

Course-Section: GERM 101 0101
 Title ELEMENTARY GERMAN I
 Instructor: KWIATKOWSKI, SA
 Enrollment: 24
 Questionnaires: 15

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 816
 JUN 26, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	4	11	4.73	350/1522	4.73	4.36	4.30	4.14	4.73	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	4	11	4.73	277/1522	4.73	4.33	4.26	4.18	4.73	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	5	9	4.53	499/1285	4.53	4.45	4.30	4.22	4.53	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	4	3	8	4.27	781/1476	4.27	4.33	4.22	4.09	4.27	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	4	9	4.47	375/1412	4.47	4.26	4.06	4.01	4.47	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	3	1	10	4.27	594/1381	4.27	4.19	4.08	3.93	4.27	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	3	11	4.67	312/1500	4.67	4.14	4.18	4.16	4.67	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	7	8	4.53	1054/1517	4.53	4.56	4.65	4.62	4.53	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	1	6	3	4	3.71	1174/1497	3.71	4.21	4.11	4.02	3.71	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	7	7	4.40	931/1440	4.40	4.45	4.45	4.40	4.40	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	2	12	4.73	897/1448	4.73	4.79	4.71	4.63	4.73	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	6	8	4.47	648/1436	4.47	4.39	4.29	4.24	4.47	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	4	10	4.60	527/1432	4.60	4.47	4.29	4.23	4.60	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	1	0	3	4	7	4.07	585/1221	4.07	3.91	3.93	3.86	4.07	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	1	4	8	4.54	370/1280	4.54	4.28	4.10	3.92	4.54	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	1	1	11	4.77	363/1277	4.77	4.60	4.34	4.13	4.77	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	2	3	8	4.46	620/1269	4.46	4.47	4.31	4.04	4.46	
4. Were special techniques successful	2	2	0	0	2	5	4	4.18	369/ 854	4.18	4.16	4.02	3.87	4.18	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	A 6	Required for Majors	5
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	B 2		Graduate 0
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	C 2	General	3
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad 15
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 2	Electives	4
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 1	Other	2
			? 1		

Course-Section: GERM 102 0101
 Title ELEMENTARY GERMAN II
 Instructor: SUTTON, SUSANNE
 Enrollment: 23
 Questionnaires: 19

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 817
 JUN 26, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	6	13	4.68	414/1522	4.53	4.36	4.30	4.14	4.68	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	17	4.89	135/1522	4.76	4.33	4.26	4.18	4.89	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	5	14	4.74	298/1285	4.74	4.45	4.30	4.22	4.74	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	13	6	4.32	724/1476	4.35	4.33	4.22	4.09	4.32	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	7	11	4.53	327/1412	4.39	4.26	4.06	4.01	4.53	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	3	6	9	4.21	643/1381	4.23	4.19	4.08	3.93	4.21	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	3	15	4.74	232/1500	4.62	4.14	4.18	4.16	4.74	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	18	4.95	292/1517	4.91	4.56	4.65	4.62	4.95	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	1	0	0	0	7	9	4.56	341/1497	4.64	4.21	4.11	4.02	4.56	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	3	15	4.83	304/1440	4.85	4.45	4.45	4.40	4.83	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	2	16	4.89	548/1448	4.94	4.79	4.71	4.63	4.89	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	3	4	11	4.44	672/1436	4.51	4.39	4.29	4.24	4.44	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	2	16	4.89	187/1432	4.87	4.47	4.29	4.23	4.89	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	1	1	1	1	6	6	4.00	606/1221	4.00	3.91	3.93	3.86	4.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	1	4	6	4.45	433/1280	4.30	4.28	4.10	3.92	4.45	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1277	4.79	4.60	4.34	4.13	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	0	0	3	2	6	4.27	763/1269	4.28	4.47	4.31	4.04	4.27	
4. Were special techniques successful	8	2	1	1	0	2	5	4.00	426/ 854	4.08	4.16	4.02	3.87	4.00	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 79	****	5.00	4.58	4.13	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 77	****	5.00	4.52	4.03	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 78	4.50	4.83	4.45	3.88	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 80	4.50	4.83	4.11	3.79	****	
Field Work															
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 45	****	4.00	4.30	3.90	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	0	A	4	Required for Majors	14	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	B	4						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	0	C	7	General	0	Under-grad	19	Non-major	18
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	3				
				?	2						

Course-Section: GERM 102 0201
 Title ELEMENTARY GERMAN II
 Instructor: SUTTON, SUSANNE
 Enrollment: 11
 Questionnaires: 8

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 818
 JUN 26, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect		
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean		

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	3	4	4.38	767/1522	4.53	4.36	4.30	4.14	4.38
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	5	4.63	407/1522	4.76	4.33	4.26	4.18	4.63
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	278/1285	4.74	4.45	4.30	4.22	4.75
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	3	4	4.38	660/1476	4.35	4.33	4.22	4.09	4.38
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	4	3	4.25	566/1412	4.39	4.26	4.06	4.01	4.25
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	4	3	4.25	604/1381	4.23	4.19	4.08	3.93	4.25
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	2	5	4.50	483/1500	4.62	4.14	4.18	4.16	4.50
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	555/1517	4.91	4.56	4.65	4.62	4.88
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	223/1497	4.64	4.21	4.11	4.02	4.71
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	272/1440	4.85	4.45	4.45	4.40	4.86
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1448	4.94	4.79	4.71	4.63	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	514/1436	4.51	4.39	4.29	4.24	4.57
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	227/1432	4.87	4.47	4.29	4.23	4.86
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	0	2	3	2	4.00	606/1221	4.00	3.91	3.93	3.86	4.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	2	2	3	4.14	657/1280	4.30	4.28	4.10	3.92	4.14
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	1	1	5	4.57	547/1277	4.79	4.60	4.34	4.13	4.57
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	2	1	4	4.29	756/1269	4.28	4.47	4.31	4.04	4.29
4. Were special techniques successful	1	1	0	1	0	2	3	4.17	380/ 854	4.08	4.16	4.02	3.87	4.17
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	6	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 215	****	****	4.36	4.31	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	6	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	83/ 228	4.50	4.50	4.35	4.33	4.50
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	6	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	123/ 217	4.50	4.50	4.51	4.51	4.50
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 216	****	****	4.42	4.41	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	6	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 205	5.00	5.00	4.23	4.28	5.00
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 79	****	5.00	4.58	4.13	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 77	****	5.00	4.52	4.03	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	6	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 65	****	5.00	4.49	3.85	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	49/ 78	4.50	4.83	4.45	3.88	4.50
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	6	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	31/ 80	4.50	4.83	4.11	3.79	4.50
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 47	****	3.60	4.41	3.90	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 45	****	4.00	4.30	3.90	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 39	****	3.00	4.40	3.99	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 35	****	3.00	4.31	4.00	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 34	****	2.75	4.30	4.11	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 37	****	4.33	4.63	4.53	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 23	****	****	4.41	4.19	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 33	****	****	4.69	4.57	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 22	****	****	4.54	4.31	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	6	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 18	****	****	4.49	4.11	****

Course-Section: GERM 102 0201
 Title ELEMENTARY GERMAN II
 Instructor: SUTTON, SUSANNE
 Enrollment: 11
 Questionnaires: 8

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 818
 JUN 26, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: GERM 201 0101
 Title INTERMEDIATE GERMAN I
 Instructor: WOLFF, XENIA
 Enrollment: 17
 Questionnaires: 12

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 819
 JUN 26, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	158/1522	4.80	4.36	4.30	4.34	4.92	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	115/1522	4.88	4.33	4.26	4.29	4.92	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/1285	4.85	4.45	4.30	4.36	5.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/1476	4.81	4.33	4.22	4.20	5.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	91/1412	4.65	4.26	4.06	4.00	4.92	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	77/1381	4.69	4.19	4.08	3.97	4.92	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/1500	4.65	4.14	4.18	4.20	5.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	438/1517	4.96	4.56	4.65	4.63	4.92	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1497	4.68	4.21	4.11	4.11	5.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1440	4.88	4.45	4.45	4.42	5.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/1448	4.92	4.79	4.71	4.78	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/1436	4.88	4.39	4.29	4.29	5.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	161/1432	4.87	4.47	4.29	4.31	4.91	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	1	1	0	0	3	6	4.30	430/1221	3.88	3.91	3.93	4.02	4.30	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	1	3	5	4.44	442/1280	4.17	4.28	4.10	4.08	4.44	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	375/1277	4.76	4.60	4.34	4.33	4.75	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	255/1269	4.72	4.47	4.31	4.33	4.88	
4. Were special techniques successful	4	1	0	0	1	2	4	4.43	240/ 854	4.09	4.16	4.02	4.00	4.43	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	1	0.00-0.99 0	A 5	Required for Majors 6	Graduate 0 Major 1
28-55	0	1.00-1.99 0	B 3		
56-83	3	2.00-2.99 0	C 1	General 0	Under-grad 12 Non-major 11
84-150	2	3.00-3.49 3	D 0		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 3	F 0	Electives 1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 4	
			? 1		

Course-Section: GERM 201 0201
 Title INTERMEDIATE GERMAN I
 Instructor: WOLFF, XENIA
 Enrollment: 20
 Questionnaires: 13

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 820
 JUN 26, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	2	10	4.69	404/1522	4.80	4.36	4.30	4.34	4.69	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	11	4.85	171/1522	4.88	4.33	4.26	4.29	4.85	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	2	10	4.69	337/1285	4.85	4.45	4.30	4.36	4.69	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	5	8	4.62	367/1476	4.81	4.33	4.22	4.20	4.62	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	1	3	8	4.38	448/1412	4.65	4.26	4.06	4.00	4.38	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	3	8	4.46	372/1381	4.69	4.19	4.08	3.97	4.46	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	3	3	7	4.31	731/1500	4.65	4.14	4.18	4.20	4.31	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	13	5.00	1/1517	4.96	4.56	4.65	4.63	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	1	0	0	3	7	4.36	544/1497	4.68	4.21	4.11	4.11	4.36	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	3	9	4.75	452/1440	4.88	4.45	4.45	4.42	4.75	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	2	10	4.83	683/1448	4.92	4.79	4.71	4.78	4.83	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	1	1	10	4.75	295/1436	4.88	4.39	4.29	4.29	4.75	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	2	10	4.83	254/1432	4.87	4.47	4.29	4.31	4.83	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	1	1	1	4	2	3	3.45	927/1221	3.88	3.91	3.93	4.02	3.45	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	1	0	3	0	5	3.89	834/1280	4.17	4.28	4.10	4.08	3.89	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	351/1277	4.76	4.60	4.34	4.33	4.78	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	1	0	1	7	4.56	547/1269	4.72	4.47	4.31	4.33	4.56	
4. Were special techniques successful	4	1	0	1	3	1	3	3.75	588/ 854	4.09	4.16	4.02	4.00	3.75	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	3	0.00-0.99 0	A 6	Required for Majors 8	Graduate 0 Major 0
28-55	2	1.00-1.99 0	B 3		
56-83	1	2.00-2.99 4	C 2	General 3	Under-grad 13 Non-major 13
84-150	5	3.00-3.49 2	D 0		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 5	F 0	Electives 0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 1	
			? 0		

Course-Section: GERM 202 0101
 Title INTERMEDIATE GERMAN II
 Instructor: WOLFF, XENIA
 Enrollment: 11
 Questionnaires: 7

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 821
 JUN 26, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	525/1522	4.57	4.36	4.30	4.34	4.57	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	164/1522	4.86	4.33	4.26	4.29	4.86	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	189/1285	4.86	4.45	4.30	4.36	4.86	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	406/1476	4.57	4.33	4.22	4.20	4.57	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	1	5	4.57	299/1412	4.57	4.26	4.06	4.00	4.57	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	272/1381	4.57	4.19	4.08	3.97	4.57	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	134/1500	4.86	4.14	4.18	4.20	4.86	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	600/1517	4.86	4.56	4.65	4.63	4.86	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	1	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	147/1497	4.80	4.21	4.11	4.11	4.80	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1440	5.00	4.45	4.45	4.42	5.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1448	5.00	4.79	4.71	4.78	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	217/1436	4.80	4.39	4.29	4.29	4.80	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	294/1432	4.80	4.47	4.29	4.31	4.80	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	99/1221	4.80	3.91	3.93	4.02	4.80	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	170/1280	4.83	4.28	4.10	4.08	4.83	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	290/1277	4.83	4.60	4.34	4.33	4.83	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	299/1269	4.83	4.47	4.31	4.33	4.83	
4. Were special techniques successful	1	1	0	0	0	3	2	4.40	252/ 854	4.40	4.16	4.02	4.00	4.40	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: GERM 302 0101
 Title ADVANCED GERMAN II
 Instructor: SUTTON, SUSANNE
 Enrollment: 9
 Questionnaires: 7

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 822
 JUN 26, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	525/1522	4.57	4.36	4.30	4.34	4.57	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	465/1522	4.57	4.33	4.26	4.25	4.57	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	2	4	4.43	626/1285	4.43	4.45	4.30	4.30	4.43	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	265/1476	4.71	4.33	4.22	4.26	4.71	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	2	4	4.43	411/1412	4.43	4.26	4.06	4.03	4.43	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	0	3	3	4.14	713/1381	4.14	4.19	4.08	4.13	4.14	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	2	1	3	3.86	1117/1500	3.86	4.14	4.18	4.13	3.86	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	4	3	4.43	1144/1517	4.43	4.56	4.65	4.62	4.43	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	312/1497	4.60	4.21	4.11	4.13	4.60	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	532/1440	4.71	4.45	4.45	4.46	4.71	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1448	5.00	4.79	4.71	4.71	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	1	5	4.57	514/1436	4.57	4.39	4.29	4.30	4.57	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	227/1432	4.86	4.47	4.29	4.29	4.86	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	144/1221	4.71	3.91	3.93	3.94	4.71	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1280	****	4.28	4.10	4.14	****	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1277	****	4.60	4.34	4.38	****	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1269	****	4.47	4.31	4.39	****	
4. Were special techniques successful	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 854	****	4.16	4.02	4.00	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	A 3	Required for Majors	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	B 2		Graduate 0
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	C 1	General	7
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	D 0		Non-major 1
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	3
			? 0		

Course-Section: GERM 311 0101
 Title INTRO GERM LIT/CULT I
 Instructor: MAY, BRIGITTE
 Enrollment: 11
 Questionnaires: 9

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 823
 JUN 26, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	290/1522	4.78	4.36	4.30	4.34	4.78	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	6	4.67	358/1522	4.67	4.33	4.26	4.25	4.67	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	258/1285	4.78	4.45	4.30	4.30	4.78	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	2	6	4.56	425/1476	4.56	4.33	4.22	4.26	4.56	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	108/1412	4.89	4.26	4.06	4.03	4.89	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	136/1381	4.78	4.19	4.08	4.13	4.78	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	2	6	4.56	435/1500	4.56	4.14	4.18	4.13	4.56	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	532/1517	4.89	4.56	4.65	4.62	4.89	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	116/1497	4.88	4.21	4.11	4.13	4.88	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	224/1440	4.89	4.45	4.45	4.46	4.89	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	548/1448	4.89	4.79	4.71	4.71	4.89	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	263/1436	4.78	4.39	4.29	4.30	4.78	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1432	5.00	4.47	4.29	4.29	5.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	5	1	0	1	0	1	3.00	1064/1221	3.00	3.91	3.93	3.94	3.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	477/1280	4.40	4.28	4.10	4.14	4.40	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	317/1277	4.80	4.60	4.34	4.38	4.80	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	509/1269	4.60	4.47	4.31	4.39	4.60	
4. Were special techniques successful	4	0	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	363/ 854	4.20	4.16	4.02	4.00	4.20	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	1	0.00-0.99 0	A 3	Required for Majors	0 Graduate 0 Major 6
28-55	0	1.00-1.99 0	B 4		
56-83	2	2.00-2.99 2	C 0	General	0 Under-grad 9 Non-major 3
84-150	2	3.00-3.49 0	D 0		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 5	F 0	Electives	0 #### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 0		
			I 0	Other	8
			? 1		

Course-Section: GERM 319 0101
 Title GERMAN TRANSLATION
 Instructor: MAY, BRIGITTE
 Enrollment: 4
 Questionnaires: 3

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 824
 JUN 26, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1522	5.00	4.36	4.30	4.34	5.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	358/1522	4.67	4.33	4.26	4.25	4.67	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1285	5.00	4.45	4.30	4.30	5.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	703/1476	4.33	4.33	4.22	4.26	4.33	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	231/1412	4.67	4.26	4.06	4.03	4.67	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	207/1381	4.67	4.19	4.08	4.13	4.67	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	700/1500	4.33	4.14	4.18	4.13	4.33	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1517	5.00	4.56	4.65	4.62	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1497	5.00	4.21	4.11	4.13	5.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1440	5.00	4.45	4.45	4.46	5.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1448	5.00	4.79	4.71	4.71	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1436	5.00	4.39	4.29	4.30	5.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	454/1432	4.67	4.47	4.29	4.29	4.67	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1280	5.00	4.28	4.10	4.14	5.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1277	5.00	4.60	4.34	4.38	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1269	5.00	4.47	4.31	4.39	5.00	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 79	5.00	5.00	4.58	4.53	5.00	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 77	5.00	5.00	4.52	4.30	5.00	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 65	5.00	5.00	4.49	4.33	5.00	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 78	5.00	4.83	4.45	4.34	5.00	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 80	5.00	4.83	4.11	3.33	5.00	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: GERM 319H 0101
 Title GERMAN TRANSLATION
 Instructor: MAY, BRIGITTE
 Enrollment: 1
 Questionnaires: 1

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 825
 JUN 26, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1522	5.00	4.36	4.30	4.34	5.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1522	5.00	4.33	4.26	4.25	5.00	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1285	5.00	4.45	4.30	4.30	5.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1476	5.00	4.33	4.22	4.26	5.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1412	5.00	4.26	4.06	4.03	5.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1381	5.00	4.19	4.08	4.13	5.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	1498/1500	1.00	4.14	4.18	4.13	1.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1517	5.00	4.56	4.65	4.62	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1497	5.00	4.21	4.11	4.13	5.00	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: GERM 481 0101
 Title SEMINAR IN GERMAN
 Instructor: LARKEY, EDWARD
 Enrollment: 5
 Questionnaires: 3

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 826
 JUN 26, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1522	5.00	4.36	4.30	4.42	5.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1522	5.00	4.33	4.26	4.34	5.00	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1285	5.00	4.45	4.30	4.42	5.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1476	5.00	4.33	4.22	4.31	5.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1412	5.00	4.26	4.06	4.11	5.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1381	5.00	4.19	4.08	4.21	5.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1500	5.00	4.14	4.18	4.25	5.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1517	5.00	4.56	4.65	4.71	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	385/1497	4.50	4.21	4.11	4.21	4.50	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1440	5.00	4.45	4.45	4.52	5.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1448	5.00	4.79	4.71	4.75	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1436	5.00	4.39	4.29	4.32	5.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1432	5.00	4.47	4.29	4.34	5.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1221	5.00	3.91	3.93	4.04	5.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1280	5.00	4.28	4.10	4.28	5.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1277	5.00	4.60	4.34	4.50	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1269	5.00	4.47	4.31	4.49	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	1	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 854	5.00	4.16	4.02	4.31	5.00	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: GERM 681 0101
 Title SEMINAR IN GERMAN
 Instructor: LARKEY, EDWARD
 Enrollment: 2
 Questionnaires: 2

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 827
 JUN 26, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	605/1522	4.50	4.36	4.30	4.45	4.50	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	1080/1522	4.00	4.33	4.26	4.29	4.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1476	5.00	4.33	4.22	4.31	5.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	339/1412	4.50	4.26	4.06	4.25	4.50	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	331/1381	4.50	4.19	4.08	4.25	4.50	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1500	5.00	4.14	4.18	4.22	5.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	1080/1517	4.50	4.56	4.65	4.73	4.50	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	385/1497	4.50	4.21	4.11	4.21	4.50	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1440	5.00	4.45	4.45	4.48	5.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1448	5.00	4.79	4.71	4.80	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	601/1436	4.50	4.39	4.29	4.37	4.50	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1432	5.00	4.47	4.29	4.33	5.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1221	5.00	3.91	3.93	3.83	5.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1280	5.00	4.28	4.10	4.24	5.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	594/1277	4.50	4.60	4.34	4.52	4.50	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1269	5.00	4.47	4.31	4.51	5.00	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 79	5.00	5.00	4.58	4.76	5.00	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 77	5.00	5.00	4.52	4.70	5.00	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 65	5.00	5.00	4.49	4.71	5.00	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 78	5.00	4.83	4.45	4.66	5.00	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 80	5.00	4.83	4.11	4.38	5.00	

Frequency Distribution

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