

Course-Section: ARCH 100 0101
 Title INTRO TO ARCHAEOLOGY
 Instructor: MASON, RICHARD
 Enrollment: 81
 Questionnaires: 53

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2004

Page 70
 JAN 19, 2005
 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	1	0	0	2	5	18	27	4.35	788/1556	4.35	4.23	4.25	4.06	4.35
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	3	3	8	14	24	4.02	1059/1557	4.02	4.23	4.21	4.13	4.02
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	3	2	9	9	29	4.13	892/1335	4.13	4.32	4.24	4.13	4.13
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	41	2	0	2	1	6	3.82	****/1510	****	4.18	4.19	4.07	****
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	1	2	0	7	13	29	4.31	472/1479	4.31	4.08	3.97	3.90	4.31
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	43	2	1	1	0	5	3.56	****/1424	****	4.08	4.08	3.91	****
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	0	10	14	27	4.27	768/1537	4.27	4.18	4.15	4.12	4.27
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	1	0	1	50	0	3.92	1493/1553	3.92	4.69	4.69	4.66	3.92
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	9	0	1	4	7	23	9	3.80	1101/1536	3.80	4.05	4.07	3.91	3.80
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	1	17	33	4.63	665/1487	4.63	4.41	4.44	4.37	4.63
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	2	7	42	4.78	798/1491	4.78	4.71	4.70	4.61	4.78
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	1	1	3	20	25	4.34	801/1489	4.34	4.28	4.27	4.18	4.34
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	4	14	32	4.56	555/1481	4.56	4.30	4.28	4.18	4.56
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	4	0	0	2	3	40	4.84	98/1246	4.84	3.87	3.93	3.78	4.84
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	28	0	8	4	4	4	5	2.76	1332/1411	2.76	4.13	4.00	3.78	2.76
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	28	0	5	3	8	5	4	3.00	1324/1413	3.00	4.38	4.23	3.96	3.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	29	0	4	4	7	2	7	3.17	1297/1408	3.17	4.37	4.27	4.03	3.17
4. Were special techniques successful	29	21	0	0	2	0	1	3.67	****/ 856	****	3.96	4.00	3.87	****
Laboratory														
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	50	0	2	0	1	0	0	1.67	****/ 258	****	4.22	4.10	3.94	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	50	2	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 238	****	4.16	4.26	4.00	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	49	3	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 102	****	4.57	4.50	3.92	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	50	2	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 98	****	4.39	4.49	3.93	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	50	0	2	0	1	0	0	1.67	****/ 61	****	3.83	3.92	3.19	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	50	0	2	0	1	0	0	1.67	****/ 60	****	4.27	3.86	3.35	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	50	2	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 52	****	4.54	4.31	4.65	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	50	2	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 47	****	4.25	4.09	3.67	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	50	0	2	0	1	0	0	1.67	****/ 39	****	4.23	3.84	4.09	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	50	2	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 16	****	4.50	4.36	4.63	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	1	A	17
			Required for Majors		34
			Graduate		0
			Major		0

28-55	11	1.00-1.99	0	B	20
56-83	7	2.00-2.99	10	C	9
84-150	9	3.00-3.49	10	D	0
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	9	F	0
				P	0
				I	0
				?	1

General	14
Electives	1
Other	3

Under-grad	53	Non-major	10
------------	----	-----------	----

- Means there are not enough responses to be significant

Course-Section: ARCH 200 0101
 Title GREEK ARCHAEOLOGY
 Instructor: KOEHLER, CAROLY
 Enrollment: 49
 Questionnaires: 30

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2004

Page 71
 JAN 19, 2005
 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	1	3	9	6	11	3.77	1291/1556	3.77	4.23	4.25	4.33	3.77
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	2	3	10	15	4.27	828/1557	4.27	4.23	4.21	4.30	4.27
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	3	4	10	13	4.10	918/1335	4.10	4.32	4.24	4.37	4.10
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	2	5	7	14	4.18	835/1510	4.18	4.18	4.19	4.23	4.18
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	1	4	9	15	4.20	579/1479	4.20	4.08	3.97	3.88	4.20
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	2	5	6	7	9	3.55	1178/1424	3.55	4.08	4.08	4.04	3.55
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	1	2	8	17	4.34	681/1537	4.34	4.18	4.15	4.17	4.34
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	0	28	5.00	1/1553	5.00	4.69	4.69	4.69	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	1	1	1	7	12	4	3.68	1190/1536	3.68	4.05	4.07	4.13	3.68
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	2	6	21	4.66	613/1487	4.66	4.41	4.44	4.47	4.66
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	2	28	4.93	359/1491	4.93	4.71	4.70	4.75	4.93
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	6	13	11	4.17	991/1489	4.17	4.28	4.27	4.32	4.17
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	2	6	6	14	3.93	1133/1481	3.93	4.30	4.28	4.37	3.93
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	2	0	6	6	16	4.13	541/1246	4.13	3.87	3.93	4.02	4.13
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	9	2	5	3	3	2.50	1360/1411	2.50	4.13	4.00	4.05	2.50
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	2	1	6	9	4	3.55	1174/1413	3.55	4.38	4.23	4.28	3.55
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	3	3	3	4	9	3.59	1191/1408	3.59	4.37	4.27	4.31	3.59
4. Were special techniques successful	8	16	2	0	2	1	1	2.83	****/ 856	****	3.96	4.00	3.92	****
Laboratory														
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	29	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 258	****	4.22	4.10	4.32	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	29	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 102	****	4.57	4.50	3.88	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	29	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 101	****	4.45	4.39	3.00	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	29	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 90	****	4.29	4.36	3.60	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	29	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 98	****	4.39	4.49	4.29	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	29	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 61	****	3.83	3.92	3.31	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	29	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 60	****	4.27	3.86	3.96	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	29	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 52	****	4.54	4.31	3.97	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	29	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 47	****	4.25	4.09	3.69	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	29	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 44	****	4.00	4.09	3.93	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	29	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 39	****	4.23	3.84	3.19	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	29	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 30	****	4.35	4.01	4.07	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	29	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 32	****	4.15	4.18	3.92	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	29	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 16	****	4.50	4.36	4.15	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	29	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 16	****	4.45	4.51	4.65	****

Course-Section: ARCH 200 0101
 Title GREEK ARCHAEOLOGY
 Instructor: KOEHLER, CAROLY
 Enrollment: 49
 Questionnaires: 30

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2004

Page 71
 JAN 19, 2005
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	1	A	9	Required for Majors	14	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	6	1.00-1.99	0	B	7						
56-83	5	2.00-2.99	4	C	8	General	4	Under-grad	30	Non-major	7
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	5	D	3						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	8	F	0	Electives	3	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	1						
				I	0	Other	7				
				?	1						