

Course-Section: ANCS 150 0101
 Title WORD ROOTS LATIN/GREEK
 Instructor: MASON, RICHARD
 Enrollment: 98
 Questionnaires: 41

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2008

Page 67
 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	2	0	1	5	4	16	13	3.90	1351/1670	3.90	4.33	4.31	4.23	3.90
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	2	0	4	18	15	4.13	1114/1666	4.13	4.18	4.27	4.30	4.13
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	0	0	0	6	11	22	4.41	703/1406	4.41	4.24	4.32	4.31	4.41
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	26	0	0	3	5	5	4.15	981/1615	4.15	4.14	4.24	4.17	4.15
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	3	8	1	3	6	10	10	3.83	1078/1566	3.83	4.15	4.07	4.03	3.83
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	25	0	0	2	5	7	4.36	611/1528	4.36	4.11	4.12	4.00	4.36
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	1	3	7	28	4.59	457/1650	4.59	4.38	4.22	4.28	4.59
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	1	0	0	7	29	1	3.84	1620/1667	3.84	4.36	4.67	4.61	3.84
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	7	3	0	3	10	16	2	3.55	1369/1626	3.55	3.97	4.11	4.07	3.55
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	9	0	0	0	8	14	10	4.06	1265/1559	4.06	4.45	4.46	4.47	4.06
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	8	0	0	2	3	7	21	4.42	1310/1560	4.42	4.81	4.72	4.68	4.42
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	9	0	0	1	10	10	11	3.97	1182/1549	3.97	4.33	4.31	4.32	3.97
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	9	0	2	4	9	8	9	3.56	1364/1546	3.56	4.47	4.32	4.32	3.56
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	8	30	0	0	3	0	0	3.00	****/1323	****	4.67	4.00	3.91	****
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	22	0	3	4	4	5	3	3.05	1257/1384	3.05	3.54	4.10	3.92	3.05
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	22	0	3	1	6	6	3	3.26	1263/1378	3.26	3.55	4.29	4.09	3.26
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	23	0	4	1	5	5	3	3.11	1299/1378	3.11	3.73	4.31	4.08	3.11
4. Were special techniques successful	22	18	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 904	****	3.00	4.03	3.94	****
Laboratory														
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	40	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 239	****	****	4.21	4.35	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors		
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	A 11	Required for Majors 14	Graduate 0	Major 0
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	B 11			
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	1	C 3	General 8	Under-grad 41	Non-major 41
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	2	D 1			
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5	F 0	Electives 2	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	
				P 0			
				I 0	Other 2		
				? 3			

Course-Section: ANCS 202 0101
 Title THE ROMAN WORLD
 Instructor: STORCH, RUDOLPH
 Enrollment: 35
 Questionnaires: 32

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2008

Page 68
 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	3	0	0	1	1	5	22	4.66	492/1670	4.66	4.33	4.31	4.32	4.66
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	3	0	0	0	1	8	20	4.66	428/1666	4.66	4.18	4.27	4.27	4.66
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	3	0	0	1	0	10	18	4.55	546/1406	4.55	4.24	4.32	4.39	4.55
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	3	17	0	0	2	5	5	4.25	874/1615	4.25	4.14	4.24	4.29	4.25
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	3	1	0	1	5	11	11	4.14	752/1566	4.14	4.15	4.07	4.00	4.14
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	3	17	0	1	3	5	3	3.83	1097/1528	3.83	4.11	4.12	4.11	3.83
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	3	0	0	1	5	5	18	4.38	757/1650	4.38	4.38	4.22	4.20	4.38
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	0	0	0	0	0	29	5.00	1/1667	5.00	4.36	4.67	4.64	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	0	3	14	10	4.26	728/1626	4.26	3.97	4.11	4.06	4.26
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	0	4	25	4.86	339/1559	4.86	4.45	4.46	4.40	4.86
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	0	1	28	4.97	239/1560	4.97	4.81	4.72	4.73	4.97
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	2	7	20	4.62	537/1549	4.62	4.33	4.31	4.25	4.62
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	1	0	0	28	4.90	242/1546	4.90	4.47	4.32	4.30	4.90
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	1	0	0	1	7	19	4.67	235/1323	4.67	4.67	4.00	4.08	4.67
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	22	0	4	0	2	1	3	2.90	1299/1384	2.90	3.54	4.10	4.07	2.90
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	22	0	4	2	2	0	2	2.40	1354/1378	2.40	3.55	4.29	4.25	2.40
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	22	0	4	0	1	2	3	3.00	1304/1378	3.00	3.73	4.31	4.26	3.00
4. Were special techniques successful	20	7	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	****/ 904	****	3.00	4.03	4.01	****
Field Work														
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	31	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 38	****	****	4.62	4.50	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	31	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.27	4.00	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	31	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 28	****	****	4.64	****	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	31	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 16	****	****	4.67	****	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	31	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 27	****	****	4.54	****	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors		
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	0	A 9	Required for Majors 16	Graduate 0	Major 4
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	B 11			
56-83	5	2.00-2.99	6	C 7	General 5	Under-grad 32	Non-major 28
84-150	8	3.00-3.49	8	D 0			
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	7	F 0	Electives 0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	
				P 0			
				I 0	Other 5		
				? 1			

Course-Section: ANCS 220 0101
 Title JUDAISM: JESUS & HILLE
 Instructor: LANDER, SHIRA
 Enrollment: 44
 Questionnaires: 19

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2008

Page 69
 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	2	2	2	13	4.37	862/1670	4.37	4.33	4.31	4.32	4.37
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	1	2	9	6	3.95	1270/1666	3.95	4.18	4.27	4.27	3.95
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	1	3	5	9	4.22	900/1406	4.22	4.24	4.32	4.39	4.22
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	9	0	0	1	5	3	4.22	910/1615	4.22	4.14	4.24	4.29	4.22
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	0	6	6	5	3.78	1129/1566	3.78	4.15	4.07	4.00	3.78
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	11	0	0	1	2	4	4.43	532/1528	4.43	4.11	4.12	4.11	4.43
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	1	6	11	4.56	499/1650	4.56	4.38	4.22	4.20	4.56
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	9	9	4.50	1157/1667	4.50	4.36	4.67	4.64	4.50
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	1	0	10	5	4.19	808/1626	4.19	3.97	4.11	4.06	4.19
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	0	2	14	4.88	323/1559	4.88	4.45	4.46	4.40	4.88
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	0	1	15	4.94	417/1560	4.94	4.81	4.72	4.73	4.94
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	1	4	11	4.63	537/1549	4.63	4.33	4.31	4.25	4.63
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	3	13	4.81	333/1546	4.81	4.47	4.32	4.30	4.81
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	0	0	1	0	2	12	4.67	235/1323	4.67	4.67	4.00	4.08	4.67
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	1	3	3	2	3.67	1033/1384	3.67	3.54	4.10	4.07	3.67
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	10	0	1	0	1	3	4	4.00	970/1378	4.00	3.55	4.29	4.25	4.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	11	0	0	0	1	4	3	4.25	867/1378	4.25	3.73	4.31	4.26	4.25
4. Were special techniques successful	10	1	2	1	1	3	1	3.00	820/ 904	3.00	3.00	4.03	4.01	3.00

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 2
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	B 6			
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	3	C 3	General 5	Under-grad 19	Non-major 17
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	4	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 2		
				? 0			

Course-Section: ANCS 350A 0101
 Title AGE OF PERIKLES
 Instructor: MASON, RICHARD
 Enrollment: 20
 Questionnaires: 13

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2008

Page 70
 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	1	0	5	7	4.38	835/1670	4.38	4.33	4.31	4.24	4.38
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	11	1	4.00	1199/1666	4.00	4.18	4.27	4.18	4.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	5	6	2	3.77	1202/1406	3.77	4.24	4.32	4.22	3.77
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	8	2	3.92	1203/1615	3.92	4.14	4.24	4.18	3.92
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	2	10	4.83	170/1566	4.83	4.15	4.07	4.04	4.83
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	4	6	2	3.83	1097/1528	3.83	4.11	4.12	4.07	3.83
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	3	6	3	4.00	1135/1650	4.00	4.38	4.22	4.12	4.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	11	1	4.08	1482/1667	4.08	4.36	4.67	4.67	4.08
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	1	8	0	3.89	1143/1626	3.89	3.97	4.11	4.06	3.89
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	1	8	1	4.00	1280/1559	4.00	4.45	4.46	4.40	4.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	596/1560	4.90	4.81	4.72	4.67	4.90
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	1	7	2	4.10	1104/1549	4.10	4.33	4.31	4.25	4.10
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	4	6	4.60	595/1546	4.60	4.47	4.32	4.24	4.60
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	9	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/1323	****	4.67	4.00	3.99	****
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	1	3	7	4.55	409/1384	4.55	3.54	4.10	4.12	4.55
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	1	3	7	4.55	571/1378	4.55	3.55	4.29	4.30	4.55
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	0	5	6	4.55	627/1378	4.55	3.73	4.31	4.33	4.55
4. Were special techniques successful	2	10	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 904	****	3.00	4.03	4.03	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	9	0	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	74/ 87	4.00	4.00	4.65	4.30	4.00
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	0	3	0	4.00	****/ 79	****	****	4.45	3.68	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	10	1	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 80	****	****	3.97	3.76	****

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 5
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B 7			
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	1	C 0	General 2	Under-grad 13	Non-major 8
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	4	D 1			
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	0	F 0	Electives 2	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	
				P 0			
				I 0	Other 7		