

Course-Section: LATN 101 0101
 Title ELEMENTARY LATIN I
 Instructor: RIVKIN, ROBERT
 Enrollment: 32
 Questionnaires: 17

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 1011
 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	16	4.94	103/1639	4.85	4.52	4.27	4.08	4.94	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	17	5.00	1/1639	4.92	4.61	4.22	4.17	5.00	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	15	4.88	175/1397	4.90	4.73	4.28	4.18	4.88	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	9	0	0	1	0	7	4.75	239/1583	4.66	4.45	4.19	4.01	4.75	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	3	0	0	0	7	7	4.50	335/1532	4.56	4.65	4.01	3.88	4.50	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	8	0	0	0	3	6	4.67	245/1504	4.46	4.64	4.05	3.78	4.67	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	2	15	4.88	123/1612	4.75	4.41	4.16	4.10	4.88	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	17	5.00	1/1635	5.00	4.43	4.65	4.56	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	1	4	11	4.63	269/1579	4.60	4.47	4.08	3.95	4.63	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	1	15	4.94	149/1518	4.89	4.65	4.43	4.38	4.94	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	16	5.00	1/1520	4.94	4.93	4.70	4.61	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	2	14	4.88	181/1517	4.75	4.45	4.27	4.20	4.88	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	0	15	5.00	1/1550	4.85	4.53	4.22	4.17	5.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	12	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	****/1295	****	****	3.94	3.84	****	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	177/1398	4.55	4.24	4.07	3.85	4.88	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	10	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1391	4.89	4.73	4.30	4.07	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	1	0	0	2	5	4.25	834/1388	4.43	4.20	4.28	4.01	4.25	
4. Were special techniques successful	9	5	0	1	0	2	0	3.33	****/ 958	3.60	3.60	3.93	3.71	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	A 9	Required for Majors	8
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	B 4		Graduate 0
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	C 2	General	3
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	D 1		Under-grad 17
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	7
			? 0		

Course-Section: LATN 101 0201
 Title ELEMENTARY LATIN I
 Instructor: RIVKIN, ROBERT
 Enrollment: 32
 Questionnaires: 24

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 1012
 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	2	2	20	4.75	318/1639	4.85	4.52	4.27	4.08	4.75	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	4	20	4.83	177/1639	4.92	4.61	4.22	4.17	4.83	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	22	4.92	145/1397	4.90	4.73	4.28	4.18	4.92	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	5	0	0	1	6	12	4.58	402/1583	4.66	4.45	4.19	4.01	4.58	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	1	4	18	4.63	262/1532	4.56	4.65	4.01	3.88	4.63	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	5	1	0	2	6	10	4.26	603/1504	4.46	4.64	4.05	3.78	4.26	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	0	6	17	4.63	364/1612	4.75	4.41	4.16	4.10	4.63	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	24	5.00	1/1635	5.00	4.43	4.65	4.56	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	1	1	3	14	4.58	312/1579	4.60	4.47	4.08	3.95	4.58	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	4	20	4.83	315/1518	4.89	4.65	4.43	4.38	4.83	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	3	21	4.88	622/1520	4.94	4.93	4.70	4.61	4.88	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	1	0	6	17	4.63	451/1517	4.75	4.45	4.27	4.20	4.63	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	5	18	4.71	414/1550	4.85	4.53	4.22	4.17	4.71	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	20	2	1	0	1	0	2.00	****/1295	****	****	3.94	3.84	****	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	1	1	1	5	10	4.22	651/1398	4.55	4.24	4.07	3.85	4.22	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	0	1	2	15	4.78	368/1391	4.89	4.73	4.30	4.07	4.78	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	0	0	1	5	12	4.61	558/1388	4.43	4.20	4.28	4.01	4.61	
4. Were special techniques successful	6	8	0	1	3	5	1	3.60	682/ 958	3.60	3.60	3.93	3.71	3.60	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	4	0.00-0.99 1	A 10	Required for Majors 11	Graduate 0 Major 0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99 0	B 8		
56-83	4	2.00-2.99 4	C 1	General 1	Under-grad 24 Non-major 24
84-150	1	3.00-3.49 2	D 3		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 3	F 0	Electives 1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 6	
			? 0		

Course-Section: LATN 201 0101
 Title INTERMEDIATE LATIN
 Instructor: FREYMAN, JAY M
 Enrollment: 13
 Questionnaires: 12

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 1013
 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	8	3	4.17	990/1639	4.13	4.52	4.27	4.35	4.17	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	5	5	4.36	735/1639	4.28	4.61	4.22	4.27	4.36	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	9	4.75	282/1397	4.60	4.73	4.28	4.39	4.75	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	0	5	5	4.50	476/1583	4.22	4.45	4.19	4.28	4.50	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	10	4.83	133/1532	4.57	4.65	4.01	4.09	4.83	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	0	2	9	4.82	146/1504	4.72	4.64	4.05	4.09	4.82	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	1	2	3	5	3.83	1229/1612	3.77	4.41	4.16	4.21	3.83	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	12	0	0	3.00	1618/1635	3.90	4.43	4.65	4.63	3.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	1	0	0	0	7	2	4.22	691/1579	4.08	4.47	4.08	4.14	4.22	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	5	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	529/1518	4.42	4.65	4.43	4.48	4.71	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	5	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1520	4.93	4.93	4.70	4.78	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	5	0	0	0	1	3	3	4.29	854/1517	4.14	4.45	4.27	4.34	4.29	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	1	2	4	4.43	742/1550	4.21	4.53	4.22	4.33	4.43	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	5	6	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/1295	****	****	3.94	4.07	****	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1398	3.86	4.24	4.07	4.14	****	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1391	4.14	4.73	4.30	4.35	****	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1388	3.43	4.20	4.28	4.37	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	A 2	Required for Majors	7
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	B 6		Graduate 0
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	C 2	General	1
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad 12
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	3
			? 0		

Course-Section: LATN 201 0201
 Title INTERMEDIATE LATIN
 Instructor: SHERWIN, WALTER
 Enrollment: 22
 Questionnaires: 20

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 1014
 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	1	1	2	7	9	4.10	1068/1639	4.13	4.52	4.27	4.35	4.10	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	2	1	0	5	12	4.20	915/1639	4.28	4.61	4.22	4.27	4.20	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	2	0	1	1	16	4.45	603/1397	4.60	4.73	4.28	4.39	4.45	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	3	2	1	2	3	9	3.94	1098/1583	4.22	4.45	4.19	4.28	3.94	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	4	0	3	0	2	11	4.31	525/1532	4.57	4.65	4.01	4.09	4.31	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	4	0	0	2	2	12	4.63	275/1504	4.72	4.64	4.05	4.09	4.63	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	3	1	4	3	9	3.70	1305/1612	3.77	4.41	4.16	4.21	3.70	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	4	16	4.80	811/1635	3.90	4.43	4.65	4.63	4.80	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	1	1	2	7	6	3.94	989/1579	4.08	4.47	4.08	4.14	3.94	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	5	0	2	0	1	3	9	4.13	1182/1518	4.42	4.65	4.43	4.48	4.13	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	6	0	0	0	0	2	12	4.86	674/1520	4.93	4.93	4.70	4.78	4.86	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	6	0	2	0	2	2	8	4.00	1083/1517	4.14	4.45	4.27	4.34	4.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	6	0	2	0	2	2	8	4.00	1077/1550	4.21	4.53	4.22	4.33	4.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	13	0	2	0	0	0	5	3.86	908/1398	3.86	4.24	4.07	4.14	3.86	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	13	0	1	0	1	0	5	4.14	903/1391	4.14	4.73	4.30	4.35	4.14	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	13	0	2	0	1	1	3	3.43	1217/1388	3.43	4.20	4.28	4.37	3.43	
4. Were special techniques successful	13	6	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 958	****	3.60	3.93	4.00	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 85	****	5.00	4.58	4.00	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 82	****	5.00	4.16	4.00	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.04	4.78	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 53	****	****	4.05	4.28	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 42	****	****	4.75	****	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 37	****	****	4.58	****	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 50	****	****	4.45	3.24	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	A	6	Required for Majors	8	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	0	B	6						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	1	C	5	General	1	Under-grad	20	Non-major	20
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	3	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	8				
				?	0						

Course-Section: LATN 402 0101
 Title SPECIAL AUTHOR SEMINAR
 Instructor: FREYMAN, JAY M
 Enrollment: 8
 Questionnaires: 6

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 1015
 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	2	4	4.67	430/1639	4.67	4.52	4.27	4.42	4.67	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	0	5	4.67	349/1639	4.67	4.61	4.22	4.29	4.67	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	367/1397	4.67	4.73	4.28	4.38	4.67	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	476/1583	4.50	4.45	4.19	4.31	4.50	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1532	5.00	4.65	4.01	4.07	5.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	138/1504	4.83	4.64	4.05	4.20	4.83	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1612	5.00	4.41	4.16	4.18	5.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	4	2	4.33	1288/1635	4.33	4.43	4.65	4.72	4.33	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	1	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1579	5.00	4.47	4.08	4.21	5.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1518	****	4.65	4.43	4.51	****	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1520	****	4.93	4.70	4.75	****	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1517	****	4.45	4.27	4.34	****	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1550	****	4.53	4.22	4.24	****	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	770/1398	4.00	4.24	4.07	4.23	4.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1391	5.00	4.73	4.30	4.48	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	647/1388	4.50	4.20	4.28	4.50	4.50	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	2	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/ 85	5.00	5.00	4.58	4.83	5.00	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	2	3	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 82	****	****	4.52	4.49	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	2	3	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 78	****	****	4.47	4.56	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	2	2	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 80	5.00	5.00	4.47	4.59	5.00	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	2	2	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 82	5.00	5.00	4.16	4.02	5.00	

Frequency Distribution

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