

Course Section: LATN 101 0101
 Title ELEMENTARY LATIN I
 Instructor: RIVKIN, ROBERT
 Enrollment: 29
 Questionnaires: 19

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2006

Page 1068
 JAN 18, 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	1	0	1	0	0	3	14	4.61	463/1669	4.71	4.68	4.23	4.02	4.61	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	3	15	4.83	157/1666	4.80	4.64	4.19	4.11	4.83	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	3	15	4.83	197/1421	4.87	4.80	4.24	4.11	4.83	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	5	0	1	0	3	9	4.54	465/1617	4.65	4.67	4.15	3.99	4.54	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	1	0	0	2	1	14	4.71	201/1555	4.64	4.78	4.00	3.92	4.71	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	3	0	1	0	2	11	4.64	266/1543	4.67	4.75	4.06	3.86	4.64	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	0	1	17	4.94	67/1647	4.85	4.57	4.12	4.06	4.94	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	13	5	4.28	1370/1668	4.19	4.55	4.67	4.62	4.28	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	2	0	0	3	4	9	4.38	538/1605	4.48	4.57	4.07	3.96	4.38	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	0	1	16	4.94	113/1514	4.92	4.77	4.39	4.32	4.94	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	1	0	16	4.88	567/1551	4.94	4.97	4.66	4.55	4.88	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	1	3	13	4.71	335/1503	4.77	4.83	4.24	4.17	4.71	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	2	15	4.88	188/1506	4.86	4.81	4.26	4.17	4.88	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	14	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/1311	3.83	3.72	3.85	3.68	****	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	1	3	5	4.44	512/1490	4.44	4.73	4.05	3.85	4.44	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	11	0	0	0	1	0	7	4.75	393/1502	4.75	4.92	4.26	4.06	4.75	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	11	0	1	0	2	3	2	3.63	1232/1489	3.63	4.49	4.29	4.07	3.63	
4. Were special techniques successful	11	1	2	0	0	1	4	3.71	669/1006	3.71	4.36	4.00	3.81	3.71	
Laboratory															
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	18	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 233	****	****	4.19	4.09	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	A 5	Required for Majors	3
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	B 10		Graduate 0
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	C 2	General	6
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	D 1		Under-grad 19
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	3
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	6
			? 0		

Course Section: LATN 101 0201
 Title: ELEMENTARY LATIN I
 Instructor: RIVKIN, ROBERT
 Enrollment: 30
 Questionnaires: 21

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2006

Page 1069
 JAN 18, 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	1	2	18	4.81	207/1669	4.71	4.68	4.23	4.02	4.81	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	3	17	4.76	231/1666	4.80	4.64	4.19	4.11	4.76	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	19	4.90	151/1421	4.87	4.80	4.24	4.11	4.90	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	8	0	0	1	1	11	4.77	207/1617	4.65	4.67	4.15	3.99	4.77	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	3	3	15	4.57	285/1555	4.64	4.78	4.00	3.92	4.57	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	7	0	0	1	2	10	4.69	226/1543	4.67	4.75	4.06	3.86	4.69	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	3	17	4.76	204/1647	4.85	4.57	4.12	4.06	4.76	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	1	0	0	15	5	4.10	1482/1668	4.19	4.55	4.67	4.62	4.10	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	1	6	12	4.58	320/1605	4.48	4.57	4.07	3.96	4.58	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	1	0	17	4.89	223/1514	4.92	4.77	4.39	4.32	4.89	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	0	19	5.00	1/1551	4.94	4.97	4.66	4.55	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	1	0	0	18	4.84	182/1503	4.77	4.83	4.24	4.17	4.84	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	1	1	16	4.83	249/1506	4.86	4.81	4.26	4.17	4.83	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	12	1	0	1	1	3	3.83	744/1311	3.83	3.72	3.85	3.68	3.83	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/1490	4.44	4.73	4.05	3.85	****	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	18	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/1502	4.75	4.92	4.26	4.06	****	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	18	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/1489	3.63	4.49	4.29	4.07	****	
4. Were special techniques successful	17	3	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/1006	3.71	4.36	4.00	3.81	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	5	0.00-0.99	1	A	7	Required for Majors	9	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	5						
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	1	C	4	General	2	Under-grad	21	Non-major	21
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	1	D	2						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	1	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	7				
				?	0						

Course Section: LATN 201 0101
 Title INTERMEDIATE LATIN
 Instructor: SHERWIN, WALTER
 Enrollment: 26
 Questionnaires: 24

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2006

Page 1070
 JAN 18, 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	1	5	18	4.71	331/1669	4.60	4.68	4.23	4.34	4.71	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	4	18	4.74	268/1666	4.37	4.64	4.19	4.29	4.74	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	4	20	4.83	197/1421	4.63	4.80	4.24	4.35	4.83	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	8	1	0	1	3	11	4.44	597/1617	4.52	4.67	4.15	4.24	4.44	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	1	0	4	17	4.68	213/1555	4.80	4.78	4.00	3.96	4.68	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	6	0	0	0	3	15	4.83	130/1543	4.72	4.75	4.06	4.10	4.83	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	3	6	15	4.50	481/1647	4.21	4.57	4.12	4.19	4.50	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	24	5.00	1/1668	4.70	4.55	4.67	4.59	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	0	4	18	4.82	135/1605	4.58	4.57	4.07	4.15	4.82	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	4	19	4.83	325/1514	4.51	4.77	4.39	4.39	4.83	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	1	22	4.96	256/1551	4.98	4.97	4.66	4.72	4.96	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	4	19	4.83	201/1503	4.81	4.83	4.24	4.29	4.83	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	1	3	18	4.65	484/1506	4.73	4.81	4.26	4.33	4.65	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	21	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/1311	3.33	3.72	3.85	3.96	****	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	20	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	****/1490	4.75	4.73	4.05	4.11	****	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	20	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	****/1502	5.00	4.92	4.26	4.31	****	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	20	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	****/1489	5.00	4.49	4.29	4.36	****	
4. Were special techniques successful	20	3	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1006	****	4.36	4.00	3.99	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 12	Required for Majors	10
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	B 8		Graduate 0
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	C 4	General	1
84-150	7	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad 24
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	1
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	12
			? 0		

Course Section: LATN 201 0201
 Title INTERMEDIATE LATIN
 Instructor: FREYMAN, JAY M
 Enrollment: 15
 Questionnaires: 12

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2006

Page 1071
 JAN 18, 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	1	4	7	4.50	590/1669	4.60	4.68	4.23	4.34	4.50	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	2	1	4	5	4.00	1094/1666	4.37	4.64	4.19	4.29	4.00	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	5	6	4.42	670/1421	4.63	4.80	4.24	4.35	4.42	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	0	4	6	4.60	394/1617	4.52	4.67	4.15	4.24	4.60	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	90/1555	4.80	4.78	4.00	3.96	4.92	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	0	0	4	6	4.60	298/1543	4.72	4.75	4.06	4.10	4.60	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	2	6	3	3.92	1149/1647	4.21	4.57	4.12	4.19	3.92	
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	6	4	4.40	1274/1668	4.70	4.55	4.67	4.59	4.40	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	8	4	4.33	591/1605	4.58	4.57	4.07	4.15	4.33	

Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	1	6	3	4.20	1118/1514	4.51	4.77	4.39	4.39	4.20	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1551	4.98	4.97	4.66	4.72	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	220/1503	4.81	4.83	4.24	4.29	4.80	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	286/1506	4.73	4.81	4.26	4.33	4.80	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	8	0	1	0	2	0	3.33	1027/1311	3.33	3.72	3.85	3.96	3.33	

Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	261/1490	4.75	4.73	4.05	4.11	4.75	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1502	5.00	4.92	4.26	4.31	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1489	5.00	4.49	4.29	4.36	5.00	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	4	0.00-0.99	2	A	1	Required for Majors	5	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	0	B	5						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	1	C	4	General	0	Under-grad	12	Non-major	12
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	3	D	1						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F	0	Electives	3	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	5				
				?	1						

Course Section: LATN 341 0101
 Title: CICERO
 Instructor: SHERWIN, WALTER
 Enrollment: 10
 Questionnaires: 8

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2006

Page 1072
 JAN 18, 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	2	6	4.75	269/1669	4.75	4.68	4.23	4.28	4.75	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	126/1666	4.88	4.64	4.19	4.20	4.88	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1421	5.00	4.80	4.24	4.25	5.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	4	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1617	5.00	4.67	4.15	4.22	5.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1555	5.00	4.78	4.00	4.03	5.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	3	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1543	5.00	4.75	4.06	4.14	5.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	250/1647	4.71	4.57	4.12	4.14	4.71	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1668	5.00	4.55	4.67	4.68	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	170/1605	4.75	4.57	4.07	4.09	4.75	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1514	5.00	4.77	4.39	4.46	5.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1551	5.00	4.97	4.66	4.70	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1503	5.00	4.83	4.24	4.28	5.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	200/1506	4.88	4.81	4.26	4.30	4.88	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	3	1	0	0	0	3	4.00	587/1311	4.00	3.72	3.85	3.97	4.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1490	5.00	4.73	4.05	4.11	5.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1502	5.00	4.92	4.26	4.28	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	348/1489	4.83	4.49	4.29	4.35	4.83	
4. Were special techniques successful	2	2	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1006	5.00	4.36	4.00	4.10	5.00	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 6	Required for Majors	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	B 1		Graduate
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	C 0	General	0
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	D 0		8
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		
			I 0	Other	4
			? 0		

- Means there are not enough responses to be significant

Course Section: LATN 396 0101
 Title INDEP READING IN LATIN
 Instructor: FREYMAN, JAY M
 Enrollment: 1
 Questionnaires: 1

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2006

Page 1073
 JAN 18, 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

Frequency Distribution

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