

Course-Section: LATN 102 1
 Title Elementary Latin II
 Instructor: Sherwin,Walter
 Enrollment: 20
 Questionnaires: 13

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 897
 JUN 28, 2010
 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	1	3	9	4.62	463/1447	4.76	4.79	4.31	4.18	4.62
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	11	4.85	162/1447	4.90	4.83	4.27	4.30	4.85
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	3	8	4.58	469/1241	4.77	4.79	4.33	4.25	4.58
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	9	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	494/1402	4.51	4.62	4.24	4.15	4.50
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	5	0	0	0	4	4	4.50	345/1358	4.54	4.59	4.11	4.03	4.50
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	5	1	0	0	1	6	4.38	519/1316	4.51	4.53	4.14	3.99	4.38
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	0	1	4	7	4.23	799/1427	4.47	4.59	4.19	4.24	4.23
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	13	5.00	1/1447	5.00	4.79	4.69	4.68	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	3	10	4.77	149/1434	4.75	4.72	4.10	4.10	4.77
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	3	10	4.77	414/1387	4.86	4.80	4.46	4.46	4.77
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	12	4.92	422/1387	4.96	4.97	4.73	4.71	4.92
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	1	11	4.77	303/1386	4.74	4.77	4.32	4.32	4.77
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	11	4.85	227/1380	4.83	4.77	4.32	4.31	4.85
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	11	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/1193	3.89	3.89	4.02	3.99	****
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	377/1172	4.58	4.67	4.15	3.95	4.50
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	9	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1182	4.83	4.89	4.35	4.18	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	1	0	0	0	3	4.00	864/1170	4.31	4.54	4.38	4.17	4.00

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: LATN 102 2
 Title Elementary Latin II
 Instructor: Rivkin,Robert H
 Enrollment: 24
 Questionnaires: 22

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 898
 JUN 28, 2010
 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	2	20	4.91	148/1447	4.76	4.79	4.31	4.18	4.91
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	21	4.95	56/1447	4.90	4.83	4.27	4.30	4.95
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	21	4.95	71/1241	4.77	4.79	4.33	4.25	4.95
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	3	1	0	1	3	14	4.53	471/1402	4.51	4.62	4.24	4.15	4.53
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	1	0	6	14	4.57	299/1358	4.54	4.59	4.11	4.03	4.57
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	7	0	1	0	2	11	4.64	256/1316	4.51	4.53	4.14	3.99	4.64
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	0	6	15	4.71	237/1427	4.47	4.59	4.19	4.24	4.71
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	22	5.00	1/1447	5.00	4.79	4.69	4.68	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	0	5	13	4.72	182/1434	4.75	4.72	4.10	4.10	4.72

Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	1	20	4.95	100/1387	4.86	4.80	4.46	4.46	4.95
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	21	5.00	1/1387	4.96	4.97	4.73	4.71	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	6	15	4.71	366/1386	4.74	4.77	4.32	4.32	4.71
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	2	18	4.81	273/1380	4.83	4.77	4.32	4.31	4.81
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	12	1	0	3	0	5	3.89	769/1193	3.89	3.89	4.02	3.99	3.89

Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	2	1	12	4.67	282/1172	4.58	4.67	4.15	3.95	4.67
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	0	0	1	3	11	4.67	430/1182	4.83	4.89	4.35	4.18	4.67
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	0	0	1	3	9	4.62	515/1170	4.31	4.54	4.38	4.17	4.62
4. Were special techniques successful	8	9	1	0	0	0	4	4.20	****/ 800	****	****	4.06	3.95	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors		
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	A 8	Required for Majors 7	Graduate 0	Major 0
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	0	B 7			
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	4	C 5	General 9	Under-grad 22	Non-major 22
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	3	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 0		
				? 0			

Course-Section: LATN 332 1
 Title Vergil
 Instructor: Freyman, Jay M
 Enrollment: 17
 Questionnaires: 13

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 899
 JUN 28, 2010
 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	1	0	12	4.85	211/1447	4.85	4.79	4.31	4.32	4.85
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	2	10	4.69	315/1447	4.69	4.83	4.27	4.23	4.69
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	2	10	4.83	204/1241	4.83	4.79	4.33	4.33	4.83
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	2	10	4.83	143/1402	4.83	4.62	4.24	4.24	4.83
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	2	10	4.69	216/1358	4.69	4.59	4.11	4.10	4.69
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	3	8	4.58	312/1316	4.58	4.53	4.14	4.13	4.58
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	1	0	11	4.83	133/1427	4.83	4.59	4.19	4.15	4.83
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	1	6	6	4.38	1168/1447	4.38	4.79	4.69	4.65	4.38
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	4	8	4.67	230/1434	4.67	4.72	4.10	4.09	4.67
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	7	0	0	0	1	0	5	4.67	566/1387	4.67	4.80	4.46	4.44	4.67
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	7	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1387	5.00	4.97	4.73	4.71	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	7	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	217/1386	4.83	4.77	4.32	4.30	4.83
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	1	0	5	4.67	463/1380	4.67	4.77	4.32	4.32	4.67
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	8	2	1	0	0	0	2	3.67	****/1193	****	3.89	4.02	4.05	****
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	152/1172	4.86	4.67	4.15	4.24	4.86
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1182	5.00	4.89	4.35	4.42	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1170	5.00	4.54	4.38	4.49	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	6	4	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 800	****	****	4.06	4.12	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	6	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/ 66	5.00	5.00	4.58	4.17	5.00
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	6	2	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/ 62	5.00	5.00	4.56	4.21	5.00
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	7	3	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 58	****	****	4.41	2.87	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	5	1	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	20/ 65	4.86	4.86	4.42	4.01	4.86
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	6	1	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/ 64	5.00	5.00	4.09	3.38	5.00

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	A	5	Required for Majors	4	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B	7						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	2	Under-grad	13	Non-major	13
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	4	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5	F	0	Electives	3	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	0						