Course-Section: GREK 102 0101 University of Maryland Title ELEMENTARY GREEK II Baltimore County

Instructor: FREYMAN, JAY M

Enrollment: 15 Questionnaires: 10

Spring 2006 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Page 846 JUN 13, 2006 Job IRBR3029

	Frequencies					Inst	ructor	Course Dept		UMBC Level		Sect		
Questions	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	1	9	4.90	159/1481	4.90	4.26	4.29	4.14	4.90
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	1	8	4.70	286/1481	4.70	4.26	4.23	4.18	4.70
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	203/1249	4.80	4.37	4.27	4.14	4.80
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	148/1424	4.88	4.27	4.21	4.06	4.88
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	2	1	6	4.20	554/1396	4.20	4.07	3.98	3.89	4.20
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1342	5.00	4.12	4.07	3.88	5.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	161/1459	4.80	4.19	4.16	4.17	4.80
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	839/1480	4.80	4.64	4.68	4.64	4.80
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	1	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	107/1450	4.89	4.10	4.09	3.97	4.89
Lecture	^	0	0	^	^	^	1.0	F 00	1 /1 400	F 00	1 16	4 40	1 26	F 00
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1409	5.00	4.46	4.42	4.36	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1407	5.00	4.77	4.69	4.57	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	3	-7	4.70	335/1399	4.70	4.30	4.26	4.23	4.70
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	U	U	U	U	Τ	9	4.90	146/1400	4.90	4.35	4.27	4.19	4.90
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	264/1262	4.67	4.18	4.05	3.77	4.67
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	276/1259	4.83	4.40	4.29	4.06	4.83
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	272/1256	4.83	4.34	4.30	4.08	4.83
4. Were special techniques successful	5	4	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 788	****	4.03	4.00	3.80	****
Frequ	ıency	Dist	rib	utio	n									

Credits	Cum. GPA	Cum. GPA Expec			Reasons		Туре		Majors			
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	5	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	0	
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	В	4							
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	1	C	0	General	2	Under-grad	10	Non-major	1	
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	0	D	0							
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	6	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means	#### - Means there are not enoug responses to be significant			
				P	1			responses to				
				I	0	Other	6					
				?	0							

Course-Section: GREK 362 0101 University of Maryland Title SEL FROM GREEK HISTORI

Baltimore County Spring 2006

Page 847

JUN 13, 2006

Job IRBR3029

Instructor: SHERWIN, WALTER Enrollment: 10

Questionnaires: 10

	Frequenc				ncies	3		Inst	ructor	Course Dept		UMBC Level		Sect
Questions	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	1	9	4.90	159/1481	4.90	4.26	4.29	4.29	4.90
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1481	5.00	4.26	4.23	4.23	5.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1249	5.00	4.37	4.27	4.28	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	5	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	178/1424	4.80	4.27	4.21	4.27	4.80
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1396	5.00	4.07	3.98	4.00	5.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	6	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	135/1342	4.75	4.12	4.07	4.12	4.75
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	0	1	8	4.60	344/1459	4.60	4.19	4.16	4.17	4.60
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	6	4	4.40	1114/1480	4.40	4.64	4.68	4.65	4.40
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	154/1450	4.78	4.10	4.09	4.10	4.78
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	7	0	0	0	0	Ο	3	5.00	1/1409	5.00	4.46	4.42	4.43	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	7	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1407	5.00	4.77	4.69	4.67	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	7	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1399	5.00	4.30	4.26	4.27	5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1400	5.00	4.35	4.27	4.28	5.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	7	2	1	0	0	0	0		****/1179	****	3.94	3.96	4.02	****
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1262	5.00	4.18	4.05	4.14	5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1259	5.00	4.40	4.29	4.34	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	232/1256	4.89	4.34	4.30	4.34	4.89
4. Were special techniques successful	1	8	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 788	****	4.03	4.00	4.07	***
Freq	encv	Dist	trib	utio	า									

## Frequency Distribution

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	d Grades	Reasons		Туре	Majors				
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	6	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	0		
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	2								
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	2	Under-grad	10	Non-major	2		
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	1	D	0								
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	7	F	0	Electives	2	#### - Means	#### - Means there are not enough				
				P	0			responses to	responses to be significant				
				I	0	Other	7	_					
				?	1								

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2006

Page 848

JUN 13, 2006

Job IRBR3029

Enrollment:	3	3
Questionnaires:	3	Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Course-Section: GREK 395 0101

BIBLICAL GREEK

SHERWIN, WALTER

Title

Instructor:

			Fre	eque	ncie	5		Inst	ructor	Course Dept		UMBC Level		Sect
Questions			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	1	2	4.67	395/1481	4.67	4.26	4.29	4.29	4.67
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1481	5.00	4.26	4.23	4.23	5.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1249	5.00	4.37	4.27	4.28	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1424	5.00	4.27	4.21	4.27	5.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1396	5.00	4.07	3.98	4.00	5.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	755/1342	4.00	4.12	4.07	4.12	4.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1459	5.00	4.19	4.16	4.17	5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1480	5.00	4.64	4.68	4.65	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1450	5.00	4.10	4.09	4.10	5.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	507/1262	4.33	4.18	4.05	4.14	4.33
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1259	5.00	4.40	4.29	4.34	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion			0	1	0	0	2	4.00	901/1256	4.00	4.34	4.30	4.34	4.00
4. Were special techniques successful	0	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	254/ 788	4.33	4.03	4.00	4.07	4.33

## Frequency Distribution

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