

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	1	1	7	14	11	3.97	1151/1522	4.28	4.40	4.30	4.34	3.97	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	2	4	14	14	4.18	955/1522	4.47	4.34	4.26	4.29	4.18	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	21	1	0	1	4	6	4.17	833/1285	4.46	4.43	4.30	4.36	4.17	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	1	4	14	15	4.26	781/1476	4.36	4.40	4.22	4.20	4.26	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	3	14	17	4.34	484/1412	4.49	4.41	4.06	4.00	4.34	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	1	4	10	19	4.38	458/1381	4.48	4.43	4.08	3.97	4.38	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	1	8	7	18	4.14	892/1500	4.41	4.49	4.18	4.20	4.14	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	18	17	4.49	1096/1517	4.59	4.48	4.65	4.63	4.49	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	7	0	0	0	3	17	8	4.18	744/1497	4.38	4.36	4.11	4.11	4.18	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	3	10	8	12	3.88	1262/1440	4.32	4.49	4.45	4.42	3.88	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	5	28	4.85	656/1448	4.90	4.88	4.71	4.78	4.85	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	1	7	16	9	4.00	1056/1436	4.34	4.47	4.29	4.29	4.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	2	3	11	16	4.18	935/1432	4.54	4.58	4.29	4.31	4.18	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	7	0	2	9	10	5	3.69	818/1221	3.90	4.05	3.93	4.02	3.69	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	1	5	8	7	4.00	718/1280	4.36	4.32	4.10	4.08	4.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	14	0	0	1	3	6	11	4.29	781/1277	4.54	4.48	4.34	4.33	4.29	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	14	0	0	0	1	2	18	4.81	332/1269	4.74	4.63	4.31	4.33	4.81	
4. Were special techniques successful	14	1	1	2	5	9	3	3.55	662/ 854	3.62	3.56	4.02	4.00	3.55	
Laboratory															
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	34	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 228	****	****	4.35	4.56	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	32	1	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 79	****	****	4.58	4.58	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	32	1	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	****/ 77	****	****	4.52	5.00	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	32	1	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/ 65	****	****	4.49	5.00	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	32	1	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 78	****	****	4.45	5.00	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	32	1	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 80	****	****	4.11	4.00	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	33	0	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/ 47	****	****	4.41	4.83	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	33	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 45	****	****	4.30	4.58	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	33	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.40	4.75	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	33	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 35	****	****	4.31	4.75	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	33	0	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/ 37	****	****	4.63	****	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	33	0	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/ 23	****	****	4.41	****	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	33	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 33	****	****	4.69	****	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	33	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 22	****	****	4.54	****	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	33	1	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 18	****	****	4.49	****	****	

Course-Section: ANTH 211 0101  
 Title CULTURAL ANTHROPOLOGY  
 Instructor: CHAPIN, BAMBI  
 Enrollment: 46

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2007

Page 56  
 JUN 26, 2007  
 Job IRBR3029

Questionnaires: 35

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	9	0.00-0.99	0	A	23	Required for Majors	20	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	6	1.00-1.99	0	B	8						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	6	C	2	General	2	Under-grad	35	Non-major	35
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	8	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5	F	0	Electives	2	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	10				
				?	1						

Course-Section: ANTH 211 0201  
 Title CULTURAL ANTHROPOLOGY  
 Instructor: MESSINGER, SETH  
 Enrollment: 40  
 Questionnaires: 28

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2007

Page 57  
 JUN 26, 2007  
 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	11	17	4.61	492/1522	4.28	4.40	4.30	4.34	4.61	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	9	19	4.68	346/1522	4.47	4.34	4.26	4.29	4.68	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	8	19	4.70	328/1285	4.46	4.43	4.30	4.36	4.70	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	9	18	4.61	378/1476	4.36	4.40	4.22	4.20	4.61	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	3	25	4.89	104/1412	4.49	4.41	4.06	4.00	4.89	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	4	23	4.85	102/1381	4.48	4.43	4.08	3.97	4.85	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	7	20	4.68	300/1500	4.41	4.49	4.18	4.20	4.68	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	13	15	4.54	1054/1517	4.59	4.48	4.65	4.63	4.54	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	0	0	9	14	4.61	312/1497	4.38	4.36	4.11	4.11	4.61	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	6	22	4.79	392/1440	4.32	4.49	4.45	4.42	4.79	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	27	5.00	1/1448	4.90	4.88	4.71	4.78	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	9	19	4.68	404/1436	4.34	4.47	4.29	4.29	4.68	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	5	22	4.81	280/1432	4.54	4.58	4.29	4.31	4.81	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	9	13	1	0	1	1	3	3.83	****/1221	3.90	4.05	3.93	4.02	****	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	2	4	15	4.62	317/1280	4.36	4.32	4.10	4.08	4.62	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	0	0	1	3	17	4.76	363/1277	4.54	4.48	4.34	4.33	4.76	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	0	0	0	6	15	4.71	420/1269	4.74	4.63	4.31	4.33	4.71	
4. Were special techniques successful	7	14	1	0	1	2	3	3.86	547/ 854	3.62	3.56	4.02	4.00	3.86	
Laboratory															
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	27	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 228	****	****	4.35	4.56	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	25	2	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 79	****	****	4.58	4.58	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	27	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 77	****	****	4.52	5.00	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	27	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 65	****	****	4.49	5.00	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	27	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 78	****	****	4.45	5.00	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	27	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 80	****	****	4.11	4.00	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	4	0.00-0.99	1	A	21	Required for Majors	16	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	4						
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	4	C	0	General	4	Under-grad	28	Non-major	28
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	4	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	7	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	7				
				?	1						

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	4	12	11	4.26	899/1522	4.28	4.40	4.30	4.34	4.26	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	10	16	4.56	488/1522	4.47	4.34	4.26	4.29	4.56	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	11	14	4.50	531/1285	4.46	4.43	4.30	4.36	4.50	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	4	10	12	4.22	827/1476	4.36	4.40	4.22	4.20	4.22	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	1	2	9	13	4.23	585/1412	4.49	4.41	4.06	4.00	4.23	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	1	4	6	14	4.19	663/1381	4.48	4.43	4.08	3.97	4.19	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	3	10	14	4.41	630/1500	4.41	4.49	4.18	4.20	4.41	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	7	20	4.74	820/1517	4.59	4.48	4.65	4.63	4.74	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	0	2	10	10	4.36	544/1497	4.38	4.36	4.11	4.11	4.36	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	4	10	12	4.31	1007/1440	4.32	4.49	4.45	4.42	4.31	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	4	22	4.85	656/1448	4.90	4.88	4.71	4.78	4.85	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	4	9	13	4.35	783/1436	4.34	4.47	4.29	4.29	4.35	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	2	6	18	4.62	514/1432	4.54	4.58	4.29	4.31	4.62	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	0	9	5	12	4.12	564/1221	3.90	4.05	3.93	4.02	4.12	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	3	3	11	4.47	416/1280	4.36	4.32	4.10	4.08	4.47	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	11	0	0	0	2	3	11	4.56	553/1277	4.54	4.48	4.34	4.33	4.56	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	11	0	0	0	1	3	12	4.69	445/1269	4.74	4.63	4.31	4.33	4.69	
4. Were special techniques successful	11	3	1	0	6	4	2	3.46	685/ 854	3.62	3.56	4.02	4.00	3.46	
Laboratory															
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	26	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 228	****	****	4.35	4.56	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	25	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 79	****	****	4.58	4.58	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	25	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 77	****	****	4.52	5.00	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	25	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 65	****	****	4.49	5.00	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	25	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 78	****	****	4.45	5.00	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	25	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 80	****	****	4.11	4.00	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	26	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 47	****	****	4.41	4.83	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	26	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 45	****	****	4.30	4.58	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	26	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.40	4.75	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	26	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 35	****	****	4.31	4.75	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	26	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 34	****	****	4.30	4.17	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	26	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 37	****	****	4.63	****	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	26	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 23	****	****	4.41	****	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	26	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 33	****	****	4.69	****	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	26	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 22	****	****	4.54	****	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	26	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 18	****	****	4.49	****	****	

Course-Section: ANTH 211 0301  
 Title CULTURAL ANTHROPOLOGY  
 Instructor: CHARD, SARAH  
 Enrollment: 44  
 Questionnaires: 27

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2007

Page 58  
 JUN 26, 2007  
 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	11	Required for Majors	17	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	B	10						
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	2	C	1	General	1	Under-grad	27	Non-major	27
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	5	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	6				
				?	0						

Course-Section: ANTH 302 0101  
 Title EVOLUTION/PHYS ANTH/AR  
 Instructor: DONATO, PAUL  
 Enrollment: 36  
 Questionnaires: 23

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2007

Page 59  
 JUN 26, 2007  
 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	4	5	13	4.30	849/1522	4.30	4.40	4.30	4.34	4.30	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	2	3	7	10	4.14	996/1522	4.14	4.34	4.26	4.25	4.14	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	2	4	4	12	4.18	817/1285	4.18	4.43	4.30	4.30	4.18	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	2	2	7	11	4.23	827/1476	4.23	4.40	4.22	4.26	4.23	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	1	1	1	3	6	10	4.10	703/1412	4.10	4.41	4.06	4.03	4.10	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	6	2	1	3	2	8	3.81	1008/1381	3.81	4.43	4.08	4.13	3.81	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	1	4	3	14	4.36	670/1500	4.36	4.49	4.18	4.13	4.36	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	16	7	4.30	1241/1517	4.30	4.48	4.65	4.62	4.30	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	2	0	0	3	7	7	4.24	674/1497	4.24	4.36	4.11	4.13	4.24	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	1	3	4	14	4.41	931/1440	4.41	4.49	4.45	4.46	4.41	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	3	2	16	4.62	1060/1448	4.62	4.88	4.71	4.71	4.62	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	1	2	6	11	4.35	772/1436	4.35	4.47	4.29	4.30	4.35	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	2	0	4	15	4.52	611/1432	4.52	4.58	4.29	4.29	4.52	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	6	1	3	0	4	6	3.79	770/1221	3.79	4.05	3.93	3.94	3.79	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	1	0	3	3	8	4.13	664/1280	4.13	4.32	4.10	4.14	4.13	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	0	0	2	2	11	4.60	527/1277	4.60	4.48	4.34	4.38	4.60	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	0	1	0	4	10	4.53	562/1269	4.53	4.63	4.31	4.39	4.53	
4. Were special techniques successful	8	7	2	1	2	0	3	3.13	766/ 854	3.13	3.56	4.02	4.00	3.13	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99 0	A 9	Required for Majors 6	Graduate 0 Major 2
28-55	6	1.00-1.99 0	B 11		
56-83	2	2.00-2.99 1	C 1	General 9	Under-grad 23 Non-major 21
84-150	3	3.00-3.49 2	D 0		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 8	F 0	Electives 1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 4	
			? 0		

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	2	1	0	6	16	4.32	825/1522	4.32	4.40	4.30	4.34	4.32	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	2	1	4	6	12	4.00	1080/1522	4.00	4.34	4.26	4.25	4.00	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	3	2	8	12	4.04	921/1285	4.04	4.43	4.30	4.30	4.04	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	2	2	6	15	4.36	671/1476	4.36	4.40	4.22	4.26	4.36	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	2	3	5	15	4.19	621/1412	4.19	4.41	4.06	4.03	4.19	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	2	1	1	2	5	14	4.30	556/1381	4.30	4.43	4.08	4.13	4.30	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	2	1	2	9	11	4.04	966/1500	4.04	4.49	4.18	4.13	4.04	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	1	24	4.96	195/1517	4.96	4.48	4.65	4.62	4.96	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	2	2	12	6	4.00	898/1497	4.00	4.36	4.11	4.13	4.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	1	1	1	8	15	4.35	976/1440	4.35	4.49	4.45	4.46	4.35	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	3	3	20	4.65	1013/1448	4.65	4.88	4.71	4.71	4.65	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	1	0	4	8	13	4.23	896/1436	4.23	4.47	4.29	4.30	4.23	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	1	1	7	15	4.36	793/1432	4.36	4.58	4.29	4.29	4.36	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	6	1	1	2	5	10	4.16	532/1221	4.16	4.05	3.93	3.94	4.16	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	1	2	2	2	12	4.16	651/1280	4.16	4.32	4.10	4.14	4.16	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	0	2	2	3	12	4.32	758/1277	4.32	4.48	4.34	4.38	4.32	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	1	0	2	4	12	4.37	699/1269	4.37	4.63	4.31	4.39	4.37	
4. Were special techniques successful	7	6	2	1	3	3	4	3.46	685/ 854	3.46	3.56	4.02	4.00	3.46	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	22	0	0	1	0	1	2	4.00	****/ 47	****	****	4.41	4.56	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	22	0	1	0	0	1	2	3.75	****/ 45	****	****	4.30	4.39	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	22	1	1	0	0	1	1	3.33	****/ 39	****	****	4.40	4.68	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	22	1	0	1	0	0	2	4.00	****/ 35	****	****	4.31	4.26	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	22	1	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 34	****	****	4.30	4.12	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	A 10	Required for Majors	1
28-55	5	1.00-1.99	B 10		Graduate 0
56-83	7	2.00-2.99	C 4	General	1
84-150	6	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad 26
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	2
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0		
			? 2	Other	21

Course-Section: ANTH 310 0101  
 Title ETHNOGRAPHIC FILM  
 Instructor: DONATO, PAUL  
 Enrollment: 45  
 Questionnaires: 30

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2007

Page 61  
 JUN 26, 2007  
 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	2	0	1	0	4	8	15	4.29	869/1522	4.29	4.40	4.30	4.34	4.29	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	0	2	10	4	12	3.93	1168/1522	3.93	4.34	4.26	4.25	3.93	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	0	1	1	4	8	14	4.18	825/1285	4.18	4.43	4.30	4.30	4.18	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	20	0	0	5	1	2	3.63	1269/1476	3.63	4.40	4.22	4.26	3.63	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	0	2	2	5	9	10	3.82	956/1412	3.82	4.41	4.06	4.03	3.82	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	25	0	1	0	1	1	3.67	****/1381	****	4.43	4.08	4.13	****	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	3	0	1	0	0	3	23	4.74	221/1500	4.74	4.49	4.18	4.13	4.74	
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	0	0	0	0	20	7	4.26	1268/1517	4.26	4.48	4.65	4.62	4.26	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	4	7	15	4.42	481/1497	4.42	4.36	4.11	4.13	4.42	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	2	2	3	20	4.52	786/1440	4.52	4.49	4.45	4.46	4.52	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	1	1	25	4.89	548/1448	4.89	4.88	4.71	4.71	4.89	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	0	0	5	8	13	4.31	825/1436	4.31	4.47	4.29	4.30	4.31	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	1	2	5	19	4.56	579/1432	4.56	4.58	4.29	4.29	4.56	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	0	0	1	0	1	25	4.85	88/1221	4.85	4.05	3.93	3.94	4.85	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	1	1	4	3	16	4.28	566/1280	4.28	4.32	4.10	4.14	4.28	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	0	3	3	19	4.64	489/1277	4.64	4.48	4.34	4.38	4.64	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	0	1	0	24	4.92	178/1269	4.92	4.63	4.31	4.39	4.92	
4. Were special techniques successful	5	23	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 854	****	3.56	4.02	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 9	Graduate 0 Major 5
28-55	1	1.00-1.99 0	B 10		
56-83	5	2.00-2.99 5	C 3	General 10	Under-grad 30 Non-major 25
84-150	14	3.00-3.49 8	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 8	
			? 1		



Course-Section: ANTH 318 0101  
 Title ANTHROPOLOGY OF SCIENC  
 Instructor: MESSINGER, SETH  
 Enrollment: 38  
 Questionnaires: 26

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2007

Page 62  
 JUN 26, 2007  
 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	2	6	18	4.62	482/1522	4.62	4.40	4.30	4.34	4.62	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	0	2	7	16	4.42	670/1522	4.42	4.34	4.26	4.25	4.42	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	6	0	1	1	3	15	4.60	425/1285	4.60	4.43	4.30	4.30	4.60	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	5	20	4.73	245/1476	4.73	4.40	4.22	4.26	4.73	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	3	21	4.80	137/1412	4.80	4.41	4.06	4.03	4.80	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	4	20	4.76	143/1381	4.76	4.43	4.08	4.13	4.76	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	9	17	4.65	325/1500	4.65	4.49	4.18	4.13	4.65	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	1	0	0	8	15	1	3.71	1475/1517	3.71	4.48	4.65	4.62	3.71	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	1	0	0	0	3	16	4.84	129/1497	4.84	4.36	4.11	4.13	4.84	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	4	22	4.85	288/1440	4.85	4.49	4.45	4.46	4.85	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	2	24	4.92	395/1448	4.92	4.88	4.71	4.71	4.92	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	5	20	4.73	326/1436	4.73	4.47	4.29	4.30	4.73	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	3	22	4.81	294/1432	4.81	4.58	4.29	4.29	4.81	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	9	1	2	2	7	4	3.69	823/1221	3.69	4.05	3.93	3.94	3.69	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	1	1	4	13	4.53	376/1280	4.53	4.32	4.10	4.14	4.53	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	0	0	2	3	14	4.63	498/1277	4.63	4.48	4.34	4.38	4.63	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	0	0	0	1	18	4.95	134/1269	4.95	4.63	4.31	4.39	4.95	
4. Were special techniques successful	7	13	1	1	1	1	2	3.33	****/ 854	****	3.56	4.02	4.00	****	
Seminar															
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	25	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 77	****	****	4.52	4.30	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	25	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 65	****	****	4.49	4.33	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	25	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 78	****	****	4.45	4.34	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	25	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 80	****	****	4.11	3.33	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	A	19	Required for Majors	10	Graduate	0	Major	7
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	B	6						
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	5	C	0	General	11	Under-grad	26	Non-major	19
84-150	6	3.00-3.49	6	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5	F	0	Electives	2	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	1						
				I	0	Other	4				
				?	0						

Course-Section: ANTH 326 0101  
 Title AMERICAN INDIAN CULTUR  
 Instructor: KAVANAGH, KATHR  
 Enrollment: 45  
 Questionnaires: 31

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2007

Page 63  
 JUN 26, 2007  
 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	5	4	21	4.42	720/1522	4.46	4.40	4.30	4.34	4.42	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	1	6	5	18	4.33	787/1522	4.47	4.34	4.26	4.25	4.33	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	0	2	10	18	4.42	638/1285	4.56	4.43	4.30	4.30	4.42	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	4	6	20	4.53	444/1476	4.57	4.40	4.22	4.26	4.53	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	4	8	18	4.35	475/1412	4.38	4.41	4.06	4.03	4.35	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	1	2	7	20	4.53	305/1381	4.42	4.43	4.08	4.13	4.53	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	1	8	21	4.67	312/1500	4.63	4.49	4.18	4.13	4.67	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	1	29	4.97	195/1517	4.98	4.48	4.65	4.62	4.97	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	1	0	1	2	10	11	4.29	612/1497	4.15	4.36	4.11	4.13	4.29	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	1	0	0	8	21	4.60	682/1440	4.60	4.49	4.45	4.46	4.60	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	30	5.00	1/1448	5.00	4.88	4.71	4.71	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	1	1	8	20	4.57	527/1436	4.63	4.47	4.29	4.30	4.57	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	1	1	1	1	4	22	4.55	579/1432	4.63	4.58	4.29	4.29	4.55	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	0	0	0	5	8	16	4.38	380/1221	4.08	4.05	3.93	3.94	4.38	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	2	2	4	5	10	3.83	864/1280	4.11	4.32	4.10	4.14	3.83	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	2	1	3	5	12	4.04	919/1277	4.07	4.48	4.34	4.38	4.04	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	1	0	3	4	14	4.36	699/1269	4.28	4.63	4.31	4.39	4.36	
4. Were special techniques successful	9	10	2	0	2	4	4	3.67	625/ 854	3.33	3.56	4.02	4.00	3.67	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99 0	A 20	Required for Majors	5
28-55	6	1.00-1.99 0	B 5		Graduate 0
56-83	3	2.00-2.99 6	C 0	General	6
84-150	8	3.00-3.49 3	D 0		Under-grad 31
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 7	F 0	Electives	1
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	11
			? 0		

Course-Section: ANTH 326 8020  
 Title AMERICAN INDIAN CULTUR  
 Instructor: EDWARDS-HEWITT,  
 Enrollment: 11  
 Questionnaires: 10

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2007

Page 64  
 JUN 26, 2007  
 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	2	1	7	4.50	605/1522	4.46	4.40	4.30	4.34	4.50	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	2	7	4.60	432/1522	4.47	4.34	4.26	4.25	4.60	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	7	4.70	337/1285	4.56	4.43	4.30	4.30	4.70	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	2	7	4.60	378/1476	4.57	4.40	4.22	4.26	4.60	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	2	6	4.40	430/1412	4.38	4.41	4.06	4.03	4.40	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	1	2	6	4.30	556/1381	4.42	4.43	4.08	4.13	4.30	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	2	7	4.60	387/1500	4.63	4.49	4.18	4.13	4.60	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1517	4.98	4.48	4.65	4.62	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	1	0	4	2	4.00	898/1497	4.15	4.36	4.11	4.13	4.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	2	7	4.60	682/1440	4.60	4.49	4.45	4.46	4.60	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1448	5.00	4.88	4.71	4.71	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	1	8	4.70	383/1436	4.63	4.47	4.29	4.30	4.70	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	1	8	4.70	418/1432	4.63	4.58	4.29	4.29	4.70	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	1	1	0	3	1	4	3.78	775/1221	4.08	4.05	3.93	3.94	3.78	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	4	5	4.40	477/1280	4.11	4.32	4.10	4.14	4.40	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	1	0	1	3	5	4.10	903/1277	4.07	4.48	4.34	4.38	4.10	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	1	0	1	2	6	4.20	816/1269	4.28	4.63	4.31	4.39	4.20	
4. Were special techniques successful	0	5	2	0	1	0	2	3.00	779/ 854	3.33	3.56	4.02	4.00	3.00	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: ANTH 397 0101  
 Title SEL TOPICS:ANTHROPOLOG  
 Instructor: RUBINSTEIN, ROB  
 Enrollment: 34  
 Questionnaires: 28

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2007

Page 65  
 JUN 26, 2007  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	0	1	0	5	21	4.70	395/1522	4.70	4.40	4.30	4.34	4.70	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	1	0	0	9	17	4.52	533/1522	4.52	4.34	4.26	4.25	4.52	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	4	23	4.85	189/1285	4.85	4.43	4.30	4.30	4.85	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	4	23	4.85	151/1476	4.85	4.40	4.22	4.26	4.85	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	2	24	4.92	81/1412	4.92	4.41	4.06	4.03	4.92	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	2	4	21	4.70	181/1381	4.70	4.43	4.08	4.13	4.70	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	4	3	20	4.59	396/1500	4.59	4.49	4.18	4.13	4.59	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	5	22	0	3.81	1465/1517	3.81	4.48	4.65	4.62	3.81	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	7	0	0	0	1	6	14	4.62	304/1497	4.62	4.36	4.11	4.13	4.62	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	1	0	7	18	4.62	669/1440	4.62	4.49	4.45	4.46	4.62	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	0	0	25	5.00	1/1448	5.00	4.88	4.71	4.71	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	1	0	2	22	4.80	217/1436	4.80	4.47	4.29	4.30	4.80	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	1	1	2	21	4.72	394/1432	4.72	4.58	4.29	4.29	4.72	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	9	0	2	3	4	7	4.00	606/1221	4.00	4.05	3.93	3.94	4.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	1	3	20	4.79	191/1280	4.79	4.32	4.10	4.14	4.79	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	0	1	1	22	4.88	254/1277	4.88	4.48	4.34	4.38	4.88	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	1	0	0	1	22	4.79	341/1269	4.79	4.63	4.31	4.39	4.79	
4. Were special techniques successful	5	5	0	0	4	3	11	4.39	262/ 854	4.39	3.56	4.02	4.00	4.39	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99 0	A 18	Required for Majors 4	Graduate 0 Major 7
28-55	4	1.00-1.99 0	B 7		
56-83	6	2.00-2.99 11	C 0	General 11	Under-grad 28 Non-major 21
84-150	10	3.00-3.49 3	D 0		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 5	F 0	Electives 2	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 10	
			? 1		