

Course-Section: LATN 101 0101
 Title ELEMENTARY LATIN I
 Instructor: SHERWIN, WALTER
 Enrollment: 31
 Questionnaires: 26

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 1093
 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	2	0	6	18	4.54	570/1674	4.72	4.23	4.27	4.07	4.54	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	4	22	4.85	184/1674	4.90	4.26	4.23	4.16	4.85	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	25	4.96	53/1423	4.98	4.36	4.27	4.16	4.96	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	8	0	2	0	3	13	4.50	490/1609	4.58	4.23	4.22	4.05	4.50	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	3	0	0	1	3	19	4.78	148/1585	4.76	4.04	3.96	3.88	4.78	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	9	0	1	0	2	13	4.69	223/1535	4.75	4.08	4.08	3.89	4.69	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	4	5	17	4.50	524/1651	4.64	4.20	4.18	4.10	4.50	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	7	19	4.73	987/1673	4.50	4.65	4.69	4.67	4.73	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	0	0	0	0	8	12	4.60	310/1656	4.73	4.06	4.07	3.96	4.60	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	4	21	4.84	319/1586	4.87	4.43	4.43	4.37	4.84	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	1	24	4.96	227/1585	4.95	4.72	4.69	4.60	4.96	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	4	21	4.84	208/1582	4.84	4.30	4.26	4.17	4.84	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	0	0	5	19	4.64	523/1575	4.77	4.32	4.27	4.17	4.64	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	16	2	0	4	1	2	3.11	1205/1380	3.11	3.94	3.94	3.78	3.11	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	1	2	11	4.71	259/1520	4.57	4.14	4.01	3.76	4.71	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	13	0	0	0	1	0	12	4.85	277/1515	4.92	4.37	4.24	3.97	4.85	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	13	0	1	0	2	1	9	4.31	845/1511	4.51	4.37	4.27	4.00	4.31	
4. Were special techniques successful	13	7	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	****/ 994	****	3.97	3.94	3.73	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	7	0.00-0.99 1	A 17	Required for Majors 10	Graduate 0 Major 0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99 0	B 4		
56-83	2	2.00-2.99 1	C 3	General 2	Under-grad 26 Non-major 4
84-150	2	3.00-3.49 2	D 1		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 4	F 0	Electives 2	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 11	
			? 0		

Course-Section: LATN 101 0201
 Title ELEMENTARY LATIN I
 Instructor: RIVKIN, ROBERT
 Enrollment: 27
 Questionnaires: 19

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 1094
 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	2	17	4.89	157/1674	4.72	4.23	4.27	4.07	4.89	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	18	4.95	83/1674	4.90	4.26	4.23	4.16	4.95	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	19	5.00	1/1423	4.98	4.36	4.27	4.16	5.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	10	0	1	0	0	8	4.67	312/1609	4.58	4.23	4.22	4.05	4.67	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	5	14	4.74	179/1585	4.76	4.04	3.96	3.88	4.74	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	8	0	0	0	2	9	4.82	127/1535	4.75	4.08	4.08	3.89	4.82	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	2	16	4.79	197/1651	4.64	4.20	4.18	4.10	4.79	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	14	5	4.26	1412/1673	4.50	4.65	4.69	4.67	4.26	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	0	0	2	12	4.86	127/1656	4.73	4.06	4.07	3.96	4.86	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	0	18	4.89	231/1586	4.87	4.43	4.43	4.37	4.89	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	18	4.95	340/1585	4.95	4.72	4.69	4.60	4.95	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	3	16	4.84	208/1582	4.84	4.30	4.26	4.17	4.84	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	0	18	4.89	181/1575	4.77	4.32	4.27	4.17	4.89	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	16	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1380	3.11	3.94	3.94	3.78	****	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	0	4	3	4.43	489/1520	4.57	4.14	4.01	3.76	4.43	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	12	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1515	4.92	4.37	4.24	3.97	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	12	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	458/1511	4.51	4.37	4.27	4.00	4.71	
4. Were special techniques successful	12	5	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	****/ 994	****	3.97	3.94	3.73	****	
Laboratory															
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	17	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 278	****	4.21	4.19	3.97	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	17	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 259	****	4.21	4.33	4.19	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 76	****	3.36	3.98	3.32	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	18	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 77	****	3.65	3.93	3.42	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	17	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 48	****	3.86	4.12	4.00	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 61	****	4.03	4.09	3.87	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	17	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 52	****	4.21	4.26	3.91	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	17	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 50	****	4.23	4.44	4.39	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 6	Required for Majors 12
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	1	B 6	
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	3	C 3	General 3
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	3	D 0	Under-grad 18
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00	4	F 0	Non-major 0
				P 0	
				I 0	
				? 4	Electives 2
					Other 2

- Means there are not enough responses to be significant

Course-Section: LATN 201 0101
 Title INTERMEDIATE LATIN
 Instructor: SHERWIN, WALTER
 Enrollment: 20
 Questionnaires: 19

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 1095
 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	3	16	4.84	205/1674	4.47	4.23	4.27	4.32	4.84	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	17	4.89	145/1674	4.63	4.26	4.23	4.26	4.89	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	2	16	4.79	226/1423	4.62	4.36	4.27	4.36	4.79	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	6	0	0	0	0	13	5.00	1/1609	4.79	4.23	4.22	4.23	5.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	5	0	0	1	2	11	4.71	191/1585	4.56	4.04	3.96	3.91	4.71	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	3	0	0	1	0	15	4.88	105/1535	4.44	4.08	4.08	4.03	4.88	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	3	6	10	4.37	727/1651	4.23	4.20	4.18	4.20	4.37	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	9	10	4.53	1189/1673	4.17	4.65	4.69	4.67	4.53	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	2	0	0	0	5	11	4.69	239/1656	4.43	4.06	4.07	4.10	4.69	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	0	0	0	4	11	4.73	538/1586	4.59	4.43	4.43	4.48	4.73	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	0	1	15	4.94	397/1585	4.83	4.72	4.69	4.76	4.94	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	5	0	0	0	0	2	12	4.86	199/1582	4.66	4.30	4.26	4.35	4.86	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	1	14	4.93	120/1575	4.56	4.32	4.27	4.39	4.93	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	12	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/1380	4.33	3.94	3.94	4.03	****	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1520	4.33	4.14	4.01	4.03	5.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	13	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1515	4.50	4.37	4.24	4.28	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	13	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	507/1511	4.33	4.37	4.27	4.28	4.67	
4. Were special techniques successful	13	5	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 994	****	3.97	3.94	3.98	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99 0	A 9	Required for Majors 7	Graduate 1 Major 0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99 0	B 7		
56-83	3	2.00-2.99 1	C 3	General 1	Under-grad 18 Non-major 1
84-150	12	3.00-3.49 2	D 0		
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00 13	F 0	Electives 0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 9	
			? 0		

Course-Section: LATN 201 0201
 Title INTERMEDIATE LATIN
 Instructor: FREYMAN, JAY M
 Enrollment: 20
 Questionnaires: 11

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 1096
 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	4	2	5	4.09	1123/1674	4.47	4.23	4.27	4.32	4.09	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	1	7	4.36	790/1674	4.63	4.26	4.23	4.26	4.36	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	0	3	7	4.45	636/1423	4.62	4.36	4.27	4.36	4.45	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	4	0	0	1	1	5	4.57	408/1609	4.79	4.23	4.22	4.23	4.57	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	2	2	6	4.40	413/1585	4.56	4.04	3.96	3.91	4.40	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	3	1	0	1	2	4	4.00	870/1535	4.44	4.08	4.08	4.03	4.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	2	3	5	4.09	1037/1651	4.23	4.20	4.18	4.20	4.09	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	1	0	0	9	1	3.82	1633/1673	4.17	4.65	4.69	4.67	3.82	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	2	5	4	4.18	805/1656	4.43	4.06	4.07	4.10	4.18	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	2	2	7	4.45	931/1586	4.59	4.43	4.43	4.48	4.45	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	1	0	0	10	4.73	981/1585	4.83	4.72	4.69	4.76	4.73	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	3	0	8	4.45	704/1582	4.66	4.30	4.26	4.35	4.45	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	4	1	6	4.18	1020/1575	4.56	4.32	4.27	4.39	4.18	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	8	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	426/1380	4.33	3.94	3.94	4.03	4.33	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	2	0	1	3.67	1092/1520	4.33	4.14	4.01	4.03	3.67	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	1024/1515	4.50	4.37	4.24	4.28	4.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	1050/1511	4.33	4.37	4.27	4.28	4.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	8	2	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 994	****	3.97	3.94	3.98	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	3	Required for Majors	7	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B	4						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	0	C	1	General	1	Under-grad	11	Non-major	1
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	1	D	3						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	6	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	3				
				?	0						

Course-Section: LATN 341 0101
 Title: CICERO
 Instructor: FREYMAN, JAY M
 Enrollment: 9
 Questionnaires: 6

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 1097
 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	6	5.00	1/1674	5.00	4.23	4.27	4.26	5.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1674	5.00	4.26	4.23	4.21	5.00	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	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	0	6	5.00	1/1609	5.00	4.23	4.22	4.27	5.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1585	5.00	4.04	3.96	3.95	5.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	131/1535	4.80	4.08	4.08	4.15	4.80	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1651	5.00	4.20	4.18	4.16	5.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	1	2	3	4.33	1361/1673	4.33	4.65	4.69	4.68	4.33	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1656	5.00	4.06	4.07	4.07	5.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1586	****	4.43	4.43	4.42	****	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1585	****	4.72	4.69	4.66	****	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1582	****	4.30	4.26	4.26	****	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1575	****	4.32	4.27	4.25	****	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	5	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	0	6	5.00	1/1520	5.00	4.14	4.01	4.09	5.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	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	0	6	5.00	1/1511	5.00	4.37	4.27	4.34	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	0	3	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	322/ 994	4.33	3.97	3.94	3.96	4.33	

Frequency Distribution

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