```
Course-Section: ARCH 120  0101            University of Maryland                             Page   84
Title         WORLD ARCHAEOLOGY              Baltimore County                             AUG  6, 2008
Instructor:   READ, ESTHER DO                 Spring 2008                                  Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:   105
Questionnaires:  48              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  5 17  25  4.38   849/1670  4.38  4.44  4.31  4.23  4.38
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    1   0  0  0  3 15  29  4.55   556/1666  4.55  4.20  4.27  4.30  4.55
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   0   0  0  0  1 18  29  4.58   515/1406  4.58  4.29  4.32  4.31  4.58
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    0  25  1  0  3  5  14  4.35   762/1615  4.35  4.16  4.24  4.17  4.35
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0   1  7  1 11 14  14  3.57  1246/1566  3.57  3.99  4.07  4.03  3.57
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 29 1  2  1  7   8  4.00   899/1528  4.00  3.93  4.12  4.00  4.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained            0   0  0  0  1  8  39  4.79   237/1650  4.79  4.45  4.22  4.28  4.79
8. How many times was class cancelled                  0   0  0  0  0 15  33  4.69  1002/1667  4.69  4.53  4.67  4.61  4.69
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 6  2  0  0  5 25  10  4.13   877/1626  4.13  4.17  4.11  4.07  4.13


             Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        0   0  0  0  5 17  26  4.44   984/1559  4.44  4.43  4.46  4.47  4.44
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   0   0  0  0  0  9  39  4.81   829/1560  4.81  4.80  4.72  4.68  4.81
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0  0  0  0  3 17  28  4.52   658/1549  4.52  4.35  4.31  4.32  4.52
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     0   0  0  2  2  8  36  4.63   570/1546  4.63  4.56  4.32  4.32  4.63
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 0 2  3  1  2 15  25  4.26   537/1323  4.26  4.50  4.00  3.91  4.26


             Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 36 0  1  0  2  2   7  4.17   740/1384  4.17  3.94  4.10  3.92  4.17
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 36 0  0  3  3  1   5  3.67  1139/1378  3.67  3.96  4.29  4.09  3.67
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 36 0 0  2  1  2   7  4.17   915/1378  4.17  4.18  4.31  4.08  4.17
4. Were special techniques successful                  36  9  0  1  0  0   2  4.00   ****/ 904  ****  4.24  4.03  3.94  ****


                              Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned         Cum. GPA        Expected Grades          Reasons                 Type                    Majors
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
  00-27   12        0.00-0.99    0       A  28      Required for Majors  36     Graduate      0        Major        0
  28-55   10        1.00-1.99    0       B  12
  56-83    3        2.00-2.99    6       C   0      General               4     Under-grad   48        Non-major   48
  84-150   4        3.00-3.49   13       D   0
  Grad.    0        3.50-4.00   10       F   1      Electives             1     #### - Means there are not enough
                                         P   0                                 responses to be significant
                                         I   0      Other                 0
                                         ?   0
```

```
Course-Section: ARCH 200  0101              University of Maryland                         Page  85
Title      GREEK ARCHAEOLOGY                    Baltimore County                         AUG  6, 2008
Instructor:   MASON, RICHARD                      Spring 2008                            Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:     58
Questionnaires:  30                  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  1  0  3 12 13  4.24 1006/1670  4.24  4.44  4.31  4.32  4.24
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals     1  0  2  2  7  9  9  3.72 1424/1666  3.72  4.20  4.27  4.27  3.72
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals    1  0  1  2  4 13  9  3.93 1108/1406  3.93  4.29  4.32  4.39  3.93
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals     1 10  2  2  5  5  5  3.47 1462/1615  3.47  4.16  4.24  4.29  3.47
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 1  1  2  3  6  8  9  3.68 1195/1566  3.68  3.99  4.07  4.00  3.68
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 1 10  4  1  5  7  2  3.11 1440/1528  3.11  3.93  4.12  4.11  3.11
7. Was the grading system clearly explained             1  0  1  0  4 13 11  4.14 1043/1650  4.14  4.45  4.22  4.20  4.14
8. How many times was class cancelled                   1  0  0  0  3 26  0  3.90 1610/1667  3.90  4.53  4.67  4.64  3.90
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 3 0 1 2 7 7 10  3.85 1172/1626  3.85  4.17  4.11  4.06  3.85


               Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared         1  0  0  1  4  8 16  4.34 1082/1559  4.34  4.43  4.46  4.40  4.34
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject    1  0  0  0  3  1 25  4.76  948/1560  4.76  4.80  4.72  4.73  4.76
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 1  0  1  1  3 13 11  4.10 1104/1549  4.10  4.35  4.31  4.25  4.10
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned      1  0  1  0  2  6 20  4.52  703/1546  4.52  4.56  4.32  4.30  4.52
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 1 3  0  3  1  2 20  4.50  326/1323  4.50  4.50  4.00  4.08  4.50


               Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 19  0  2  1  3  3  2  3.18 1223/1384  3.18  3.94  4.10  4.07  3.18
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 19  0  2  0  5  1  3  3.27 1261/1378  3.27  3.96  4.29  4.25  3.27
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 19 0 2  0  2  2  5  3.73 1125/1378  3.73  4.18  4.31  4.26  3.73
4. Were special techniques successful                   19  8  0  0  3  0  0  3.00 ****/ 904  ****  4.24  4.03  4.01  ****


               Laboratory
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material   28  1  0  0  1  0  0  3.00 ****/ 232  ****  ****  4.19  4.35  ****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information 28 0 0 0  1  0  1  4.00 ****/ 239  ****  ****  4.21  4.33  ****


                                   Frequency Distribution


Credits Earned        Cum. GPA        Expected Grades          Reasons                Type                Majors
---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
00-27      4      0.00-0.99   0        A   7      Required for Majors  11    Graduate     0      Major       0
28-55      1      1.00-1.99   0        B   9
56-83      3      2.00-2.99   3        C   6      General               7    Under-grad  30      Non-major  30
84-150     6      3.00-3.49   4        D   1
Grad.      0      3.50-4.00   6        F   0      Electives             2    #### - Means there are not enough
                                       P   1                                responses to be significant
                                       I   0      Other                 5
                                       ?   0
```

```
Course-Section: ARCH 201  0101              University of Maryland                        Page   86
Title       ROMAN ARCHAEOLOGY                 Baltimore County                            AUG  6, 2008
Instructor:  LANE, MICHAEL                    Spring 2008                                 Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:     61
Questionnaires:  39                    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  2  1  9 27  4.56  600/1670  4.56 4.44  4.31 4.32  4.56
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    0   0  0  1  5  8 25  4.46  686/1666  4.46 4.20  4.27 4.27  4.46
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   0   0  1  2  1  6 29  4.54  566/1406  4.54 4.29  4.32 4.39  4.54
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    0   2  2  0  2  6 27  4.51  541/1615  4.51 4.16  4.24 4.29  4.51
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0  0  1  2  5 13 18  4.15  743/1566  4.15 3.99  4.07 4.00  4.15
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 2 0 2 6 15 14  4.11  842/1528  4.11 3.93  4.12 4.11  4.11
7. Was the grading system clearly explained            0   0  0  1  3 12 23  4.46  630/1650  4.46 4.45  4.22 4.20  4.46
8. How many times was class cancelled                  0   0  0  0  0 18 21  4.54 1134/1667  4.54 4.53  4.67 4.64  4.54
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 4 0 0 0 2 18 15  4.37  595/1626  4.37 4.17  4.11 4.06  4.37

                 Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        0   0  0  0  0  5 34  4.87  323/1559  4.87 4.43  4.46 4.40  4.87
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   0   0  0  0  1  4 34  4.85  751/1560  4.85 4.80  4.72 4.73  4.85
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0  0  0  0  2  7 30  4.72  424/1549  4.72 4.35  4.31 4.25  4.72
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     0   0  0  0  2  9 28  4.67  520/1546  4.67 4.56  4.32 4.30  4.67
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 1 1 0 0 2 9 26  4.65  248/1323  4.65 4.50  4.00 4.08  4.65

                 Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 1 0 1 0 1 13 23  4.50  434/1384  4.50 3.94  4.10 4.07  4.50
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 1 0 0 0 2  5 31  4.76  389/1378  4.76 3.96  4.29 4.25  4.76
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 1 0 0 0 2 8 28  4.68  511/1378  4.68 4.18  4.31 4.26  4.68
4. Were special techniques successful                  1   1  0  3  5  9 20  4.24  378/ 904  4.24 4.24  4.03 4.01  4.24

                 Seminar
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 38 0 0 0 0 1  0  4.00 ****/  79  **** 4.40  4.64 4.75  ****

                 Self  Paced
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal    38  0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  16  **** ****  4.67 **** ****
```

                          Frequency Distribution

```
Credits Earned        Cum. GPA         Expected Grades        Reasons                    Type                  Majors
---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
 00-27     4       0.00-0.99    0       A   18        Required for Majors  21      Graduate      0        Major       0
 28-55    10       1.00-1.99    1       B   11
 56-83     7       2.00-2.99    3       C    5        General               5      Under-grad   39        Non-major  39
 84-150    7       3.00-3.49    7       D    0
 Grad.     0       3.50-4.00   12       F    0        Electives             1      #### - Means there are not enough
                                        P    0                                    responses to be significant
                                        I    0        Other                10
                                        ?    1
```

Questionnaires: 14   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  4  9  4.57  589/1670  4.57  4.44  4.31  4.24  4.57
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals   0   0  0  0  5  3  6  4.07 1154/1666  4.07  4.20  4.27  4.18  4.07
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals  0   4  0  0  1  7  2  4.10  997/1406  4.10  4.29  4.32  4.22  4.10
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals   0   0  0  1  1  5  7  4.29  837/1615  4.29  4.16  4.24  4.18  4.29
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0  0  0  0  0  6  8  4.57  354/1566  4.57  3.99  4.07  4.04  4.57
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 0 0 0 1 5 8  4.50  421/1528  4.50  3.93  4.12  4.07  4.50
7. Was the grading system clearly explained           0   0  0  0  1  6  7  4.43  690/1650  4.43  4.45  4.22  4.12  4.43
8. How many times was class cancelled                 0   0  0  0  0  0 14  5.00    1/1667  5.00  4.53  4.67  4.67  5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 2 0 0 0 2 4 6  4.33  637/1626  4.33  4.17  4.11  4.06  4.33


                 Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared       0   0  0  1  2  6  5  4.07 1263/1559  4.07  4.43  4.46  4.40  4.07
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject  0   0  0  0  1  1 12  4.79  892/1560  4.79  4.80  4.72  4.67  4.79
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0 0 0 0 3 7 4     4.07 1116/1549  4.07  4.35  4.31  4.25  4.07
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned    0   0  0  1  1  3  9  4.43  822/1546  4.43  4.56  4.32  4.24  4.43
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 0 0 0 1 0 3 10  4.57  288/1323  4.57  4.50  4.00  3.99  4.57


                 Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 1 0 0 1 3 5 4     3.92  909/1384  3.92  3.94  4.10  4.12  3.92
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 1 0 0 1 3 2 7     4.15  911/1378  4.15  3.96  4.29  4.30  4.15
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 1 0 0 2 1 3 7    4.15  921/1378  4.15  4.18  4.31  4.33  4.15
4. Were special techniques successful                 1  11  0  0  2  0  0  3.00 ****/ 904  ****  4.24  4.03  4.03  ****


                 Seminar
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 4 0 0 0 2 2 6    4.40   68/  87  4.40  4.40  4.65  4.30  4.40
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 4 0 0 0 3 0 7   4.40   59/  79  4.40  4.40  4.64  4.53  4.40
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 4 0 0 0 2 1 7    4.50   48/  75  4.50  4.50  4.57  4.50  4.50
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned   4   0  0  0  1  5  4  4.30   53/  79  4.30  4.30  4.45  3.68  4.30
5. Were criteria for grading made clear               4   0  0  0  2  2  6  4.40   32/  80  4.40  4.40  3.97  3.76  4.40
```

                                      Frequency Distribution

```
Credits Earned          Cum. GPA          Expected Grades       Reasons               Type                Majors
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
 00-27    2      0.00-0.99    0        A   4      Required for Majors  1     Graduate     0      Major        0
 28-55    2      1.00-1.99    0        B   8
 56-83    1      2.00-2.99    0        C   2      General              1     Under-grad  14      Non-major   14
 84-150   6      3.00-3.49    8        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
```