```
Course-Section: ARCH 200  0101                    University of Maryland                              Page   75
Title      GREEK ARCHAEOLOGY                        Baltimore County                                 JUL  2, 2009
Instructor:   KOEHLER, CAROLY                       Spring 2009                                      Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:      59
Questionnaires:  20                         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   1   2   4   5   8  3.85 1283/1576  3.85  4.45  4.30  4.35  3.85
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    0   0   0   2   6   3   9  3.95 1187/1576  3.95  4.32  4.27  4.32  3.95
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   0   0   1   2   1   7   9  4.05  955/1342  4.05  4.37  4.32  4.41  4.05
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    0   0   1   1   2   6  10  4.15  953/1520  4.15  4.48  4.25  4.26  4.15
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0  0   3   0   3   4  10  3.90  989/1465  3.90  4.42  4.12  4.09  3.90
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 0  2   1   5   5   7  3.70 1123/1434  3.70  4.19  4.14  4.06  3.70
7. Was the grading system clearly explained            0   0   0   0   2   5  13  4.55  469/1547  4.55  4.48  4.19  4.22  4.55
8. How many times was class cancelled                  0   0   0   0   0   2  18  4.90  469/1574  4.90  4.51  4.64  4.62  4.90
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 3 0 1   2   5   3   6  3.65 1240/1554  3.65  4.20  4.10  4.05  3.65

            Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        1   0   1   1   4   4   9  4.00 1233/1488  4.00  4.61  4.47  4.44  4.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   0   0   0   0   0   3  17  4.85  683/1493  4.85  4.91  4.73  4.75  4.85
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 1  0   0   5   2   6   6  3.68 1279/1486  3.68  4.25  4.32  4.29  3.68
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     2   0   5   0   1   3   9  3.61 1295/1489  3.61  4.36  4.32  4.31  3.61
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 0 0  2   0   2   3  13  4.25  533/1277  4.25  4.33  4.03  4.01  4.25

            Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 16 0  0   0   2   1   1  3.75 ****/1279  ****  4.20  4.17  4.14  ****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 13 0  1   0   2   1   3  3.71 1070/1270  3.71  4.29  4.35  4.30  3.71
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 13 0 0   0   2   0   5  4.43  711/1269  4.43  4.67  4.35  4.29  4.43
4. Were special techniques successful                  13   4   0   0   2   0   1  3.67 ****/ 878  ****  4.58  4.05  3.92  ****

            Laboratory
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material  19   0   0   0   0   0   1  5.00 ****/ 234  ****  ****  4.23  4.44  ****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information 19 0 0  0   0   0   1  5.00 ****/ 240  ****  ****  4.35  4.47  ****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 19 0  0   0   0   0   1  5.00 ****/ 229  ****  ****  4.51  4.65  ****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance           19   0   0   0   1   0   0  3.00 ****/ 232  ****  ****  4.29  4.38  ****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 19   0   0   0   0   0   1  5.00 ****/ 379  ****  ****  4.20  4.29  ****

            Seminar
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 19  0   0   0   0   0   1  5.00 ****/  85  ****  ****  4.72  4.78  ****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 19 0  0   0   0   1   0  4.00 ****/  79  ****  ****  4.69  4.72  ****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 19  0   0   0   0   0   1  5.00 ****/  72  ****  ****  4.64  4.83  ****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned    19   0   0   0   0   0   1  5.00 ****/  80  ****  ****  4.61  4.80  ****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear                19   0   0   0   0   0   1  5.00 ****/ 375  ****  ****  4.01  4.21  ****

            Field Work
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 19   0   0   0   1   0   0  3.00 ****/  52  ****  ****  4.48  4.74  ****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 19   0   0   0   0   0   1  5.00 ****/  48  ****  ****  4.40  4.71  ****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation       19   0   0   0   0   0   1  5.00 ****/  44  ****  ****  4.73  4.69  ****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations   19   0   0   0   0   0   1  5.00 ****/  45  ****  ****  4.57  4.64  ****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities 19   0   0   0   0   0   1  5.00 ****/ 326  ****  ****  4.03  4.43  ****

            Self  Paced
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 19  0   0   0   0   0   1  5.00 ****/  40  ****  ****  4.60  5.00  ****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal    19   0   0   0   0   1   0  4.00 ****/  24  ****  ****  4.83  5.00  ****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful      19   0   0   0   0   1   0  4.00 ****/  35  ****  ****  4.67  5.00  ****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful       19   0   0   0   0   0   1  5.00 ****/  28  ****  ****  4.78  5.00  ****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students     19   0   0   0   0   0   1  5.00 ****/ 382  ****  ****  4.08  4.39  ****
```

```
Course-Section: ARCH 200  0101                    University of Maryland                         Page   75
Title           GREEK ARCHAEOLOGY                  Baltimore County                              JUL  2, 2009
Instructor:     KOEHLER, CAROLY                    Spring 2009                                   Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:      59
Questionnaires:  20                        Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire
```

```
                                          Frequency Distribution


Credits Earned           Cum. GPA           Expected Grades            Reasons                  Type                      Majors
----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
 00-27     2         0.00-0.99    0          A    2        Required for Majors  9       Graduate     0        Major         0
 28-55     2         1.00-1.99    1          B    6
 56-83     1         2.00-2.99    2          C    9        General              5       Under-grad  20        Non-major    20
 84-150    1         3.00-3.49    1          D    0
 Grad.     0         3.50-4.00    5          F    0        Electives            4       #### - Means there are not enough
                                             P    0                                     responses to be significant
                                             I    0        Other                4
                                             ?    3
```

```
Course-Section: ARCH 330  0101                    University of Maryland                              Page   76
Title          ARCH BRONZE AGE GREECE             Baltimore County                                   JUL  2, 2009
Instructor:    LANE, MICHAEL                      Spring 2009                                         Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:       32
Questionnaires:   28                          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   1   3  24  4.82  227/1576  4.82  4.45  4.30 4.30  4.82
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    1   0   0   2   1   3  21  4.59  489/1576  4.59  4.32  4.27 4.28  4.59
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   0   0   0   1   3   2  22  4.61  480/1342  4.61  4.37  4.32 4.30  4.61
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    0   1   0   0   2   4  21  4.70  302/1520  4.70  4.48  4.25 4.25  4.70
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0   0   1   0   3   3  21  4.54  347/1465  4.54  4.42  4.12 4.09  4.54
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 4   1   0   3   5  15  4.38  554/1434  4.38  4.19  4.14 4.15  4.38
7. Was the grading system clearly explained            1   0   0   2   2   4  19  4.48  559/1547  4.48  4.48  4.19 4.21  4.48
8. How many times was class cancelled                  0   0   0   0   0   1  27  4.96  188/1574  4.96  4.51  4.64 4.61  4.96
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 9 1 0   0   0   6  12  4.67  263/1554  4.67  4.20  4.10 4.09  4.67

            Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        1   0   0   0   0   0  27  5.00    1/1488  5.00  4.61  4.47 4.47  5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   1   0   0   0   0   1  26  4.96  223/1493  4.96  4.91  4.73 4.70  4.96
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 2  0   0   0   2   7  17  4.58  596/1486  4.58  4.25  4.32 4.32  4.58
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     1   0   0   0   0   3  24  4.89  217/1489  4.89  4.36  4.32 4.34  4.89
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 1 0  0   0   2   3  22  4.74  165/1277  4.74  4.33  4.03 4.11  4.74

            Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 10 0  1   0   2   5  10  4.28  649/1279  4.28  4.20  4.17 4.20  4.28
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 10 0  0   0   1   2  15  4.78  389/1270  4.78  4.29  4.35 4.42  4.78
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 10 0  0   0   0   1  17  4.94  167/1269  4.94  4.67  4.35 4.41  4.94
4. Were special techniques successful                  10   0  1   0   3   5   9  4.17  415/ 878  4.17  4.58  4.05 4.09  4.17
```

```
                                              Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned          Cum. GPA          Expected Grades          Reasons                 Type                  Majors
------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
 00-27      1           0.00-0.99   0       A   13        Required for Majors  0      Graduate      0        Major       0
 28-55      1           1.00-1.99   0       B   12
 56-83      5           2.00-2.99   1       C    0        General              4      Under-grad   28        Non-major  28
 84-150    10           3.00-3.49   6       D    0
 Grad.      0           3.50-4.00  11       F    0        Electives            2      #### - Means there are not enough
                                            P    0                                    responses to be significant
                                            I    0        Other               19
                                            ?    0
```

```
Course-Section: ARCH 410  0101              University of Maryland                          Page   77
Title       ARCH METHODS AND THEOR          Baltimore County                               JUL  2, 2009
Instructor:  READ, ESTHER DO                Spring 2009                                     Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:    16
Questionnaires: 12                      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   1   2   9  4.67  415/1576  4.67  4.45  4.30  4.46  4.67
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals   0   0   0   0   3   1   8  4.42  743/1576  4.42  4.32  4.27  4.35  4.42
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals  0   1   0   0   2   2   7  4.45  646/1342  4.45  4.37  4.32  4.46  4.45
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals   0   0   0   0   1   3   8  4.58  418/1520  4.58  4.48  4.25  4.38  4.58
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0  0   0   0   0   2  10  4.83  159/1465  4.83  4.42  4.12  4.22  4.83
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 0 1  0   0   2   9  4.50  398/1434  4.50  4.19  4.14  4.30  4.50
7. Was the grading system clearly explained           0   0   0   1   1   2   8  4.42  673/1547  4.42  4.48  4.19  4.24  4.42
8. How many times was class cancelled                 0   0   0   1   4   5   2  3.67 1545/1574  3.67  4.51  4.64  4.69  3.67
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 1 0 0 0  3   2   6  4.27  692/1554  4.27  4.20  4.10  4.24  4.27


               Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared       0   0   0   0   0   2  10  4.83  355/1488  4.83  4.61  4.47  4.55  4.83
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject  0   0   0   0   0   1  11  4.92  501/1493  4.92  4.91  4.73  4.80  4.92
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0 0  0   0   2   2   8  4.50  678/1486  4.50  4.25  4.32  4.41  4.50
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned    0   0   1   0   0   1  10  4.58  602/1489  4.58  4.36  4.32  4.38  4.58
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 1 7 1  0   0   0   3  4.00  692/1277  4.00  4.33  4.03  4.04  4.00


               Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 4 0 1  0   1   1   5  4.13  758/1279  4.13  4.20  4.17  4.31  4.13
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 4 0 1  0   0   1   6  4.38  756/1270  4.38  4.29  4.35  4.53  4.38
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 4 0 0  1   0   0   7  4.63  567/1269  4.63  4.67  4.35  4.55  4.63
4. Were special techniques successful                 4   4   0   0   0   0   4  5.00    1/ 878  5.00  4.58  4.05  4.33  5.00


               Laboratory
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material 11  0   0   0   0   0   1  5.00 ****/ 234  ****  ****  4.23  4.28  ****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information 11 0 0 0 0   0   1  5.00 ****/ 240  ****  ****  4.35  4.45  ****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 11 0 0 0 0    0   1  5.00 ****/ 229  ****  ****  4.51  4.70  ****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance          11  0   0   0   0   0   1  5.00 ****/ 232  ****  ****  4.29  4.56  ****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 11  0   0   0   0   0   1  5.00 ****/ 379  ****  ****  4.20  4.19  ****


               Seminar
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 11 0 0 0  0   0   1  5.00 ****/  85  ****  ****  4.72  4.77  ****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 11 0 0 0 0   0   1  5.00 ****/  79  ****  ****  4.69  4.69  ****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 11 0 0 0  0   0   1  5.00 ****/  72  ****  ****  4.64  4.64  ****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned   11  0   0   0   0   0   1  5.00 ****/  80  ****  ****  4.61  4.52  ****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear               11  0   0   0   0   0   1  5.00 ****/ 375  ****  ****  4.01  3.90  ****


               Field Work
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 11 0 0 0  0   0   1  5.00 ****/  52  ****  ****  4.48  4.70  ****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 11 0 0 0  0   0   1  5.00 ****/  48  ****  ****  4.40  4.30  ****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation      11  0   0   0   0   0   1  5.00 ****/  44  ****  ****  4.73  4.60  ****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations  11  0   0   0   0   0   1  5.00 ****/  45  ****  ****  4.57  4.34  ****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities 11 0 0 0  0   0   1  5.00 ****/ 326  ****  ****  4.03  3.97  ****


               Self  Paced
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 11 0 0 0 0   0   1  5.00 ****/  40  ****  ****  4.60  5.00  ****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal   11  0   0   0   0   0   1  5.00 ****/  24  ****  ****  4.83  5.00  ****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful     11  0   0   0   0   0   1  5.00 ****/  35  ****  ****  4.67  5.00  ****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful      11  0   0   0   0   0   1  5.00 ****/  28  ****  ****  4.78  5.00  ****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students    11  0   0   0   0   0   1  5.00 ****/ 382  ****  ****  4.08  3.88  ****
```

```
Enrollment:      16
Questionnaires:  12                       Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire


                                            Frequency Distribution


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