

Course Section: ARCH 100 0101  
 Title INTRO TO ARCHAEOLOGY  
 Instructor: MASON, RICHARD  
 Enrollment: 84  
 Questionnaires: 48

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 62  
 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	3	11	15	17	3.88	1307/1669	3.88	4.24	4.23	4.02	3.88	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	3	6	6	16	17	3.79	1315/1666	3.79	4.09	4.19	4.11	3.79	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	3	2	7	16	20	4.00	969/1421	4.00	4.27	4.24	4.11	4.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	33	2	1	4	4	4	3.47	1393/1617	3.47	4.02	4.15	3.99	3.47	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	7	0	2	4	17	17	4.22	584/1555	4.23	4.12	4.00	3.92	4.22	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	38	1	3	1	2	3	3.30	****/1543	****	3.89	4.06	3.86	****	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	2	7	15	24	4.27	839/1647	4.27	4.44	4.12	4.06	4.27	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	5	39	4	0	2.98	1654/1668	2.98	4.07	4.67	4.62	2.98	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	9	2	0	2	13	17	5	3.68	1267/1605	3.68	3.85	4.07	3.96	3.68	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	1	0	6	11	29	4.43	923/1514	4.43	4.36	4.39	4.32	4.43	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	3	2	42	4.83	732/1551	4.83	4.82	4.66	4.55	4.83	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	2	2	7	15	21	4.09	1025/1503	4.09	4.10	4.24	4.17	4.09	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	2	2	6	7	30	4.30	876/1506	4.30	4.22	4.26	4.17	4.30	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	3	0	2	1	16	25	4.45	298/1311	4.45	4.29	3.85	3.68	4.45	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	31	0	8	2	0	5	2	2.47	1435/1490	2.47	3.27	4.05	3.85	2.47	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	30	0	8	4	3	3	0	2.06	1494/1502	2.06	3.44	4.26	4.06	2.06	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	30	0	6	1	6	5	0	2.56	1465/1489	2.56	3.68	4.29	4.07	2.56	
4. Were special techniques successful	30	14	3	0	1	0	0	1.50	****/1006	****	4.00	4.00	3.81	****	
Laboratory															
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	47	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 233	****	****	4.19	4.09	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	6	0.00-0.99 0	A 12	Required for Majors	31
28-55	6	1.00-1.99 2	B 21		Graduate 0
56-83	5	2.00-2.99 6	C 8	General	11
84-150	8	3.00-3.49 10	D 4		Under-grad 48
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 8	F 0	Electives	1
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	2
			? 0		

Course Section: ARCH 120 0101  
 Title: WORLD ARCHAEOLOGY  
 Instructor: READ, ESTHER DO  
 Enrollment: 97  
 Questionnaires: 34

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 63  
 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	1	0	0	0	4	15	14	4.30	852/1669	4.30	4.24	4.23	4.02	4.30	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	1	2	16	14	4.30	814/1666	4.30	4.09	4.19	4.11	4.30	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	0	0	0	1	11	20	4.59	475/1421	4.59	4.27	4.24	4.11	4.59	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	11	0	0	5	12	5	4.00	1029/1617	4.00	4.02	4.15	3.99	4.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	0	2	4	8	11	7	3.53	1212/1555	3.53	4.12	4.00	3.92	3.53	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	17	2	1	2	8	3	3.56	1239/1543	3.56	3.89	4.06	3.86	3.56	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	1	0	0	10	21	4.56	412/1647	4.56	4.44	4.12	4.06	4.56	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	4	28	1	3.91	1594/1668	3.91	4.07	4.67	4.62	3.91	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	9	1	0	0	2	14	8	4.25	690/1605	4.25	3.85	4.07	3.96	4.25	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	1	2	15	14	4.31	1042/1514	4.31	4.36	4.39	4.32	4.31	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	1	8	23	4.69	1000/1551	4.69	4.82	4.66	4.55	4.69	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	2	18	12	4.31	823/1503	4.31	4.10	4.24	4.17	4.31	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	3	7	22	4.59	556/1506	4.59	4.22	4.26	4.17	4.59	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	2	1	0	4	13	11	4.14	519/1311	4.14	4.29	3.85	3.68	4.14	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	32	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1490	****	3.27	4.05	3.85	****	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	31	0	0	1	1	0	1	3.33	****/1502	****	3.44	4.26	4.06	****	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	32	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1489	****	3.68	4.29	4.07	****	
Laboratory															
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	33	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 233	****	****	4.19	4.09	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	33	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 206	****	****	4.15	4.01	****	
Self Paced															
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	33	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 42	****	****	4.31	4.08	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	0	A	13	Required for Majors	14	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	7						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	1	C	2	General	3	Under-grad	34	Non-major	34
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	2	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	2				
				?	0						

Course Section: ARCH 200 0101  
 Title GREEK ARCHAEOLOGY  
 Instructor: KOEHLER, CAROLY  
 Enrollment: 58  
 Questionnaires: 39

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 64  
 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	1	2	6	11	19	4.15	1039/1669	4.15	4.24	4.23	4.34	4.15	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	2	8	18	10	3.87	1257/1666	3.87	4.09	4.19	4.29	3.87	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	4	4	11	19	4.10	932/1421	4.10	4.27	4.24	4.35	4.10	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	4	1	3	4	13	13	4.00	1029/1617	4.00	4.02	4.15	4.24	4.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	4	13	21	4.36	477/1555	4.36	4.12	4.00	3.96	4.36	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	3	2	12	12	10	3.62	1220/1543	3.62	3.89	4.06	4.10	3.62	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	2	6	8	22	4.32	790/1647	4.32	4.44	4.12	4.19	4.32	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	38	4.97	214/1668	4.97	4.07	4.67	4.59	4.97	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	1	1	2	9	18	3	3.61	1312/1605	3.61	3.85	4.07	4.15	3.61	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	1	1	4	15	17	4.21	1106/1514	4.21	4.36	4.39	4.39	4.21	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	3	35	4.87	594/1551	4.87	4.82	4.66	4.72	4.87	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	1	1	10	12	15	4.00	1066/1503	4.00	4.10	4.24	4.29	4.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	6	0	5	11	17	3.85	1204/1506	3.85	4.22	4.26	4.33	3.85	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	2	0	6	7	24	4.31	414/1311	4.31	4.29	3.85	3.96	4.31	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	10	0	4	1	13	7	4	3.21	1288/1490	3.21	3.27	4.05	4.11	3.21	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	10	0	3	5	7	5	9	3.41	1334/1502	3.41	3.44	4.26	4.31	3.41	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	10	0	2	3	6	11	7	3.62	1232/1489	3.62	3.68	4.29	4.36	3.62	
4. Were special techniques successful	10	24	0	1	1	1	2	3.80	****/1006	****	4.00	4.00	3.99	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	7	0.00-0.99 0	A 11	Required for Majors 18	Graduate 0 Major 0
28-55	3	1.00-1.99 0	B 18		
56-83	8	2.00-2.99 4	C 7	General 7	Under-grad 39 Non-major 39
84-150	6	3.00-3.49 9	D 1		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 2	F 0	Electives 1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 1		
			I 0	Other 12	
			? 0		

Course Section: ARCH 330 0101  
 Title ARCH BRONZE AGE GREECE  
 Instructor: GOLDBERG, MARIL  
 Enrollment: 18  
 Questionnaires: 8

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 65  
 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	3	5	4.63	448/1669	4.63	4.24	4.23	4.28	4.63	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	5	3	4.38	727/1666	4.38	4.09	4.19	4.20	4.38	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	1	5	4.38	710/1421	4.38	4.27	4.24	4.25	4.38	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	5	4.63	370/1617	4.63	4.02	4.15	4.22	4.63	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	3	4	4.38	461/1555	4.38	4.12	4.00	4.03	4.38	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	4	4	4.50	390/1543	4.50	3.89	4.06	4.14	4.50	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	3	5	4.63	345/1647	4.63	4.44	4.12	4.14	4.63	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	4	3	4.43	1257/1668	4.43	4.07	4.67	4.68	4.43	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	2	5	1	3.88	1116/1605	3.88	3.85	4.07	4.09	3.88	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	4	4	4.50	799/1514	4.50	4.36	4.39	4.46	4.50	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	594/1551	4.88	4.82	4.66	4.70	4.88	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	1	1	3	3	4.00	1066/1503	4.00	4.10	4.24	4.28	4.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	1	2	4	4.13	1010/1506	4.13	4.22	4.26	4.30	4.13	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	1	4	3	4.25	445/1311	4.25	4.29	3.85	3.97	4.25	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	4	2	4.14	778/1490	4.14	3.27	4.05	4.11	4.14	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	286/1502	4.86	3.44	4.26	4.28	4.86	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	329/1489	4.86	3.68	4.29	4.35	4.86	
4. Were special techniques successful	1	0	0	1	0	4	2	4.00	479/1006	4.00	4.00	4.00	4.10	4.00	

Frequency Distribution

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