

Course-Section: ARCH 200 0101
 Title GREEK ARCHAEOLOGY
 Instructor: KOEHLER, CAROLY
 Enrollment: 54
 Questionnaires: 36

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 55
 JUN 14, 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	7	13	12	3.89	1204/1504	3.89	4.24	4.27	4.26	3.89
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	4	5	15	11	3.86	1154/1503	3.86	4.22	4.20	4.18	3.86
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	6	9	7	14	3.81	1062/1290	3.81	4.32	4.28	4.27	3.81
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	4	8	10	13	3.91	1093/1453	3.91	4.22	4.21	4.20	3.91
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	2	5	8	21	4.33	479/1421	4.33	4.08	4.00	3.90	4.33
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	4	3	7	10	12	3.64	1084/1365	3.64	4.11	4.08	4.00	3.64
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	2	1	3	13	17	4.17	866/1485	4.17	4.20	4.16	4.15	4.17
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	1	0	3	32	4.83	778/1504	4.83	4.68	4.69	4.68	4.83
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	0	2	1	11	12	4	3.50	1233/1483	3.50	4.07	4.06	4.02	3.50
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	2	0	8	9	17	4.08	1136/1425	4.08	4.41	4.41	4.40	4.08
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	1	3	2	29	4.69	940/1426	4.69	4.72	4.69	4.71	4.69
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	1	2	10	13	10	3.81	1141/1418	3.81	4.29	4.25	4.22	3.81
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	3	8	11	12	3.78	1158/1416	3.78	4.34	4.26	4.24	3.78
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	1	5	4	6	19	4.06	618/1199	4.06	3.95	3.97	3.95	4.06
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	15	0	3	2	7	4	5	3.29	1084/1312	3.29	4.12	4.00	3.98	3.29
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	15	0	2	2	1	7	9	3.90	992/1303	3.90	4.39	4.24	4.23	3.90
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	15	0	0	0	5	10	6	4.05	912/1299	4.05	4.34	4.25	4.21	4.05
4. Were special techniques successful	15	15	1	1	2	1	1	3.00	****/ 758	****	4.05	4.01	3.89	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	34	1	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 233	****	4.07	4.09	4.30	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	35	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 244	****	4.12	4.09	4.24	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	35	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 227	****	4.49	4.40	4.58	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	35	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 225	****	4.40	4.23	4.52	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	35	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 207	****	4.22	4.09	4.22	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	35	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 76	****	4.60	4.61	4.22	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	35	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 70	****	4.54	4.35	4.30	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	35	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 67	****	4.32	4.34	4.50	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	35	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 76	****	4.41	4.44	4.21	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	35	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 73	****	4.17	4.17	4.24	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	35	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 58	****	3.98	4.43	4.41	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	35	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 56	****	4.12	4.23	4.24	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	35	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 44	****	4.68	4.65	4.51	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	35	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 47	****	4.32	4.29	4.65	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	34	0	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/ 39	****	4.61	4.44	4.28	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	35	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 40	****	4.28	4.53	4.44	****

2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	35	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/	35	****	4.43	4.49	4.50	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	35	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/	36	****	4.38	4.60	4.13	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	35	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/	20	****	5.00	4.24	5.00	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	35	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/	16	****	5.00	4.51	5.00	****

Course-Section: ARCH 200 0101
 Title GREEK ARCHAEOLOGY
 Instructor: KOEHLER, CAROLY
 Enrollment: 54
 Questionnaires: 36

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 55
 JUN 14, 2005
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	9	0.00-0.99	0	A	11	Required for Majors	20	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	5	1.00-1.99	0	B	12						
56-83	8	2.00-2.99	5	C	9	General	10	Under-grad	36	Non-major	7
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	4	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	12	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	6				
				?	1						

Course-Section: ARCH 201 0101
 Title ROMAN ARCHAEOLOGY
 Instructor: GOLDBERG, MARIL
 Enrollment: 56
 Questionnaires: 42

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 56
 JUN 14, 2005
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies		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	4	10	8	18	3.86	1219/1504	3.86	4.24	4.27	4.26	3.86
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	2	8	8	8	16	3.67	1247/1503	3.67	4.22	4.20	4.18	3.67
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	2	3	2	17	18	4.10	898/1290	4.10	4.32	4.28	4.27	4.10
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	3	13	15	10	3.78	1177/1453	3.78	4.22	4.21	4.20	3.78
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	4	3	7	15	13	3.71	986/1421	3.71	4.08	4.00	3.90	3.71
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	3	3	11	12	13	3.69	1046/1365	3.69	4.11	4.08	4.00	3.69
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	4	5	7	10	16	3.69	1210/1485	3.69	4.20	4.16	4.15	3.69
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	7	35	4.83	778/1504	4.83	4.68	4.69	4.68	4.83
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	1	1	2	11	15	6	3.66	1175/1483	3.66	4.07	4.06	4.02	3.66
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	4	6	6	26	4.29	1015/1425	4.29	4.41	4.41	4.40	4.29
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	1	0	6	35	4.79	773/1426	4.79	4.72	4.69	4.71	4.79
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	2	5	7	10	18	3.88	1106/1418	3.88	4.29	4.25	4.22	3.88
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	3	2	9	4	24	4.05	1015/1416	4.05	4.34	4.26	4.24	4.05
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	2	2	3	9	25	4.29	463/1199	4.29	3.95	3.97	3.95	4.29
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	5	2	7	7	15	3.69	932/1312	3.69	4.12	4.00	3.98	3.69
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	3	8	6	19	4.14	869/1303	4.14	4.39	4.24	4.23	4.14
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	1	2	2	8	23	4.39	696/1299	4.39	4.34	4.25	4.21	4.39
4. Were special techniques successful	7	1	3	2	5	14	10	3.76	506/ 758	3.76	4.05	4.01	3.89	3.76
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	12	0	6	3	5	10	6	3.23	52/ 58	3.23	3.98	4.43	4.41	3.23
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	13	0	3	4	3	7	12	3.72	47/ 56	3.72	4.12	4.23	4.24	3.72
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	12	7	0	1	2	4	16	4.52	31/ 44	4.52	4.68	4.65	4.51	4.52
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	13	4	2	0	7	4	12	3.96	32/ 47	3.96	4.32	4.29	4.65	3.96
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	13	11	2	1	2	6	7	3.83	34/ 39	3.83	4.61	4.44	4.28	3.83

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	6	0.00-0.99 0	A 20	Required for Majors	27
28-55	7	1.00-1.99 1	B 12		
56-83	6	2.00-2.99 11	C 7	General	5
84-150	8	3.00-3.49 9	D 0	Under-grad	42
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 9	F 0		
			P 0		
			I 0		
			? 2		
			Other		11

- Means there are not enough responses to be significant

Course-Section: ARCH 330 0101
 Title ARCH BRONZE AGE GREECE
 Instructor: GOLDBERG, MARIL
 Enrollment: 19
 Questionnaires: 13

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 57
 JUN 14, 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	0	1	3	2	7	4.15	1000/1504	4.15	4.24	4.27	4.27	4.15
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	5	7	4.46	556/1503	4.46	4.22	4.20	4.22	4.46
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	0	12	4.85	173/1290	4.85	4.32	4.28	4.31	4.85
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	5	8	4.62	320/1453	4.62	4.22	4.21	4.23	4.62
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	3	1	9	4.46	356/1421	4.46	4.08	4.00	4.01	4.46
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	4	8	4.54	274/1365	4.54	4.11	4.08	4.08	4.54
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	0	3	3	6	4.00	990/1485	4.00	4.20	4.16	4.17	4.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	3	10	4.77	879/1504	4.77	4.68	4.69	4.65	4.77
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	1	2	5	4	4.00	850/1483	4.00	4.07	4.06	4.08	4.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	1	0	0	5	7	4.31	1002/1425	4.31	4.41	4.41	4.43	4.31
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	13	5.00	1/1426	5.00	4.72	4.69	4.71	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	1	0	1	4	7	4.23	867/1418	4.23	4.29	4.25	4.26	4.23
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	2	1	2	8	4.23	887/1416	4.23	4.34	4.26	4.27	4.23
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	1	3	9	4.62	207/1199	4.62	3.95	3.97	4.02	4.62
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	2	1	3	6	4.08	694/1312	4.08	4.12	4.00	4.09	4.08
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	177/1303	4.92	4.39	4.24	4.27	4.92
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	2	10	4.83	273/1299	4.83	4.34	4.25	4.30	4.83
4. Were special techniques successful	1	1	0	0	2	5	4	4.18	333/ 758	4.18	4.05	4.01	4.00	4.18

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	0	Major	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	7						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	3	C	0	General	2	Under-grad	13	Non-major	2
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	3	D	1						
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	8				
				?	0						

Course-Section: ARCH 404 0101
 Title SEM:CLASSICL ARCHAEOLO
 Instructor: KOEHLER, CAROLY
 Enrollment: 12
 Questionnaires: 10

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 58
 JUN 14, 2005
 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		

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	1	0	1	8	4.60	416/1504	4.60	4.24	4.27	4.33	4.60
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	4	3	3.90	1136/1503	3.90	4.22	4.20	4.18	3.90
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	0	1	0	6	4.71	290/1290	4.71	4.32	4.28	4.32	4.71
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	158/1453	4.80	4.22	4.21	4.22	4.80
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	0	1	7	4.56	283/1421	4.56	4.08	4.00	4.02	4.56
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	4	5	4.40	420/1365	4.40	4.11	4.08	4.09	4.40
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	0	0	0	6	3	4.33	670/1485	4.33	4.20	4.16	4.14	4.33
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1504	5.00	4.68	4.69	4.73	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	282/1483	4.57	4.07	4.06	4.11	4.57

Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	1	2	2	5	4.10	1129/1425	4.10	4.41	4.41	4.38	4.10
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	502/1426	4.90	4.72	4.69	4.72	4.90
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	2	2	6	4.40	709/1418	4.40	4.29	4.25	4.25	4.40
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	3	2	5	4.20	921/1416	4.20	4.34	4.26	4.26	4.20
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	1	0	0	1	4	4	4.33	429/1199	4.33	3.95	3.97	4.05	4.33

Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	1	3	5	4.10	689/1312	4.10	4.12	4.00	4.07	4.10
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	1	3	6	4.50	563/1303	4.50	4.39	4.24	4.34	4.50
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	203/1299	4.90	4.34	4.25	4.38	4.90
4. Were special techniques successful	0	9	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 758	****	4.05	4.01	4.17	****

Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	0	0	0	0	1	1	8	4.70	47/ 76	4.70	4.60	4.61	4.63	4.70
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	0	0	0	0	1	1	8	4.70	34/ 70	4.70	4.54	4.35	4.63	4.70
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	1	7	4.50	37/ 67	4.50	4.32	4.34	4.34	4.50
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	0	3	1	0	0	2	4	4.14	56/ 76	4.14	4.41	4.44	4.51	4.14
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	0	4	0	0	1	3	2	4.17	41/ 73	4.17	4.17	4.17	4.29	4.17

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	4	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	3						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	0	C	2	General	5	Under-grad	10	Non-major	1
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	0	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	7	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	5				
				?	0						