 38 **** **** 4.19 4.07 **** Frequency Distribution Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades Reasons Type Majors 00-27 1 0.00-0.99 0 A 6 Required for Majors 4 Graduate 0 Major 1 28-55 3 1.00-1.99 0 B 3 56-83 0 2.00-2.99 1 C 1 General 4 Under-grad 13 Non-major 12 84-150 1 3.00-3.49 2 D 0 Grad. 0 3.50-4.00 2 F 0 Electives 0 #### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	2. Was th	e instru	ctor available	for ind	ividual attention	12	0	1	0		-	0	1.00	****/	79	****	4.63	4.64	4.72	
Field Work 1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 12 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 80 **** 4.13 3.97 3.99 **** 2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 12 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 41 **** **** 4.50 3.91 **** Erequency Distribution Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades Reasons Type Majors 00-27 1 0.00-0.99 0 A 6 Required for Majors 4 Graduate 0 Major 1 28-55 3 1.00-1.99 0 B 3 56-83 0 2.00-2.99 1 C 1 General 4 Under-grad 13 Non-major 12 84-150 1 3.00-3.49 2 D 0 Grad. 0 3.50-4.00 2 F 0 Electives 0 #### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant		_	-		-			_			0	0		,				4.57	4.46	
Field Work 1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 12 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 41 **** **** 4.50 3.91 **** 2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 12 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 38 **** **** 4.19 4.07 **** Trequency Distribution Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades Reasons Type Majors 00-27 1 0.00-0.99 0 A 6 Required for Majors 4 Graduate 0 Major 1 28-55 3 1.00-1.99 0 B 3 56-83 0 2.00-2.99 1 C 1 General 4 Under-grad 13 Non-major 12 84-150 1 3.00-3.49 2 D 0 Grad. 0 3.50-4.00 2 F 0 Electives 0 #### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	_				-		-	-				-								
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 12 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 41 **** **** 4.50 3.91 **** 2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 12 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 38 **** **** 4.19 4.07 **** Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades Reasons Type Majors	5. Were c	riteria 1	for grading mad	e clear		12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/	80	****	4.13	3.97	3.99	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 12 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 38 **** **** 4.19 4.07 **** Frequency Distribution Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades Reasons Type Majors 00-27 1 0.00-0.99 0 A 6 Required for Majors 4 Graduate 0 Major 1 28-55 3 1.00-1.99 0 B 3 56-83 0 2.00-2.99 1 C 1 General 4 Under-grad 13 Non-major 12 84-150 1 3.00-3.49 2 D 0 Grad. 0 3.50-4.00 2 F 0 Electives 0 #### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant																				
Frequency Distribution Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades Reasons Type Majors 00-27 1 0.00-0.99 0 A 6 Required for Majors 4 Graduate 0 Major 1 28-55 3 1.00-1.99 0 B 3 56-83 0 2.00-2.99 1 C 1 General 4 Under-grad 13 Non-major 12 84-150 1 3.00-3.49 2 D 0 Grad. 0 3.50-4.00 2 F 0 Electives 0 #### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant		_			_						-			****/ ****/		****	****			****
Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades Reasons Type Majors 00-27 1 0.00-0.99 0 A 6 Required for Majors 3 1.00-1.99 0 B 3 Required for Majors 4 Graduate 0 Major 1 0 Major 1 28-55 3 1.00-1.99 0 B 3 C 1 General 4 Under-grad 13 Non-major 12 0 Major 1 84-150 1 3.00-3.49 2 D 0 D 0 0 #### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	z. Dia yo	ou clearly	y understand yo	ur evar							U	1	5.00	, , ,	30			4.19	4.07	
00-27							utio	n												
28-55 3 1.00-1.99 0 B 3 56-83 0 2.00-2.99 1 C 1 General 4 Under-grad 13 Non-major 12 84-150 1 3.00-3.49 2 D 0 Grad. 0 3.50-4.00 2 F 0 Electives 0 #### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	asons	; 				Туј	pe 			Majors	3
56-83 0 2.00-2.99 1 C 1 General 4 Under-grad 13 Non-major 12 84-150 1 3.00-3.49 2 D 0 Grad. 0 3.50-4.00 2 F 0 Electives 0 #### - Means there are not enough P 0 responses to be significant						1			ajors 4 Gradua		duate	е	0	Majo	or	1				
Grad. 0 3.50-4.00 2 F 0 Electives 0 #### - Means there are not enough P 0 responses to be significant	56-83	0	2.00-2.99	1	C 1	General			4 Under-grad 13 Non-ma				-major	12						
<u> </u>						Electives				0 #### - Means there are not enough				jh						

Course-Section: GERM 102 0201 University of Maryland Title ELEMENTARY GERMAN II Baltimore County Instructor: HENDRICHS, ANJA Spring 2008

Ρ

I

0

0

0

Enrollment:

Questionnaires: 18

25

iversity of Maryland Page 865
Baltimore County AUG 6, 2008
Spring 2008 Job IRBR3029

responses to be significant

 2tudant	College	Evaluation	Ougetionn	aira

						Frequencies			Inst	tructor	Course Dept		t UMBC Level		Sect			
		Questions			NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		General																
1 Did 1701	u gain ne	General w insights,skil		m this source	0	0	0	Λ	0	1	17	4.94	124/1670	4.63	4.36	4.31	4.23	4.94
		ctor make clear			0	0	0	0	0	1	17	4.94	104/1666	4.66	4.30	4.27	4.23	4.94
		estions reflect			0	0	0	0	0	2	16	4.89	205/1406	4.60	4.48	4.32	4.31	4.89
	_	ations reflect		_	0	1	1	0	1	7	8	4.24	898/1615	4.19	4.34	4.24	4.17	4.24
				what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	4	13	4.67	295/1515	4.26	4.26	4.07	4.17	4.67
				to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	6	11	4.56	383/1528	4.03	4.23	4.12	4.00	4.56
		signments contri g system clearly		-	0	0	0	0	0	2	16	4.89	173/1650	4.52	4.16	4.22	4.28	4.89
		was class cance		ilica	0	0	0	0	0	15	3		1430/1667	3.35	4.47	4.67		4.17
	-			ching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	7	10	4.59	339/1626		4.08	4.11	4.07	4.59
	,	,																
		Lecture																
1. Were th	he instru	actor's lectures	well	prepared	1 0 0 0 0					2	15	4.88	307/1559	4.56	4.38	4.46	4.47	4.88
2. Did the	e instruc	ctor seem intere	sted i	n the subject	1 0 0 0 0 1					1	16	4.94	358/1560	4.78	4.75	4.72	4.68	4.94
3. Was led	cture mat	erial presented	and e	explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	4	13	4.76	352/1549	4.42	4.34	4.31	4.32	4.76
4. Did the	e lecture	es contribute to	what	you learned	1	0	0	0	1	0	16	4.88	253/1546	4.60	4.40	4.32	4.32	4.88
5. Did aud	diovisual	l techniques enh	ance y	our understanding	2	2	0	1	2	5	6	4.14	626/1323	3.95	3.96	4.00	3.91	4.14
		Discuss																
				what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	3	9	4.75	257/1384		4.29	4.10	3.92	4.75
		-	_	ed to participate	6	0	0	0	0	2	10		316/1378	4.42	4.56	4.29	4.09	4.83
		_		nd open discussion	6	0	0	0	2	2	8	4.50	653/1378	4.30	4.45	4.31	4.08	4.50
4. Were sp	pecial te	echniques succes	sful		6	1	0	0	0	4	7	4.64	190/ 904	4.22	4.11	4.03	3.94	4.64
				Frequ	iency	/ Dis	trib	ution	n									
Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades	Reasons							Туј	pe			Majors		
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 11	Required for Major				s	4	Graduat	е	0	Majo	or	3		
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	1	В 5														
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	0	C 1	General				2 Under-		Under-g	rad 1	.8	Non-	-major	15		
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	2	D 0							_							
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5	F 0	Electives						2	#### - Means there are not			enoug	ŗh		

Other

Course-Section: GERM 201 0101 University of Maryl Title INTERMEDIATE GERMAN I Baltimore County Instructor: SUTTON, SUSANNE Spring 2008

University of Maryland Page 866
Baltimore County AUG 6, 2008
Spring 2008 Job IRBR3029

Enrollment:	12	
Questionnaires:	10	Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

			_					_		~				a .
				eque:		s	_		tructor	Course	_			
Questions		NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	4	5	4.40	809/1670	4.45	4.36	4.31	4.32	4.40
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	3	6	4.50	622/1666	4.50	4.31	4.27	4.27	4.50
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	4	5	4.40	715/1406	4.57	4.48	4.32	4.39	4.40
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	3	6	4.50	552/1615	4.75	4.34	4.24	4.29	4.50
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	3	5	1	3.78	1129/1566	3.89	4.26	4.07	4.00	3.78
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	1	6	2	3.90	1039/1528	3.95	4.23	4.12	4.11	3.90
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	0	5	4	4.20	973/1650	4.48	4.16	4.22	4.20	4.20
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	8	2	4.20	1409/1667	4.35	4.47	4.67	4.64	4.20
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	1	0	1	4	3	3.89	1143/1626	4.07	4.08	4.11	4.06	3.89
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	2	3	5	4.30	1122/1559	4.40	4.38	4.46	4.40	4.30
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	855/1560	4.90	4.75	4.72	4.73	4.80
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	3	6	4.50	683/1549	4.63	4.34	4.31	4.25	4.50
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	3	6	4.50	715/1546	4.75	4.40	4.32	4.30	4.50
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	1	0	0	3	2	4	4.11	648/1323	4.31	3.96	4.00	4.08	4.11
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	1	0	4	2	3.63	1049/1384	3.69	4.29	4.10	4.07	3.63
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	1	1	6	4.63	510/1378	4.31	4.56	4.29	4.25	4.63
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	2	2	4	4.25	867/1378	4.50	4.45	4.31	4.26	4.25
4. Were special techniques successful	2	0	0	0	4	1	3	3.88	580/ 904	3.94	4.11	4.03	4.01	3.88
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	9	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 232	****	****	4.19	4.35	****
Frequ	lency	Dis	strib	utio	n									
			_											

Credits E	ts Earned Cum. GPA Exp			Expected	Grades	Reasons		Type	Majors		
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	 А	2	Required for Majors	6	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	1						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	7	General	2	Under-grad	10	Non-major	9
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	0	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	
				P	0			responses to	be sig	nificant	
				I	0	Other	2	-			
				2	Λ						

Course-Section: GERM 201 0201 University of Maryland INTERMEDIATE GERMAN I Baltimore County SUTTON, SUSANNE

Title

Instructor:

Enrollment:

84-150

Grad.

2

3.00-3.49

3.50-4.00

3

D

F

Ρ

I

?

0

0

0

0

0

Questionnaires: 4

4

Page 867 AUG 6, 2008 Spring 2008 Job IRBR3029

2

- Means there are not enough

responses to be significant

	Ouestionnaire

	Frequencies						Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	pt UMBC Leve		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	Ο	1	0	3	4.50	665/1670	4.45	4.36	4.31	4.32	4.50
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	622/1666	4.50	4.31	4.27	4.27	4.50
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	318/1406	4.57	4.48	4.32	4.39	4.75
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1615	4.75	4.34	4.24	4.29	5.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	851/1566	3.89	4.26	4.07	4.00	4.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned		0	0	0	1	2	1		899/1528	3.95	4.23	4.12	4.11	4.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	. 0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	272/1650	4.48	4.16	4.22	4.20	4.75
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	2	2		1157/1667	4.35	4.47	4.67	4.64	4.50
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness		0 0 0 0 0 3			3	1		728/1626		4.08	4.11	4.06		
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0 0 0 0 0 2 2					4 E0	896/1559	4.40	4.38	4.46	4 40	4 E O		
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	4.50 5.00	1/1560		4.75	4.72	4.40	4.50 5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	1	3		366/1549	4.63	4.75	4.72	4.73	4.75
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	4		1/1546		4.40	4.31	4.25	5.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	0	2	2		326/1323			4.00		4.50
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	U	U	U	U	U	2	4	4.50	320/1323	4.31	3.96	4.00	4.08	4.50
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	1	1	3.75	996/1384		4.29	4.10	4.07	3.75
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	2	0	2	4.00	970/1378	4.31	4.56	4.29	4.25	4.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	1	3		439/1378		4.45	4.31		4.75
4. Were special techniques successful	0	2	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	461/ 904	3.94	4.11	4.03	4.01	4.00
Freq	quency Distribution													
							_							
Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades	es Reasons 						Ту]	pe 			Majors			
00-27 1 0.00-0.99 0 A 1	Required for Major				ijors 1		Graduat	е	0	Majo	r	0		
28-55 1 1.00-1.99 0 B 2	-													
56-83 0 2.00-2.99 0 C 1	General					1 Under-gr		rad	4	Non-	major	4		

Electives

Other

Course-Section: GERM 202 0101 University of Maryland Page 868 Title INTERMEDIATE GERMAN II Baltimore County AUG 6, 2008

Instructor: WOLFF, XENIA

Enrollment: 10 Questionnaires: 9

Spring 2008 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire Job IRBR3029

			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	Λ	Λ	0	2	7	4.78	338/1670	4.78	4.36	4.31	4.32	4.78
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	190/1666		4.31	4.27	4.27	4.89
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1406		4.48	4.32	4.39	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	272/1615	4.78	4.34	4.24	4.29	4.78
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	1	7	4.67	295/1566		4.26	4.07	4.00	4.67
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1528	5.00	4.23	4.12	4.11	5.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	255/1650		4.16	4.22	4.20	4.78
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1667	5.00	4.47	4.67	4.64	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	1	0	0	1	6	4.38	595/1626	4.38	4.08	4.11	4.06	4.38
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness			-	·	Ü	_	Ū	1.50	333, 1020	1.50	1.00		1.00	1.50
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1559	5.00	4.38	4.46	4.40	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1560	5.00	4.75	4.72	4.73	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1549	5.00	4.34	4.31	4.25	5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1546	5.00	4.40	4.32	4.30	5.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	1	1	7	4.67	235/1323	4.67	3.96	4.00	4.08	4.67
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	324/1384	4.67	4.29	4.10	4.07	4.67
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1378	5.00	4.56	4.29	4.25	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1378	5.00	4.45	4.31	4.26	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	3	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	123/ 904	4.83	4.11	4.03	4.01	4.83
Frequ	Dist	trib	utio	n										

Credits Earned Cum.				Expected	Grades	Reasons		Type	Majors		
00-27	0	0 0.00-0.99 0 A 2		Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	1		
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	В	5						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	4	Under-grad	9	Non-major	8
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	0	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	ı
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	4	_			
				2	Λ						

Course-Section: GERM 302 0101 University of Maryl Title ADVANCED GERMAN II Baltimore County Instructor: SUTTON, SUSANNE Spring 2008

I

0

2

Enrollment:

Questionnaires: 7

8

University of Maryland Page 869
Baltimore County AUG 6, 2008
Spring 2008 Job IRBR3029

Student	Course	Evaluation	Ouestionnaire

				Fre	-	ncies	5			tructor	Course	_	UMBC	Level	Sect			
		Questions	1		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		General																
1. Did you	ı gain ne	w insights,skil		n this course	0	0	0	1	1	2	3	4.00	1216/1670	4.00	4.36	4.31	4.24	4.00
2. Did the	e instruc	tor make clear	the exp	pected goals	0	0	0	1	0	1	5	4.43	751/1666	4.43	4.31	4.27	4.18	4.43
3. Did the	e exam qu	estions reflect	the ex	spected goals	0	0	0	1	0	2	4	4.29	852/1406	4.29	4.48	4.32	4.22	4.29
4. Did oth	ner evalu	ations reflect	the exp	pected goals	0	0	0	0	1	1	5	4.57	477/1615	4.57	4.34	4.24	4.18	4.57
5. Did ass	signed re	adings contribu	te to v	what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	5	1	4.00	851/1566	4.00	4.26	4.07	4.04	4.00
6. Did wri	6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learner								2	2	3	4.14	805/1528	4.14	4.23	4.12	4.07	4.14
7. Was the	0	0	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	471/1650	4.57	4.16	4.22	4.12	4.57				
8. How mar	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1667	5.00	4.47	4.67	4.67	5.00				
9. How wou	1	1	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	797/1626	4.20	4.08	4.11	4.06	4.20				
		Lecture																
		ctor's lectures	_	-	0	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	355/1559	4.86	4.38	4.46	4.40	4.86
		tor seem intere		-	0	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	725/1560	4.86	4.75	4.72	4.67	4.86
				xplained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	4	3	4.43	789/1549	4.43	4.34	4.31	4.25	4.43
		s contribute to	_		0	0	0	0	1	2	4	4.43	822/1546	4.43	4.40	4.32	4.24	4.43
5. Did aud	diovisual	techniques enh	ance yo	our understanding	0	2	0	1	0	2	2	4.00	692/1323	4.00	3.96	4.00	3.99	4.00
1 542		Discuss		3	_	0	0	^	0	^	-	F 00	4444/1204	****	4 00	4 10	4 10	****
				what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/1384 ****/1378	****	4.29 4.56	4.10 4.29	4.12 4.30	****
				d to participate d open discussion	6 6	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/1378	****	4.45	4.29	4.30	****
		chniques succes		open discussion	6	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 904		4.45	4.31	4.33	****
4. Were st	peciai te	ciniiques succes	SIUI		0	U	U	U	U	U	Т	5.00	/ 904		4.11	4.03	4.03	
				Frequ	ency	Dist	rib	ution	ı									
Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	asons	5			Туј	pe			Majors	
00-27							quire	ed fo	or Ma	ijors	5	0	Graduat	9	0	Majo	r	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	В 3									1		_			_
56-83 2 2.00-2.99 1 C 0						Ger	nera:	L				0	Under-g	rad	7	Non-	major	7
84-150 2 3.00-3.49 2 D 0										,			,					
Grad. 0 3.50-4.00 2 F 0					Electives 2 #### - Means there are					_		n						
Р 0						responses to be significant to the significant to t						e sign	ııııcan	IT				

Other

Course-Section: GERM 312 0101 University of Maryland Page 870 Title INTRO GERM LIT/CULT II Baltimore County AUG 6, 2008

Instructor: MAY, BRIGITTE

Enrollment: 3

Questionnaires: 3

Spring 2008
Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1670	5.00	4.36	4.31	4.24	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	415/1666	4.67	4.31	4.27	4.18	4.67
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	423/1406	4.67	4.48	4.32	4.22	4.67
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	379/1615	4.67	4.34	4.24	4.18	4.67
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1566	5.00	4.26	4.07	4.04	5.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	300/1528	4.67	4.23	4.12	4.07	4.67
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	361/1650	4.67	4.16	4.22	4.12	4.67
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	3	0	4.00	1524/1667	4.00	4.47	4.67	4.67	4.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1626	5.00	4.08	4.11	4.06	5.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1559	5.00	4.38	4.46	4.40	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1560	5.00	4.75	4.72	4.67	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	488/1549	4.67	4.34	4.31	4.25	4.67
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1546	5.00	4.40	4.32	4.24	5.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	1	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	326/1323	4.50	3.96	4.00	3.99	4.50
Frequ	ency	Dist	ribu	ution	ı									

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

Baltimore County

Frequencies

Instructor

Page 871

AUG 6, 2008

Job IRBR3029

Course Dept UMBC Level Sect

Course-Section: GERM 319 0101 University of Maryland Title GERMAN TRANSLATION Instructor: LARKEY, EDWARD Spring 2008

Enrollment:	9	
Questionnaires:	9	Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

P I

?

0

0

Questions						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	om this course	0	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	338/1670	4.78	4.36	4.31	4.24	4.78
2. Did th	e instru	ctor make clear	the ex	pected goals	0	0	0	0	2	2	5	4.33	870/1666	4.33	4.31	4.27	4.18	4.33
3. Did th	e exam q	uestions reflec	t the e	expected goals	0	3	0	1	0	0	5	4.50	597/1406	4.50	4.48	4.32	4.22	4.50
4. Did ot	her eval	uations reflect	the ex	pected goals	0	0	0	0	1	3	5	4.44	633/1615	4.44	4.34	4.24	4.18	4.44
5. Did as	signed r	eadings contrib	ute to	what you learned	0	1	0	0	0	4	4	4.50	389/1566	4.50	4.26	4.07	4.04	4.50
6. Did wr	itten as	signments contr	ibute t	o what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	3	6	4.67	300/1528	4.67	4.23	4.12	4.07	4.67
7. Was th	e gradin	g system clearl	y expla	ined	0	0	0	1	3	3	2	3.67	1404/1650	3.67	4.16	4.22	4.12	3.67
8. How ma	ny times	was class cand	elled		0	0	0	0	0	4	5	4.56	1119/1667	4.56	4.47	4.67	4.67	4.56
9. How wo	uld you	grade the overa	ll tead	hing effectiveness	1	0	0	0	2	2	4	4.25	728/1626	4.25	4.08	4.11	4.06	4.25
1. Were t	he instr	uctor's lecture	3	0	0	0	0	3	3	4.50	896/1559	4.50	4.38	4.46	4.40	4.50		
	2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject							0	0	3	3	4.50	1248/1560	4.50	4.75	4.72	4.67	4.50
3. Was le	cture ma	terial presente	d and e	explained clearly	3	0	0	0	0	3	3	4.50	683/1549	4.50	4.34	4.31	4.25	4.50
4. Did th	e lectur	es contribute t	o what	you learned	3	0	0	0	1	2	3	4.33	919/1546	4.33	4.40	4.32	4.24	4.33
5. Did au	diovisua	l techniques en	hance y	our understanding	3	1	0	0	2	3	0	3.60	990/1323	3.60	3.96	4.00	3.99	3.60
		Discus	sion															
1. Did cl	ass disc	ussions contrib	ute to	what you learned	4	0	0	0	2	1	2	4.00	820/1384	4.00	4.29	4.10	4.12	4.00
				ed to participate	4	0	0	0	2	0	3	4.20	894/1378	4.20	4.56	4.29	4.30	4.20
		_	_	d open discussion	4	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	590/1378	4.60	4.45	4.31	4.33	4.60
4. Were s	pecial to	echniques succe	ssful	-	4	0	0	1	1	1	2	3.80	605/ 904	3.80	4.11	4.03	4.03	3.80
				Frequ	ıency	, Dis	trib	ution	n									
Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Pos	ason	c			Тур	20			Majors	
	Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grad									5 								,
00-27						Re	quir	ed fo	or M	ajors	3	0	Graduate	9	0	Majo	or	6
28-55													_					
	56-83 5 2.00-2.99 1 C 1					Ge	nera	1				0	Under-gr	rad	9	Non-	major	3
84-150 1 3.00-3.49 2 D 0																		
Grad. 0 3.50-4.00 3 F 0						El	ecti	ves				1			there are not enough			
P 0						responses to be						e sign	nificar	ıt				

Other

Course-Section: GERM 481 0101 University of Maryland SEMINAR IN GERMAN Baltimore County

D 0

F 0

0

1

P 0

I

Title

Instructor:

Enrollment:

84-150

Grad.

2

3.00-3.49 1

3.50-4.00 3

Ouestionnaires: 7

MAY, BRIGITTE

7

AUG 6, 2008 Spring 2008 Job IRBR3029

Page 872

- Means there are not enough

responses to be significant

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Quebelonn	all CD	•		beddelle eoe	AL DC	пуат	uacı	OII Q	acsc.	LOIIII	<i>x</i> <u> </u>	-						
							Fr	eque:	ncies	3		Inst	ructor	Course	e Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
		Questions	3		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		 General																
1. Did yo	u gain n	ew insights,skil	ls fro	om this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1670	5.00	4.36	4.31	4.45	5.00
2. Did th	e instru	ctor make clear	the ex	xpected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	216/1666	4.86	4.31	4.27	4.35	4.86
3. Did th	e exam q	uestions reflect	the e	expected goals	1	1	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	261/1406	4.80	4.48	4.32	4.48	4.80
		uations reflect			0	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	210/1615	4.86	4.34	4.24	4.37	4.86
				what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	258/1566	4.71		4.07	4.17	4.71
				to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	0	6	4.71				4.12	4.26	4.71
	_	g system clearly	_	ained	0	0	1	0	1	0	5		1032/1650		4.16	4.22	4.28	4.14
		was class cance			0	0	0	0	0	1	6		768/1667					4.86
9. How wo	uld you	grade the overal	.l tead	ching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	151/1626	4.83	4.08	4.11	4.28	4.83
		Lecture	<u> </u>															
1. Were t	1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared							0	0	1	6	4.86	355/1559	4.86	4.38	4.46	4.58	4.86
2. Did th	2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject						0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1560	5.00	4.75	4.72	4.80	5.00
3. Was le	cture ma	terial presented	l and	explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	598/1549	4.57	4.34	4.31	4.43	4.57
4. Did th	e lectur	es contribute to	what	you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	288/1546	4.86	4.40	4.32	4.43	4.86
5. Did au	diovisua	l techniques enh	nance y	your understanding	0	2	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	273/1323	4.60	3.96	4.00	4.10	4.60
		Discuss	sion															
1. Did cl	ass disc	ussions contribu	ite to	what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1384	5.00	4.29	4.10	4.32	5.00
2. Were a	ll stude	nts actively end	courage	ed to participate	2	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1378	5.00	4.56	4.29	4.55	5.00
3. Did th	e instru	ctor encourage f	air a	nd open discussion	2	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1378	5.00	4.45	4.31	4.60	5.00
4. Were s	pecial t	echniques succes	sful		2	1	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	243/ 904	4.50	4.11	4.03	4.22	4.50
		Seminar	-															
1. Were a	ssigned	topics relevant	to the	e announced theme	3	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/ 87	5.00	5.00	4.65	4.80	5.00
2. Was th	e instru	ctor available f	or in	dividual attention	3	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	47/ 79	4.75	4.63	4.64	4.60	4.75
3. Did re	search p	rojects contribu	ite to	what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/ 75	5.00	5.00	4.57	4.56	5.00
4. Did pr	esentati	ons contribute t	o what	t you learned	3	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	36/ 79	4.75	4.88	4.45	4.53	4.75
5. Were c	riteria	for grading made	clear	r	3	0	0	0	2	1	1	3.75	51/ 80	3.75	4.13	3.97	3.67	3.75
	Fre						trib	utio	n									
Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Re	asons	3			Тν	ре			Majors	2
	cum. GPA expected Grades																	
00-27 1 0.00-0.99 1 A 3					Re	quir	ed f	or Ma	ajor	3	0	Graduat	е	0	Majo	or	4	
28-55 0 1.00-1.99 0 B 3 56-83 2 2.00-2.99 1 C 0						a		1				1	TTm d a se		7	Mar		2
56-83 84-150	2	2.00-2.99	1	C 0		Ge	nera	Т				1	Under-g	rad	7	non-	-major	3

Electives

Other

Course-Section: GERM 681 0101 SEMINAR IN GERMAN MAY, BRIGITTE

P

I

0

0

Title

Instructor:

Enrollment:

Questionnaires: 3

4

University of Maryland Page 873 Baltimore County AUG 6, 2008 Spring 2008 Job IRBR3029

1

responses to be significant

Student Cour	se Evaluation Questionnaire
--------------	-----------------------------

															T 3			
							Fre	eque	ncies	3		Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC Level		Sect
		Questions	3		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		General	 1															
1. Did vo	u gain n	ew insights,skil		m this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1670	5.00	4.36	4.31	4.46	5.00
		ctor make clear			0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1666		4.31	4.27	4.34	5.00
		uestions reflect			0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1406		4.48	4.32	4.36	5.00
		uations reflect			1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1615		4.34	4.24	4.33	5.00
				what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1566		4.26	4.07	4.20	5.00
				o what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1528		4.23	4.12	4.33	5.00
		g system clearly		_	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1650		4.16	4.22	4.30	5.00
	8. How many times was class cancelled								0	0	3	5.00	1/1667		4.47	4.67	4.74	5.00
				hing effectiveness	0 2	0	0 1	0	0	0	0		1626/1626		4.08	4.11		1.00
J. 110W WO	9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectivenes								U	U	U	1.00	1020/1020	1.00	1.00	7,11	1.20	1.00
		Lecture	e															
1. Were t	he instr	uctor's lectures	s well	prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1559	5.00	4.38	4.46	4.49	5.00
2. Did th	e instru	ctor seem intere	ested i	n the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1560	5.00	4.75	4.72	4.81	5.00
3. Was le	cture ma	terial presented	d and e	explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1549	5.00	4.34	4.31	4.37	5.00
4. Did the	e lectur	es contribute to	o what	you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1546	5.00	4.40	4.32	4.40	5.00
5. Did au	diovisua	l techniques enh	nance y	our understanding	0	2	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	692/1323	4.00	3.96	4.00	4.03	4.00
		D																
1 544 -1		Discuss			0	0	0	0	0	0	2	г оо	1 /1204	F 00	4 20	1 10	4 01	г оо
				what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1384		4.29	4.10	4.21	5.00
				d to participate	0	-				-	-	5.00	1/1378		4.56	4.29	4.42	5.00
				d open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1378		4.45	4.31	4.51	5.00
4. were s	pecial t	echniques succes	ssiui		0	0	0	U	U	2	1	4.33	328/ 904	4.33	4.11	4.03	4.04	4.33
		Seminar	r															
1. Were a	ssigned	topics relevant	to the	announced theme	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 87	5.00	5.00	4.65	4.61	5.00
2. Was the	e instru	ctor available f	for ind	lividual attention	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	53/ 79	4.50	4.63	4.64	4.67	4.50
3. Did re	search p	rojects contribu	ute to	what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 75	5.00	5.00	4.57	4.66	5.00
4. Did pr	esentati	ons contribute t	to what	you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 79	5.00	4.88	4.45	4.58	5.00
5. Were c	riteria	for grading made	e clear		1	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	30/ 80	4.50	4.13	3.97	4.32	4.50
		- D:	d la-		_													
	terrey	7 Dist	LLID	ucio	[]													
Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	asons	3			Ту	pe			Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 1		Red	 guir	ed f	or Ma	ajors	 3	0	 Graduat	 е	2	Majo	r or	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	в 0			_			-						J -		
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C 0		Ger	1				1	Under-9	grad 1		Non-major		3	
84-150 0 3.00-3.49 0 D 0					General								_				3	
Grad. 2 3.50-4.00 1 F 0						Electives					0	#### - Means there are not enough					h	
	_	2.22 2.30	_	E 0	Electives							"""" reals elect are not					_	

Other