

Course-Section: ARCH 120 0101
 Title: WORLD ARCHAEOLOGY
 Instructor: READ, ESTHER DO
 Enrollment: 90
 Questionnaires: 64

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2006

Page 60
 JUN 13, 2006
 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	4	0	1	0	3	12	44	4.63	428/1481	4.63	4.26	4.29	4.14	4.63	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	3	0	0	1	2	15	43	4.64	361/1481	4.64	4.26	4.23	4.18	4.64	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	3	0	0	0	2	6	53	4.84	184/1249	4.84	4.37	4.27	4.14	4.84	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	3	41	0	0	0	4	16	4.80	178/1424	4.80	4.27	4.21	4.06	4.80	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	4	0	13	5	9	15	18	3.33	1167/1396	3.33	4.07	3.98	3.89	3.33	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	6	46	0	0	1	4	7	4.50	****/1342	****	4.12	4.07	3.88	****	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	5	0	0	1	3	16	39	4.58	378/1459	4.58	4.19	4.16	4.17	4.58	
8. How many times was class cancelled	4	0	0	0	10	47	3	3.88	1422/1480	3.88	4.64	4.68	4.64	3.88	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	10	2	0	0	6	27	19	4.25	630/1450	4.25	4.10	4.09	3.97	4.25	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	5	0	0	1	1	14	43	4.68	544/1409	4.68	4.46	4.42	4.36	4.68	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	1	1	5	53	4.83	659/1407	4.83	4.77	4.69	4.57	4.83	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	0	1	0	18	41	4.65	390/1399	4.65	4.30	4.26	4.23	4.65	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	1	3	8	48	4.72	361/1400	4.72	4.35	4.27	4.19	4.72	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	13	1	5	8	16	17	3.91	681/1179	3.91	3.94	3.96	3.85	3.91	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	53	0	2	2	2	1	4	3.27	****/1262	****	4.18	4.05	3.77	****	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	52	0	3	1	1	2	5	3.42	****/1259	****	4.40	4.29	4.06	****	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	53	0	2	1	0	3	5	3.73	****/1256	****	4.34	4.30	4.08	****	
4. Were special techniques successful	53	8	0	1	0	0	2	4.00	****/ 788	****	4.03	4.00	3.80	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	8	0.00-0.99 0	A 35	Required for Majors 33	Graduate 0 Major 0
28-55	5	1.00-1.99 0	B 17		
56-83	2	2.00-2.99 7	C 2	General 8	Under-grad 64 Non-major 15
84-150	11	3.00-3.49 7	D 0		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 8	F 0	Electives 1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 9	
			? 0		

Course-Section: ARCH 201 0101
 Title ROMAN ARCHAEOLOGY
 Instructor: GOLDBERG, MARIL
 Enrollment: 53
 Questionnaires: 35

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2006

Page 61
 JUN 13, 2006
 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	0	2	14	18	4.47	587/1481	4.47	4.26	4.29	4.40	4.47	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	1	4	12	17	4.32	747/1481	4.32	4.26	4.23	4.29	4.32	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	4	5	25	4.62	393/1249	4.62	4.37	4.27	4.36	4.62	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	3	2	10	19	4.32	658/1424	4.32	4.27	4.21	4.28	4.32	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	1	2	11	18	4.33	435/1396	4.33	4.07	3.98	3.94	4.33	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	5	15	13	4.18	615/1342	4.18	4.12	4.07	4.05	4.18	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	2	4	8	20	4.35	671/1459	4.35	4.19	4.16	4.17	4.35	
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	3	25	5	4.06	1334/1480	4.06	4.64	4.68	4.68	4.06	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	3	0	2	3	17	6	3.96	890/1450	3.96	4.10	4.09	4.15	3.96	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	1	9	24	4.68	544/1409	4.68	4.46	4.42	4.47	4.68	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	1	33	4.97	150/1407	4.97	4.77	4.69	4.78	4.97	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	4	8	22	4.53	545/1399	4.53	4.30	4.26	4.29	4.53	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	1	2	5	25	4.53	571/1400	4.53	4.35	4.27	4.34	4.53	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	1	0	0	3	4	25	4.69	167/1179	4.69	3.94	3.96	4.05	4.69	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	3	10	11	4.33	507/1262	4.33	4.18	4.05	4.11	4.33	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	11	0	0	0	0	3	21	4.88	238/1259	4.88	4.40	4.29	4.34	4.88	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	11	0	0	0	0	9	15	4.63	496/1256	4.63	4.34	4.30	4.28	4.63	
4. Were special techniques successful	11	3	1	1	2	8	9	4.10	372/ 788	4.10	4.03	4.00	3.98	4.10	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	8	0.00-0.99 0	A 11	Required for Majors 14	Graduate 0 Major 0
28-55	5	1.00-1.99 1	B 12		
56-83	4	2.00-2.99 5	C 5	General 4	Under-grad 35 Non-major 6
84-150	4	3.00-3.49 3	D 1		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 6	F 0	Electives 2	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 10	
			? 2		

Course-Section: ARCH 410 0101
 Title ARCH METHODS AND THEOR
 Instructor: READ, ESTHER DO
 Enrollment: 24
 Questionnaires: 21

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2006

Page 62
 JUN 13, 2006
 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	2	5	14	4.57	487/1481	4.57	4.26	4.29	4.45	4.57	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	5	5	11	4.29	790/1481	4.29	4.26	4.23	4.32	4.29	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	4	15	4.62	393/1249	4.62	4.37	4.27	4.44	4.62	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	8	10	4.29	706/1424	4.29	4.27	4.21	4.35	4.29	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	2	8	10	4.29	476/1396	4.29	4.07	3.98	4.09	4.29	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	1	10	9	4.29	519/1342	4.29	4.12	4.07	4.21	4.29	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	1	5	6	8	3.90	1048/1459	3.90	4.19	4.16	4.25	3.90	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	5	14	2	3.86	1427/1480	3.86	4.64	4.68	4.74	3.86	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	2	10	8	4.30	578/1450	4.30	4.10	4.09	4.28	4.30	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	2	8	11	4.43	865/1409	4.43	4.46	4.42	4.51	4.43	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	1	19	4.86	614/1407	4.86	4.77	4.69	4.79	4.86	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	3	7	11	4.38	703/1399	4.38	4.30	4.26	4.36	4.38	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	5	15	4.67	421/1400	4.67	4.35	4.27	4.38	4.67	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	12	1	0	3	1	4	3.78	780/1179	3.78	3.94	3.96	4.07	3.78	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	3	11	6	4.05	694/1262	4.05	4.18	4.05	4.33	4.05	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	1	7	13	4.57	532/1259	4.57	4.40	4.29	4.57	4.57	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	1	4	16	4.71	406/1256	4.71	4.34	4.30	4.60	4.71	
4. Were special techniques successful	0	16	0	2	0	0	3	3.80	****/ 788	****	4.03	4.00	4.26	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	A 12	Required for Majors	3
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	B 8		Graduate 0
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	C 0	General	11
84-150	8	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad 21
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	1
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	7
			? 0		