

Course-Section: ARCH 120 0101
 Title WORLD ARCHAEOLOGY
 Instructor: READ, ESTHER DO
 Enrollment: 97
 Questionnaires: 58

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2004

Page 59
 JUN 14, 2004
 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	5	15	37	4.56	476/1470	4.56	4.22	4.29	4.13	4.56	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	0	0	3	14	39	4.64	322/1470	4.64	4.19	4.23	4.17	4.64	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	13	43	4.74	214/1252	4.74	4.29	4.27	4.21	4.74	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	26	0	1	2	5	22	4.60	313/1413	4.60	4.19	4.24	4.12	4.60	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	2	4	3	10	17	21	3.87	882/1391	3.87	4.09	4.02	3.96	3.87	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	4	33	1	0	2	5	13	4.38	439/1347	4.38	4.05	4.10	4.01	4.38	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	5	14	38	4.58	357/1455	4.58	4.10	4.16	4.16	4.58	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	1	0	0	4	40	12	4.14	1327/1469	4.14	4.63	4.70	4.65	4.14	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	11	1	0	0	6	12	28	4.48	367/1451	4.48	4.00	4.08	3.99	4.48	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	0	18	38	4.68	544/1407	4.68	4.38	4.43	4.40	4.68	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	1	8	47	4.82	646/1404	4.82	4.68	4.70	4.62	4.82	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	2	13	40	4.69	345/1401	4.69	4.24	4.28	4.22	4.69	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	1	11	44	4.77	285/1398	4.77	4.27	4.27	4.21	4.77	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	6	0	1	7	17	23	4.29	429/1176	4.29	3.80	3.96	3.84	4.29	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	44	0	1	0	0	5	8	4.36	****/1276	****	4.10	4.06	3.81	****	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	44	0	1	2	1	3	7	3.93	****/1277	****	4.42	4.30	4.02	****	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	44	0	1	2	1	3	7	3.93	****/1271	****	4.31	4.28	4.02	****	
4. Were special techniques successful	44	4	1	0	2	2	5	4.00	****/ 763	****	3.98	4.06	3.92	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	13	0.00-0.99 1	A 34	Required for Majors	34
28-55	15	1.00-1.99 0	B 14	Graduate	0
56-83	4	2.00-2.99 15	C 3	General	9
84-150	5	3.00-3.49 9	D 0	Under-grad	58
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 4	F 0	Electives	1
			P 0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	
			I 0	Other	5
			? 1		

Course-Section: ARCH 200 0101
 Title GREEK ARCHAEOLOGY
 Instructor: KOEHLER, CAROLY
 Enrollment: 47
 Questionnaires: 32

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2004

Page 60
 JUN 14, 2004
 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	1	6	8	17	4.28	833/1470	4.28	4.22	4.29	4.28	4.28	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	2	7	10	12	3.94	1090/1470	3.94	4.19	4.23	4.22	3.94	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	1	5	10	15	4.16	825/1252	4.16	4.29	4.27	4.28	4.16	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	1	2	5	12	11	3.97	1040/1413	3.97	4.19	4.24	4.24	3.97	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	0	6	4	20	4.35	430/1391	4.35	4.09	4.02	3.97	4.35	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	2	1	3	8	11	6	3.62	1118/1347	3.62	4.05	4.10	4.01	3.62	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	5	9	17	4.39	598/1455	4.39	4.10	4.16	4.20	4.39	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	31	4.97	261/1469	4.97	4.63	4.70	4.73	4.97	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	1	0	3	7	12	5	3.70	1127/1451	3.70	4.00	4.08	4.04	3.70	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	1	3	10	18	4.41	889/1407	4.41	4.38	4.43	4.41	4.41	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	1	30	4.91	462/1404	4.91	4.68	4.70	4.71	4.91	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	2	5	9	14	4.17	936/1401	4.17	4.24	4.28	4.26	4.17	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	3	4	10	14	4.03	1007/1398	4.03	4.27	4.27	4.26	4.03	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	1	0	1	3	7	20	4.48	271/1176	4.48	3.80	3.96	3.99	4.48	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	10	0	3	4	6	5	4	3.14	1142/1276	3.14	4.10	4.06	4.01	3.14	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	10	0	0	2	4	7	9	4.05	893/1277	4.05	4.42	4.30	4.25	4.05	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	10	0	1	0	6	3	12	4.14	835/1271	4.14	4.31	4.28	4.25	4.14	
4. Were special techniques successful	10	13	4	1	1	1	2	2.56	747/ 763	2.56	3.98	4.06	3.98	2.56	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	31	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 236	****	4.18	4.22	4.25	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	31	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 248	****	4.08	4.23	4.22	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	31	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 233	****	4.54	4.33	4.53	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	31	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 232	****	4.33	4.28	4.42	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	31	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 73	****	4.53	4.59	4.42	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	31	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 73	****	4.90	4.70	4.47	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	31	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 64	****	4.67	4.66	4.36	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	31	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 74	****	4.51	4.50	4.28	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	31	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 71	****	4.13	4.16	4.25	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	31	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 45	****	4.00	4.34	4.50	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	31	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 42	****	4.60	4.17	4.63	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	31	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 37	****	4.60	4.48	4.60	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	31	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 35	****	4.40	4.18	4.59	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	31	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 30	****	4.60	4.30	4.75	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	31	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 45	****	3.47	4.42	4.72	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	31	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 34	****	4.60	4.48	4.34	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	31	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 43	****	4.40	4.62	4.78	****	

Course-Section: ARCH 200 0101
 Title GREEK ARCHAEOLOGY
 Instructor: KOEHLER, CAROLY
 Enrollment: 47
 Questionnaires: 32

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2004

Page 60
 JUN 14, 2004
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	8	0.00-0.99	0	A	13	Required for Majors	16	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	0	B	12						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	5	C	4	General	5	Under-grad	32	Non-major	6
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	6	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	11	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	1						
				I	0	Other	12				
				?	1						

Course-Section: ARCH 370 0101
 Title MARITIME ARCHAEOLOGY
 Instructor: KOEHLER, CAROLY
 Enrollment: 24
 Questionnaires: 19

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2004

Page 61
 JUN 14, 2004
 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	1	3	5	8	3.84	1207/1470	3.84	4.22	4.29	4.31	3.84	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	2	3	5	5	4	3.32	1383/1470	3.32	4.19	4.23	4.22	3.32	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	7	1	2	2	3	4	3.58	1105/1252	3.58	4.29	4.27	4.27	3.58	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	1	3	5	9	4.05	956/1413	4.05	4.19	4.24	4.27	4.05	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	2	4	3	10	4.11	686/1391	4.11	4.09	4.02	4.00	4.11	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	2	2	5	10	4.21	602/1347	4.21	4.05	4.10	4.11	4.21	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	2	4	2	10	3.95	1028/1455	3.95	4.10	4.16	4.12	3.95	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	2	17	4.89	671/1469	4.89	4.63	4.70	4.67	4.89	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	1	1	0	0	9	3	4.00	845/1451	4.00	4.00	4.08	4.07	4.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	2	1	2	7	6	3.78	1262/1407	3.78	4.38	4.43	4.41	3.78	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	1	2	0	15	4.61	1002/1404	4.61	4.68	4.70	4.69	4.61	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	4	5	5	4	3.50	1262/1401	3.50	4.24	4.28	4.27	3.50	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	1	1	3	1	7	5	3.71	1185/1398	3.71	4.27	4.27	4.25	3.71	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	1	0	1	1	6	9	4.35	382/1176	4.35	3.80	3.96	3.97	4.35	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	2	2	2	5	6	3.65	966/1276	3.65	4.10	4.06	4.10	3.65	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	1	2	4	10	4.35	724/1277	4.35	4.42	4.30	4.34	4.35	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	1	3	3	10	4.29	731/1271	4.29	4.31	4.28	4.33	4.29	
4. Were special techniques successful	2	16	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 763	****	3.98	4.06	4.07	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	14	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/ 73	5.00	4.53	4.59	4.39	5.00	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	14	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/ 73	5.00	4.90	4.70	4.60	5.00	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	37/ 64	4.80	4.67	4.66	4.85	4.80	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	31/ 74	4.80	4.51	4.50	4.64	4.80	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	14	0	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	38/ 71	4.20	4.13	4.16	4.34	4.20	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 6	Required for Majors	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	B 11		Graduate 0
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	C 1	General	6
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad 19
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	2
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	12
			? 1		