

Course Section: GREK 101 0101  
 Title ELEMENTARY GREEK I  
 Instructor: SHERWIN, WALTER  
 Enrollment: 24  
 Questionnaires: 16

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 984  
 JAN 18, 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	1	14	4.81	199/1669	4.81	4.83	4.23	4.02	4.81	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	13	4.81	173/1666	4.81	4.83	4.19	4.11	4.81	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	15	4.94	106/1421	4.94	4.81	4.24	4.11	4.94	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	4	0	0	1	1	10	4.75	219/1617	4.75	4.81	4.15	3.99	4.75	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	6	10	4.63	249/1555	4.63	4.82	4.00	3.92	4.63	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	0	0	3	11	4.79	157/1543	4.79	4.85	4.06	3.86	4.79	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	3	4	9	4.38	697/1647	4.38	4.74	4.12	4.06	4.38	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	16	5.00	1/1668	5.00	4.78	4.67	4.62	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	0	3	10	4.77	163/1605	4.77	4.66	4.07	3.96	4.77	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	4	12	4.75	441/1514	4.75	4.75	4.39	4.32	4.75	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	15	4.94	358/1551	4.94	4.98	4.66	4.55	4.94	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	4	12	4.75	277/1503	4.75	4.75	4.24	4.17	4.75	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	2	13	4.75	353/1506	4.75	4.81	4.26	4.17	4.75	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	12	1	0	0	1	2	3.75	791/1311	3.75	2.81	3.85	3.68	3.75	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	1	2	4	4	4.00	849/1490	4.00	4.50	4.05	3.85	4.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	0	0	3	7	4.70	459/1502	4.70	4.79	4.26	4.06	4.70	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	0	1	0	4	4	4.22	936/1489	4.22	4.52	4.29	4.07	4.22	
4. Were special techniques successful	5	7	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	143/1006	4.75	4.88	4.00	3.81	4.75	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 9	Required for Majors	3
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	B 4		Graduate 0
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	C 2	General	1
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad 16
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	2
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	10
			? 0		

Course Section: GREK 201 0101  
 Title INTERMEDIATE GREEK  
 Instructor: KOEHLER, CAROLY  
 Enrollment: 9  
 Questionnaires: 6

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 985  
 JAN 18, 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	4	4.67	389/1669	4.67	4.83	4.23	4.34	4.67	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	0	5	4.67	359/1666	4.67	4.83	4.19	4.29	4.67	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	557/1421	4.50	4.81	4.24	4.35	4.50	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	323/1617	4.67	4.81	4.15	4.24	4.67	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	128/1555	4.83	4.82	4.00	3.96	4.83	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	3	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1543	5.00	4.85	4.06	4.10	5.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	150/1647	4.83	4.74	4.12	4.19	4.83	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1668	5.00	4.78	4.67	4.59	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	759/1605	4.20	4.66	4.07	4.15	4.20	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	3	3	4.50	799/1514	4.50	4.75	4.39	4.39	4.50	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1551	5.00	4.98	4.66	4.72	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	556/1503	4.50	4.75	4.24	4.29	4.50	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	471/1506	4.67	4.81	4.26	4.33	4.67	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	3	1	0	0	0	2	3.67	846/1311	3.67	2.81	3.85	3.96	3.67	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	445/1490	4.50	4.50	4.05	4.11	4.50	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	1	0	5	4.67	486/1502	4.67	4.79	4.26	4.31	4.67	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	348/1489	4.83	4.52	4.29	4.36	4.83	
4. Were special techniques successful	0	4	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1006	5.00	4.88	4.00	3.99	5.00	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 5	Required for Majors	2
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	B 1		Graduate
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	C 0	General	1
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		
			I 0		
			? 0	Other	3

#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant

Course Section: GREK 401 0101  
 Title SPECIAL AUTHOR SEMINAR  
 Instructor: FREYMAN, JAY M  
 Enrollment: 4  
 Questionnaires: 4

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 986  
 JAN 18, 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	4	5.00	1/1669	5.00	4.83	4.23	4.39	5.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1666	5.00	4.83	4.19	4.22	5.00	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1421	5.00	4.81	4.24	4.38	5.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1617	5.00	4.81	4.15	4.22	5.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1555	5.00	4.82	4.00	4.08	5.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	180/1543	4.75	4.85	4.06	4.18	4.75	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1647	5.00	4.74	4.12	4.14	5.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	1329/1668	4.33	4.78	4.67	4.70	4.33	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1605	5.00	4.66	4.07	4.16	5.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1514	5.00	4.75	4.39	4.45	5.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1551	5.00	4.98	4.66	4.73	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1503	5.00	4.75	4.24	4.27	5.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1506	5.00	4.81	4.26	4.29	5.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	2	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	1296/1311	1.00	2.81	3.85	3.88	1.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1490	5.00	4.50	4.05	4.26	5.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1502	5.00	4.79	4.26	4.46	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	684/1489	4.50	4.52	4.29	4.52	4.50	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 112	5.00	5.00	4.38	4.74	5.00	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 97	5.00	5.00	4.36	4.69	5.00	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	63/ 92	4.00	4.00	4.22	4.48	4.00	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 105	5.00	5.00	4.20	4.27	5.00	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 98	5.00	5.00	3.95	3.86	5.00	

Frequency Distribution

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