

Course-Section: LATN 101 0101
 Title ELEMENTARY LATIN I
 Instructor: RIVKIN, ROBERT
 Enrollment: 30
 Questionnaires: 21

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 1032
 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	1	0	0	0	0	3	17	4.85	230/1649	4.82	4.51	4.28	4.11	4.85	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	3	17	4.85	182/1648	4.82	4.56	4.23	4.16	4.85	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	1	18	4.85	199/1375	4.80	4.69	4.27	4.10	4.85	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	6	0	0	1	2	10	4.69	291/1595	4.66	4.51	4.20	4.03	4.69	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	3	16	4.75	180/1533	4.70	4.68	4.04	3.87	4.75	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	4	0	0	0	4	12	4.75	194/1512	4.78	4.72	4.10	3.86	4.75	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	3	2	15	4.60	395/1623	4.65	4.36	4.16	4.08	4.60	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	9	11	4.55	1148/1646	4.55	4.59	4.69	4.67	4.55	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	1	1	0	0	3	13	4.59	305/1621	4.61	4.50	4.06	3.96	4.59	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	0	2	17	4.89	259/1568	4.82	4.58	4.43	4.39	4.89	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	0	0	18	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	4	14	4.78	310/1564	4.76	4.67	4.28	4.20	4.78	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	2	16	4.89	227/1559	4.92	4.60	4.29	4.20	4.89	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	5	10	1	1	1	2	1	3.17	1189/1352	3.83	3.83	3.98	3.86	3.17	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	437/1384	4.68	4.42	4.08	3.86	4.50	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	15	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	312/1382	4.85	4.82	4.29	4.03	4.83	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	15	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	522/1368	4.48	4.53	4.30	4.01	4.67	
4. Were special techniques successful	15	3	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 948	****	****	3.95	3.75	****	
Laboratory															
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	20	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 555	****	****	4.29	4.14	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	2	0.00-0.99 0	A 12	Required for Majors	12
28-55	2	1.00-1.99 0	B 5		Graduate 0
56-83	3	2.00-2.99 1	C 2	General	2
84-150	4	3.00-3.49 4	D 0		Under-grad 21
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 6	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	5
			? 0		

Course-Section: LATN 101 0201
 Title ELEMENTARY LATIN I
 Instructor: RIVKIN, ROBERT
 Enrollment: 35
 Questionnaires: 21

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 1033
 FEB 11, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	0	0	0	4	16	4.80	274/1649	4.82	4.51	4.28	4.11	4.80
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	4	16	4.80	216/1648	4.82	4.56	4.23	4.16	4.80
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	5	15	4.75	296/1375	4.80	4.69	4.27	4.10	4.75
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	4	0	0	0	6	10	4.63	362/1595	4.66	4.51	4.20	4.03	4.63
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	5	14	4.65	249/1533	4.70	4.68	4.04	3.87	4.65
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	4	0	0	0	3	13	4.81	151/1512	4.78	4.72	4.10	3.86	4.81
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	0	6	14	4.70	284/1623	4.65	4.36	4.16	4.08	4.70
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	9	11	4.55	1148/1646	4.55	4.59	4.69	4.67	4.55
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	0	0	6	10	4.63	270/1621	4.61	4.50	4.06	3.96	4.63
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	1	3	16	4.75	480/1568	4.82	4.58	4.43	4.39	4.75
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	20	5.00	1/1572	5.00	4.96	4.70	4.64	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	5	15	4.75	342/1564	4.76	4.67	4.28	4.20	4.75
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	1	19	4.95	123/1559	4.92	4.60	4.29	4.20	4.95
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	11	0	0	1	2	5	4.50	303/1352	3.83	3.83	3.98	3.86	4.50
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	175/1384	4.68	4.42	4.08	3.86	4.86
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	14	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	292/1382	4.85	4.82	4.29	4.03	4.86
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	14	0	1	0	0	1	5	4.29	827/1368	4.48	4.53	4.30	4.01	4.29
4. Were special techniques successful	14	2	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	****/ 948	****	****	3.95	3.75	****
Field Work														
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	18	1	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 312	****	****	3.68	3.51	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 6	Required for Majors	6
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	B 5		Graduate 0
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	C 4	General	5
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad 21
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
			? 0		

Course-Section: LATN 201 0101
 Title INTERMEDIATE LATIN
 Instructor: SHERWIN, WALTER
 Enrollment: 27
 Questionnaires: 21

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 1034
 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	1	3	17	4.76	317/1649	4.22	4.51	4.28	4.29	4.76	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	2	17	4.71	300/1648	4.26	4.56	4.23	4.25	4.71	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	0	1	19	4.81	233/1375	4.59	4.69	4.27	4.37	4.81	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	1	3	15	4.74	254/1595	4.41	4.51	4.20	4.22	4.74	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	7	0	1	0	2	11	4.64	256/1533	4.54	4.68	4.04	4.04	4.64	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	1	0	1	17	4.79	171/1512	4.52	4.72	4.10	4.14	4.79	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	1	8	11	4.38	659/1623	4.19	4.36	4.16	4.21	4.38	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	21	5.00	1/1646	4.50	4.59	4.69	4.63	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	1	0	0	0	4	15	4.79	146/1621	4.36	4.50	4.06	4.01	4.79	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	1	0	1	1	17	4.65	652/1568	4.18	4.58	4.43	4.39	4.65	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	20	5.00	1/1572	4.90	4.96	4.70	4.73	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	5	15	4.75	342/1564	4.49	4.67	4.28	4.27	4.75	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	0	1	18	4.80	318/1559	4.25	4.60	4.29	4.33	4.80	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	18	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/1352	****	3.83	3.98	4.07	****	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	****/1384	3.83	4.42	4.08	3.99	****	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	18	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/1382	4.58	4.82	4.29	4.19	****	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	18	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/1368	4.42	4.53	4.30	4.21	****	
4. Were special techniques successful	18	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 948	****	****	3.95	3.89	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99 0	A 10	Required for Majors 11	Graduate 0 Major 0
28-55	3	1.00-1.99 0	B 9		
56-83	0	2.00-2.99 2	C 2	General 0	Under-grad 21 Non-major 21
84-150	6	3.00-3.49 3	D 0		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 9	F 0	Electives 1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 10	
			? 0		

Course-Section: LATN 201 0201
 Title INTERMEDIATE LATIN
 Instructor: FREYMAN, JAY M
 Enrollment: 24
 Questionnaires: 16

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 1035
 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	4	10	1	3.69	1415/1649	4.22	4.51	4.28	4.29	3.69	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	3	2	6	5	3.81	1304/1648	4.26	4.56	4.23	4.25	3.81	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	4	9	4.38	694/1375	4.59	4.69	4.27	4.37	4.38	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	4	0	1	3	2	6	4.08	1021/1595	4.41	4.51	4.20	4.22	4.08	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	0	2	4	8	4.43	454/1533	4.54	4.68	4.04	4.04	4.43	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	8	0	0	1	4	3	4.25	687/1512	4.52	4.72	4.10	4.14	4.25	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	4	5	6	4.00	1029/1623	4.19	4.36	4.16	4.21	4.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	16	0	4.00	1544/1646	4.50	4.59	4.69	4.63	4.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	3	9	2	3.93	1030/1621	4.36	4.50	4.06	4.01	3.93	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	6	0	0	0	5	3	2	3.70	1418/1568	4.18	4.58	4.43	4.39	3.70	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	6	0	0	0	1	0	9	4.80	840/1572	4.90	4.96	4.70	4.73	4.80	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	7	0	0	0	2	3	4	4.22	971/1564	4.49	4.67	4.28	4.27	4.22	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	1	3	4	2	3.70	1308/1559	4.25	4.60	4.29	4.33	3.70	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	6	8	1	1	0	0	0	1.50	****/1352	****	3.83	3.98	4.07	****	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	1	1	1	5	4	3.83	921/1384	3.83	4.42	4.08	3.99	3.83	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	0	2	1	9	4.58	555/1382	4.58	4.82	4.29	4.19	4.58	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	0	2	3	7	4.42	742/1368	4.42	4.53	4.30	4.21	4.42	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	A	5	Required for Majors	7	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	4						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	1	C	5	General	3	Under-grad	16	Non-major	16
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	3	D	1						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	4				
				?	0						

Course-Section: LATN 302 0101
 Title ROMAN COMEDY
 Instructor: SHERWIN, WALTER
 Enrollment: 19
 Questionnaires: 19

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 1036
 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		
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	0	0	1	8	9	4.44	723/1649	4.44	4.51	4.28	4.27	4.44
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	5	12	4.61	427/1648	4.61	4.56	4.23	4.18	4.61
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	4	13	4.67	401/1375	4.67	4.69	4.27	4.22	4.67
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	4	0	0	1	6	7	4.43	608/1595	4.43	4.51	4.20	4.21	4.43
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	4	0	0	0	1	13	4.93	85/1533	4.93	4.68	4.04	4.05	4.93
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	9	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1512	5.00	4.72	4.10	4.11	5.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	1	5	3	9	4.11	968/1623	4.11	4.36	4.16	4.08	4.11
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	1	0	0	17	4.83	782/1646	4.83	4.59	4.69	4.67	4.83
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	0	7	10	4.59	305/1621	4.59	4.50	4.06	4.02	4.59
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	7	0	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	220/1568	4.92	4.58	4.43	4.39	4.92
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	7	0	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/1572	5.00	4.96	4.70	4.64	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	7	0	0	0	0	2	10	4.83	234/1564	4.83	4.67	4.28	4.25	4.83
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	1	2	9	4.67	512/1559	4.67	4.60	4.29	4.23	4.67
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	0	4	4	4.50	437/1384	4.50	4.42	4.08	4.11	4.50
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	11	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1382	5.00	4.82	4.29	4.37	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	11	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	426/1368	4.75	4.53	4.30	4.39	4.75
4. Were special techniques successful	11	7	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 948	****	****	3.95	4.00	****
Seminar														
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	16	1	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	****/ 288	****	****	3.68	3.58	****
Field Work														
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	18	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 312	****	****	3.68	3.60	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors		
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A 11	Required for Majors 1	Graduate 1	Major 1
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B 4			
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	3	C 1	General 7	Under-grad 18	Non-major 18
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	3	D 0			
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00	6	F 0	Electives 1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	
				P 0			
				I 0	Other 9		
				? 0			