

Course-Section: GERM 101 0101  
 Title ELEMENTARY GERMAN I  
 Instructor: SUTTON, SUSANNE  
 Enrollment: 22  
 Questionnaires: 15

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2006

Page 835  
 JUN 13, 2006  
 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	2	3	10	4.53	522/1481	4.53	4.26	4.29	4.14	4.53	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	2	10	4.47	574/1481	4.47	4.26	4.23	4.18	4.47	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	2	10	4.47	548/1249	4.47	4.37	4.27	4.14	4.47	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	2	10	4.40	557/1424	4.40	4.27	4.21	4.06	4.40	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	6	7	4.33	435/1396	4.33	4.07	3.98	3.89	4.33	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	4	4	6	4.14	649/1342	4.14	4.12	4.07	3.88	4.14	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	3	3	9	4.40	611/1459	4.40	4.19	4.16	4.17	4.40	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	15	5.00	1/1480	5.00	4.64	4.68	4.64	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	0	2	2	6	4.40	473/1450	4.40	4.10	4.09	3.97	4.40	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	1	1	3	9	4.43	865/1409	4.43	4.46	4.42	4.36	4.43	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	1	0	2	11	4.64	986/1407	4.64	4.77	4.69	4.57	4.64	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	1	1	4	8	4.36	733/1399	4.36	4.30	4.26	4.23	4.36	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	2	3	8	4.29	844/1400	4.29	4.35	4.27	4.19	4.29	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	1	1	0	4	3	5	3.85	732/1179	3.85	3.94	3.96	3.85	3.85	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	2	5	6	4.31	537/1262	4.31	4.18	4.05	3.77	4.31	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	2	0	11	4.69	422/1259	4.69	4.40	4.29	4.06	4.69	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	4	2	7	4.23	785/1256	4.23	4.34	4.30	4.08	4.23	
4. Were special techniques successful	2	1	0	0	3	5	4	4.08	374/ 788	4.08	4.03	4.00	3.80	4.08	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	14	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 246	****	4.26	4.20	3.93	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	14	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 249	****	4.08	4.11	3.95	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	14	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 242	****	4.45	4.40	4.33	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	14	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 240	****	4.37	4.20	4.20	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 217	****	4.42	4.04	4.02	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	14	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 68	****	4.66	4.49	4.54	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 69	****	4.26	4.53	4.18	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 63	****	4.24	4.44	4.17	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 69	****	4.19	4.35	4.14	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 68	****	3.98	3.92	3.80	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 59	****	3.92	4.30	4.00	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	14	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 51	****	4.04	4.00	3.44	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 36	****	5.00	4.60	5.00	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	14	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 41	****	3.68	4.26	****	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 31	****	3.50	4.42	****	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 55	****	3.90	4.55	4.48	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 31	****	4.28	4.75	4.42	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	14	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 51	****	4.42	4.65	4.63	****	

Course-Section: GERM 101 0101  
 Title ELEMENTARY GERMAN I  
 Instructor: SUTTON, SUSANNE  
 Enrollment: 22  
 Questionnaires: 15

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2006

Page 835  
 JUN 13, 2006  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	A	3	Required for Majors	9	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	7						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	1	C	5	General	2	Under-grad	15	Non-major	4
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	5	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	4				
				?	0						

Course-Section: GERM 102 0101  
 Title ELEMENTARY GERMAN II  
 Instructor: KWIATKOWSKI, SA  
 Enrollment: 7  
 Questionnaires: 6

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2006

Page 836  
 JUN 13, 2006  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	3	2	4.17	947/1481	4.16	4.26	4.29	4.14	4.17	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	3	2	4.17	909/1481	4.08	4.26	4.23	4.18	4.17	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	3	4.50	498/1249	4.57	4.37	4.27	4.14	4.50	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	4	1	4.00	959/1424	4.14	4.27	4.21	4.06	4.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	4	2	4.33	435/1396	4.27	4.07	3.98	3.89	4.33	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	3	2	4.17	626/1342	4.00	4.12	4.07	3.88	4.17	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	5	1	4.17	854/1459	4.27	4.19	4.16	4.17	4.17	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	4	2	0	3.33	1462/1480	3.42	4.64	4.68	4.64	3.33	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	3	2	0	3.40	1267/1450	3.35	4.10	4.09	3.97	3.40	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	3	3	4.50	762/1409	4.28	4.46	4.42	4.36	4.50	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	3	3	4.50	1107/1407	4.44	4.77	4.69	4.57	4.50	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	5	1	4.17	910/1399	3.94	4.30	4.26	4.23	4.17	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	3	1	2	3.83	1110/1400	3.83	4.35	4.27	4.19	3.83	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	1	1	2	0	2	0	2.60	1123/1179	3.10	3.94	3.96	3.85	2.60	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	1	1	2	1	3.17	1108/1262	3.44	4.18	4.05	3.77	3.17	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	2	1	3	4.17	836/1259	4.30	4.40	4.29	4.06	4.17	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	571/1256	4.29	4.34	4.30	4.08	4.50	
4. Were special techniques successful	0	4	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	176/ 788	4.10	4.03	4.00	3.80	4.50	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	5	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 246	****	4.26	4.20	3.93	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	5	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 249	****	4.08	4.11	3.95	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	5	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 242	****	4.45	4.40	4.33	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	5	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 240	****	4.37	4.20	4.20	****	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: GERM 102 0201  
 Title ELEMENTARY GERMAN II  
 Instructor: KWIATKOWSKI, SA  
 Enrollment: 24  
 Questionnaires: 19

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2006

Page 837  
 JUN 13, 2006  
 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	4	8	7	4.16	957/1481	4.16	4.26	4.29	4.14	4.16	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	6	7	6	4.00	1000/1481	4.08	4.26	4.23	4.18	4.00	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	5	13	4.63	369/1249	4.57	4.37	4.27	4.14	4.63	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	2	9	7	4.28	717/1424	4.14	4.27	4.21	4.06	4.28	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	6	3	10	4.21	536/1396	4.27	4.07	3.98	3.89	4.21	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	6	6	6	3.84	927/1342	4.00	4.12	4.07	3.88	3.84	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	3	6	10	4.37	659/1459	4.27	4.19	4.16	4.17	4.37	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	9	9	0	3.50	1454/1480	3.42	4.64	4.68	4.64	3.50	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	2	9	5	1	3.29	1296/1450	3.35	4.10	4.09	3.97	3.29	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	6	4	7	4.06	1137/1409	4.28	4.46	4.42	4.36	4.06	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	3	5	10	4.39	1194/1407	4.44	4.77	4.69	4.57	4.39	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	4	3	5	6	3.72	1174/1399	3.94	4.30	4.26	4.23	3.72	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	2	5	5	6	3.83	1110/1400	3.83	4.35	4.27	4.19	3.83	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	3	0	1	7	4	3	3.60	860/1179	3.10	3.94	3.96	3.85	3.60	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	2	4	4	4	3.71	907/1262	3.44	4.18	4.05	3.77	3.71	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	0	1	6	7	4.43	661/1259	4.30	4.40	4.29	4.06	4.43	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	0	0	5	2	6	4.08	872/1256	4.29	4.34	4.30	4.08	4.08	
4. Were special techniques successful	5	1	0	2	4	3	4	3.69	555/ 788	4.10	4.03	4.00	3.80	3.69	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 3	Required for Majors	12
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	B 6		Graduate 0
56-83	5	2.00-2.99	C 7	General	1
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad 19
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	0
			P 1		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	6
			? 0		

Course-Section: GERM 201 0101  
 Title INTERMEDIATE GERMAN I  
 Instructor: SUTTON, SUSANNE  
 Enrollment: 13  
 Questionnaires: 8

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2006

Page 838  
 JUN 13, 2006  
 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	5	2	4.29	805/1481	4.57	4.26	4.29	4.40	4.29	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	2	4	4.43	632/1481	4.64	4.26	4.23	4.29	4.43	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	278/1249	4.77	4.37	4.27	4.36	4.71	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	2	4	4.43	533/1424	4.29	4.27	4.21	4.28	4.43	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	3	3	4.29	476/1396	4.36	4.07	3.98	3.94	4.29	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	3	3	4.29	519/1342	4.56	4.12	4.07	4.05	4.29	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	2	1	4	4.29	749/1459	4.43	4.19	4.16	4.17	4.29	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1480	5.00	4.64	4.68	4.68	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	0	5	0	4.00	836/1450	4.50	4.10	4.09	4.15	4.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	682/1409	4.70	4.46	4.42	4.47	4.57	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	614/1407	4.85	4.77	4.69	4.78	4.86	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	1	3	3	4.29	801/1399	4.54	4.30	4.26	4.29	4.29	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	1	5	4.57	521/1400	4.79	4.35	4.27	4.34	4.57	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	0	1	5	1	4.00	590/1179	3.50	3.94	3.96	4.05	4.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	1	0	0	1	3	4.00	708/1262	3.75	4.18	4.05	4.11	4.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	680/1259	3.95	4.40	4.29	4.34	4.40	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	0	3	2	4.40	680/1256	4.20	4.34	4.30	4.28	4.40	
4. Were special techniques successful	3	1	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	394/ 788	4.00	4.03	4.00	3.98	4.00	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	1	0.00-0.99 0	A 0	Required for Majors 6	Graduate 0 Major 0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99 0	B 5		
56-83	0	2.00-2.99 0	C 1	General 0	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 1	
			? 0		

Course-Section: GERM 201 0201  
 Title INTERMEDIATE GERMAN I  
 Instructor: WOLFF, XENIA  
 Enrollment: 9  
 Questionnaires: 7

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2006

Page 839  
 JUN 13, 2006  
 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	6	4.86	196/1481	4.57	4.26	4.29	4.40	4.86	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	149/1481	4.64	4.26	4.23	4.29	4.86	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	184/1249	4.77	4.37	4.27	4.36	4.83	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	2	3	4.14	863/1424	4.29	4.27	4.21	4.28	4.14	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	2	4	4.43	363/1396	4.36	4.07	3.98	3.94	4.43	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	104/1342	4.56	4.12	4.07	4.05	4.83	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	1	5	4.57	378/1459	4.43	4.19	4.16	4.17	4.57	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1480	5.00	4.64	4.68	4.68	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1450	4.50	4.10	4.09	4.15	5.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	290/1409	4.70	4.46	4.42	4.47	4.83	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	659/1407	4.85	4.77	4.69	4.78	4.83	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	212/1399	4.54	4.30	4.26	4.29	4.80	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1400	4.79	4.35	4.27	4.34	5.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	1	1	0	2	0	1	3.00	1041/1179	3.50	3.94	3.96	4.05	3.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	995/1262	3.75	4.18	4.05	4.11	3.50	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	1094/1259	3.95	4.40	4.29	4.34	3.50	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	901/1256	4.20	4.34	4.30	4.28	4.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	5	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 788	4.00	4.03	4.00	3.98	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 246	****	4.26	4.20	4.51	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 249	****	4.08	4.11	4.32	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 242	****	4.45	4.40	4.63	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 240	****	4.37	4.20	4.58	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 217	****	4.42	4.04	4.28	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 68	****	4.66	4.49	5.00	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 69	****	4.26	4.53	4.83	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 63	****	4.24	4.44	4.00	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 69	****	4.19	4.35	4.72	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 68	****	3.98	3.92	3.55	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 59	****	3.92	4.30	4.67	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 51	****	4.04	4.00	4.07	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 36	****	5.00	4.60	4.64	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 41	****	3.68	4.26	4.69	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 31	****	3.50	4.42	4.80	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 55	****	3.90	4.55	4.44	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 31	****	4.28	4.75	4.50	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 51	****	4.42	4.65	4.66	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 34	****	4.50	4.83	4.43	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 24	****	4.50	4.82	5.00	****	

Course-Section: GERM 201 0201  
 Title INTERMEDIATE GERMAN I  
 Instructor: WOLFF, XENIA  
 Enrollment: 9  
 Questionnaires: 7

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2006

Page 839  
 JUN 13, 2006  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	3	Required for Majors	6	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	1						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	3	C	2	General	1	Under-grad	7	Non-major	1
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	2	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	1				
				?	0						

Course-Section: GERM 202 0101  
 Title INTERMEDIATE GERMAN II  
 Instructor: WOLFF, XENIA  
 Enrollment: 6  
 Questionnaires: 6

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2006

Page 840  
 JUN 13, 2006  
 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	6	5.00	1/1481	5.00	4.26	4.29	4.40	5.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	162/1481	4.83	4.26	4.23	4.29	4.83	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1249	5.00	4.37	4.27	4.36	5.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1424	5.00	4.27	4.21	4.28	5.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	193/1396	4.67	4.07	3.98	3.94	4.67	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	104/1342	4.83	4.12	4.07	4.05	4.83	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	0	5	4.67	276/1459	4.67	4.19	4.16	4.17	4.67	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1480	5.00	4.64	4.68	4.68	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1450	5.00	4.10	4.09	4.15	5.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1409	5.00	4.46	4.42	4.47	5.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1407	5.00	4.77	4.69	4.78	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1399	5.00	4.30	4.26	4.29	5.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	218/1400	4.83	4.35	4.27	4.34	4.83	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	1	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1179	5.00	3.94	3.96	4.05	5.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	264/1262	4.67	4.18	4.05	4.11	4.67	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1259	5.00	4.40	4.29	4.34	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1256	5.00	4.34	4.30	4.28	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	3	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	133/ 788	4.67	4.03	4.00	3.98	4.67	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 3	Required for Majors	1 Graduate 0 Major 0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	B 2		
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	C 0	General	1 Under-grad 6 Non-major 0
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	3
			? 0		



Course-Section: GERM 302 0101  
 Title ADVANCED GERMAN II  
 Instructor: MAY, BRIGITTE  
 Enrollment: 13  
 Questionnaires: 12

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2006

Page 841  
 JUN 13, 2006  
 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	6	4.50	549/1481	4.50	4.26	4.29	4.29	4.50	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	4	8	4.67	324/1481	4.67	4.26	4.23	4.23	4.67	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	10	4.83	184/1249	4.83	4.37	4.27	4.28	4.83	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	122/1424	4.92	4.27	4.21	4.27	4.92	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	7	4	4.25	502/1396	4.25	4.07	3.98	4.00	4.25	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	6	6	4.50	303/1342	4.50	4.12	4.07	4.12	4.50	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	1	2	3	5	3.83	1101/1459	3.83	4.19	4.16	4.17	3.83	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	2	2	7	1	3.58	1450/1480	3.58	4.64	4.68	4.65	3.58	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	4	7	4.64	238/1450	4.64	4.10	4.09	4.10	4.64	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	1	2	8	4.64	603/1409	4.64	4.46	4.42	4.43	4.64	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1407	5.00	4.77	4.69	4.67	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	129/1399	4.91	4.30	4.26	4.27	4.91	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	2	9	4.82	239/1400	4.82	4.35	4.27	4.28	4.82	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	8	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/1179	****	3.94	3.96	4.02	****	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	205/1262	4.75	4.18	4.05	4.14	4.75	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	238/1259	4.88	4.40	4.29	4.34	4.88	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	0	0	3	5	4.63	496/1256	4.63	4.34	4.30	4.34	4.63	
4. Were special techniques successful	4	1	0	0	1	2	4	4.43	209/ 788	4.43	4.03	4.00	4.07	4.43	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	A	6	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	1	Major	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	4						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	1	C	0	General	1	Under-grad	11	Non-major	2
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00	6	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	9				
				?	1						

Course-Section: GERM 312 0101  
 Title INTRO GERM LIT/CULT II  
 Instructor: MAY, BRIGITTE  
 Enrollment: 10  
 Questionnaires: 10

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2006

Page 842  
 JUN 13, 2006  
 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	6	4.60	461/1481	4.60	4.26	4.29	4.29	4.60	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	4	6	4.60	399/1481	4.60	4.26	4.23	4.23	4.60	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	203/1249	4.80	4.37	4.27	4.28	4.80	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	136/1424	4.90	4.27	4.21	4.27	4.90	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1396	5.00	4.07	3.98	4.00	5.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	86/1342	4.90	4.12	4.07	4.12	4.90	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	101/1459	4.90	4.19	4.16	4.17	4.90	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	839/1480	4.80	4.64	4.68	4.65	4.80	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	99/1450	4.90	4.10	4.09	4.10	4.90	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1409	5.00	4.46	4.42	4.43	5.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1407	5.00	4.77	4.69	4.67	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1399	5.00	4.30	4.26	4.27	5.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1400	5.00	4.35	4.27	4.28	5.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	0	1	3	5	4.44	307/1179	4.44	3.94	3.96	4.02	4.44	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1262	5.00	4.18	4.05	4.14	5.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1259	5.00	4.40	4.29	4.34	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	272/1256	4.83	4.34	4.30	4.34	4.83	
4. Were special techniques successful	4	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/ 788	5.00	4.03	4.00	4.07	5.00	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 3	Required for Majors	0
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	B 4		Graduate 0
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	C 1	General	0
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad 10
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	9
			? 1		

Course-Section: GERM 319 0101  
 Title GERMAN TRANSLATION  
 Instructor: SUTTON, SUSANNE  
 Enrollment: 8  
 Questionnaires: 5

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2006

Page 843  
 JUN 13, 2006  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	461/1481	4.60	4.26	4.29	4.29	4.60	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	183/1481	4.80	4.26	4.23	4.23	4.80	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	245/1249	4.75	4.37	4.27	4.28	4.75	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	178/1424	4.80	4.27	4.21	4.27	4.80	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1396	5.00	4.07	3.98	4.00	5.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1342	5.00	4.12	4.07	4.12	5.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	0	0	0	4	4.20	827/1459	4.20	4.19	4.16	4.17	4.20	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1480	5.00	4.64	4.68	4.65	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	334/1450	4.50	4.10	4.09	4.10	4.50	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	417/1409	4.75	4.46	4.42	4.43	4.75	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1407	5.00	4.77	4.69	4.67	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1399	5.00	4.30	4.26	4.27	5.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	591/1400	4.50	4.35	4.27	4.28	4.50	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	2	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	894/1179	3.50	3.94	3.96	4.02	3.50	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1262	5.00	4.18	4.05	4.14	5.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	358/1259	4.75	4.40	4.29	4.34	4.75	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1256	5.00	4.34	4.30	4.34	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	1	1	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	394/ 788	4.00	4.03	4.00	4.07	4.00	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 2	Required for Majors	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	B 1		Graduate 0
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	C 1	General	1
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad 5
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 421 0101  
 Title STUDIES IN GERMAN LIT  
 Instructor: LARKEY, EDWARD  
 Enrollment: 3  
 Questionnaires: 2

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2006

Page 844  
 JUN 13, 2006  
 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	
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1481	5.00	4.26	4.29	4.45	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	517/1481	4.50	4.26	4.23	4.32	4.50
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1249	5.00	4.37	4.27	4.44	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1424	5.00	4.27	4.21	4.35	5.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1396	5.00	4.07	3.98	4.09	5.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1342	5.00	4.12	4.07	4.21	5.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1459	5.00	4.19	4.16	4.25	5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1480	5.00	4.64	4.68	4.74	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	334/1450	4.50	4.10	4.09	4.28	4.50
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1409	5.00	4.46	4.42	4.51	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1407	5.00	4.77	4.69	4.79	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1399	5.00	4.30	4.26	4.36	5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1400	5.00	4.35	4.27	4.38	5.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1179	5.00	3.94	3.96	4.07	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	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	1						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	1	General	0	Under-grad	2	Non-major	0
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	1	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 621 0101  
 Title STUDIES GERM POP CULTU  
 Instructor: LARKEY, EDWARD  
 Enrollment: 1  
 Questionnaires: 1

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2006

Page 845  
 JUN 13, 2006  
 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	1/1481	5.00	4.26	4.29	4.28	5.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1481	5.00	4.26	4.23	4.11	5.00	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1249	5.00	4.37	4.27	4.24	5.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1424	5.00	4.27	4.21	4.16	5.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1396	5.00	4.07	3.98	4.00	5.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1342	5.00	4.12	4.07	4.18	5.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1459	5.00	4.19	4.16	4.01	5.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1480	5.00	4.64	4.68	4.74	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1450	5.00	4.10	4.09	3.96	5.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1409	5.00	4.46	4.42	4.36	5.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1407	5.00	4.77	4.69	4.73	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1399	5.00	4.30	4.26	4.16	5.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1400	5.00	4.35	4.27	4.17	5.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	590/1179	4.00	3.94	3.96	3.81	4.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1262	5.00	4.18	4.05	4.07	5.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1259	5.00	4.40	4.29	4.30	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1256	5.00	4.34	4.30	4.33	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 788	5.00	4.03	4.00	3.97	5.00	

Frequency Distribution

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