```
Course-Section: ARCH 100  0101              University of Maryland                              Page   70
Title      INTRO TO ARCHAEOLOGY             Baltimore County                                   JAN 21, 2006
Instructor:   MASON, RICHARD                Fall   2005                                         Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:      84
Questionnaires: 52                     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    3   0  2  4  8 13 22  4.00 1196/1674  4.00  4.23  4.27 4.07  4.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals     2   0  4  6 14 13 13  3.50 1499/1674  3.50  4.26  4.23 4.16  3.50
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals    2   0  3  6 11 19 11  3.58 1252/1423  3.58  4.36  4.27 4.16  3.58
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals     2  43  0  2  1  3  1  3.43 ****/1609  ****  4.23  4.22 4.05  ****
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 2   0  4  3 11 13 19  3.80 1006/1585  3.80  4.04  3.96 3.88  3.80
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 2 40 3  1  3  0  3  2.90 ****/1535  ****  4.08  4.08 3.89  ****
7. Was the grading system clearly explained             2   0  2  4  7 10 27  4.12 1009/1651  4.12  4.20  4.18 4.10  4.12
8. How many times was class cancelled                   2   0  0  0  0  1 49  4.98  142/1673  4.98  4.65  4.69 4.67  4.98
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 11 0 0  4 14 16  7  3.63 1313/1656  3.63  4.06  4.07 3.96  3.63


            Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared         2   0  1  0  5 13 31  4.46  916/1586  4.46  4.43  4.43 4.37  4.46
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject    2   0  0  0  4  6 40  4.72 1002/1585  4.72  4.72  4.69 4.60  4.72
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 2   0  1  1 10 19 19  4.08 1089/1582  4.08  4.30  4.26 4.17  4.08
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned      2   0  1  3  4 13 29  4.32  895/1575  4.32  4.32  4.27 4.17  4.32
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 4  0  1  2  5  9 31  4.40  385/1380  4.40  3.94  3.94 3.78  4.40


            Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 28  0 12  3  4  5  0  2.08 1503/1520  2.08  4.14  4.01 3.76  2.08
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 29  0  8  5  5  2  3  2.43 1479/1515  2.43  4.37  4.24 3.97  2.43
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 29 0  6  3  6  4  4  2.87 1453/1511  2.87  4.37  4.27 4.00  2.87
4. Were special techniques successful                   28 23  0  0  1  0  0  3.00 ****/ 994  ****  3.97  3.94 3.73  ****


            Laboratory
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material   51  0  0  0  1  0  0  3.00 ****/ 265  ****  4.06  4.23 3.97  ****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information 51 0 0  0  1  0  0  3.00 ****/ 278  ****  4.21  4.19 3.97  ****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 51 0  0  0  1  0  0  3.00 ****/ 260  ****  4.43  4.46 4.41  ****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance            51  0  0  0  1  0  0  3.00 ****/ 259  ****  4.21  4.33 4.19  ****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified  51  0  0  0  1  0  0  3.00 ****/ 233  ****  4.36  4.20 4.00  ****


            Seminar
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 51  0  0  0  1  0  0  3.00 ****/ 103  ****  4.39  4.41 4.33  ****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 51 0 0  0  1  0  0  3.00 ****/ 101  ****  4.33  4.48 4.18  ****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 51  0  0  0  1  0  0  3.00 ****/  95  ****  4.15  4.31 3.99  ****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned     51  0  0  0  1  0  0  3.00 ****/  99  ****  4.36  4.39 4.10  ****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear                 51  0  0  0  1  0  0  3.00 ****/  97  ****  3.76  4.14 3.69  ****


            Field Work
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned  51  0  0  0  1  0  0  3.00 ****/  76  ****  3.36  3.98 3.32  ****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria  51  0  0  0  1  0  0  3.00 ****/  77  ****  3.65  3.93 3.42  ****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation        51  0  0  0  1  0  0  3.00 ****/  53  ****  4.19  4.45 4.34  ****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations    51  0  0  0  1  0  0  3.00 ****/  48  ****  3.86  4.12 4.00  ****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities  51  0  0  0  1  0  0  3.00 ****/  49  ****  3.74  4.27 4.30  ****


            Self  Paced
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 50  0  0  0  1  1  0  3.50 ****/  61  ****  4.03  4.09 3.87  ****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal     51  0  0  0  1  0  0  3.00 ****/  52  ****  4.21  4.26 3.91  ****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful       50  1  0  0  1  0  0  3.00 ****/  50  ****  4.23  4.44 4.39  ****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful        50  1  0  0  1  0  0  3.00 ****/  35  ****  4.22  4.36 3.92  ****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students      50  1  0  0  1  0  0  3.00 ****/  31  ****  4.25  4.34 3.88  ****
```

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	6	0.00-0.99	0	A	7	Required for Majors	28	Graduate	1	Major	0
28-55	7	1.00-1.99	0	B	14						
56-83	6	2.00-2.99	11	C	18	General	9	Under-grad	51	Non-major	37
84-150	6	3.00-3.49	6	D	2						
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00	4	F	1	Electives	4	#### - Means there are not enough			
				P	2			responses to be significant			
				I	0	Other	7				
				?	2						

```
Course-Section: ARCH 200  0101          University of Maryland                    Page   71
Title       GREEK ARCHAEOLOGY               Baltimore County                    JAN 21, 2006
Instructor:  KOEHLER, CAROLY                   Fall   2005                       Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:     49
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  1  1  3  8 19  4.34  841/1674  4.34  4.23  4.27  4.32  4.34
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    0   0  0  2  1 12 17  4.38  776/1674  4.38  4.26  4.23  4.26  4.38
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   0   0  0  2  2 10 18  4.38  728/1423  4.38  4.36  4.27  4.36  4.38
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    0   1  0  1  5 10 15  4.26  852/1609  4.26  4.23  4.22  4.23  4.26
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0   0  0  0  3 11 18  4.47  360/1585  4.47  4.04  3.96  3.91  4.47
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 1  1  0  2  3 13 12  4.17  767/1535  4.17  4.08  4.08  4.03  4.17
7. Was the grading system clearly explained            0   0  0  1  2  9 20  4.50  524/1651  4.50  4.20  4.18  4.20  4.50
8. How many times was class cancelled                  0   1  0  0  0  0 31  5.00    1/1673  5.00  4.65  4.69  4.67  5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 2 0  0  1  4 17  8  4.07  918/1656  4.07  4.06  4.07  4.10  4.07

            Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        2   0  0  0  2  9 19  4.57  795/1586  4.57  4.43  4.43  4.48  4.57
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   1   0  0  0  0  4 27  4.87  640/1585  4.87  4.72  4.69  4.76  4.87
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 1  0  0  0  5 13 13  4.26  935/1582  4.26  4.30  4.26  4.35  4.26
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     1   0  1  1  3  7 19  4.35  867/1575  4.35  4.32  4.27  4.39  4.35
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 1  0  1  0  3  3 24  4.58  253/1380  4.58  3.94  3.94  4.03  4.58

            Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 24  0  1  1  1  3  2  3.50 1169/1520  3.50  4.14  4.01  4.03  3.50
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 24  0  0  1  3  2  2  3.63 1267/1515  3.63  4.37  4.24  4.28  3.63
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 24 0  1  0  4  1  2  3.38 1340/1511  3.38  4.37  4.27  4.28  3.38
4. Were special techniques successful                  24   5  1  0  1  1  0  2.67 ****/ 994  ****  3.97  3.94  3.98  ****
```

                                Frequency Distribution

```
Credits Earned        Cum. GPA         Expected Grades        Reasons                Type                    Majors
----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
 00-27    11      0.00-0.99    1       A   10       Required for Majors  15     Graduate      0      Major        0
 28-55     2      1.00-1.99    0       B   16
 56-83     4      2.00-2.99    3       C    5       General               3     Under-grad   32      Non-major    8
 84-150    3      3.00-3.49    2       D    0
 Grad.     0      3.50-4.00    7       F    0       Electives             1     #### - Means there are not enough
                                       P    0                                  responses to be significant
                                       I    0       Other                13
                                       ?    1
```

```
Course-Section: ARCH 340  0101          University of Maryland                        Page   72
Title         CITIES OF THE PAST        Baltimore County                             JAN 21, 2006
Instructor:   GOLDBERG, MARIL           Fall   2005                                  Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:      32
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   1  0  0  0  3  5  10  4.39  792/1674  4.39  4.23  4.27  4.26  4.39
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    0  0  0  0  5  5   9  4.21  980/1674  4.21  4.26  4.23  4.21  4.21
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   0  0  0  1  4  8   6  4.00 1016/1423  4.00  4.36  4.27  4.27  4.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    0  0  0  0  3  6  10  4.37  701/1609  4.37  4.23  4.22  4.27  4.37
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0  0  1  1  2  5  10  4.16  652/1585  4.16  4.04  3.96  3.95  4.16
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 0  0  1  5  4   9  4.11  828/1535  4.11  4.08  4.08  4.15  4.11
7. Was the grading system clearly explained            0  0  0  1  5  5   8  4.05 1064/1651  4.05  4.20  4.18  4.16  4.05
8. How many times was class cancelled                  0  0  0  0  0  3  16  4.84  814/1673  4.84  4.65  4.69  4.68  4.84
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 2 0  1  1  3  6   6  3.88 1139/1656  3.88  4.06  4.07  4.07  3.88

                  Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        0  0  1  1  3  4  10  4.11 1250/1586  4.11  4.43  4.43  4.42  4.11
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   0  0  0  0  0  3  16  4.84  713/1585  4.84  4.72  4.69  4.66  4.84
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0  0  1  1  3  5   9  4.05 1104/1582  4.05  4.30  4.26  4.26  4.05
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     0  0  1  1  2  5  10  4.16 1050/1575  4.16  4.32  4.27  4.25  4.16
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 0 0  0  1  3  5  10  4.26  480/1380  4.26  3.94  3.94  4.01  4.26

                  Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 4  0  1  0  3  5   6  4.00  810/1520  4.00  4.14  4.01  4.09  4.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 4  0  0  0  2  3  10  4.53  603/1515  4.53  4.37  4.24  4.32  4.53
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 4 0  0  0  3  3   9  4.40  751/1511  4.40  4.37  4.27  4.34  4.40
4. Were special techniques successful                  4  0  0  0  3  3   9  4.40  287/ 994  4.40  3.97  3.94  3.96  4.40
```

```
                                    Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned        Cum. GPA        Expected Grades        Reasons              Type                Majors
--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
 00-27     1       0.00-0.99   0        A    7        Required for Majors  9    Graduate     0       Major        0
 28-55     3       1.00-1.99   0        B    8
 56-83     3       2.00-2.99   4        C    4        General              2    Under-grad  19       Non-major    2
 84-150    8       3.00-3.49   5        D    0
 Grad.     0       3.50-4.00   6        F    0        Electives            0    #### - Means there are not enough
                                        P    0                                 responses to be significant
                                        I    0        Other                8
                                        ?    0
```