

Course-Section: LATN 102 0101
 Title ELEMENTARY LATIN II
 Instructor: RIVKIN, ROBERT
 Enrollment: 17
 Questionnaires: 14

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 934
 JUN 26, 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	2	11	4.71	380/1522	4.77	4.80	4.30	4.14	4.71	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	4	10	4.71	299/1522	4.77	4.79	4.26	4.18	4.71	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	3	10	4.64	386/1285	4.73	4.78	4.30	4.22	4.64	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	2	2	8	4.50	473/1476	4.75	4.69	4.22	4.09	4.50	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	4	9	4.57	299/1412	4.74	4.76	4.06	4.01	4.57	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	6	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	149/1381	4.65	4.65	4.08	3.93	4.75	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	3	2	9	4.43	600/1500	4.62	4.69	4.18	4.16	4.43	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	1	12	4.92	389/1517	4.87	4.82	4.65	4.62	4.92	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	1	6	4	4.27	633/1497	4.56	4.70	4.11	4.02	4.27	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	1	12	4.92	153/1440	4.96	4.95	4.45	4.40	4.92	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	13	5.00	1/1448	5.00	4.97	4.71	4.63	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	3	10	4.77	279/1436	4.78	4.83	4.29	4.24	4.77	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	3	10	4.77	338/1432	4.88	4.83	4.29	4.23	4.77	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	2	2	1	0	1	5	3.67	832/1221	4.02	4.02	3.93	3.86	3.67	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	390/1280	4.75	4.81	4.10	3.92	4.50	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	290/1277	4.92	4.96	4.34	4.13	4.83	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	0	0	0	3	3	4.50	586/1269	4.68	4.79	4.31	4.04	4.50	
4. Were special techniques successful	8	3	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 854	4.25	4.25	4.02	3.87	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	3	0.00-0.99 0	A 5	Required for Majors 4	Graduate 0 Major 0
28-55	2	1.00-1.99 0	B 6		
56-83	2	2.00-2.99 0	C 0	General 2	Under-grad 14 Non-major 14
84-150	2	3.00-3.49 1	D 1		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 7	F 0	Electives 0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 6	
			? 0		

Course-Section: LATN 102 0201
 Title ELEMENTARY LATIN II
 Instructor: RIVKIN, ROBERT
 Enrollment: 15
 Questionnaires: 11

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 935
 JUN 26, 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	9	4.82	239/1522	4.77	4.80	4.30	4.14	4.82	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	9	4.82	193/1522	4.77	4.79	4.26	4.18	4.82	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	0	10	4.82	220/1285	4.73	4.78	4.30	4.22	4.82	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	5	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1476	4.75	4.69	4.22	4.09	5.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	101/1412	4.74	4.76	4.06	4.01	4.91	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	0	1	9	4.55	297/1381	4.65	4.65	4.08	3.93	4.55	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	2	9	4.82	154/1500	4.62	4.69	4.18	4.16	4.82	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	2	9	4.82	691/1517	4.87	4.82	4.65	4.62	4.82	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	125/1497	4.56	4.70	4.11	4.02	4.86	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1440	4.96	4.95	4.45	4.40	5.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1448	5.00	4.97	4.71	4.63	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	1	0	9	4.80	217/1436	4.78	4.83	4.29	4.24	4.80	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1432	4.88	4.83	4.29	4.23	5.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	2	1	0	0	1	6	4.38	380/1221	4.02	4.02	3.93	3.86	4.38	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1280	4.75	4.81	4.10	3.92	5.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1277	4.92	4.96	4.34	4.13	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	277/1269	4.68	4.79	4.31	4.04	4.86	
4. Were special techniques successful	4	3	0	1	0	0	3	4.25	330/ 854	4.25	4.25	4.02	3.87	4.25	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: LATN 312 0101
 Title SILVER AGE
 Instructor: FREYMAN, JAY M
 Enrollment: 10
 Questionnaires: 9

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 936
 JUN 26, 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	1	8	4.89	190/1522	4.89	4.80	4.30	4.34	4.89	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	233/1522	4.78	4.79	4.26	4.25	4.78	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	165/1285	4.89	4.78	4.30	4.30	4.89	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	226/1476	4.75	4.69	4.22	4.26	4.75	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1412	5.00	4.76	4.06	4.03	5.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	4	5	4.56	289/1381	4.56	4.65	4.08	4.13	4.56	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	1	7	4.67	312/1500	4.67	4.69	4.18	4.13	4.67	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	4	5	4.56	1037/1517	4.56	4.82	4.65	4.62	4.56	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	189/1497	4.75	4.70	4.11	4.13	4.75	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1440	****	4.95	4.45	4.46	****	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	7	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1448	****	4.97	4.71	4.71	****	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	7	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1436	****	4.83	4.29	4.30	****	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1432	****	4.83	4.29	4.29	****	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	7	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1221	****	4.02	3.93	3.94	****	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1280	5.00	4.81	4.10	4.14	5.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1277	5.00	4.96	4.34	4.38	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1269	5.00	4.79	4.31	4.39	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	0	7	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 854	****	4.25	4.02	4.00	****	

Frequency Distribution

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

- Means there are not enough responses to be significant

Course-Section: LATN 332 0101
 Title VERGIL
 Instructor: SHERWIN, WALTER
 Enrollment: 15
 Questionnaires: 14

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 937
 JUN 26, 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	12	4.79	275/1522	4.79	4.80	4.30	4.34	4.79	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	12	4.86	164/1522	4.86	4.79	4.26	4.25	4.86	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	1	12	4.79	248/1285	4.79	4.78	4.30	4.30	4.79	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	4	0	1	0	2	7	4.50	473/1476	4.50	4.69	4.22	4.26	4.50	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	0	2	11	4.57	299/1412	4.57	4.76	4.06	4.03	4.57	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	6	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	149/1381	4.75	4.65	4.08	4.13	4.75	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	0	0	0	2	11	4.85	139/1500	4.85	4.69	4.18	4.13	4.85	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	14	5.00	1/1517	5.00	4.82	4.65	4.62	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	1	0	0	0	1	12	4.92	83/1497	4.92	4.70	4.11	4.13	4.92	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	172/1440	4.92	4.95	4.45	4.46	4.92	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	494/1448	4.91	4.97	4.71	4.71	4.91	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	123/1436	4.91	4.83	4.29	4.30	4.91	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	3	8	4.73	383/1432	4.73	4.83	4.29	4.29	4.73	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	10	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1221	****	4.02	3.93	3.94	****	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	222/1280	4.75	4.81	4.10	4.14	4.75	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	10	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1277	5.00	4.96	4.34	4.38	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	11	0	0	0	2	0	1	3.67	****/1269	****	4.79	4.31	4.39	****	
4. Were special techniques successful	11	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/ 854	****	4.25	4.02	4.00	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 79	****	****	4.58	4.53	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	8	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	4						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	2	C	2	General	3	Under-grad	14	Non-major	14
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
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	11				
				?	0						