

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	3	1	7	13	20	4.05	1086/1509	4.35	4.41	4.31	4.34	4.05
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	0	2	13	9	18	4.02	1071/1509	4.32	4.36	4.26	4.32	4.02
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	9	10	24	4.30	747/1287	4.42	4.40	4.30	4.35	4.30	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	2	10	10	21	4.09	917/1459	4.34	4.37	4.22	4.30	4.09
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	2	1	8	12	20	4.09	746/1406	4.41	4.48	4.09	4.09	4.09
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	1	13	14	13	3.88	954/1384	4.18	4.28	4.11	4.09	3.88
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	3	0	1	1	7	12	20	4.20	823/1489	4.32	4.46	4.17	4.19	4.20
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	1	0	4	37	4.83	722/1506	4.27	4.47	4.67	4.61	4.83
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	2	0	2	7	21	7	3.89	990/1463	3.96	4.21	4.09	4.08	3.89
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	2	5	16	20	4.26	1071/1438	4.50	4.54	4.46	4.48	4.26
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	2	5	35	4.79	828/1421	4.89	4.92	4.73	4.76	4.79
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	1	8	13	20	4.24	902/1411	4.46	4.48	4.31	4.37	4.24
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	1	5	12	23	4.31	859/1405	4.50	4.57	4.32	4.39	4.31
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	0	1	2	7	16	16	4.05	644/1236	4.22	4.07	4.00	4.11	4.05
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	18	0	2	3	8	4	9	3.58	1021/1260	4.15	4.20	4.14	4.19	3.58
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	18	0	0	0	5	4	17	4.46	611/1255	4.33	4.42	4.33	4.37	4.46
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	18	0	0	0	5	3	18	4.50	620/1258	4.63	4.74	4.38	4.44	4.50
4. Were special techniques successful	18	0	5	3	5	7	6	3.23	774/ 873	3.71	3.72	4.03	4.04	3.23
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	43	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 184	****	****	4.16	4.54	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	43	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 198	****	****	4.22	4.51	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	43	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 184	****	****	4.48	4.62	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	43	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 177	****	****	4.36	4.65	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	43	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 165	****	****	4.18	4.56	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	43	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 89	****	****	4.49	5.00	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	43	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 92	****	****	4.54	****	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	43	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 90	****	****	4.50	****	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	43	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 92	****	****	4.38	4.00	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	43	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 93	****	****	4.06	2.88	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	43	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.39	4.79	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	43	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.41	4.50	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	43	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 47	****	****	4.51	4.83	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	43	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 47	****	****	4.18	4.56	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	43	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 44	****	****	4.32	4.67	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors		
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	A 23	Required for Majors 12	Graduate 0	Major 5
28-55	6	1.00-1.99	0	B 10	General 23	Under-grad 44	Non-major 39
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	3	C 2			
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	5	D 0			
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	7	F 0	Electives 2	#### - Means there are not enough	

P	0			responses to be significant
I	0	Other	1	
?	3			

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	3	2	3	11	14	3.94	1184/1509	4.35	4.41	4.31	4.34	3.94
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	2	1	3	9	17	4.19	932/1509	4.32	4.36	4.26	4.32	4.19
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	3	1	2	3	4	18	4.29	755/1287	4.42	4.40	4.30	4.35	4.29
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	1	2	5	8	16	4.13	894/1459	4.34	4.37	4.22	4.30	4.13
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	2	1	2	2	25	4.47	377/1406	4.41	4.48	4.09	4.09	4.47
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	2	3	6	20	4.21	659/1384	4.18	4.28	4.11	4.09	4.21
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	9	11	12	4.03	965/1489	4.32	4.46	4.17	4.19	4.03
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	17	15	4.47	1108/1506	4.27	4.47	4.67	4.61	4.47
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	1	2	3	19	4	3.79	1068/1463	3.96	4.21	4.09	4.08	3.79
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	1	5	9	15	4.27	1063/1438	4.50	4.54	4.46	4.48	4.27
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	1	2	27	4.87	639/1421	4.89	4.92	4.73	4.76	4.87
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	1	0	6	8	14	4.17	950/1411	4.46	4.48	4.31	4.37	4.17
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	3	0	2	6	19	4.27	889/1405	4.50	4.57	4.32	4.39	4.27
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	2	1	2	4	4	16	4.19	545/1236	4.22	4.07	4.00	4.11	4.19
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	18	0	1	0	2	5	7	4.13	696/1260	4.15	4.20	4.14	4.19	4.13
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	19	0	0	0	3	4	7	4.29	762/1255	4.33	4.42	4.33	4.37	4.29
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	19	0	0	1	2	0	11	4.50	620/1258	4.63	4.74	4.38	4.44	4.50
4. Were special techniques successful	19	0	1	1	3	2	7	3.93	517/ 873	3.71	3.72	4.03	4.04	3.93
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	32	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.39	4.79	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	32	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.41	4.50	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	32	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 47	****	****	4.51	4.83	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	32	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 47	****	****	4.18	4.56	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	32	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 44	****	****	4.32	4.67	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	A 21	Required for Majors	6
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	B 9	Graduate	0
56-83	6	2.00-2.99	C 0	Under-grad	33
84-150	6	3.00-3.49	D 0	Non-major	33
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	1
			P 0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	
			I 0	Other	3
			? 1		

Course-Section: ANTH 211 3
 Title Cultural Anthropology
 Instructor: Myford,Laura C
 Enrollment: 45
 Questionnaires: 22

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2009

Page 50
 MAR 22, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	7	15	4.68	386/1509	4.35	4.41	4.31	4.34	4.68
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	5	14	4.45	621/1509	4.32	4.36	4.26	4.32	4.45
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	3	0	0	3	0	15	4.67	359/1287	4.42	4.40	4.30	4.35	4.67
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	4	4	14	4.45	536/1459	4.34	4.37	4.22	4.30	4.45
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	3	4	14	4.36	478/1406	4.41	4.48	4.09	4.09	4.36
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	1	4	5	11	4.24	639/1384	4.18	4.28	4.11	4.09	4.24
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	1	6	14	4.50	458/1489	4.32	4.46	4.17	4.19	4.50
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	6	10	6	4.00	1383/1506	4.27	4.47	4.67	4.61	4.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	1	0	0	2	8	7	4.29	588/1463	3.96	4.21	4.09	4.08	4.29
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	3	18	4.77	413/1438	4.50	4.54	4.46	4.48	4.77
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	21	4.95	269/1421	4.89	4.92	4.73	4.76	4.95
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	1	1	2	18	4.68	389/1411	4.46	4.48	4.31	4.37	4.68
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	2	19	4.82	273/1405	4.50	4.57	4.32	4.39	4.82
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	1	0	2	2	4	12	4.30	451/1236	4.22	4.07	4.00	4.11	4.30
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	2	2	11	4.60	352/1260	4.15	4.20	4.14	4.19	4.60
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	0	0	3	13	4.81	278/1255	4.33	4.42	4.33	4.37	4.81
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	0	0	1	1	13	4.80	363/1258	4.63	4.74	4.38	4.44	4.80
4. Were special techniques successful	6	0	1	0	4	2	9	4.13	405/ 873	3.71	3.72	4.03	4.04	4.13

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors		
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	2	A 17	Required for Majors 6	Graduate 0	Major 1
28-55	8	1.00-1.99	0	B 4			
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	2	C 0	General 10	Under-grad 22	Non-major 21
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	2	D 0			
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5	F 0	Electives 4	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	
				P 0			
				I 0	Other 0		
				? 0			

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	2	0	0	1	3	7	16	4.41	724/1509	4.35	4.41	4.31	4.34	4.41
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	0	1	2	11	13	4.33	774/1509	4.32	4.36	4.26	4.32	4.33
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	3	0	1	3	7	13	4.33	708/1287	4.42	4.40	4.30	4.35	4.33
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	0	1	0	3	10	13	4.26	770/1459	4.34	4.37	4.22	4.30	4.26
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	1	5	6	14	4.27	575/1406	4.41	4.48	4.09	4.09	4.27
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	2	3	7	14	4.15	718/1384	4.18	4.28	4.11	4.09	4.15
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	2	0	11	14	4.37	630/1489	4.32	4.46	4.17	4.19	4.37
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	1	4	15	7	4.04	1371/1506	4.27	4.47	4.67	4.61	4.04
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	1	0	1	7	8	7	3.91	970/1463	3.96	4.21	4.09	4.08	3.91
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	6	0	1	0	3	4	15	4.39	940/1438	4.50	4.54	4.46	4.48	4.39
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	5	0	0	0	1	2	21	4.83	716/1421	4.89	4.92	4.73	4.76	4.83
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	5	0	0	1	4	4	15	4.38	768/1411	4.46	4.48	4.31	4.37	4.38
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	1	3	4	16	4.46	696/1405	4.50	4.57	4.32	4.39	4.46
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	5	0	1	2	2	9	10	4.04	644/1236	4.22	4.07	4.00	4.11	4.04
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	2	2	3	12	4.32	574/1260	4.15	4.20	4.14	4.19	4.32
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	10	0	1	1	1	6	10	4.21	810/1255	4.33	4.42	4.33	4.37	4.21
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	10	0	0	0	0	5	14	4.74	444/1258	4.63	4.74	4.38	4.44	4.74
4. Were special techniques successful	10	1	1	0	2	5	10	4.28	322/ 873	3.71	3.72	4.03	4.04	4.28
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	27	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 184	****	****	4.16	4.54	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	28	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 198	****	****	4.22	4.51	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	28	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 184	****	****	4.48	4.62	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	28	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 177	****	****	4.36	4.65	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	28	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 165	****	****	4.18	4.56	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	28	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 89	****	****	4.49	5.00	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	28	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 92	****	****	4.54	****	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	28	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 92	****	****	4.38	4.00	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	28	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 93	****	****	4.06	2.88	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	27	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.39	4.79	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	27	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.41	4.50	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	27	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 47	****	****	4.51	4.83	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	27	0	0	2	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 47	****	****	4.18	4.56	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	27	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 44	****	****	4.32	4.67	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	28	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 49	****	****	4.26	4.33	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	28	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 41	****	****	4.14	****	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	28	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 46	****	****	4.31	4.00	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	28	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 37	****	****	4.05	****	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	28	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.27	****	****

Course-Section: ANTH 211 4
 Title Cultural Anthropology
 Instructor: Myford, Laura C
 Enrollment: 46
 Questionnaires: 29

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2009

Page 51
 MAR 22, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	14	Required for Majors	4	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	7	1.00-1.99	0	B	8						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	3	C	0	General	16	Under-grad	29	Non-major	28
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	2	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	1						

Course-Section: ANTH 211 5
 Title Cultural Anthropology
 Instructor: Edwards-Hewitt,
 Enrollment: 16
 Questionnaires: 12

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2009

Page 52
 MAR 22, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	2	9	4.67	410/1509	4.35	4.41	4.31	4.34	4.67
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	5	7	4.58	447/1509	4.32	4.36	4.26	4.32	4.58
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	6	6	4.50	519/1287	4.42	4.40	4.30	4.35	4.50
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	9	4.75	191/1459	4.34	4.37	4.22	4.30	4.75
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	10	4.83	121/1406	4.41	4.48	4.09	4.09	4.83
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	5	6	4.42	430/1384	4.18	4.28	4.11	4.09	4.42
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	2	2	8	4.50	458/1489	4.32	4.46	4.17	4.19	4.50
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	12	0	4.00	1383/1506	4.27	4.47	4.67	4.61	4.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	1	0	0	2	7	1	3.90	983/1463	3.96	4.21	4.09	4.08	3.90
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	2	10	4.83	319/1438	4.50	4.54	4.46	4.48	4.83
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/1421	4.89	4.92	4.73	4.76	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	2	10	4.83	211/1411	4.46	4.48	4.31	4.37	4.83
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	0	1	10	4.67	459/1405	4.50	4.57	4.32	4.39	4.67
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	1	0	0	1	3	7	4.55	248/1236	4.22	4.07	4.00	4.11	4.55
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	2	5	3	4.10	712/1260	4.15	4.20	4.14	4.19	4.10
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	1	0	1	5	3	3.90	992/1255	4.33	4.42	4.33	4.37	3.90
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	0	4	6	4.60	549/1258	4.63	4.74	4.38	4.44	4.60
4. Were special techniques successful	2	6	1	0	2	0	1	3.00	801/ 873	3.71	3.72	4.03	4.04	3.00
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 89	****	****	4.49	5.00	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 92	****	****	4.38	4.00	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 93	****	****	4.06	2.88	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.39	4.79	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	11	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.41	4.50	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 47	****	****	4.51	4.83	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	11	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 47	****	****	4.18	4.56	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	11	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 44	****	****	4.32	4.67	****

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: ANTH 302 1
 Title Evolution/Phys Anth/Ar
 Instructor: Donato,Paul E
 Enrollment: 29
 Questionnaires: 17

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2009

Page 53
 MAR 22, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	4	5	8	4.24	901/1509	4.24	4.41	4.31	4.32	4.24
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	5	5	7	4.12	1002/1509	4.12	4.36	4.26	4.25	4.12
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	3	3	6	5	3.76	1088/1287	3.76	4.40	4.30	4.33	3.76
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	3	4	3	6	3.59	1279/1459	3.59	4.37	4.22	4.26	3.59
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	4	6	7	4.18	674/1406	4.18	4.48	4.09	4.12	4.18
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	5	0	1	5	1	5	3.83	993/1384	3.83	4.28	4.11	4.15	3.83
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	2	6	9	4.41	583/1489	4.41	4.46	4.17	4.14	4.41
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	17	5.00	1/1506	5.00	4.47	4.67	4.67	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	3	6	8	4.29	588/1463	4.29	4.21	4.09	4.08	4.29
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	2	3	11	4.56	725/1438	4.56	4.54	4.46	4.43	4.56
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	2	14	4.88	614/1421	4.88	4.92	4.73	4.73	4.88
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	3	6	7	4.25	885/1411	4.25	4.48	4.31	4.29	4.25
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	3	4	9	4.38	788/1405	4.38	4.57	4.32	4.32	4.38
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	1	4	1	4	4	2	2.93	1154/1236	2.93	4.07	4.00	4.07	2.93
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	1	1	3	3	4	3.67	982/1260	3.67	4.20	4.14	4.22	3.67
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	0	2	3	7	4.42	656/1255	4.42	4.42	4.33	4.37	4.42
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	0	1	1	10	4.75	421/1258	4.75	4.74	4.38	4.42	4.75
4. Were special techniques successful	5	11	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 873	****	3.72	4.03	4.08	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors		
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 3	Required for Majors 6	Graduate 0	Major 3
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B 8			
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	1	C 3	General 4	Under-grad 17	Non-major 14
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	4	D 0			
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5	F 0	Electives 4	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	
				P 0			
				I 0	Other 1		
				? 1			

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	4	15	4.70	374/1509	4.70	4.41	4.31	4.32	4.70
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	6	12	4.50	543/1509	4.50	4.36	4.26	4.25	4.50
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	3	16	4.75	261/1287	4.75	4.40	4.30	4.33	4.75
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	6	12	4.45	553/1459	4.45	4.37	4.22	4.26	4.45
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	3	16	4.75	164/1406	4.75	4.48	4.09	4.12	4.75
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	5	14	4.65	234/1384	4.65	4.28	4.11	4.15	4.65
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	6	14	4.70	243/1489	4.70	4.46	4.17	4.14	4.70
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	1	0	0	0	19	4.80	782/1506	4.80	4.47	4.67	4.67	4.80
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	0	0	0	0	6	8	4.57	271/1463	4.57	4.21	4.09	4.08	4.57
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	1	18	4.95	131/1438	4.95	4.54	4.46	4.43	4.95
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	19	5.00	1/1421	5.00	4.92	4.73	4.73	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	2	3	13	4.61	482/1411	4.61	4.48	4.31	4.29	4.61
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	2	16	4.79	309/1405	4.79	4.57	4.32	4.32	4.79
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	0	1	1	1	4	11	4.28	474/1236	4.28	4.07	4.00	4.07	4.28
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	1	3	10	4.64	323/1260	4.64	4.20	4.14	4.22	4.64
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	0	0	2	1	10	4.62	494/1255	4.62	4.42	4.33	4.37	4.62
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	0	0	0	2	11	4.85	312/1258	4.85	4.74	4.38	4.42	4.85
4. Were special techniques successful	7	4	0	2	2	2	3	3.67	650/ 873	3.67	3.72	4.03	4.08	3.67
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.39	4.61	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.41	4.34	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 47	****	****	4.18	4.47	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors		
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 9	Required for Majors 7	Graduate 0	Major 4
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B 5			
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	0	C 3	General 2	Under-grad 20	Non-major 16
84-150	6	3.00-3.49	2	D 0			
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	6	F 0	Electives 8	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	
				P 0			
				I 0	Other 0		
				? 0			

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	2	12	13	4.41	724/1509	4.41	4.41	4.31	4.32	4.41
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	4	12	11	4.26	859/1509	4.26	4.36	4.26	4.25	4.26
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	6	0	0	2	7	12	4.48	554/1287	4.48	4.40	4.30	4.33	4.48
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	7	18	4.59	356/1459	4.59	4.37	4.22	4.26	4.59
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	3	5	19	4.59	275/1406	4.59	4.48	4.09	4.12	4.59
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	10	15	4.48	367/1384	4.48	4.28	4.11	4.15	4.48
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	2	0	0	1	8	16	4.60	341/1489	4.60	4.46	4.17	4.14	4.60
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	25	2	4.07	1357/1506	4.07	4.47	4.67	4.67	4.07
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	1	9	13	4.52	309/1463	4.52	4.21	4.09	4.08	4.52
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	3	12	11	4.31	1032/1438	4.31	4.54	4.46	4.43	4.31
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	1	25	4.96	215/1421	4.96	4.92	4.73	4.73	4.96
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	5	7	14	4.35	799/1411	4.35	4.48	4.31	4.29	4.35
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	8	17	4.62	526/1405	4.62	4.57	4.32	4.32	4.62
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	17	1	1	2	1	4	3.67	904/1236	3.67	4.07	4.00	4.07	3.67
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	2	5	12	4.53	402/1260	4.53	4.20	4.14	4.22	4.53
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	0	0	0	4	15	4.79	310/1255	4.79	4.42	4.33	4.37	4.79
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	0	0	0	2	17	4.89	248/1258	4.89	4.74	4.38	4.42	4.89
4. Were special techniques successful	8	13	1	0	2	0	3	3.67	****/ 873	****	3.72	4.03	4.08	****
Laboratory														
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	26	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 198	****	****	4.22	4.17	****
Seminar														
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	26	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 92	****	****	4.54	4.67	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	26	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 90	****	****	4.50	4.63	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	18	Required for Majors	14	Graduate	0	Major	8
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B	7						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	1	C	2	General	3	Under-grad	27	Non-major	19
84-150	7	3.00-3.49	9	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	6	F	0	Electives	5	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	1				
				?	0						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	1	3	7	16	4.41	724/1509	4.41	4.41	4.31	4.32	4.41
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	7	19	4.67	356/1509	4.67	4.36	4.26	4.25	4.67
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	24	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/1287	****	4.40	4.30	4.33	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	7	18	4.59	356/1459	4.59	4.37	4.22	4.26	4.59
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	0	7	19	4.63	253/1406	4.63	4.48	4.09	4.12	4.63
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	3	7	17	4.52	341/1384	4.52	4.28	4.11	4.15	4.52
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	5	22	4.81	145/1489	4.81	4.46	4.17	4.14	4.81
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	15	12	4.44	1127/1506	4.44	4.47	4.67	4.67	4.44
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	1	13	11	4.40	467/1463	4.40	4.21	4.09	4.08	4.40
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	3	10	13	4.38	950/1438	4.38	4.54	4.46	4.43	4.38
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	1	24	4.96	215/1421	4.96	4.92	4.73	4.73	4.96
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	2	9	13	4.46	677/1411	4.46	4.48	4.31	4.29	4.46
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	2	8	15	4.52	615/1405	4.52	4.57	4.32	4.32	4.52
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	0	2	6	18	4.62	205/1236	4.62	4.07	4.00	4.07	4.62
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	2	0	4	9	4.33	558/1260	4.33	4.20	4.14	4.22	4.33
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	12	0	1	0	0	3	11	4.53	554/1255	4.53	4.42	4.33	4.37	4.53
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	12	0	0	0	0	2	13	4.87	286/1258	4.87	4.74	4.38	4.42	4.87
4. Were special techniques successful	12	0	1	1	3	5	5	3.80	585/ 873	3.80	3.72	4.03	4.08	3.80
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	26	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.39	4.61	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	26	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.41	4.34	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	26	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 47	****	****	4.51	4.62	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	26	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 47	****	****	4.18	4.47	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	26	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 44	****	****	4.32	4.40	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 20	Required for Majors	13
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	B 4		Graduate 0
56-83	5	2.00-2.99	C 1	General	7
84-150	8	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad 27
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	5
			P 1		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	1
			? 1		

Course-Section: ANTH 400 1
 Title Anthropological Theory
 Instructor: Donato, Paul E
 Enrollment: 15
 Questionnaires: 11

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2009

Page 57
 MAR 22, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	4	7	4.64	446/1509	4.64	4.41	4.31	4.39	4.64
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	2	7	4.45	621/1509	4.45	4.36	4.26	4.26	4.45
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	1	8	4.55	481/1287	4.55	4.40	4.30	4.38	4.55
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	9	4.82	141/1459	4.82	4.37	4.22	4.32	4.82
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	2	8	4.64	246/1406	4.64	4.48	4.09	4.11	4.64
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	2	7	4.45	394/1384	4.45	4.28	4.11	4.23	4.45
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	1	1	8	4.45	527/1489	4.45	4.46	4.17	4.18	4.45
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1506	5.00	4.47	4.67	4.67	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	0	4	4	4.50	325/1463	4.50	4.21	4.09	4.18	4.50
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	1	9	4.73	497/1438	4.73	4.54	4.46	4.50	4.73
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1421	5.00	4.92	4.73	4.76	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	243/1411	4.80	4.48	4.31	4.35	4.80
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	172/1405	4.90	4.57	4.32	4.34	4.90
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	3	0	4	4.14	691/1260	4.14	4.20	4.14	4.25	4.14
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	1	1	1	4	4.14	851/1255	4.14	4.42	4.33	4.46	4.14
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	299/1258	4.86	4.74	4.38	4.51	4.86

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	5	Required for Majors	9	Graduate	0	Major	7
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	3						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	1	C	1	General	0	Under-grad	11	Non-major	4
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	0						