

Course-Section: LATN 102 0101  
 Title ELEMENTARY LATIN II  
 Instructor: RIVKIN, ROBERT  
 Enrollment: 23  
 Questionnaires: 17

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2005

Page 959  
 JUN 14, 2005  
 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	0	0	0	0	0	1	16	4.94	79/1504	4.91	4.24	4.27	4.13	4.94
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	17	5.00	1/1503	4.82	4.22	4.20	4.16	5.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	0	16	4.88	145/1290	4.85	4.32	4.28	4.19	4.88
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	10	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	129/1453	4.71	4.22	4.21	4.11	4.86
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	2	5	9	4.29	516/1421	4.48	4.08	4.00	3.91	4.29
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	5	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	77/1365	4.56	4.11	4.08	3.96	4.92
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	2	14	4.76	190/1485	4.68	4.20	4.16	4.13	4.76
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	2	15	4.88	691/1504	4.94	4.68	4.69	4.66	4.88
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	1	4	12	4.65	226/1483	4.69	4.07	4.06	3.97	4.65
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	1	16	4.94	107/1425	4.97	4.41	4.41	4.36	4.94
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	16	4.94	301/1426	4.97	4.72	4.69	4.56	4.94
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	2	14	4.76	247/1418	4.82	4.29	4.25	4.20	4.76
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	2	14	4.76	310/1416	4.88	4.34	4.26	4.21	4.76
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	3	0	0	1	2	11	4.71	149/1199	4.61	3.95	3.97	3.82	4.71
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	****/1312	4.60	4.12	4.00	3.69	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	13	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	****/1303	4.60	4.39	4.24	3.93	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	13	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	****/1299	4.40	4.34	4.25	3.94	****
4. Were special techniques successful	13	1	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 758	****	4.05	4.01	3.80	****
Laboratory														
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 225	****	4.40	4.23	4.01	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	16	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 207	****	4.22	4.09	4.01	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	5	0.00-0.99	0	A	7	Required for Majors	9	Graduate	1	Major	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	5						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	4	C	5	General	3	Under-grad	16	Non-major	1
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00	8	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	4				
				?	0						

Course-Section: LATN 102 0201  
 Title ELEMENTARY LATIN II  
 Instructor: RIVKIN, ROBERT  
 Enrollment: 18  
 Questionnaires: 17

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2005

Page 960  
 JUN 14, 2005  
 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	2	15	4.88	146/1504	4.91	4.24	4.27	4.13	4.88
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	4	12	4.65	335/1503	4.82	4.22	4.20	4.16	4.65
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	3	13	4.81	194/1290	4.85	4.32	4.28	4.19	4.81
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	8	0	0	1	2	6	4.56	385/1453	4.71	4.22	4.21	4.11	4.56
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	0	2	1	12	4.67	212/1421	4.48	4.08	4.00	3.91	4.67
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	7	1	0	2	0	7	4.20	645/1365	4.56	4.11	4.08	3.96	4.20
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	5	11	4.59	370/1485	4.68	4.20	4.16	4.13	4.59
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	17	5.00	1/1504	4.94	4.68	4.69	4.66	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	1	0	0	0	4	11	4.73	161/1483	4.69	4.07	4.06	3.97	4.73
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	0	0	15	5.00	1/1425	4.97	4.41	4.41	4.36	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	0	15	5.00	1/1426	4.97	4.72	4.69	4.56	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	0	2	13	4.87	152/1418	4.82	4.29	4.25	4.20	4.87
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	0	15	5.00	1/1416	4.88	4.34	4.26	4.21	5.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	7	0	0	1	2	5	4.50	271/1199	4.61	3.95	3.97	3.82	4.50
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	297/1312	4.60	4.12	4.00	3.69	4.60
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	12	0	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	507/1303	4.60	4.39	4.24	3.93	4.60
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	12	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	678/1299	4.40	4.34	4.25	3.94	4.40
4. Were special techniques successful	12	3	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 758	****	4.05	4.01	3.80	****
Field Work														
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	16	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 39	****	4.61	4.44	5.00	****
Self Paced														
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 20	****	5.00	4.24	4.92	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors				
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 8	Required for Majors	11	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	B 7						
56-83	6	2.00-2.99	C 1	General	1	Under-grad	17	Non-major	2
84-150	6	3.00-3.49	D 1						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
			P 0						
			I 0	Other	5				
			? 0						

Course-Section: LATN 312 0101  
 Title SILVER AGE  
 Instructor: SHERWIN, WALTER  
 Enrollment: 10  
 Questionnaires: 10

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2005

Page 961  
 JUN 14, 2005  
 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	0	0	0	0	1	1	8	4.70	327/1504	4.70	4.24	4.27	4.27	4.70
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	2	7	4.60	380/1503	4.60	4.22	4.20	4.22	4.60
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	0	9	4.80	201/1290	4.80	4.32	4.28	4.31	4.80
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	4	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	140/1453	4.83	4.22	4.21	4.23	4.83
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	3	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1421	5.00	4.08	4.00	4.01	5.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	4	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1365	5.00	4.11	4.08	4.08	5.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	2	2	6	4.40	591/1485	4.40	4.20	4.16	4.17	4.40
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	830/1504	4.80	4.68	4.69	4.65	4.80
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1483	5.00	4.07	4.06	4.08	5.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	6	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	420/1425	4.75	4.41	4.41	4.43	4.75
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	6	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1426	5.00	4.72	4.69	4.71	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	6	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1418	5.00	4.29	4.25	4.26	5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	623/1416	4.50	4.34	4.26	4.27	4.50
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	3	5	4.44	424/1312	4.44	4.12	4.00	4.09	4.44
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1303	5.00	4.39	4.24	4.27	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	1	0	0	1	7	4.44	634/1299	4.44	4.34	4.25	4.30	4.44
4. Were special techniques successful	1	6	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/ 758	5.00	4.05	4.01	4.00	5.00
Seminar														
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	9	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 73	****	4.17	4.17	4.25	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 7	Required for Majors	1 Graduate 0 Major 0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	B 2		
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	C 0	General	2 Under-grad 10 Non-major 0
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	D 0		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	1
			P 0		
			I 0		
			? 0	Other	6

#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant

Course-Section: LATN 402 0101  
 Title SPECIAL AUTHOR SEMINAR  
 Instructor: FREYMAN, JAY M  
 Enrollment: 15  
 Questionnaires: 13

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2005

Page 962  
 JUN 14, 2005  
 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	
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	2	0	11	4.69	327/1504	4.69	4.24	4.27	4.33	4.69
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	12	4.92	85/1503	4.92	4.22	4.20	4.18	4.92
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	0	12	4.85	173/1290	4.85	4.32	4.28	4.32	4.85
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1453	5.00	4.22	4.21	4.22	5.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/1421	5.00	4.08	4.00	4.02	5.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	6	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1365	5.00	4.11	4.08	4.09	5.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	1	1	10	4.54	423/1485	4.54	4.20	4.16	4.14	4.54
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	13	5.00	1/1504	5.00	4.68	4.69	4.73	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	4	9	4.69	187/1483	4.69	4.07	4.06	4.11	4.69
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	8	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1425	5.00	4.41	4.41	4.38	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	8	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1426	5.00	4.72	4.69	4.72	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	10	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/1418	****	4.29	4.25	4.25	****
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	1	0	0	2	4.00	****/1416	****	4.34	4.26	4.26	****
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	12	4.92	89/1312	4.92	4.12	4.00	4.07	4.92
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	0	13	5.00	1/1303	5.00	4.39	4.24	4.34	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	0	13	5.00	1/1299	5.00	4.34	4.25	4.38	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	1	8	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	185/ 758	4.50	4.05	4.01	4.17	4.50

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	8	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	2						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	0	C	1	General	7	Under-grad	13	Non-major	1
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	10	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	1						
				I	0	Other	6				
				?	0						