

Course-Section: GREK 101 0101
 Title ELEMENTARY GREEK I
 Instructor: FREYMAN, JAY M
 Enrollment: 26
 Questionnaires: 14

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 946
 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	0	0	13	4.79	265/1674	4.79	4.23	4.27	4.07	4.79	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	4	8	4.36	803/1674	4.36	4.26	4.23	4.16	4.36	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	5	7	4.36	750/1423	4.36	4.36	4.27	4.16	4.36	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	0	0	3	8	4.73	252/1609	4.73	4.23	4.22	4.05	4.73	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	0	2	11	4.64	238/1585	4.64	4.04	3.96	3.88	4.64	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	1	0	0	2	10	4.54	346/1535	4.54	4.08	4.08	3.89	4.54	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	2	5	7	4.36	741/1651	4.36	4.20	4.18	4.10	4.36	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	9	5	4.36	1347/1673	4.36	4.65	4.69	4.67	4.36	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	2	1	0	0	4	6	4.27	693/1656	4.27	4.06	4.07	3.96	4.27	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	1	0	0	2	8	4.45	931/1586	4.45	4.43	4.43	4.37	4.45	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	1	0	10	4.82	786/1585	4.82	4.72	4.69	4.60	4.82	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	1	0	2	8	4.55	589/1582	4.55	4.30	4.26	4.17	4.55	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	1	0	0	1	9	4.55	646/1575	4.55	4.32	4.27	4.17	4.55	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	8	0	1	0	0	2	4.00	****/1380	****	3.94	3.94	3.78	****	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	295/1520	4.67	4.14	4.01	3.76	4.67	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	483/1515	4.67	4.37	4.24	3.97	4.67	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	323/1511	4.83	4.37	4.27	4.00	4.83	
4. Were special techniques successful	8	4	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 994	****	3.97	3.94	3.73	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	1	A	4	Required for Majors	3	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B	4						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	3	C	3	General	1	Under-grad	14	Non-major	1
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	0	D	2						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	9				
				?	0						

Course-Section: GREK 201 0101
 Title INTERMEDIATE GREEK
 Instructor: SHERWIN, WALTER
 Enrollment: 5
 Questionnaires: 3

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 947
 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	0	3	5.00	1/1674	5.00	4.23	4.27	4.32	5.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1674	5.00	4.26	4.23	4.26	5.00	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1423	5.00	4.36	4.27	4.36	5.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1609	5.00	4.23	4.22	4.23	5.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1585	5.00	4.04	3.96	3.91	5.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1535	5.00	4.08	4.08	4.03	5.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1651	5.00	4.20	4.18	4.20	5.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	1072/1673	4.67	4.65	4.69	4.67	4.67	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	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	0	2	5.00	1/1586	5.00	4.43	4.43	4.48	5.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	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	2	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	0	0	2	5.00	1/1575	5.00	4.32	4.27	4.39	5.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	397/1520	4.50	4.14	4.01	4.03	4.50	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1515	5.00	4.37	4.24	4.28	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1511	5.00	4.37	4.27	4.28	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	1	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	474/ 994	4.00	3.97	3.94	3.98	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	1	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	B 0						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	C 0	General	0	Under-grad	3	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	2				
			? 0						

Course-Section: GREK 371 0101
 Title HOMER
 Instructor: KOEHLER, CAROLY
 Enrollment: 12
 Questionnaires: 9

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 948
 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	8	4.89	167/1674	4.89	4.23	4.27	4.26	4.89	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	153/1674	4.89	4.26	4.23	4.21	4.89	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1423	5.00	4.36	4.27	4.27	5.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	131/1609	4.89	4.23	4.22	4.27	4.89	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	96/1585	4.89	4.04	3.96	3.95	4.89	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	4	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1535	5.00	4.08	4.08	4.15	5.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	0	8	4.78	208/1651	4.78	4.20	4.18	4.16	4.78	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1673	5.00	4.65	4.69	4.68	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	118/1656	4.88	4.06	4.07	4.07	4.88	

Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1586	****	4.43	4.43	4.42	****	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	7	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1585	****	4.72	4.69	4.66	****	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1582	****	4.30	4.26	4.26	****	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1575	****	4.32	4.27	4.25	****	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1380	****	3.94	3.94	4.01	****	

Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	145/1520	4.89	4.14	4.01	4.09	4.89	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1515	5.00	4.37	4.24	4.32	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	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	0	7	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 994	****	3.97	3.94	3.96	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	2	0.00-0.99 1	A 6	Required for Majors	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99 0	B 1		Graduate 0
56-83	2	2.00-2.99 1	C 0	General	1
84-150	2	3.00-3.49 1	D 0		Under-grad 9
Grad.	0	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		