

Course-Section: LATN 102 0101
 Title ELEMENTARY LATIN II
 Instructor: RIVKIN, ROBERT
 Enrollment: 21
 Questionnaires: 9

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 999
 JUL 2, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor Mean	Instructor Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5								

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1576	4.88	4.75	4.30	4.11	5.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	256/1576	4.79	4.67	4.27	4.18	4.78	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	191/1342	4.85	4.69	4.32	4.19	4.89	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	4	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1520	4.85	4.67	4.25	4.09	5.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	2	6	4.56	335/1465	4.54	4.57	4.12	4.02	4.56	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	3	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	270/1434	4.67	4.33	4.14	3.94	4.67	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	135/1547	4.66	4.57	4.19	4.10	4.89	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	720/1574	4.63	4.54	4.64	4.59	4.78	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	3	5	4.63	298/1554	4.67	4.61	4.10	4.01	4.63	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	278/1488	4.84	4.73	4.47	4.41	4.89	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	607/1493	4.89	4.93	4.73	4.65	4.89	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	311/1486	4.71	4.70	4.32	4.26	4.78	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1489	4.88	4.62	4.32	4.22	5.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	7	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/1277	****	****	4.03	3.91	****	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	335/1279	4.67	4.64	4.17	3.96	4.67	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1270	5.00	5.00	4.35	4.09	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	1	0	5	4.67	535/1269	4.67	4.84	4.35	4.09	4.67	
4. Were special techniques successful	3	1	0	1	0	2	2	4.00	464/ 878	4.00	4.00	4.05	3.91	4.00	
Seminar															
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 375	****	****	4.01	3.78	****	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: LATN 102 0201
 Title ELEMENTARY LATIN II
 Instructor: RIVKIN, ROBERT
 Enrollment: 21
 Questionnaires: 21

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 1000
 JUL 2, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor Mean	Instructor Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5								
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	3	17	4.76	289/1576	4.88	4.75	4.30	4.11	4.76	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	2	18	4.81	222/1576	4.79	4.67	4.27	4.18	4.81	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	2	18	4.81	240/1342	4.85	4.69	4.32	4.19	4.81	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	8	0	0	1	2	10	4.69	311/1520	4.85	4.67	4.25	4.09	4.69	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	6	13	4.52	353/1465	4.54	4.57	4.12	4.02	4.52	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	9	0	0	1	2	9	4.67	270/1434	4.67	4.33	4.14	3.94	4.67	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	2	5	13	4.43	657/1547	4.66	4.57	4.19	4.10	4.43	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	2	7	12	4.48	1115/1574	4.63	4.54	4.64	4.59	4.48	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	0	5	13	4.72	215/1554	4.67	4.61	4.10	4.01	4.72	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	1	2	17	4.80	401/1488	4.84	4.73	4.47	4.41	4.80	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	1	0	19	4.90	557/1493	4.89	4.93	4.73	4.65	4.90	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	1	5	14	4.65	484/1486	4.71	4.70	4.32	4.26	4.65	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	3	16	4.75	378/1489	4.88	4.62	4.32	4.22	4.75	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	15	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	****/1277	****	****	4.03	3.91	****	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	1	0	5	4.67	335/1279	4.67	4.64	4.17	3.96	4.67	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	16	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	****/1270	5.00	5.00	4.35	4.09	****	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	16	0	0	1	1	0	3	4.00	****/1269	4.67	4.84	4.35	4.09	****	
4. Were special techniques successful	16	4	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 878	4.00	4.00	4.05	3.91	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	3	0.00-0.99 0	A 9	Required for Majors 12	Graduate 0 Major 0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99 0	B 6		
56-83	2	2.00-2.99 3	C 5	General 1	Under-grad 21 Non-major 21
84-150	5	3.00-3.49 2	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 3	
			? 0		

Course-Section: LATN 341 0101
 Title: CICERO
 Instructor: SHERWIN, WALTER
 Enrollment: 24
 Questionnaires: 21

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 1001
 JUL 2, 2009
 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	0	1	0	7	12	4.50	637/1576	4.50	4.75	4.30	4.30	4.50	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	8	12	4.60	476/1576	4.60	4.67	4.27	4.28	4.60	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	4	16	4.80	240/1342	4.80	4.69	4.32	4.30	4.80	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	5	0	0	1	3	10	4.64	357/1520	4.64	4.67	4.25	4.25	4.64	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	3	0	0	2	4	11	4.53	353/1465	4.53	4.57	4.12	4.09	4.53	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	9	0	0	1	2	8	4.64	296/1434	4.64	4.33	4.14	4.15	4.64	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	0	4	7	8	4.21	882/1547	4.21	4.57	4.19	4.21	4.21	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	2	18	4.90	469/1574	4.90	4.54	4.64	4.61	4.90	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	0	0	0	0	6	9	4.60	316/1554	4.60	4.61	4.10	4.09	4.60	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	0	2	16	4.89	278/1488	4.89	4.73	4.47	4.47	4.89	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	0	1	17	4.94	334/1493	4.94	4.93	4.73	4.70	4.94	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	0	5	13	4.72	379/1486	4.72	4.70	4.32	4.32	4.72	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	1	3	14	4.72	420/1489	4.72	4.62	4.32	4.34	4.72	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	17	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1277	****	****	4.03	4.11	****	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	400/1279	4.57	4.64	4.17	4.20	4.57	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	14	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1270	5.00	5.00	4.35	4.42	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	14	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	332/1269	4.86	4.84	4.35	4.41	4.86	
4. Were special techniques successful	14	5	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 878	****	4.00	4.05	4.09	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	A	11	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	B	7						
56-83	6	2.00-2.99	0	C	1	General	4	Under-grad	21	Non-major	21
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	5	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	9	F	0	Electives	2	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	12				
				?	0						

Course-Section: LATN 383 0101
 Title HISTORY OF ROMAN LIT I
 Instructor: FREYMAN, JAY M
 Enrollment: 9
 Questionnaires: 4

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 1002
 JUL 2, 2009
 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	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	301/1576	4.75	4.75	4.30	4.30	4.75
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	608/1576	4.50	4.67	4.27	4.28	4.50
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	1	4.25	835/1342	4.25	4.69	4.32	4.30	4.25
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	768/1520	4.33	4.67	4.25	4.25	4.33
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	264/1465	4.67	4.57	4.12	4.09	4.67
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	1	0	1	3.33	1289/1434	3.33	4.33	4.14	4.15	3.33
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	238/1547	4.75	4.57	4.19	4.21	4.75
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	4	0	4.00	1459/1574	4.00	4.54	4.64	4.61	4.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	395/1554	4.50	4.61	4.10	4.09	4.50
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	1048/1488	4.33	4.73	4.47	4.47	4.33
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1493	5.00	4.93	4.73	4.70	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	468/1486	4.67	4.70	4.32	4.32	4.67
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	1118/1489	4.00	4.62	4.32	4.34	4.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	335/1279	4.67	4.64	4.17	4.20	4.67
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1270	5.00	5.00	4.35	4.42	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1269	5.00	4.84	4.35	4.41	5.00

Frequency Distribution

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