

Course-Section: GERM 101 0101  
 Title ELEMENTARY GERMAN I  
 Instructor: KWIATKOWSKI, SA  
 Enrollment: 24  
 Questionnaires: 14

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2005

Page 933  
 JAN 21, 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	5	5	4.07	1139/1674	4.41	4.23	4.27	4.07	4.07	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	3	7	3	3.86	1305/1674	4.27	4.26	4.23	4.16	3.86	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	5	6	4.21	878/1423	4.36	4.36	4.27	4.16	4.21	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	5	1	0	1	3	4	4.00	1094/1609	4.11	4.23	4.22	4.05	4.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	1	1	2	6	3	3.69	1100/1585	4.06	4.04	3.96	3.88	3.69	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	2	1	0	2	6	3	3.83	1083/1535	3.92	4.08	4.08	3.89	3.83	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	2	10	1	3.79	1303/1651	4.08	4.20	4.18	4.10	3.79	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	8	6	4.43	1289/1673	4.59	4.65	4.69	4.67	4.43	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	1	0	4	5	0	3.30	1455/1656	3.86	4.06	4.07	3.96	3.30	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	4	4	5	4.08	1265/1586	4.47	4.43	4.43	4.37	4.08	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	7	7	4.50	1225/1585	4.72	4.72	4.69	4.60	4.50	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	1	4	6	2	3.69	1336/1582	4.15	4.30	4.26	4.17	3.69	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	0	4	2	6	3.92	1200/1575	4.36	4.32	4.27	4.17	3.92	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	1	1	2	4	4	1	3.17	1190/1380	3.72	3.94	3.94	3.78	3.17	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	1	3	2	5	3.75	1027/1520	3.98	4.14	4.01	3.76	3.75	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	2	1	3	6	4.08	999/1515	4.28	4.37	4.24	3.97	4.08	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	1	1	3	2	5	3.75	1221/1511	3.94	4.37	4.27	4.00	3.75	
4. Were special techniques successful	2	2	0	1	3	2	4	3.90	568/ 994	3.88	3.97	3.94	3.73	3.90	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	A 3	Required for Majors	3
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	B 6		Graduate 0
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	C 3	General	5
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	D 0		14
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	3
			P 1		### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	1
			? 0		

Course-Section: GERM 101 0201  
 Title ELEMENTARY GERMAN I  
 Instructor: SUTTON, SUSANNE  
 Enrollment: 27  
 Questionnaires: 16

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2005

Page 934  
 JAN 21, 2006  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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	12	4.75	298/1674	4.41	4.23	4.27	4.07	4.75	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	3	12	4.69	352/1674	4.27	4.26	4.23	4.16	4.69	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	4	10	4.50	575/1423	4.36	4.36	4.27	4.16	4.50	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	1	9	4	4.21	905/1609	4.11	4.23	4.22	4.05	4.21	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	7	8	4.44	386/1585	4.06	4.04	3.96	3.88	4.44	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	5	6	5	4.00	870/1535	3.92	4.08	4.08	3.89	4.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	2	6	8	4.38	713/1651	4.08	4.20	4.18	4.10	4.38	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	4	12	4.75	958/1673	4.59	4.65	4.69	4.67	4.75	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	0	8	6	4.43	493/1656	3.86	4.06	4.07	3.96	4.43	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	2	13	4.87	284/1586	4.47	4.43	4.43	4.37	4.87	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	1	14	4.93	397/1585	4.72	4.72	4.69	4.60	4.93	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	1	4	10	4.60	525/1582	4.15	4.30	4.26	4.17	4.60	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	3	12	4.80	279/1575	4.36	4.32	4.27	4.17	4.80	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	0	3	5	7	4.27	480/1380	3.72	3.94	3.94	3.78	4.27	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	0	1	6	7	4.20	700/1520	3.98	4.14	4.01	3.76	4.20	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	3	2	10	4.47	681/1515	4.28	4.37	4.24	3.97	4.47	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	1	3	4	7	4.13	997/1511	3.94	4.37	4.27	4.00	4.13	
4. Were special techniques successful	1	0	1	0	3	7	4	3.87	586/ 994	3.88	3.97	3.94	3.73	3.87	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	15	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 265	****	4.06	4.23	3.97	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	15	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 278	****	4.21	4.19	3.97	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	15	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 260	****	4.43	4.46	4.41	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 259	****	4.21	4.33	4.19	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	15	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 233	****	4.36	4.20	4.00	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	15	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 103	****	4.39	4.41	4.33	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 99	****	4.36	4.39	4.10	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	15	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 97	****	3.76	4.14	3.69	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 76	****	3.36	3.98	3.32	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	15	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 77	****	3.65	3.93	3.42	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 53	****	4.19	4.45	4.34	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 48	****	3.86	4.12	4.00	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	15	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 49	****	3.74	4.27	4.30	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 61	****	4.03	4.09	3.87	****	

Course-Section: GERM 101 0201  
 Title ELEMENTARY GERMAN I  
 Instructor: SUTTON, SUSANNE  
 Enrollment: 27  
 Questionnaires: 16

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2005

Page 934  
 JAN 21, 2006  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: GERM 102 0101  
 Title ELEMENTARY GERMAN II  
 Instructor: SUTTON, SUSANNE  
 Enrollment: 19  
 Questionnaires: 13

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2005

Page 935  
 JAN 21, 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	1	2	4	6	4.15	1066/1674	4.08	4.23	4.27	4.07	4.15	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	4	6	4.23	956/1674	4.32	4.26	4.23	4.16	4.23	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	3	7	4.31	803/1423	4.45	4.36	4.27	4.16	4.31	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	6	4	4.08	1048/1609	4.14	4.23	4.22	4.05	4.08	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	1	3	4	4	3.92	893/1585	4.01	4.04	3.96	3.88	3.92	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	2	7	3	3.85	1074/1535	4.02	4.08	4.08	3.89	3.85	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	2	2	8	4.31	809/1651	4.45	4.20	4.18	4.10	4.31	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	6	7	4.54	1182/1673	4.72	4.65	4.69	4.67	4.54	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	1	0	0	3	7	2	3.92	1107/1656	3.96	4.06	4.07	3.96	3.92	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	6	6	4.50	858/1586	4.50	4.43	4.43	4.37	4.50	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	2	10	4.83	737/1585	4.87	4.72	4.69	4.60	4.83	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	1	1	4	6	4.25	935/1582	4.28	4.30	4.26	4.17	4.25	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	0	1	4	6	4.17	1040/1575	4.13	4.32	4.27	4.17	4.17	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	1	0	0	5	4	2	3.73	923/1380	3.80	3.94	3.94	3.78	3.73	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	3	1	0	4	5	3.54	1157/1520	3.71	4.14	4.01	3.76	3.54	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	3	0	10	4.54	603/1515	4.44	4.37	4.24	3.97	4.54	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	1	2	1	9	4.38	769/1511	4.32	4.37	4.27	4.00	4.38	
4. Were special techniques successful	0	1	0	1	1	6	4	4.08	450/ 994	3.92	3.97	3.94	3.73	4.08	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	A 2	Required for Majors	9
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	B 2		Graduate 0
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	C 4	General	13
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	D 3		Non-major 5
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	0
			P 1		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	2
			? 0		

Course-Section: GERM 102 0201  
 Title ELEMENTARY GERMAN II  
 Instructor: SUTTON, SUSANNE  
 Enrollment: 17  
 Questionnaires: 10

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2005

Page 936  
 JAN 21, 2006  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	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	1	2	3	4	4.00	1196/1674	4.08	4.23	4.27	4.07	4.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	4	5	4.40	737/1674	4.32	4.26	4.23	4.16	4.40	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	0	8	4.60	459/1423	4.45	4.36	4.27	4.16	4.60	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	3	5	4.20	930/1609	4.14	4.23	4.22	4.05	4.20	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	1	0	1	2	5	4.11	692/1585	4.01	4.04	3.96	3.88	4.11	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	1	3	5	4.20	737/1535	4.02	4.08	4.08	3.89	4.20	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	0	1	8	4.60	393/1651	4.45	4.20	4.18	4.10	4.60	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	706/1673	4.72	4.65	4.69	4.67	4.90	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	0	2	1	2	4.00	955/1656	3.96	4.06	4.07	3.96	4.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	1	0	2	7	4.50	858/1586	4.50	4.43	4.43	4.37	4.50	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	567/1585	4.87	4.72	4.69	4.60	4.90	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	1	1	2	6	4.30	882/1582	4.28	4.30	4.26	4.17	4.30	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	1	4	4	4.10	1100/1575	4.13	4.32	4.27	4.17	4.10	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	1	0	1	2	2	3	3.88	817/1380	3.80	3.94	3.94	3.78	3.88	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	0	2	2	4	3.89	936/1520	3.71	4.14	4.01	3.76	3.89	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	3	0	6	4.33	827/1515	4.44	4.37	4.24	3.97	4.33	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	3	0	5	4.25	896/1511	4.32	4.37	4.27	4.00	4.25	
4. Were special techniques successful	1	1	2	0	0	2	4	3.75	638/ 994	3.92	3.97	3.94	3.73	3.75	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 265	****	4.06	4.23	3.97	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 278	****	4.21	4.19	3.97	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 260	****	4.43	4.46	4.41	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 259	****	4.21	4.33	4.19	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 233	****	4.36	4.20	4.00	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	9	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 103	****	4.39	4.41	4.33	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	9	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 101	****	4.33	4.48	4.18	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 95	****	4.15	4.31	3.99	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 99	****	4.36	4.39	4.10	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	9	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 97	****	3.76	4.14	3.69	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 76	****	3.36	3.98	3.32	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	9	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 77	****	3.65	3.93	3.42	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	9	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 53	****	4.19	4.45	4.34	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	9	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 48	****	3.86	4.12	4.00	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	9	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 49	****	3.74	4.27	4.30	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 61	****	4.03	4.09	3.87	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	9	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 52	****	4.21	4.26	3.91	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	9	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 50	****	4.23	4.44	4.39	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	9	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 35	****	4.22	4.36	3.92	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	9	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 31	****	4.25	4.34	3.88	****	

Course-Section: GERM 102 0201  
 Title ELEMENTARY GERMAN II  
 Instructor: SUTTON, SUSANNE  
 Enrollment: 17  
 Questionnaires: 10

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2005

Page 936  
 JAN 21, 2006  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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	1	1.00-1.99	1	B	4						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	0	C	2	General	3	Under-grad	10	Non-major	3
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	1						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	1						

Course-Section: GERM 201 0101  
 Title INTERMEDIATE GERMAN I  
 Instructor: XIE, WEI  
 Enrollment: 21  
 Questionnaires: 13

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2005

Page 937  
 JAN 21, 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	1	3	5	4	3.92	1296/1674	4.27	4.23	4.27	4.32	3.92	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	1	3	3	5	3.77	1364/1674	4.20	4.26	4.23	4.26	3.77	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	3	9	4.62	445/1423	4.61	4.36	4.27	4.36	4.62	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	3	2	6	4.27	825/1609	4.36	4.23	4.22	4.23	4.27	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	3	0	0	1	3	6	4.50	326/1585	4.44	4.04	3.96	3.91	4.50	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	4	1	7	4.25	667/1535	4.06	4.08	4.08	4.03	4.25	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	2	4	7	4.38	700/1651	4.47	4.20	4.18	4.20	4.38	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	2	9	2	4.00	1566/1673	4.47	4.65	4.69	4.67	4.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	1	2	4	2	3.78	1222/1656	4.03	4.06	4.07	4.10	3.78	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	1	3	4	5	4.00	1300/1586	4.32	4.43	4.43	4.48	4.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	5	7	4.46	1258/1585	4.62	4.72	4.69	4.76	4.46	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	3	4	6	4.23	956/1582	4.44	4.30	4.26	4.35	4.23	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	2	1	4	6	4.08	1111/1575	4.35	4.32	4.27	4.39	4.08	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	4	0	0	1	3	5	4.44	348/1380	4.22	3.94	3.94	4.03	4.44	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	0	2	4	4	3.91	924/1520	3.83	4.14	4.01	4.03	3.91	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	1	3	7	4.55	594/1515	4.40	4.37	4.24	4.28	4.55	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	2	3	5	4.30	845/1511	4.15	4.37	4.27	4.28	4.30	
4. Were special techniques successful	3	2	1	0	0	3	4	4.13	432/ 994	3.92	3.97	3.94	3.98	4.13	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 265	****	4.06	4.23	4.34	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 278	****	4.21	4.19	4.36	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 260	****	4.43	4.46	4.51	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 259	****	4.21	4.33	4.42	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 233	****	4.36	4.20	4.48	****	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: GERM 201 0201  
 Title INTERMEDIATE GERMAN I  
 Instructor: WOLFF, XENIA  
 Enrollment: 19  
 Questionnaires: 18

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2005

Page 938  
 JAN 21, 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	2	0	0	0	2	2	12	4.63	458/1674	4.27	4.23	4.27	4.32	4.63	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	0	0	1	4	11	4.63	433/1674	4.20	4.26	4.23	4.26	4.63	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	3	0	0	0	2	2	11	4.60	459/1423	4.61	4.36	4.27	4.36	4.60	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	0	0	0	2	5	9	4.44	598/1609	4.36	4.23	4.22	4.23	4.44	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	3	4	9	4.38	442/1585	4.44	4.04	3.96	3.91	4.38	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	1	4	3	7	3.88	1048/1535	4.06	4.08	4.08	4.03	3.88	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	0	2	3	11	4.56	445/1651	4.47	4.20	4.18	4.20	4.56	
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	1	15	4.94	494/1673	4.47	4.65	4.69	4.67	4.94	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	2	6	6	4.29	680/1656	4.03	4.06	4.07	4.10	4.29	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	0	0	0	5	9	4.64	693/1586	4.32	4.43	4.43	4.48	4.64	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	0	0	3	11	4.79	853/1585	4.62	4.72	4.69	4.76	4.79	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	0	0	0	5	9	4.64	467/1582	4.44	4.30	4.26	4.35	4.64	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	5	8	4.62	565/1575	4.35	4.32	4.27	4.39	4.62	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	6	0	0	3	2	3	4.00	666/1380	4.22	3.94	3.94	4.03	4.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	10	0	1	0	2	2	3	3.75	1027/1520	3.83	4.14	4.01	4.03	3.75	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	10	0	1	0	1	0	6	4.25	898/1515	4.40	4.37	4.24	4.28	4.25	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	10	0	1	0	1	2	4	4.00	1050/1511	4.15	4.37	4.27	4.28	4.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	10	1	1	0	2	1	3	3.71	657/ 994	3.92	3.97	3.94	3.98	3.71	

Frequency Distribution

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



Course-Section: GERM 202 0101  
 Title INTERMEDIATE GERMAN II  
 Instructor: WOLFF, XENIA  
 Enrollment: 12  
 Questionnaires: 12

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2005

Page 939  
 JAN 21, 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	10	4.83	214/1674	4.83	4.23	4.27	4.32	4.83	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	9	4.75	270/1674	4.75	4.26	4.23	4.26	4.75	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	9	4.75	262/1423	4.75	4.36	4.27	4.36	4.75	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/1609	5.00	4.23	4.22	4.23	5.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	2	9	4.67	224/1585	4.67	4.04	3.96	3.91	4.67	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	0	11	4.83	119/1535	4.83	4.08	4.08	4.03	4.83	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	1	1	9	4.50	524/1651	4.50	4.20	4.18	4.20	4.50	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/1673	5.00	4.65	4.69	4.67	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	4	8	4.67	257/1656	4.67	4.06	4.07	4.10	4.67	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	214/1586	4.91	4.43	4.43	4.48	4.91	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1585	5.00	4.72	4.69	4.76	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1582	5.00	4.30	4.26	4.35	5.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	3	7	4.55	646/1575	4.55	4.32	4.27	4.39	4.55	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	0	1	3	7	4.55	278/1380	4.55	3.94	3.94	4.03	4.55	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	2	0	9	4.64	316/1520	4.64	4.14	4.01	4.03	4.64	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1515	5.00	4.37	4.24	4.28	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	2	9	4.82	346/1511	4.82	4.37	4.27	4.28	4.82	
4. Were special techniques successful	1	1	0	1	0	4	5	4.30	337/ 994	4.30	3.97	3.94	3.98	4.30	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	3	0.00-0.99 0	A 7	Required for Majors	0
28-55	2	1.00-1.99 0	B 3		Graduate 1
56-83	0	2.00-2.99 1	C 0	General	3
84-150	4	3.00-3.49 1	D 0		Under-grad 11
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00 6	F 0	Electives	2
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	6
			? 1		

Course-Section: GERM 301 0101  
 Title ADVANCED GERMAN I  
 Instructor: MAY, BRIGITTE  
 Enrollment: 19  
 Questionnaires: 14

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2005

Page 940  
 JAN 21, 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	5	9	4.64	432/1674	4.64	4.23	4.27	4.26	4.64	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	4	10	4.71	314/1674	4.71	4.26	4.23	4.21	4.71	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	4	8	4.43	672/1423	4.43	4.36	4.27	4.27	4.43	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	6	8	4.57	408/1609	4.57	4.23	4.22	4.27	4.57	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	1	6	5	4.33	482/1585	4.33	4.04	3.96	3.95	4.33	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	3	9	4.75	169/1535	4.75	4.08	4.08	4.15	4.75	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	0	3	1	8	4.42	658/1651	4.42	4.20	4.18	4.16	4.42	
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	7	5	4.42	1300/1673	4.42	4.65	4.69	4.68	4.42	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	3	10	4.77	178/1656	4.77	4.06	4.07	4.07	4.77	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	4	9	4.57	784/1586	4.57	4.43	4.43	4.42	4.57	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	14	5.00	1/1585	5.00	4.72	4.69	4.66	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	5	9	4.64	467/1582	4.64	4.30	4.26	4.26	4.64	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	13	4.93	137/1575	4.93	4.32	4.27	4.25	4.93	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	8	0	1	1	3	1	3.67	962/1380	3.67	3.94	3.94	4.01	3.67	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	3	5	4.63	323/1520	4.63	4.14	4.01	4.09	4.63	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1515	5.00	4.37	4.24	4.32	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	278/1511	4.88	4.37	4.27	4.34	4.88	
4. Were special techniques successful	6	1	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	178/ 994	4.57	3.97	3.94	3.96	4.57	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 103	****	4.39	4.41	4.10	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 101	****	4.33	4.48	4.30	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 95	****	4.15	4.31	3.91	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 99	****	4.36	4.39	4.29	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 97	****	3.76	4.14	3.48	****	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: GERM 303 0101  
 Title TOPICS IN GERMAN  
 Instructor: MAY, BRIGITTE  
 Enrollment: 16  
 Questionnaires: 13

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2005

Page 941  
 JAN 21, 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	4	8	4.54	570/1674	4.54	4.23	4.27	4.26	4.54	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	10	4.77	259/1674	4.77	4.26	4.23	4.21	4.77	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	12	4.92	105/1423	4.92	4.36	4.27	4.27	4.92	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	10	4.77	212/1609	4.77	4.23	4.22	4.27	4.77	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	11	4.85	116/1585	4.85	4.04	3.96	3.95	4.85	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	3	8	4.46	427/1535	4.46	4.08	4.08	4.15	4.46	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	2	11	4.85	151/1651	4.85	4.20	4.18	4.16	4.85	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	1	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	635/1673	4.92	4.65	4.69	4.68	4.92	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	1	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1656	5.00	4.06	4.07	4.07	5.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	1	11	4.77	474/1586	4.77	4.43	4.43	4.42	4.77	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	2	11	4.85	713/1585	4.85	4.72	4.69	4.66	4.85	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	3	10	4.77	299/1582	4.77	4.30	4.26	4.26	4.77	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	11	4.85	235/1575	4.85	4.32	4.27	4.25	4.85	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	2	0	0	2	0	9	4.64	220/1380	4.64	3.94	3.94	4.01	4.64	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	213/1520	4.78	4.14	4.01	4.09	4.78	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	230/1515	4.89	4.37	4.24	4.32	4.89	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	266/1511	4.89	4.37	4.27	4.34	4.89	
4. Were special techniques successful	4	0	0	0	1	0	8	4.78	107/ 994	4.78	3.97	3.94	3.96	4.78	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 4	Required for Majors	0
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	B 5		Graduate 0
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	C 3	General	2
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad 13
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	1
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	7
			? 1		

Course-Section: GERM 481 0101  
 Title SEMINAR IN GERMAN  
 Instructor: MAY, BRIGITTE  
 Enrollment: 7  
 Questionnaires: 6

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2005

Page 942  
 JAN 21, 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	5	4.83	214/1674	4.83	4.23	4.27	4.42	4.83	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1674	5.00	4.26	4.23	4.31	5.00	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1423	5.00	4.36	4.27	4.34	5.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1609	5.00	4.23	4.22	4.30	5.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	121/1585	4.83	4.04	3.96	4.01	4.83	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1535	5.00	4.08	4.08	4.18	5.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	157/1651	4.83	4.20	4.18	4.23	4.83	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	832/1673	4.83	4.65	4.69	4.67	4.83	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1656	5.00	4.06	4.07	4.19	5.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1586	5.00	4.43	4.43	4.46	5.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1585	5.00	4.72	4.69	4.76	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1582	5.00	4.30	4.26	4.31	5.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1575	5.00	4.32	4.27	4.35	5.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1380	5.00	3.94	3.94	4.04	5.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1520	5.00	4.14	4.01	4.18	5.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1515	5.00	4.37	4.24	4.40	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	358/1511	4.80	4.37	4.27	4.45	4.80	
4. Were special techniques successful	1	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/ 994	5.00	3.97	3.94	4.19	5.00	

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
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	C 0	General	2
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad
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
			? 2		