

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	2	4	9	13	4.18	945/1447	4.18	4.53	4.31	4.18	4.18
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	1	4	11	11	4.07	1011/1447	4.07	4.35	4.27	4.30	4.07
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	10	16	4.50	541/1241	4.50	4.56	4.33	4.25	4.50
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	17	0	1	0	2	8	4.55	448/1402	4.55	4.50	4.24	4.15	4.55
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	4	0	2	5	5	12	4.13	727/1358	4.13	4.39	4.11	4.03	4.13
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	17	0	0	0	4	7	4.64	265/1316	4.64	4.50	4.14	3.99	4.64
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	2	9	16	4.52	446/1427	4.52	4.31	4.19	4.24	4.52
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	18	10	4.36	1189/1447	4.36	4.48	4.69	4.68	4.36
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	0	0	0	10	10	2	3.64	1169/1434	3.64	4.17	4.10	4.10	3.64
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	1	3	8	5	9	3.69	1274/1387	3.69	4.41	4.46	4.46	3.69
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	2	2	4	4	15	4.04	1314/1387	4.04	4.68	4.73	4.71	4.04
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	1	1	8	6	11	3.93	1111/1386	3.93	4.39	4.32	4.32	3.93
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	1	4	1	3	7	11	3.77	1165/1380	3.77	4.44	4.32	4.31	3.77
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	25	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/1193	****	3.87	4.02	3.99	****
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	16	0	2	2	1	3	4	3.42	1021/1172	3.42	4.07	4.15	3.95	3.42
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	16	0	2	1	2	3	4	3.50	1078/1182	3.50	4.30	4.35	4.18	3.50
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	16	0	3	1	2	2	4	3.25	1117/1170	3.25	4.27	4.38	4.17	3.25
4. Were special techniques successful	16	10	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 800	****	****	4.06	3.95	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	26	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 189	****	****	4.34	4.18	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	27	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 192	****	****	4.34	4.31	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	26	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 186	****	****	4.48	4.46	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	26	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 187	****	****	4.33	4.37	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	26	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 168	****	****	4.20	4.29	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	27	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 66	****	****	4.58	3.95	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	27	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 65	****	****	4.42	3.78	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	27	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 64	****	****	4.09	3.75	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	27	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 38	****	****	4.49	3.83	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	27	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 36	****	****	4.25	4.26	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	27	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.72	4.50	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	27	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 21	****	****	4.57	4.38	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	2	A 14	Required for Majors 0
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	0	B 10	Graduate 0
56-83	9	2.00-2.99	1	C 3	Major 0
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	3	D 0	Non-major 28
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5	F 0	
			P 0		

General 15  
 Electives 10  
 #### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant

I	0	Other	2
?	0		

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	0	3	26	4.90	158/1447	4.90	4.53	4.31	4.31	4.90
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	2	26	4.86	145/1447	4.86	4.35	4.27	4.23	4.86
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	1	27	4.90	150/1241	4.90	4.56	4.33	4.35	4.90
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	9	0	0	1	4	15	4.70	281/1402	4.70	4.50	4.24	4.24	4.70
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	4	9	16	4.41	441/1358	4.41	4.39	4.11	4.12	4.41
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	18	0	0	1	3	7	4.55	352/1316	4.55	4.50	4.14	4.08	4.55
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	4	6	19	4.52	446/1427	4.52	4.31	4.19	4.14	4.52
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	1	0	0	0	21	7	4.25	1252/1447	4.25	4.48	4.69	4.70	4.25
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	0	8	17	4.68	222/1434	4.68	4.17	4.10	3.97	4.68
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	2	27	4.93	140/1387	4.93	4.41	4.46	4.42	4.93
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	29	5.00	1/1387	5.00	4.68	4.73	4.71	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	1	1	26	4.89	147/1386	4.89	4.39	4.32	4.24	4.89
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	4	25	4.86	204/1380	4.86	4.44	4.32	4.30	4.86
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	2	0	0	3	7	16	4.50	288/1193	4.50	3.87	4.02	4.04	4.50
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	3	3	8	4.36	504/1172	4.36	4.07	4.15	4.12	4.36
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	15	0	0	0	1	5	8	4.50	553/1182	4.50	4.30	4.35	4.30	4.50
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	15	0	0	0	0	3	11	4.79	352/1170	4.79	4.27	4.38	4.32	4.79
4. Were special techniques successful	15	7	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	****/ 800	****	****	4.06	4.01	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	28	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 189	****	****	4.34	4.47	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	28	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 192	****	****	4.34	4.38	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	28	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 186	****	****	4.48	4.57	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	28	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 187	****	****	4.33	4.46	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	28	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 168	****	****	4.20	4.15	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	28	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 66	****	****	4.58	4.43	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	28	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 62	****	****	4.56	4.28	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	28	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 58	****	****	4.41	3.79	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	28	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 65	****	****	4.42	4.36	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	28	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 64	****	****	4.09	3.70	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	28	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 38	****	****	4.49	2.25	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	28	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 36	****	****	4.25	3.25	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	28	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 28	****	****	4.52	****	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	28	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.30	****	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	28	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 27	****	****	4.43	****	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	28	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.72	****	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	28	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 21	****	****	4.57	****	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	28	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.64	****	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	28	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 20	****	****	4.60	****	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	28	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 15	****	****	4.61	****	****

Course-Section: ANCS 202 1  
 Title The Roman World  
 Instructor: Phin, Timothy J  
 Enrollment: 49  
 Questionnaires: 29

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2010

Page 55  
 JUN 28, 2010  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	22	Required for Majors	3	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B	5						
56-83	5	2.00-2.99	3	C	0	General	19	Under-grad	29	Non-major	29
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	6	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5	F	0	Electives	5	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	1				
				?	1						

Course-Section: ANCS 210 1  
 Title Classical Mythology  
 Instructor: Sherwin,Walter  
 Enrollment: 80  
 Questionnaires: 49

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2010

Page 56  
 JUN 28, 2010  
 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	7	11	31	4.49	612/1447	4.49	4.53	4.31	4.31	4.49
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	7	12	30	4.47	590/1447	4.47	4.35	4.27	4.23	4.47
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	3	2	6	38	4.61	439/1241	4.61	4.56	4.33	4.35	4.61
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	40	0	0	1	1	7	4.67	****/1402	****	4.50	4.24	4.24	****
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	2	7	12	28	4.35	518/1358	4.35	4.39	4.11	4.12	4.35
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	44	1	0	1	0	3	3.80	****/1316	****	4.50	4.14	4.08	****
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	1	4	8	35	4.53	422/1427	4.53	4.31	4.19	4.14	4.53
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	3	45	4.94	339/1447	4.94	4.48	4.69	4.70	4.94
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	0	13	16	15	4.05	828/1434	4.05	4.17	4.10	3.97	4.05
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	4	3	42	4.78	398/1387	4.78	4.41	4.46	4.42	4.78
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	1	2	4	42	4.78	829/1387	4.78	4.68	4.73	4.71	4.78
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	6	9	34	4.57	539/1386	4.57	4.39	4.32	4.24	4.57
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	5	3	41	4.73	366/1380	4.73	4.44	4.32	4.30	4.73
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	3	1	1	15	10	19	3.98	684/1193	3.98	3.87	4.02	4.04	3.98
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	38	0	5	1	1	2	2	2.55	****/1172	****	4.07	4.15	4.12	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	38	0	4	4	0	2	1	2.27	****/1182	****	4.30	4.35	4.30	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	38	0	4	4	2	1	0	2.00	****/1170	****	4.27	4.38	4.32	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors		
-----												
00-27	4	0.00-0.99	0	A	26	Required for Majors		4	Graduate	0	Major	4
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	0	B	14							
56-83	9	2.00-2.99	7	C	7	General		25	Under-grad	49	Non-major	45
84-150	9	3.00-3.49	12	D	0							
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	10	F	0	Electives		17	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0							
				I	0	Other		0				
				?	1							

Course-Section: ANCS 330 1  
 Title Ancient Sci & Tech  
 Instructor: Mason, Richard S  
 Enrollment: 20  
 Questionnaires: 13

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2010

Page 57  
 JUN 28, 2010  
 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	1	4	8	4.54	551/1447	4.54	4.53	4.31	4.32	4.54
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	4	5	4	4.00	1053/1447	4.00	4.35	4.27	4.23	4.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	0	1	4	7	4.23	798/1241	4.23	4.56	4.33	4.33	4.23
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	1	1	4	6	4.25	766/1402	4.25	4.50	4.24	4.24	4.25
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	2	10	4.69	216/1358	4.69	4.39	4.11	4.10	4.69
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	0	6	6	4.31	572/1316	4.31	4.50	4.14	4.13	4.31
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	1	3	3	4	3.67	1201/1427	3.67	4.31	4.19	4.15	3.67
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	8	5	4.38	1168/1447	4.38	4.48	4.69	4.65	4.38
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	2	3	5	4.30	578/1434	4.30	4.17	4.10	4.09	4.30
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	2	5	5	4.25	1039/1387	4.25	4.41	4.46	4.44	4.25
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	12	4.92	422/1387	4.92	4.68	4.73	4.71	4.92
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	1	1	6	5	4.15	962/1386	4.15	4.39	4.32	4.30	4.15
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	1	3	8	4.38	775/1380	4.38	4.44	4.32	4.32	4.38
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	6	2	0	0	5	0	3.14	1065/1193	3.14	3.87	4.02	4.05	3.14
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	5	4	4.44	428/1172	4.44	4.07	4.15	4.24	4.44
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	219/1182	4.89	4.30	4.35	4.42	4.89
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	364/1170	4.78	4.27	4.38	4.49	4.78
4. Were special techniques successful	4	8	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 800	****	****	4.06	4.12	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors		
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 4	Required for Majors 1	Graduate 1	Major 1
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B 5			
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	3	C 1	General 0	Under-grad 12	Non-major 12
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	0	D 0			
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00	3	F 0	Electives 10	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	
				P 0			
				I 0	Other 1		
				? 0			