

Course-Section: ARCH 120 0101
 Title WORLD ARCHAEOLOGY
 Instructor: READ, ESTHER DO
 Enrollment: 94
 Questionnaires: 39

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 68
 JUN 26, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	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	2	15	22	4.51	593/1522	4.51	4.43	4.30	4.14	4.51	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	13	26	4.67	358/1522	4.67	4.13	4.26	4.18	4.67	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	9	30	4.77	268/1285	4.77	4.07	4.30	4.22	4.77	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	18	0	0	1	7	12	4.55	425/1476	4.55	4.08	4.22	4.09	4.55	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	2	4	5	9	18	3.97	799/1412	3.97	4.26	4.06	4.01	3.97	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	20	0	0	2	4	12	4.56	289/1381	4.56	4.10	4.08	3.93	4.56	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	1	2	13	22	4.47	527/1500	4.47	4.23	4.18	4.16	4.47	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	10	24	4	3.84	1460/1517	3.84	4.21	4.65	4.62	3.84	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	9	1	0	0	5	14	10	4.17	744/1497	4.17	4.04	4.11	4.02	4.17	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	0	7	30	4.81	336/1440	4.81	4.49	4.45	4.40	4.81	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	1	1	6	29	4.70	954/1448	4.70	4.87	4.71	4.63	4.70	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	1	10	26	4.68	404/1436	4.68	4.24	4.29	4.24	4.68	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	1	8	28	4.73	383/1432	4.73	4.40	4.29	4.23	4.73	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	5	3	0	0	1	6	24	4.74	129/1221	4.74	4.56	3.93	3.86	4.74	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	34	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	****/1280	****	3.65	4.10	3.92	****	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	34	0	0	1	0	0	4	4.40	****/1277	****	4.59	4.34	4.13	****	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	34	0	0	1	0	0	4	4.40	****/1269	****	4.55	4.31	4.04	****	
4. Were special techniques successful	34	2	1	0	0	0	2	3.67	****/ 854	****	4.11	4.02	3.87	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	4	0.00-0.99 0	A 24	Required for Majors 23	Graduate 0 Major 1
28-55	5	1.00-1.99 0	B 4		
56-83	8	2.00-2.99 5	C 1	General 7	Under-grad 39 Non-major 38
84-150	7	3.00-3.49 9	D 0		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 10	F 0	Electives 0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 1	
			? 0		

Course-Section: ARCH 201 0101
 Title ROMAN ARCHAEOLOGY
 Instructor: MASON, RICHARD
 Enrollment: 59
 Questionnaires: 33

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 69
 JUN 26, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	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	13	15	4.34	802/1522	4.34	4.43	4.30	4.34	4.34	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	1	2	5	16	8	3.88	1206/1522	3.88	4.13	4.26	4.29	3.88	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	2	4	1	14	11	3.88	1038/1285	3.88	4.07	4.30	4.36	3.88	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	1	0	2	6	14	8	3.93	1091/1476	3.93	4.08	4.22	4.20	3.93	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	3	2	10	16	4.16	655/1412	4.16	4.26	4.06	4.00	4.16	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	5	1	1	10	11	4	3.59	1132/1381	3.59	4.10	4.08	3.97	3.59	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	3	3	9	17	4.25	780/1500	4.25	4.23	4.18	4.20	4.25	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	1	9	21	1	3.69	1477/1517	3.69	4.21	4.65	4.63	3.69	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	1	0	0	4	15	7	4.12	820/1497	4.12	4.04	4.11	4.11	4.12	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	2	13	17	4.47	851/1440	4.47	4.49	4.45	4.42	4.47	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	1	0	4	26	4.77	821/1448	4.77	4.87	4.71	4.78	4.77	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	1	1	3	14	13	4.16	965/1436	4.16	4.24	4.29	4.29	4.16	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	1	1	11	18	4.38	784/1432	4.38	4.40	4.29	4.31	4.38	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	1	3	6	22	4.53	259/1221	4.53	4.56	3.93	4.02	4.53	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	18	0	2	1	5	3	4	3.40	1081/1280	3.40	3.65	4.10	4.08	3.40	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	18	0	0	1	3	5	6	4.07	913/1277	4.07	4.59	4.34	4.33	4.07	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	18	0	0	0	3	5	7	4.27	770/1269	4.27	4.55	4.31	4.33	4.27	
4. Were special techniques successful	18	12	0	1	2	0	0	2.67	****/ 854	****	4.11	4.02	4.00	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	6	0.00-0.99 0	A 7	Required for Majors 16	Graduate 0 Major 0
28-55	8	1.00-1.99 0	B 11		
56-83	2	2.00-2.99 4	C 9	General 6	Under-grad 33 Non-major 33
84-150	6	3.00-3.49 8	D 1		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 8	F 1	Electives 1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 6	
			? 1		

Course-Section: ARCH 340 0101
 Title CITIES OF THE PAST
 Instructor: GOLDBERG, MARIL
 Enrollment: 24
 Questionnaires: 14

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 70
 JUN 26, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	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	2	5	7	4.36	791/1522	4.36	4.43	4.30	4.34	4.36	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	8	5	4.29	844/1522	4.29	4.13	4.26	4.25	4.29	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	6	5	4.14	849/1285	4.14	4.07	4.30	4.30	4.14	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	8	4	4.14	913/1476	4.14	4.08	4.22	4.26	4.14	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	0	5	8	4.43	411/1412	4.43	4.26	4.06	4.03	4.43	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	3	3	7	4.14	713/1381	4.14	4.10	4.08	4.13	4.14	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	2	3	9	4.50	483/1500	4.50	4.23	4.18	4.13	4.50	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	8	6	4.43	1144/1517	4.43	4.21	4.65	4.62	4.43	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	1	1	7	4	4.08	852/1497	4.08	4.04	4.11	4.13	4.08	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	5	8	4.50	798/1440	4.50	4.49	4.45	4.46	4.50	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	14	5.00	1/1448	5.00	4.87	4.71	4.71	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	1	0	9	4	4.14	972/1436	4.14	4.24	4.29	4.30	4.14	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	3	4	7	4.29	862/1432	4.29	4.40	4.29	4.29	4.29	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	1	1	0	1	5	6	4.15	532/1221	4.15	4.56	3.93	3.94	4.15	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	0	2	8	2	3.77	900/1280	3.77	3.65	4.10	4.14	3.77	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	0	1	12	4.92	182/1277	4.92	4.59	4.34	4.38	4.92	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	4	10	4.71	420/1269	4.71	4.55	4.31	4.39	4.71	
4. Were special techniques successful	0	0	0	0	2	7	5	4.21	352/ 854	4.21	4.11	4.02	4.00	4.21	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: ARCH 380 0101
 Title HELLENISTIC ARCHAEOLOG
 Instructor: KOEHLER, CAROLY
 Enrollment: 15
 Questionnaires: 10

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 71
 JUN 26, 2007
 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	0	5	5	4.50	605/1522	4.50	4.43	4.30	4.34	4.50	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	0	2	5	2	3.70	1290/1522	3.70	4.13	4.26	4.25	3.70	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	2	1	4	1	3.50	1160/1285	3.50	4.07	4.30	4.30	3.50	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	6	1	3.70	1222/1476	3.70	4.08	4.22	4.26	3.70	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	0	2	7	4.50	339/1412	4.50	4.26	4.06	4.03	4.50	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	1	4	4	4.10	753/1381	4.10	4.10	4.08	4.13	4.10	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	0	2	5	2	3.70	1219/1500	3.70	4.23	4.18	4.13	3.70	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	487/1517	4.90	4.21	4.65	4.62	4.90	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	1	1	7	1	3.80	1113/1497	3.80	4.04	4.11	4.13	3.80	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	8	2	4.20	1094/1440	4.20	4.49	4.45	4.46	4.20	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1448	5.00	4.87	4.71	4.71	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	2	6	2	4.00	1056/1436	4.00	4.24	4.29	4.30	4.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	3	2	5	4.20	928/1432	4.20	4.40	4.29	4.29	4.20	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	99/1221	4.80	4.56	3.93	3.94	4.80	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	3	2	3	3.78	894/1280	3.78	3.65	4.10	4.14	3.78	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	1	0	8	4.78	351/1277	4.78	4.59	4.34	4.38	4.78	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	1	1	7	4.67	461/1269	4.67	4.55	4.31	4.39	4.67	
4. Were special techniques successful	1	6	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	426/ 854	4.00	4.11	4.02	4.00	4.00	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	1	0	0	1	0	2	6	4.44	61/ 79	4.44	4.44	4.58	4.53	4.44	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	1	0	0	0	1	1	7	4.67	50/ 77	4.67	4.67	4.52	4.30	4.67	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	2	2	5	4.33	49/ 65	4.33	4.33	4.49	4.33	4.33	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	3	2	2	2	3.33	71/ 78	3.33	3.33	4.45	4.34	3.33	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	1	0	1	0	4	0	4	3.67	60/ 80	3.67	3.67	4.11	3.33	3.67	

Frequency Distribution

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