

Course-Section: LATN 102 0101
 Title ELEMENTARY LATIN II
 Instructor: RIVKIN, ROBERT
 Enrollment: 21
 Questionnaires: 16

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2006

Page 925
 JUN 13, 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	6	10	4.63	439/1481	4.59	4.26	4.29	4.14	4.63	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	5	9	4.38	693/1481	4.52	4.26	4.23	4.18	4.38	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	3	4	8	4.33	679/1249	4.47	4.37	4.27	4.14	4.33	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	6	0	0	0	3	7	4.70	263/1424	4.56	4.27	4.21	4.06	4.70	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	0	1	7	6	4.36	419/1396	4.27	4.07	3.98	3.89	4.36	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	5	0	0	0	4	7	4.64	214/1342	4.66	4.12	4.07	3.88	4.64	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	1	6	8	4.31	719/1459	4.32	4.19	4.16	4.17	4.31	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	2	14	4.88	743/1480	4.94	4.64	4.68	4.64	4.88	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	2	3	7	4.42	459/1450	4.41	4.10	4.09	3.97	4.42	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	1	0	0	2	13	4.63	618/1409	4.75	4.46	4.42	4.36	4.63	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	16	5.00	1/1407	5.00	4.77	4.69	4.57	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	4	11	4.63	431/1399	4.66	4.30	4.26	4.23	4.63	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	1	14	4.81	239/1400	4.79	4.35	4.27	4.19	4.81	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	9	0	0	2	1	4	4.29	419/1179	4.27	3.94	3.96	3.85	4.29	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/1262	4.33	4.18	4.05	3.77	****	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	13	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/1259	5.00	4.40	4.29	4.06	****	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	13	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/1256	3.63	4.34	4.30	4.08	****	
4. Were special techniques successful	13	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 788	3.80	4.03	4.00	3.80	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	A 5	Required for Majors	5	
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	B 5		Graduate 0	
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	C 4	General	2	
84-150	2	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		7
			? 2			

Course-Section: LATN 102 0201
 Title ELEMENTARY LATIN II
 Instructor: RIVKIN, ROBERT
 Enrollment: 19
 Questionnaires: 18

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2006

Page 926
 JUN 13, 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	1	6	11	4.56	505/1481	4.59	4.26	4.29	4.14	4.56	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	4	13	4.67	324/1481	4.52	4.26	4.23	4.18	4.67	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	3	13	4.61	393/1249	4.47	4.37	4.27	4.14	4.61	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	6	0	0	2	3	7	4.42	545/1424	4.56	4.27	4.21	4.06	4.42	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	1	4	3	9	4.18	574/1396	4.27	4.07	3.98	3.89	4.18	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	5	0	0	1	2	10	4.69	166/1342	4.66	4.12	4.07	3.88	4.69	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	3	6	9	4.33	695/1459	4.32	4.19	4.16	4.17	4.33	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	18	5.00	1/1480	4.94	4.64	4.68	4.64	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	1	0	0	6	10	4.41	459/1450	4.41	4.10	4.09	3.97	4.41	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	2	15	4.88	217/1409	4.75	4.46	4.42	4.36	4.88	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	17	5.00	1/1407	5.00	4.77	4.69	4.57	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	1	3	12	4.69	349/1399	4.66	4.30	4.26	4.23	4.69	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	2	14	4.76	299/1400	4.79	4.35	4.27	4.19	4.76	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	9	0	0	2	2	4	4.25	442/1179	4.27	3.94	3.96	3.85	4.25	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	1	0	3	5	4.33	507/1262	4.33	4.18	4.05	3.77	4.33	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	9	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1259	5.00	4.40	4.29	4.06	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	10	0	2	0	1	1	4	3.63	1079/1256	3.63	4.34	4.30	4.08	3.63	
4. Were special techniques successful	10	3	0	1	1	1	2	3.80	515/ 788	3.80	4.03	4.00	3.80	3.80	
Laboratory															
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	17	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 249	****	4.08	4.11	3.95	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	0	A	4	Required for Majors	11	Graduate	1	Major	0
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B	7						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	5	C	6	General	1	Under-grad	17	Non-major	0
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	6	D	0						
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	5				
				?	0						

Course-Section: LATN 301 0101
 Title SEL ROMAN HISTORIANS
 Instructor: SHERWIN, WALTER
 Enrollment: 13
 Questionnaires: 13

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2006

Page 927
 JUN 13, 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	12	4.92	127/1481	4.92	4.26	4.29	4.29	4.92	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	12	4.92	92/1481	4.92	4.26	4.23	4.23	4.92	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	12	4.92	113/1249	4.92	4.37	4.27	4.28	4.92	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	5	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	148/1424	4.88	4.27	4.21	4.27	4.88	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	3	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	82/1396	4.90	4.07	3.98	4.00	4.90	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	6	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1342	5.00	4.12	4.07	4.12	5.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	3	9	4.62	332/1459	4.62	4.19	4.16	4.17	4.62	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	7	6	4.46	1072/1480	4.46	4.64	4.68	4.65	4.46	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	3	9	4.75	164/1450	4.75	4.10	4.09	4.10	4.75	

Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	7	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	290/1409	4.83	4.46	4.42	4.43	4.83	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	6	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1407	5.00	4.77	4.69	4.67	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	6	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	170/1399	4.86	4.30	4.26	4.27	4.86	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	218/1400	4.83	4.35	4.27	4.28	4.83	

Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1262	5.00	4.18	4.05	4.14	5.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1259	5.00	4.40	4.29	4.34	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	0	1	0	8	4.78	332/1256	4.78	4.34	4.30	4.34	4.78	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99 0	A 10	Required for Majors	2 Graduate 0 Major 0
28-55	2	1.00-1.99 0	B 1		
56-83	0	2.00-2.99 1	C 1	General	3 Under-grad 13 Non-major 0
84-150	7	3.00-3.49 0	D 0		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 11	F 0	Electives	2
			P 0		
			I 0	Other	7
			? 0		

- Means there are not enough responses to be significant

Course-Section: LATN 331 0101
 Title TIBULLUS/PROPERTIUS/OV
 Instructor: FREYMAN, JAY M
 Enrollment: 12
 Questionnaires: 12

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2006

Page 928
 JUN 13, 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	10	4.83	210/1481	4.83	4.26	4.29	4.29	4.83	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	103/1481	4.92	4.26	4.23	4.23	4.92	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/1249	5.00	4.37	4.27	4.28	5.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	1	10	4.75	217/1424	4.75	4.27	4.21	4.27	4.75	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/1396	5.00	4.07	3.98	4.00	5.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	1	0	0	1	3	6	4.50	303/1342	4.50	4.12	4.07	4.12	4.50	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	2	10	4.83	143/1459	4.83	4.19	4.16	4.17	4.83	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	631/1480	4.92	4.64	4.68	4.65	4.92	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	89/1450	4.92	4.10	4.09	4.10	4.92	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	10	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1409	****	4.46	4.42	4.43	****	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	126/1262	4.91	4.18	4.05	4.14	4.91	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	1	0	10	4.82	294/1259	4.82	4.40	4.29	4.34	4.82	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	216/1256	4.91	4.34	4.30	4.34	4.91	
4. Were special techniques successful	1	10	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 788	****	4.03	4.00	4.07	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 68	****	4.66	4.49	4.70	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 69	****	4.26	4.53	4.66	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 63	****	4.24	4.44	4.56	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 69	****	4.19	4.35	4.48	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 68	****	3.98	3.92	4.43	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors				
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 6	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	B 4						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	C 0	General	3	Under-grad	12	Non-major	1
84-150	7	3.00-3.49	D 0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	3	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
			P 0						
			I 0	Other	5				
			? 1						