Course Section: AFST 100 0201

Title INTRO BLACK EXPERIENCE

Instructor: WALLACE, BELIND

The column to th

Enrollment: 41
Questionnaires: 34

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2006

Page 7
JAN 18, 2007
Job IRBR3029

Student	Course	Evaluation	Questionnaire
---------	--------	------------	---------------

Ouestions	NR	NA	Fre	equer 2	ncie 3	s 4	5		ructor Rank		Dept Mean		Level Mean	Sect Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	2	8	24	4.65	419/1669	4.65	4.40	4.23	4.02	4.65
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	4	8	22	4.53	527/1666	4.53	4.18	4.19	4.11	4.53
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	6	27	4.76	267/1421		4.23	4.24	4.11	4.76
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	5	0	1	3	11	13	4.29	770/1617	4.29	4.09	4.15	3.99	4.29
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	1	8	24	4.62	255/1555	4.62	4.41	4.00	3.92	4.62
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	17	0	0	5	7	5	4.00	895/1543	4.00	4.17	4.06	3.86	4.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	0	7	8	18		885/1647		3.99	4.12	4.06	4.24
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	2	2	21	8		1498/1668	4.06	4.48	4.67	4.62	4.06
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	8	0	0	0	1	12	13	4.46	423/1605	4.46	3.91	4.07	3.96	4.46
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	1	6	26	4.76	441/1514	4.76	4.07	4.39	4.32	4.76
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	1	32	4.97	205/1551	4.97	4.84	4.66	4.55	4.97
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	4	10	18	4.44	670/1503	4.44	4.12	4.24	4.17	4.44
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	0	5	27	4.76	353/1506	4.76		4.26	4.17	4.76
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	1	0	6	13	13	4.12	525/1311	4.12	3.91	3.85	3.68	4.12
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	10	24	4.71	308/1490	4.71	4.27	4.05	3.85	4.71
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	2	8	24	4.65	504/1502	4.65	4.40	4.26	4.06	4.65
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	1	1	5		4.71		4.71		4.29	4.07	4.71
4. Were special techniques successful	0	3	4	1	8	6	12	3.68	689/1006	3.68	3.99	4.00	3.81	3.68
Laboratory														
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	32	0	2	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 233	****	****	4.19	4.09	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	30	0	4	0	0	0	0		****/ 58	****	5.00	4.22	4.00	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	32	0	1	0	1	0	0		****/ 52	****	5.00	4.06	3.81	***
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	32	1	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 39	****	5.00	4.39	4.30	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	33	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 30	****	5.00	4.33	4.30	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	30	0	2	1	0	0	1	2.25	****/ 55	****	****	4.34	4.17	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	31	1	0	0	0	0	2		****/ 42	****	****	4.31	4.08	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	30	2	0	0	0	0	2		****/ 46	****	****	4.45	4.26	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	31	2	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 33	****	****	4.25	4.25	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	32	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 29	****	****	4.34	4.22	****
1 Substitution of the substitution of th		_	ŭ	ŭ	٠	Ū	_	3.00	, 25			1.51		
_														

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expecte	d Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors	
00-27	7	0.00-0.99	0	 А	14	Required for Majors	19	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	7	1.00-1.99	1	В	15						
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	4	C	3	General	7	Under-grad	34	Non-major	34
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	5	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means	there	are not enough	n
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	2	_			
				2	0						

Course Section: AFST 201 0101

Title INTRO METHODS/RSRCH AF

Instructor: Enrollment:

ROBINSON, THOMA

6 Questionnaires: 6

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2006

Page 8 JAN 18, 2007 Job IRBR3029

Seneral Sene				Fr	eque	ncie	3		Inst	tructor	Course	e Dept	UMBC	Level	Sec
Did you gain new insights, skills from this course 0 0 1 0 2 0 3 3.67 1409/1669 3.67 4.40 4.23 4.24 4.25 Did the instructor make clear the expected goals 0 0 0 1 1 0 0 5 57/1421 4.50 4.23 4.24 4.25 Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals 0 0 0 0 1 1 4 4.50 557/1421 4.50 4.23 4.24 4.35 Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0 0 0 0 1 1 2 3 4.33 492/1555 4.33 4.41 4.00 3.95 Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 6 5.00 1/1647 5.00 3.99 4.17 4.06 Now any times was class cancelled 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 6 5.00 1/1647 5.00 3.99 4.12 4.19 5. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 3 2 4.17 789/1605 4.17 3.91 4.07 4.15 4. Ecture New the this instructor seem interested in the subject 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 5 5.00 1/1647 5.00 4.84 4.67 4.29 4. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 5 5.00 1/1647 5.00 4.84 4.66 4.72 5. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 5 5.00 1/1647 5.00 4.84 4.67 4.29 4. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 5 5.00 1/1658 5.00 4.84 4.66 4.72 5. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 6 5.00 1/1658 5.00 4.84 4.66 4.72 5. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 6 5.00 1/1658 5.00 4.84 4.66 4.72 5. Did cales discussions contribute to what you learned 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 6 5.00 1/1659 4.83 308/1514 4.83 4.07 4.39 4.39 4.70 4.70 4.70 4.70 4.70 4.70 4.70 4.70	Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mea
Did you gain new insights, skills from this course 0 0 1 0 2 0 3 3.67 1409/1669 3.67 4.40 4.23 4.24 4.25 Did the instructor make clear the expected goals 0 0 0 1 1 0 0 5 57/1421 4.50 4.23 4.24 4.25 Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals 0 0 0 0 1 1 4 4.50 557/1421 4.50 4.23 4.24 4.35 Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0 0 0 0 1 1 2 3 4.33 492/1555 4.33 4.41 4.00 3.95 Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 6 5.00 1/1647 5.00 3.99 4.17 4.06 Now any times was class cancelled 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 6 5.00 1/1647 5.00 3.99 4.12 4.19 5. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 3 2 4.17 789/1605 4.17 3.91 4.07 4.15 4. Ecture New the this instructor seem interested in the subject 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 5 5.00 1/1647 5.00 4.84 4.67 4.29 4. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 5 5.00 1/1647 5.00 4.84 4.66 4.72 5. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 5 5.00 1/1647 5.00 4.84 4.67 4.29 4. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 5 5.00 1/1658 5.00 4.84 4.66 4.72 5. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 6 5.00 1/1658 5.00 4.84 4.66 4.72 5. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 6 5.00 1/1658 5.00 4.84 4.66 4.72 5. Did cales discussions contribute to what you learned 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 6 5.00 1/1659 4.83 308/1514 4.83 4.07 4.39 4.39 4.70 4.70 4.70 4.70 4.70 4.70 4.70 4.70															
Did the instructor make clear the expected goals		Λ	Λ	1	Λ	2	Λ	2	3 67	1409/1669	3 67	4 40	4 23	1 31	3 6
Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals 0 0 0 0 1 1 4 4.50 557/1421 4.50 4.23 4.24 4.35 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals 0 4 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 1/1617 5.00 4.09 4.15 4.24 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0 4 0 1 0 0 1 3.50 1260/1543 3.50 4.17 4.06 4.10 3.96 4. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 4 0 1 0 0 0 1 3.50 1260/1543 3.50 4.17 4.06 4.10 3. Was the grading system clearly explained 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 6 5.00 1/1647 5.00 3.99 4.12 4.19 5. How may times was class cancelled 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 6 5.00 1/1647 5.00 3.99 4.12 4.19 5. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 0 0 0 0 0 1 3 2 4.17 789/1605 4.17 3.91 4.07 4.15 4. Ecture Lecture			-	_	-	_	-	_		,					4.5
Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals 0 4 0 0 0 2 5.00 1/1617 5.00 4.09 4.15 4.24 5. Did assignmed readings contribute to what you learned 0 0 0 0 1 3.50 1269/1555 4.33 4.91 4.00 3.95 4. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 0 0 0 0 1 3.50 1269/1554 3.50 4.17 4.06 4.10 3.				-	_	-		_							4.5
Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0 0 0 0 0 1 2 3 4.33 492/1555 4.33 4.41 4.00 3.96 4. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 4 0 1 0 0 1 3.50 1260/1543 3.50 4.17 4.06 4.10 3. Was the grading system clearly explained 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 6 5.00 1/1647 5.00 3.99 4.12 4.19 5. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 0 0 0 0 0 1 3 2 4.17 789/1605 4.17 3.91 4.07 4.15 4. Lecture Lecture	-				-		_	_							
Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 4 0 1 0 0 1 3.50 1260/1543 3.50 4.17 4.06 4.10 3. Was the grading system clearly explained 0 0 0 0 0 0 6 5.00 1/1647 5.00 3.99 4.12 4.19 5. How many times was class cancelled 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 6 5.00 1/1668 5.00 4.48 4.67 4.59 5. How many times was class cancelled 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 6 5.00 1/1668 5.00 4.48 4.67 4.59 5. How many times was class cancelled 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 3 2 4.17 789/1605 4.17 3.91 4.07 4.15 4. Lecture Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 0 0 0 0 0 1 5 4.83 308/1514 4.83 4.07 4.39 4.39 4. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 0 0 0 0 0 0 6 5.00 1/1551 5.00 4.84 4.66 4.72 5. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0 0 0 0 0 1 5 5.00 1/1551 5.00 4.84 4.66 4.72 5. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 0 0 0 0 0 0 2 4 4.67 471/1506 4.67 4.20 4.24 4.29 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 0 0 0 0 0 0 2 2 4 4.67 471/1506 4.67 4.20 4.26 4.33 4. Did taldents actively encouraged to participate 1 0 0 0 0 0 5 5.00 1/1502 5.00 4.40 4.26 4.31 5. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 1 0 0 0 0 0 5 5.00 1/1502 5.00 4.40 4.26 4.31 5. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 1 0 0 0 0 0 5 5.00 1/1502 5.00 4.40 4.26 4.31 5. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 1 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/1006 **** 3.99 4.00 3.99 ** Were special techniques successful Laboratory Were you provided with adequate background information 5 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/112 **** 5.00 4.38 4.59 ** **Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 5 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/12 *** 5.00 4.38 4.59 ** **Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 5 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0		-	-	-	-	-	-	_		,					
Was the grading system clearly explained			-	-	-			_		. ,					
How many times was class cancelled			_	-	_	-	-	_							
How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness			-	-	-		-	-		,					
Lecture Were the instructor's lectures well prepared Were the instructor seem interested in the subject 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 5 4.83 308/1514 4.83 4.07 4.39 4.39 4. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 6 5.00 1/1551 5.00 4.84 4.66 4.72 5. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0 0 0 0 1 1 4 4.50 556/1503 4.50 4.12 4.24 4.29 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 0 0 0 0 0 0 2 4 4.67 471/1506 4.67 4.20 4.26 4.33 4. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding Discussion Discussion Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 1 0 1 0 1 1 2 3.60 1117/1490 3.60 4.27 4.05 4.11 3. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 1 0 0 0 0 0 5 5.00 1/1502 5.00 4.40 4.26 4.31 5. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion Laboratory Were you provided with adequate background information Seminar Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme Seminar Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme Seminar Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme Seminar Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme Seminar Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme Seminar Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme Seminar Seminar Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme Sominar Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme Sominar Seminar Seminar Seminar Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme Sominar Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme Sominar Seminar Seminar Seminar Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme Sominar Seminar Semi				-	-		-			,					
Mere the instructor's lectures well prepared 0 0 0 0 0 1 1 5 4.83 308/1514 4.83 4.07 4.39 4.39 4. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 0 0 0 0 0 0 6 5.00 1/1551 5.00 4.84 4.66 4.72 5. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0 0 0 0 1 1 4 4.50 556/1503 4.50 4.12 4.24 4.29 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 0 0 0 0 0 2 2 4 4.67 471/1506 4.67 4.20 4.26 4.33 4. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 0 1 1 0 0 0 2 2 3.80 764/1311 3.80 3.91 3.85 3.96 3.	. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	U	U	U	U	1	3	2	4.1/	789/1605	4.17	3.91	4.07	4.15	4.1
Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 0 0 0 0 0 0 6 5.00 1/1551 5.00 4.84 4.66 4.72 5. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0 0 0 0 1 1 4 4.50 556/1503 4.50 4.12 4.24 4.29 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 0 0 0 0 0 2 4 4.67 471/1506 4.67 4.20 4.26 4.33 4. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 0 1 1 0 0 2 2 3.80 764/1311 3.80 3.91 3.85 3.96 3. Discussion Discussion Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 1 0 1 0 1 1 2 3.60 1117/1490 3.60 4.27 4.05 4.11 3. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 1 0 0 0 0 0 5 5.00 1/1502 5.00 4.40 4.26 4.31 5. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 1 0 0 0 0 3 0 2 3.80 1168/1489 3.80 4.39 4.29 4.36 3. Were special techniques successful 1 4 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/1006 **** 3.99 4.00 3.99 ** Laboratory Were you provided with adequate background information 5 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 112 **** 5.00 4.38 4.59 ** Was the instructor available for individual attention 5 0 0 1 0 0 2.00 ****/ 97 **** 4.00 4.36 4.60 ** Field Work Did field experience contribute to what you learned 5 0 0 1 0 0 0 2.00 ****/ 58 **** 5.00 4.06 5.00 ** Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 5 0 0 1 0 0 0 2.00 ****/ 58 **** 5.00 4.22 4.20 ** Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 5 0 0 1 0 0 0 2.00 ****/ 58 **** 5.00 4.06 5.00 ** Frequency Distribution Frequency Distribution Frequency Distribution	Lecture														
Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0 0 0 1 1 4 4.50 556/1503 4.50 4.12 4.24 4.29 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 0 0 0 0 0 2 2 4 4.67 471/1506 4.67 4.20 4.26 4.33 4. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 0 1 0 0 2 2 3.80 764/1311 3.80 3.91 3.85 3.96 3. Discussion Discussion Discussion Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 1 0 1 0 1 1 2 3.60 1117/1490 3.60 4.27 4.05 4.11 3. Were all students actively encouraged for participate 1 0 0 0 0 0 5 5.00 1/1502 5.00 4.04 4.26 4.31 5. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 1 0 0 0 3 0 2 3.80 1168/1489 3.80 4.39 4.29 4.36 3. Were special techniques successful 1 4 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/1006 **** 3.99 4.00 3.99 *** Ware special techniques successful Discussion 1 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/1006 **** 4.19 4.36 *** Were you provided with adequate background information 5 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 233 **** 4.19 4.36 *** Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 5 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0	. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	308/1514	4.83	4.07	4.39	4.39	4.8
Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 0 0 0 0 0 2 4 4.67 471/1506 4.67 4.20 4.26 4.33 4. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 0 1 1 0 0 2 2 3.80 764/1311 3.80 3.91 3.85 3.96 3. Discussion Discussion Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 1 0 1 0 1 1 2 3.60 1117/1490 3.60 4.27 4.05 4.11 3. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 1 0 0 0 0 0 5 5.00 1/1502 5.00 4.40 4.26 4.31 5. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 1 0 0 0 3 0 2 3.80 1168/1489 3.80 4.39 4.29 4.36 3. Were special techniques successful 1 4 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/1006 **** 3.99 4.00 3.99 ** Laboratory Were you provided with adequate background information 5 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/1006 **** 3.99 4.00 3.99 ** Seminar Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 5 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 112 **** 5.00 4.38 4.59 ** Was the instructor available for individual attention 5 0 0 1 0 0 0 2.00 ****/ 97 **** 4.00 4.36 4.60 ** Field Work Did field experience contribute to what you learned 5 0 0 1 0 0 0 2.00 ****/ 58 **** 5.00 4.22 4.20 ** Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 5 0 1 0 0 0 2.00 ****/ 52 **** 5.00 4.06 5.00 ** Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 5 0 0 1 0 0 0 2.00 ****/ 55 **** 5.00 4.06 5.00 ** Prequency Distribution Frequency Distribution	. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1551	5.00	4.84	4.66	4.72	5.
Discussion	. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	556/1503	4.50	4.12	4.24	4.29	4.
Discussion Discussion Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 1 0 1 0 1 1 2 3.60 1117/1490 3.60 4.27 4.05 4.11 3. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 1 0 0 0 0 0 5 5.00 1/1502 5.00 4.40 4.26 4.31 5. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 1 0 0 0 3 0 2 3.80 1168/1489 3.80 4.39 4.29 4.36 3. Were special techniques successful 1 4 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/1006 **** 3.99 4.00 3.99 ** Laboratory Were you provided with adequate background information 5 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 233 **** **** 4.19 4.36 ** Seminar Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 5 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 97 **** 4.00 4.36 4.60 ** Field Work Did field experience contribute to what you learned 5 0 0 1 0 0 2.00 ****/ 58 **** 5.00 4.22 4.20 *** Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 5 0 1 0 0 0 1.00 ****/ 52 **** 5.00 4.06 5.00 ** Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 5 0 0 1 0 0 0 2.00 ****/ 55 **** **** 4.34 4.67 ** Did study questions make clear the expected goal 5 0 0 1 0 0 3.00 ****/ 42 **** **** 4.31 5.00 ** Frequency Distribution Frequency Distribution	. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	471/1506	4.67	4.20	4.26	4.33	4.
Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 1 0 1 0 1 1 2 3.60 1117/1490 3.60 4.27 4.05 4.11 3. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 1 0 0 0 0 0 5 5.00 1/1502 5.00 4.40 4.26 4.31 5. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 1 0 0 0 3 0 2 3.80 1168/1489 3.80 4.39 4.29 4.36 5. Were special techniques successful 1 4 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/1006 **** 3.99 4.00 3.99 ** Laboratory Were you provided with adequate background information 5 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 233 **** **** 4.19 4.36 ** Seminar Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 5 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 112 **** 5.00 4.38 4.59 ** Was the instructor available for individual attention 5 0 0 1 0 0 0 2.00 ****/ 97 **** 4.00 4.36 4.60 ** Field Work Did field experience contribute to what you learned 5 0 0 1 0 0 0 2.00 ****/ 58 **** 5.00 4.22 4.20 ** Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 5 0 0 1 0 0 0 2.00 ****/ 52 **** 5.00 4.06 5.00 ** Self Paced Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 5 0 0 1 0 0 0 2.00 ****/ 42 **** **** 4.31 5.00 ** Frequency Distribution Frequency Distribution	. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	1	1	0	0	2	2	3.80	764/1311	3.80	3.91	3.85	3.96	3.
Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 1 0 1 0 1 1 2 3.60 1117/1490 3.60 4.27 4.05 4.11 3. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 1 0 0 0 0 0 5 5.00 1/1502 5.00 4.40 4.26 4.31 5. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 1 0 0 0 3 0 2 3.80 1168/1489 3.80 4.39 4.29 4.36 5. Were special techniques successful 1 4 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/1006 **** 3.99 4.00 3.99 ** Laboratory Were you provided with adequate background information 5 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 233 **** **** 4.19 4.36 ** Seminar Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 5 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 112 **** 5.00 4.38 4.59 ** Was the instructor available for individual attention 5 0 0 1 0 0 0 2.00 ****/ 97 **** 4.00 4.36 4.60 ** Field Work Did field experience contribute to what you learned 5 0 0 1 0 0 0 2.00 ****/ 58 **** 5.00 4.22 4.20 ** Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 5 0 0 1 0 0 0 2.00 ****/ 52 **** 5.00 4.06 5.00 ** Self Paced Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 5 0 0 1 0 0 0 2.00 ****/ 42 **** **** 4.31 5.00 ** Frequency Distribution Frequency Distribution	Disquesion														
Were all students actively encouraged to participate 1 0 0 0 0 0 5 5.00 1/1502 5.00 4.40 4.26 4.31 5. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 1 0 0 0 3 0 2 3.80 1168/1489 3.80 4.39 4.29 4.36 3. Were special techniques successful 1 4 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/1006 **** 3.99 4.00 3.99 ** Laboratory		1	0	1	0	1	1	2	2 60	1117/1400	2 60	4 27	4 OE	1 11	2
Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 1 0 0 0 3 0 2 3.80 1168/1489 3.80 4.39 4.29 4.36 3. Were special techniques successful 1 4 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/1006 **** 3.99 4.00 3.99 ** Laboratory Were you provided with adequate background information 5 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 233 **** **** 4.19 4.36 ** Seminar Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 5 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 112 **** 5.00 4.38 4.59 ** Was the instructor available for individual attention 5 0 0 1 0 0 0 2.00 ****/ 97 **** 4.00 4.36 4.60 ** Field Work Did field experience contribute to what you learned 5 0 0 1 0 0 0 2.00 ****/ 58 **** 5.00 4.22 4.20 ** Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 5 0 1 0 0 0 0 1.00 ****/ 52 **** 5.00 4.06 5.00 ** Self Paced Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 5 0 0 1 0 0 0 2.00 ****/ 58 **** 4.34 4.67 ** Did study questions make clear the expected goal 5 0 0 1 0 0 3.00 ****/ 42 **** **** 4.31 5.00 ** Frequency Distribution redits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades Reasons Type Majors					-										
Laboratory . Were you provided with adequate background information 5 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/1006 **** 3.99 4.00 3.99 ** Seminar . Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 5 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 233 **** **** 4.19 4.36 ** Was the instructor available for individual attention 5 0 0 1 0 0 0 2.00 ****/ 112 **** 5.00 4.38 4.59 ** Field Work . Did field experience contribute to what you learned 5 0 0 1 0 0 0 2.00 ****/ 58 **** 5.00 4.22 4.20 ** . Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 5 0 1 0 0 0 0 1.00 ****/ 52 **** 5.00 4.06 5.00 ** Self Paced . Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 5 0 0 1 0 0 0 2.00 ****/ 55 **** 5.00 4.06 5.00 ** Frequency Distribution redits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades Reasons Type Majors							-								
Laboratory . Were you provided with adequate background information 5 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 233 **** **** 4.19 4.36 ** Seminar . Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 5 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 112 **** 5.00 4.38 4.59 ** . Was the instructor available for individual attention 5 0 0 1 0 0 0 2.00 ****/ 97 **** 4.00 4.36 4.60 ** Field Work . Did field experience contribute to what you learned 5 0 0 1 0 0 0 2.00 ****/ 58 **** 5.00 4.22 4.20 ** . Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 5 0 1 0 0 0 0 1.00 ****/ 52 **** 5.00 4.06 5.00 ** Self Paced . Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 5 0 0 1 0 0 0 2.00 ****/ 55 **** **** 4.34 4.67 ** . Did study questions make clear the expected goal 5 0 0 1 0 0 3.00 ****/ 42 **** **** 4.31 5.00 ** Frequency Distribution redits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades Reasons Type Majors															
Seminar Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 5 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 233 **** **** 4.19 4.36 ** Seminar Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 5 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 112 **** 5.00 4.38 4.59 ** Was the instructor available for individual attention 5 0 0 1 0 0 0 2.00 ****/ 97 **** 4.00 4.36 4.60 ** Field Work Did field experience contribute to what you learned 5 0 0 1 0 0 0 2.00 ****/ 58 **** 5.00 4.22 4.20 ** Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 5 0 1 0 0 0 0 1.00 ****/ 52 **** 5.00 4.06 5.00 ** Self Paced Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 5 0 0 1 0 0 0 2.00 ****/ 55 **** **** 4.34 4.67 ** Did study questions make clear the expected goal 5 0 0 1 0 0 3.00 ****/ 42 **** **** 4.31 5.00 ** Frequency Distribution Tedits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades Reasons Type Majors	. Were special techniques successiui	1	4	U	U	U	U	1	5.00	/1006		3.99	4.00	3.99	
Seminar . Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 5 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 112 **** 5.00 4.38 4.59 ** . Was the instructor available for individual attention 5 0 0 1 0 0 0 2.00 ****/ 97 **** 4.00 4.36 4.60 ** Field Work . Did field experience contribute to what you learned 5 0 0 1 0 0 0 2.00 ****/ 58 **** 5.00 4.22 4.20 ** . Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 5 0 1 0 0 0 0 1.00 ****/ 52 **** 5.00 4.06 5.00 ** Self Paced . Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 5 0 0 1 0 0 0 2.00 ***/ 55 **** **** 4.34 4.67 ** . Did study questions make clear the expected goal 5 0 0 1 0 0 3.00 ***/ 42 **** **** 4.31 5.00 ** Frequency Distribution redits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades Reasons Type Majors	Laboratory														
Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 5 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 112 **** 5.00 4.38 4.59 ** Was the instructor available for individual attention 5 0 0 1 0 0 0 2.00 ****/ 97 **** 4.00 4.36 4.60 ** Field Work Did field experience contribute to what you learned 5 0 0 1 0 0 0 2.00 ****/ 58 **** 5.00 4.22 4.20 ** Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 5 0 1 0 0 0 0 1.00 ****/ 52 **** 5.00 4.06 5.00 ** Self Paced Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 5 0 0 1 0 0 0 2.00 ****/ 55 **** 4.34 4.67 ** Did study questions make clear the expected goal 5 0 0 1 0 0 3.00 ****/ 42 **** 4.31 5.00 ** Frequency Distribution Redits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades Reasons Type Majors	. Were you provided with adequate background information $% \left(x\right) =\left(x\right) $	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 233	****	****	4.19	4.36	* *
Field Work Did field experience contribute to what you learned 5 0 0 1 0 0 0 2.00 ****/ 97 **** 4.00 4.36 4.60 ** Field Work Did field experience contribute to what you learned 5 0 0 1 0 0 0 2.00 ****/ 58 **** 5.00 4.22 4.20 ** Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 5 0 1 0 0 0 0 1.00 ****/ 52 **** 5.00 4.06 5.00 ** Self Paced Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 5 0 0 1 0 0 0 2.00 ****/ 55 **** **** 4.34 4.67 ** Did study questions make clear the expected goal 5 0 0 1 0 0 3.00 ****/ 42 **** **** 4.31 5.00 ** Frequency Distribution redits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades Reasons Type Majors	Seminar														
Field Work Did field experience contribute to what you learned 5 0 0 1 0 0 0 2.00 ****/ 97 **** 4.00 4.36 4.60 ** Field Work Did field experience contribute to what you learned 5 0 0 1 0 0 0 2.00 ****/ 58 **** 5.00 4.22 4.20 ** Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 5 0 1 0 0 0 0 1.00 ****/ 52 **** 5.00 4.06 5.00 ** Self Paced Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 5 0 0 1 0 0 0 2.00 ***/ 55 **** **** 4.34 4.67 ** Did study questions make clear the expected goal 5 0 0 1 0 0 3.00 ****/ 42 **** **** 4.31 5.00 ** Frequency Distribution Tedits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades Reasons Type Majors	. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 112	****	5.00	4.38	4.59	* *
Did field experience contribute to what you learned 5 0 0 1 0 0 0 2.00 ****/ 58 **** 5.00 4.22 4.20 ** Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 5 0 1 0 0 0 0 1.00 ****/ 52 **** 5.00 4.06 5.00 ** Self Paced Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 5 0 0 1 0 0 0 2.00 ****/ 55 **** **** 4.34 4.67 ** Did study questions make clear the expected goal 5 0 0 1 0 0 3.00 ****/ 42 **** **** 4.31 5.00 ** Frequency Distribution Tedits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades Reasons Type Majors		5	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 97	****	4.00	4.36	4.60	* *
Did field experience contribute to what you learned 5 0 0 1 0 0 0 2.00 ****/ 58 **** 5.00 4.22 4.20 ** Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 5 0 1 0 0 0 1.00 ****/ 52 **** 5.00 4.06 5.00 ** Self Paced Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 5 0 0 1 0 0 0 2.00 ****/ 55 **** **** 4.34 4.67 ** Did study questions make clear the expected goal 5 0 0 1 0 0 3.00 ****/ 42 **** **** 4.31 5.00 ** Frequency Distribution Tedits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades Reasons Type Majors	Field Work														
Self Paced Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 5 0 1 0 0 0 1.00 ****/ 52 **** 5.00 4.06 5.00 ** Self Paced Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 5 0 0 1 0 0 2.00 ****/ 55 **** **** 4.34 4.67 ** Did study questions make clear the expected goal 5 0 0 1 0 0 3.00 ****/ 42 **** **** 4.31 5.00 ** Frequency Distribution redits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades Reasons Type Majors		5	Ω	Λ	1	Ω	Λ	Λ	2 00	****/ 5Q	****	5 00	4 22	4 20	* *
Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 5 0 0 1 0 0 0 2.00 ****/ 55 **** **** 4.34 4.67 ** Did study questions make clear the expected goal 5 0 0 0 1 0 0 3.00 ****/ 42 **** **** 4.31 5.00 ** Frequency Distribution Tedits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades Reasons Type Majors	-		-	-	0	-	-	0		, 50	****				* *
Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 5 0 0 1 0 0 0 2.00 ****/ 55 **** **** 4.34 4.67 ** Did study questions make clear the expected goal 5 0 0 0 1 0 0 3.00 ****/ 42 **** **** 4.31 5.00 ** Frequency Distribution Tedits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades Reasons Type Majors	Oalf David														
Did study questions make clear the expected goal 5 0 0 0 1 0 0 3.00 ****/ 42 **** **** 4.31 5.00 ** Frequency Distribution redits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades Reasons Type Majors		_	0	0	1	0	0	0	2 00	****/	****	****	1 21	1 67	**
Frequency Distribution redits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades Reasons Type Majors					_		-	•		,	++++	++++			
redits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades Reasons Type Majors	. Did study questions make clear the expected goar	5	U	U	U	1	U	U	3.00	****/ 42			4.31	5.00	
·	Frequ	iency	Dis	trib	utio	n									
	redits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades				Re	asons	3			Туј	pe			Majors	;
	00-27 0 0.00-0.99 0 A 2		Re		 ed f	 or M:	aior		1	Graduat	 e	 0	Maic		3

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	 А	2	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	3
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	В	2						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	2	C	2	General	0	Under-grad	6	Non-major	3
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	5	-		_	
				2	Λ						

Course Section: AFST 206 0101 University of Maryland AFRO-AMER HIST SURVEY

Baltimore County Fall 2006

Title Instructor: MCANDREW, JENNI

Enrollment: 20 Questionnaires: 15

Ε	Page	9
JAN	18,	2007
Job	IRBR	3029

Student	Course	Evaluation	Questionnaire
---------	--------	------------	---------------

			Fre	eque	ncies	3		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	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	1	4	10	4.60	478/1669	4.60	4.40	4.23	4.34	4.60
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	7	6	4.27	868/1666	4.27	4.18	4.19	4.29	4.27
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	2	2	3	8	4.13	909/1421	4.13	4.23	4.24	4.35	4.13
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	9	4	4.13	934/1617	4.13	4.09	4.15	4.24	4.13
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	2	11	4.60	262/1555	4.60	4.41	4.00	3.96	4.60
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	2	6	6	4.07	857/1543	4.07	4.17	4.06	4.10	4.07
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	1	4	2	7	3.87	1196/1647	3.87	3.99	4.12	4.19	3.87
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	1	3	11	4.67	1068/1668	4.67	4.48	4.67	4.59	4.67
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	4	6	2	3.83	1148/1605	3.83	3.91	4.07	4.15	3.83
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	2	5	7	4.36	1003/1514	4.36	4.07	4.39	4.39	4.36
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	1	1	12	4.79	825/1551	4.79	4.84	4.66	4.72	4.79
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	1	2	4	6	4.15	969/1503	4.15	4.12	4.24	4.29	4.15
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	1	2	2	8	4.31	868/1506	4.31	4.20	4.26	4.33	4.31
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	1	2	3	1	5	2	3.15	1088/1311	3.15	3.91	3.85	3.96	3.15
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	1	0	1	2	6	4.20	742/1490	4.20	4.27	4.05	4.11	4.20
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	1	1	1	2	5	3.90	1117/1502	3.90	4.40	4.26	4.31	3.90
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	0	1	1	8	4.70	500/1489	4.70	4.39	4.29	4.36	4.70
4. Were special techniques successful	5	1	1	0	3	2	3	3.67	694/1006	3.67	3.99	4.00	3.99	3.67

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	d Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	Α	5	Required for Majors	4	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	0	В	8						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	4	C	0	General	1	Under-grad	15	Non-major	15
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	n
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	8	_			
				?	0						

Course Section: AFST 213 0101

Title AFRICA: CULT/DEVELOPMN

Instructor: LAMOUSE-SMITH,

Enrollment: 30

Questionnaires: 23

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2006

Page 10 JAN 18, 2007 Job IRBR3029

			Fre	equer	ncies	5		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Ouestions	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	0	5	4	13	4.22	963/1669	4.22	4.40	4.23	4.34	4.22
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	2	2	8	9	2	3.30	1534/1666	3.30	4.18	4.19	4.29	3.30
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	3	3	5	6	5	3.32	1296/1421	3.32	4.23	4.24	4.35	3.32
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	5	3	1	5	6	3	3.28	1467/1617	3.28	4.09	4.15	4.24	3.28
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	0	5	3	12	4.19	611/1555	4.19	4.41	4.00	3.96	4.19
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	5	0	3	6	4	4	3.53	1253/1543	3.53	4.17	4.06	4.10	3.53
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	4	5	6	4			1537/1647	2.96	3.99	4.12	4.19	2.96
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	1	2			882/1668	4.82	4.48	4.67	4.59	4.82
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	0	1	1	5	8	2	3.53	1348/1605	3.53	3.91	4.07	4.15	3.53
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	1	2	6	7	6	3.68	1346/1514	3.68	4.07	4.39	4.39	3.68
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	2	3			1000/1551	4.68	4.84	4.66	4.72	4.68
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	1	1	7	8	4		1297/1503	3.62	4.12	4.24	4.29	3.62
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	3	3	7	8		1121/1506	3.95	4.20	4.26	4.33	3.95
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	3	1	2	4	5	-	3.72	807/1311					3.72
5. Fix additioning techniques emance four anaerseanaing	_	3	-	_	-		Ū	3.72	00771311	3.72	3.71	3.03	3.70	3.72
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	1	0	5	5	7	3.94	913/1490	3.94	4.27	4.05	4.11	3.94
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	1	1	3	1	12	4.22	900/1502	4.22	4.40	4.26	4.31	4.22
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	1	2	1	6	8		1038/1489	4.00	4.39	4.29	4.36	4.00
4. Were special techniques successful	5	14	1	1	2	0	0		****/1006	****	3.99		3.99	****
1. Were apecial ecciniques adecessian	3		_	_	2	O	U	2.25	71000		3.77	1.00	3.77	
Laboratory														
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	22	0	1	0	0	0	0	1 00	****/ 233	****	****	4.19	4.36	****
z. were you provided with adequate background information	22	O	_	U	U	U	U	1.00	, 255			1.10	1.50	
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	21	0	0	0	1	1	Ο	3 50	****/ 112	****	5.00	4.38	4.59	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	21	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/ 97	****	4.00	4.36	4.60	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	21	0	0	0	1	1	0		****/ 92	****	3.00	4.22	4.50	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	21	0	0	0	2	0	0		****/ 105	****	4.00	4.20	4.63	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	21	0	0	0	2	0	0		****/ 98	****	4.00	3.95	4.20	****
J. Were criteria for grading made crear	21	O	U	O	2	O	U	3.00	, 50		1.00	3.73	1.20	
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	22	0	0	0	1	0	0	3 00	****/ 58	****	5.00	4.22	4.20	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	21	0	0	1	0	0	1		****/ 52	****	5.00	4.06	5.00	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	22	0	0	1	0	0	0		****/ 39	****	5.00	4.39	5.00	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	22	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 40	****	5.00	3.97	5.00	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	22	0	1	0	0	0	0		****/ 30	****	5.00	4.33	5.00	****
J. Did conferences help you carry out freid activities	22	U	_	U	U	U	U	1.00	/ 30		3.00	1.55	3.00	
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	22	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 55	****	****	4.34	4.67	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	22	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 42	****	****	4.31	5.00	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	21	1	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 46	****	****	4.45	5.00	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	22	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 33	****	****	4.25	5.00	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	22	0	0	1	0	0	0		****/ 29	****	****	4.34	5.00	****
J. Here there chough proceeds for all the students	22	J	J	_	J	J	U	2.00	, 29			1.01	5.00	

Course Section: AFST 213 0101

Title AFRICA: CULT/DEVELOPMN

Instructor: LAMOUSE-SMITH,

Enrollment: 30
Questionnaires: 23

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2006 Page 10 JAN 18, 2007 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	l Grades	Reasons		Type	Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	9	Required for Majors	9	Graduate (	0 Major	1
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	В	7					
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	4	C	2	General	3	Under-grad 23	3 Non-major	22
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	1	D	0					
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	2	#### - Means th	here are not enoug	h
				P	0			responses to be	e significant	
				I	0	Other	4			
				?	1					

#### Course Section: AFST 215 0101 University of Maryland Page 11 Title Baltimore County JAN 18, 2007 INTRO TO AFRICAN DANCE Fall 2006 Job IRBR3029

Instructor: ANSAHBREW, KWAM

Enrollment: 8

Questionnaires: 1 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

? 0

							Fre	eque	ncies	5		Inst	ructor	Course	e Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
		Question	S		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		 Genera	 1															
1. Did vo	u gain ne	ew insights,ski		m this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1669	5.00	4.40	4.23	4.34	5.00
		ctor make clear			0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1666	5.00	4.18	4.19	4.29	5.00
		uestions reflec			0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1421		4.23	4.24	4.35	5.00
	_	uations reflect		_	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1617	5.00	4.09	4.15	4.24	5.00
5. Did as	signed re	eadings contrib	ute to	what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1555	5.00	4.41	4.00	3.96	5.00
				o what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1543	5.00	4.17	4.06	4.10	5.00
		g system clearl		_	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1647	5.00	3.99	4.12	4.19	5.00
		was class cand			0	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	1654/1668	3.00	4.48	4.67	4.59	3.00
		Semina																
1 Word a	aaianod t			announced theme	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 112	5.00	5.00	4.38	4.59	5.00
	_	-		ividual attention	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	68/ 97		4.00	4.36	4.60	4.00
				what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	0	0		77/ 92		3.00	4.22	4.50	3.00
		ons contribute			0	0	0	0	0	1	0		72/ 105		4.00	4.22	4.63	4.00
		for grading mad			0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	46/ 98		4.00	3.95	4.03	4.00
5. Were C.	IICEIIA I	ror grading mad	e Clear		U	U	U	U	U	_	U	4.00	40/ 90	4.00	4.00	3.93	4.20	4.00
		Field	Work															
				hat you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 58	5.00	5.00	4.22	4.20	5.00
2. Did you	u clearly	y understand yo	ur eval	uation criteria	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 52	5.00	5.00	4.06	5.00	5.00
3. Was the	e instru	ctor available	for con	sultation	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 39	5.00	5.00	4.39	5.00	5.00
4. To what	t degree	could you disc	uss you	r evaluations	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 40	5.00	5.00	3.97	5.00	5.00
5. Did co	nferences	s help you carr	y out f	ield activities	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 30	5.00	5.00	4.33	5.00	5.00
				Frequ	iency	Dis	trib	utio	n									
Credits E	arnod	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				P.O.	asons	,			Ψ.	pe			Majors	•
																		, 
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 1		Re	quir	ed f	or Ma	ajors	5	0	Graduat	e	0	Majo	r	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	в 0														
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C 0		Ge	nera	1				1	Under-9	rad	1	Non-	major	1
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D 0														
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	0	F 0		El	ecti	ves				0	#### -				_	gh
				P 0									respons	es to l	oe sign	nificar	ıt	
				I 0		Ot]	her					0						

Course Section: AFST 230 0101

COMP AFRICAN RELIGIONS

Title Instructor: ANSAHBREW, KWAM

Enrollment: 30 Questionnaires: 18

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

University of Maryland

Baltimore County

Fall 2006

Page 12 JAN 18, 2007 Job IRBR3029

			Fr	equer	ncies	3		Ins	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	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	Λ	0	0	0	2	2	13	4.56	534/1669	4.56	4.40	4.23	4.34	4.56
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	1	0	2	4	10	4.29	827/1666	4.29	4.18	4.19	4.29	4.29
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	3	2	12	4.53	538/1421	4.53	4.23	4.24	4.35	4.53
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	1	1	3	12	4.33	717/1617	4.33	4.09	4.15	4.24	4.33
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	3	14	4.72	189/1555	4.72	4.41	4.00	3.96	4.72
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	3	0	0	3	2	9	4.43	490/1543	4.43	4.17	4.06	4.10	4.43
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	1	4	3	9		1043/1647	4.00	3.99	4.12	4.19	4.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	5	7	5		1530/1668	4.00	4.48	4.67	4.59	4.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	1	1	0	2	2	8	4.23	713/1605		3.91	4.07	4.15	4.23
	_	_	_	-	_	_	-		0,					
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	1	1	1	8	6	4.00	1199/1514	4.00	4.07	4.39	4.39	4.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	17	4.94	307/1551	4.94	4.84	4.66	4.72	4.94
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	1	1	5	10	4.41	702/1503	4.41	4.12	4.24	4.29	4.41
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	4	13	4.67	471/1506	4.67	4.20	4.26	4.33	4.67
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	1	1	0	3	4	8	4.13	525/1311		3.91	3.85	3.96	4.13
									,					
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	2	15	4.88	155/1490	4.88	4.27	4.05	4.11	4.88
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	0	1	16	4.94	142/1502	4.94	4.40	4.26	4.31	4.94
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	0	17	5.00	1/1489	5.00	4.39	4.29	4.36	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	1	9	0	0	2	0	6	4.50	235/1006	4.50	3.99	4.00	3.99	4.50
*														
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 112	****	5.00	4.38	4.59	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	17	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 97	****	4.00	4.36	4.60	****
From		. D.i	d To-											

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	d Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors	
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	A	5	Required for Majors	5	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	1	В	7						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	4	Under-grad	18	Non-major	18
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	0	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	n
				P	0			responses to	be sig	nificant	
				I	0	Other	3	_			
				2	0						

Course Section: AFST 245 0101

Title INTRO TO BLACK MUSIC

Instructor: DALILI, EFIA

Enrollment: 26
Questionnaires: 20

# Baltimore County Fall 2006

Page 13 JAN 18, 2007 Job IRBR3029

# Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

University of Maryland

			Frequencies			Inst	ructor	Course	Dept.	UMBC	Level	Sect		
Questions	NR	NA	1	_	3	4	5	Mean	Rank		Mean		Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	1	3	6	10	4.25	914/1669	4.25	4.40	4.23	4.34	4.25
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	4	7	9	4.25	881/1666	4.25	4.18	4.19	4.29	4.25
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	2	6	4	8		1061/1421		4.23	4.24	4.35	3.90
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	1	1	7	10	4.20	863/1617	4.20	4.09	4.15	4.24	4.20
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	2	7	10	4.30	516/1555	4.30	4.41	4.00	3.96	4.30
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	2	7	10	4.30	608/1543	4.30	4.17	4.06	4.10	4.30
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	2	1	7	9		1017/1647	4.05	3.99	4.12	4.19	4.05
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	19	4.95	428/1668	4.95	4.48	4.67	4.59	4.95
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	3	0	0	3	6	3	4.00	918/1605	4.00	3.91	4.07	4.15	4.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	1	1	9	7	4.22	1100/1514	4.22	4.07	4.39	4.39	4.22
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	2	18	4.90	512/1551	4.90	4.84	4.66	4.72	4.90
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	2	11	7	4.25	879/1503	4.25	4.12	4.24	4.29	4.25
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	6	13	4.60	547/1506	4.60	4.20	4.26	4.33	4.60
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	1	0	0	2	17	4.70	174/1311	4.70	3.91	3.85	3.96	4.70
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	2	3	7	4.42	546/1490	4.42	4.27	4.05	4.11	4.42
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	0	0	3	3	6	4.25	880/1502	4.25	4.40	4.26	4.31	4.25
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	0	0	0	2	10	4.83	348/1489	4.83	4.39	4.29	4.36	4.83
4. Were special techniques successful	8	1	2	0	0	4		3.91	,			4.00		3.91
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	18	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 226	****	****	4.20	4.42	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	18	0	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/ 233	****	****	4.19	4.36	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	19	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 225	****	****	4.50	4.74	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	19	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 223	****	****	4.35	4.71	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	19	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 206	****	****	4.15	4.59	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	19	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 112	****	5.00	4.38	4.59	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	19	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 97	****	4.00	4.36	4.60	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 92	****	3.00	4.22	4.50	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 105	****	4.00	4.20	4.63	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	19	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 98	****	4.00	3.95	4.20	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 58	****	5.00	4.22	4.20	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	18	0	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/ 52	****	5.00	4.06	5.00	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	19	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 39	****	5.00	4.39	5.00	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	19	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 40	****	5.00	3.97	5.00	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	19	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 30	****	5.00	4.33	5.00	****
	-	-	-	-	•	-	_		, 30			. = =		
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 55	****	****	4.34	4.67	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	19	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 42	****	****	4.31	5.00	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	19	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 46	****	****	4.45	5.00	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	19	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 33	****	****	4.25	5.00	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	19	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 29	****	***	4.34	5.00	****

Course Section: AFST 245 0101

Title INTRO TO BLACK MUSIC

Instructor: DALILI, EFIA

Enrollment: 26
Questionnaires: 20

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2006 Page 13 JAN 18, 2007 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits E	Earned	Cum. GPA		Expecte	d Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	. — — — А	13	Required for Majors	11	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	6						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	5	C	0	General	4	Under-grad	20	Non-major	20
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means	there	e are not enough	h
				P	0			responses to	be si	lgnificant	
				I	0	Other	4				
				?	0						

Course Section: AFST 260 0101 University of Maryland Title BLACK LITERATURE TO 19 Baltimore County Instructor:

Page 14 JAN 18, 2007 Fall 2006 Job IRBR3029 PETERS, JONATHA

Enrollment:	12	
Questionnaires:	8	Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

					Frequencies							Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
		Question	s		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		 Genera	 1															
1. Did vo	ou gain n	ew insights,ski	_	m this course	0	0	2	2	2	2	0	2.50	1648/1669	2.50	4.40	4.23	4.34	2.50
		ctor make clear			0	0	4	2	2	0	0		1664/1666		4.18	4.19	4.29	1.75
		uestions reflec			0	1	3	2	0	2	0	2.14	1419/1421	2.14	4.23	4.24	4.35	2.14
	_	uations reflect		_	0	2	1	2	2	1	0	2.50	1591/1617	2.50	4.09	4.15	4.24	2.50
5. Did as	ssigned re	eadings contrib	ute to	what you learned	1	0	1	2	2	2	0	2.71	1497/1555	2.71	4.41	4.00	3.96	2.71
6. Did wr	ritten as:	signments contr	ibute t	o what you learned	1	0	1	2	2	2	0	2.71	1492/1543	2.71	4.17	4.06	4.10	2.71
7. Was th	ne gradin	g system clearl	y expla	ined	1	0	3	3	1	0	0	1.71	1633/1647	1.71	3.99	4.12	4.19	1.71
8. How ma	any times	was class canc	elled		1	1	0	0	2	2	2	4.00	1530/1668	4.00	4.48	4.67	4.59	4.00
9. How wo	ould you	grade the overa	ll teac	hing effectiveness	5	0	0	2	0	0	1	3.00	1501/1605	3.00	3.91	4.07	4.15	3.00
		Lectur	e															
1. Were t	he instr	uctor's lecture		prepared	2	0	3	1	2	0	0	1.83	1509/1514	1.83	4.07	4.39	4.39	1.83
		n the subject	1	0	0	0	1	1	5		1135/1551		4.84	4.66	4.72	4.57		
	as lecture material presented and explained clear						2	3	1	1	0		1486/1503		4.12	4.24	4.29	2.14
	. Was recture material presented and explained clearly . Did the lectures contribute to what you learned						2	2	1	1	0		1487/1506			4.26	4.33	2.17
				our understanding	2	1	2	0	3	0	0		1264/1311		3.91		3.96	2.20
		Discus	gion															
1 Did al	lace died			what you learned	1	0	2	2	1	2	Λ	2 43	1443/1490	2.43	4.27	4.05	4.11	2.43
				d to participate	1	0	0	3	1	3	0		1395/1502		4.40	4.26	4.31	3.00
				d open discussion	1	0	0	4	1	2	0		1447/1489		4.39	4.29	4.36	2.71
		echniques succe		a open arbeassion	1	5	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	967/1006		3.99	4.00	3.99	2.50
1. Wele b	Special c	cemmiques succe	BBLUI		_	5	O	_	_	O	Ü	2.50	20171000	2.30	3.77	1.00	3.77	2.50
				Frequ	ıency	7 Dist	trib	ution	n									
Credits E	Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades				Rea	asons	5			Ту	pe			Majors	5	
00-27	0-27 1 0.00-0.99 0 A 5									ajors		 5	Graduat		0	Majo		0
28-55						r.ec	quil	=u L(	OT IM	JOES		J	Graduat	C	U	Ma JC	, <u> </u>	U
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	2	C 0		Ger	nera	1				1	Under-g	rad	8	Non-	major	8
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	1	D 0		GEI	иска.	_				_	onder -g.	Luu	J	INOII-	iia jui	U
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F 0		E1	ecti	ves				0	#### - 1	Means t	here a	re not	enous	rh
oraa.	Ü	3.30 1.00	-	P 0	Hiccorves							-	respons				_	,
				т 0		O+1	her					0	1 05 50115	L	.c bigi			
						001						-						

Course Section: AFST 261 0101

Title 20TH CENTURY BLACK LIT

Instructor: WALLACE, BELIND

Enrollment:

20 Questionnaires: 15

# University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2006

Page 15 JAN 18, 2007 Job IRBR3029

			Fre	equer	ncies	;		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank		Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	15	5.00	1/1669	5.00	4.40	4.23	4.34	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	6	9	4.60	439/1666	4.60	4.18	4.19	4.29	4.60
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	11	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	557/1421	4.50	4.23	4.24	4.35	4.50
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	4	9	4.47	554/1617	4.47	4.09	4.15	4.24	4.47
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	1	13	4.93	80/1555	4.93	4.41	4.00	3.96	4.93
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	1	12	4.79	157/1543	4.79	4.17	4.06	4.10	4.79
<ol> <li>Was the grading system clearly explained</li> </ol>	2	0	0	0	3	1	9	4.46	549/1647		3.99	4.12	4.19	4.46
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	1	8	5		1364/1668	4.29	4.48	4.67	4.59	4.29
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	0	4	7	4.64	268/1605	4.64	3.91	4.07	4.15	4.64
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	5	10	4.67	584/1514	4.67	4.07	4.39	4.39	4.67
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	15	5.00	1/1551	5.00	4.84	4.66	4.72	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	4	11	4.73	300/1503	4.73	4.12	4.24	4.29	4.73
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	15	5.00	1/1506	5.00	4.20	4.26	4.33	5.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	4	2	2	0	2	5	3.55	919/1311	3.55	3.91	3.85	3.96	3.55
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/1490	5.00	4.27	4.05	4.11	5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/1502	5.00	4.40	4.26	4.31	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/1489	5.00	4.39	4.29	4.36	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	3	3	0	0	4	4	1	3.67	694/1006	3.67		4.00	3.99	3.67
Laboratory														
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	13	0	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/ 233	****	****	4.19	4.36	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	E 00	****/ 112	****	5.00	4.38	4.59	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	14	0	1	0	0	0	0		****/ 97	****	4.00	4.36	4.60	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 92	****	3.00	4.22	4.50	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 105	****	4.00	4.20	4.63	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	14	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 98	****	4.00	3.95	4.20	****
		-	-	-	-	_			,					
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 58	****	5.00	4.22	4.20	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	14	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 52	****	5.00	4.06	5.00	***
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	14	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 39	****	5.00	4.39	5.00	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	14	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 40	****	5.00	3.97	5.00	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	14	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 30	****	5.00	4.33	5.00	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 55	****	****	4.34	4.67	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 42	****	****	4.31	5.00	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	14	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 46	****	****	4.45	5.00	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	14	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 33	****	****	4.25	5.00	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 29	****	****	4.34	5.00	****

Course Section: AFST 261 0101

Title 20TH CENTURY BLACK LIT

Instructor: WALLACE, BELIND

Enrollment: 20
Questionnaires: 15

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2006 Page 15 JAN 18, 2007 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	 А	9	Required for Majors	6	Graduate	0	Major	2
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	В	3						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	2	C	2	General	3	Under-grad	15	Non-major	13
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	2	#### - Means	there	are not enough	n
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	5				
				?	0						

Course Section: AFST 271 0101 University of Maryland Baltimore County INTRO COMMUNITY INVOLV

> ? 0

Title Instructor: ALEX, ELIZABETH Fall 2006

Enrollment:	10	
Questionnaires:	7	Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

					_	ncies		_		ructor	Course	_		Level	Sect			
		Question	5		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		Genera	 1															
1. Did vo	u gain ne	ew insights,ski	_	m this course	0	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	318/1669	4.71	4.40	4.23	4.34	4.71
_	_	ctor make clear			0	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	142/1666		4.18	4.19	4.29	4.86
		estions reflec		_	0	2	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	217/1421	4.80	4.23	4.24	4.35	4.80
4. Did ot	her evalu	ations reflect	the ex	pected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	137/1617	4.86	4.09	4.15	4.24	4.86
5. Did as	signed re	eadings contrib	ute to	what you learned	0	0	0	1	0	1	5	4.43	418/1555	4.43	4.41	4.00	3.96	4.43
6. Did wr	itten ass	signments contr	ibute t	o what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	0	6	4.71	210/1543	4.71	4.17	4.06	4.10	4.71
7. Was th	e grading	g system clearl	y expla	ined	0	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	139/1647	4.86	3.99	4.12	4.19	4.86
8. How max	ny times	was class canc	elled		0	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	1017/1668	4.71	4.48	4.67	4.59	4.71
9. How wo	uld you g	grade the overa	ll teac	hing effectiveness	4	0	0	0	2	1	0	3.33	1428/1605	3.33	3.91	4.07	4.15	3.33
		Lectur																
		actor's lecture			0	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	274/1514		4.07	4.39	4.39	4.86
		n the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	7		1/1551	5.00	4.84	4.66	4.72	5.00		
	3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly							0	0	0	7		1/1503	5.00	4.12	4.24	4.29	5.00
		es contribute t		-	0	0	0	0	1	1	5		575/1506		4.20	4.26	4.33	4.57
5. Did au	diovisual	l techniques en	nance y	our understanding	0	2	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	219/1311	4.60	3.91	3.85	3.96	4.60
		Discus	aion															
1 Did al	acc dica			what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1490	5.00	4.27	4.05	4.11	5.00
				d to participate	1	0	0	0	0	0	6		1/1502	5.00	4.40	4.26	4.31	5.00
				d open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	0	6		1/1489	5.00	4.39	4.29	4.36	5.00
		echniques succe		a open arbeablion	1	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1006		3.99	4.00	3.99	
1	poorar or	John Pacco	55242		_	ŭ	Ū	ŭ	Ü	Ü		5.00	1,1000	3.00	3.,,	1.00	3.,,,	3.00
				Frequ	iency	Dist	trib	utio	n									
Credits E	arned	Expected Grades				Rea	asons	3			Туј	pe			Majors	;		
	00-27 0 0.00-0.99 0 A 2																	
00-27	00-27						quir	ea I	or Ma	a Jors	3	Т	Graduat	=	0	Majo	r.	1
28-55 56-83	1	2.00-2.99	0	C 0		Cos	nerai	1				0	Under-g	rad	7	Mon	major	6
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	1	D 0		Ger	nera.	т				U	onder-g.	Lau	,	NOII-	ıııa Jor	O
Grad. 0 3.50-4.00 1 F 0						רים.	ecti	700				0	#### - 1	Meane +	hara n	re not	enous	rh
Grau.	U	3.50-4.00	1	P 0		E16	-CLI	ves				U	respons				_	111
						O+1	har					3	T CPFOILE	-6 LU L	c argi.	ıııcaı		
				Ι υ	0 Other													

Page 16

JAN 18, 2007

Job IRBR3029

Course Section: AFST 275 0101 University of Maryland Page 17
Title CRIM JUST & BLACK AMER Baltimore County JAN 18, 2007

Instructor: BROOKS, GARY M

Enrollment: 12

Questionnaires: 10

# Fall 2006 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Job IRBR3029

			Fre	equei	ncie	S		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	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	0	1	8	4.60	478/1669	4.60	4.40	4.23	4.34	4.60
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	2	7	4.60	439/1666	4.60	4.18	4.19	4.29	4.60
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	217/1421	4.80	4.23	4.24	4.35	4.80
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	4	1	0	1	1	3	3.83	1207/1617	3.83	4.09	4.15	4.24	3.83
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	100/1555	4.90	4.41	4.00	3.96	4.90
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	6	0	1	0	0	3	4.25	659/1543	4.25	4.17	4.06	4.10	4.2
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	2	1	7	4.50	481/1647	4.50	3.99	4.12	4.19	4.50
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	5	5	4.50	1190/1668	4.50	4.48	4.67	4.59	4.50
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	1	6	1	4.00	918/1605	4.00	3.91	4.07	4.15	4.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	1	8	4.70	537/1514	4.70	4.07	4.39	4.39	4.70
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1551	5.00	4.84	4.66	4.72	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	3	6	4.50	556/1503	4.50	4.12	4.24	4.29	4.5
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	1	0	8	4.40	770/1506		4.20	4.26	4.33	4.4
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	8	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/1311	****	3.91	3.85	3.96	***
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	155/1490	4.89	4.27	4.05	4.11	4.8
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	256/1502		4.40	4.26	4.31	4.8
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	299/1489	4.89	4.39	4.29	4.36	4.8
4. Were special techniques successful	1	7	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1006	****	3.99	4.00	3.99	***
Frequ	ency	Dist	trib	ution	n									
Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades				Rea	ason	S			ТУ	pe			Majors	;
00-27 1 0.00-0.99 1 A 3		Red	quire	ed fo	or Ma	 ajor	 rs	 1	Graduat	 e	0	 Majo	 or	0

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	d Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	1	A	3	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	В	6						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	1	C	0	General	6	Under-grad	10	Non-major	10
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	4	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	n
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	3	_			
				?	0						

University of Maryland Baltimore County

Fall 2006

Page 18

JAN 18, 2007

Job IRBR3029

Enrollment: 18 Questionnaires: 6 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Course Section: AFST 344 0101

BLACK FOLKLORE

PETERS, JONATHA

Title

Instructor:

					Frequencies				Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect			
		Question	S		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		 Genera	 1															
1. Did yo	u gain ne	ew insights,ski	lls fro	m this course	0	0	0	0	3	3	0	3.50	1480/1669	3.50	4.40	4.23	4.28	3.50
2. Did th	e instru	ctor make clear	the ex	pected goals	0	0	0	1	4	1	0	3.00	1578/1666	3.00	4.18	4.19	4.20	3.00
3. Did th	e exam qu	estions reflec	t the e	xpected goals	0	0	0	3	1	2	0	2.83	1384/1421	2.83	4.23	4.24	4.25	2.83
4. Did ot	her evalu	uations reflect	the ex	pected goals	0	1	0	1	2	1	1	3.40	1425/1617	3.40	4.09	4.15	4.22	3.40
5. Did as	5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned						0	1	4	1	0	3.00	1427/1555	3.00	4.41	4.00	4.03	3.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned						0	0	1	3	0	2	3.50	1260/1543	3.50	4.17	4.06	4.14	3.50
7. Was the grading system clearly explained						0	2	2	2	0	0	2.00	1619/1647	2.00	3.99	4.12	4.14	2.00
8. How ma	8. How many times was class cancelled						0	0	0	1	5	4.83	844/1668	4.83	4.48	4.67	4.68	4.83
	9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectivenes						0	2	1	2	1	3.33	1428/1605	3.33	3.91	4.07	4.09	3.33
1 Were t	he instr	Lectur actor's lecture		prepared	1	0	1	0	2	1	1	3 20	1438/1514	3.20	4.07	4.39	4.46	3.20
					1	0	0	0	2	1	2		1404/1551	4.00	4.84	4.66	4.70	4.00
	2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly						0	0	3	2	0		1366/1503	3.40	4.12	4.24	4.28	3.40
		es contribute t			1	0 0	1	0	1	2	-		1347/1506		4.20	4.26	4.30	3.40
				our understanding	1	1	1	0	1	1	1		1057/1311		3.91	3.85		3.25
J. Dia aa	aiovibaa.	r ccciniiques en	nance y	our unacrocanaring	_	_	_	O	_	_	_	3.23	1037/1311	3.23	3.71	3.03	3.77	3.23
		Discus	sion															
1. Did cl	ass disc	ussions contrib	ute to	what you learned	2	0	1	0	2	1	0	2.75	1404/1490	2.75	4.27	4.05	4.11	2.75
2. Were a	ll studer	nts actively en	courage	d to participate	2	0	1	1	1	0	1	2.75	1450/1502	2.75	4.40	4.26	4.28	2.75
3. Did th	e instru	ctor encourage	fair an	d open discussion	2	0	1	0	2	1	0	2.75	1441/1489	2.75	4.39	4.29	4.35	2.75
4. Were s	pecial te	echniques succe	ssful		2	3	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1006	****	3.99	4.00	4.10	****
				Frequ	iency	/ Dist	trib	utio:	n									
Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Re	asons	3			Ту	pe			Majors	\$
														- 				
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 3		Red	quir	ed f	or Ma	ajors	3	2	Graduat	e	2	Majo	or	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В 1									_				_	
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	1	C 0	General							1	Under-g	rad	4	Non-	-major	6
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	2	D 0											_			
Grad.	2	3.50-4.00	1	F 0	Electives						1	#### -				_	jh	
				P 0							respons	es to b	e sign	nificar	ıt			
				I 0		Ot1	her					1						
				? 1														

Course Section: AFST 353 0101 University of Maryland Title AFR AMER HIST SINCE 18

Baltimore County Instructor: SUTTON, KAREN E Fall 2006

Enrollment: 5

Questionnaires: 4

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Page 19

JAN 18, 2007

Job IRBR3029

		Frequencies Ins						Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC Level		Sect
Questions		NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mear
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1669	5.00	4.40	4.23	4.28	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	777/1666	4.33	4.18	4.19	4.20	4.3
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1421	5.00	4.23	4.24	4.25	5.0
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	1	0	1	1	3.00	1516/1617	3.00	4.09	4.15	4.22	3.0
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learn	ned 0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1555	5.00	4.41	4.00	4.03	5.0
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you lea	rned 0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	180/1543	4.75	4.17	4.06	4.14	4.7
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	481/1647	4.50	3.99	4.12	4.14	4.5
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1668	5.00	4.48	4.67	4.68	5.0
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effective	eness 0	1	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	591/1605	4.33	3.91	4.07	4.09	4.3
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	2	0	2	4.00	1199/1514	4.00	4.07	4.39	4.46	4.0
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1551	5.00	4.84	4.66	4.70	5.0
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clear	rly 0	0	0	0	2	0	2	4.00	1066/1503	4.00	4.12	4.24	4.28	4.0
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	1	1	1	3.50	1319/1506	3.50	4.20	4.26	4.30	3.5
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understand	ling 0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1311	5.00	3.91	3.85	3.97	5.0
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learn	ned 0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	261/1490	4.75	4.27	4.05	4.11	4.7
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participa	ate 0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1502	5.00	4.40	4.26	4.28	5.0
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discuss	sion 0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1489	5.00	4.39	4.29	4.35	5.0
4. Were special techniques successful	0	3	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	479/1006	4.00	3.99	4.00	4.10	4.0
	Frequency	7 Dis	trib	utio:	n									
Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Gr	rades			Re	asons	S		Туре					5	
00-27 0 0 00-0 99 0 A 3		Required for Majors 2 Graduate 0						0	Maior					

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

#### Course Section: AFST 361 0101 University of Maryland Page 20 Title STUDIES IN BLACK DRAMA Baltimore County JAN 18, 2007 Fall 2006 Job IRBR3029

Instructor: PETERS, JONATHA

Enrollment: 5 Questionnaires: 2

			Fre	eque	ncie	S		Inst	tructor	Course Dept		UMBC Level		Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	F 00	1 /1 6 6 0	5.00	4.40	4 22	4 20	5.00
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1669			4.23	4.28	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1666 1/1421	5.00 5.00	4.18	4.19 4.24	4.20	5.00 5.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	-	-	-	-	0	2	5.00					4.25	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1617	5.00	4.09	4.15	4.22	5.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1555	5.00	4.41	4.00	4.03	5.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1543	5.00	4.17	4.06	4.14	5.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1647	5.00	3.99	4.12	4.14	5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1668	5.00	4.48	4.67	4.68	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	Τ	0	0	Τ	0	0	3.00	1501/1605	3.00	3.91	4.07	4.09	3.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	Ο	Ω	Λ	Λ	2	Λ	Λ	3 00	1457/1514	3.00	4.07	4.39	4.46	3.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1551	5.00	4.84	4.66	4.70	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	0	1		1066/1503	4.00	4.12	4.24	4.28	4.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	0	1		1069/1506		4.20	4.26	4.30	4.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50			3.91	3.85	3.97	3.50
J. Did addiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	U	U	U		U	U	_	3.30	JJJ/ IJII	3.30	3.91	3.03	3.91	3.30
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	849/1490	4.00	4.27	4.05	4.11	4.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	1013/1502	4.00	4.40	4.26	4.28	4.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	1038/1489	4.00	4.39	4.29	4.35	4.00
4. Were special techniques successful	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	479/1006	4.00	3.99	4.00	4.10	4.00
Frequ	iency	Dist	crib	utio	n									

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected	l Grades	Reasons		Туре	Majors		
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	А	2	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	0						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	2	Non-major	2
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	0	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	ı
				P	0			responses to	be sig	nificant	
				I	0	Other	1	_			
				?	0						

University of Maryland Page 21
Baltimore County JAN 18, 2007
Fall 2006 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Course Section: AFST 368 0101

8

AFRICAN RELIGIONS

LAMOUSE-SMITH,

Title

Instructor:

Enrollment:

Questionnaires: 5

Ouestions				NTD.	377		_	ncies		_		ructor	Course Dept Mean Mean		UMBC Level Mean Mean			
		Question	3		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		Genera	 1															
1. Did you o	ain new			n this course	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	207/1669	4.80	4.40	4.23	4.28	4.80
		r make clear			0	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	. ,	4.40	4.18	4.19	4.20	4.40
				spected goals	0	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40		4.40	4.23	4.24	4.25	4.40
	_	ions reflect		-	0	1	0	0	2	0	2	4.00	1029/1617	4.00	4.09	4.15	4.22	4.00
			_	what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	4		141/1555		4.41	4.00	4.03	4.80
	6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned						0	1	0	1	2		895/1543		4.17	4.06	4.14	4.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained						0	0	0	2	1	2	4.00	1043/1647	4.00	3.99	4.12	4.14	4.00
-	8. How many times was class cancelled							0	1	3	1	4.00	1530/1668	4.00	4.48	4.67	4.68	4.00
-	9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness							0	0	1							4.09	4.75
Lecture							0	0	1	1	2	4 40	055/1514	4 40	4 07	4 20	1 16	4 40
	1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared						0	0	1	1	3	4.40			4.07		4.46	4.40
	2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly						0	0	0	1		4.80	788/1551	4.80	4.84	4.66		4.80
		_			0	0	0	0	0	2		4.60 4.60		4.60 4.60	4.12	4.24		4.60 4.60
		contribute to	_	our understanding	0	1	0	0	0	0		5.00	1/1311		3.91			
5. Dia audio	ovisual t	echniques en	nance yo	our understanding	U	Τ	U	U	U	U	4	5.00	1/1311	5.00	3.91	3.85	3.97	5.00
		Discus	sion															
1. Did class	discuss	ions contrib	ute to v	what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	214/1490	4.80	4.27	4.05	4.11	4.80
2. Were all	students	actively en	couraged	d to participate	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	336/1502	4.80	4.40	4.26	4.28	4.80
3. Did the i	nstructo	r encourage :	fair and	d open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1489	5.00	4.39	4.29	4.35	5.00
4. Were spec	ial tech	niques succe	ssful		0	2	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	178/1006	4.67	3.99	4.00	4.10	4.67
				Freq	uency	7 Dis	trib	utio	n									
				- 1														
Credits Earr	ied	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	asons	3			Туј	pe			Majors	;
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	1	A 4		Re	guir	ed f	or Ma	jors	 3	1	Graduat	e	0	Majo	r )r	1
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	в 1			-			_						3 -		
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	1	C 0		Ger	nera	l				1	Under-g	rad	5	Non-	major	4
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	1	D 0									3				-	
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F 0	Electives							0	#### - 1	Means t	here a	re not	enoug	ſh
				P 0		210001702						respons	es to b	e sign	ifican	ıt		
				I 0	Other					2	_							
? 0																		

Course Section: AFST 375 0101 University of Maryland Page 22 THE BLACK CHURCH Baltimore County JAN 18, 2007 KING, SHARON Fall 2006 Job IRBR3029

C+11don+	00,,,,,,,,,	Errolmotion	Ouestionnaire
Student	Course	Evaluation	Ouestronnarie

Title

Instructor: Enrollment:

Questionnaires: 10

17

						Frequencies In					Inst	ructor	cuctor Course Dept			UMBC Level		
		Question	S		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		Genera	 1															
1. Did vo	ou gain n	ew insights,ski	_	m this course	0	0	0	1	1	2	6	4.30	852/1669	4.30	4.40	4.23	4.28	4.30
		ctor make clear			0	0	0	1	2	1	6	4.20	957/1666	4.20	4.18	4.19	4.20	4.20
		uestions reflec		_	1	4	1	0	0	1	3	4.00	969/1421	4.00	4.23	4.24	4.25	4.00
4. Did ot	her eval	uations reflect	the ex	pected goals	0	0	0	0	3	3	4	4.10	970/1617	4.10	4.09	4.15	4.22	4.10
5. Did as	ssigned re	eadings contrib	ute to	what you learned	0	0	0	1	3	1	5	4.00	773/1555	4.00	4.41	4.00	4.03	4.00
6. Did wr	6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned						0	0	2	3	4	4.22	690/1543	4.22	4.17	4.06	4.14	4.22
7. Was th	7. Was the grading system clearly explained						1	1	2	0	5	3.78	1265/1647	3.78	3.99	4.12	4.14	3.78
8. How ma	8. How many times was class cancelled						0	0	0	2	8	4.80	901/1668	4.80	4.48	4.67	4.68	4.80
				hing effectiveness	1	0	0	0	1	6	2	4.11	840/1605	4.11	3.91	4.07	4.09	4.11
Lecture 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared							0	0	2	1	7	4.50	799/1514	4.50	4.07	4.39	4.46	4.50
	2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject				0	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1551		4.84	4.66	4.70	5.00
				xplained clearly	0	0	1	0	2	1	6	4.10	1015/1503		4.12	4.24	4.28	4.10
		es contribute t		1	0	0	0	0	1	4	5	4.40	770/1506		4.20	4.26	4.30	4.40
				our understanding	1	0	0	1	3	0	5	4.00	587/1311	4.00	3.91	3.85	3.97	4.00
		Discus	sion															
1 Did cl	lass disc			what you learned	3	0	0	0	1	0	6	4.71	298/1490	4.71	4.27	4.05	4.11	4.71
				d to participate	3	0	0	0	1	1	5	4.57	567/1502		4.40	4.26	4.28	4.57
				d open discussion	4	0	0	1	0	0	5	4.50	684/1489	4.50	4.39	4.29	4.35	4.50
		echniques succe		a open alboabbion	4	0	0	1	0	1	4	4.33	344/1006		3.99	4.00	4.10	4.33
				Frequ	ionai	. Dia	+ r i b	1+101	_									
				riedo	aeric ₎	DIS	CIID	20101	.1									
Credits E	Earned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	asons	3			Ту	pe			Majors	}
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A 5		Re	quir	ed fo	or Ma	ajor	 S	2	Graduat	 e	0	Majo	r r	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В 2			_			-						3		
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	0-2.99 3 C 0				nera	l				3	Under-g	rad 1	.0	Non-	major	10
84-150																		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	0	F 0		El	ecti	ves				1	#### - 1	Means t	here a	re not	enoug	ıh
			P 0										respons	es to b	e sign	nificar	ıt	
				I 0		Ot]	her					1						

?

0