

Course Section: ANCS 110 0101
 Title INTRO TO ANCIENT EGYPT
 Instructor: MASON, RICHARD
 Enrollment: 81
 Questionnaires: 54

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2006

Page 44
 JAN 18, 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	5	0	0	1	4	13	31	4.51	578/1669	4.51	4.37	4.23	4.02	4.51	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	4	0	1	3	11	18	17	3.94	1178/1666	3.94	3.80	4.19	4.11	3.94	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	5	0	1	1	13	15	19	4.02	961/1421	4.02	3.64	4.24	4.11	4.02	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	5	23	3	2	5	5	11	3.73	1262/1617	3.73	3.87	4.15	3.99	3.73	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	5	2	6	5	6	14	16	3.62	1170/1555	3.62	4.22	4.00	3.92	3.62	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	5	28	2	4	6	4	5	3.29	1336/1543	3.29	3.85	4.06	3.86	3.29	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	6	0	0	4	9	17	18	4.02	1032/1647	4.02	3.48	4.12	4.06	4.02	
8. How many times was class cancelled	5	0	0	0	34	15	0	3.31	1645/1668	3.31	3.51	4.67	4.62	3.31	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	12	2	0	2	6	23	9	3.97	970/1605	3.98	3.98	4.07	3.96	3.97	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	5	0	1	1	2	14	31	4.49	830/1514	4.49	4.37	4.39	4.32	4.49	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	5	0	0	1	0	2	46	4.90	539/1551	4.90	4.84	4.66	4.55	4.90	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	5	0	2	2	4	17	24	4.20	923/1503	4.20	4.12	4.24	4.17	4.20	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	2	5	6	36	4.55	594/1506	4.55	4.31	4.26	4.17	4.55	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	5	0	1	1	4	9	34	4.51	259/1311	4.51	4.01	3.85	3.68	4.51	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	34	0	6	2	7	4	1	2.60	1423/1490	2.60	3.67	4.05	3.85	2.60	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	33	0	5	2	6	5	3	2.95	1409/1502	2.95	3.96	4.26	4.06	2.95	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	33	0	1	4	3	4	9	3.76	1186/1489	3.76	4.28	4.29	4.07	3.76	
4. Were special techniques successful	32	21	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/1006	****	****	4.00	3.81	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	53	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 58	****	****	4.22	4.00	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	2	0.00-0.99 0	A 17	Required for Majors	34
28-55	9	1.00-1.99 2	B 14		Graduate 0
56-83	9	2.00-2.99 9	C 9	General	8
84-150	8	3.00-3.49 5	D 3		Under-grad 54
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 11	F 0	Electives	1
			P 2		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	8
			? 0		

Course Section: ANCS 200 0101
 Title ISRAEL/ANCIENT NEAR EA
 Instructor: GARFEIN, SUSANN
 Enrollment: 60
 Questionnaires: 27

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2006

Page 45
 JAN 18, 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	2	0	2	11	12	4.15	1052/1669	4.15	4.37	4.23	4.34	4.15	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	4	8	14	4.30	827/1666	4.30	3.80	4.19	4.29	4.30	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	5	7	15	4.37	710/1421	4.37	3.64	4.24	4.35	4.37	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	4	3	0	4	4	12	3.96	1098/1617	3.96	3.87	4.15	4.24	3.96	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	2	2	8	14	4.19	622/1555	4.19	4.22	4.00	3.96	4.19	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	6	3	0	2	4	12	4.05	869/1543	4.05	3.85	4.06	4.10	4.05	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	1	5	10	10	4.00	1043/1647	4.00	3.48	4.12	4.19	4.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	23	4	4.15	1451/1668	4.15	3.51	4.67	4.59	4.15	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	2	1	2	13	7	3.88	1108/1605	3.88	3.98	4.07	4.15	3.88	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	1	1	5	20	4.63	647/1514	4.63	4.37	4.39	4.39	4.63	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	1	0	7	19	4.63	1083/1551	4.63	4.84	4.66	4.72	4.63	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	1	3	2	10	11	4.00	1066/1503	4.00	4.12	4.24	4.29	4.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	0	1	7	17	4.37	799/1506	4.37	4.31	4.26	4.33	4.37	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	1	1	2	10	9	4	3.50	939/1311	3.50	4.01	3.85	3.96	3.50	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	1	2	6	3	3.92	945/1490	3.92	3.67	4.05	4.11	3.92	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	15	0	1	0	1	5	5	4.08	982/1502	4.08	3.96	4.26	4.31	4.08	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	15	0	0	0	2	5	5	4.25	920/1489	4.25	4.28	4.29	4.36	4.25	
4. Were special techniques successful	15	11	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/1006	****	****	4.00	3.99	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	A	9	Required for Majors	16	Graduate	0	Major	3
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	0	B	9						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	1	C	5	General	5	Under-grad	27	Non-major	24
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	5	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	6	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	1						
				I	0	Other	3				
				?	1						

Course Section: ANCS 250H 0101
 Title THE SCHOOL OF ATHENS
 Instructor: MASON, RICHARD
 Enrollment: 16
 Questionnaires: 13

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2006

Page 46
 JAN 18, 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	0	7	6	4.46	647/1669	4.46	4.37	4.23	4.34	4.46	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	1	7	3	1	3.15	1559/1666	3.15	3.80	4.19	4.29	3.15	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	6	4	2	0	2.54	1405/1421	2.54	3.64	4.24	4.35	2.54	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	0	2	6	4	3.92	1140/1617	3.92	3.87	4.15	4.24	3.92	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	11	4.85	124/1555	4.85	4.22	4.00	3.96	4.85	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	6	5	4.23	680/1543	4.23	3.85	4.06	4.10	4.23	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	3	3	4	2	0	2.42	1596/1647	2.42	3.48	4.12	4.19	2.42	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	12	1	0	3.08	1653/1668	3.08	3.51	4.67	4.59	3.08	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	2	5	3	4.10	851/1605	4.10	3.98	4.07	4.15	4.10	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	2	1	5	5	4.00	1199/1514	4.00	4.37	4.39	4.39	4.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	13	5.00	1/1551	5.00	4.84	4.66	4.72	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	1	2	4	6	4.15	969/1503	4.15	4.12	4.24	4.29	4.15	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	1	7	4	4.00	1069/1506	4.00	4.31	4.26	4.33	4.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	10	2	1	0	0	0	1.33	****/1311	****	4.01	3.85	3.96	****	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	0	3	3	4.50	445/1490	4.50	3.67	4.05	4.11	4.50	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	306/1502	4.83	3.96	4.26	4.31	4.83	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	348/1489	4.83	4.28	4.29	4.36	4.83	
4. Were special techniques successful	7	5	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/1006	****	****	4.00	3.99	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	3	0	0	0	0	3	7	4.70	50/ 112	4.70	4.70	4.38	4.59	4.70	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	3	9	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 97	****	****	4.36	4.60	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	3	9	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 92	****	****	4.22	4.50	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	3	1	0	0	0	4	5	4.56	48/ 105	4.56	4.56	4.20	4.63	4.56	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	3	2	1	2	4	1	0	2.63	85/ 98	2.63	2.63	3.95	4.20	2.63	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	5	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	2
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B	6						
56-83	5	2.00-2.99	0	C	1	General	4	Under-grad	13	Non-major	11
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	8	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	7				
				?	0						

Course Section: ANCS 350 0101
 Title Atheian Acropolis
 Instructor:
 Enrollment: 0
 Questionnaires: 7

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2006

Page 5
 JAN 18, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank						

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	2	2	3	4.14	1052/1669	****	4.14	4.23	4.02	4.14	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	1	2	1	2	3.29	1536/1666	****	3.93	4.19	4.11	3.29	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	4	1	0	0	2	0	3.00	1516/1617	****	4.02	4.15	3.99	3.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	3	1	3	4.00	773/1555	****	4.12	4.00	3.92	4.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	1	0	2	3	3.71	1167/1543	****	3.98	4.06	3.86	3.71	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	5	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	1393/1647	****	3.81	4.12	4.06	3.50	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1668	****	4.72	4.67	4.62	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	1	0	0	1	2	3	4.33	591/1605	****	3.90	4.07	3.96	4.33	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	584/1514	****	4.30	4.39	4.32	4.67	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1551	****	4.63	4.66	4.55	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1503	****	4.15	4.24	4.17	5.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1506	****	4.07	4.26	4.17	5.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1311	****	4.14	3.85	3.68	5.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	0	1	5	4.29	667/1490	****	4.11	4.05	3.85	4.29	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	438/1502	****	4.32	4.26	4.06	4.71	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	329/1489	****	4.23	4.29	4.07	4.86	
4. Were special techniques successful	0	5	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1006	****	4.20	4.00	3.81	5.00	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 5	Required for Majors	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	B 0		0
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	C 0	General	5
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	D 0		7
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		
			I 0		
			? 2		

- Means there are not enough responses to be significant