

Course-Section: ANCS 110 1
 Title Intro To Ancient Egypt
 Instructor: Mason, Richard S
 Enrollment: 93
 Questionnaires: 61

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2009

Page 43
 MAR 22, 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	2	0	0	0	6	15	38	4.54	551/1509	4.54	4.58	4.31	4.18	4.54
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	4	7	22	27	4.20	922/1509	4.20	4.25	4.26	4.25	4.20
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	3	9	16	32	4.28	755/1287	4.28	4.38	4.30	4.24	4.28
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	47	1	0	3	0	9	4.23	****/1459	****	4.43	4.22	4.11	****
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	4	5	5	12	13	21	3.71	1074/1406	3.71	4.26	4.09	4.02	3.71
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	46	2	0	3	3	6	3.79	****/1384	****	4.57	4.11	3.98	****
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	6	8	46	4.67	276/1489	4.67	4.18	4.17	4.20	4.67
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	36	24	4.40	1166/1506	4.40	4.32	4.67	4.66	4.40
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	9	1	1	1	5	25	19	4.18	714/1463	4.18	4.15	4.09	4.02	4.18
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	2	8	50	4.80	363/1438	4.80	4.67	4.46	4.44	4.80
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	2	58	4.97	215/1421	4.97	4.97	4.73	4.66	4.97
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	8	19	33	4.42	725/1411	4.42	4.39	4.31	4.27	4.42
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	1	0	0	4	5	50	4.78	321/1405	4.78	4.63	4.32	4.27	4.78
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	1	0	0	5	11	42	4.64	193/1236	4.64	4.07	4.00	3.87	4.64
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	39	0	9	2	1	3	7	2.86	1202/1260	2.86	3.53	4.14	3.95	2.86
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	39	0	6	4	4	3	5	2.86	1226/1255	2.86	3.46	4.33	4.15	2.86
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	39	0	4	1	5	3	9	3.55	1136/1258	3.55	3.97	4.38	4.18	3.55
4. Were special techniques successful	38	20	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/ 873	****	4.00	4.03	3.89	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	4	0.00-0.99 0	A 18	Required for Majors 5	Graduate 0 Major 2
28-55	11	1.00-1.99 1	B 19	General 32	Under-grad 61 Non-major 59
56-83	5	2.00-2.99 5	C 14		
84-150	7	3.00-3.49 5	D 1	Electives 16	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 16	F 1		
			P 0		
			I 0		
			? 4	Other 4	

Course-Section: ANCS 200 1
 Title Israel/Ancient Near Ea
 Instructor: Davis, Andrew R
 Enrollment: 55
 Questionnaires: 31

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2009

Page 44
 MAR 22, 2010
 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	0	1	6	24	4.74	315/1509	4.74	4.58	4.31	4.34	4.74
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	8	23	4.74	267/1509	4.74	4.25	4.26	4.32	4.74
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	6	24	4.74	272/1287	4.74	4.38	4.30	4.35	4.74
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	9	0	0	3	5	14	4.50	454/1459	4.50	4.43	4.22	4.30	4.50
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	3	1	6	10	11	3.81	1009/1406	3.81	4.26	4.09	4.09	3.81
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	9	0	0	4	2	16	4.55	320/1384	4.55	4.57	4.11	4.09	4.55
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	3	6	21	4.52	446/1489	4.52	4.18	4.17	4.19	4.52
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	12	18	4.60	990/1506	4.60	4.32	4.67	4.61	4.60
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	1	2	15	9	4.19	702/1463	4.19	4.15	4.09	4.08	4.19
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	2	29	4.94	153/1438	4.94	4.67	4.46	4.48	4.94
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	2	29	4.94	376/1421	4.94	4.97	4.73	4.76	4.94
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	8	23	4.74	315/1411	4.74	4.39	4.31	4.37	4.74
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	2	28	4.87	205/1405	4.87	4.63	4.32	4.39	4.87
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	4	0	2	7	2	16	4.19	545/1236	4.19	4.07	4.00	4.11	4.19
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	18	0	2	1	4	1	5	3.46	1063/1260	3.46	3.53	4.14	4.19	3.46
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	19	0	1	2	5	0	4	3.33	1167/1255	3.33	3.46	4.33	4.37	3.33
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	19	0	0	0	1	4	7	4.50	620/1258	4.50	3.97	4.38	4.44	4.50
4. Were special techniques successful	19	10	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 873	****	4.00	4.03	4.04	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	30	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 89	****	4.75	4.49	5.00	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	5	0.00-0.99 0	A 20	Required for Majors 2	Graduate 0 Major 0
28-55	3	1.00-1.99 0	B 7		
56-83	4	2.00-2.99 4	C 3	General 19	Under-grad 31 Non-major 31
84-150	2	3.00-3.49 3	D 0		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 5	F 0	Electives 5	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 2	
			? 0		

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies		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	1	4	8	18	36	4.25	882/1509	4.25	4.58	4.31	4.34	4.25
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	8	13	25	20	3.82	1215/1509	3.82	4.25	4.26	4.32	3.82
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	3	6	11	21	26	3.91	1010/1287	3.91	4.38	4.30	4.35	3.91
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	52	0	3	2	7	3	3.67	****/1459	****	4.43	4.22	4.30	****
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	4	3	13	19	28	3.96	873/1406	3.96	4.26	4.09	4.09	3.96
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	57	1	1	1	3	4	3.80	****/1384	****	4.57	4.11	4.09	****
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	2	1	5	16	43	4.45	541/1489	4.45	4.18	4.17	4.19	4.45
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	58	9	4.13	1330/1506	4.13	4.32	4.67	4.61	4.13
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	7	2	3	2	6	32	15	3.93	944/1463	3.93	4.15	4.09	4.08	3.93
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	1	1	8	15	42	4.43	891/1438	4.43	4.67	4.46	4.48	4.43
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	2	65	4.97	161/1421	4.97	4.97	4.73	4.76	4.97
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	2	5	10	22	28	4.03	1040/1411	4.03	4.39	4.31	4.37	4.03
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	2	6	13	45	4.53	605/1405	4.53	4.63	4.32	4.39	4.53
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	14	8	5	15	12	9	3.18	1093/1236	3.18	4.07	4.00	4.11	3.18
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	43	0	10	6	3	1	4	2.29	1250/1260	2.29	3.53	4.14	4.19	2.29
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	42	0	15	2	5	1	2	1.92	1255/1255	1.92	3.46	4.33	4.37	1.92
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	43	0	12	0	7	3	2	2.29	1252/1258	2.29	3.97	4.38	4.44	2.29
4. Were special techniques successful	43	21	3	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 873	****	4.00	4.03	4.04	****
Laboratory														
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	64	0	1	0	1	1	0	2.67	****/ 198	****	****	4.22	4.51	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	62	2	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	****/ 89	****	4.75	4.49	5.00	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	62	4	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 92	****	4.63	4.54	****	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	65	0	2	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 48	****	4.22	4.39	4.79	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	65	0	1	1	0	0	0	1.50	****/ 48	****	4.67	4.41	4.50	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	66	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 47	****	4.71	4.51	4.83	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	64	0	1	0	2	0	0	2.33	****/ 49	****	****	4.26	4.33	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	65	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 41	****	****	4.14	****	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	65	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 46	****	****	4.31	4.00	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	65	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 37	****	****	4.05	****	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	65	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.27	****	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors		
00-27	4	0.00-0.99	0	A	23	Required for Majors		12	Graduate	0	Major	4
28-55	9	1.00-1.99	0	B	19							
56-83	7	2.00-2.99	7	C	16	General		39	Under-grad	67	Non-major	63
84-150	14	3.00-3.49	13	D	2							
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	12	F	0	Electives		9	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0							
				I	0	Other		1				

Course-Section: ANCS 320 1
 Title Women & Gender
 Instructor: Goldberg, Marily
 Enrollment: 28
 Questionnaires: 19

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2009

Page 46
 MAR 22, 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	1	1	4	13	4.53	574/1509	4.53	4.58	4.31	4.32	4.53
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	0	8	10	4.42	667/1509	4.42	4.25	4.26	4.25	4.42
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	4	13	4.58	453/1287	4.58	4.38	4.30	4.33	4.58
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	1	0	4	13	4.61	335/1459	4.61	4.43	4.22	4.26	4.61
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	17	4.89	94/1406	4.89	4.26	4.09	4.12	4.89
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	3	14	4.63	251/1384	4.63	4.57	4.11	4.15	4.63
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	0	7	11	4.61	330/1489	4.61	4.18	4.17	4.14	4.61
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	11	7	4.39	1177/1506	4.39	4.32	4.67	4.67	4.39
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	1	5	6	5	3.88	998/1463	3.88	4.15	4.09	4.08	3.88
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	1	0	0	4	14	4.58	712/1438	4.58	4.67	4.46	4.43	4.58
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	19	5.00	1/1421	5.00	4.97	4.73	4.73	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	1	2	5	11	4.37	779/1411	4.37	4.39	4.31	4.29	4.37
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	2	3	13	4.42	733/1405	4.42	4.63	4.32	4.32	4.42
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	4	0	0	5	5	5	4.00	664/1236	4.00	4.07	4.00	4.07	4.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	1	0	6	7	4.36	543/1260	4.36	3.53	4.14	4.22	4.36
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	1	1	2	10	4.50	575/1255	4.50	3.46	4.33	4.37	4.50
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	1	0	1	12	4.71	468/1258	4.71	3.97	4.38	4.42	4.71
4. Were special techniques successful	5	0	1	1	1	5	6	4.00	442/ 873	4.00	4.00	4.03	4.08	4.00
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	1	0	2	0	1	4	11	4.22	32/ 48	4.22	4.22	4.39	4.61	4.22
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	1	0	0	0	1	4	13	4.67	20/ 48	4.67	4.67	4.41	4.34	4.67
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	1	4	0	0	0	4	10	4.71	24/ 47	4.71	4.71	4.51	4.62	4.71
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	1	3	0	0	1	5	9	4.53	23/ 47	4.53	4.53	4.18	4.47	4.53
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	1	6	0	0	1	2	9	4.67	16/ 44	4.67	4.67	4.32	4.40	4.67

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors				
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	A 4	Required for Majors	7	Graduate	0	Major	4
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	B 7						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	C 5	General	11	Under-grad	19	Non-major	15
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	D 1						
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				
			? 1						

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	9	4.82	235/1509	4.82	4.58	4.31	4.32	4.82
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	6	3	4.09	1020/1509	4.09	4.25	4.26	4.25	4.09
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	10	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1287	****	4.38	4.30	4.33	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	5	4	4.18	843/1459	4.18	4.43	4.22	4.26	4.18
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	90/1406	4.91	4.26	4.09	4.12	4.91
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	3	7	4.55	320/1384	4.55	4.57	4.11	4.15	4.55
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	2	2	5	2	0	2.64	1454/1489	2.64	4.18	4.17	4.14	2.64
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	10	1	4.09	1349/1506	4.09	4.32	4.67	4.67	4.09
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	0	4	5	4.56	286/1463	4.56	4.15	4.09	4.08	4.56
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	0	3	5	4.63	646/1438	4.63	4.67	4.46	4.43	4.63
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1421	5.00	4.97	4.73	4.73	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	1	0	2	5	4.38	768/1411	4.38	4.39	4.31	4.29	4.38
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	568/1405	4.57	4.63	4.32	4.32	4.57
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	5	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	421/1236	4.33	4.07	4.00	4.07	4.33
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	3	6	4.67	308/1260	4.67	3.53	4.14	4.22	4.67
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	1	1	7	4.67	443/1255	4.67	3.46	4.33	4.37	4.67
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	398/1258	4.78	3.97	4.38	4.42	4.78
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	3	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	43/ 89	4.75	4.75	4.49	4.86	4.75
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	3	0	0	0	0	3	5	4.63	54/ 92	4.63	4.63	4.54	4.67	4.63
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	1	3	4	4.38	59/ 90	4.38	4.38	4.50	4.63	4.38
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	3	5	4.63	40/ 92	4.63	4.63	4.38	4.73	4.63
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	3	1	1	1	2	2	1	3.14	78/ 93	3.14	3.14	4.06	3.94	3.14

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	7	Required for Majors	3	Graduate	1	Major	7
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	1						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	2	C	1	General	1	Under-grad	10	Non-major	4
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	0	D	0						
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00	7	F	0	Electives	5	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	1						