

Course-Section: GREK 101 0101
 Title ELEMENTARY GREEK I
 Instructor: FREYMAN, JAY M
 Enrollment: 28
 Questionnaires: 28

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 935
 FEB 11, 2009
 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	9	0	1	0	0	3	15	4.63	471/1649	4.63	4.77	4.28	4.11	4.63	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	10	0	0	0	0	6	12	4.67	362/1648	4.67	4.77	4.23	4.16	4.67	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	9	0	0	1	3	15	4.74	321/1375	4.74	4.83	4.27	4.10	4.74		
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	9	3	0	1	0	4	11	4.56	428/1595	4.56	4.79	4.20	4.03	4.56	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	0	4	15	4.79	162/1533	4.79	4.83	4.04	3.87	4.79	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	3	6	10	4.37	564/1512	4.37	4.73	4.10	3.86	4.37	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	9	0	1	0	3	1	14	4.42	608/1623	4.42	4.35	4.16	4.08	4.42	
8. How many times was class cancelled	9	0	0	0	0	16	3	4.16	1469/1646	4.16	4.47	4.69	4.67	4.16	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	11	0	0	0	1	7	9	4.47	415/1621	4.47	4.78	4.06	3.96	4.47	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	12	0	0	0	0	4	12	4.75	480/1568	4.75	4.87	4.43	4.39	4.75	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	12	0	0	0	0	0	16	5.00	1/1572	5.00	4.96	4.70	4.64	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	12	0	1	0	1	6	8	4.25	939/1564	4.25	4.71	4.28	4.20	4.25	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	12	0	1	0	1	2	12	4.50	695/1559	4.50	4.71	4.29	4.20	4.50	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	14	13	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1352	****	****	3.98	3.86	****	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	21	0	0	1	2	3	1	3.57	1051/1384	3.57	4.36	4.08	3.86	3.57	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	21	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1382	5.00	5.00	4.29	4.03	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	21	0	0	0	1	2	4	4.43	732/1368	4.43	4.39	4.30	4.01	4.43	
4. Were special techniques successful	21	5	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 948	****	****	3.95	3.75	****	
Seminar															
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	27	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 288	****	****	3.68	3.54	****	
Field Work															
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	25	0	0	2	0	1	0	2.67	****/ 312	****	****	3.68	3.51	****	
Self Paced															
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	27	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 110	****	****	3.99	3.83	****	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: GREK 201 0101
 Title INTERMEDIATE GREEK
 Instructor: SHERWIN, WALTER
 Enrollment: 9
 Questionnaires: 9

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 936
 FEB 11, 2009
 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	8	4.67	433/1649	4.67	4.77	4.28	4.29	4.67	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	161/1648	4.89	4.77	4.23	4.25	4.89	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	296/1375	4.75	4.83	4.27	4.37	4.75	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	3	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	192/1595	4.80	4.79	4.20	4.22	4.80	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	1	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	204/1533	4.71	4.83	4.04	4.04	4.71	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	2	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	142/1512	4.83	4.73	4.10	4.14	4.83	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	1	2	2	3	3.88	1198/1623	3.88	4.35	4.16	4.21	3.88	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1646	5.00	4.47	4.69	4.63	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	105/1621	4.88	4.78	4.06	4.01	4.88	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	316/1568	4.86	4.87	4.43	4.39	4.86	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	665/1572	4.88	4.96	4.70	4.73	4.88	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	197/1564	4.88	4.71	4.28	4.27	4.88	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	3	5	4.63	561/1559	4.63	4.71	4.29	4.33	4.63	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	6	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/1352	****	****	3.98	4.07	****	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	247/1384	4.75	4.36	4.08	3.99	4.75	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1382	5.00	5.00	4.29	4.19	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	1	0	0	1	2	3.75	1095/1368	3.75	4.39	4.30	4.21	3.75	
Laboratory															
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 555	****	5.00	4.29	4.33	****	
Seminar															
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	8	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 288	****	****	3.68	3.65	****	
Field Work															
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	8	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 312	****	****	3.68	3.59	****	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: GREK 361 0101
 Title GREEK ORATORY
 Instructor: FREYMAN, JAY M
 Enrollment: 4
 Questionnaires: 4

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 937
 FEB 11, 2009
 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	1/1649	5.00	4.77	4.28	4.27	5.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	263/1648	4.75	4.77	4.23	4.18	4.75	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1375	5.00	4.83	4.27	4.22	5.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1595	5.00	4.79	4.20	4.21	5.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1533	5.00	4.83	4.04	4.05	5.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1512	5.00	4.73	4.10	4.11	5.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	220/1623	4.75	4.35	4.16	4.08	4.75	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	3	1	4.25	1398/1646	4.25	4.47	4.69	4.67	4.25	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1621	5.00	4.78	4.06	4.02	5.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1568	5.00	4.87	4.43	4.39	5.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1572	5.00	4.96	4.70	4.64	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1564	5.00	4.71	4.28	4.25	5.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1559	5.00	4.71	4.29	4.23	5.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	247/1384	4.75	4.36	4.08	4.11	4.75	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1382	5.00	5.00	4.29	4.37	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1368	5.00	4.39	4.30	4.39	5.00	
Laboratory															
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 555	5.00	5.00	4.29	4.22	5.00	

Frequency Distribution

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