

Course-Section: ANCS 110 0101
 Title INTRO TO ANCIENT EGYPT
 Instructor: MASON, RICHARD
 Enrollment: 108
 Questionnaires: 57

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 87
 FEB 13, 2008
 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	5	9	12	29	4.18	964/1639	4.18	4.25	4.27	4.08	4.18
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	1	5	16	16	17	3.78	1338/1639	3.78	3.86	4.22	4.17	3.78
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	0	1	11	6	16	21	3.82	1144/1397	3.82	3.84	4.28	4.18	3.82
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	21	4	7	10	5	8	3.18	1503/1583	3.18	3.87	4.19	4.01	3.18
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	2	14	9	16	15	3.50	1241/1532	3.50	4.36	4.01	3.88	3.50
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	18	6	8	15	4	5	2.84	1441/1504	2.84	3.85	4.05	3.78	2.84
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	5	13	12	26	4.05	1010/1612	4.05	3.45	4.16	4.10	4.05
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	1	0	6	49	4.84	766/1635	4.84	4.52	4.65	4.56	4.84
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	8	0	1	4	12	17	15	3.84	1109/1579	3.84	4.03	4.08	3.95	3.84
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	1	3	15	35	4.56	745/1518	4.56	4.23	4.43	4.38	4.56
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	4	5	45	4.76	890/1520	4.76	4.82	4.70	4.61	4.76
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	2	15	16	21	4.04	1065/1517	4.04	4.18	4.27	4.20	4.04
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	6	5	12	32	4.27	882/1550	4.27	4.16	4.22	4.17	4.27
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	0	1	1	5	13	34	4.44	313/1295	4.44	3.20	3.94	3.84	4.44
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	44	0	3	2	2	2	4	3.15	****/1398	****	3.99	4.07	3.85	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	44	0	3	2	4	0	4	3.00	****/1391	****	4.66	4.30	4.07	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	43	0	2	2	3	1	6	3.50	****/1388	****	4.44	4.28	4.01	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	6	0.00-0.99 3	A 8	Required for Majors	34
28-55	10	1.00-1.99 0	B 22		
56-83	7	2.00-2.99 9	C 20	General	12
84-150	9	3.00-3.49 14	D 1		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 9	F 0	Electives	1
			P 1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	
			I 0	Other	6
			? 0		

Course-Section: ANCS 320 0101
 Title WOMEN & GENDER IN CLA
 Instructor: GOLDBERG, MARIL
 Enrollment: 19
 Questionnaires: 15

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 88
 FEB 13, 2008
 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	0	0	2	6	6	4.29	860/1639	4.29	4.25	4.27	4.28	4.29
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	4	3	7	4.21	895/1639	4.21	3.86	4.22	4.20	4.21
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	7	6	4.36	705/1397	4.36	3.84	4.28	4.26	4.36
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	1	3	3	7	4.14	900/1583	4.14	3.87	4.19	4.24	4.14
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	0	13	4.86	125/1532	4.86	4.36	4.01	4.05	4.86
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	3	4	7	4.29	585/1504	4.29	3.85	4.05	4.12	4.29
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	3	0	4	6	3.79	1263/1612	3.79	3.45	4.16	4.12	3.79
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	8	6	4.43	1215/1635	4.43	4.52	4.65	4.66	4.43
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	4	7	2	3.85	1102/1579	3.85	4.03	4.08	4.07	3.85
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	1	4	3	6	4.00	1237/1518	4.00	4.23	4.43	4.39	4.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	1	0	13	4.86	674/1520	4.86	4.82	4.70	4.68	4.86
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	3	5	6	4.21	928/1517	4.21	4.18	4.27	4.23	4.21
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	4	5	5	4.07	1043/1550	4.07	4.16	4.22	4.20	4.07
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	2	0	3	1	3	5	3.83	783/1295	3.83	3.20	3.94	3.95	3.83
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	1	0	4	2	4	3.73	987/1398	3.73	3.99	4.07	4.13	3.73
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	0	0	2	9	4.82	321/1391	4.82	4.66	4.30	4.35	4.82
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	0	1	2	8	4.64	533/1388	4.64	4.44	4.28	4.34	4.64
4. Were special techniques successful	4	0	0	1	1	5	4	4.09	438/ 958	4.09	4.09	3.93	3.97	4.09

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	1	A	8	Required for Majors	5	Graduate	0	Major	3
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	2						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	1	C	4	General	7	Under-grad	15	Non-major	12
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	2				
				?	0						

Course-Section: ANCS 350H 0101
 Title REDISCOVERY OF ANTIQUI
 Instructor: MASON, RICHARD
 Enrollment: 9
 Questionnaires: 7

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 89
 FEB 13, 2008
 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	3	4.29	860/1639	4.29	4.25	4.27	4.28	4.29
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	3	1	3.57	1455/1639	3.57	3.86	4.22	4.20	3.57
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	4	0	0	2	1	0	3.33	1318/1397	3.33	3.84	4.28	4.26	3.33
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	3	3	4.29	761/1583	4.29	3.87	4.19	4.24	4.29
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	203/1532	4.71	4.36	4.01	4.05	4.71
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	4	3	4.43	466/1504	4.43	3.85	4.05	4.12	4.43
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	2	1	2	0	1	2.50	1576/1612	2.50	3.45	4.16	4.12	2.50
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	5	2	4.29	1326/1635	4.29	4.52	4.65	4.66	4.29
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	0	3	2	4.40	496/1579	4.40	4.03	4.08	4.07	4.40
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	2	2	3	4.14	1175/1518	4.14	4.23	4.43	4.39	4.14
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	674/1520	4.86	4.82	4.70	4.68	4.86
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	2	1	4	4.29	854/1517	4.29	4.18	4.27	4.23	4.29
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	1	1	4	4.14	991/1550	4.14	4.16	4.22	4.20	4.14
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	3	2	1	0	0	0	1.33	1292/1295	1.33	3.20	3.94	3.95	1.33
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	625/1398	4.25	3.99	4.07	4.13	4.25
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	616/1391	4.50	4.66	4.30	4.35	4.50
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	1	0	0	3	4.25	834/1388	4.25	4.44	4.28	4.34	4.25

Frequency Distribution

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