

Course-Section: AFST 100 0201
 Title INTRO BLACK EXPERIENCE
 Instructor: TEMPLE, CHRISTE
 Enrollment: 47
 Questionnaires: 38

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 14
 JAN 21, 2006
 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	2	0	4	32	4.74	320/1674	4.77	4.23	4.27	4.07	4.74	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	0	5	11	21	4.34	816/1674	4.47	4.26	4.23	4.16	4.34	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	4	7	27	4.61	459/1423	4.50	4.36	4.27	4.16	4.61	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	3	4	9	22	4.32	771/1609	4.56	4.23	4.22	4.05	4.32	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	4	8	25	4.57	289/1585	4.58	4.04	3.96	3.88	4.57	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	6	14	16	4.22	715/1535	4.41	4.08	4.08	3.89	4.22	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	1	3	2	9	10	12	3.72	1345/1651	3.96	4.20	4.18	4.10	3.72	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	22	15	4.41	1311/1673	4.30	4.65	4.69	4.67	4.41	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	9	0	1	0	0	10	18	4.52	373/1656	4.38	4.06	4.07	3.96	4.52	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	1	7	29	4.76	496/1586	4.78	4.43	4.43	4.37	4.76	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	37	5.00	1/1585	5.00	4.72	4.69	4.60	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	1	0	4	11	21	4.38	808/1582	4.59	4.30	4.26	4.17	4.38	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	3	6	28	4.68	481/1575	4.74	4.32	4.27	4.17	4.68	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	1	0	0	2	10	24	4.61	234/1380	4.18	3.94	3.94	3.78	4.61	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	1	0	0	3	31	4.80	191/1520	4.90	4.14	4.01	3.76	4.80	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	1	0	9	25	4.66	493/1515	4.83	4.37	4.24	3.97	4.66	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	1	1	0	4	29	4.69	488/1511	4.84	4.37	4.27	4.00	4.69	
4. Were special techniques successful	3	7	6	2	7	6	7	3.21	844/ 994	4.11	3.97	3.94	3.73	3.21	
Laboratory															
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	36	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 278	****	4.21	4.19	3.97	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	33	1	0	1	0	1	2	4.00	****/ 103	****	4.39	4.41	4.33	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	32	2	0	0	3	1	0	3.25	****/ 101	****	4.33	4.48	4.18	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	33	2	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/ 95	****	4.15	4.31	3.99	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	33	1	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	****/ 99	****	4.36	4.39	4.10	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	33	2	1	0	1	0	1	3.00	****/ 97	****	3.76	4.14	3.69	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	35	0	1	0	1	0	1	3.00	****/ 76	****	3.36	3.98	3.32	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	34	0	1	1	0	0	2	3.25	****/ 77	****	3.65	3.93	3.42	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	33	2	0	0	2	1	0	3.33	****/ 53	****	4.19	4.45	4.34	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	34	2	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 48	****	3.86	4.12	4.00	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	34	2	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 49	****	3.74	4.27	4.30	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	34	0	1	0	1	0	2	3.50	****/ 61	****	4.03	4.09	3.87	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	33	4	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 52	****	4.21	4.26	3.91	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	34	2	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 50	****	4.23	4.44	4.39	****	

Course-Section: AFST 100 0201
 Title INTRO BLACK EXPERIENCE
 Instructor: TEMPLE, CHRISTE
 Enrollment: 47
 Questionnaires: 38

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 14
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	10	0.00-0.99	2	A	16	Required for Majors	16	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	5	1.00-1.99	0	B	16						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	4	C	1	General	7	Under-grad	38	Non-major	12
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	2	D	1						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	10				
				?	0						

Course-Section: AFST 100 0301
 Title INTRO BLACK EXPERIENCE
 Instructor: MCANDREW, JENNI
 Enrollment: 7
 Questionnaires: 5

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 15
 JAN 21, 2006
 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	1	4	4.80	243/1674	4.77	4.23	4.27	4.07	4.80	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	460/1674	4.47	4.26	4.23	4.16	4.60	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	2	4.40	697/1423	4.50	4.36	4.27	4.16	4.40	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	173/1609	4.56	4.23	4.22	4.05	4.80	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	265/1585	4.58	4.04	3.96	3.88	4.60	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	283/1535	4.41	4.08	4.08	3.89	4.60	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	0	1	3	4.20	934/1651	3.96	4.20	4.18	4.10	4.20	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	4	1	4.20	1463/1673	4.30	4.65	4.69	4.67	4.20	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	1	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	719/1656	4.38	4.06	4.07	3.96	4.25	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	389/1586	4.78	4.43	4.43	4.37	4.80	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1585	5.00	4.72	4.69	4.60	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	246/1582	4.59	4.30	4.26	4.17	4.80	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	279/1575	4.74	4.32	4.27	4.17	4.80	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	1	0	1	0	2	1	3.75	902/1380	4.18	3.94	3.94	3.78	3.75	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1520	4.90	4.14	4.01	3.76	5.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1515	4.83	4.37	4.24	3.97	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1511	4.84	4.37	4.27	4.00	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	0	1	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/ 994	4.11	3.97	3.94	3.73	5.00	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: AFST 201 0101
 Title INTRO METHODS/RSRCH AF
 Instructor: ROBINSON, THOMA
 Enrollment: 8
 Questionnaires: 7

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 16
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	1	5	4.57	521/1674	4.57	4.23	4.27	4.32	4.57	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	176/1674	4.86	4.26	4.23	4.26	4.86	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	167/1423	4.86	4.36	4.27	4.36	4.86	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1609	5.00	4.23	4.22	4.23	5.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	2	3	4.14	662/1585	4.14	4.04	3.96	3.91	4.14	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	2	1	3	4.17	767/1535	4.17	4.08	4.08	4.03	4.17	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	145/1651	4.86	4.20	4.18	4.20	4.86	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1673	5.00	4.65	4.69	4.67	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	185/1656	4.75	4.06	4.07	4.10	4.75	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1586	5.00	4.43	4.43	4.48	5.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1585	5.00	4.72	4.69	4.76	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1582	5.00	4.30	4.26	4.35	5.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1575	5.00	4.32	4.27	4.39	5.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	4	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	303/1380	4.50	3.94	3.94	4.03	4.50	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	173/1520	4.83	4.14	4.01	4.03	4.83	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1515	5.00	4.37	4.24	4.28	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	507/1511	4.67	4.37	4.27	4.28	4.67	
4. Were special techniques successful	1	5	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 994	****	3.97	3.94	3.98	****	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: AFST 206 0101
 Title AFRO-AMER HIST SURVEY
 Instructor: MCANDREW, JENNI
 Enrollment: 26
 Questionnaires: 9

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 17
 JAN 21, 2006
 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	0	9	5.00	1/1674	5.00	4.23	4.27	4.32	5.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	1	1	2	4	3.78	1358/1674	3.78	4.26	4.23	4.26	3.78	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	2	5	4.50	575/1423	4.50	4.36	4.27	4.36	4.50	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	3	3	4.00	1094/1609	4.00	4.23	4.22	4.23	4.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	167/1585	4.75	4.04	3.96	3.91	4.75	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	0	2	2	3	3.75	1147/1535	3.75	4.08	4.08	4.03	3.75	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	1	3	0	3	3.38	1493/1651	3.38	4.20	4.18	4.20	3.38	
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	4	3	4.43	1289/1673	4.43	4.65	4.69	4.67	4.43	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	1	3	2	4.17	827/1656	4.17	4.06	4.07	4.10	4.17	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	1	1	0	3	1	3.33	1510/1586	3.33	4.43	4.43	4.48	3.33	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	737/1585	4.83	4.72	4.69	4.76	4.83	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	438/1582	4.67	4.30	4.26	4.35	4.67	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	246/1575	4.83	4.32	4.27	4.39	4.83	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	2	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	303/1380	4.50	3.94	3.94	4.03	4.50	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	1	0	5	4.67	295/1520	4.67	4.14	4.01	4.03	4.67	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	629/1515	4.50	4.37	4.24	4.28	4.50	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	1	0	5	4.67	507/1511	4.67	4.37	4.27	4.28	4.67	
4. Were special techniques successful	3	0	1	0	0	1	4	4.17	408/ 994	4.17	3.97	3.94	3.98	4.17	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: AFST 230 0101
 Title COMP AFRICAN RELIGIONS
 Instructor: ANSAH, KWAME
 Enrollment: 25
 Questionnaires: 20

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 18
 JAN 21, 2006
 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	2	4	13	4.40	768/1674	4.40	4.23	4.27	4.32	4.40	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	7	11	4.40	737/1674	4.40	4.26	4.23	4.26	4.40	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	5	13	4.55	517/1423	4.55	4.36	4.27	4.36	4.55	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	4	2	1	2	1	9	3.93	1185/1609	3.93	4.23	4.22	4.23	3.93	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	3	16	4.84	116/1585	4.84	4.04	3.96	3.91	4.84	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	9	1	0	2	3	5	4.00	870/1535	4.00	4.08	4.08	4.03	4.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	3	5	12	4.45	613/1651	4.45	4.20	4.18	4.20	4.45	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	2	18	4.90	706/1673	4.90	4.65	4.69	4.67	4.90	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	2	0	0	4	4	7	4.20	794/1656	4.20	4.06	4.07	4.10	4.20	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	5	4	11	4.30	1104/1586	4.30	4.43	4.43	4.48	4.30	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	2	18	4.90	567/1585	4.90	4.72	4.69	4.76	4.90	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	6	13	4.60	525/1582	4.60	4.30	4.26	4.35	4.60	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	1	5	13	4.50	692/1575	4.50	4.32	4.27	4.39	4.50	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	1	4	4	11	4.25	489/1380	4.25	3.94	3.94	4.03	4.25	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	1	0	1	16	4.78	213/1520	4.78	4.14	4.01	4.03	4.78	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	0	2	16	4.89	230/1515	4.89	4.37	4.24	4.28	4.89	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	0	0	18	5.00	1/1511	5.00	4.37	4.27	4.28	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	2	10	2	0	1	3	2	3.38	795/ 994	3.38	3.97	3.94	3.98	3.38	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	17	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 103	****	4.39	4.41	4.07	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	17	1	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 101	****	4.33	4.48	4.45	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	18	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 95	****	4.15	4.31	4.33	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 99	****	4.36	4.39	4.22	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	18	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 97	****	3.76	4.14	4.63	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 76	****	3.36	3.98	3.97	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 77	****	3.65	3.93	4.20	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 53	****	4.19	4.45	4.50	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 48	****	3.86	4.12	4.50	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 49	****	3.74	4.27	4.82	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 61	****	4.03	4.09	4.23	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 50	****	4.23	4.44	4.42	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 35	****	4.22	4.36	4.63	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 31	****	4.25	4.34	4.50	****	

Frequency Distribution															
Credits Earned	Cum. GPA			Expected Grades		Reasons		Type			Majors				
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	9	Required for Majors		11	Graduate	0	Major		0		
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	7										
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	1	C	0	General		2	Under-grad	20	Non-major		4		
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	4	D	1										
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	0	F	0	Electives		1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant						
				P	0										
				I	0	Other		3							

Course-Section: AFST 241 0101
 Title MAKING OF CARIBBEAN
 Instructor: WALLACE, BELIND
 Enrollment: 3
 Questionnaires: 2

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 19
 JAN 21, 2006
 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	0	2	5.00	1/1674	5.00	4.23	4.27	4.32	5.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	578/1674	4.50	4.26	4.23	4.26	4.50	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1609	5.00	4.23	4.22	4.23	5.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1585	5.00	4.04	3.96	3.91	5.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	373/1535	4.50	4.08	4.08	4.03	4.50	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	1562/1651	3.00	4.20	4.18	4.20	3.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1673	5.00	4.65	4.69	4.67	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1656	5.00	4.06	4.07	4.10	5.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1586	5.00	4.43	4.43	4.48	5.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1585	5.00	4.72	4.69	4.76	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	632/1582	4.50	4.30	4.26	4.35	4.50	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1575	5.00	4.32	4.27	4.39	5.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1380	5.00	3.94	3.94	4.03	5.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1520	5.00	4.14	4.01	4.03	5.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1515	5.00	4.37	4.24	4.28	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1511	5.00	4.37	4.27	4.28	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	205/ 994	4.50	3.97	3.94	3.98	4.50	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: AFST 260 0101
 Title BLACK LITERATURE TO 19
 Instructor: PETERS, JONATHA
 Enrollment: 36
 Questionnaires: 16

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 20
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	7	7	1	1	0	1.75	1673/1674	1.75	4.23	4.27	4.32	1.75	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	10	3	1	2	0	1.69	1673/1674	1.69	4.26	4.23	4.26	1.69	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	9	2	3	2	0	1.88	1421/1423	1.88	4.36	4.27	4.36	1.88	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	6	5	2	2	0	2.00	1607/1609	2.00	4.23	4.22	4.23	2.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	6	5	3	1	1	2.13	1571/1585	2.13	4.04	3.96	3.91	2.13	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	7	3	3	1	1	2.07	1523/1535	2.07	4.08	4.08	4.03	2.07	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	11	3	1	0	0	1.33	1650/1651	1.33	4.20	4.18	4.20	1.33	
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	2	10	2	4.00	1566/1673	4.00	4.65	4.69	4.67	4.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	1	8	3	2	0	0	1.54	1650/1656	1.54	4.06	4.07	4.10	1.54	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	7	6	1	2	0	1.88	1584/1586	1.88	4.43	4.43	4.48	1.88	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	2	2	2	4	6	3.63	1543/1585	3.63	4.72	4.69	4.76	3.63	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	8	4	2	1	1	1.94	1579/1582	1.94	4.30	4.26	4.35	1.94	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	8	4	2	0	2	2.00	1562/1575	2.00	4.32	4.27	4.39	2.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	4	5	2	3	0	1	2.09	1358/1380	2.09	3.94	3.94	4.03	2.09	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	5	3	2	1	1	2.17	1500/1520	2.17	4.14	4.01	4.03	2.17	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	2	3	4	2	1	2.75	1460/1515	2.75	4.37	4.24	4.28	2.75	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	1	1	7	2	1	3.08	1408/1511	3.08	4.37	4.27	4.28	3.08	
4. Were special techniques successful	4	8	1	2	1	0	0	2.00	977/ 994	2.00	3.97	3.94	3.98	2.00	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	7	Required for Majors	6	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	B	5						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	4	Under-grad	16	Non-major	10
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	3				
				?	1						

Course-Section: AFST 261 0101
 Title 20TH CENTURY BLACK LIT
 Instructor: TEMPLE, CHRISTE
 Enrollment: 30
 Questionnaires: 22

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 21
 JAN 21, 2006
 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	0	3	18	4.73	331/1674	4.73	4.23	4.27	4.32	4.73	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	7	13	4.45	657/1674	4.45	4.26	4.23	4.26	4.45	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	5	0	0	1	6	10	4.53	551/1423	4.53	4.36	4.27	4.36	4.53	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	1	19	4.73	252/1609	4.73	4.23	4.22	4.23	4.73	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	0	0	21	4.86	106/1585	4.86	4.04	3.96	3.91	4.86	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	1	5	15	4.55	337/1535	4.55	4.08	4.08	4.03	4.55	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	2	1	4	4	11	3.95	1162/1651	3.95	4.20	4.18	4.20	3.95	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	21	4.95	353/1673	4.95	4.65	4.69	4.67	4.95	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	0	0	0	0	10	6	4.38	561/1656	4.38	4.06	4.07	4.10	4.38	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	2	6	14	4.55	816/1586	4.55	4.43	4.43	4.48	4.55	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	22	5.00	1/1585	5.00	4.72	4.69	4.76	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	1	0	7	14	4.55	589/1582	4.55	4.30	4.26	4.35	4.55	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	5	16	4.68	467/1575	4.68	4.32	4.27	4.39	4.68	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	3	2	0	1	9	7	4.00	666/1380	4.00	3.94	3.94	4.03	4.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	1	1	2	14	4.61	330/1520	4.61	4.14	4.01	4.03	4.61	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	0	0	1	17	4.94	124/1515	4.94	4.37	4.24	4.28	4.94	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	0	0	2	16	4.89	266/1511	4.89	4.37	4.27	4.28	4.89	
4. Were special techniques successful	4	1	0	2	3	1	11	4.24	369/ 994	4.24	3.97	3.94	3.98	4.24	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 10	Required for Majors	5
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	B 8		Graduate 0
56-83	6	2.00-2.99	C 0	General	5
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad 22
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	3
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	7
			? 2		

Course-Section: AFST 271 0101
 Title INTRO COMMUNITY INVOLV
 Instructor: MURRAY, DON
 Enrollment: 15
 Questionnaires: 12

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 22
 JAN 21, 2006
 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	3	0	0	2	7	3.83	1366/1674	3.83	4.23	4.27	4.32	3.83	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	3	1	2	2	3	3.09	1599/1674	3.09	4.26	4.23	4.26	3.09	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	3	1	0	4	4	3.42	1296/1423	3.42	4.36	4.27	4.36	3.42	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	1	1	1	4	4	3.82	1278/1609	3.82	4.23	4.22	4.23	3.82	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	0	1	2	7	4.27	539/1585	4.27	4.04	3.96	3.91	4.27	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	2	0	2	4	3	3.55	1273/1535	3.55	4.08	4.08	4.03	3.55	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	2	3	3	2	3.27	1520/1651	3.27	4.20	4.18	4.20	3.27	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/1673	5.00	4.65	4.69	4.67	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	2	1	3	1	2	3.00	1540/1656	3.00	4.06	4.07	4.10	3.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	2	1	1	3	3	3.40	1499/1586	3.40	4.43	4.43	4.48	3.40	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	1	2	7	4.60	1142/1585	4.60	4.72	4.69	4.76	4.60	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	1	1	2	3	2	3.44	1427/1582	3.44	4.30	4.26	4.35	3.44	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	2	0	0	3	4	3.78	1279/1575	3.78	4.32	4.27	4.39	3.78	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	5	0	1	3	0	0	2.75	1290/1380	2.75	3.94	3.94	4.03	2.75	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	1	1	1	3	3	3.67	1092/1520	3.67	4.14	4.01	4.03	3.67	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	1	0	1	1	6	4.22	922/1515	4.22	4.37	4.24	4.28	4.22	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	1	1	2	1	4	3.67	1265/1511	3.67	4.37	4.27	4.28	3.67	
4. Were special techniques successful	3	3	2	1	1	1	1	2.67	954/ 994	2.67	3.97	3.94	3.98	2.67	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 4	Required for Majors	1
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	B 3		Graduate 0
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	C 0	General	2
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad 12
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	2
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	3
			? 0		

Course-Section: AFST 275 0101
 Title CRIM JUST & BLACK AMER
 Instructor: WIGGINS, JAMES
 Enrollment: 14
 Questionnaires: 10

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 23
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	1	2	4	3	3.90	1322/1674	3.90	4.23	4.27	4.32	3.90	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	2	6	2	0	3.00	1608/1674	3.00	4.26	4.23	4.26	3.00	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	4	5	1	3.70	1192/1423	3.70	4.36	4.27	4.36	3.70	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	4	0	0	3	2	1	3.67	1377/1609	3.67	4.23	4.22	4.23	3.67	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	3	2	4	3.90	907/1585	3.90	4.04	3.96	3.91	3.90	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	7	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	870/1535	4.00	4.08	4.08	4.03	4.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	2	3	4	4.00	1097/1651	4.00	4.20	4.18	4.20	4.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1673	5.00	4.65	4.69	4.67	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	3	5	0	3.63	1319/1656	3.63	4.06	4.07	4.10	3.63	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	2	5	3	4.10	1250/1586	4.10	4.43	4.43	4.48	4.10	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1585	5.00	4.72	4.69	4.76	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	1	3	3	3	3.80	1272/1582	3.80	4.30	4.26	4.35	3.80	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	2	1	4	3	3.80	1264/1575	3.80	4.32	4.27	4.39	3.80	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	7	1	2	0	0	0	1.67	1372/1380	1.67	3.94	3.94	4.03	1.67	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	3	2	5	4.20	700/1520	4.20	4.14	4.01	4.03	4.20	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	1	2	7	4.60	543/1515	4.60	4.37	4.24	4.28	4.60	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	2	2	1	5	3.90	1139/1511	3.90	4.37	4.27	4.28	3.90	
4. Were special techniques successful	0	8	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/ 994	****	3.97	3.94	3.98	****	
Laboratory															
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	9	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 278	****	4.21	4.19	4.36	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	8	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 103	****	4.39	4.41	4.07	****	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: AFST 344 0101
 Title BLACK FOLKLORE
 Instructor: PETERS, JONATHA
 Enrollment: 22
 Questionnaires: 1

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 24
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1.00	1674/1674	1.00	4.23	4.27	4.26	1.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	2.00	1672/1674	2.00	4.26	4.23	4.21	2.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	3.00	1557/1609	3.00	4.23	4.22	4.27	3.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1.00	1583/1585	1.00	4.04	3.96	3.95	1.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	3.00	1435/1535	3.00	4.08	4.08	4.15	3.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	2.00	1636/1651	2.00	4.20	4.18	4.16	2.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	4.00	1566/1673	4.00	4.65	4.69	4.68	4.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	2.00	1641/1656	2.00	4.06	4.07	4.07	2.00
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1.00	1585/1586	1.00	4.43	4.43	4.42	1.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	4.00	1472/1585	4.00	4.72	4.69	4.66	4.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1.00	1581/1582	1.00	4.30	4.26	4.26	1.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	2.00	1562/1575	2.00	4.32	4.27	4.25	2.00
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	2.00	1507/1520	2.00	4.14	4.01	4.09	2.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	2.00	1493/1515	2.00	4.37	4.24	4.32	2.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	4.00	1050/1511	4.00	4.37	4.27	4.34	4.00

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: AFST 345 0101
 Title BLACK AMERICAN MUSIC
 Instructor: DALILI, EFIA
 Enrollment: 22
 Questionnaires: 17

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 25
 JAN 21, 2006
 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	0	3	3	10	4.44	719/1674	4.44	4.23	4.27	4.26	4.44	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	3	4	9	4.38	776/1674	4.38	4.26	4.23	4.21	4.38	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	1	1	1	3	3	7	3.93	1079/1423	3.93	4.36	4.27	4.27	3.93	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	6	9	4.50	490/1609	4.50	4.23	4.22	4.27	4.50	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	0	3	3	9	4.19	622/1585	4.19	4.04	3.96	3.95	4.19	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	0	2	6	7	4.13	807/1535	4.13	4.08	4.08	4.15	4.13	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	1	6	9	4.50	524/1651	4.50	4.20	4.18	4.16	4.50	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	16	5.00	1/1673	5.00	4.65	4.69	4.68	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	7	1	0	0	4	4	1	3.67	1297/1656	3.67	4.06	4.07	4.07	3.67	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	1	2	2	11	4.44	960/1586	4.44	4.43	4.43	4.42	4.44	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	0	1	13	4.93	453/1585	4.93	4.72	4.69	4.66	4.93	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	4	2	9	4.33	850/1582	4.33	4.30	4.26	4.26	4.33	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	2	1	2	10	4.33	886/1575	4.33	4.32	4.27	4.25	4.33	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	0	0	0	2	3	10	4.53	284/1380	4.53	3.94	3.94	4.01	4.53	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	2	1	7	4.50	397/1520	4.50	4.14	4.01	4.09	4.50	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	0	0	1	1	8	4.70	453/1515	4.70	4.37	4.24	4.32	4.70	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	0	0	1	2	7	4.60	563/1511	4.60	4.37	4.27	4.34	4.60	
4. Were special techniques successful	7	1	0	2	0	1	6	4.22	374/ 994	4.22	3.97	3.94	3.96	4.22	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	15	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 265	****	4.06	4.23	4.26	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	15	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 278	****	4.21	4.19	4.24	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	15	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 260	****	4.43	4.46	4.49	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	15	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 259	****	4.21	4.33	4.33	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	15	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 233	****	4.36	4.20	4.18	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	15	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 103	****	4.39	4.41	4.10	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	15	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 101	****	4.33	4.48	4.30	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 95	****	4.15	4.31	3.91	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 99	****	4.36	4.39	4.29	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	15	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 97	****	3.76	4.14	3.48	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 76	****	3.36	3.98	4.03	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	15	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 77	****	3.65	3.93	3.70	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	15	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 53	****	4.19	4.45	3.87	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	15	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 48	****	3.86	4.12	3.67	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	15	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 49	****	3.74	4.27	3.27	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 61	****	4.03	4.09	3.20	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	15	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 52	****	4.21	4.26	3.50	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	15	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 50	****	4.23	4.44	3.82	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	15	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 35	****	4.22	4.36	3.29	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	15	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 31	****	4.25	4.34	4.29	****	

Course-Section: AFST 345 0101
 Title BLACK AMERICAN MUSIC
 Instructor: DALILI, EFIA
 Enrollment: 22
 Questionnaires: 17

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 25
 JAN 21, 2006
 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	6	Required for Majors	6	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B	6						
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	3	C	0	General	1	Under-grad	17	Non-major	5
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	5	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	4				
				?	0						

Course-Section: AFST 361 0101
 Title STUDIES IN BLACK DRAMA
 Instructor: PETERS, JONATHA
 Enrollment: 6
 Questionnaires: 4

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 26
 JAN 21, 2006
 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	2	2	4.50	607/1674	4.50	4.23	4.27	4.26	4.50	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	578/1674	4.50	4.26	4.23	4.21	4.50	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	376/1423	4.67	4.36	4.27	4.27	4.67	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	490/1609	4.50	4.23	4.22	4.27	4.50	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	3	1	4.25	557/1585	4.25	4.04	3.96	3.95	4.25	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	169/1535	4.75	4.08	4.08	4.15	4.75	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	524/1651	4.50	4.20	4.18	4.16	4.50	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	1203/1673	4.50	4.65	4.69	4.68	4.50	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	381/1656	4.50	4.06	4.07	4.07	4.50	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	3	1	4.25	1144/1586	4.25	4.43	4.43	4.42	4.25	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	917/1585	4.75	4.72	4.69	4.66	4.75	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	3	1	4.25	935/1582	4.25	4.30	4.26	4.26	4.25	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	692/1575	4.50	4.32	4.27	4.25	4.50	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	303/1380	4.50	3.94	3.94	4.01	4.50	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	295/1520	4.67	4.14	4.01	4.09	4.67	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	483/1515	4.67	4.37	4.24	4.32	4.67	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	507/1511	4.67	4.37	4.27	4.34	4.67	
4. Were special techniques successful	1	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 994	5.00	3.97	3.94	3.96	5.00	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: AFST 369 0101
 Title BLACK FAMILIES IN U.S.
 Instructor: KING, SHARON
 Enrollment: 14
 Questionnaires: 12

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 27
 JAN 21, 2006
 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	1	4	3	3	3.50	1511/1674	3.50	4.23	4.27	4.26	3.50	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	0	5	3	3	3.58	1460/1674	3.58	4.26	4.23	4.21	3.58	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	4	5	4.08	968/1423	4.08	4.36	4.27	4.27	4.08	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	4	4	3	3.91	1224/1609	3.91	4.23	4.22	4.27	3.91	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	0	2	2	6	3.83	976/1585	3.83	4.04	3.96	3.95	3.83	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	1	3	1	5	3.73	1170/1535	3.73	4.08	4.08	4.15	3.73	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	1	1	3	2	4	3.64	1390/1651	3.64	4.20	4.18	4.16	3.64	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	1	0	4	6	4.36	1339/1673	4.36	4.65	4.69	4.68	4.36	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	7	0	0	0	2	0	3	4.20	794/1656	4.20	4.06	4.07	4.07	4.20	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	1	3	2	3	3.78	1409/1586	3.78	4.43	4.43	4.42	3.78	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	615/1585	4.89	4.72	4.69	4.66	4.89	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	1	1	4	3	4.00	1129/1582	4.00	4.30	4.26	4.26	4.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	2	0	1	3	3	3.56	1358/1575	3.56	4.32	4.27	4.25	3.56	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	0	0	1	1	1	6	4.33	426/1380	4.33	3.94	3.94	4.01	4.33	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	2	1	2	5	4.00	810/1520	4.00	4.14	4.01	4.09	4.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	0	3	7	4.70	453/1515	4.70	4.37	4.24	4.32	4.70	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	358/1511	4.80	4.37	4.27	4.34	4.80	
4. Were special techniques successful	2	0	0	0	2	2	6	4.40	287/ 994	4.40	3.97	3.94	3.96	4.40	
Laboratory															
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 278	****	4.21	4.19	4.24	****	
Seminar															
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 101	****	4.33	4.48	4.30	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 95	****	4.15	4.31	3.91	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 99	****	4.36	4.39	4.29	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 97	****	3.76	4.14	3.48	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 76	****	3.36	3.98	4.03	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 77	****	3.65	3.93	3.70	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 53	****	4.19	4.45	3.87	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 48	****	3.86	4.12	3.67	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 49	****	3.74	4.27	3.27	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 61	****	4.03	4.09	3.20	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 52	****	4.21	4.26	3.50	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 50	****	4.23	4.44	3.82	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 35	****	4.22	4.36	3.29	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 31	****	4.25	4.34	4.29	****	

Course-Section: AFST 369 0101
 Title BLACK FAMILIES IN U.S.
 Instructor: KING, SHARON
 Enrollment: 14
 Questionnaires: 12

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 27
 JAN 21, 2006
 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	6	Required for Majors	2	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	4						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	1	C	0	General	3	Under-grad	12	Non-major	6
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	3	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	3				
				?	0						

Course-Section: AFST 375 0101
 Title THE BLACK CHURCH
 Instructor: KING, SHARON
 Enrollment: 15
 Questionnaires: 11

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 28
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	3	2	2	4	3.64	1464/1674	3.64	4.23	4.27	4.26	3.64	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	2	3	2	4	3.73	1388/1674	3.73	4.26	4.23	4.21	3.73	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	5	2	2	3.67	1214/1423	3.67	4.36	4.27	4.27	3.67	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	2	2	3	3	3.45	1468/1609	3.45	4.23	4.22	4.27	3.45	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	1	2	1	1	5	3.70	1093/1585	3.70	4.04	3.96	3.95	3.70	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	1	2	3	1	3	3.30	1366/1535	3.30	4.08	4.08	4.15	3.30	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	2	1	3	2	2	3.10	1555/1651	3.10	4.20	4.18	4.16	3.10	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	3	8	4.73	1001/1673	4.73	4.65	4.69	4.68	4.73	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	1	0	1	0	2	1	3.75	1237/1656	3.75	4.06	4.07	4.07	3.75	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	1	1	2	5	4.22	1168/1586	4.22	4.43	4.43	4.42	4.22	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	1	0	0	0	7	4.50	1225/1585	4.50	4.72	4.69	4.66	4.50	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	1	1	3	4	4.11	1070/1582	4.11	4.30	4.26	4.26	4.11	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	1	1	2	5	4.22	983/1575	4.22	4.32	4.27	4.25	4.22	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	0	0	0	1	1	7	4.67	200/1380	4.67	3.94	3.94	4.01	4.67	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	1	0	1	7	4.56	367/1520	4.56	4.14	4.01	4.09	4.56	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1515	5.00	4.37	4.24	4.32	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1511	5.00	4.37	4.27	4.34	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	2	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	107/ 994	4.78	3.97	3.94	3.96	4.78	
Laboratory															
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	10	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 278	****	4.21	4.19	4.24	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 260	****	4.43	4.46	4.49	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 259	****	4.21	4.33	4.33	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 233	****	4.36	4.20	4.18	****	
Seminar															
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 101	****	4.33	4.48	4.30	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 95	****	4.15	4.31	3.91	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 99	****	4.36	4.39	4.29	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 97	****	3.76	4.14	3.48	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 76	****	3.36	3.98	4.03	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 77	****	3.65	3.93	3.70	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 53	****	4.19	4.45	3.87	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 48	****	3.86	4.12	3.67	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 49	****	3.74	4.27	3.27	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 61	****	4.03	4.09	3.20	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 52	****	4.21	4.26	3.50	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 50	****	4.23	4.44	3.82	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 35	****	4.22	4.36	3.29	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 31	****	4.25	4.34	4.29	****	

Course-Section: AFST 375 0101
 Title THE BLACK CHURCH
 Instructor: KING, SHARON
 Enrollment: 15
 Questionnaires: 11

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 28
 JAN 21, 2006
 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	4	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	4						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	2	C	0	General	4	Under-grad	11	Non-major	2
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	3				
				?	1						

Course-Section: AFST 390 0101
 Title AMER HLTH CARE & BLK C
 Instructor: REEDER, IRMA C
 Enrollment: 15
 Questionnaires: 10

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 29
 JAN 21, 2006
 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	3	7	4.70	367/1674	4.70	4.23	4.27	4.26	4.70	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	7	4.70	338/1674	4.70	4.26	4.23	4.21	4.70	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	203/1423	4.80	4.36	4.27	4.27	4.80	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	2	7	4.60	374/1609	4.60	4.23	4.22	4.27	4.60	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	1	8	4.70	204/1585	4.70	4.04	3.96	3.95	4.70	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	0	1	8	4.60	283/1535	4.60	4.08	4.08	4.15	4.60	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	175/1651	4.80	4.20	4.18	4.16	4.80	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1673	5.00	4.65	4.69	4.68	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	0	3	5	4.63	292/1656	4.63	4.06	4.07	4.07	4.63	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	249/1586	4.89	4.43	4.43	4.42	4.89	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1585	5.00	4.72	4.69	4.66	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	286/1582	4.78	4.30	4.26	4.26	4.78	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	192/1575	4.89	4.32	4.27	4.25	4.89	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	3	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	540/1380	4.20	3.94	3.94	4.01	4.20	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	213/1520	4.78	4.14	4.01	4.09	4.78	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	230/1515	4.89	4.37	4.24	4.32	4.89	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1511	5.00	4.37	4.27	4.34	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	1	1	0	0	1	2	5	4.50	205/ 994	4.50	3.97	3.94	3.96	4.50	

Frequency Distribution

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