

Course-Section: GREK 101 0101
 Title ELEMENTARY GREEK I
 Instructor: SHERWIN, WALTER
 Enrollment: 16
 Questionnaires: 12

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 916
 FEB 13, 2008
 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	11	4.92	154/1639	4.92	4.73	4.27	4.08	4.92	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	9	4.75	252/1639	4.75	4.58	4.22	4.17	4.75	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/1397	5.00	4.75	4.28	4.18	5.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	4	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	155/1583	4.88	4.62	4.19	4.01	4.88	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	0	0	3	7	4.70	216/1532	4.70	4.70	4.01	3.88	4.70	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	4	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1504	5.00	4.82	4.05	3.78	5.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	2	3	7	4.42	617/1612	4.42	4.32	4.16	4.10	4.42	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	662/1635	4.91	4.49	4.65	4.56	4.91	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	1	2	7	4.60	283/1579	4.60	4.65	4.08	3.95	4.60	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	0	11	4.83	315/1518	4.83	4.73	4.43	4.38	4.83	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/1520	5.00	5.00	4.70	4.61	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	3	8	4.58	498/1517	4.58	4.73	4.27	4.20	4.58	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	0	11	4.83	253/1550	4.83	4.85	4.22	4.17	4.83	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	10	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1295	****	****	3.94	3.84	****	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	1	0	1	3	4.20	675/1398	4.20	4.46	4.07	3.85	4.20	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	332/1391	4.80	4.69	4.30	4.07	4.80	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	740/1388	4.40	4.56	4.28	4.01	4.40	
4. Were special techniques successful	7	4	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 958	****	****	3.93	3.71	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 224	****	****	4.10	3.90	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 240	****	****	4.11	4.01	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 219	****	****	4.44	4.44	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 215	****	****	4.35	4.43	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 198	****	****	4.18	4.25	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 85	****	****	4.58	4.50	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 82	****	****	4.52	4.12	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 80	****	****	4.47	4.39	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 82	****	****	4.16	3.90	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.04	3.61	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 53	****	****	4.05	3.51	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 42	****	****	4.75	4.79	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 37	****	****	4.58	5.00	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 32	****	****	4.56	4.60	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 50	****	****	4.45	4.54	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 32	****	****	4.51	4.67	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 43	****	****	4.69	4.69	****	

Course-Section: GREK 101 0101
 Title ELEMENTARY GREEK I
 Instructor: SHERWIN, WALTER
 Enrollment: 16
 Questionnaires: 12

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 916
 FEB 13, 2008
 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	4	Required for Majors	2	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	8						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	3	Under-grad	12	Non-major	12
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	0	D	0						
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	6				
				?	0						

Course-Section: GREK 201 0101
 Title INTERMEDIATE GREEK
 Instructor: FREYMAN, JAY M
 Enrollment: 17
 Questionnaires: 13

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 917
 FEB 13, 2008
 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	582/1639	4.54	4.73	4.27	4.35	4.54	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	5	6	4.42	667/1639	4.42	4.58	4.22	4.27	4.42	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	2	2	8	4.50	517/1397	4.50	4.75	4.28	4.39	4.50	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	1	1	2	7	4.36	654/1583	4.36	4.62	4.19	4.28	4.36	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	2	10	4.69	216/1532	4.69	4.70	4.01	4.09	4.69	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	0	1	2	8	4.64	268/1504	4.64	4.82	4.05	4.09	4.64	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	3	4	6	4.23	837/1612	4.23	4.32	4.16	4.21	4.23	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	12	1	4.08	1466/1635	4.08	4.49	4.65	4.63	4.08	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	0	3	7	4.70	220/1579	4.70	4.65	4.08	4.14	4.70	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	5	0	0	0	1	1	6	4.63	656/1518	4.63	4.73	4.43	4.48	4.63	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	5	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1520	5.00	5.00	4.70	4.78	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	5	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	181/1517	4.88	4.73	4.27	4.34	4.88	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	208/1550	4.88	4.85	4.22	4.33	4.88	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	5	5	2	0	0	0	1	2.33	****/1295	****	****	3.94	4.07	****	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	294/1398	4.71	4.46	4.07	4.14	4.71	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	0	1	1	5	4.57	564/1391	4.57	4.69	4.30	4.35	4.57	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	435/1388	4.71	4.56	4.28	4.37	4.71	
4. Were special techniques successful	6	4	2	0	0	0	1	2.33	****/ 958	****	****	3.93	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	5
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	B 4		Graduate 0
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	C 6	General	0
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
			? 0		