

Course-Section: ANCS 150 0101  
 Title WORD ROOTS LATIN/GREEK  
 Instructor: MASON, RICHARD  
 Enrollment: 97  
 Questionnaires: 34

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2007

Page 51  
 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	1	1	4	12	16	4.21	949/1522	4.21	4.53	4.30	4.14	4.21	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	2	1	5	7	19	4.18	955/1522	4.18	4.29	4.26	4.18	4.18	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	0	6	6	21	4.35	690/1285	4.35	4.49	4.30	4.22	4.35	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	25	0	0	2	3	4	4.22	827/1476	4.22	4.11	4.22	4.09	4.22	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	4	1	1	7	10	11	3.97	812/1412	3.97	4.33	4.06	4.01	3.97	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	21	0	0	4	3	6	4.15	703/1381	4.15	4.07	4.08	3.93	4.15	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	6	3	25	4.56	435/1500	4.56	4.48	4.18	4.16	4.56	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	2	0	2	2	19	9	4.09	1358/1517	4.09	4.37	4.65	4.62	4.09	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	1	0	7	18	5	3.84	1089/1497	3.84	4.28	4.11	4.02	3.84	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	1	1	4	10	17	4.24	1055/1440	4.24	4.62	4.45	4.40	4.24	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	1	2	4	27	4.68	989/1448	4.68	4.85	4.71	4.63	4.68	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	1	2	3	8	20	4.29	835/1436	4.29	4.34	4.29	4.24	4.29	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	2	1	2	7	5	17	4.09	995/1432	4.09	4.54	4.29	4.23	4.09	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	30	2	0	0	1	0	2.00	****/1221	****	4.26	3.93	3.86	****	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	21	0	2	0	6	2	3	3.31	1117/1280	3.31	3.74	4.10	3.92	3.31	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	20	0	1	0	4	2	7	4.00	930/1277	4.00	4.28	4.34	4.13	4.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	21	0	1	1	3	2	6	3.85	985/1269	3.85	4.17	4.31	4.04	3.85	
4. Were special techniques successful	21	10	0	1	2	0	0	2.67	****/ 854	****	4.11	4.02	3.87	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	6	0.00-0.99 1	A 17	Required for Majors 16	Graduate 0 Major 2
28-55	6	1.00-1.99 0	B 9		
56-83	3	2.00-2.99 2	C 3	General 8	Under-grad 34 Non-major 32
84-150	6	3.00-3.49 6	D 0		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 7	F 0	Electives 4	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 1		
			I 0	Other 2	
			? 0		

Course-Section: ANCS 201 0101  
 Title THE ANCIENT GREEKS  
 Instructor: MASON, RICHARD  
 Enrollment: 89  
 Questionnaires: 47

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2007

Page 52  
 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	1	7	9	30	4.45	681/1522	4.45	4.53	4.30	4.34	4.45	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	2	7	20	18	4.15	986/1522	4.15	4.29	4.26	4.29	4.15	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	3	6	19	18	4.13	857/1285	4.13	4.49	4.30	4.36	4.13	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	25	3	0	5	6	8	3.73	1212/1476	3.73	4.11	4.22	4.20	3.73	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	3	5	17	21	4.22	603/1412	4.22	4.33	4.06	4.00	4.22	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	22	2	3	5	4	10	3.71	1076/1381	3.71	4.07	4.08	3.97	3.71	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	1	2	6	10	26	4.29	750/1500	4.29	4.48	4.18	4.20	4.29	
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	1	33	11	4.22	1284/1517	4.22	4.37	4.65	4.63	4.22	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	1	1	8	21	12	3.98	938/1497	3.98	4.28	4.11	4.11	3.98	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	2	5	11	29	4.43	904/1440	4.43	4.62	4.45	4.42	4.43	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	1	1	4	41	4.81	765/1448	4.81	4.85	4.71	4.78	4.81	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	1	1	9	12	24	4.21	916/1436	4.21	4.34	4.29	4.29	4.21	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	1	4	9	31	4.40	758/1432	4.40	4.54	4.29	4.31	4.40	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	26	5	6	3	2	5	2.81	1121/1221	2.81	4.26	3.93	4.02	2.81	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	29	0	3	2	5	3	5	3.28	1126/1280	3.28	3.74	4.10	4.08	3.28	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	31	0	1	1	3	2	9	4.06	913/1277	4.06	4.28	4.34	4.33	4.06	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	31	0	2	1	4	0	9	3.81	997/1269	3.81	4.17	4.31	4.33	3.81	
4. Were special techniques successful	30	14	1	1	0	0	1	2.67	****/ 854	****	4.11	4.02	4.00	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	12	0.00-0.99 1	A 12	Required for Majors	17
28-55	9	1.00-1.99 0	B 15		
56-83	2	2.00-2.99 3	C 12	General	9
84-150	5	3.00-3.49 6	D 0	Under-grad	47
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 14	F 1	Electives	2
			P 1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	
			I 0	Other	12
			? 0		

Course-Section: ANCS 202 0101  
 Title THE ROMAN WORLD  
 Instructor: STORCH, RUDOLPH  
 Enrollment: 38  
 Questionnaires: 29

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2007

Page 53  
 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	2	0	0	0	6	3	18	4.44	681/1522	4.44	4.53	4.30	4.34	4.44	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	0	1	3	8	15	4.37	738/1522	4.37	4.29	4.26	4.29	4.37	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	0	0	2	1	7	17	4.44	602/1285	4.44	4.49	4.30	4.36	4.44	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	18	0	2	0	2	5	4.11	945/1476	4.11	4.11	4.22	4.20	4.11	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	3	3	11	10	3.93	865/1412	3.93	4.33	4.06	4.00	3.93	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	20	0	2	1	1	4	3.88	961/1381	3.88	4.07	4.08	3.97	3.88	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	2	1	6	19	4.50	483/1500	4.50	4.48	4.18	4.20	4.50	
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	13	14	4.52	1071/1517	4.52	4.37	4.65	4.63	4.52	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	0	0	2	2	10	9	4.13	794/1497	4.13	4.28	4.11	4.11	4.13	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	1	1	7	18	4.56	740/1440	4.56	4.62	4.45	4.42	4.56	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	2	25	4.93	395/1448	4.93	4.85	4.71	4.78	4.93	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	1	3	9	14	4.33	793/1436	4.33	4.34	4.29	4.29	4.33	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	3	5	19	4.59	537/1432	4.59	4.54	4.29	4.31	4.59	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	0	0	1	0	9	17	4.56	246/1221	4.56	4.26	3.93	4.02	4.56	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	18	0	5	0	1	2	3	2.82	1234/1280	2.82	3.74	4.10	4.08	2.82	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	18	0	1	2	0	3	5	3.82	1046/1277	3.82	4.28	4.34	4.33	3.82	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	18	0	2	1	0	3	5	3.73	1047/1269	3.73	4.17	4.31	4.33	3.73	
4. Were special techniques successful	18	8	0	1	0	0	2	4.00	****/ 854	****	4.11	4.02	4.00	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	10	Required for Majors	9	Graduate	0	Major	3
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	7						
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	6	C	6	General	7	Under-grad	29	Non-major	26
84-150	13	3.00-3.49	8	D	1						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	6	F	0	Electives	3	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	2						
				I	0	Other	7				
				?	1						

Course-Section: ANCS 220 0101  
 Title JUDAISM: JESUS & HILLE  
 Instructor: LANDER, SHIRA  
 Enrollment: 49  
 Questionnaires: 26

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2007

Page 54  
 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	3	5	18	4.58	525/1522	4.58	4.53	4.30	4.34	4.58	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	4	8	13	4.27	864/1522	4.27	4.29	4.26	4.29	4.27	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	11	14	4.50	531/1285	4.50	4.49	4.30	4.36	4.50	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	7	1	0	5	5	8	4.00	1009/1476	4.00	4.11	4.22	4.20	4.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	2	5	18	4.54	322/1412	4.54	4.33	4.06	4.00	4.54	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	18	0	0	1	5	2	4.13	733/1381	4.13	4.07	4.08	3.97	4.13	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	3	6	17	4.54	454/1500	4.54	4.48	4.18	4.20	4.54	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	1	11	14	4.50	1080/1517	4.50	4.37	4.65	4.63	4.50	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	3	0	0	2	7	11	4.45	457/1497	4.45	4.28	4.11	4.11	4.45	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	1	24	4.88	224/1440	4.88	4.62	4.45	4.42	4.88	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	4	22	4.85	656/1448	4.85	4.85	4.71	4.78	4.85	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	1	3	7	15	4.38	741/1436	4.38	4.34	4.29	4.29	4.38	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	6	18	4.62	514/1432	4.62	4.54	4.29	4.31	4.62	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	0	2	4	19	4.68	168/1221	4.68	4.26	3.93	4.02	4.68	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	3	3	7	4.31	553/1280	4.31	3.74	4.10	4.08	4.31	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	13	0	0	0	2	2	9	4.54	573/1277	4.54	4.28	4.34	4.33	4.54	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	13	0	0	0	3	1	9	4.46	620/1269	4.46	4.17	4.31	4.33	4.46	
4. Were special techniques successful	14	5	0	0	4	1	2	3.71	604/ 854	3.71	4.11	4.02	4.00	3.71	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	25	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 79	****	****	4.58	4.58	****	
Field Work															
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	25	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 45	****	****	4.30	4.58	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	25	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.40	4.75	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	25	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 37	****	****	4.63	****	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	25	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 23	****	****	4.41	****	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	25	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 33	****	****	4.69	****	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	6	0.00-0.99	0	A	5
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	1	B	13
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	3	C	5
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	4	D	0
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0
				P	1
				I	0
				?	0
			Required for Majors	15	Graduate
			General	4	Under-grad
			Electives	2	Non-major
			Other	3	

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

Course-Section: ANCS 350 0101  
 Title TOPICS: ANCIENT STUDIE  
 Instructor: MASON, RICHARD  
 Enrollment: 2  
 Questionnaires: 2

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2007

Page 55  
 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	0	2	5.00	1/1522	5.00	4.53	4.30	4.34	5.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	545/1522	4.50	4.29	4.26	4.25	4.50	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1285	5.00	4.49	4.30	4.30	5.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	473/1476	4.50	4.11	4.22	4.26	4.50	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1412	5.00	4.33	4.06	4.03	5.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	331/1381	4.50	4.07	4.08	4.13	4.50	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	483/1500	4.50	4.48	4.18	4.13	4.50	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	1080/1517	4.50	4.37	4.65	4.62	4.50	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1497	5.00	4.28	4.11	4.13	5.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1440	5.00	4.62	4.45	4.46	5.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1448	5.00	4.85	4.71	4.71	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	601/1436	4.50	4.34	4.29	4.30	4.50	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1432	5.00	4.54	4.29	4.29	5.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1221	5.00	4.26	3.93	3.94	5.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1280	5.00	3.74	4.10	4.14	5.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1277	5.00	4.28	4.34	4.38	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1269	5.00	4.17	4.31	4.39	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	194/ 854	4.50	4.11	4.02	4.00	4.50	

Frequency Distribution

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