

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	3	5	3	7	11	3.62	1457/1649	4.26	4.39	4.28	4.29	3.62	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	3	5	8	4	9	3.38	1535/1648	4.18	4.25	4.23	4.25	3.38	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	4	4	5	3	13	3.59	1176/1375	4.17	4.36	4.27	4.37	3.59	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	1	1	9	6	10	3.85	1231/1595	4.28	4.37	4.20	4.22	3.85	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	3	1	1	9	15	4.10	748/1533	4.35	4.49	4.04	4.04	4.10	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	2	4	2	8	3	9	3.42	1309/1512	4.21	4.32	4.10	4.14	3.42	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	2	5	10	11	3.97	1089/1623	4.22	4.33	4.16	4.21	3.97	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	12	17	4.59	1121/1646	4.44	4.37	4.69	4.63	4.59	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	3	3	9	8	2	3.12	1483/1621	3.99	4.16	4.06	4.01	3.12	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	1	1	5	7	15	4.17	1183/1568	4.42	4.49	4.43	4.39	4.17	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	4	24	4.79	858/1572	4.94	4.91	4.70	4.73	4.79	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	1	4	7	5	11	3.75	1297/1564	4.34	4.43	4.28	4.27	3.75	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	4	2	7	4	11	3.57	1351/1559	4.35	4.47	4.29	4.33	3.57	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	0	2	0	6	6	13	4.04	672/1352	4.05	4.05	3.98	4.07	4.04	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	11	0	3	2	2	4	7	3.56	1060/1384	4.18	4.32	4.08	3.99	3.56	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	11	0	0	1	2	4	11	4.39	732/1382	4.65	4.66	4.29	4.19	4.39	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	11	0	0	0	1	7	10	4.50	654/1368	4.78	4.79	4.30	4.21	4.50	
4. Were special techniques successful	11	9	1	1	2	1	4	3.67	645/ 948	3.95	3.98	3.95	3.89	3.67	
Laboratory															
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	28	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 243	****	****	4.12	4.47	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	27	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 555	5.00	5.00	4.29	4.33	****	
Seminar															
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	28	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 92	****	****	4.35	5.00	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	27	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 288	****	****	3.68	3.65	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	28	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.06	3.93	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	28	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.09	4.05	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	28	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.47	4.49	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	28	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.38	3.66	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	28	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 312	****	****	3.68	3.59	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	28	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 53	****	****	4.30	4.07	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	28	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.16	1.50	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	28	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 41	****	****	4.43	3.50	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	A 4	Required for Majors 18
28-55	6	1.00-1.99	0	B 12	Graduate 0
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	6	C 10	Under-grad 29
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	6	D 0	Non-major 28
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F 0	
				P 0	

- Means there are not enough responses to be significant

I	0	Other	7
?	0		

Course-Section: ANTH 211 0201
 Title CULTURAL ANTHROPOLOGY
 Instructor: CHAPIN, BAMBI
 Enrollment: 45
 Questionnaires: 33

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 78
 FEB 11, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	1	4	8	20	4.42	749/1649	4.26	4.39	4.28	4.29	4.42	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	4	8	20	4.50	556/1648	4.18	4.25	4.23	4.25	4.50	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	5	0	0	4	8	16	4.43	641/1375	4.17	4.36	4.27	4.37	4.43	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	7	24	4.67	321/1595	4.28	4.37	4.20	4.22	4.67	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	3	3	26	4.64	264/1533	4.35	4.49	4.04	4.04	4.64	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	8	23	4.64	286/1512	4.21	4.32	4.10	4.14	4.64	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	8	24	4.70	284/1623	4.22	4.33	4.16	4.21	4.70	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	1	8	24	4.70	1004/1646	4.44	4.37	4.69	4.63	4.70	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	1	0	3	12	14	4.27	676/1621	3.99	4.16	4.06	4.01	4.27	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	3	11	18	4.47	904/1568	4.42	4.49	4.43	4.39	4.47	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	1	31	4.97	237/1572	4.94	4.91	4.70	4.73	4.97	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	1	1	10	20	4.53	620/1564	4.34	4.43	4.28	4.27	4.53	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	2	2	6	22	4.50	695/1559	4.35	4.47	4.29	4.33	4.50	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	1	0	1	8	9	13	4.10	638/1352	4.05	4.05	3.98	4.07	4.10	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	3	4	2	12	4.10	764/1384	4.18	4.32	4.08	3.99	4.10	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	12	0	0	0	1	5	15	4.67	483/1382	4.65	4.66	4.29	4.19	4.67	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	12	0	0	0	1	3	17	4.76	415/1368	4.78	4.79	4.30	4.21	4.76	
4. Were special techniques successful	12	5	1	1	2	7	5	3.88	546/ 948	3.95	3.98	3.95	3.89	3.88	
Laboratory															
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	32	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 555	5.00	5.00	4.29	4.33	****	
Field Work															
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	32	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 312	****	****	3.68	3.59	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	21	Required for Majors	15	Graduate	0	Major	3
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B	7						
56-83	10	2.00-2.99	4	C	3	General	7	Under-grad	33	Non-major	30
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	9	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	9				
				?	0						

Course-Section: ANTH 211 0301
 Title CULTURAL ANTHROPOLOGY
 Instructor: CHARD, SARAH
 Enrollment: 44
 Questionnaires: 31

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 79
 FEB 11, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	5	0	0	0	3	5	18	4.58	550/1649	4.26	4.39	4.28	4.29	4.58	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	5	0	0	1	1	8	16	4.50	556/1648	4.18	4.25	4.23	4.25	4.50	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	5	0	0	0	1	7	18	4.65	412/1375	4.17	4.36	4.27	4.37	4.65	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	5	0	0	0	1	12	13	4.46	552/1595	4.28	4.37	4.20	4.22	4.46	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	2	1	10	13	4.31	575/1533	4.35	4.49	4.04	4.04	4.31	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	2	1	11	12	4.27	675/1512	4.21	4.32	4.10	4.14	4.27	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	5	0	0	0	3	8	15	4.46	555/1623	4.22	4.33	4.16	4.21	4.46	
8. How many times was class cancelled	5	0	0	0	0	21	5	4.19	1440/1646	4.44	4.37	4.69	4.63	4.19	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	9	1	0	1	1	8	11	4.38	535/1621	3.99	4.16	4.06	4.01	4.38	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	5	0	0	0	1	4	21	4.77	461/1568	4.42	4.49	4.43	4.39	4.77	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	5	0	0	0	0	0	26	5.00	1/1572	4.94	4.91	4.70	4.73	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	5	0	0	0	1	7	18	4.65	486/1564	4.34	4.43	4.28	4.27	4.65	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	1	25	4.96	82/1559	4.35	4.47	4.29	4.33	4.96	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	5	1	0	0	8	5	12	4.16	582/1352	4.05	4.05	3.98	4.07	4.16	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	20	0	0	0	1	5	5	4.36	582/1384	4.18	4.32	4.08	3.99	4.36	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	20	0	0	0	1	0	10	4.82	332/1382	4.65	4.66	4.29	4.19	4.82	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	20	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1368	4.78	4.79	4.30	4.21	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	20	4	1	0	3	1	2	3.43	****/ 948	3.95	3.98	3.95	3.89	****	
Field Work															
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	30	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 312	****	****	3.68	3.59	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors				
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	A 12	Required for Majors 16	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	8	1.00-1.99	0	B 12					
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	3	C 1	General	5	Under-grad	31	Non-major 30
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	6	D 0					
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	7	F 0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant		
				P 1					
				I 0	Other	5			
				? 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	4	0	0	0	1	6	7	4.43	749/1649	4.26	4.39	4.28	4.29	4.43	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	4	0	0	0	4	1	9	4.36	770/1648	4.18	4.25	4.23	4.25	4.36	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	4	0	0	2	3	2	7	4.00	950/1375	4.17	4.36	4.27	4.37	4.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	4	0	0	1	2	5	6	4.14	956/1595	4.28	4.37	4.20	4.22	4.14	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	1	0	6	7	4.36	525/1533	4.35	4.49	4.04	4.04	4.36	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	1	5	8	4.50	380/1512	4.21	4.32	4.10	4.14	4.50	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	5	0	0	2	3	4	4	3.77	1264/1623	4.22	4.33	4.16	4.21	3.77	
8. How many times was class cancelled	4	0	0	0	0	10	4	4.29	1377/1646	4.44	4.37	4.69	4.63	4.29	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	8	0	0	0	2	4	4	4.20	754/1621	3.99	4.16	4.06	4.01	4.20	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	0	1	2	3	8	4.29	1096/1568	4.42	4.49	4.43	4.39	4.29	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	0	0	0	14	5.00	1/1572	4.94	4.91	4.70	4.73	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	0	0	1	6	7	4.43	754/1564	4.34	4.43	4.28	4.27	4.43	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	2	5	7	4.36	881/1559	4.35	4.47	4.29	4.33	4.36	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	5	0	1	1	2	3	6	3.92	792/1352	4.05	4.05	3.98	4.07	3.92	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	1	2	11	4.71	284/1384	4.18	4.32	4.08	3.99	4.71	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	0	1	2	11	4.71	435/1382	4.65	4.66	4.29	4.19	4.71	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	0	0	2	12	4.86	316/1368	4.78	4.79	4.30	4.21	4.86	
4. Were special techniques successful	4	1	0	0	1	7	5	4.31	323/ 948	3.95	3.98	3.95	3.89	4.31	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 221	****	****	4.16	4.45	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 243	****	****	4.12	4.47	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 212	****	****	4.40	4.62	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 209	****	****	4.35	4.64	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	6	0	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/ 555	5.00	5.00	4.29	4.33	5.00	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	16	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 88	****	****	4.54	3.75	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	16	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 85	****	****	4.47	3.33	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 81	****	****	4.43	3.67	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 92	****	****	4.35	5.00	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	16	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/ 288	****	****	3.68	3.65	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 52	****	****	4.06	3.93	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	15	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 48	****	****	4.09	4.05	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	15	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.47	4.49	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	15	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/ 39	****	****	4.38	3.66	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	15	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/ 312	****	****	3.68	3.59	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 53	****	****	4.30	4.07	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.16	1.50	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 41	****	****	4.43	3.50	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 24	****	****	4.42	2.00	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 110	****	****	3.99	3.72	****	

Course-Section: ANTH 211 8620
 Title CULTURAL ANTHROPOLOGY
 Instructor: TURE, KHALFANI
 Enrollment: 19
 Questionnaires: 18

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 80
 FEB 11, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: ANTH 311 0101
 Title URBAN ANTHROPOLOGY
 Instructor: CHARD, SARAH
 Enrollment: 35
 Questionnaires: 23

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 81
 FEB 11, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	4	19	4.83	256/1649	4.83	4.39	4.28	4.27	4.83	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	6	14	4.43	658/1648	4.43	4.25	4.23	4.18	4.43	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	4	19	4.83	219/1375	4.83	4.36	4.27	4.22	4.83	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	7	15	4.61	383/1595	4.61	4.37	4.20	4.21	4.61	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	22	4.96	53/1533	4.96	4.49	4.04	4.05	4.96	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	0	9	13	4.48	422/1512	4.48	4.32	4.10	4.11	4.48	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	0	6	16	4.61	395/1623	4.61	4.33	4.16	4.08	4.61	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	1	0	0	0	11	10	4.48	1221/1646	4.48	4.37	4.69	4.67	4.48	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	0	6	14	4.70	207/1621	4.70	4.16	4.06	4.02	4.70	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	1	21	4.95	123/1568	4.95	4.49	4.43	4.39	4.95	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	1	21	4.95	296/1572	4.95	4.91	4.70	4.64	4.95	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	1	2	19	4.82	253/1564	4.82	4.43	4.28	4.25	4.82	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	2	19	4.82	306/1559	4.82	4.47	4.29	4.23	4.82	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	0	0	0	2	6	13	4.52	291/1352	4.52	4.05	3.98	3.97	4.52	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	1	0	11	4.83	185/1384	4.83	4.32	4.08	4.11	4.83	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	11	0	0	0	1	1	10	4.75	394/1382	4.75	4.66	4.29	4.37	4.75	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	11	0	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	237/1368	4.92	4.79	4.30	4.39	4.92	
4. Were special techniques successful	11	9	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 948	****	3.98	3.95	4.00	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99 0	A 12	Required for Majors 3	Graduate 0 Major 11
28-55	2	1.00-1.99 0	B 8		
56-83	4	2.00-2.99 0	C 0	General 3	Under-grad 23 Non-major 12
84-150	7	3.00-3.49 3	D 0		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 8	F 0	Electives 2	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 12	
			? 0		

Course-Section: ANTH 314 0101
 Title PSYCH ANTHROPOLOGY
 Instructor: CHAPIN, BAMBI
 Enrollment: 36
 Questionnaires: 30

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 82
 FEB 11, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	2	4	7	17	4.30	912/1649	4.30	4.39	4.28	4.27	4.30
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	7	10	13	4.20	966/1648	4.20	4.25	4.23	4.18	4.20
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	23	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	****/1375	****	4.36	4.27	4.22	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	3	10	16	4.37	685/1595	4.37	4.37	4.20	4.21	4.37
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	3	12	15	4.40	476/1533	4.40	4.49	4.04	4.05	4.40
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	4	11	15	4.37	564/1512	4.37	4.32	4.10	4.11	4.37
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	2	3	3	22	4.50	502/1623	4.50	4.33	4.16	4.08	4.50
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	12	18	4.60	1103/1646	4.60	4.37	4.69	4.67	4.60
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	1	1	0	2	12	9	4.17	789/1621	4.17	4.16	4.06	4.02	4.17
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	1	5	9	14	4.24	1129/1568	4.24	4.49	4.43	4.39	4.24
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	1	2	26	4.86	690/1572	4.86	4.91	4.70	4.64	4.86
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	5	9	15	4.34	844/1564	4.34	4.43	4.28	4.25	4.34
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	5	6	18	4.45	777/1559	4.45	4.47	4.29	4.23	4.45
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	2	0	1	9	7	10	3.96	741/1352	3.96	4.05	3.98	3.97	3.96
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	15	0	1	0	1	5	8	4.27	667/1384	4.27	4.32	4.08	4.11	4.27
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	15	0	0	0	1	0	14	4.87	282/1382	4.87	4.66	4.29	4.37	4.87
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	15	0	0	0	1	0	14	4.87	306/1368	4.87	4.79	4.30	4.39	4.87
4. Were special techniques successful	15	3	0	0	4	3	5	4.08	413/ 948	4.08	3.98	3.95	4.00	4.08
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	29	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 221	****	****	4.16	4.07	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	29	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 243	****	****	4.12	3.89	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	29	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 212	****	****	4.40	4.21	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	29	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 209	****	****	4.35	4.12	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	29	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 555	****	5.00	4.29	4.22	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	29	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 88	****	****	4.54	4.63	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	29	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 85	****	****	4.47	4.55	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	29	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 81	****	****	4.43	4.30	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	29	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 92	****	****	4.35	4.46	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	29	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 288	****	****	3.68	3.58	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	29	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.06	3.59	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	29	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.09	4.21	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	29	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.47	4.43	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	29	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.38	4.32	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	29	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 312	****	****	3.68	3.60	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	29	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 53	****	****	4.30	4.32	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	29	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.16	4.44	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	29	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 41	****	****	4.43	5.00	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	29	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 24	****	****	4.42	5.00	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	29	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 110	****	****	3.99	4.05	****

Course-Section: ANTH 314 0101
 Title PSYCH ANTHROPOLOGY
 Instructor: CHAPIN, BAMBI
 Enrollment: 36
 Questionnaires: 30

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 82
 FEB 11, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	1	A	22	Required for Majors	6	Graduate	0	Major	11
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	6						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	6	C	1	General	10	Under-grad	30	Non-major	19
84-150	14	3.00-3.49	7	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	11				
				?	1						

Course-Section: ANTH 320 0101
 Title WITCHCRAFT AND MAGIC
 Instructor: RUBINSTEIN, ROB
 Enrollment: 55
 Questionnaires: 34

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 83
 FEB 11, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	0	1	1	9	22	4.58	550/1649	4.58	4.39	4.28	4.27	4.58	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	4	13	16	4.36	756/1648	4.36	4.25	4.23	4.18	4.36	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	1	0	0	1	8	23	4.69	380/1375	4.69	4.36	4.27	4.22	4.69	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	1	3	8	21	4.48	524/1595	4.48	4.37	4.20	4.21	4.48	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	2	6	24	4.69	225/1533	4.69	4.49	4.04	4.05	4.69	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	3	8	21	4.56	338/1512	4.56	4.32	4.10	4.11	4.56	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	3	0	0	2	3	10	16	4.29	768/1623	4.29	4.33	4.16	4.08	4.29	
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	9	21	2	3.78	1618/1646	3.78	4.37	4.69	4.67	3.78	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	4	13	13	4.30	632/1621	4.30	4.16	4.06	4.02	4.30	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	2	10	20	4.56	779/1568	4.56	4.49	4.43	4.39	4.56	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	1	5	26	4.78	876/1572	4.78	4.91	4.70	4.64	4.78	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	4	9	18	4.45	715/1564	4.45	4.43	4.28	4.25	4.45	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	2	8	22	4.63	561/1559	4.63	4.47	4.29	4.23	4.63	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	6	5	0	4	5	11	3.68	960/1352	3.68	4.05	3.98	3.97	3.68	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	1	2	7	13	4.39	551/1384	4.39	4.32	4.08	4.11	4.39	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	11	0	0	1	4	3	15	4.39	724/1382	4.39	4.66	4.29	4.37	4.39	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	11	0	0	0	2	5	16	4.61	579/1368	4.61	4.79	4.30	4.39	4.61	
4. Were special techniques successful	11	20	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 948	****	3.98	3.95	4.00	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99 0	A 19	Required for Majors 4	Graduate 0 Major 9
28-55	1	1.00-1.99 0	B 9		
56-83	1	2.00-2.99 1	C 0	General 16	Under-grad 34 Non-major 25
84-150	13	3.00-3.49 5	D 0		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 11	F 0	Electives 1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 0		
			I 1	Other 4	
			? 0		