

Course-Section: AFST 100 0101
 Title INTRO BLACK EXPERIENCE
 Instructor: TEMPLE, CHRISTE
 Enrollment: 28
 Questionnaires: 24

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 22
 FEB 11, 2009
 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	3	4	6	11	4.04	1156/1649	4.25	4.47	4.28	4.11	4.04	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	3	4	5	12	4.08	1076/1648	4.17	4.35	4.23	4.16	4.08	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	2	3	0	8	11	3.96	992/1375	4.16	4.31	4.27	4.10	3.96	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	1	2	5	7	8	3.83	1248/1595	4.11	4.28	4.20	4.03	3.83	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	6	6	12	4.25	624/1533	4.14	4.35	4.04	3.87	4.25	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	4	3	7	8	3.63	1191/1512	4.13	4.19	4.10	3.86	3.63	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	3	4	4	5	7	3.39	1438/1623	3.89	4.21	4.16	4.08	3.39	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	21	3	4.13	1491/1646	4.63	4.67	4.69	4.67	4.13	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	2	2	0	4	9	4	3.68	1247/1621	4.21	4.05	4.06	3.96	3.68	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	1	3	3	7	10	3.92	1340/1568	4.16	4.41	4.43	4.39	3.92	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	2	21	4.91	532/1572	4.82	4.80	4.70	4.64	4.91	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	3	2	7	5	6	3.39	1429/1564	4.00	4.29	4.28	4.20	3.39	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	1	3	8	10	3.96	1159/1559	4.24	4.35	4.29	4.20	3.96	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	1	0	1	3	10	9	4.17	573/1352	4.57	4.17	3.98	3.86	4.17	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	3	0	6	10	4.21	697/1384	4.09	4.36	4.08	3.86	4.21	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	1	1	2	4	11	4.21	857/1382	4.25	4.52	4.29	4.03	4.21	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	1	2	0	1	15	4.42	732/1368	4.43	4.53	4.30	4.01	4.42	
4. Were special techniques successful	5	1	1	1	3	9	4	3.78	591/ 948	3.48	3.83	3.95	3.75	3.78	
Laboratory															
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	23	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 243	****	****	4.12	4.08	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	23	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 209	****	****	4.35	4.38	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	16	1	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/ 555	4.80	4.70	4.29	4.14	5.00	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	23	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 88	****	****	4.54	4.31	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	23	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 85	****	****	4.47	4.30	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	23	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 81	****	****	4.43	4.39	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	23	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 92	****	****	4.35	4.01	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	15	0	0	0	0	9	0	4.00	83/ 288	4.06	4.00	3.68	3.54	4.00	
Field Work															
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	23	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.47	4.36	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	23	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.38	4.37	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	21	1	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 312	4.00	4.05	3.68	3.51	****	
Self Paced															
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	9	0	0	0	0	15	0	4.00	40/ 110	3.89	3.93	3.99	3.83	4.00	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	4	0.00-0.99	0	A	6	Required for Majors	7	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	0	B	10						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	3	C	4	General	11	Under-grad	24	Non-major	24
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	5	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						

I	0	Other	2
?	0		

Course-Section: AFST 100 0201
 Title INTRO BLACK EXPERIENCE
 Instructor: SUTTON, KAREN E
 Enrollment: 16
 Questionnaires: 10

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 23
 FEB 11, 2009
 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	2	2	5	4.10	1116/1649	4.25	4.47	4.28	4.11	4.10	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	0	1	3	5	4.10	1065/1648	4.17	4.35	4.23	4.16	4.10	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	1	0	5	3	3.80	1087/1375	4.16	4.31	4.27	4.10	3.80	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	0	1	3	5	4.10	1010/1595	4.11	4.28	4.20	4.03	4.10	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	1	2	5	4.22	653/1533	4.14	4.35	4.04	3.87	4.22	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	5	4	4.44	465/1512	4.13	4.19	4.10	3.86	4.44	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	1	4	4	4.33	720/1623	3.89	4.21	4.16	4.08	4.33	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	881/1646	4.63	4.67	4.69	4.67	4.78	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	1	0	0	2	0	4	4.33	595/1621	4.21	4.05	4.06	3.96	4.33	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	1	1	1	2	5	3.90	1347/1568	4.16	4.41	4.43	4.39	3.90	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	2	7	4.60	1146/1572	4.82	4.80	4.70	4.64	4.60	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	2	0	1	2	5	3.80	1273/1564	4.00	4.29	4.28	4.20	3.80	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	0	1	1	6	3.90	1197/1559	4.24	4.35	4.29	4.20	3.90	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1352	4.57	4.17	3.98	3.86	5.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	1	0	1	1	2	3.60	1039/1384	4.09	4.36	4.08	3.86	3.60	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	1	0	0	1	3	4.00	946/1382	4.25	4.52	4.29	4.03	4.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	1	0	0	0	4	4.20	876/1368	4.43	4.53	4.30	4.01	4.20	
4. Were special techniques successful	5	2	1	0	0	0	2	3.67	645/ 948	3.48	3.83	3.95	3.75	3.67	
Laboratory															
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 555	4.80	4.70	4.29	4.14	****	
Seminar															
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	7	0	0	0	0	3	0	4.00	83/ 288	4.06	4.00	3.68	3.54	4.00	
Field Work															
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	9	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 312	4.00	4.05	3.68	3.51	****	
Self Paced															
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	3	0	0	0	0	7	0	4.00	40/ 110	3.89	3.93	3.99	3.83	4.00	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: AFST 100 0301
 Title INTRO BLACK EXPERIENCE
 Instructor: MACK-SHELTON, K
 Enrollment: 20
 Questionnaires: 15

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 24
 FEB 11, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR		Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	6	9	4.60	510/1649	4.25	4.47	4.28	4.11	4.60
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	8	6	4.33	797/1648	4.17	4.35	4.23	4.16	4.33
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	4	11	4.73	321/1375	4.16	4.31	4.27	4.10	4.73
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	5	8	4.40	636/1595	4.11	4.28	4.20	4.03	4.40
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	5	3	6	3.93	885/1533	4.14	4.35	4.04	3.87	3.93
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	8	6	4.33	595/1512	4.13	4.19	4.10	3.86	4.33
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	3	1	5	6	3.93	1134/1623	3.89	4.21	4.16	4.08	3.93
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	15	5.00	1/1646	4.63	4.67	4.69	4.67	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	6	9	4.60	288/1621	4.21	4.05	4.06	3.96	4.60
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	5	10	4.67	636/1568	4.16	4.41	4.43	4.39	4.67
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	14	4.93	414/1572	4.82	4.80	4.70	4.64	4.93
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	3	12	4.80	263/1564	4.00	4.29	4.28	4.20	4.80
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	13	4.87	250/1559	4.24	4.35	4.29	4.20	4.87
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	0	7	8	4.53	286/1352	4.57	4.17	3.98	3.86	4.53
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	3	2	10	4.47	478/1384	4.09	4.36	4.08	3.86	4.47
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	2	3	10	4.53	593/1382	4.25	4.52	4.29	4.03	4.53
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	1	3	11	4.67	522/1368	4.43	4.53	4.30	4.01	4.67
4. Were special techniques successful	0	9	0	2	3	0	1	3.00	844/ 948	3.48	3.83	3.95	3.75	3.00
Laboratory														
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	14	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 243	****	****	4.12	4.08	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	14	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 209	****	****	4.35	4.38	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	4	1	1	0	0	0	9	4.60	282/ 555	4.80	4.70	4.29	4.14	4.60
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	13	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 88	****	****	4.54	4.31	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	13	0	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/ 85	****	****	4.47	4.30	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 81	****	****	4.43	4.39	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	13	0	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/ 92	****	****	4.35	4.01	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	9	0	0	0	0	5	1	4.17	75/ 288	4.06	4.00	3.68	3.54	4.17
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.06	3.72	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	14	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.09	3.65	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	14	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.47	4.36	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	14	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.38	4.37	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	10	0	0	0	0	5	0	4.00	68/ 312	4.00	4.05	3.68	3.51	4.00
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 53	****	****	4.30	4.17	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	13	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.16	4.06	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	13	0	0	2	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 41	****	****	4.43	4.27	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	13	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 24	****	****	4.42	4.24	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	5	1	0	1	1	7	0	3.67	92/ 110	3.89	3.93	3.99	3.83	3.67

Course-Section: AFST 100 0301
 Title INTRO BLACK EXPERIENCE
 Instructor: MACK-SHELTON, K
 Enrollment: 20
 Questionnaires: 15

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 24
 FEB 11, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	0	A	2	Required for Majors	7	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B	6						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	1	C	7	General	4	Under-grad	15	Non-major	14
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F	0	Electives	2	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	3				
				?	0						

Course-Section: AFST 206 0101
 Title AFRICAN-AMER HIST SURV
 Instructor: SUTTON, KAREN E
 Enrollment: 29
 Questionnaires: 19

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 25
 FEB 11, 2009
 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	0	6	1	10	3.89	1279/1649	3.89	4.47	4.28	4.29	3.89	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	3	3	7	0	6	3.16	1579/1648	3.16	4.35	4.23	4.25	3.16	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	3	6	4	5	1	2.74	1355/1375	2.74	4.31	4.27	4.37	2.74	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	2	2	7	6	2	3.21	1497/1595	3.21	4.28	4.20	4.22	3.21	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	2	2	1	5	8	3.83	986/1533	3.83	4.35	4.04	4.04	3.83	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	1	3	3	1	6	4	3.29	1359/1512	3.29	4.19	4.10	4.14	3.29	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	2	0	4	8	5	3.74	1281/1623	3.74	4.21	4.16	4.21	3.74	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	1	0	1	9	7	4.17	1462/1646	4.17	4.67	4.69	4.63	4.17	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	1	1	2	3	6	0	3.17	1473/1621	3.17	4.05	4.06	4.01	3.17	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	5	2	5	3	3	2.83	1543/1568	2.83	4.41	4.43	4.39	2.83	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	1	4	13	4.67	1071/1572	4.67	4.80	4.70	4.73	4.67	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	5	2	2	4	4	3.00	1496/1564	3.00	4.29	4.28	4.27	3.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	9	1	0	3	4	2.53	1527/1559	2.53	4.35	4.29	4.33	2.53	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	1	0	2	4	11	4.33	457/1352	4.33	4.17	3.98	4.07	4.33	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	3	2	4	3	3	3.07	1250/1384	3.07	4.36	4.08	3.99	3.07	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	1	0	4	4	6	3.93	1005/1382	3.93	4.52	4.29	4.19	3.93	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	1	1	5	8	4.33	796/1368	4.33	4.53	4.30	4.21	4.33	
4. Were special techniques successful	3	6	0	3	3	3	1	3.20	811/ 948	3.20	3.83	3.95	3.89	3.20	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	14	3	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 221	****	****	4.16	4.45	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	15	0	0	1	0	3	0	3.50	****/ 243	****	****	4.12	4.47	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	15	2	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/ 212	****	****	4.40	4.62	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	15	2	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/ 209	****	****	4.35	4.64	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	12	2	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	282/ 555	4.60	4.70	4.29	4.33	4.60	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	16	1	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/ 88	****	****	4.54	3.75	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	17	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 85	****	****	4.47	3.33	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/ 81	****	****	4.43	3.67	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 92	****	****	4.35	5.00	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	14	0	0	0	1	4	0	3.80	167/ 288	3.80	4.00	3.68	3.65	3.80	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	****/ 52	****	****	4.06	3.93	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	16	0	0	1	1	1	0	3.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.09	4.05	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	16	0	0	1	0	1	1	3.67	****/ 39	****	****	4.47	4.49	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	16	0	0	1	0	1	1	3.67	****/ 39	****	****	4.38	3.66	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	15	0	0	0	1	3	0	3.75	****/ 312	****	4.05	3.68	3.59	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 53	****	****	4.30	4.07	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	17	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 30	****	****	4.16	1.50	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	17	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 41	****	****	4.43	3.50	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	17	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 24	****	****	4.42	2.00	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	6	0	0	0	1	12	0	3.92	73/ 110	3.92	3.93	3.99	3.72	3.92	

Course-Section: AFST 206 0101
 Title AFRICAN-AMER HIST SURV
 Instructor: SUTTON, KAREN E
 Enrollment: 29
 Questionnaires: 19

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 25
 FEB 11, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	7	Required for Majors	5	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	B	5						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	1	C	1	General	2	Under-grad	19	Non-major	19
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	4	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	1						
				I	0	Other	7				
				?	0						

Course-Section: AFST 212 0101
 Title AFRICAN HISTORY
 Instructor: CHUKU, GLORIA
 Enrollment: 24
 Questionnaires: 18

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 26
 FEB 11, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor Mean	Instructor Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5								

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	1	1	6	10	4.39	803/1649	4.39	4.47	4.28	4.29	4.39	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	5	10	4.33	797/1648	4.33	4.35	4.23	4.25	4.33	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	5	11	4.50	546/1375	4.50	4.31	4.27	4.37	4.50	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	0	2	6	9	4.22	853/1595	4.22	4.28	4.20	4.22	4.22	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	3	2	3	9	3.89	935/1533	3.89	4.35	4.04	4.04	3.89	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	3	1	5	9	4.11	826/1512	4.11	4.19	4.10	4.14	4.11	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	2	2	3	3	8	3.72	1287/1623	3.72	4.21	4.16	4.21	3.72	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	2	8	8	4.33	1340/1646	4.33	4.67	4.69	4.63	4.33	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	2	5	5	3	3.60	1302/1621	3.60	4.05	4.06	4.01	3.60	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	1	1	4	12	4.50	852/1568	4.50	4.41	4.43	4.39	4.50	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	4	14	4.78	894/1572	4.78	4.80	4.70	4.73	4.78	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	2	1	5	10	4.28	918/1564	4.28	4.29	4.28	4.27	4.28	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	0	5	12	4.56	640/1559	4.56	4.35	4.29	4.33	4.56	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	1	1	0	3	3	9	4.19	565/1352	4.19	4.17	3.98	4.07	4.19	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	4	7	3	3.93	867/1384	3.93	4.36	4.08	3.99	3.93	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	1	2	2	9	4.36	757/1382	4.36	4.52	4.29	4.19	4.36	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	1	0	1	2	10	4.43	732/1368	4.43	4.53	4.30	4.21	4.43	
4. Were special techniques successful	5	10	1	0	0	1	1	3.33	****/ 948	****	3.83	3.95	3.89	****	
Laboratory															
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	8	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/ 555	5.00	4.70	4.29	4.33	5.00	
Seminar															
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	9	0	0	0	0	9	0	4.00	83/ 288	4.00	4.00	3.68	3.65	4.00	
Field Work															
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	14	0	0	0	0	4	0	4.00	****/ 312	****	4.05	3.68	3.59	****	
Self Paced															
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	4	0	0	1	0	13	0	3.86	84/ 110	3.86	3.93	3.99	3.72	3.86	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	7	Required for Majors	8	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B	6						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	0	C	2	General	3	Under-grad	18	Non-major	18
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	5	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	3	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	3				
				?	1						

Course-Section: AFST 213 0101
 Title AFRICA: CULT/DEVELOPMN
 Instructor: BADRU, LATEEF
 Enrollment: 37
 Questionnaires: 27

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 27
 FEB 11, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor Mean	Instructor Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5								
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	1	3	6	17	4.44	723/1649	4.44	4.47	4.28	4.29	4.44	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	3	1	9	13	4.23	920/1648	4.23	4.35	4.23	4.25	4.23	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	7	0	2	4	5	9	4.05	932/1375	4.05	4.31	4.27	4.37	4.05	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	3	1	8	14	4.27	806/1595	4.27	4.28	4.20	4.22	4.27	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	2	2	8	13	4.28	594/1533	4.28	4.35	4.04	4.04	4.28	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	2	0	10	14	4.26	687/1512	4.26	4.19	4.10	4.14	4.26	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	2	2	7	6	9	3.69	1303/1623	3.69	4.21	4.16	4.21	3.69	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	12	14	4.54	1166/1646	4.54	4.67	4.69	4.63	4.54	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	12	0	0	0	3	8	4	4.07	881/1621	4.07	4.05	4.06	4.01	4.07	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	0	0	2	8	13	4.48	891/1568	4.48	4.41	4.43	4.39	4.48	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	2	5	18	4.64	1096/1572	4.64	4.80	4.70	4.73	4.64	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	1	2	9	12	4.33	854/1564	4.33	4.29	4.28	4.27	4.33	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	1	3	5	15	4.42	818/1559	4.42	4.35	4.29	4.33	4.42	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	5	3	0	1	6	2	10	4.11	633/1352	4.11	4.17	3.98	4.07	4.11	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	3	4	11	4.44	499/1384	4.44	4.36	4.08	3.99	4.44	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	9	0	0	0	3	5	10	4.39	732/1382	4.39	4.52	4.29	4.19	4.39	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	0	1	2	4	11	4.39	764/1368	4.39	4.53	4.30	4.21	4.39	
4. Were special techniques successful	10	3	0	1	2	4	7	4.21	357/ 948	4.21	3.83	3.95	3.89	4.21	
Laboratory															
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	22	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	****/ 555	****	4.70	4.29	4.33	****	
Seminar															
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	21	0	0	1	0	5	0	3.67	****/ 288	****	4.00	3.68	3.65	****	
Field Work															
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	24	0	0	1	0	2	0	3.33	****/ 312	****	4.05	3.68	3.59	****	
Self Paced															
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	16	0	0	0	0	10	1	4.09	39/ 110	4.09	3.93	3.99	3.72	4.09	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors		
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 14	Required for Majors 11	Graduate 0	Major 0
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B 4			
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	1	C 1	General 6	Under-grad 27	Non-major 27
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	2	D 0			
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5	F 0	Electives 0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	
				P 0			
				I 0	Other 2		
				? 2			

Course-Section: AFST 230 0101
 Title COMP AFRICAN RELIGIONS
 Instructor: ANSAHBREW, KWAM
 Enrollment: 32
 Questionnaires: 18

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 28
 FEB 11, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR NA		Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	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	1	0	5	11	4.53	617/1649	4.53	4.47	4.28	4.29	4.53
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	3	0	1	0	2	4	8	4.20	966/1648	4.20	4.35	4.23	4.25	4.20
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	1	3	13	4.71	360/1375	4.71	4.31	4.27	4.37	4.71	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	4	0	1	1	2	9	4.46	552/1595	4.46	4.28	4.20	4.22	4.46
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	2	3	11	4.56	319/1533	4.56	4.35	4.04	4.04	4.56
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	4	1	3	1	0	7	3.75	1119/1512	3.75	4.19	4.10	4.14	3.75
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	1	2	2	3	8	3.94	1134/1623	3.94	4.21	4.16	4.21	3.94
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	1	0	0	0	0	16	5.00	1/1646	5.00	4.67	4.69	4.63	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	0	1	0	2	6	3	3.83	1123/1621	3.83	4.05	4.06	4.01	3.83
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	1	1	4	0	11	4.12	1227/1568	4.12	4.41	4.43	4.39	4.12
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	1	1	0	15	4.71	1022/1572	4.71	4.80	4.70	4.73	4.71
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	1	0	3	2	10	4.25	939/1564	4.25	4.29	4.28	4.27	4.25
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	2	1	0	2	11	4.19	1016/1559	4.19	4.35	4.29	4.33	4.19
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	1	2	0	2	1	10	4.13	607/1352	4.13	4.17	3.98	4.07	4.13
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	1	1	9	4.73	275/1384	4.73	4.36	4.08	3.99	4.73
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	0	0	0	2	9	4.82	332/1382	4.82	4.52	4.29	4.19	4.82
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	264/1368	4.90	4.53	4.30	4.21	4.90
4. Were special techniques successful	7	5	1	0	0	0	5	4.33	310/ 948	4.33	3.83	3.95	3.89	4.33
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	16	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 221	****	****	4.16	4.45	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 243	****	****	4.12	4.47	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 212	****	****	4.40	4.62	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 209	****	****	4.35	4.64	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	10	0	1	0	0	0	7	4.50	293/ 555	4.50	4.70	4.29	4.33	4.50
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 88	****	****	4.54	3.75	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 85	****	****	4.47	3.33	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 81	****	****	4.43	3.67	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 92	****	****	4.35	5.00	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	14	0	0	0	0	3	1	4.25	****/ 288	****	4.00	3.68	3.65	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.06	3.93	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.09	4.05	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.47	4.49	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.38	3.66	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	15	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	****/ 312	****	4.05	3.68	3.59	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 53	****	****	4.30	4.07	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.16	1.50	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 41	****	****	4.43	3.50	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 24	****	****	4.42	2.00	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	12	0	0	0	0	5	1	4.17	30/ 110	4.17	3.93	3.99	3.72	4.17

Course-Section: AFST 230 0101
 Title COMP AFRICAN RELIGIONS
 Instructor: ANSAHBREW, KWAM
 Enrollment: 32
 Questionnaires: 18

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 28
 FEB 11, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: AFST 275 0101
 Title CRIM JUST & BLACK AMER
 Instructor: BROOKS, GARY M
 Enrollment: 19
 Questionnaires: 17

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 29
 FEB 11, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	4	13	4.76	317/1649	4.76	4.47	4.28	4.29	4.76	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	4	13	4.76	253/1648	4.76	4.35	4.23	4.25	4.76	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	3	12	4.59	480/1375	4.59	4.31	4.27	4.37	4.59	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	5	0	2	0	2	8	4.33	722/1595	4.33	4.28	4.20	4.22	4.33	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	2	2	11	4.60	288/1533	4.60	4.35	4.04	4.04	4.60	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	6	1	0	1	1	6	4.22	723/1512	4.22	4.19	4.10	4.14	4.22	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	1	2	13	4.75	220/1623	4.75	4.21	4.16	4.21	4.75	
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	1	0	0	7	7	4.27	1391/1646	4.27	4.67	4.69	4.63	4.27	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	0	1	6	5	4.33	595/1621	4.33	4.05	4.06	4.01	4.33	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	2	14	4.76	461/1568	4.76	4.41	4.43	4.39	4.76	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	17	5.00	1/1572	5.00	4.80	4.70	4.73	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	2	14	4.76	326/1564	4.76	4.29	4.28	4.27	4.76	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	3	13	4.71	463/1559	4.71	4.35	4.29	4.33	4.71	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	1	0	3	4	9	4.18	573/1352	4.18	4.17	3.98	4.07	4.18	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	2	0	12	4.71	284/1384	4.71	4.36	4.08	3.99	4.71	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	1	1	12	4.79	362/1382	4.79	4.52	4.29	4.19	4.79	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	1	1	12	4.79	392/1368	4.79	4.53	4.30	4.21	4.79	
4. Were special techniques successful	3	4	0	0	1	1	8	4.70	143/ 948	4.70	3.83	3.95	3.89	4.70	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	15	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 221	****	****	4.16	4.45	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 243	****	****	4.12	4.47	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	15	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 212	****	****	4.40	4.62	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	15	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 209	****	****	4.35	4.64	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	14	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 555	****	4.70	4.29	4.33	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	15	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 88	****	****	4.54	3.75	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	15	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 85	****	****	4.47	3.33	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	15	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 81	****	****	4.43	3.67	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 92	****	****	4.35	5.00	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	13	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	****/ 288	****	4.00	3.68	3.65	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.06	3.93	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	15	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.09	4.05	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	15	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.47	4.49	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	15	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.38	3.66	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	11	1	0	0	0	4	1	4.20	57/ 312	4.20	4.05	3.68	3.59	4.20	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 53	****	****	4.30	4.07	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	15	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.16	1.50	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	15	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 41	****	****	4.43	3.50	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	15	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 24	****	****	4.42	2.00	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	7	1	0	0	0	8	1	4.11	37/ 110	4.11	3.93	3.99	3.72	4.11	

Course-Section: AFST 275 0101
 Title CRIM JUST & BLACK AMER
 Instructor: BROOKS, GARY M
 Enrollment: 19
 Questionnaires: 17

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 29
 FEB 11, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	A	8	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B	3						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	2	C	2	General	10	Under-grad	17	Non-major	17
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	1				
				?	0						

Course-Section: AFST 312 0101
 Title WEST AFRICAN HISTORY
 Instructor: CHUKU, GLORIA
 Enrollment: 14
 Questionnaires: 10

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 30
 FEB 11, 2009
 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	2	2	5	4.10	1116/1649	4.10	4.47	4.28	4.27	4.10	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	3	1	3	3	3.60	1448/1648	3.60	4.35	4.23	4.18	3.60	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	3	5	4.20	855/1375	4.20	4.31	4.27	4.22	4.20	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	3	2	4	3.90	1202/1595	3.90	4.28	4.20	4.21	3.90	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	1	0	3	4	3.60	1180/1533	3.60	4.35	4.04	4.05	3.60	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	1	3	0	5	3.70	1149/1512	3.70	4.19	4.10	4.11	3.70	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	3	0	3	3	3.40	1434/1623	3.40	4.21	4.16	4.08	3.40	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	833/1646	4.80	4.67	4.69	4.67	4.80	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	1	2	2	3	0	2.88	1541/1621	2.88	4.05	4.06	4.02	2.88	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	1	4	4	4.33	1050/1568	4.33	4.41	4.43	4.39	4.33	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	1	1	7	4.67	1071/1572	4.67	4.80	4.70	4.64	4.67	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	1	0	4	0	4	3.67	1336/1564	3.67	4.29	4.28	4.25	3.67	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	1	3	4	4.11	1067/1559	4.11	4.35	4.29	4.23	4.11	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	1	2	2	2	2	0	2.50	1301/1352	2.50	4.17	3.98	3.97	2.50	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	3	1	3	4.00	795/1384	4.00	4.36	4.08	4.11	4.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	3	1	3	4.00	946/1382	4.00	4.52	4.29	4.37	4.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	2	3	2	4.00	948/1368	4.00	4.53	4.30	4.39	4.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	3	4	2	0	0	0	1	2.33	926/ 948	2.33	3.83	3.95	4.00	2.33	
Laboratory															
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	7	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/ 555	5.00	4.70	4.29	4.22	5.00	
Seminar															
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	6	0	0	0	0	4	0	4.00	83/ 288	4.00	4.00	3.68	3.58	4.00	
Field Work															
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	8	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 312	****	4.05	3.68	3.60	****	
Self Paced															
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	4	0	0	1	0	5	0	3.67	92/ 110	3.67	3.93	3.99	4.05	3.67	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: AFST 320 0101
 Title CONTEMP AFRICAN POLITI
 Instructor: BADRU, LATEEF
 Enrollment: 29
 Questionnaires: 15

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 31
 FEB 11, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor Mean	Instructor Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5								

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	0	14	4.87	221/1649	4.87	4.47	4.28	4.27	4.87	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	4	10	4.60	441/1648	4.60	4.35	4.23	4.18	4.60	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	1	0	2	11	4.64	422/1375	4.64	4.31	4.27	4.22	4.64	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	4	11	4.73	254/1595	4.73	4.28	4.20	4.21	4.73	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	13	4.87	124/1533	4.87	4.35	4.04	4.05	4.87	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	14	4.93	77/1512	4.93	4.19	4.10	4.11	4.93	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	0	0	1	2	11	4.71	261/1623	4.71	4.21	4.16	4.08	4.71	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	1	6	8	4.47	1230/1646	4.47	4.67	4.69	4.67	4.47	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	1	0	0	0	3	5	4.63	270/1621	4.63	4.05	4.06	4.02	4.63	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	3	11	4.79	424/1568	4.79	4.41	4.43	4.39	4.79	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	14	5.00	1/1572	5.00	4.80	4.70	4.64	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	3	11	4.79	294/1564	4.79	4.29	4.28	4.25	4.79	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	2	12	4.86	261/1559	4.86	4.35	4.29	4.23	4.86	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	1	0	0	1	2	9	4.67	208/1352	4.67	4.17	3.98	3.97	4.67	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	135/1384	4.92	4.36	4.08	4.11	4.92	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	218/1382	4.92	4.52	4.29	4.37	4.92	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	237/1368	4.92	4.53	4.30	4.39	4.92	
4. Were special techniques successful	3	2	1	1	0	1	7	4.20	365/ 948	4.20	3.83	3.95	4.00	4.20	
Laboratory															
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	11	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/ 555	5.00	4.70	4.29	4.22	5.00	
Seminar															
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	13	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 288	****	4.00	3.68	3.58	****	
Self Paced															
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	10	0	0	1	0	4	0	3.60	94/ 110	3.60	3.93	3.99	4.05	3.60	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	10	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	1						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	2	C	1	General	7	Under-grad	15	Non-major	15
84-150	6	3.00-3.49	6	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F	1	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	5				
				?	0						

Course-Section: AFST 350 0101
 Title PSYCHOLOGY OF RACISM
 Instructor: ROBINSON, THOMA
 Enrollment: 29
 Questionnaires: 22

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 32
 FEB 11, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor Mean	Instructor Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5								

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	2	3	17	4.68	408/1649	4.68	4.47	4.28	4.27	4.68	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	4	17	4.73	291/1648	4.73	4.35	4.23	4.18	4.73	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	3	18	4.77	271/1375	4.77	4.31	4.27	4.22	4.77	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	4	4	14	4.45	566/1595	4.45	4.28	4.20	4.21	4.45	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	6	14	4.55	334/1533	4.55	4.35	4.04	4.05	4.55	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	2	4	4	10	3.82	1082/1512	3.82	4.19	4.10	4.11	3.82	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	0	4	17	4.68	296/1623	4.68	4.21	4.16	4.08	4.68	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	22	5.00	1/1646	5.00	4.67	4.69	4.67	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	1	0	0	2	7	8	4.35	571/1621	4.35	4.05	4.06	4.02	4.35	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	2	19	4.90	245/1568	4.90	4.41	4.43	4.39	4.90	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	21	5.00	1/1572	5.00	4.80	4.70	4.64	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	3	18	4.86	216/1564	4.86	4.29	4.28	4.25	4.86	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	2	19	4.82	306/1559	4.82	4.35	4.29	4.23	4.82	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	1	0	4	5	11	4.19	556/1352	4.19	4.17	3.98	3.97	4.19	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	3	4	11	4.44	499/1384	4.44	4.36	4.08	4.11	4.44	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	0	2	2	14	4.67	483/1382	4.67	4.52	4.29	4.37	4.67	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	1	1	2	14	4.61	569/1368	4.61	4.53	4.30	4.39	4.61	
4. Were special techniques successful	4	11	0	0	3	2	2	3.86	555/ 948	3.86	3.83	3.95	4.00	3.86	
Laboratory															
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	15	1	0	0	1	0	5	4.67	272/ 555	4.67	4.70	4.29	4.22	4.67	
Seminar															
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 85	****	****	4.47	4.55	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	16	1	0	1	0	4	0	3.60	****/ 288	****	4.00	3.68	3.58	****	
Field Work															
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	16	0	0	0	0	6	0	4.00	68/ 312	4.00	4.05	3.68	3.60	4.00	
Self Paced															
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	14	0	0	1	0	7	0	3.75	88/ 110	3.75	3.93	3.99	4.05	3.75	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	1	A	6	Required for Majors	2	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B	11						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	5	C	2	General	10	Under-grad	22	Non-major	21
84-150	7	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	8				
				?	0						

Course-Section: AFST 352 0101
 Title AFAM HISTORY TO 1865
 Instructor: MACK-SHELTON, K
 Enrollment: 3
 Questionnaires: 2

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 33
 FEB 11, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean		
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5						Mean	Rank

General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	644/1649	4.50	4.47	4.28	4.27	4.50
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1648	5.00	4.35	4.23	4.18	5.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1375	5.00	4.31	4.27	4.22	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1595	5.00	4.28	4.20	4.21	5.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1533	5.00	4.35	4.04	4.05	5.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1512	5.00	4.19	4.10	4.11	5.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1623	5.00	4.21	4.16	4.08	5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1646	5.00	4.67	4.69	4.67	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	914/1621	4.00	4.05	4.06	4.02	4.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1568	5.00	4.41	4.43	4.39	5.00
Laboratory														
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 555	5.00	4.70	4.29	4.22	5.00
Seminar														
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	83/ 288	4.00	4.00	3.68	3.58	4.00
Self Paced														
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	40/ 110	4.00	3.93	3.99	4.05	4.00

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: AFST 360 0101
 Title STUDIES IN BLACK FICTI
 Instructor: TEMPLE, CHRISTE
 Enrollment: 13
 Questionnaires: 9

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 34
 FEB 11, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	0	8	4.78	306/1649	4.78	4.47	4.28	4.27	4.78	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	161/1648	4.89	4.35	4.23	4.18	4.89	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	5	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	546/1375	4.50	4.31	4.27	4.22	4.50	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	150/1595	4.88	4.28	4.20	4.21	4.88	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	115/1533	4.89	4.35	4.04	4.05	4.89	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	1	7	4.67	263/1512	4.67	4.19	4.10	4.11	4.67	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	3	6	4.67	321/1623	4.67	4.21	4.16	4.08	4.67	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	1	4	4	4.33	1340/1646	4.33	4.67	4.69	4.67	4.33	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	1	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	191/1621	4.71	4.05	4.06	4.02	4.71	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	273/1568	4.89	4.41	4.43	4.39	4.89	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1572	5.00	4.80	4.70	4.64	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	310/1564	4.78	4.29	4.28	4.25	4.78	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	227/1559	4.89	4.35	4.29	4.23	4.89	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	1	0	0	4	0	4	4.00	690/1352	4.00	4.17	3.98	3.97	4.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	160/1384	4.89	4.36	4.08	4.11	4.89	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	262/1382	4.89	4.52	4.29	4.37	4.89	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	1	0	8	4.78	403/1368	4.78	4.53	4.30	4.39	4.78	
4. Were special techniques successful	0	8	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 948	****	3.83	3.95	4.00	****	
Laboratory															
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	7	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 555	****	4.70	4.29	4.22	****	
Seminar															
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	8	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 288	****	4.00	3.68	3.58	****	
Field Work															
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	8	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 312	****	4.05	3.68	3.60	****	
Self Paced															
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	3	0	0	0	0	6	0	4.00	40/ 110	4.00	3.93	3.99	4.05	4.00	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	1	A	7	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	2						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	4	Under-grad	9	Non-major	9
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	5				
				?	0						

Course-Section: AFST 369 0101
 Title BLACK FAMILIES IN U.S.
 Instructor: KING, SHARON
 Enrollment: 14
 Questionnaires: 5

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 35
 FEB 11, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor Mean	Instructor Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5								

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	274/1649	4.80	4.47	4.28	4.27	4.80	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	441/1648	4.60	4.35	4.23	4.18	4.60	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	464/1375	4.60	4.31	4.27	4.22	4.60	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	383/1595	4.60	4.28	4.20	4.21	4.60	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	288/1533	4.60	4.35	4.04	4.05	4.60	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	194/1512	4.75	4.19	4.10	4.11	4.75	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	220/1623	4.75	4.21	4.16	4.08	4.75	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1646	5.00	4.67	4.69	4.67	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	374/1621	4.50	4.05	4.06	4.02	4.50	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	387/1568	4.80	4.41	4.43	4.39	4.80	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	1146/1572	4.60	4.80	4.70	4.64	4.60	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	263/1564	4.80	4.29	4.28	4.25	4.80	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	586/1559	4.60	4.35	4.29	4.23	4.60	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	1	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1352	5.00	4.17	3.98	3.97	5.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	201/1384	4.80	4.36	4.08	4.11	4.80	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1382	5.00	4.52	4.29	4.37	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1368	5.00	4.53	4.30	4.39	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	0	1	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/ 948	5.00	3.83	3.95	4.00	5.00	
Laboratory															
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	3	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	490/ 555	3.00	4.70	4.29	4.22	3.00	
Seminar															
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	4	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 288	****	4.00	3.68	3.58	****	
Field Work															
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	4	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 312	****	4.05	3.68	3.60	****	
Self Paced															
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	2	0	0	0	0	3	0	4.00	40/ 110	4.00	3.93	3.99	4.05	4.00	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 3	Required for Majors 0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B 1	Graduate 0
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	1	C 0	Major 0
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	0	D 0	Non-major 5
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	0	F 0	
				P 0	
				I 0	
				? 0	

- Means there are not enough responses to be significant

Course-Section: AFST 370 0101
 Title BLK WOMEN:CROSS-CULT P
 Instructor: TEMPLE, CHRISTE
 Enrollment: 19
 Questionnaires: 6

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 36
 FEB 11, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	2	3	4.33	871/1649	4.33	4.47	4.28	4.27	4.33	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	3	2	4.17	999/1648	4.17	4.35	4.23	4.18	4.17	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	0	3	2	4.00	950/1375	4.00	4.31	4.27	4.22	4.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	2	1	3.67	1335/1595	3.67	4.28	4.20	4.21	3.67	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	0	3	2	3.83	986/1533	3.83	4.35	4.04	4.05	3.83	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	1	2	2	3.67	1170/1512	3.67	4.19	4.10	4.11	3.67	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	2	3	4.33	720/1623	4.33	4.21	4.16	4.08	4.33	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	782/1646	4.83	4.67	4.69	4.67	4.83	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	595/1621	4.33	4.05	4.06	4.02	4.33	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	3	2	4.17	1191/1568	4.17	4.41	4.43	4.39	4.17	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	0	5	4.67	1071/1572	4.67	4.80	4.70	4.64	4.67	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	2	2	2	4.00	1127/1564	4.00	4.29	4.28	4.25	4.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	2	3	4.33	901/1559	4.33	4.35	4.29	4.23	4.33	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	556/1352	4.20	4.17	3.98	3.97	4.20	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	2	3	4.33	613/1384	4.33	4.36	4.08	4.11	4.33	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	616/1382	4.50	4.52	4.29	4.37	4.50	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	2	0	2	2	3.67	1129/1368	3.67	4.53	4.30	4.39	3.67	
4. Were special techniques successful	0	1	1	0	1	2	1	3.40	746/ 948	3.40	3.83	3.95	4.00	3.40	
Laboratory															
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 555	****	4.70	4.29	4.22	****	
Seminar															
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	5	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 288	****	4.00	3.68	3.58	****	
Field Work															
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	3	0	0	0	0	3	0	4.00	68/ 312	4.00	4.05	3.68	3.60	4.00	
Self Paced															
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	2	0	0	0	0	4	0	4.00	40/ 110	4.00	3.93	3.99	4.05	4.00	

Frequency Distribution

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

- Means there are not enough responses to be significant

Course-Section: AFST 385 0101
 Title PROB SOLV URBAN BLK CO
 Instructor: HICKEY, TERRY
 Enrollment: 22
 Questionnaires: 19

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 37
 FEB 11, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	1	0	0	3	15	4.63	471/1649	4.63	4.47	4.28	4.27	4.63	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	5	12	4.47	599/1648	4.47	4.35	4.23	4.18	4.47	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	11	0	0	1	1	6	4.63	443/1375	4.63	4.31	4.27	4.22	4.63	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	5	12	4.47	538/1595	4.47	4.28	4.20	4.21	4.47	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	0	0	4	13	4.56	327/1533	4.56	4.35	4.04	4.05	4.56	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	1	0	5	10	4.50	380/1512	4.50	4.19	4.10	4.11	4.50	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	2	0	1	4	11	4.22	849/1623	4.22	4.21	4.16	4.08	4.22	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	4	14	4.78	881/1646	4.78	4.67	4.69	4.67	4.78	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	8	0	0	1	1	7	2	3.91	1060/1621	3.91	4.05	4.06	4.02	3.91	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	1	0	1	4	13	4.47	891/1568	4.47	4.41	4.43	4.39	4.47	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	2	17	4.89	615/1572	4.89	4.80	4.70	4.64	4.89	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	1	3	3	12	4.37	822/1564	4.37	4.29	4.28	4.25	4.37	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	5	13	4.63	549/1559	4.63	4.35	4.29	4.23	4.63	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	1	2	0	3	4	7	3.88	836/1352	3.88	4.17	3.98	3.97	3.88	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	1	2	14	4.76	238/1384	4.76	4.36	4.08	4.11	4.76	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	1	1	15	4.82	322/1382	4.82	4.52	4.29	4.37	4.82	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	1	0	2	14	4.71	484/1368	4.71	4.53	4.30	4.39	4.71	
4. Were special techniques successful	2	8	1	0	2	2	4	3.89	542/ 948	3.89	3.83	3.95	4.00	3.89	
Laboratory															
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 243	****	****	4.12	3.89	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 212	****	****	4.40	4.21	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	11	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/ 555	5.00	4.70	4.29	4.22	5.00	
Seminar															
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	14	0	0	0	0	5	0	4.00	83/ 288	4.00	4.00	3.68	3.58	4.00	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.06	3.59	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	18	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.09	4.21	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	17	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 39	****	****	4.47	4.43	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 53	****	****	4.30	4.32	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	14	0	0	0	0	5	0	4.00	40/ 110	4.00	3.93	3.99	4.05	4.00	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors		
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A 14	Required for Majors 2	Graduate 0	Major 0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B 2			
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	1	C 0	General 8	Under-grad 19	Non-major 19
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	3	D 0			
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	6	F 0	Electives 2	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	
				P 0			
				I 0	Other 2		
				? 0			

Course-Section: AFST 390 0101
 Title AMER HLTH CARE & BLK C
 Instructor: PIGATT-CANTY, W
 Enrollment: 14
 Questionnaires: 11

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 38
 FEB 11, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor Mean	Instructor Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5								
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	2	1	8	4.55	590/1649	4.55	4.47	4.28	4.27	4.55	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	2	8	4.64	401/1648	4.64	4.35	4.23	4.18	4.64	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	3	1	1	6	3.91	1034/1375	3.91	4.31	4.27	4.22	3.91	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	3	2	5	4.20	890/1595	4.20	4.28	4.20	4.21	4.20	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	2	7	4.45	421/1533	4.45	4.35	4.04	4.05	4.45	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	1	4	5	4.09	839/1512	4.09	4.19	4.10	4.11	4.09	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	3	2	6	4.27	791/1623	4.27	4.21	4.16	4.08	4.27	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1646	5.00	4.67	4.69	4.67	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	3	3	3	4.00	914/1621	4.00	4.05	4.06	4.02	4.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	2	1	7	4.50	852/1568	4.50	4.41	4.43	4.39	4.50	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	840/1572	4.80	4.80	4.70	4.64	4.80	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	1	1	8	4.70	434/1564	4.70	4.29	4.28	4.25	4.70	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	1	0	1	7	4.20	1009/1559	4.20	4.35	4.29	4.23	4.20	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	3	1	1	1	1	3	3.57	1016/1352	3.57	4.17	3.98	3.97	3.57	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	437/1384	4.50	4.36	4.08	4.11	4.50	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	616/1382	4.50	4.52	4.29	4.37	4.50	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	0	1	0	5	4.67	522/1368	4.67	4.53	4.30	4.39	4.67	
4. Were special techniques successful	5	1	0	1	1	0	3	4.00	431/ 948	4.00	3.83	3.95	4.00	4.00	
Laboratory															
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	6	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/ 555	5.00	4.70	4.29	4.22	5.00	
Seminar															
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	4	0	0	0	0	7	0	4.00	83/ 288	4.00	4.00	3.68	3.58	4.00	
Field Work															
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	10	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 312	****	4.05	3.68	3.60	****	
Self Paced															
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	4	0	0	0	0	7	0	4.00	40/ 110	4.00	3.93	3.99	4.05	4.00	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	1	A	5	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	2						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	1	C	2	General	4	Under-grad	11	Non-major	11
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	5				
				?	1						