

Course-Section: ARCH 200 1
 Title Greek Archaeology & Ar
 Instructor: Koehler, Carolyn
 Enrollment: 36
 Questionnaires: 20

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 73
 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	1	0	2	1	6	4	6	3.58	1318/1447	3.79	4.28	4.31	4.31	3.58
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	3	4	8	4	3.68	1254/1447	3.80	4.13	4.27	4.23	3.68
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	3	4	5	7	3.84	1028/1241	3.82	4.23	4.33	4.35	3.84
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	2	0	1	5	8	3	3.76	1158/1402	3.88	4.09	4.24	4.24	3.76
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	2	2	6	9	4.16	700/1358	4.20	4.43	4.11	4.12	4.16
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	2	4	8	4	3.63	1069/1316	3.66	3.96	4.14	4.08	3.63
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	3	2	8	6	3.89	1083/1427	3.86	4.27	4.19	4.14	3.89
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	1	0	18	4.89	511/1447	4.91	4.57	4.69	4.70	4.89
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	1	2	10	2	1	3.00	1349/1434	3.33	3.88	4.10	3.97	3.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	2	10	7	4.26	1031/1387	4.22	4.43	4.46	4.42	4.26
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	1	3	15	4.74	889/1387	4.83	4.88	4.73	4.71	4.74
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	3	1	9	6	3.95	1095/1386	3.85	4.24	4.32	4.24	3.95
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	2	6	6	5	3.74	1175/1380	3.66	4.28	4.32	4.30	3.74
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	1	3	5	10	4.26	470/1193	4.13	4.46	4.02	4.04	4.26
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	10	0	1	0	5	3	1	3.30	1050/1172	3.35	3.47	4.15	4.12	3.30
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	10	0	0	1	3	4	2	3.70	1027/1182	3.75	3.79	4.35	4.30	3.70
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	10	0	0	1	2	5	2	3.80	976/1170	3.90	3.95	4.38	4.32	3.80
4. Were special techniques successful	10	7	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/ 800	****	3.80	4.06	4.01	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors		
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A 5	Required for Majors 3	Graduate 0	Major 0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B 6			
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C 6	General 9	Under-grad 20	Non-major 20
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	0	D 0			
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F 0	Electives 4	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	
				P 0			
				I 0	Other 0		
				? 0			

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	1	0	6	9	9	4.00	1058/1447	3.79	4.28	4.31	4.31	4.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	2	7	7	9	3.92	1123/1447	3.80	4.13	4.27	4.23	3.92
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	2	0	6	10	7	3.80	1054/1241	3.82	4.23	4.33	4.35	3.80
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	2	4	11	8	4.00	976/1402	3.88	4.09	4.24	4.24	4.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	7	2	15	4.24	626/1358	4.20	4.43	4.11	4.12	4.24
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	2	6	7	8	3.68	1038/1316	3.66	3.96	4.14	4.08	3.68
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	0	1	8	9	6	3.83	1123/1427	3.86	4.27	4.19	4.14	3.83
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	2	23	4.92	388/1447	4.91	4.57	4.69	4.70	4.92
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	1	0	1	9	7	4	3.67	1150/1434	3.33	3.88	4.10	3.97	3.67
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	2	5	3	13	4.17	1098/1387	4.22	4.43	4.46	4.42	4.17
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	2	22	4.92	475/1387	4.83	4.88	4.73	4.71	4.92
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	1	2	6	8	7	3.75	1191/1386	3.85	4.24	4.32	4.24	3.75
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	2	4	4	6	8	3.58	1223/1380	3.66	4.28	4.32	4.30	3.58
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	2	0	3	2	9	8	4.00	652/1193	4.13	4.46	4.02	4.04	4.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	15	0	1	2	1	4	2	3.40	1024/1172	3.35	3.47	4.15	4.12	3.40
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	15	0	1	1	1	3	4	3.80	996/1182	3.75	3.79	4.35	4.30	3.80
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	15	0	0	1	2	3	4	4.00	864/1170	3.90	3.95	4.38	4.32	4.00
4. Were special techniques successful	14	7	0	1	1	2	0	3.25	****/ 800	****	3.80	4.06	4.01	****
Laboratory														
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	24	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 192	****	****	4.34	4.38	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	24	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 38	****	****	4.49	2.25	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	24	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 36	****	****	4.25	3.25	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	24	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.72	****	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors		
00-27	5	0.00-0.99	0	A 6	Required for Majors 7	Graduate 0	Major 0
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	2	B 7			
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	1	C 9	General 14	Under-grad 25	Non-major 25
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	6	D 1			
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F 0	Electives 3	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	
				P 0			
				I 0	Other 0		
				? 1			

Course-Section: ARCH 201 01
 Title Roman Archaeology & Ar
 Instructor: Mason, Richard S
 Enrollment: 98
 Questionnaires: 48

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 75
 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	1	0	3	0	5	11	28	4.30	829/1447	4.30	4.28	4.31	4.31	4.30
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	3	5	8	16	15	3.74	1232/1447	3.74	4.13	4.27	4.23	3.74
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	3	2	7	12	23	4.06	896/1241	4.06	4.23	4.33	4.35	4.06
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	22	4	1	8	2	10	3.52	1256/1402	3.52	4.09	4.24	4.24	3.52
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	1	4	1	2	8	31	4.33	540/1358	4.33	4.43	4.11	4.12	4.33
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	19	6	3	5	3	11	3.36	1192/1316	3.36	3.96	4.14	4.08	3.36
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	3	1	7	9	26	4.17	858/1427	4.17	4.27	4.19	4.14	4.17
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	35	12	4.26	1252/1447	4.26	4.57	4.69	4.70	4.26
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	10	1	3	2	6	12	14	3.86	1010/1434	3.86	3.88	4.10	3.97	3.86
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	2	0	6	12	26	4.30	1000/1387	4.30	4.43	4.46	4.42	4.30
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	1	3	2	40	4.76	844/1387	4.76	4.88	4.73	4.71	4.76
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	2	2	5	12	25	4.22	911/1386	4.22	4.24	4.32	4.24	4.22
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	2	1	4	5	34	4.48	689/1380	4.48	4.28	4.32	4.30	4.48
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	1	2	0	2	6	34	4.59	230/1193	4.59	4.46	4.02	4.04	4.59
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	31	0	5	0	2	4	6	3.35	1037/1172	3.35	3.47	4.15	4.12	3.35
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	31	0	7	0	3	3	4	2.82	1151/1182	2.82	3.79	4.35	4.30	2.82
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	31	0	6	0	2	0	9	3.35	1105/1170	3.35	3.95	4.38	4.32	3.35
4. Were special techniques successful	31	15	1	1	0	0	0	1.50	****/ 800	****	3.80	4.06	4.01	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	4	0.00-0.99 2	A 10	Required for Majors 10	Graduate 0 Major 0
28-55	8	1.00-1.99 0	B 20		
56-83	5	2.00-2.99 1	C 6	General 14	Under-grad 48 Non-major 48
84-150	6	3.00-3.49 6	D 3		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 11	F 0	Electives 18	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 1		
			I 0	Other 0	
			? 2		

Course-Section: ARCH 340 01
 Title Cities Of The Past
 Instructor: Goldberg, Marily
 Enrollment: 21
 Questionnaires: 14

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 76
 JUN 28, 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	1	1	2	10	4.50	585/1447	4.50	4.28	4.31	4.32	4.50
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	4	7	4.29	824/1447	4.29	4.13	4.27	4.23	4.29
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	1	1	2	9	4.46	587/1241	4.46	4.23	4.33	4.33	4.46
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	5	6	4.14	873/1402	4.14	4.09	4.24	4.24	4.14
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	0	5	8	4.43	430/1358	4.43	4.43	4.11	4.10	4.43
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	5	2	7	4.14	719/1316	4.14	3.96	4.14	4.13	4.14
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	2	4	8	4.43	568/1427	4.43	4.27	4.19	4.15	4.43
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	3	11	4.79	786/1447	4.79	4.57	4.69	4.65	4.79
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	5	5	3	3.85	1024/1434	3.85	3.88	4.10	4.09	3.85
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	1	1	3	8	4.38	921/1387	4.38	4.43	4.46	4.44	4.38
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	13	5.00	1/1387	5.00	4.88	4.73	4.71	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	1	0	6	6	4.31	839/1386	4.31	4.24	4.32	4.30	4.31
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	3	9	4.62	534/1380	4.62	4.28	4.32	4.32	4.62
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	1	1	2	9	4.46	323/1193	4.46	4.46	4.02	4.05	4.46
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	1	1	2	2	3.83	841/1172	3.83	3.47	4.15	4.24	3.83
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	271/1182	4.83	3.79	4.35	4.42	4.83
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	480/1170	4.67	3.95	4.38	4.49	4.67
4. Were special techniques successful	8	1	0	1	1	1	2	3.80	562/ 800	3.80	3.80	4.06	4.12	3.80

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	1	A	5	Required for Majors	3	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	8						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	1	C	1	General	7	Under-grad	14	Non-major	14
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	4	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5	F	0	Electives	4	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	0						

Course-Section: ARCH 350 1
 Title Topics In Archaeology
 Instructor: Read, Esther D
 Enrollment: 14
 Questionnaires: 7

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 77
 JUN 28, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1447	5.00	4.28	4.31	4.32	5.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1447	5.00	4.13	4.27	4.23	5.00	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1241	5.00	4.23	4.33	4.33	5.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1402	5.00	4.09	4.24	4.24	5.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1358	5.00	4.43	4.11	4.10	5.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1316	5.00	3.96	4.14	4.13	5.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1427	5.00	4.27	4.19	4.15	5.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	7	0	4.00	1361/1447	4.00	4.57	4.69	4.65	4.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1434	5.00	3.88	4.10	4.09	5.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1387	5.00	4.43	4.46	4.44	5.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1387	5.00	4.88	4.73	4.71	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1386	5.00	4.24	4.32	4.30	5.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1380	5.00	4.28	4.32	4.32	5.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1193	5.00	4.46	4.02	4.05	5.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1172	****	3.47	4.15	4.24	****	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1182	****	3.79	4.35	4.42	****	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1170	****	3.95	4.38	4.49	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors		

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