

Course-Section: ANCS 150 0101
 Title WORD ROOTS LATIN/GREEK
 Instructor: MASON, RICHARD
 Enrollment: 87
 Questionnaires: 23

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 42
 JUN 14, 2005
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	1	0	4	5	12	4.23	927/1504	4.23	4.26	4.27	4.13	4.23
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	1	0	3	8	10	4.18	919/1503	4.18	4.02	4.20	4.16	4.18
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	6	15	4.64	378/1290	4.64	4.31	4.28	4.19	4.64
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	16	0	0	1	2	3	4.33	680/1453	4.33	4.23	4.21	4.11	4.33
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	5	2	0	4	3	8	3.88	879/1421	3.88	4.28	4.00	3.91	3.88
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	15	0	0	1	2	4	4.43	395/1365	4.43	4.18	4.08	3.96	4.43
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	1	2	3	16	4.55	412/1485	4.55	4.27	4.16	4.13	4.55
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	5	17	4.77	866/1504	4.77	4.63	4.69	4.66	4.77
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	1	0	1	6	7	4	3.78	1111/1483	3.78	4.04	4.06	3.97	3.78
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	1	0	3	8	9	4.14	1105/1425	4.14	4.37	4.41	4.36	4.14
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	2	0	7	12	4.38	1207/1426	4.38	4.81	4.69	4.56	4.38
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	1	0	1	7	12	4.38	727/1418	4.38	4.40	4.25	4.20	4.38
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	3	1	2	8	7	3.71	1184/1416	3.71	4.39	4.26	4.21	3.71
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	18	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/1199	****	3.65	3.97	3.82	****
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	15	0	4	0	3	0	1	2.25	1278/1312	2.25	3.54	4.00	3.69	2.25
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	16	0	0	0	1	2	4	4.43	652/1303	4.43	4.23	4.24	3.93	4.43
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	17	0	0	0	1	0	5	4.67	445/1299	4.67	4.62	4.25	3.94	4.67

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	5	0.00-0.99	0	A	7	Required for Majors	14	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	6	1.00-1.99	0	B	10						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	4	C	3	General	5	Under-grad	23	Non-major	23
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	4	D	1						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	6	F	0	Electives	3	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	0						

Course-Section: ANCS 201 0101
 Title THE ANCIENT GREEKS
 Instructor: MASON, RICHARD
 Enrollment: 89
 Questionnaires: 56

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 43
 JUN 14, 2005
 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	2	0	1	1	5	14	33	4.43	669/1504	4.43	4.26	4.27	4.26	4.43
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	4	7	18	26	4.20	910/1503	4.20	4.02	4.20	4.18	4.20
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	0	1	1	7	14	31	4.35	691/1290	4.35	4.31	4.28	4.27	4.35
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	44	0	0	2	1	7	4.50	****/1453	****	4.23	4.21	4.20	****
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	0	3	2	5	15	29	4.20	587/1421	4.20	4.28	4.00	3.90	4.20
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	49	0	0	2	0	3	4.20	****/1365	****	4.18	4.08	4.00	****
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	0	4	12	38	4.56	391/1485	4.56	4.27	4.16	4.15	4.56
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	0	0	0	0	15	38	4.72	940/1504	4.72	4.63	4.69	4.68	4.72
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	10	0	0	0	6	18	22	4.35	530/1483	4.35	4.04	4.06	4.02	4.35
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	2	16	35	4.62	634/1425	4.62	4.37	4.41	4.40	4.62
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	2	52	4.96	201/1426	4.96	4.81	4.69	4.71	4.96
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	1	0	4	19	29	4.42	695/1418	4.42	4.40	4.25	4.22	4.42
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	0	1	10	42	4.70	394/1416	4.70	4.39	4.26	4.24	4.70
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	8	4	3	13	11	15	3.65	864/1199	3.65	3.65	3.97	3.95	3.65
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	45	0	4	2	2	1	2	2.55	****/1312	****	3.54	4.00	3.98	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	44	0	3	1	3	2	3	3.08	****/1303	****	4.23	4.24	4.23	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	44	0	2	0	0	0	10	4.33	****/1299	****	4.62	4.25	4.21	****
4. Were special techniques successful	45	10	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 758	****	3.48	4.01	3.89	****
Self Paced														
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	55	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 20	****	****	4.24	5.00	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	6	0.00-0.99 0	A 23	Required for Majors	34
28-55	9	1.00-1.99 0	B 19		Graduate 0
56-83	11	2.00-2.99 8	C 6	General	8
84-150	9	3.00-3.49 10	D 0		Under-grad 56
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 16	F 0	Electives	4
			P 3		
			I 0		
			? 1	Other	7

- Means there are not enough responses to be significant

Course-Section: ANCS 204 0101
 Title MASTERPIECES OF ANC LI
 Instructor: MASON, RICHARD
 Enrollment: 15
 Questionnaires: 11

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 44
 JUN 14, 2005
 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	7	4.55	495/1504	4.55	4.26	4.27	4.26	4.55
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	4	3	4	4.00	1052/1503	4.00	4.02	4.20	4.18	4.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	4	5	4.27	766/1290	4.27	4.31	4.28	4.27	4.27
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	5	5	4.50	440/1453	4.50	4.23	4.21	4.20	4.50
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1421	5.00	4.28	4.00	3.90	5.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	6	4	4.27	558/1365	4.27	4.18	4.08	4.00	4.27
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	2	2	6	4.18	842/1485	4.18	4.27	4.16	4.15	4.18
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	6	5	4.45	1130/1504	4.45	4.63	4.69	4.68	4.45
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	8	2	4.20	700/1483	4.20	4.04	4.06	4.02	4.20
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	5	6	4.55	736/1425	4.55	4.37	4.41	4.40	4.55
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1426	5.00	4.81	4.69	4.71	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	4	7	4.64	414/1418	4.64	4.40	4.25	4.22	4.64
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	9	4.82	243/1416	4.82	4.39	4.26	4.24	4.82
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	8	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/1199	****	3.65	3.97	3.95	****
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	111/1312	4.90	3.54	4.00	3.98	4.90
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	197/1303	4.90	4.23	4.24	4.23	4.90
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	1	2	7	4.60	504/1299	4.60	4.62	4.25	4.21	4.60
4. Were special techniques successful	1	6	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	304/ 758	4.25	3.48	4.01	3.89	4.25

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	7	Required for Majors	3	Graduate	0	Major	3
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	3						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	3	C	0	General	3	Under-grad	11	Non-major	8
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	3				
				?	1						

Course-Section: ANCS 220 0101
 Title JUDAISM: JESUS & HILLE
 Instructor: KIRSCH, DANIEL
 Enrollment: 37
 Questionnaires: 28

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 45
 JUN 14, 2005
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	1	9	12	6	3.82	1234/1504	3.82	4.26	4.27	4.26	3.82
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	4	8	9	7	3.68	1243/1503	3.68	4.02	4.20	4.18	3.68
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	2	1	0	7	9	9	3.96	971/1290	3.96	4.31	4.28	4.27	3.96
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	1	2	5	11	8	3.85	1136/1453	3.85	4.23	4.21	4.20	3.85
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	1	5	10	11	4.04	725/1421	4.04	4.28	4.00	3.90	4.04
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	5	0	2	6	9	6	3.83	954/1365	3.83	4.18	4.08	4.00	3.83
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	3	8	5	11	3.79	1158/1485	3.79	4.27	4.16	4.15	3.79
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	12	16	4.57	1047/1504	4.57	4.63	4.69	4.68	4.57
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	1	6	14	4	3.84	1051/1483	3.84	4.04	4.06	4.02	3.84
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	1	4	11	11	4.19	1082/1425	4.19	4.37	4.41	4.40	4.19
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	3	24	4.89	549/1426	4.89	4.81	4.69	4.71	4.89
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	1	5	10	11	4.15	947/1418	4.15	4.40	4.25	4.22	4.15
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	7	4	16	4.33	806/1416	4.33	4.39	4.26	4.24	4.33
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	22	1	0	1	1	2	3.60	****/1199	****	3.65	3.97	3.95	****
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	11	0	1	2	5	6	3	3.47	1023/1312	3.47	3.54	4.00	3.98	3.47
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	11	0	1	4	4	4	4	3.35	1149/1303	3.35	4.23	4.24	4.23	3.35
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	11	0	0	0	1	5	11	4.59	517/1299	4.59	4.62	4.25	4.21	4.59
4. Were special techniques successful	11	10	1	1	4	1	0	2.71	725/ 758	2.71	3.48	4.01	3.89	2.71

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	0	A	8	Required for Majors	9	Graduate	0	Major	3
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	1	B	18						
56-83	5	2.00-2.99	1	C	1	General	8	Under-grad	28	Non-major	25
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	8	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	9				
				?	0						