Title INTRO BLACK EXPERIENCE

Instructor: MACK-SHELTON, K

Enrollment: 45

Spring 2009 Questionnaires: 32

Page JUL 2, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questi	tionnaire
----------------------------------	-----------

University of Maryland

Baltimore County

			Fre	eauer	ncies	3		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Ouestions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank		Mean			Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	5	7	20	4.47	697/1576	3.65	4.36	4.30	4.11	4.47
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	9	5	17	4.19	1005/1576	3.62	4.26	4.27	4.18	4.19
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	2	4	8	18	4.31	788/1342	3.69	4.30	4.32	4.19	4.31
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	5	7	19	4.45	597/1520	3.78	4.23	4.25	4.09	4.45
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	1	5	5	20	4.31	587/1465	3.72	4.34	4.12	4.02	4.31
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	3	1	3	2	6	16	4.18	768/1434	3.59	3.97	4.14	3.94	4.18
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	5	6	20	4.41	690/1547	3.94	4.05	4.19	4.10	4.41
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	31	4.97	188/1574	4.73	4.65	4.64	4.59	4.97
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	9	23	4.72	222/1554	3.50	4.02	4.10	4.01	4.72
- ·														
Lecture	0	0	0	0	_	_	0.1	4 50	760/1400	2.66	4 22	4 45	4 47	4 50
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	2	9	21	4.59	762/1488	3.66	4.33	4.47	4.41	4.59
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	1	30	4.91	557/1493	4.32	4.77	4.73	4.65	4.91
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	2	6	23	4.68	453/1486	3.91	4.29	4.32	4.26	4.68
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	2	5	24	4.71	448/1489	3.72	4.36	4.32		4.71
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	2	0	0	5	2	22	4.59	268/1277	4.26	3.99	4.03	3.91	4.59
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	3	7	22	4.59	387/1279	4.00	4.19	4.17	3.96	4.59
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	4	7	21	4.53	612/1270	4.17	4.56	4.35	4.09	4.53
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	1	2	4	25	4.66	543/1269	4.18	4.52	4.35	4.09	4.66
4. Were special techniques successful	1	13	3	1	9	2	3	3.06	796/ 878		3.79		3.91	
	_		_	_	-	_	_		,					
Laboratory														
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	29	0	1	0	0	0	2	3.67	****/ 240	****	****	4.35	4.29	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	29	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 232	****	****	4.29	4.27	****
Seminar  2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	20	1	0	0	0	1	1	4 50	****/ 79	****	****	4.69	4.52	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	29 25	1 2	0	0	0 1	1	1 4		****/ 375	****	5.00		1.52	****
5. Were criteria for grading made crear	25	۷	U	U	Τ	U	4	4.00	/ 3/5		5.00	4.01	3.70	
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	30	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 52	****	****	4.48	4.20	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	30	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 48	****	****	4.40	4.11	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	30	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 44	****	****	4.73	4.71	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	30	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 45	****	****	4.57	4.72	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	28	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	****/ 326	****	5.00	4.03	3.64	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	30	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 40	****	****	4.60	4.44	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	30	1	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 24	****	****	4.83	4.71	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	30	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 35	****	****	4.67	4.68	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	30	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 28	****	****	4.78	4.65	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	26	1	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	****/ 382	****	5.00	4.08	3.86	****

Title INTRO BLACK EXPERIENCE

Instructor:

MACK-SHELTON, K

Enrollment: 45 Questionnaires: 32 Baltimore County Spring 2009

Page JUL 2, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

University of Maryland

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expecte	d Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	7	0.00-0.99	0	 А	14	Required for Majors	23	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	6	1.00-1.99	0	В	11						
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	6	C	7	General	6	Under-grad	32	Non-major	32
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	4	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means	there	are not enough	h
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	2	-			
				?	0						

INTRO BLACK EXPERIENCE

Title Instructor: SUTTON, KAREN E

Enrollment:

Questionnaires: 18

35

Spring 2009

Page JUL 2, 2009 Job IRBR3029

#### Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

University of Maryland

Baltimore County

			Fre	eauer	ncies	3		Inst	tructor	Course	Dept.	UMBC:	Level	Sect
Ouestions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank		_		Mean	
**************************************														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	6	1	6	0	5	2.83	1554/1576	3.65	4.36	4.30	4.11	2.83
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	4	1	7	2	4		1519/1576	3.62	4.26	4.27	4.18	3.06
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	1	3	3	6	0	5		1290/1342	3.69	4.30	4.32	4.19	3.06
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	2	4	5	2	4		1461/1520	3.78	4.23	4.25	4.09	3.12
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	4	2	4	2	_		1366/1465	3.72		4.12	4.02	3.12
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	4	2	5	2			1380/1434	3.59		4.14	3.94	3.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	1	2	8	0			1356/1547	3.94	4.05	4.19	4.10	3.47
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	9			1079/1574	4.73	4.65	4.64	4.59	4.50
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	1	4	1	5	1			1541/1554		4.02		4.01	
7. now would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	O	_	1	_	5	_	U	2.27	1311/1331	3.30	1.02	1.10	1.01	2.27
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	6	1	3	1	4	2 73	1471/1488	3.66	4.33	4.47	4.41	2.73
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	1	1	4	4	5		1456/1493	4.32	4.77	4.73	4.65	3.73
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	2	2	7	0	_		1407/1486	3.91	4.29	4.32	4.26	3.13
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	6	1	3	1	4		1456/1489	3.72	4.36	4.32		2.73
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	0	2	0	2	3	7	3.93	780/1277	4.26	3.99	4.03	3.91	
5. Did addiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	U	2	U	2	3	/	3.93	700/12/7	4.20	3.99	4.03	3.91	3.93
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	1	2	2	2	3	2 40	1106/1279	4.00	4.19	4.17	3.96	3.40
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	2	1	0	1	<i>5</i>		100/12/9	4.17	4.19	4.17	4.09	3.40
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	2	1	1	0	6		1055/1269	4.17	4.52	4.35	4.09	3.70
	8	2	2	2	0	0							3.91	
4. Were special techniques successful	8	2	4	2	U	U	4	3.25	770/ 878	3.15	3.79	4.05	3.91	3.25
Laboratory														
Laboratory	1.0	0	0	0	0	0	2	F 00	++++/ 024	++++	****	4 02	4 00	****
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	16	0	0		0	-	_		****/ 234	****	****	4.23	4.08	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	16	0	•	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 240	****	****	4.35	4.29	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	17 17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 229 ****/ 232	****	****	4.51 4.29	4.43	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	17	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 379	****	****	4.29		****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	Ι/	U	U	U	U	U	Т	5.00	***/ 3/9		* * * *	4.20	4.15	
Cominan														
Seminar	15	0	1	0	0	0	2	2 67	****/ 85	****	****	4.72	4 50	****
<ol> <li>Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme</li> <li>Was the instructor available for individual attention</li> </ol>	16	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 85 ****/ 79	****	****	4.72	4.52	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	1	0	0	1		****/ 72	****	****	4.69	4.52 4.43	****
	16	0	0	0	1	0	1		****/ 80	****	****			****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned		0	1	0	0	0	1		,	****		4.61	4.55	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	16	U	Т	U	U	U	Т	3.00	****/ 375	* * * *	5.00	4.01	3.78	
Field Work														
	1 77	0	0	0	0	0	-1	5.00	****/ 52	****	****	4 40	4 00	***
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	17	-	•	-	-	-	1		,	****	****	4.48	4.20	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.40	4.11	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 44 ****/ 45	****		4.73	4.71	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	17	0	0	-	0	0	1	3.00	, 13	****	****	4.57	4.72	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 326	***	5.00	4.03	3.64	***
0.15 7 1														
Self Paced	1 77	^		0			-	F 00	**** 4 ^	الدائد الدائد		4	4 4 4	4.4.4.
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 40	****	****	4.60	4.44	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 24	****	****	4.83	4.71	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 35	****	****	4.67	4.68	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 28		****	4.78	4.65	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 382	****	5.00	4.08	3.86	****

Title INTRO BLACK EXPERIENCE

Instructor:

Questionnaires: 18

SUTTON, KAREN E

Enrollment:

35

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2009

Page JUL 2, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	4	0.00-0.99	1	 А	6	Required for Majors	9	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	1	В	6						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	2	C	0	General	2	Under-grad	18	Non-major	18
84-150	4	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						

INTRO METHODS/RSRCH AF

Title Instructor: ROBINSON, THOMA

Enrollment: 13 Questionnaires: 10

# University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2009

Page JUL 2, 2009 Job IRBR3029

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

	Questions					M	373		_	ncies		-		ructor	Course	_		Level	
			Questions	5 - – – – – – -		NR 	NA 	1	2 	3 	4 	5 	Mean	Rank 	Mean 	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
			Genera]	L															
			ew insights,skil			0	0	0	0	2	4	4	4.20	1019/1576	4.20	4.36	4.30	4.35	4.20
			ctor make clear			0	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	222/1576	4.80	4.26	4.27	4.32	4.80
			uestions reflect			0	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	179/1342	4.90	4.30	4.32	4.41	4.90
			uations reflect			0	2	0	0	0	2	6	4.75		4.75	4.23	4.25	4.26	4.75
					what you learned	0	0	0	1	3	3	3		1067/1465	3.80	4.34	4.12	4.09	3.80
			-		what you learned	0	3	1	1	0	3	2		1181/1434	3.57	3.97	4.14	4.06	3.57
			g system clearly		ined	0	0	0	0	0	3	7	4.70	303/1547	4.70	4.05	4.19	4.22	4.70
			was class cance			0	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1574	5.00	4.65	4.64	4.62	
9. Ho	w woul	ld you	grade the overal	ll teach	ning effectiveness	6	0	0	0	0	3	1	4.25	712/1554	4.25	4.02	4.10	4.05	4.25
			Lecture	2															
1. We:	re the	e instr	uctor's lectures	well p	prepared	0	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	401/1488	4.80	4.33	4.47	4.44	4.80
2. Die	d the	instru	ctor seem intere	ested in	n the subject	0	0	0	0	1	1	8	4.70	1017/1493	4.70	4.77	4.73	4.75	4.70
3. Was	s lect	ure ma	terial presented	d and ex	xplained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	2	7	4.60	561/1486	4.60	4.29	4.32	4.29	4.60
4. Die	d the	lectur	es contribute to	what y	you learned	0	0	0	0	0	4	6	4.60	579/1489	4.60	4.36	4.32	4.31	4.60
5. Die	d audi	lovisua	l techniques enh	nance yo	our understanding	0	1	1	1	2	2	3	3.56	997/1277	3.56	3.99	4.03	4.01	3.56
1 54			Discuss		J	_	^	0	1	1	2	2	4 00	000/1070	4 00	4 10	4 17	4 1 4	4 00
					what you learned	2	0	0	1 0	1 1	3 1	3 6	4.00		4.00	4.19	4.17	4.14	4.00
					d to participate d open discussion	2		0	0	2	1	-	4.63	541/1270	4.63	4.56	4.35	4.30	4.63
			ctor encourage i echniques succes		d open discussion	2	0 6	0	0	2	0	0	4.38	747/1269 ****/ 878	4.38	4.52 3.79	4.35	4.29 3.92	4.38
4. WE.	re spe	ciai t	eciniiques succes	ssiui		4	0	U	U	2	U	U	3.00	/ 676		3.19	4.05	3.94	
			Seminar	-															
5. We:	re cri	lteria	for grading made	e clear		7	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/ 375	5.00	5.00	4.01	4.21	5.00
			Field V	7															
5 Dia	d conf	Farence	rieid v s help you carry		ield activities	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5 00	****/ 326	****	5 00	4.03	4 43	****
J. DI	a Com	erence	s help you cally	out 1.	ieid activities	9	U	U	U	U	U		5.00	320		3.00	4.03	4.43	
			Self I	aced															
5. We:	re the	ere eno	ugh proctors for	all th	ne students	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 382	****	5.00	4.08	4.39	****
					Frequ	ency	Dist	trib	utior	ı									
Credi	ts Ear	rned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	asons				Туј	pe			Majors	;
00-2	 7	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 2			mir		or Ma	ior		2	Graduat		0	Majo		0
28-5		1	1.00-1.99	0	B 4		re(	1u11	eu I	JI Ma	וייינ	5	۷	Graduati	=	U	Ma JC	) <u>.</u>	U
56-8		2	2.00-2.99	2	C 2		Ger	nera	1				1	Under-q	rad 1	.0	Non-	-major	10
84-1		2	3.00-3.49	3	D 0		001		-				_	onaci g.		. •	1,011		
Grad		0	3.50-4.00	1	F 0		Ele	ecti <sup>.</sup>	ves				0	#### - I	Means t	here a	are not	enoug	rh
		-			P 0									response				_	•
					I 0		Otl	ner					5	_		3			
					? 1														

Title AFRICAN-AMER HIST SURV

SUTTON, KAREN E

Instructor:

56-83

Grad.

84-150

0

0

0

2.00-2.99

3.00-3.49

3.50-4.00

0

0

С

D

F

Ρ

I

?

0

0 0

0

1

Enrollment: 25 Questionnaires: 8

## Spring 2009 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

University of Maryland

Baltimore County

Page JUL 2, 2009 Job IRBR3029

			Fre	equer	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	2	5	4.50	637/1576	4.50	4.36	4.30	4.35	4.50
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	1	4		1058/1576	4.13	4.26	4.27	4.32	4.13
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	2	4	4.25	835/1342	4.25	4.30	4.32	4.41	4.25
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	3	0	4	4.14	961/1520	4.14	4.23	4.25	4.26	4.14
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	3	4	4.38	537/1465	4.38	4.34	4.12	4.09	4.38
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	1	3	3	4.00	878/1434	4.00	3.97	4.14	4.06	4.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	2	2	3		1167/1547	3.88	4.05	4.19	4.22	3.88
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	2			758/1574	4.75		4.64	4.62	4.75
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	0	3	0	0	3.00	1448/1554	3.00	4.02	4.10	4.05	3.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	1	1	1	1	4	3.75	1353/1488	3.75	4.33	4.47	4.44	3.75
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	908/1493	4.75	4.77	4.73	4.75	4.75
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	2	5	4.50	678/1486	4.50	4.29	4.32	4.29	4.50
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	2	1	4		1205/1489	3.88	4.36	4.32	4.31	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	1	1	0	0	2	3	4.00	692/1277	4.00	3.99			4.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	0	2	1	3	3.71	981/1279	3.71	4.19	4.17	4.14	3.71
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	1	0	1	0	4	4.00	928/1270	4.00	4.56	4.35	4.30	4.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	1	0	0	1	4	4.17	870/1269	4.17	4.52	4.35	4.29	4.17
4. Were special techniques successful	2	3	0	1	0	0	2	4.00	464/ 878	4.00	3.79	4.05	3.92	4.00
Seminar														
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	6	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 375	5.00	5.00	4.01	4.21	5.00
Field Work	_	0	0	0	0	0	•	<b>-</b> 00	1 / 206	F 00	F 00	4 00	4 42	F 00
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	6	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 326	5.00	5.00	4.03	4.43	5.00
Self Paced														
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	5	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/ 382	5.00	5.00	4.08	4.39	5.00
Frequ	iencv	Dist	tribı	ıtior	n									
	201107	210	01 10	.0101	-									
Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades				Rea	sons	5			Туј	pe			Majors	
00-27 1 0.00-0.99 0 A 4		Red	quire	ed fo	or Ma	jors	3	2	Graduate	e	0	Majo	r	0
28-55 0 1.00-1.99 0 B 3														

General

Other

Electives

1

0

2

Under-grad

8

responses to be significant

#### - Means there are not enough

Non-major

8

Title INTRO TO CONTEMP AFRIC

Instructor: BADRU, LATEEF

Enrollment: 61

Questionnaires: 49

#### University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2009

Page 9 JUL 2, 2009 Job IRBR3029

			Fre	aniei	ncie	S		Tngi	tructor	Course	Dent	TIMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean			Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	2	1	4	9	32	4.42		4.42	4.36	4.30	4.35	4.42
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	2	4	7	14	21		1138/1576	4.00	4.26	4.27	4.32	4.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	1	2	7	9	5	23		1084/1342	3.87	4.30	4.32	4.41	3.87
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	1	1	2	10	9	25	4.17	937/1520	4.17	4.23	4.25	4.26	4.17
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	3	5	2	4	6	12	17	3.93	961/1465	3.93	4.34	4.12	4.09	3.93
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	3	9	12	23	4.17	768/1434	4.17	3.97	4.14	4.06	4.17
<ol> <li>Was the grading system clearly explained</li> </ol>	2	1	1	6	9	10	20	3.91	1134/1547	3.91	4.05	4.19	4.22	3.91
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	2	45	4.96	235/1574	4.96	4.65	4.64	4.62	4.96
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	19	2	1	2	5	14	6	3.79	1145/1554	3.79	4.02	4.10	4.05	3.79
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	8	0	1	3	7	7	23	4.17	1165/1488	4.17	4.33	4.47	4.44	4.17
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	6	0	0	0	2	4	37	4.81	784/1493	4.81	4.77	4.73	4.75	4.81
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	8	0	0	4	8	8	21		1054/1486	4.12	4.29	4.32	4.29	4.12
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	1	8	7	25	4.37	856/1489	4.37	4.36	4.32	4.31	4.37
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	9	0	4	1	8	6	21	3.97		3.98	3.99	4.03		3.97
Pi annonia.														
Discussion  1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2.5	0	0	0	4	9	11	4.29	633/1279	4.29	4.19	4.17	4.14	4.29
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	25	0	0	0	3	8	13	4.42			4.19	4.17	4.14	4.42
	25					-	13			4.42				
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	26	0 5	2 1	1	4	3		4.04		4.04	4.52	4.35	4.29	4.04
4. Were special techniques successful	26	5	Τ	0	3	7	7	4.06	455/ 878	4.06	3.79	4.05	3.92	4.06
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	45	0	0	0	1	1	2		****/ 234	****	****	4.23	4.44	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	45	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	,	****	****	4.35	4.47	***
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	45	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	****/ 229	****	****	4.51	4.65	***
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	46	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00		****	****	4.29	4.38	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	46	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 379	***	****	4.20	4.29	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	46	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 85	****	****	4.72	4.78	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	47	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 79	****	****	4.69	4.72	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	47	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 72	****	****	4.64	4.83	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	46	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 80	****	****	4.61	4.80	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	41	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	****/ 375	****	5.00	4.01	4.21	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	47	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.48	4.74	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	47	0	0	0	0	0	2		****/ 48	****	****	4.40	4.71	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	47	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00		****	****	4.73	4.69	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	47	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00		****	****	4.57	4.64	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	42	0	0	0	0	0	7		****/ 326	****	5.00	4.03	4.43	****
5. Did Conferences help you carry out freid activities	72	U	U	U	U	O	,	3.00	/ 320		3.00	1.05	1.13	
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	47	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 40	****	****	4.60	5.00	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	47	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 24	****	****	4.83	5.00	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	47	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 35	****	****	4.67	5.00	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	47	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 28	****	****	4.78	5.00	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	43	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	****/ 382	****	5.00	4.08	4.39	****

Title INTRO TO CONTEMP AFRIC

Instructor: BADRU, LATEEF

Enrollment: 61
Questionnaires: 49

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2009 Page 9
JUL 2, 2009
Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits	Earned	Cum. GPA		Expected	d Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	21	Required for Majors	12	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	В	6						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	3	C	0	General	2	Under-grad	49	Non-major	49
84-150	13	3.00-3.49	5	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	7	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means	there	are not enough	n
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	12	-			
				?	1						

Title AFRICA: CULT/DEVELOPMN

Instructor: CHUKU, GLORIA

Enrollment:

32 Questionnaires: 23

#### University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2009

Page 10 JUL 2, 2009 Job IRBR3029

#### Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

							Fre	equei	ncies	S		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 vo	nı gain ne	w insights,ski		om this course	0	0	0	1	1	6	15	4.52	609/1576	4.52	4.36	4.30	4.35	4.52
_	_	tor make clear			0	0	0	2	3	6	12	4.22	978/1576		4.26	4.27	4.32	4.22
		estions reflec			0	0	0	3	2	8	10	4.09	944/1342	4.09	4.30	4.32	4.41	4.09
		ations reflect			0	1	0	2	2	7	11	4.23		4.23	4.23	4.25	4.26	4.23
				what you learned	0	0	3	0	6	5	9	3.74	1116/1465	3.74	4.34	4.12	4.09	3.74
				to what you learned	1	0	0	1	3	11	7	4.09	840/1434	4.09	3.97	4.14	4.06	4.09
7. Was th	e grading	system clearly	y expla	ained	3	0	0	1	0	5	14	4.60	411/1547	4.60	4.05	4.19	4.22	4.60
8. How ma	ny times	was class canc	elled		2	0	0	0	0	10	11	4.52	1063/1574	4.52	4.65	4.64	4.62	4.52
9. How wo	ould you g	rade the overa	ll tead	ching effectiveness	5	1	0	0	1	9	7	4.35	597/1554	4.35	4.02	4.10	4.05	4.35
		Lectur	e															
1. Were t	he instru	ctor's lecture	s well	prepared	2	0	0	1	1	6	13	4.48	907/1488	4.48	4.33	4.47	4.44	4.48
		tor seem inter			2	0	0	0	0	1	20	4.95	279/1493		4.77	4.73	4.75	4.95
				explained clearly	2	0	0	1	2	6	12	4.38	841/1486	4.38	4.29	4.32	4.29	4.38
		s contribute to			2	1	0	0	1	5	14	4.65	513/1489	4.65	4.36	4.32	4.31	4.65
				our understanding	2	0	3	2	3	2	11	3.76	882/1277	3.76	3.99	4.03	4.01	3.76
		Discus	sion															
1. Did cl	ass discu			what you learned	9	0	0	0	1	6	7	4.43	532/1279	4.43	4.19	4.17	4.14	4.43
				ed to participate	10	0	0	0	2	2	9	4.54	612/1270	4.54	4.56	4.35	4.30	4.54
				nd open discussion	10	0	0	0	2	3	8	4.46	677/1269	4.46	4.52	4.35	4.29	4.46
		chniques succe			11	1	0	2	0	2	7	4.27	355/ 878		3.79	4.05	3.92	4.27
		Semina:	r															
1. Were a	ssigned t			announced theme	21	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 85	****	****	4.72	4.78	****
	_	ns contribute			21	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 80	****	****	4.61	4.80	****
		or grading made			20	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 375	****	5.00	4.01		****
		Field	Work															
1. Did fi	eld exper			what you learned	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.48	4.74	****
				luation criteria	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.40	4.71	****
		Self :	Daced															
5. Were t	here enou	gh proctors for		the students	21	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 382	****	5.00	4.08	4.39	****
				Frequ	iency	Dis	trib	utio	n									
Q.,, 31 b		G G73		_	-					_			_				No	
Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				ке:	asons	5 			Ту]	pe 			Majors 	. – – – –
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	A 10		Red	quir	ed fo	or Ma	ajor	s 1	.5	Graduat	е	0	Majo	or	0
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	В 9		~		,				2	77 3		2	3~		0.0
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	1	C 2		Gei	nera	T				3	Under-g	rad 2	3	Non-	-major	23
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	7	D 0		- 7						1			1			1-
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F 0		Εle	ecti	ves				1	#### - 1				_	ın
				P 0 I 0		O+1	0.00					3	respons	es to D	e sign	ııııcaı	11	
				1 0		OE	ner					3						

?

0

Course-Section: AFST 215 0101 Title

INTRO TO AFRICAN DANCE

Instructor: ANSAHBREW, KWAM

Enrollment: 23 Questionnaires: 13 University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2009

Page 11 JUL 2, 2009 Job IRBR3029

		Frequencies NR NA 1 2 3 4 5						Inst	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	0	0	0	0	1	2	10	4.69	373/1576	4.69	4.36	4.30	4.35	4.69
	Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	2			568/1576			4.27	4.32	
	Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	8	0	0	0	2	3		480/1342		4.30	4.32	4.41	
	Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	8	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/1520	****	4.23	4.25	4.26	****
	Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	11	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/1465	****	4.34	4.12	4.09	****
6.	Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	5	2	0	1	1	2	3.17	1339/1434	3.17	3.97	4.14	4.06	3.17
7.	Was the grading system clearly explained	0	2	4	2	1	1	3	2.73	1501/1547	2.73	4.05	4.19	4.22	2.73
8.	How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	2	8	3	4.08	1434/1574	4.08	4.65	4.64	4.62	4.08
9.	How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	8	0	0	1	3	0	1	3.20	1405/1554	3.20	4.02	4.10	4.05	3.20
	Lecture														
1.	Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	6	0	0	1	1	1	4	4.14	1181/1488	4.14	4.33	4.47	4.44	4.14
2.	Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	5	0	0	0	1	0	7	4.75	908/1493	4.75	4.77	4.73	4.75	4.75
3.	Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	6	0	1	0	2	1	3	3.71	1269/1486	3.71	4.29	4.32	4.29	3.71
4.	Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	3	0	4	4.14	1035/1489	4.14	4.36	4.32	4.31	4.14
5.	Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	5	3	0	0	2	1	2	4.00	692/1277	4.00	3.99	4.03	4.01	4.00
	Discussion														
1.	Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	2	0	0	0	3	3.40	1106/1279	3.40	4.19	4.17	4.14	3.40
2.	Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1270	5.00	4.56	4.35	4.30	5.00
3.	Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	386/1269	4.80	4.52	4.35	4.29	4.80
4.	Were special techniques successful	8	0	0	1	1	0	3	4.00	464/ 878	4.00	3.79	4.05	3.92	4.00
	Seminar														
2.	Was the instructor available for individual attention	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 79	****	****	4.69	4.72	***
5.	Were criteria for grading made clear	12	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 375	****	5.00	4.01	4.21	****
	Frequ	iency	Dist	tribu	ıtior	ı									
Cr	edits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades				Rea	asons	5			Tyı	oe			Majors	
Cr	edits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades				Rea	asons	5 			Туј	pe 			Majors	

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expecte	d Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	 А	12	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	В	0						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	1	C	0	General	6	Under-grad	13	Non-major	13
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	4	#### - Means	there	are not enough	h
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	2	-		_	
				?	0						

Title 20TH CENTURY BLACK LIT

Instructor: TEMPLE, CHRISTE

Enrollment: 30

30

Questionnaires: 16

#### University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2009

Page 12 JUL 2, 2009 Job IRBR3029

			Fre	mier	ncies			Tng	tructor	Course	Dent	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	0	0	0	5	11	4.69	387/1576	4.69	4.36	4.30	4.35	4.69
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	5	9	4.53	568/1576	4.53	4.26	4.27	4.32	4.53
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	0	0	0	0	4	10	4.71	345/1342	4.71	4.30	4.32	4.41	4.71
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	2	0	0	1	5	7	4.46	579/1520	4.46	4.23	4.25	4.26	4.46
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	15	5.00	1/1465	5.00	4.34	4.12	4.09	5.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	2	0	1	1	6	5	4.15	787/1434	4.15	3.97	4.14	4.06	4.15
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	3	6	7	4.25	838/1547	4.25	4.05	4.19	4.22	4.25
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	1	8	6	4.33	1262/1574	4.33	4.65	4.64	4.62	4.33
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	1	6	6	4.38	558/1554	4.38	4.02	4.10	4.05	4.38
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	1	2	12	4.73	547/1488	4.73	4.33	4.47	4.44	4.73
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	15	5.00	1/1493	5.00	4.77	4.73	4.75	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	1	1	4	9	4.40	821/1486	4.40	4.29	4.32	4.29	4.40
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	3	1	11	4.53	660/1489	4.53	4.36	4.32	4.31	4.53
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	11	1	0	2	0	1	3.00	1149/1277	3.00	3.99	4.03	4.01	3.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	2	10	4.83	204/1279	4.83	4.19	4.17	4.14	4.83
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	0	2	2	8	4.50	636/1270	4.50	4.56	4.35	4.30	4.50
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	0	0	2	10	4.83	353/1269	4.83	4.52	4.35	4.29	4.83
4. Were special techniques successful	4	3	0	2	1	4	2	3.67	671/ 878	3.67	3.79	4.05	3.92	3.67
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5 00	****/ 234	****	****	4.23	4.44	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 240	****	****	4.35	4.47	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00		****	****	4.51	4.65	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	15	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 232	****	****	4.29	4.38	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	15	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 379	****	****	4.20	4.29	****
Combinati														
Seminar	1 -	0	0	0	0	0	1	F 00	++++/ 05	****	****	4 70	4 70	****
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	15 15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 85 ****/ 79	****	****	4.72 4.69	4.78 4.72	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 72	****	****	4.69	4.72	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00		****	****	4.61	4.80	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	14	0	0	0	0	0	2		****/ 375	****	5.00	4.01	4.21	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 52	***	****	4.48	4.74	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.40	4.71	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	15	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 44	****	****	4.73	4.69	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	15	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 45	****	****	4.57	4.64	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	12	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/ 326	5.00	5.00	4.03	4.43	5.00
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 40	****	****	4.60	5.00	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 24	****	****	4.83	5.00	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 35	****	****	4.67	5.00	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 28	****	****	4.78	5.00	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	13	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 382	****	5.00	4.08	4.39	****

Title 20TH CENTURY BLACK LIT

Instructor: TEMP

TEMPLE, CHRISTE

Enrollment: 30
Questionnaires: 16

#### University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2009

Page 12 JUL 2, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	d Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	 А	6	Required for Majors	4	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	В	5						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	2	C	0	General	4	Under-grad	16	Non-major	16
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	3	#### - Means	there	are not enough	h
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	0	-			
				?	0						

Course-Section: AFST 323 0101

Title ECON DEVELOP IN AFRICA

Instructor: BADRU, LATEEF

Enrollment: 30 Questionnaires: 17

#### University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2009

Page 13 JUL 2, 2009 Job IRBR3029

			Fre	eaner	ncies			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	0	0	0	3	14	4.82	227/1576	4.82	4.36	4.30	4.30	4.82
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	2	13	4.75	279/1576	4.75	4.26	4.27	4.28	4.75
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	4	12	4.75	298/1342	4.75	4.30	4.32	4.30	4.75
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	0	3	13	4.65	357/1520	4.65	4.23	4.25	4.25	4.65
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	3	13	4.71	238/1465	4.71	4.34	4.12	4.09	4.71
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	16	4.94	66/1434	4.94	3.97	4.14	4.15	4.94
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	2	0	1	4	10	4.18	916/1547	4.18	4.05	4.19	4.21	4.18
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	3	14	4.82	625/1574	4.82	4.65	4.64	4.61	4.82
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	10	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	222/1554	4.71	4.02	4.10	4.09	4.71
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	3	13	4.71	610/1488	4.71	4.33	4.47	4.47	4.71
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	17	5.00	1/1493	5.00	4.77	4.73	4.70	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	2	3	12	4.59	584/1486	4.59	4.29	4.32	4.32	4.59
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	1	15	4.82	286/1489	4.82	4.36	4.32	4.34	4.82
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	0	0	0	0	4	11	4.73	170/1277	4.73	3.99	4.03	4.11	4.73
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	1	0	0	12	4.77	253/1279	4.77	4.19	4.17	4.20	4.77
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	0	0	2	11	4.85	317/1270	4.85	4.56	4.35	4.42	4.85
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	0	1	1	10	4.75	444/1269	4.75	4.52	4.35	4.41	4.75
4. Were special techniques successful	5	3	1	0	2	0	6	4.11	440/ 878	4.11	3.79	4.05	4.09	4.11
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	15	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 234	****	****	4.23	4.24	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	15	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 240	****	****	4.35	4.32	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	15	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 229	****	****	4.51	4.48	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	15	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 232	****	****	4.29	4.16	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 379	***	****	4.20	4.17	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	15	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 85	****	****	4.72	4.67	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	15	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 79	****	****	4.69	4.69	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 72	****	****	4.64	4.53	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	0	0	2		****/ 80	****	****	4.61	4.22	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	14	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 375	***	5.00	4.01	4.12	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.48	4.37	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	15	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.40	3.92	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	15	0	0	0	0	0	2		****/ 44	****	****	4.73	4.63	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	15	0	0	0	0	0	2		****/ 45	****	****	4.57	4.50	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	12	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/ 326	5.00	5.00	4.03	4.23	5.00
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 40	****	****	4.60	4.83	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 24	****	****	4.83	4.89	***
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00		****	****	4.67	5.00	***
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	16	0	0	0	0	0	1		,	****	****	4.78	5.00	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	14	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 382	****	5.00	4.08	4.24	****

Course-Section: AFST 323 0101

Title ECON DEVELOP IN AFRICA

Instructor: BADRU, LATEEF

Enrollment: 30
Questionnaires: 17

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2009 Page 13 JUL 2, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	 А	9	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	1						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	1	C	0	General	4	Under-grad	17	Non-major	17
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5	F	0	Electives	2	#### - Means	there	are not enough	h
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	3	-		-	
				?	1						

Course-Section: AFST 354 0101

Title AFRO-AMER WOMENS HISTO

Instructor: MACK-SHELTON, K

Enrollment: 14
Questionnaires: 10

#### University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2009

Page 14 JUL 2, 2009 Job IRBR3029

			Question	s		NR	NA	Fre	equer 2	ncies 3	4	5	Inst Mean	ructor Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean		Level Mean	Sect Mean
			Genera	1															
1. 1	nid voi	gain ne	w insights,ski	_	m this course	0	0	0	0	0	3	7	4.70	373/1576	4.70	4.36	4.30	4.30	4.70
			tor make clear			0	0	0	0	1	1	8	4.70	350/1576	4.70	4.26	4.27	4.28	4.70
			estions reflec		-	0	0	0	0	1	1	8	4.70	369/1342	4.70	4.30	4.32	4.30	4.70
4.	Did oth	ıer evalu	ations reflect	the ex	pected goals	0	0	0	0	1	2	7	4.60	395/1520	4.60	4.23	4.25	4.25	4.60
5.	Did ass	signed re	adings contrib	ute to	what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	122/1465	4.90	4.34	4.12	4.09	4.90
6. 1	Did wri	tten ass	ignments contr	ibute t	o what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	1	7	4.50	398/1434	4.50	3.97	4.14	4.15	4.50
			system clearl		ined	0	0	0	0	2	1	7	4.50	527/1547	4.50	4.05	4.19	4.21	4.50
8.	How man	y times	was class cand	elled		0	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1574	5.00	4.65	4.64	4.61	5.00
9. 1	How wou	ıld you g	rade the overa	ll teac	hing effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	160/1554	4.80	4.02	4.10	4.09	4.80
			Lectur	е															
			ctor's lecture			0	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	401/1488	4.80	4.33	4.47	4.47	4.80
			tor seem inter			0	0	0	0	0	0		5.00	1/1493	5.00	4.77	4.73	4.70	5.00
			_		xplained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	2		4.80	271/1486	4.80	4.29	4.32	4.32	4.80
			s contribute t			0	0	0	0	0	1	9		194/1489	4.90	4.36	4.32	4.34	4.90
5.	Did aud	liovisual	techniques en	hance y	our understanding	0	0	1	0	5	2	2	3.40	1066/1277	3.40	3.99	4.03	4.11	3.40
			Discus	sion															
1. 1	Did cla	ss discu			what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1279	5.00	4.19	4.17	4.20	5.00
2. 1	Were al	.l studen	ts actively en	courage	d to participate	0	0	0	1	0	1	8	4.60	559/1270	4.60	4.56	4.35	4.42	4.60
					d open discussion	0	0	0	0	1	0	9	4.80	386/1269	4.80	4.52	4.35	4.41	4.80
4.	Were sp	ecial te	chniques succe	ssful	-	0	4	0	1	3	0	2	3.50	709/ 878	3.50	3.79	4.05	4.09	3.50
			Semina	r															
5. 1	Were cr	riteria f	or grading mad	e clear	,	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 375	****	5.00	4.01	4.12	****
			Field																
5.	Did con	ferences	help you carr	y out f	ield activities	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 326	****	5.00	4.03	4.23	****
			Self																
5. 1	Were th	ere enou	gh proctors fo	r all t	he students	8	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 382	****	5.00	4.08	4.24	****
					Frequ	ency	Dist	trib	ution	n									
Cre	dits Ea	irned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	asons	3			Туј	pe			Majors	;
0.0	 -27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 2		Per	 miir		or Ma			4	Graduat		0	 Majo		0
	-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B 5		110	2411	_u _ (	J_ 1'1C	בטנג	5	•	Graduat	_	J	ra je		U
	-83	1	2.00-2.99	4	C 3		Ger	nera:	l				5	Under-g	rad 1	0	Non-	major	10
	-150	2	3.00-3.49	3	D 0								-			-		5	
	ad.	0	3.50-4.00	0	F 0		Ele	ectiv	ves				1	#### - 1	Means t	here a	re not	enouq	ıh
					P 0									respons	es to b	e sign	ifican	ıt	
					I 0		Otl	her					0	_		_			
					? 0														

STUDIES IN BLACK DRAMA

Title Instructor: TEMPLE, CHRISTE

Enrollment: 17 Questionnaires: 13

Spring 2009 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Page 15 JUL 2, 2009 Job IRBR3029

				_	ncies	5	_		tructor	Course	_			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	1	0	1	4	7	4.23	976/1576	4.23	4.36	4.30	4.30	4.23
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	2	3	3	4	3.54	1384/1576	3.54	4.26	4.27	4.28	3.54
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	6	0	2	3	0	2	3.29	1263/1342	3.29	4.30	4.32	4.30	3.29
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	0	6	2	4	3.62	1325/1520	3.62	4.23	4.25	4.25	3.62
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	2	4	6	4.33	571/1465	4.33	4.34	4.12	4.09	4.33
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	2	3	2	5	3.83	1045/1434	3.83	3.97	4.14	4.15	3.83
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	1	5	4	1	3.25	1413/1547	3.25	4.05	4.19	4.21	3.25
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	5	6	4.55	1048/1574	4.55	4.65	4.64	4.61	4.55
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	1	1	2	6	2	3.58	1274/1554	3.58	4.02	4.10	4.09	3.58
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	1	2	1	2	5	3.73	1359/1488	3.73	4.33	4.47	4.47	3.73
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	501/1493	4.92	4.77	4.73	4.70	4.92
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	1	2	1	3	4	3.64	1296/1486	3.64	4.29	4.32	4.32	3.64
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	2	1	1	0	7	3.82	1231/1489	3.82	4.36	4.32	4.34	3.82
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	0	2	1	2	3	3	3.36	1077/1277	3.36	3.99	4.03	4.11	3.36
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	1	1	2	5	4.22	689/1279	4.22	4.19	4.17	4.20	4.22
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	0	2	1	6	4.44	696/1270	4.44	4.56	4.35	4.42	4.44
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	0	1	2	6	4.56	614/1269	4.56	4.52	4.35	4.41	4.56
4. Were special techniques successful	4	1	2	1	3	0	2	2.88	829/ 878	2.88	3.79	4.05	4.09	2.88
Seminar														
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	11	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 375	****	5.00	4.01	4.12	****
Field Work														
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	10	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 326	****	5.00	4.03	4.23	****
Freq	iency	Dist	ribu	ıtioı	n									

University of Maryland

Baltimore County

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

Course-Section: AFST 375 0101 University of Maryland Title THE BLACK CHURCH

Baltimore County Spring 2009

Instructor: KING, SHARON Enrollment: 19 Questionnaires: 11

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Page 16 JUL 2, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Commercial   Com				NR	NA	Fre	eque: 2	ncies 3	4	5	Ins Mean	tructor Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean	
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course 0 0 0 0 1 1 3 7 4.55 \$82/1576 4.55 4.36 4.30 4.30 4.30 4.55 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals 1 0 0 0 1 1 2 7 4.56 \$82/1576 4.55 4.36 4.36 4.30 4.30 4.30 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals 5. Did written assignment readings contribute to what you learned 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 7. Was the grading system clearly explained 8. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 8. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 9. So would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 9. Sow would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 9. Sow would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 9. Sow would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 9. Sow would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 9. Sow would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 9. Sow would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 9. Sow would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 1 0 0 0 1 1 4 5 6 4.09 995/1488 4.40 4.02 4.02 4.09 4.40 1. Were the instructor seem interested in the subject 1 0 0 0 0 1 1 2 7 4.05 095/1488 4.40 4.03 4.47 4.77 4.70 1. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 1 1 0 0 0 0 1 2 7 4.05 085/1489 4.06 4.03 4.23 4.24 4.00 1. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 1. Were all students actively encouraged fair and open discussion 2. Were all students actively encouraged fair and open discussion 2. Were all students actively encouraged fair and open discussion 2. Were all students actively encouraged for participate 2 0 0 0 0 0 1 5 5.00 ***/ 52 **** 4.56 4.94 4.79 4.70 4.70 1. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 2 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0			General															
2. Did the instructors wake clear the expected goals	1. Did voi	u gain ne		s from this course	0	0	0	0	1	3	7	4.55	582/1576	4.55	4.36	4.30	4.30	4.55
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   0   1   0   1   1   4   4.10   88/13/32   4.10   4.30   4.32   4.30   4.10	_	-	-					0					,					
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals 0 1 0 0 0 3 4 4 3 4.00 1041/1500 4.00 4.23 4.25 4.25 4.00 5. Did assignmend readings contribute to what you learned 0 0 0 0 0 1 5 5 6 56/1405 4.36 4.34 4.12 4.09 4.05 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 0 0 0 2 2 3 3 4 3.82 1057/1434 3.82 3.07 4.14 4.12 4.09 4.05 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 0 0 0 1 3 1 6 0 9 787/1547 4.09 4.05 4.05 4.19 4.21 4.09 8. How many times was class cancelled 0 0 0 0 1 3 1 6 4.04 477/1554 4.09 4.05 4.05 4.04 4.01 4.09 4.04 8.00 4.00 4.00 4.00 4.00 4.00 4.00						1	0	1	1		4							4.10
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0 0 0 0 0 1 5 5 4 4.36 4.36 4.36 4.36 4.24 4.09 4.38 6. Did written assigned to contribute to what you learned 0 0 0 2 2 3 4 4.44 1971554 4.09 4.05 4.19 4.12 4.09 8.70 kms the grading system clearly explained 0 0 0 0 1 3 1 6 4.09 9791547 4.09 4.05 4.19 4.21 4.09 8.80 kms the grading system clearly explained 0 0 0 0 0 0 3 8 4 4.44 4771554 4.44 4.03 4.02 4.10 4.09 4.44 1.09 8.80 kms the grading system clearly explained 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 5 4 4.44 4771554 4.44 4.03 4.02 4.10 4.09 4.44 1.09 8.80 kms the grading system clearly explained 2 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 5 4 4.44 4771554 4.44 4.02 4.10 4.09 4.44 1.09 8.40 1.00 1.00 1.00 1.00 1.00 1.00 1.00 1		_			0		0	0		4	3							
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 7. Was the grading system clearly explained 8. Now many times was class cancelled 9. 0 0 0 1 3 1 6 4.09 997/1434 4.09 4.09 4.09 4.04 4.09 4.09 4.08 4.08 4.09 8. Now many times was class cancelled 9. 0 0 0 0 0 0 3 8 4.73 813/1574 4.73 4.65 4.64 4.01 4.09 8. Now many times was class cancelled 9. 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 5 8 4.73 813/1574 4.73 4.05 4.04 4.09 4.04 4.09 4.04 4.09 4.04 4.09 4.09					0	0	0	0	1	5	5	4.36	546/1465	4.36	4.34	4.12	4.09	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained		-	-	_	0	0	0	2	2	3	4	3.82	1057/1434	3.82	3.97	4.14	4.15	3.82
8. How many times was class cancelled 9. 0 0 0 0 0 0 3 8 8 4.73 813/1574 4.73 4.65 4.64 4.61 4.73 1. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 2 0 0 0 0 0 5 8 8 4.44 477/1554 4.44 4.02 4.10 4.09 4.44    Lecture			-	-	0	0	0	1	3	1	6					4.19	4.21	4.09
Now would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness   2   0   0   0   0   5   4   4.44   4.77/1554   4.44   4.02   4.10   4.09   4.44				-	0	0	0	0	0	3	8	4.73	813/1574			4.64	4.61	4.73
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 1. 0 0 0 0 1 4 5 5 4.09 995/1488 4.40 4.33 4.47 4.73 4.70 5.00 2. Nada lecture material presented and explained clearly 3. 0 0 0 0 1 3 6 4.50 6/8/1486 4.50 4.70 4.73 4.70 5.00 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 4. 0 0 0 0 1 3 6 4.50 6/8/1486 4.50 4.50 4.29 4.32 4.32 4.50 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 6. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 7. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 8. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 8. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 8. Eminar 8. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 9. Did class discussions relevant to the announced theme 10 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0						0	0	0	0		4							4.44
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 1 0 0 0 0 0 1 0 5.00 1/1493 5.00 4.77 4.73 4.70 5.00 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 1 0 0 0 0 1 2 5.00 678/1486 4.50 4.29 4.32 4.32 4.50 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 1 0 0 0 0 1 2 7 4.60 579/1489 4.60 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 1 0 0 0 0 1 2 7 4.60 579/1489 4.60 5. Did audiovisual techniques contribute to what you learned 2 0 0 0 0 0 4 5 4.56 283/1277 4.56 3.99 4.03 4.11 4.56  **Discussion***  1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 2 0 0 0 0 0 4 5 4.56 413/1279 4.56 4.19 4.17 4.20 4.56 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 2 0 0 0 0 0 2 3 4 4.22 383/1273 4.56 4.19 4.17 4.20 4.56 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 2 0 0 0 0 1 2 6 4.56 614/1269 4.56 4.59 4.05 4.09 4.21  **Seminar***  1. More assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 10 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 55 **** *** *** 4.72 4.67 ****  2. Did presentations contribute to what you learned 10 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ***/ 55 **** *** 4.64 4.53 ****  3. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 10 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ***/ 55 **** *** 4.48 4.37 ****  2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 10 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ***/ 52 **** 4.48 4.37 ****  2. Did gield experience contribute to what you learned 10 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ***/ 52 **** 4.48 4.37 ****  2. Did gield experience contribute to what you learned 10 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ***/ 52 **** 4.48 4.37 ****  3. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 10 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ***/ 52 **** 4.48 4.37 ****  3. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 10 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ***/ 52 **** 4.48 4.37 ****  3. Did classing presented to some presentation contribute to what you learned 10 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ***/ 52 **** 5.00 4.01 4.12 ****  3. Did conferences help you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 10 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ***/ 52 **** 5.00 4.03 4.23 ****  3. Was the instructor available for consu			Lecture															
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 1 0 0 0 0 1 3 3 6 4.50 678/1486 4.50 4.02 4.32 4.32 4.50 4. bid the lectures contribute to what you learned 1 0 0 0 1 1 0 1 0 1 0 1 0 6 83/1277 4.56 3.99 4.03 4.11 4.56 Expected Grades	1. Were th	he instru	actor's lectures	well prepared	1	0	0	0	1	4	5	4.40	995/1488	4.40	4.33	4.47	4.47	4.40
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2. Did the	e instruc	ctor seem interes	sted in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1493	5.00	4.77	4.73	4.70	5.00
Discussion   Dis	3. Was led	cture mat	erial presented	and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	1	3	6	4.50	678/1486	4.50	4.29	4.32	4.32	4.50
Discussion 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 2 0 0 0 0 4 5 4.56 413/1279 4.56 4.19 4.17 4.20 4.56 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 2 0 0 0 0 2 7 4.78 389/1270 4.78 4.56 4.35 4.42 4.78 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 2 0 0 0 1 2 6 4.56 614/1269 4.56 4.52 4.35 4.41 4.56 4. Were special techniques successful 2 0 0 0 0 1 2 6 4.56 614/1269 4.56 4.52 4.35 4.41 4.56 4. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 10 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ***/ 85 **** 4.72 4.67 **** 2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 10 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ***/ 85 **** 4.69 4.69 *** 3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 10 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ***/ 79 **** 4.69 4.69 **** 4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned 10 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 72 **** 4.64 4.53 **** 4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned 10 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 72 **** 4.64 4.53 **** 4. Did greate and projects contribute to what you learned 10 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 72 **** 4.64 4.53 **** 4. Did greatent projects on the projects of the p	4. Did the	e lecture	es contribute to	what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	2	7	4.60	579/1489	4.60	4.36	4.32	4.34	4.60
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 2 0 0 0 0 0 4 5 4.56 413/1279 4.56 4.19 4.17 4.20 4.56 2. Were all students actively encourage fair and open discussion 2 0 0 0 0 1 2 7 4.78 389/1270 4.78 4.56 4.15 4.42 4.78 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 2 0 0 0 0 1 2 6 4.56 614/1269 4.56 4.52 4.35 4.41 4.56 4.89 4.79 4.79 4.79 4.79 4.79 4.79 4.79 4.7	5. Did aud	diovisual	techniques enha	nce your understanding	1	1	0	1	0	1	7	4.56	283/1277	4.56	3.99	4.03	4.11	4.56
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 2 0 0 0 0 0 2 7 4.78 389/1270 4.78 4.56 4.52 4.35 4.41 4.56 4. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 2 0 0 0 1 2 6 4.56 6.16/1269 4.56 4.52 4.35 4.41 4.56 4. Were special techniques successful 2 0 0 0 0 2 3 4 4.22 383/878 4.22 3.79 4.05 4.09 4.22    Seminar   1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 10 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 85 **** 4.72 4.67 ****   1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 10 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 79 **** 4.69 4.69 ****   2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 10 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 79 **** 4.69 4.69 ****   3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 10 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 72 **** 4.64 4.53 ****   4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned 10 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 72 **** 4.64 4.53 ****   5. Were criteria for grading made clear   10 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 72 **** 4.64 4.53 ****   5. Were criteria for grading made clear   10 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 52 **** 5.00 4.01 4.12 ****    6. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 10 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 52 **** 5.00 4.01 4.12 ****   7. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 10 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 52 **** 4.48 4.37 ****   2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation 10 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 48 **** 4.40 3.92 ****   3. Was the instructor available for consultation 10 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 52 **** 4.64 4.53 ****   8. Did conferences help you carry out field activities 10 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 52 **** 5.00 4.03 4.23 ****   5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities 10 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ***/ 52 **** 5.00 4.08 4.24 5.00 ***   8. Did conferences help you carry out field activities 10 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0											_							
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 2 0 0 0 1 2 3 4 4.22 383/878 4.56 4.52 4.35 4.41 4.56 4. Were special techniques successful 2 0 0 0 0 1 2 3 4 4.22 383/878 4.22 3.79 4.05 4.09 4.22    Seminar  1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 10 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 72 **** 4.62 4.67 ****  2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 10 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 79 **** 4.69 4.69 ****  3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 10 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 79 **** 4.64 4.53 ****  4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned 10 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 375 **** 5.00 4.01 4.12 ****  Field Work  1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 10 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 375 **** 5.00 4.01 4.12 ****  Field Work  2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 10 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 52 **** 4.48 4.37 ****  2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 10 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 48 **** 4.40 3.92 ****  3. Was the instructor available for consultation 10 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 48 **** **** 4.40 3.92 ****  5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities 10 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 48 **** **** 4.40 3.92 ****  5. Were there enough proctors for all the students 8 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 45 **** 5.00 4.03 4.23 ****  Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades Reasons Type Majors  Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades Reasons Type Majors  Frequency Distribution  Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades Required for Majors 1 Graduate 0 Major 0				_														
Seminar   Semi							-	-	•				,					
Seminar   Semi		d the instructor encourage fair and open discu						-			-							
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 10 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ***** 85 **** 4.72 4.67 ****  2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 10 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 **** 79 **** **** 4.79 4.69 ****  3. Did presentations contribute to what you learned 10 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 **** 72 **** **** 4.64 4.53 ****  4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned 10 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 **** 80 **** **** 4.61 4.22 ****  5. Were criteria for grading made clear 10 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 **** 80 **** **** 4.61 4.22 ****  Field Work 1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 10 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 **** 50 4.01 4.12 ****  2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 10 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 **** 52 **** **** 4.48 4.37 ****  3. Was the instructor available for consultation 10 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 **** 48 **** **** 4.40 3.92 ****  4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations 10 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 **** 48 **** **** 4.73 4.63 ****  5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities 10 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 **** 45 **** 5.00 4.03 4.23 ****  5. Were there enough proctors for all the students 8 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 **** 45 **** 5.00 4.03 4.23 ****  Frequency Distribution  Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades Reasons Type Majors  Frequency Distribution  Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades Reasons Type Majors  Frequency Distribution  Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades Reasons Type Majors  Frequency Distribution  Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades Reasons Type Majors  Frequency Distribution  Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades Reasons Type Majors  Frequency Distribution  Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades Reasons Type Majors  Frequency Distribution  Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades Reasons Type Majors  Frequency Distribution  Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades Reasons Type Majors  Frequency Distribution Output Type Majors  Frequency Distribution Outp	4. Were sp	<u> </u>				0	0	0	2	3	4	4.22	383/ 878	4.22	3.79	4.05	4.09	4.22
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 10 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 79 **** **** 4.69 4.69 **** 3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 10 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 72 *** **** *** 4.64 4.53 **** 4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned 10 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 80 **** 4.61 4.22 **** 5. Were criteria for grading made clear 10 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 80 **** 5.00 4.01 4.12 ****  Field Work  1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 10 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 52 **** 5.00 4.01 4.12 ****  Field Work  2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 10 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 52 **** **** 4.48 4.37 ****  3. Was the instructor available for consultation 10 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 48 **** **** 4.40 3.92 ****  4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations 10 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 44 **** **** 4.73 4.63 ****  5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities 10 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 45 **** 5.00 4.03 4.23 ****  Self Paced  5. Were there enough proctors for all the students 8 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 326 **** 5.00 4.03 4.23 ****  Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades Reasons Type Majors  O0-27 1 0.00-0.99 0 A 4 Required for Majors 1 Graduate 0 Major 0 28-5 0 1.00-1.99 0 B 5 General 6 Under-grad 11 Non-major 11 84-150 2 3.00-3.49 1 D 0 Graduate 0 #### - Means there are not enough Graduate 0 #### - Means there are not enough F 0 Graduate 0 #### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	1 77				1.0	0	0	0	0	0	1	F 00	**** OF			4 70	4 67	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 10 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 **** 72 **** **** 4.64 4.53 **** 4.01 dpresentations contribute to what you learned 10 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 **** 78 0 **** **** 4.61 4.22 **** 5. Were criteria for grading made clear 10 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 **** 78 0 **** 5.00 4.01 4.12 ****    Field Work  1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 10 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 **** 52 **** 5.00 4.01 4.12 ****    1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 10 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 **** 52 **** **** 4.48 4.37 ****    2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 10 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 **** 48 **** **** 4.40 3.92 ****    3. Was the instructor available for consultation 10 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 **** 44 *** **** 4.73 4.63 ****    4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations 10 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 **** 44 *** **** 4.57 4.50 ****    5. Were there enough proctors for all the students 8 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 **** 45 **** 5.00 4.03 4.23 ****    5. Were there enough proctors for all the students 8 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 **** 45 **** 5.00 4.03 4.23 ****    Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades Reasons Type Majors 1 Graduate 0 Major 0 28-55 0 1.00-1.99 0 B 5 5    56-83 2 2.00-2.99 1 C 1 General General 0 General 0 Under-grad 11 Non-major 11 84-150 2 3.00-3.49 1 D 0 General 0 Cher 12    Gradual 0 3.50-4.00 0 F 0 Electives 0 F 0 #### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant 10 other 12    The state of the state of the significant of the significant of the significant 10 other 12    The state of the significant 10 other 10						-	-	-	-	-	_		, 05					++++
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned 10 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 80 **** **** 4.61 4.22 **** 5. Were criteria for grading made clear 10 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 375 **** 5.00 4.01 4.12 **** Field Work  1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 10 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 52 **** **** 4.48 4.37 **** 2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 10 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 48 **** **** 4.40 3.92 **** 3. Was the instructor available for consultation 10 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 48 **** **** 4.73 4.63 **** 5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities 10 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 45 **** 5.00 4.03 4.23 **** 5. Were there enough proctors for all the students 8 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 326 **** 5.00 4.03 4.23 **** 5.00 5.00 4.08 4.24 5.00 **** 5.00 5.00 5.00 4.08 4.24 5.00 **** 5.00 5.00 5.00 4.08 4.24 5.00 **** 5.00 5.00 5.00 5.00 5.00 5.00										-	_		,					++++
Field Work   Field Work   Single   Field Work   Field Work   Single   Field Work   Single   Field Work   Single   Field Work   Single		_	-	_						-			, , , , ,					
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 10 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 52 **** **** 4.48 4.37 **** 2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 10 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 48 **** **** 4.40 3.92 **** 4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations 10 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 44 **** **** 4.73 4.63 **** 5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities 10 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 45 *** **** 4.57 4.50 ****  Self Paced 5. Were there enough proctors for all the students 8 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 326 **** 5.00 4.03 4.23 ****  Frequency Distribution  Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades Reasons Type Majors  O0-27 1 0.00-0.99 0 A 4 Required for Majors 1 Graduate 0 Major 0 28-55 0 1.00-1.99 0 B 5 56-83 2 2.00-2.99 1 C 1 General 6 Under-grad 11 Non-major 11 84-150 2 3.00-3.49 1 D 0 0 Grad. 0 3.50-4.00 0 F 0 Electives 0 #### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant  I 0 Other 2	_			-									,					
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 10 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 52 **** **** 4.48 4.37 **** 2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 10 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 48 **** **** 4.40 3.92 **** 4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations 10 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 44 **** **** 4.73 4.63 **** 5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities 10 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 45 *** **** 4.57 4.50 ****  Self Paced 5. Were there enough proctors for all the students 8 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 326 **** 5.00 4.03 4.23 ****  Frequency Distribution  Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades Reasons Type Majors  O0-27 1 0.00-0.99 0 A 4 Required for Majors 1 Graduate 0 Major 0 28-55 0 1.00-1.99 0 B 5 56-83 2 2.00-2.99 1 C 1 General 6 Under-grad 11 Non-major 11 84-150 2 3.00-3.49 1 D 0 0 Grad. 0 3.50-4.00 0 F 0 Electives 0 #### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant  I 0 Other 2			Field Wo	nrk														
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 10 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 48 **** **** 4.40 3.92 ****  3. Was the instructor available for consultation 10 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 44 **** **** 4.73 4.63 ****  4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations 10 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 45 **** **** 4.57 4.50 ****  5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities 10 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 326 **** 5.00 4.03 4.23 ****   Self Paced  5. Were there enough proctors for all the students 8 0 0 0 0 0 0 3 5.00 1/ 382 5.00 5.00 4.08 4.24 5.00  Frequency Distribution  Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades Reasons Type Majors  O0-27 1 0.00-0.99 0 A 4 Required for Majors 1 Graduate 0 Major 0  28-55 0 1.00-1.99 0 B 5  56-83 2 2.00-2.99 1 C 1 General 6 Under-grad 11 Non-major 11  84-150 2 3.00-3.49 1 D 0 General 6 Under-grad 11 Non-major 11  84-150 2 3.00-3.49 1 D 0 Graduate 0 Fermion 11  84-150 2 3.00-3.49 1 D 0 General 6 Selectives 0 #### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant 12  Belectives 0 #### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant 13  Craduate 0 Selectives 0 Select	1. Did fie	eld exper		:===	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.48	4.37	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation 10 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 **** 44 **** **** 4.73 4.63 **** 4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations 10 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 **** 45 **** **** 4.57 4.50 **** 5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities 10 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 **** 326 **** 5.00 4.03 4.23 ****  Self Paced  5. Were there enough proctors for all the students 8 0 0 0 0 0 3 5.00 1/382 5.00 5.00 4.08 4.24 5.00 ****  Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades Reasons Type Majors  O0-27 1 0.00-0.99 0 A 4 Required for Majors 1 Graduate 0 Major 0 28-55 0 1.00-1.99 0 B 5 56-83 2 2.00-2.99 1 C 1 General 6 Under-grad 11 Non-major 11 84-150 2 3.00-3.49 1 D 0 Grad. 0 3.50-4.00 0 F 0 Electives 0 #### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant									0	0	1		, -		****			****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations 10 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 **** 45 **** **** 4.57 4.50 **** 5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities 10 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 **** 326 **** 5.00 4.03 4.23 **** 5.00 5.00 4.03 4.23 **** 5.00 5.00 4.08 4.24 5.00    Self Paced 5. Were there enough proctors for all the students 8 0 0 0 0 0 0 3 5.00 1/382 5.00 5.00 4.08 4.24 5.00    Frequency Distribution   Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades Reasons Type Majors 1 Graduate 0 Major 0   28-55 0 1.00-1.99 0 B 5   56-83 2 2.00-2.99 1 C 1 General 6 Under-grad 11 Non-major 11   84-150 2 3.00-3.49 1 D 0   Grad. 0 3.50-4.00 0 F 0 Electives 0 #### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant    Frequency Distribution    Output	_	_	_		10	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 44	****	****	4.73		****
Self Paced 5. Were there enough proctors for all the students    Self Paced   Self					10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 45	****	****			****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students 8 0 0 0 0 0 3 5.00 1/382 5.00 5.00 4.08 4.24 5.00  Frequency Distribution  Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades Reasons Type Majors  00-27 1 0.00-0.99 0 A 4 Required for Majors 1 Graduate 0 Major 0 28-55 0 1.00-1.99 0 B 5 5 56-83 2 2.00-2.99 1 C 1 General 6 Under-grad 11 Non-major 11 84-150 2 3.00-3.49 1 D 0 Grad. 0 3.50-4.00 0 F 0 Electives 0 #### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant		_	_	-						0	1				5.00			****
Credits Earned   Cum. GPA   Expected Grades   Reasons   Type   Majors			Self Pa	iced														
Credits Earned         Cum. GPA         Expected Grades         Reasons         Type         Majors           00-27 1 0.00-0.99 0 28-55 0 1.00-1.99 0 B 5         B 5         Cum. GPA         Required for Majors 1 Graduate 0 Major	5. Were th	here enou	igh proctors for	all the students	8	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/ 382	5.00	5.00	4.08	4.24	5.00
00-27			Frequ	ıency	Dis	trib	utio:	n										
28-55	Credits Ea	arned	Expected Grades				Re	asons	\$			Ту	pe			Majors	5	
28-55	00-27						 guir	ed f	or Ma	ior	 s	1	Graduat	 .e	 0	Maic	 or	0
56-83 2 2.00-2.99 1 C 1 General 6 Under-grad 11 Non-major 11 84-150 2 3.00-3.49 1 D 0 Grad. 0 3.50-4.00 0 F 0 Electives 0 #### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant 1 0 Other 2											-	-	~~~		-	) (	•	ŭ
84-150 2 3.00-3.49 1 D 0  Grad. 0 3.50-4.00 0 F 0 Electives 0 #### - Means there are not enough P 0 I 0 Other 2		2				Gei	nera:	1				6	Under-c	rad 1	11	Non-	major	11
P 0 responses to be significant I 0 Other 2	84-150	2	3.00-3.49	1 D 0									_				-	
I 0 Other 2	Grad.	0	0 F 0		Ele	ecti	ves				0	#### -	Means t	here a	re not	enoug	jh	
				P 0									respons	ses to b	oe sign	ifican	nt	
						Ot1	her					2						

Course-Section: AFST 385 0101 Title

PROB SOLV URBAN BLK CO

Instructor: HICKEY, TERRY

Enrollment: 19 Questionnaires: 14 University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2009

Page 17 JUL 2, 2009 Job IRBR3029

			_				_	ncies		_		tructor	Course	_		Level	Sect
	Questions	5	1	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
	Genera	 l															
. Did you qai	n new insights,skil	lls from this course		0	0	0	0	1	2	11	4.71	347/1576	4.71	4.36	4.30	4.30	4.71
		the expected goals		0	0	0	0	0	4	10	4.71	324/1576	4.71	4.26	4.27	4.28	4.71
. Did the exa	m questions reflect	t the expected goals		0	10	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	583/1342	4.50	4.30	4.32	4.30	4.50
. Did other e	evaluations reflect	the expected goals		0	0	0	1	0	3	10	4.57	429/1520	4.57	4.23	4.25	4.25	4.57
. Did assigne	ed readings contribu	ite to what you learr	ned	0	0	0	1	0	2	11	4.64	277/1465	4.64	4.34	4.12	4.09	4.64
. Did writter	assignments contri	ibute to what you lea	arned	0	0	0	0	1	3	10	4.64	287/1434	4.64	3.97	4.14	4.15	4.64
. Was the gra	ding system clearly	v explained		0	0	0	0	1	3	10	4.64	363/1547	4.64	4.05	4.19	4.21	4.64
. How many ti	mes was class cance	elled		1	0	0	0	0	4	9	4.69	866/1574	4.69	4.65	4.64	4.61	4.69
		ll teaching effective	eness	1	0	0	0	0	2	11	4.85	142/1554	4.85	4.02	4.10	4.09	4.85
	Lecture	<u>-</u>															
. Were the ir				2	0	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	223/1488	4.92	4.33	4.47	4.47	4.92
	Were the instructor's lectures well prepared  Did the instructor seem interested in the subject  Was lecture material presented and explained clea					0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/1493	5.00	4.77	4.73	4.70	5.00
			rlv	2	0	0	0	1	2	9	4.67	468/1486	4.67	4.29	4.32	4.32	4.67
	-	-	1	2	0	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	174/1489	4.92	4.36	4.32	4.34	4.92
	as recture material presented and explained crear yid the lectures contribute to what you learned yid audiovisual techniques enhance your understand					0	0	1	4	3	4.25	533/1277	4.25	3.99	4.03	4.11	
. Dia addiovi	-						Ü	-	-	3	1.25	333/12//	1.25	3.33	1.03		1.23
	Discuss																
		ute to what you learr		3	0	0	0	0	2	9	4.82	214/1279	4.82	4.19	4.17	4.20	4.82
		couraged to participa		3	0	0	0	0	2	9	4.82	345/1270	4.82	4.56	4.35	4.42	4.82
		fair and open discuss	sion	3	0	0	0	0	2	9	4.82	375/1269		4.52	4.35	4.41	4.82
. Were specia	l techniques succes	ssful		3	2	0	0	1	5	3	4.22	383/ 878	4.22	3.79	4.05	4.09	4.22
	Semina	c															
. Were criter	ia for grading made	e clear	-	12	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 375	****	5.00	4.01	4.12	****
	Field V	Vork															
. Did confere	ences help you carry	y out field activitie	es i	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 326	***	5.00	4.03	4.23	****
			Freque	ncy	Dist	cribu	ıtioı	n									
redits Earned	l Cum. GPA	Expected Gr	rades				Rea	asons	3			Ту	ne			Majors	
								, 									
00-27 0	0.00-0.99	0 A 10			Red	quire	ed fo	or Ma	ajor	s	0	Graduat	е	0	Majo	r	1
28-55 0	1.00-1.99	0 B 1 2 C 0			~						_	77 3		4			10
56-83 5	2.00-2.99			Ger	neral	L				6	Under-g	rad 1	. 4	Non-	major	13	
84-150 5	3.00-3.49									_							
Grad. 0	3.50-4.00			Ele	ectiv	res				0	#### - 1				_	h	
		P 0										respons	es to b	e sign	ifican	ıt	
		I 0			Oth	ner					6						
		? 1															

Course-Section: AFST 440 0101 University of Maryland TOPICS AFST STUDIES Instructor: CHUKU, GLORIA

Title

Enrollment:

Questionnaires: 5

7

Baltimore County Spring 2009

Page 18

JUL 2, 2009

Job IRBR3029

Student	Course	Fvaluation	Ouestionnaire
Student	Course	Evaluation	Questionnaire

							Fr	equei	ncies	3		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 Did wo	u gain n	Genera ew insights,ski	_	m this sourse	0	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.40	787/1576	4.40	4.36	4.30	4.46	4.40
		ew insignes,ski ctor make clear			0	0	0	0	2	1	2		1138/1576	4.00	4.26	4.27	4.35	4.00
		uestions reflec			1	2	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	583/1342	4.50	4.30	4.32	4.46	4.50
	_	uations reflect		_	0	0	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	921/1520	4.20	4.23	4.25	4.38	4.20
				what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1465	5.00	4.34	4.12	4.22	5.00
	-	-		o what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	398/1434	4.50	3.97	4.14	4.30	4.50
		g system clearl			0	0	0	0	2	1	2		1041/1547	4.00	4.05	4.19	4.24	4.00
		was class canc		illea	0	0	0	0	0	4	1		1367/1574		4.65	4.64	4.69	4.20
	-			hing effectiveness	0	0	0	0	2	3	0		1267/1554	3.60	4.02	4.10		3.60
J. HOW WO	outa you	grade the overa	II Ceac	illing effectiveness	U	U	U	U	2	J	U	3.00	1207/1334	3.00	1.02	4.10	1.21	3.00
		Lectur	е															
1. Were t	he instr	uctor's lecture	s well	prepared	0	0	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	750/1488	4.60	4.33	4.47	4.55	4.60
2. Did th	ne instru	ctor seem inter	ested i	n the subject	0	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	1286/1493	4.40	4.77	4.73	4.80	4.40
3. Was le	cture ma	terial presente	d and e	explained clearly	0	0	0	1	0	1	3	4.20	1003/1486	4.20	4.29	4.32	4.41	4.20
4. Did th	ne lectur	es contribute t	o what	you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	579/1489	4.60	4.36	4.32	4.38	4.60
5. Did au	diovisua	l techniques en	hance y	our understanding	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	132/1277	4.80	3.99	4.03	4.04	4.80
		Discus				_				_	_							
				what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	665/1279	4.25	4.19	4.17	4.31	4.25
		-	_	ed to participate	1	0	0	0	0	2	2		636/1270	4.50	4.56	4.35	4.53	4.50
		_		d open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	444/1269	4.75	4.52	4.35	4.55	4.75
4. Were s	special to	echniques succe	sstul		1	2	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	464/ 878	4.00	3.79	4.05	4.33	4.00
				Frequ	ıency	Dis	trib	utio	n									
Credits E	lownod	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Do	asons	_			Т				Majawa	
credits E	.arned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades					asons	5 			Ту]	pe 			Majors	; 
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 3		Re	quir	ed fo	or Ma	ajors		1	Graduat	е	0	Majo	r	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	в 2												_		
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	0	C 0		Ge	nera	1				3	Under-g	rad	5	Non-	major	5
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	1	D 0														
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F 0		El	ecti <sup>.</sup>	ves				0	#### - 1	Means t	here a	re not	enoug	ſh
				P 0									respons	es to b	e sign	ifican	ıt	
				I 0		Ot!	her					1						

Course-Section: AFST 495 0101
Title FIELD RESEARCH AFR STU

FIELD RESEARCH AFR STU Baltimore County ROBINSON, THOMA Spring 2009

Instructor: ROBINSON, THOMA

Enrollment: 6
Questionnaires: 5

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

University of Maryland Page 19
Baltimore County JUL 2, 2009
Spring 2009 Job IRBR3029

					Frequencies						Instructor		Course Dept		UMBC Level		Sect	
		Questions	3		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	1	0	1	1	2	3 60	1410/1576	3.60	4 36	4.30	4.46	3.60
	2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals					0	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	996/1576	4.20	4.26	4.27		4.20
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals					0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	240/1342	4.80	4.30	4.32		4.80
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals					0	0	0	1	0	1	3	4.20		4.20	4.23	4.25	4.38	4.20
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned						0	0	0	0	2			304/1465	4.60		4.12	4.22	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned						1	1	1	0	1			1380/1434	3.00	3.97	4.14		3.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained						0	0	1	0	1			900/1547		4.05	4.19	4.24	
8. How many times was class cancelled						0	0	0	0	2			1003/1574	4.60	4.65	4.64	4.69	4.60
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness						0	0	0	1	0			623/1554				4.24	4.33
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared						0	0	0	0	3	2	4.40	995/1488	4.40	4.33	4.47	4.55	4.40
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject						0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	1125/1493	4.60	4.77	4.73	4.80	4.60
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly						0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	821/1486	4.40	4.29	4.32	4.41	4.40
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned						0	0	1	0	1	3	4.20	997/1489	4.20	4.36	4.32	4.38	4.20
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding						0	0	1	0	0	2	4.00	692/1277	4.00	3.99	4.03	4.04	4.00
Discussion																		
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned						0	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	1249/1279	2.50	4.19	4.17	4.31	2.50
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate						0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1270	5.00	4.56	4.35	4.53	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion						0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	644/1269	4.50	4.52	4.35	4.55	4.50
4. Were special techniques successful						1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 878	***	3.79	4.05	4.33	****
Self Paced																		
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students						0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 382	****	5.00	4.08	3.88	***
Frequency Distribution																		
Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades						Reasons							Туј	pe	e		Majors	
														_				
00-27 28-55	0 1	0.00-0.99 1.00-1.99	0 0	A 1 B 3	Required for Majors					3	0	Graduat	е	0	Majo	r	0	
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C 0	General						0	Under-g	rad	5	Non-	major	5	
84-150	3	3.00-2.99	3	D 0	General						U	onder-g.	Lau	5	NOI1-	·IIIa JOI	5	
Grad.						Electives						2	#### - 1	Means there are not enough				
P 0							FIECCIACD						responses to be significant					
							Other					2					11100110	
	? 0										_							