Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ARCH 200 01	Term - Spring 2012	Enrollment: 55
Title:	Greek Archaeology & Art		Questionnaires: 37
Instructor:	Lane,Michael		

| Questions | NR | NA | Frequencies | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Org | UMBC | Level | Sect |
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	2	0	1	0	1	14	19	4.43	750/1542	4.43	4.60	4.33	4.35	4.43
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	1	1	1	9	23	4.49	642/1542	4.49	4.36	4.29	4.29	4.49
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	0	1	1	1	5	27	4.60	476/1339	4.60	4.43	4.32	4.40	4.60
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	3	1	1	1	0	9	22	4.52	536/1498	4.52	4.21	4.26	4.31	4.52
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	4	0	1	1	3	9	19	4.33	552/1428	4.33	4.31	4.12	4.17	4.33
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	2	6	8	18	4.24	706/1407	4.24	3.96	4.15	4.14	4.24
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	3	0	0	2	1	9	22	4.50	518/1521	4.50	4.47	4.20	4.22	4.50
8. How many times was class cancelled	5	0	0	0	0	9	23	4.72	948/1541	4.72	4.26	4.70	4.68	4.72
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	8	1	0	0	1	16	11	4.36	561/1518	4.36	4.34	4.11	4.12	4.36
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	0	0	0	3	30	4.91	209/1472	4.91	4.76	4.46	4.53	4.91
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	0	0	0	33	5.00	1/1475	5.00	4.90	4.72	4.79	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	6	0	0	0	1	5	25	4.77	319/1471	4.77	4.60	4.32	4.37	4.77
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	1	0	2	30	4.85	257/1470	4.85	4.68	4.33	4.40	4.85
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	3	1	0	1	8	20	4.53	300/1310	4.53	4.56	4.06	4.19	4.53
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	16	0	1	1	4	5	10	4.05	760/1210	4.05	3.71	4.18	4.18	4.05
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	16	0	0	1	3	4	13	4.38	698/1211	4.38	4.04	4.37	4.34	4.38
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	16	0	0	0	1	4	16	4.71	449/1207	4.71	4.21	4.41	4.40	4.71
4. Were special techniques successful	16	14	0	0	4	1	2	3.71	****/859	****	3.53	4.08	4.07	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section: ARCH 200 01		Term - Spring 2012									Enrollment: 55			
Title: Greek Archaeology & Art											Questionnaires: 37			
Instructor: Lane,Michael														

			Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	36	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/210	****	****	4.17	4.32	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	0	A	7	Required for Majors	5	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	0	B	18						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	5	C	5	General	21	Under-grad	37	Non-major	8
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	3	D	1						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	6	F	0	Electives	2	**** - Means there are not enough responses			
				P	0			to be significant			
				I	0	Other	3				
				?	5						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section: ARCH 201 01		Term - Spring 2012		Enrollment: 64
Title: Roman Archaeology & Art				**Questionnaires: 42**
Instructor: Mason,Richard S				

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			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	2	2	7	12	18	4.02	1159/1542	4.02	4.60	4.33	4.35	4.02
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	3	5	8	14	12	3.64	1354/1542	3.64	4.36	4.29	4.29	3.64
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	4	7	4	8	19	3.74	1134/1339	3.74	4.43	4.32	4.40	3.74
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	22	3	1	3	6	6	3.58	1319/1498	3.58	4.21	4.26	4.31	3.58
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	2	5	8	13	13	3.73	1112/1428	3.73	4.31	4.12	4.17	3.73
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	21	4	4	5	2	5	3.00	1349/1407	3.00	3.96	4.15	4.14	3.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	4	8	8	21	4.05	1026/1521	4.05	4.47	4.20	4.22	4.05
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	6	24	11	1	3.17	1537/1541	3.17	4.26	4.70	4.68	3.17
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	2	2	1	10	17	5	3.63	1236/1518	3.63	4.34	4.11	4.12	3.63
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	1	4	8	26	4.51	804/1472	4.51	4.76	4.46	4.53	4.51
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	1	5	33	4.82	754/1475	4.82	4.90	4.72	4.79	4.82
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	4	2	15	18	4.21	985/1471	4.21	4.60	4.32	4.37	4.21
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	2	0	4	7	26	4.41	800/1470	4.41	4.68	4.33	4.40	4.41
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	5	1	0	1	4	4	27	4.58	262/1310	4.58	4.56	4.06	4.19	4.58
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	28	0	6	1	4	2	1	2.36	1199/1210	2.36	3.71	4.18	4.18	2.36
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	27	0	7	0	5	2	1	2.33	1209/1211	2.33	4.04	4.37	4.34	2.33
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	28	0	5	0	2	4	3	3.00	1172/1207	3.00	4.21	4.41	4.40	3.00
Laboratory														
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	40	0	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/210	****	****	4.17	4.32	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ARCH 201 01	Term - Spring 2012	Enrollment: 64
Title:	Roman Archaeology & Art		Questionnaires: 42
Instructor:	Mason,Richard S		

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies 1	2	3	4	5	Instructor Mean	Rank	Course Mean	Org Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	40	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/69	****	5.00	4.56	4.68	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	40	0	2	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/32	****	****	4.20	4.55	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	40	0	2	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/35	****	****	4.36	4.10	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	40	1	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/25	****	****	4.59	4.70	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	40	1	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/23	****	****	4.41	4.50	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	40	1	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/17	****	****	4.62	4.50	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	40	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/30	****	****	4.27	3.95	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	40	1	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/29	****	****	4.29	4.50	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	A	10	Required for Majors	11	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	B	11						
56-83	7	2.00-2.99	3	C	12	General	23	Under-grad	42	Non-major	21
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	13	F	0	Electives	2	**** - Means there are not enough responses			
				P	1			to be significant			
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	6						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ARCH 220 01	Term - Spring 2012		Enrollment: 54
Title:	Archaeology and Art of A			Questionnaires: 28
Instructor:	Mason,Richard S			

| Questions | NR | NA | Frequencies | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Org | UMBC | Level | Sect |
			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	5	19	4.54	596/1542	4.54	4.60	4.33	4.35	4.54
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	11	14	4.39	765/1542	4.39	4.36	4.29	4.29	4.39
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	1	0	2	11	13	4.30	793/1339	4.30	4.43	4.32	4.40	4.30
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	17	2	2	2	0	5	3.36	1390/1498	3.36	4.21	4.26	4.31	3.36
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	1	1	0	4	9	12	4.19	692/1428	4.19	4.31	4.12	4.17	4.19
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	20	3	0	2	0	2	2.71	1384/1407	2.71	3.96	4.15	4.14	2.71
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	0	3	9	14	4.42	630/1521	4.42	4.47	4.20	4.22	4.42
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	17	10	0	3.37	1530/1541	3.37	4.26	4.70	4.68	3.37
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	0	0	0	2	13	7	4.23	721/1518	4.23	4.34	4.11	4.12	4.23
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	1	7	19	4.67	598/1472	4.67	4.76	4.46	4.53	4.67
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	1	2	23	4.85	700/1475	4.85	4.90	4.72	4.79	4.85
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	1	13	13	4.44	725/1471	4.44	4.60	4.32	4.37	4.44
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	2	4	19	4.68	468/1470	4.68	4.68	4.33	4.40	4.68
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	2	0	0	1	1	21	4.87	89/1310	4.87	4.56	4.06	4.19	4.87
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	16	0	2	1	3	2	4	3.42	1041/1210	3.42	3.71	4.18	4.18	3.42
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	16	0	0	3	1	3	5	3.83	1015/1211	3.83	4.04	4.37	4.34	3.83
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	16	0	1	1	3	2	5	3.75	1038/1207	3.75	4.21	4.41	4.40	3.75

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ARCH 220 01		Term - Spring 2012		Enrollment:	54
Title:	Archaeology and Art of A				Questionnaires:	28
Instructor:	Mason,Richard S					

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies 1	2	3	4	5	Instructor Mean	Rank	Course Mean	Org Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
Discussion														
4. Were special techniques successful	15	8	0	0	3	1	1	3.60	****/859	****	3.53	4.08	4.07	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	0	A	7	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	10						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	1	C	3	General	3	Under-grad	28	Non-major	12
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	4	D	1						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	6	F	0	Electives	15	**** - Means there are not enough responses			
				P	0			to be significant			
				I	0	Other	4				
				?	7						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section: ARCH 350 01		Term - Spring 2012		Enrollment: 10
Title: Topics In Archaeology				Questionnaires: 10
Instructor: Read,Esther D				

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			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	0	2	8	4.80	260/1542	4.86	4.60	4.33	4.37	4.80
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	7	4.70	366/1542	4.50	4.36	4.29	4.31	4.70
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	4	5	4.56	529/1339	4.65	4.43	4.32	4.36	4.56
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	3	6	4.67	357/1498	4.58	4.21	4.26	4.32	4.67
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	0	2	7	4.50	390/1428	4.37	4.31	4.12	4.15	4.50
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	0	1	8	4.60	306/1407	4.53	3.96	4.15	4.20	4.60
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	2	7	4.60	408/1521	4.42	4.47	4.20	4.23	4.60
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	1	0	0	0	5	4	4.44	1174/1541	4.65	4.26	4.70	4.71	4.44
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	3	7	4.70	211/1518	4.67	4.34	4.11	4.13	4.70
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	209/1472	4.91	4.76	4.46	4.46	4.90
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	808/1475	4.86	4.90	4.72	4.74	4.80
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	163/1471	4.72	4.60	4.32	4.33	4.90
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	349/1470	4.81	4.68	4.33	4.35	4.78
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	0	2	0	7	4.56	285/1310	4.43	4.56	4.06	4.11	4.56
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1210	4.50	3.71	4.18	4.27	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1211	4.90	4.04	4.37	4.45	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1207	4.60	4.21	4.41	4.51	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section: ARCH 350 01	Term - Spring 2012	Enrollment: 10
Title: Topics In Archaeology		Questionnaires: 10
Instructor: Read,Esther D		

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Org Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
Discussion														
4. Were special techniques successful	8	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/859	3.40	3.53	4.08	4.13	****

Frequency Distribution

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

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section: ARCH 350 02	Term - Spring 2012	Enrollment: 15
Title: Topics In Archaeology		Questionnaires: 13
Instructor: Lane,Michael F		

| Questions | NR | NA | Frequencies | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Org | UMBC | Level | Sect |
			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	0	1	12	4.92	135/1542	4.86	4.60	4.33	4.37	4.92
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	5	6	4.31	867/1542	4.50	4.36	4.29	4.31	4.31
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	1	1	10	4.75	313/1339	4.65	4.43	4.32	4.36	4.75
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	1	4	7	4.50	549/1498	4.58	4.21	4.26	4.32	4.50
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	1	0	3	8	4.23	650/1428	4.37	4.31	4.12	4.15	4.23
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	1	0	3	7	4.45	467/1407	4.53	3.96	4.15	4.20	4.45
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	3	4	6	4.23	859/1521	4.42	4.47	4.20	4.23	4.23
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	2	11	4.85	787/1541	4.65	4.26	4.70	4.71	4.85
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	0	4	7	4.64	269/1518	4.67	4.34	4.11	4.13	4.64
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	1	12	4.92	167/1472	4.91	4.76	4.46	4.46	4.92
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	12	4.92	430/1475	4.86	4.90	4.72	4.74	4.92
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	4	8	4.54	607/1471	4.72	4.60	4.32	4.33	4.54
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	11	4.85	257/1470	4.81	4.68	4.33	4.35	4.85
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	2	5	6	4.31	526/1310	4.43	4.56	4.06	4.11	4.31
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	2	1	7	4.50	430/1210	4.50	3.71	4.18	4.27	4.50
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	194/1211	4.90	4.04	4.37	4.45	4.90
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	1	2	7	4.60	556/1207	4.60	4.21	4.41	4.51	4.60
4. Were special techniques successful	3	5	1	0	2	0	2	3.40	745/859	3.40	3.53	4.08	4.13	3.40

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ARCH 350 02	Term - Spring 2012	Enrollment:	15
Title:	Topics In Archaeology		Questionnaires:	13
Instructor:	Lane,Michael F			

| Questions | NR | NA | Frequencies | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Org | UMBC | Level | Sect |
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/32	****	****	4.20	3.88	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	11	0	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/35	****	****	4.36	4.08	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	11	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/25	****	****	4.59	4.24	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	11	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/23	****	****	4.41	3.84	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	11	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/17	****	****	4.62	4.17	****

Frequency Distribution

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

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ARCH 370 01	Term - Spring 2012	Enrollment: 11
Title:	Maritime Archaeology		Questionnaires: 8
Instructor:	Koehler,Carolyn		

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies 1	2	3	4	5	Instructor Mean	Rank	Course Mean	Org Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	196/1542	4.88	4.60	4.33	4.37	4.88
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	1	6	4.63	466/1542	4.63	4.36	4.29	4.31	4.63
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	1	6	4.63	455/1339	4.63	4.43	4.32	4.36	4.63
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	0	0	7	4.63	404/1498	4.63	4.21	4.26	4.32	4.63
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	107/1428	4.88	4.31	4.12	4.15	4.88
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	178/1407	4.75	3.96	4.15	4.20	4.75
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1521	5.00	4.47	4.20	4.23	5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1541	5.00	4.26	4.70	4.71	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	1	2	5	4.50	373/1518	4.50	4.34	4.11	4.13	4.50
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	3	5	4.63	659/1472	4.63	4.76	4.46	4.46	4.63
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1475	5.00	4.90	4.72	4.74	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	0	7	4.75	346/1471	4.75	4.60	4.32	4.33	4.75
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	2	5	4.50	692/1470	4.50	4.68	4.33	4.35	4.50
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	0	4	4	4.50	324/1310	4.50	4.56	4.06	4.11	4.50
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	1	1	5	4.25	634/1210	4.25	3.71	4.18	4.27	4.25
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	1	0	7	4.75	352/1211	4.75	4.04	4.37	4.45	4.75
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1207	5.00	4.21	4.41	4.51	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	0	2	1	0	1	2	2	3.67	646/859	3.67	3.53	4.08	4.13	3.67

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ARCH 370 01
Title:	Maritime Archaeology
Instructor:	Koehler,Carolyn

Term - Spring 2012

Enrollment:	11
Questionnaires:	8

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies 1	2	3	4	5	Instructor Mean	Instructor Rank	Course Mean	Org Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/69	5.00	5.00	4.56	4.70	5.00
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/69	5.00	5.00	4.60	4.68	5.00
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	0	7	4.75	31/68	4.75	4.75	4.50	4.51	4.75
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	3	5	4.63	42/73	4.63	4.63	4.54	4.55	4.63
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/67	5.00	5.00	4.17	4.46	5.00

Frequency Distribution

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