

Course-Section: LATN 102 0101
 Title ELEMENTARY LATIN II
 Instructor: RIVKIN, ROBERT
 Enrollment: 19
 Questionnaires: 13

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2008

Page 1000
 AUG 6, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean		
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5						Mean	Rank

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	13	5.00	1/1670	4.84	4.67	4.31	4.23	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	12	4.92	138/1666	4.92	4.79	4.27	4.30	4.92
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	12	4.92	153/1406	4.87	4.84	4.32	4.31	4.92
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	4	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	272/1615	4.68	4.58	4.24	4.17	4.78
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	4	8	4.67	295/1566	4.66	4.69	4.07	4.03	4.67
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	3	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	202/1528	4.59	4.61	4.12	4.00	4.78
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	1	2	9	4.67	361/1650	4.78	4.73	4.22	4.28	4.67
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/1667	4.76	4.74	4.67	4.61	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/1626	4.88	4.72	4.11	4.07	5.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	2	10	4.83	387/1559	4.87	4.87	4.46	4.47	4.83
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	536/1560	4.96	4.97	4.72	4.68	4.92
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	1	0	11	4.83	266/1549	4.77	4.85	4.31	4.32	4.83
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	1	10	4.75	407/1546	4.75	4.79	4.32	4.32	4.75
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	7	3	0	1	0	1	2.20	1290/1323	2.95	2.95	4.00	3.91	2.20
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	434/1384	4.61	4.31	4.10	3.92	4.50
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	481/1378	4.84	4.88	4.29	4.09	4.67
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	0	0	0	3	3	4.50	653/1378	4.60	4.63	4.31	4.08	4.50
4. Were special techniques successful	7	3	0	0	2	0	1	3.67	****/ 904	4.56	4.56	4.03	3.94	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors		
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	A 6	Required for Majors 6	Graduate 0	Major 0
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B 2			
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	0	C 3	General 2	Under-grad 13	Non-major 13
84-150	2	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 4		
				? 1			

Course-Section: LATN 102 0201
 Title ELEMENTARY LATIN II
 Instructor: RIVKIN, ROBERT (Instr. A)
 Enrollment: 25
 Questionnaires: 25

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2008

Page 1001
 AUG 6, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor Mean	Instructor Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5							
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	4	20	4.76	350/1670	4.84	4.67	4.31	4.23	4.76
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	23	4.92	138/1666	4.92	4.79	4.27	4.30	4.92
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	2	22	4.84	233/1406	4.87	4.84	4.32	4.31	4.84
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	9	0	0	2	2	12	4.63	423/1615	4.68	4.58	4.24	4.17	4.63
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	0	1	6	16	4.65	302/1566	4.66	4.69	4.07	4.03	4.65
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	7	0	0	2	4	10	4.50	421/1528	4.59	4.61	4.12	4.00	4.50
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	2	22	4.84	201/1650	4.78	4.73	4.22	4.28	4.84
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	9	16	4.64	1042/1667	4.76	4.74	4.67	4.61	4.64
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	0	0	5	15	4.75	207/1626	4.88	4.72	4.11	4.07	4.75
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	2	22	4.92	248/1559	4.87	4.87	4.46	4.47	4.89
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	24	5.00	1/1560	4.96	4.97	4.72	4.68	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	3	1	20	4.71	439/1549	4.77	4.85	4.31	4.32	4.71
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	4	19	4.75	407/1546	4.75	4.79	4.32	4.32	4.75
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	14	2	1	1	0	6	3.70	941/1323	2.95	2.95	4.00	3.91	3.70
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	1	0	2	12	4.67	324/1384	4.61	4.31	4.10	3.92	4.67
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	10	0	0	0	0	1	14	4.93	170/1378	4.84	4.88	4.29	4.09	4.93
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	11	0	0	1	0	2	11	4.64	550/1378	4.60	4.63	4.31	4.08	4.64
4. Were special techniques successful	10	6	0	0	1	2	6	4.56	222/ 904	4.56	4.56	4.03	3.94	4.56
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	24	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 87	****	****	4.65	4.67	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	24	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 79	****	****	4.64	4.72	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	24	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 79	****	****	4.45	4.59	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	24	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 80	****	****	3.97	3.99	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	24	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 41	****	****	4.50	3.91	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	24	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 38	****	****	4.19	4.07	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	24	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 38	****	****	4.62	4.63	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	24	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.27	4.42	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	24	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.47	4.28	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	24	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 28	****	****	4.64	4.59	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	24	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 16	****	****	4.67	4.83	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	24	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 27	****	****	4.54	4.46	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	24	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 10	****	****	4.84	4.75	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	24	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 6	****	****	4.92	4.83	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors		
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	0	A 9	Required for Majors 11	Graduate 0	Major 0
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B 10			
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	1	C 4	General 1	Under-grad 25	Non-major 25
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	7	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	10
?	0		

Course-Section: LATN 102 0201
 Title ELEMENTARY LATIN II
 Instructor: RIVKIN, ROBERT (Instr. B)
 Enrollment: 25
 Questionnaires: 25

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2008

Page 1002
 AUG 6, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					5	Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	Mean		Rank						
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	4	20	4.76	350/1670	4.84	4.67	4.31	4.23	4.76	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	23	4.92	138/1666	4.92	4.79	4.27	4.30	4.92	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	2	22	4.84	233/1406	4.87	4.84	4.32	4.31	4.84	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	9	0	0	2	2	12	4.63	423/1615	4.68	4.58	4.24	4.17	4.63	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	0	1	6	16	4.65	302/1566	4.66	4.69	4.07	4.03	4.65	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	7	0	0	2	4	10	4.50	421/1528	4.59	4.61	4.12	4.00	4.50	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	2	22	4.84	201/1650	4.78	4.73	4.22	4.28	4.84	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	9	16	4.64	1042/1667	4.76	4.74	4.67	4.61	4.64	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	19	0	0	0	0	3	3	4.50	****/1626	4.88	4.72	4.11	4.07	4.75	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	18	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	355/1559	4.87	4.87	4.46	4.47	4.89	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	19	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	****/1560	4.96	4.97	4.72	4.68	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	19	0	0	0	1	0	5	4.67	****/1549	4.77	4.85	4.31	4.32	4.71	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	****/1546	4.75	4.79	4.32	4.32	4.75	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	19	3	1	0	1	1	0	2.67	****/1323	2.95	2.95	4.00	3.91	3.70	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	1	0	2	12	4.67	324/1384	4.61	4.31	4.10	3.92	4.67	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	10	0	0	0	0	1	14	4.93	170/1378	4.84	4.88	4.29	4.09	4.93	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	11	0	0	1	0	2	11	4.64	550/1378	4.60	4.63	4.31	4.08	4.64	
4. Were special techniques successful	10	6	0	0	1	2	6	4.56	222/ 904	4.56	4.56	4.03	3.94	4.56	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	24	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 87	****	****	4.65	4.67	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	24	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 79	****	****	4.64	4.72	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	24	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 79	****	****	4.45	4.59	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	24	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 80	****	****	3.97	3.99	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	24	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 41	****	****	4.50	3.91	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	24	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 38	****	****	4.19	4.07	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	24	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 38	****	****	4.62	4.63	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	24	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.27	4.42	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	24	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.47	4.28	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	24	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 28	****	****	4.64	4.59	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	24	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 16	****	****	4.67	4.83	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	24	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 27	****	****	4.54	4.46	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	24	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 10	****	****	4.84	4.75	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	24	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 6	****	****	4.92	4.83	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors		
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	0	A 9	Required for Majors 11	Graduate 0	Major 0
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B 10			
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	1	C 4	General 1	Under-grad 25	Non-major 25
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	7	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	10
?	0		

Course-Section: LATN 312 0101
 Title SILVER AGE
 Instructor: SHERWIN, WALTER
 Enrollment: 16
 Questionnaires: 14

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2008

Page 1003
 AUG 6, 2008
 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	2	0	0	0	2	6	4	4.17	1094/1670	4.17	4.67	4.31	4.24	4.17
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	0	0	0	7	5	4.42	767/1666	4.42	4.79	4.27	4.18	4.42
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	0	0	0	1	1	10	4.75	318/1406	4.75	4.84	4.32	4.22	4.75
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	5	0	1	0	2	4	4.29	837/1615	4.29	4.58	4.24	4.18	4.29
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	2	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	187/1566	4.80	4.69	4.07	4.04	4.80
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	3	0	0	0	3	6	4.67	300/1528	4.67	4.61	4.12	4.07	4.67
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	0	1	3	8	4.58	457/1650	4.58	4.73	4.22	4.12	4.58
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	4	8	4.67	1022/1667	4.67	4.74	4.67	4.67	4.67
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	1	5	6	4.42	547/1626	4.42	4.72	4.11	4.06	4.42
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	6	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	323/1559	4.88	4.87	4.46	4.40	4.88
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	6	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1560	5.00	4.97	4.72	4.67	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	6	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1549	5.00	4.85	4.31	4.25	5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	265/1546	4.88	4.79	4.32	4.24	4.88
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	6	7	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1323	****	2.95	4.00	3.99	****
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	9	0	2	0	0	0	3	3.40	1141/1384	3.40	4.31	4.10	4.12	3.40
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	10	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1378	5.00	4.88	4.29	4.30	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	10	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	439/1378	4.75	4.63	4.31	4.33	4.75
4. Were special techniques successful	9	4	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 904	****	4.56	4.03	4.03	****
Field Work														
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 38	****	****	4.62	4.68	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.27	4.38	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 28	****	****	4.64	3.33	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 27	****	****	4.54	2.63	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors		
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A 3	Required for Majors 0	Graduate 0	Major 0
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	B 5			
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	2	C 4	General 2	Under-grad 14	Non-major 14
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	5	D 0			
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F 0	Electives 0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	
				P 0			
				I 0	Other 10		
				? 0			