```
Course-Section: ARCH 120  0101                  University of Maryland                              Page   87
Title      WORLD ARCHAEOLOGY                        Baltimore County                               FEB 11, 2009
Instructor:    READ, ESTHER DO                       Fall   2008                                   Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:      84
Questionnaires:  41                          Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire
```

```
                                                    Frequencies        Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
              Questions                      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   4  10  26  4.55  577/1649  4.55  4.33  4.28  4.11  4.55
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals   1   0   0   0   4  12  24  4.50  556/1648  4.50  4.27  4.23  4.16  4.50
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals  1   0   0   0   2  10  28  4.65  412/1375  4.65  4.35  4.27  4.10  4.65
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals   1  31   0   1   0   1   7  4.56 ****/1595  ****  4.09  4.20  4.03  ****
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 1  1   3   3  13   7  13  3.62 1173/1533  3.62  4.10  4.04  3.87  3.62
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 1 34   0   1   0   1   4  4.33 ****/1512  ****  4.14  4.10  3.86  ****
7. Was the grading system clearly explained           1   0   0   1   1   5  33  4.75  220/1623  4.75  4.49  4.16  4.08  4.75
8. How many times was class cancelled                 1   0   0   0   3  32   5  4.05 1525/1646  4.05  4.23  4.69  4.67  4.05
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 7 1   0   0   2  17  14  4.36  559/1621  4.36  4.03  4.06  3.96  4.36

              Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared       1   0   0   1   1   7  31  4.70  588/1568  4.70  4.55  4.43  4.39  4.70
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject  1   0   0   0   2   1  37  4.88  665/1572  4.88  4.84  4.70  4.64  4.88
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 1 0   0   0   2   5  33  4.78  310/1564  4.78  4.28  4.28  4.20  4.78
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned    1   0   0   2   0   1  37  4.82  295/1559  4.82  4.24  4.29  4.20  4.82
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 1 3   1   1   1  10  24  4.49  322/1352  4.49  4.43  3.98  3.86  4.49

              Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 29 0   2   0   3   0   7  3.83  921/1384  3.83  3.62  4.08  3.86  3.83
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 29 0   3   1   1   1   6  3.50 1216/1382  3.50  3.83  4.29  4.03  3.50
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 29 0  1   1   2   2   6  3.92 1023/1368  3.92  3.91  4.30  4.01  3.92
4. Were special techniques successful                 28  11   0   0   0   0   2  5.00 ****/ 948  ****  4.21  3.95  3.75  ****
```

Frequency Distribution

```
Credits Earned        Cum. GPA        Expected Grades        Reasons                 Type                    Majors
--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
  00-27      1      0.00-0.99   0      A   24       Required for Majors  28      Graduate      0      Major        0
  28-55      9      1.00-1.99   0      B    6
  56-83      4      2.00-2.99   3      C    2       General               6      Under-grad   41      Non-major   41
  84-150     4      3.00-3.49   6      D    0
  Grad.      0      3.50-4.00   9      F    0       Electives             0      #### - Means there are not enough
                                       P    0                                   responses to be significant
                                       I    0       Other                 1
                                       ?    0
```

```
Course-Section: ARCH 200  0101            University of Maryland                        Page   88
Title      GREEK ARCHAEOLOGY                Baltimore County                            FEB 11, 2009
Instructor:   KOEHLER, CAROLY               Fall  2008                                  Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:      59
Questionnaires:  32                  Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire
```

```
                                          Frequencies      Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
              Questions                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  4  2  7  8 11  3.63 1457/1649  3.63  4.33  4.28  4.29  3.63
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals     0  0  1  3  9  8 11  3.78 1326/1648  3.78  4.27  4.23  4.25  3.78
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals    0  0  2  3  6  9 12  3.81 1081/1375  3.81  4.35  4.27  4.37  3.81
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals     0  1  3  1  8  7 12  3.77 1275/1595  3.77  4.09  4.20  4.22  3.77
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 2  0  3  4  5  4 14  3.73 1084/1533  3.73  4.10  4.04  4.04  3.73
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 0 1  2  7  9 13  3.97  938/1512  3.97  4.14  4.10  4.14  3.97
7. Was the grading system clearly explained             1  0  0  5  2  9 15  4.10  984/1623  4.10  4.49  4.16  4.21  4.10
8. How many times was class cancelled                   1  0  0  0  0 20 11  4.35 1325/1646  4.35  4.23  4.69  4.63  4.35
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 6 2 1 1 5 15  2  3.67 1261/1621  3.67  4.03  4.06  4.01  3.67

              Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared         2  0  0  2  8  6 14  4.07 1252/1568  4.07  4.55  4.43  4.39  4.07
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject    2  0  1  0  3  4 22  4.53 1212/1572  4.53  4.84  4.70  4.73  4.53
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 2  0  1  3  6  9 11  3.87 1240/1564  3.87  4.28  4.28  4.27  3.87
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned      2  0  2  9  6  4  9  3.30 1432/1559  3.30  4.24  4.29  4.33  3.30
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 2 0  0  5  6  4 15  3.97  741/1352  3.97  4.43  3.98  4.07  3.97

              Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 17 0  3  1  5  2  4  3.20 1209/1384  3.20  3.62  4.08  3.99  3.20
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 16 0  3  4  2  2  5  3.13 1306/1382  3.13  3.83  4.29  4.19  3.13
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 19 0 2  3  2  1  5  3.31 1239/1368  3.31  3.91  4.30  4.21  3.31
4. Were special techniques successful                   19  9  1  1  1  0  1  2.75 ****/ 948  ****  4.21  3.95  3.89  ****

              Seminar
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 31  0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  88  ****  ****  4.54  3.75  ****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 31 0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  85  ****  ****  4.47  3.33  ****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 31  0  0  0  0  1  0  4.00 ****/  81  ****  ****  4.43  3.67  ****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned     31  0  0  0  0  1  0  4.00 ****/  92  ****  ****  4.35  5.00  ****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear                 31  0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/ 288  ****  ****  3.68  3.65  ****

              Field Work
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned  31  0  1  0  0  0  0  1.00 ****/  52  ****  ****  4.06  3.93  ****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria  31  0  0  0  0  1  0  4.00 ****/  48  ****  ****  4.09  4.05  ****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation        31  0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  39  ****  ****  4.47  4.49  ****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations    31  0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  39  ****  ****  4.38  3.66  ****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities  31  0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/ 312  ****  ****  3.68  3.59  ****

              Self  Paced
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 31  0  0  0  1  0  0  3.00 ****/  53  ****  ****  4.30  4.07  ****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal     31  0  0  0  1  0  0  3.00 ****/  30  ****  ****  4.16  1.50  ****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful       31  0  0  0  1  0  0  3.00 ****/  41  ****  ****  4.43  3.50  ****

                          Frequency Distribution
```

```
Credits Earned        Cum. GPA       Expected Grades         Reasons                  Type                    Majors
---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
00-27      3        0.00-0.99   1      A    7      Required for Majors  18     Graduate      0        Major        0
28-55      2        1.00-1.99   0      B    7                                                         
56-83      4        2.00-2.99   3      C   11      General               3     Under-grad   32        Non-major   32
84-150     1        3.00-3.49   2      D    0                                                         
Grad.      0        3.50-4.00   3      F    2      Electives             3     #### - Means there are not enough
                                       P    0                                 responses to be significant
                                       I    0      Other                 5
```

?   0

```
Course-Section: ARCH 201  0101                    University of Maryland                                          Page   89
Title         ROMAN ARCHAEOLOGY                     Baltimore County                                             FEB 11, 2009
Instructor:   MASON, RICHARD                           Fall  2008                                               Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:      60
Questionnaires: 38                          Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire
```

```
                                                   Frequencies            Instructor    Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
          Questions                          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  1  3  4 30  4.66   446/1649   4.66  4.33  4.28  4.29  4.66
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals      0   0  0  1  5 14 18  4.29   862/1648   4.29  4.27  4.23  4.25  4.29
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals     0   0  0  0  5 12 21  4.42   641/1375   4.42  4.35  4.27  4.37  4.42
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals      0   1  0  0  7 15 15  4.22   865/1595   4.22  4.09  4.20  4.22  4.22
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned  0   0  1  0  4  8 25  4.47   399/1533   4.47  4.10  4.04  4.04  4.47
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0  0  1  3  7 10 17  4.03   873/1512   4.03  4.14  4.10  4.14  4.03
7. Was the grading system clearly explained              0   0  0  1  2  7 28  4.63   358/1623   4.63  4.49  4.16  4.21  4.63
8. How many times was class cancelled                    1   0  0  0  1 34  2  4.03  1536/1646   4.03  4.23  4.69  4.63  4.03
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 5  1  1  0  1 14 16  4.38   547/1621   4.38  4.03  4.06  4.01  4.38

          Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared          0   0  0  0  1  5 32  4.82   372/1568   4.82  4.55  4.43  4.39  4.82
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject     0   0  0  0  0  0 38  5.00     1/1572   5.00  4.84  4.70  4.73  5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly  0   0  0  0  2  9 27  4.66   486/1564   4.66  4.28  4.28  4.27  4.66
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned       0   0  0  0  0 11 27  4.71   448/1559   4.71  4.24  4.29  4.33  4.71
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 0   0  0  1  2  8 27  4.61   247/1352   4.61  4.43  3.98  4.07  4.61

          Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 22   0  3  1  4  4  4  3.31  1169/1384   3.31  3.62  4.08  3.99  3.31
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 22   0  1  2  4  1  8  3.81  1065/1382   3.81  3.83  4.29  4.19  3.81
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 22  0  1  1  3  3  8  4.00   948/1368   4.00  3.91  4.30  4.21  4.00
4. Were special techniques successful                   22  13  1  0  0  0  2  3.67  ****/ 948   ****  4.21  3.95  3.89  ****

          Field Work
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned  37   0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00  ****/  52   ****  ****  4.06  3.93  ****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria   37   0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00  ****/  48   ****  ****  4.09  4.05  ****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation         37   0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00  ****/  39   ****  ****  4.47  4.49  ****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations     37   0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00  ****/  39   ****  ****  4.38  3.66  ****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities   37   0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00  ****/ 312   ****  ****  3.68  3.59  ****
```

```
                                       Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned         Cum. GPA        Expected Grades        Reasons              Type                Majors
----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
  00-27     2        0.00-0.99   1       A    9       Required for Majors  15    Graduate     1      Major       0
  28-55     4        1.00-1.99   0       B   18
  56-83     3        2.00-2.99   2       C    5       General              14    Under-grad  37      Non-major  38
  84-150    5        3.00-3.49   4       D    0
  Grad.     1        3.50-4.00   5       F    0       Electives             0    #### - Means there are not enough
                                         P    0                                  responses to be significant
                                         I    0       Other                 5
                                         ?    0
```

```
Course-Section: ARCH 340  0101                University of Maryland                                    Page   90
Title          CITIES OF THE PAST             Baltimore County                                         FEB 11, 2009
Instructor:    GOLDBERG, MARIL                Fall  2008                                               Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:    25
Questionnaires: 19                     Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire


                                                   Frequencies       Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
                Questions                  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  4  2 13  4.47  683/1649  4.47  4.33  4.28 4.27  4.47
 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    0   0  0  1  0  6 12  4.53  533/1648  4.53  4.27  4.23 4.18  4.53
 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   0   0  0  0  2  5 12  4.53  529/1375  4.53  4.35  4.27 4.22  4.53
 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    0   1  0  2  0  7  9  4.28  794/1595  4.28  4.09  4.20 4.21  4.28
 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0  0  0  0  1  6 12  4.58  311/1533  4.58  4.10  4.04 4.05  4.58
 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 0 1  0  3  1 14  4.42  493/1512  4.42  4.14  4.10 4.11  4.42
 7. Was the grading system clearly explained            0   0  0  0  3  4 12  4.47  541/1623  4.47  4.49  4.16 4.08  4.47
 8. How many times was class cancelled                  2   0  0  0  0  9  8  4.47 1221/1646  4.47  4.23  4.69 4.67  4.47
 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 5 0 1  0  4  6  3  3.71 1225/1621  3.71  4.03  4.06 4.02  3.71


                Lecture
 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        1   0  0  0  2  3 13  4.61  715/1568  4.61  4.55  4.43 4.39  4.61
 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   1   0  0  0  0  1 17  4.94  355/1572  4.94  4.84  4.70 4.64  4.94
 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 1  0  0  2  5  5  6  3.83 1256/1564  3.83  4.28  4.28 4.25  3.83
 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     1   1  2  0  3  1 11  4.12 1067/1559  4.12  4.24  4.29 4.23  4.12
 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 1 1  0  0  2  2 13  4.65  221/1352  4.65  4.43  3.98 3.97  4.65


                Discussion
 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 4  0  1  1  0  6  7  4.13  743/1384  4.13  3.62  4.08 4.11  4.13
 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 4  0  0  0  0  2 13  4.87  282/1382  4.87  3.83  4.29 4.37  4.87
 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 4 0  0  1  3  0 11  4.40  752/1368  4.40  3.91  4.30 4.39  4.40
 4. Were special techniques successful                  4   1  0  0  4  3  7  4.21  357/ 948  4.21  4.21  3.95 4.00  4.21


                Seminar
 1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 18  0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  88  ****  ****  4.54 4.63  ****
 2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 18 0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  85  ****  ****  4.47 4.55  ****
 3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 18  0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  81  ****  ****  4.43 4.30  ****
 4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned    18   0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  92  ****  ****  4.35 4.46  ****
 5. Were criteria for grading made clear                18   0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/ 288  ****  ****  3.68 3.58  ****


                Self  Paced
 1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 18  0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  53  ****  ****  4.30 4.32  ****
 2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal    18   0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  30  ****  ****  4.16 4.44  ****
 3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful      18   0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  41  ****  ****  4.43 5.00  ****
 4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful       18   0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  24  ****  ****  4.42 5.00  ****
 5. Were there enough proctors for all the students     18   0  0  0  0  1  0  4.00 ****/ 110  ****  ****  3.99 4.05  ****

                              Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned        Cum. GPA        Expected Grades        Reasons              Type              Majors
------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
 00-27     2      0.00-0.99   0        A   4        Required for Majors  3    Graduate    0      Major       0
 28-55     1      1.00-1.99   0        B   9
 56-83     1      2.00-2.99   3        C   4        General              4    Under-grad  19     Non-major   19
 84-150    4      3.00-3.49   4        D   0
 Grad.     0      3.50-4.00   3        F   0        Electives            1    #### - Means there are not enough
                                       P   0                                 responses to be significant
                                       I   0        Other               11
                                       ?   0
```