

Course-Section: AFST 100 1
 Title Intro Black Experience
 Instructor: Temple,Christel
 Enrollment: 51
 Questionnaires: 43

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2009

Page 10
 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	5	9	29	4.56	540/1509	4.54	4.41	4.31	4.18	4.56
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	2	1	12	8	19	3.98	1109/1509	4.30	4.27	4.26	4.25	3.98
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	10	3	2	7	9	12	3.76	1091/1287	4.19	4.25	4.30	4.24	3.76
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	2	3	9	12	16	3.88	1103/1459	4.19	4.19	4.22	4.11	3.88
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	5	12	24	4.40	446/1406	4.65	4.23	4.09	4.02	4.40
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	2	2	9	7	22	4.07	767/1384	4.31	4.17	4.11	3.98	4.07
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	1	2	4	7	11	17	3.90	1106/1489	4.31	4.15	4.17	4.20	3.90
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	35	7	4.17	1315/1506	4.72	4.63	4.67	4.66	4.17	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	2	1	1	7	12	18	4.15	738/1463	4.31	3.85	4.09	4.02	4.15
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	3	4	13	23	4.30	1032/1438	4.53	4.34	4.46	4.44	4.30
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	42	4.98	161/1421	4.93	4.76	4.73	4.66	4.98
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	1	0	11	14	17	4.07	1020/1411	4.48	4.29	4.31	4.27	4.07
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	3	8	31	4.60	540/1405	4.70	4.29	4.32	4.27	4.60
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	1	0	0	1	5	36	4.83	90/1236	4.67	4.28	4.00	3.87	4.83
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	1	2	8	29	4.54	396/1260	4.41	4.23	4.14	3.95	4.54
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	2	3	8	28	4.51	568/1255	4.32	4.37	4.33	4.15	4.51
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	1	0	1	5	34	4.73	444/1258	4.60	4.44	4.38	4.18	4.73
4. Were special techniques successful	2	14	8	5	5	3	6	2.78	843/ 873	3.65	3.88	4.03	3.89	2.78
Laboratory														
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	40	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 198	****	****	4.22	4.14	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	40	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 184	****	****	4.48	4.48	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	40	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 177	****	****	4.36	4.29	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	40	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 89	****	****	4.49	4.31	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	42	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 92	****	****	4.54	4.16	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	41	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 90	****	****	4.50	4.21	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	40	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 92	****	****	4.38	4.21	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	41	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 93	****	****	4.06	3.92	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	40	0	2	0	0	0	1	2.33	****/ 48	****	****	4.39	3.75	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	42	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.41	4.29	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	42	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 47	****	****	4.51	4.53	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	42	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 47	****	****	4.18	4.26	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	42	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 44	****	****	4.32	4.12	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	40	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	****/ 49	****	****	4.26	4.28	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	40	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/ 41	****	****	4.14	4.13	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	40	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	****/ 46	****	****	4.31	4.52	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	40	0	0	2	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 37	****	****	4.05	4.47	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	40	0	0	0	2	0	1	3.67	****/ 30	****	****	4.27	4.21	****

Course-Section: AFST 100 1
 Title Intro Black Experience
 Instructor: Temple,Christel
 Enrollment: 51
 Questionnaires: 43

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2009

Page 10
 MAR 22, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	6	0.00-0.99	1	A	13	Required for Majors	4	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	10	1.00-1.99	0	B	17						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	4	C	6	General	22	Under-grad	43	Non-major	43
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	13	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	3				
				?	6						

Course-Section: AFST 100 2
 Title Intro Black Experience
 Instructor: Sutton, Karen E.
 Enrollment: 33
 Questionnaires: 10

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2009

Page 11
 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	7	4.60	482/1509	4.54	4.41	4.31	4.18	4.60
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	1	8	4.70	322/1509	4.30	4.27	4.26	4.25	4.70
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	208/1287	4.19	4.25	4.30	4.24	4.80
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	146/1459	4.19	4.19	4.22	4.11	4.80
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	135/1406	4.65	4.23	4.09	4.02	4.80
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	1	8	4.70	199/1384	4.31	4.17	4.11	3.98	4.70
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	2	7	4.60	341/1489	4.31	4.15	4.17	4.20	4.60
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1506	4.72	4.63	4.67	4.66	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	1	4	3	4.25	628/1463	4.31	3.85	4.09	4.02	4.25
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	3	7	4.70	545/1438	4.53	4.34	4.46	4.44	4.70
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	794/1421	4.93	4.76	4.73	4.66	4.80
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	3	7	4.70	376/1411	4.48	4.29	4.31	4.27	4.70
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	285/1405	4.70	4.29	4.32	4.27	4.80
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	126/1236	4.67	4.28	4.00	3.87	4.75
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	1	2	4	4.43	487/1260	4.41	4.23	4.14	3.95	4.43
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	1	0	2	4	4.29	762/1255	4.32	4.37	4.33	4.15	4.29
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	468/1258	4.60	4.44	4.38	4.18	4.71
4. Were special techniques successful	3	1	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	209/ 873	3.65	3.88	4.03	3.89	4.50

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	1	0.00-0.99 0	A 5	Required for Majors 0	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 3	Under-grad 10 Non-major 10
84-150	0	3.00-3.49 0	D 0		
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 0	
			? 0		

Course-Section: AFST 100 3
 Title Intro Black Experience
 Instructor: Mack-Shelton,Ki
 Enrollment: 27
 Questionnaires: 19

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2009

Page 12
 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	8	10	4.47	635/1509	4.54	4.41	4.31	4.18	4.47
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	5	5	9	4.21	901/1509	4.30	4.27	4.26	4.25	4.21
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	3	0	6	9	4.00	924/1287	4.19	4.25	4.30	4.24	4.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	1	2	2	6	7	3.89	1103/1459	4.19	4.19	4.22	4.11	3.89
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	5	14	4.74	175/1406	4.65	4.23	4.09	4.02	4.74
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	1	3	6	8	4.17	701/1384	4.31	4.17	4.11	3.98	4.17
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	3	2	13	4.42	569/1489	4.31	4.15	4.17	4.20	4.42
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	1	0	0	0	0	18	5.00	1/1506	4.72	4.63	4.67	4.66	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	9	10	4.53	309/1463	4.31	3.85	4.09	4.02	4.53
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	2	4	13	4.58	712/1438	4.53	4.34	4.46	4.44	4.58
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	19	5.00	1/1421	4.93	4.76	4.73	4.66	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	4	14	4.68	389/1411	4.48	4.29	4.31	4.27	4.68
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	4	14	4.68	432/1405	4.70	4.29	4.32	4.27	4.68
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	3	5	11	4.42	338/1236	4.67	4.28	4.00	3.87	4.42
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	1	0	7	10	4.26	613/1260	4.41	4.23	4.14	3.95	4.26
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	1	0	2	8	8	4.16	845/1255	4.32	4.37	4.33	4.15	4.16
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	1	0	2	4	12	4.37	749/1258	4.60	4.44	4.38	4.18	4.37
4. Were special techniques successful	1	9	1	1	1	3	3	3.67	650/ 873	3.65	3.88	4.03	3.89	3.67
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	16	2	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 184	****	****	4.16	4.06	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	16	0	2	0	0	1	0	2.00	****/ 198	****	****	4.22	4.14	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	16	2	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 184	****	****	4.48	4.48	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	16	2	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 177	****	****	4.36	4.29	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	16	2	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 165	****	****	4.18	4.15	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	16	2	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 89	****	****	4.49	4.31	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	16	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 92	****	****	4.54	4.16	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	16	2	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 92	****	****	4.38	4.21	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	16	2	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 93	****	****	4.06	3.92	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	16	0	2	0	0	1	0	2.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.39	3.75	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	16	0	2	0	0	1	0	2.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.41	4.29	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	16	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 47	****	****	4.51	4.53	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	16	2	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 47	****	****	4.18	4.26	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	16	2	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 44	****	****	4.32	4.12	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	15	0	1	0	2	1	0	2.75	****/ 49	****	****	4.26	4.28	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	15	2	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 41	****	****	4.14	4.13	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	15	0	0	2	0	1	1	3.25	****/ 46	****	****	4.31	4.52	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	15	3	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 37	****	****	4.05	4.47	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	15	3	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.27	4.21	****

Course-Section: AFST 100 3
 Title Intro Black Experience
 Instructor: Mack-Shelton,Ki
 Enrollment: 27
 Questionnaires: 19

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2009

Page 12
 MAR 22, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	4	0.00-0.99	0	A	5	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B	8						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	2	C	5	General	13	Under-grad	19	Non-major	19
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	0	F	0	Electives	3	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	1						
				I	0	Other	1				
				?	0						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies		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	7	4	3	5	2	2.57	1501/1509	2.57	4.41	4.31	4.34	2.57
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	7	7	3	2	2	2.29	1504/1509	2.29	4.27	4.26	4.32	2.29
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	10	2	6	2	1	2.14	1286/1287	2.14	4.25	4.30	4.35	2.14
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	2	8	1	5	2	2	2.39	1456/1459	2.39	4.19	4.22	4.30	2.39
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	12	3	4	0	2	1.90	1405/1406	1.90	4.23	4.09	4.09	1.90
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	4	7	2	6	0	2	2.29	1380/1384	2.29	4.17	4.11	4.09	2.29
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	5	6	3	3	3	2.65	1451/1489	2.65	4.15	4.17	4.19	2.65
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	2	4	14	4.60	990/1506	4.60	4.63	4.67	4.61	4.60
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	2	4	6	3	1	0	2.07	1453/1463	2.07	3.85	4.09	4.08	2.07
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	9	5	3	2	1	2.05	1431/1438	2.05	4.34	4.46	4.48	2.05
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	2	3	7	4	4	3.25	1408/1421	3.25	4.76	4.73	4.76	3.25
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	9	3	7	0	1	2.05	1403/1411	2.05	4.29	4.31	4.37	2.05
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	13	2	3	1	1	1.75	1401/1405	1.75	4.29	4.32	4.39	1.75
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	4	3	3	5	5	3.20	1088/1236	3.20	4.28	4.00	4.11	3.20
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	8	3	3	1	0	1.80	1260/1260	1.80	4.23	4.14	4.19	1.80
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	5	2	5	0	3	2.60	1237/1255	2.60	4.37	4.33	4.37	2.60
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	4	1	6	0	4	2.93	1233/1258	2.93	4.44	4.38	4.44	2.93
4. Were special techniques successful	6	6	3	4	2	0	0	1.89	868/ 873	1.89	3.88	4.03	4.04	1.89
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	19	0	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/ 184	****	****	4.16	4.54	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	19	0	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/ 198	****	****	4.22	4.51	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	19	0	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/ 184	****	****	4.48	4.62	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	19	0	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	****/ 177	****	****	4.36	4.65	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	19	0	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/ 165	****	****	4.18	4.56	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	19	0	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/ 89	****	****	4.49	5.00	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	19	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/ 92	****	****	4.54	****	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	19	0	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/ 90	****	****	4.50	****	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/ 92	****	****	4.38	4.00	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	19	0	0	2	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 93	****	****	4.06	2.88	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.39	4.79	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	19	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.41	4.50	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	19	0	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/ 47	****	****	4.51	4.83	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	19	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/ 47	****	****	4.18	4.56	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	19	0	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/ 44	****	****	4.32	4.67	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 49	****	****	4.26	4.33	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	19	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 41	****	****	4.14	****	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	19	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 46	****	****	4.31	4.00	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	19	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 37	****	****	4.05	****	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	19	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.27	****	****

Course-Section: AFST 206 1
 Title African-Amer Hist Surv
 Instructor: Sutton, Karen E.
 Enrollment: 32
 Questionnaires: 21

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2009

Page 13
 MAR 22, 2010
 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	9	Required for Majors	4	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	6						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	1	C	0	General	5	Under-grad	21	Non-major	21
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	4	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	6	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	1				
				?	0						

Course-Section: AFST 212 1
 Title African History
 Instructor: Chuku,Gloria If
 Enrollment: 35
 Questionnaires: 28

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2009

Page 14
 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	2	2	6	18	4.43	698/1509	4.43	4.41	4.31	4.34	4.43
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	6	10	12	4.21	901/1509	4.21	4.27	4.26	4.32	4.21
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	3	3	9	12	4.11	875/1287	4.11	4.25	4.30	4.35	4.11
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	0	6	11	10	4.04	958/1459	4.04	4.19	4.22	4.30	4.04
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	8	7	12	4.15	702/1406	4.15	4.23	4.09	4.09	4.15
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	4	4	9	11	3.96	859/1384	3.96	4.17	4.11	4.09	3.96
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	2	1	4	5	16	4.14	875/1489	4.14	4.15	4.17	4.19	4.14
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	1	0	15	12	4.36	1194/1506	4.36	4.63	4.67	4.61	4.36
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	1	13	7	4	3.56	1220/1463	3.56	3.85	4.09	4.08	3.56
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	1	1	0	5	21	4.57	712/1438	4.57	4.34	4.46	4.48	4.57
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	1	1	4	22	4.68	1002/1421	4.68	4.76	4.73	4.76	4.68
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	1	0	5	10	12	4.14	971/1411	4.14	4.29	4.31	4.37	4.14
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	2	0	6	20	4.57	568/1405	4.57	4.29	4.32	4.39	4.57
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	0	2	1	3	8	12	4.04	649/1236	4.04	4.28	4.00	4.11	4.04
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	3	5	6	11	4.00	746/1260	4.00	4.23	4.14	4.19	4.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	1	1	3	9	11	4.12	862/1255	4.12	4.37	4.33	4.37	4.12
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	1	3	8	13	4.32	777/1258	4.32	4.44	4.38	4.44	4.32
4. Were special techniques successful	3	3	4	1	2	9	6	3.55	691/ 873	3.55	3.88	4.03	4.04	3.55
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	26	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 184	****	****	4.16	4.54	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	26	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 198	****	****	4.22	4.51	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	26	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 184	****	****	4.48	4.62	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	26	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 177	****	****	4.36	4.65	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	26	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 165	****	****	4.18	4.56	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	26	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 89	****	****	4.49	5.00	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	26	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 92	****	****	4.54	****	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	26	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 90	****	****	4.50	****	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	26	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 92	****	****	4.38	4.00	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	26	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 93	****	****	4.06	2.88	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	26	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 48	****	****	4.39	4.79	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	26	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 48	****	****	4.41	4.50	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	26	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 47	****	****	4.51	4.83	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	26	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 47	****	****	4.18	4.56	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	26	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 44	****	****	4.32	4.67	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	26	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 49	****	****	4.26	4.33	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	26	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 41	****	****	4.14	****	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	26	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 46	****	****	4.31	4.00	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	26	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 37	****	****	4.05	****	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	26	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.27	****	****

Course-Section: AFST 212 1
 Title African History
 Instructor: Chuku, Gloria If
 Enrollment: 35
 Questionnaires: 28

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2009

Page 14
 MAR 22, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	2	A	5	Required for Majors	7	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	B	12						
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	3	C	5	General	5	Under-grad	28	Non-major	28
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	6	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F	0	Electives	7	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	2				
				?	2						

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	5	18	4.71	363/1509	4.71	4.41	4.31	4.34	4.71
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	5	16	4.50	543/1509	4.50	4.27	4.26	4.32	4.50
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	5	17	4.63	403/1287	4.63	4.25	4.30	4.35	4.63
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	4	4	14	4.45	536/1459	4.45	4.19	4.22	4.30	4.45
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	2	3	17	4.57	294/1406	4.57	4.23	4.09	4.09	4.57
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	1	0	0	3	5	13	4.48	376/1384	4.48	4.17	4.11	4.09	4.48
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	2	0	4	5	11	4.05	958/1489	4.05	4.15	4.17	4.19	4.05
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	1	21	4.95	292/1506	4.95	4.63	4.67	4.61	4.95
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	1	1	0	3	7	9	4.15	738/1463	4.15	3.85	4.09	4.08	4.15
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	2	4	6	12	4.17	1135/1438	4.17	4.34	4.46	4.48	4.17
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	1	22	4.88	614/1421	4.88	4.76	4.73	4.76	4.88
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	1	4	4	14	4.35	799/1411	4.35	4.29	4.31	4.37	4.35
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	3	0	5	15	4.25	896/1405	4.25	4.29	4.32	4.39	4.25
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	1	1	1	3	7	10	4.09	620/1236	4.09	4.28	4.00	4.11	4.09
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	1	0	1	3	15	4.55	383/1260	4.55	4.23	4.14	4.19	4.55
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	0	0	3	17	4.85	246/1255	4.85	4.37	4.33	4.37	4.85
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	0	0	5	15	4.75	421/1258	4.75	4.44	4.38	4.44	4.75
4. Were special techniques successful	4	10	1	1	0	0	8	4.30	306/ 873	4.30	3.88	4.03	4.04	4.30
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	21	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 184	****	****	4.16	4.54	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	22	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 198	****	****	4.22	4.51	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	22	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 184	****	****	4.48	4.62	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	22	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 177	****	****	4.36	4.65	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	22	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 165	****	****	4.18	4.56	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	21	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 89	****	****	4.49	5.00	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	21	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 92	****	****	4.54	****	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	21	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 90	****	****	4.50	****	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	21	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 92	****	****	4.38	4.00	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	21	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/ 93	****	****	4.06	2.88	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	21	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.39	4.79	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	21	0	1	0	0	0	2	3.67	****/ 48	****	****	4.41	4.50	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	21	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 47	****	****	4.51	4.83	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	21	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/ 47	****	****	4.18	4.56	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	21	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 44	****	****	4.32	4.67	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	21	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 49	****	****	4.26	4.33	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	21	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 41	****	****	4.14	****	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	21	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 46	****	****	4.31	4.00	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	21	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 37	****	****	4.05	****	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	21	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 30	****	****	4.27	****	****

Course-Section: AFST 230 1
 Title: Comp African Religions
 Instructor: Ansah-Brew, Kwam
 Enrollment: 39
 Questionnaires: 24

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2009

Page 15
 MAR 22, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	0	A	13	Required for Majors	2	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	B	4						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	2	C	0	General	7	Under-grad	24	Non-major	24
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	5	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	2				
				?	2						

Course-Section: AFST 271 1
 Title Intro Community Involv
 Instructor: Rhodes, Jason J
 Enrollment: 14
 Questionnaires: 10

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2009

Page 16
 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	1	2	2	5	4.10	1044/1509	4.10	4.41	4.31	4.34	4.10
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	2	1	3	4	3.90	1164/1509	3.90	4.27	4.26	4.32	3.90
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	8	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/1287	****	4.25	4.30	4.35	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	4	0	0	1	2	3	4.33	686/1459	4.33	4.19	4.22	4.30	4.33
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	4	0	1	1	2	2	3.83	986/1406	3.83	4.23	4.09	4.09	3.83
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	5	1	0	1	2	1	3.40	1235/1384	3.40	4.17	4.11	4.09	3.40
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	2	0	1	1	2	4	4.13	896/1489	4.13	4.15	4.17	4.19	4.13
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	1	0	0	9	0	3.70	1474/1506	3.70	4.63	4.67	4.61	3.70
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	1	1	2	1	0	2.60	1439/1463	2.60	3.85	4.09	4.08	2.60
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	2	0	2	2	4	3.60	1358/1438	3.60	4.34	4.46	4.48	3.60
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	1	8	4.70	979/1421	4.70	4.76	4.73	4.76	4.70
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	2	3	1	4	3.70	1222/1411	3.70	4.29	4.31	4.37	3.70
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	2	1	2	1	3	3.22	1326/1405	3.22	4.29	4.32	4.39	3.22
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	1	0	0	2	6	4.33	421/1236	4.33	4.28	4.00	4.11	4.33
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	1	0	2	4	4.29	597/1260	4.29	4.23	4.14	4.19	4.29
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	1	1	5	4.57	526/1255	4.57	4.37	4.33	4.37	4.57
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	1	0	2	4	4.29	802/1258	4.29	4.44	4.38	4.44	4.29
4. Were special techniques successful	3	0	1	0	0	2	4	4.14	394/ 873	4.14	3.88	4.03	4.04	4.14
Laboratory														
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 198	****	****	4.22	4.51	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.39	4.79	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.41	4.50	****
Self Paced														
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 46	****	****	4.31	4.00	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 37	****	****	4.05	****	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 7	Required for Majors	1	Graduate 0 Major 1
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	B 1			
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	C 0	General	1	Under-grad 10 Non-major 9
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	D 0			
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	4	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 0			
			I 0	Other	0	
			? 1			

Course-Section: AFST 275 1
 Title Crim Just & Black Amer
 Instructor: Brooks, Gary Mor
 Enrollment: 15
 Questionnaires: 11

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2009

Page 17
 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	8	4.64	446/1509	4.64	4.41	4.31	4.34	4.64
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	9	4.82	192/1509	4.82	4.27	4.26	4.32	4.82
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	8	4.73	293/1287	4.73	4.25	4.30	4.35	4.73
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	2	1	0	0	3	4	4.13	894/1459	4.13	4.19	4.22	4.30	4.13
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	4	6	4.45	389/1406	4.45	4.23	4.09	4.09	4.45
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	4	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	89/1384	4.86	4.17	4.11	4.09	4.86
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	0	3	7	4.70	243/1489	4.70	4.15	4.17	4.19	4.70
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	782/1506	4.80	4.63	4.67	4.61	4.80
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	0	1	3	2	4.17	726/1463	4.17	3.85	4.09	4.08	4.17
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	219/1438	4.91	4.34	4.46	4.48	4.91
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	0	10	4.82	768/1421	4.82	4.76	4.73	4.76	4.82
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	138/1411	4.91	4.29	4.31	4.37	4.91
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	285/1405	4.80	4.29	4.32	4.39	4.80
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	1	1	0	1	2	4	4.00	664/1236	4.00	4.28	4.00	4.11	4.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	150/1260	4.89	4.23	4.14	4.19	4.89
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	321/1255	4.78	4.37	4.33	4.37	4.78
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	236/1258	4.90	4.44	4.38	4.44	4.90
4. Were special techniques successful	1	4	0	0	1	3	2	4.17	383/ 873	4.17	3.88	4.03	4.04	4.17
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 89	****	****	4.49	5.00	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors		

00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	3	Required for Majors		1	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	4							
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	2	C	0	General		0	Under-grad	11	Non-major	11
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	2	D	0							
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F	0	Electives		4	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0							
				I	0	Other		3				
				?	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	0	2	11	4.85	210/1509	4.85	4.41	4.31	4.32	4.85
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	10	4.77	245/1509	4.77	4.27	4.26	4.25	4.77
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	0	2	9	4.82	199/1287	4.82	4.25	4.30	4.33	4.82
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	4	9	4.69	247/1459	4.69	4.19	4.22	4.26	4.69
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	1	3	7	4.55	306/1406	4.55	4.23	4.09	4.12	4.55
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	1	10	4.75	149/1384	4.75	4.17	4.11	4.15	4.75
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	0	2	1	8	4.55	411/1489	4.55	4.15	4.17	4.14	4.55
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	6	7	4.54	1046/1506	4.54	4.63	4.67	4.67	4.54
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	0	3	2	3	4.00	853/1463	4.00	3.85	4.09	4.08	4.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	2	10	4.83	319/1438	4.83	4.34	4.46	4.43	4.83
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/1421	5.00	4.76	4.73	4.73	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	1	2	8	4.64	456/1411	4.64	4.29	4.31	4.29	4.64
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	1	1	9	4.73	381/1405	4.73	4.29	4.32	4.32	4.73
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	0	0	1	1	3	5	4.20	536/1236	4.20	4.28	4.00	4.07	4.20
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	2	0	8	4.60	352/1260	4.60	4.23	4.14	4.22	4.60
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	205/1255	4.90	4.37	4.33	4.37	4.90
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	1	1	8	4.70	486/1258	4.70	4.44	4.38	4.42	4.70
4. Were special techniques successful	3	0	0	1	1	1	7	4.40	261/ 873	4.40	3.88	4.03	4.08	4.40
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 89	****	****	4.49	4.86	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 92	****	****	4.54	4.67	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 90	****	****	4.50	4.63	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 92	****	****	4.38	4.73	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 93	****	****	4.06	3.94	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.39	4.61	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.41	4.34	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 47	****	****	4.51	4.62	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 47	****	****	4.18	4.47	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 44	****	****	4.32	4.40	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 49	****	****	4.26	5.00	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 41	****	****	4.14	5.00	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 46	****	****	4.31	5.00	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 37	****	****	4.05	5.00	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.27	5.00	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors		
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A 4	Required for Majors 7	Graduate 0	Major 0
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B 3			
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	2	C 1	General 0	Under-grad 13	Non-major 13
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	2	D 0			
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F 0	Electives 1	#### - Means there are not enough	

P	0			responses to be significant
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	0	0	3	10	4.77	291/1509	4.77	4.41	4.31	4.32	4.77
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	4	9	4.69	322/1509	4.69	4.27	4.26	4.25	4.69
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	2	10	4.69	326/1287	4.69	4.25	4.30	4.33	4.69
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	10	4.77	182/1459	4.77	4.19	4.22	4.26	4.77
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	1	1	10	4.54	313/1406	4.54	4.23	4.09	4.12	4.54
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	1	10	4.75	149/1384	4.75	4.17	4.11	4.15	4.75
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	2	2	9	4.54	422/1489	4.54	4.15	4.17	4.14	4.54
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	1	3	9	4.62	981/1506	4.62	4.63	4.67	4.67	4.62
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	1	4	6	4.45	396/1463	4.45	3.85	4.09	4.08	4.45
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	2	10	4.69	545/1438	4.69	4.34	4.46	4.43	4.69
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	13	5.00	1/1421	5.00	4.76	4.73	4.73	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	2	10	4.69	376/1411	4.69	4.29	4.31	4.29	4.69
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	11	4.85	239/1405	4.85	4.29	4.32	4.32	4.85
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	0	0	3	9	4.75	126/1236	4.75	4.28	4.00	4.07	4.75
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	2	2	7	4.45	460/1260	4.45	4.23	4.14	4.22	4.45
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	0	2	9	4.82	278/1255	4.82	4.37	4.33	4.37	4.82
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	236/1258	4.91	4.44	4.38	4.42	4.91
4. Were special techniques successful	2	5	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	209/ 873	4.50	3.88	4.03	4.08	4.50
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	11	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 184	****	****	4.16	4.07	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	11	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 198	****	****	4.22	4.17	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 184	****	****	4.48	4.52	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 177	****	****	4.36	4.30	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 165	****	****	4.18	4.11	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 89	****	****	4.49	4.86	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 92	****	****	4.54	4.67	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 90	****	****	4.50	4.63	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 92	****	****	4.38	4.73	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 93	****	****	4.06	3.94	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.39	4.61	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.41	4.34	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 47	****	****	4.51	4.62	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 47	****	****	4.18	4.47	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 44	****	****	4.32	4.40	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 49	****	****	4.26	5.00	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 41	****	****	4.14	5.00	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 46	****	****	4.31	5.00	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 37	****	****	4.05	5.00	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.27	5.00	****

Course-Section: AFST 320 1
 Title Contemp African Politi
 Instructor: Badru,Lateef Ol
 Enrollment: 22
 Questionnaires: 13

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2009

Page 19
 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	1	A	8	Required for Majors	5	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	1						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	1	C	1	General	2	Under-grad	13	Non-major	13
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F	0	Electives	2	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	1				
				?	0						

Course-Section: AFST 350 1
 Title Psychology of Racism
 Instructor: Robinson JR,Tho
 Enrollment: 27
 Questionnaires: 18

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2009

Page 20
 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	1	0	0	0	0	2	15	4.88	176/1509	4.88	4.41	4.31	4.32	4.88
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	18	5.00	1/1509	5.00	4.27	4.26	4.25	5.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	18	5.00	1/1287	5.00	4.25	4.30	4.33	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	0	1	16	4.78	173/1459	4.78	4.19	4.22	4.26	4.78
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	2	0	15	4.76	158/1406	4.76	4.23	4.09	4.12	4.76
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	0	2	15	4.72	174/1384	4.72	4.17	4.11	4.15	4.72
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	0	18	5.00	1/1489	5.00	4.15	4.17	4.14	5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	18	5.00	1/1506	5.00	4.63	4.67	4.67	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	2	0	0	5	7	4.07	815/1463	4.07	3.85	4.09	4.08	4.07
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	1	1	15	4.82	334/1438	4.82	4.34	4.46	4.43	4.82
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	17	5.00	1/1421	5.00	4.76	4.73	4.73	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	0	17	5.00	1/1411	5.00	4.29	4.31	4.29	5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	1	15	4.94	120/1405	4.94	4.29	4.32	4.32	4.94
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	1	0	0	2	1	12	4.67	176/1236	4.67	4.28	4.00	4.07	4.67
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	1	2	10	4.69	287/1260	4.69	4.23	4.14	4.22	4.69
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	0	1	0	12	4.85	254/1255	4.85	4.37	4.33	4.37	4.85
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	0	1	0	12	4.85	312/1258	4.85	4.44	4.38	4.42	4.85
4. Were special techniques successful	6	6	0	0	2	1	3	4.17	383/ 873	4.17	3.88	4.03	4.08	4.17

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: AFST 353 1
 Title Afr Amer Hist Since 18
 Instructor: Mack-Shelton,Ki
 Enrollment: 15
 Questionnaires: 11

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2009

Page 21
 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	1	2	1	3	4	3.64	1354/1509	3.64	4.41	4.31	4.32	3.64
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	4	0	1	5	3.45	1388/1509	3.45	4.27	4.26	4.25	3.45
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	2	2	0	3	4	3.45	1178/1287	3.45	4.25	4.30	4.33	3.45
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	1	1	2	4	2	3.50	1314/1459	3.50	4.19	4.22	4.26	3.50
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	2	0	1	2	5	3.80	1009/1406	3.80	4.23	4.09	4.12	3.80
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	2	1	3	3	3.27	1282/1384	3.27	4.17	4.11	4.15	3.27
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	4	1	0	3	3	3.00	1403/1489	3.00	4.15	4.17	4.14	3.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	3	7	4.70	917/1506	4.70	4.63	4.67	4.67	4.70
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	1	2	1	0	3	1	3.00	1392/1463	3.00	3.85	4.09	4.08	3.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	1	2	1	6	4.20	1116/1438	4.20	4.34	4.46	4.43	4.20
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	1	9	4.73	933/1421	4.73	4.76	4.73	4.73	4.73
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	1	0	3	1	5	3.90	1145/1411	3.90	4.29	4.31	4.29	3.90
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	2	1	2	4	3.60	1241/1405	3.60	4.29	4.32	4.32	3.60
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	1	1	0	3	3	2	3.56	960/1236	3.56	4.28	4.00	4.07	3.56
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	3	0	1	2	2	3.00	1162/1260	3.00	4.23	4.14	4.22	3.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	3	0	1	0	4	3.25	1180/1255	3.25	4.37	4.33	4.37	3.25
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	3	0	1	1	3	3.13	1215/1258	3.13	4.44	4.38	4.42	3.13
4. Were special techniques successful	3	6	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 873	****	3.88	4.03	4.08	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	10	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 184	****	****	4.16	4.07	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	10	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 198	****	****	4.22	4.17	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	10	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 184	****	****	4.48	4.52	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	10	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 177	****	****	4.36	4.30	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	10	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 165	****	****	4.18	4.11	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	10	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 89	****	****	4.49	4.86	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	10	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 92	****	****	4.54	4.67	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 90	****	****	4.50	4.63	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 92	****	****	4.38	4.73	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	10	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 93	****	****	4.06	3.94	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.39	4.61	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	10	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.41	4.34	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	10	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 47	****	****	4.51	4.62	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	10	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 47	****	****	4.18	4.47	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	10	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 44	****	****	4.32	4.40	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	10	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 49	****	****	4.26	5.00	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	10	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 41	****	****	4.14	5.00	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	10	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 46	****	****	4.31	5.00	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	10	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 37	****	****	4.05	5.00	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	10	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.27	5.00	****

Course-Section: AFST 353 1
 Title Afr Amer Hist Since 18
 Instructor: Mack-Shelton,Ki
 Enrollment: 15
 Questionnaires: 11

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2009

Page 21
 MAR 22, 2010
 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	3	Required for Majors	4	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	5						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	4	C	2	General	1	Under-grad	11	Non-major	10
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	0	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	0				
				?	0						

Course-Section: AFST 369 1
 Title Black Families In U.S.
 Instructor: King, Sharon M.
 Enrollment: 18
 Questionnaires: 15

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2009

Page 22
 MAR 22, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies		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	0	3	11	4.53	563/1509	4.53	4.41	4.31	4.32	4.53
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	3	10	4.53	507/1509	4.53	4.27	4.26	4.25	4.53
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	6	7	4.33	708/1287	4.33	4.25	4.30	4.33	4.33
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	4	9	4.47	520/1459	4.47	4.19	4.22	4.26	4.47
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	2	3	8	4.29	551/1406	4.29	4.23	4.09	4.12	4.29
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	2	4	8	4.27	609/1384	4.27	4.17	4.11	4.15	4.27
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	1	1	4	2	6	3.79	1184/1489	3.79	4.15	4.17	4.14	3.79
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	1	4	10	4.60	990/1506	4.60	4.63	4.67	4.67	4.60
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	8	0	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	271/1463	4.57	3.85	4.09	4.08	4.57
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	7	8	4.53	762/1438	4.53	4.34	4.46	4.43	4.53
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	3	11	4.79	828/1421	4.79	4.76	4.73	4.73	4.79
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	1	6	7	4.43	713/1411	4.43	4.29	4.31	4.29	4.43
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	5	8	4.40	758/1405	4.40	4.29	4.32	4.32	4.40
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	0	0	1	1	3	8	4.38	373/1236	4.38	4.28	4.00	4.07	4.38
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	209/1260	4.80	4.23	4.14	4.22	4.80
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	0	1	2	7	4.60	505/1255	4.60	4.37	4.33	4.37	4.60
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	1	0	1	8	4.60	549/1258	4.60	4.44	4.38	4.42	4.60
4. Were special techniques successful	5	1	0	1	0	1	7	4.56	193/ 873	4.56	3.88	4.03	4.08	4.56
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 184	****	****	4.16	4.07	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	13	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 198	****	****	4.22	4.17	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	13	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 184	****	****	4.48	4.52	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	13	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 177	****	****	4.36	4.30	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 165	****	****	4.18	4.11	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	12	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 89	****	****	4.49	4.86	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	12	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 92	****	****	4.54	4.67	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 90	****	****	4.50	4.63	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 92	****	****	4.38	4.73	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	12	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 93	****	****	4.06	3.94	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.39	4.61	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	12	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.41	4.34	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	12	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 47	****	****	4.51	4.62	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	12	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 47	****	****	4.18	4.47	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	12	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 44	****	****	4.32	4.40	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 49	****	****	4.26	5.00	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	13	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 41	****	****	4.14	5.00	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	13	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 46	****	****	4.31	5.00	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	13	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 37	****	****	4.05	5.00	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	13	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.27	5.00	****

Course-Section: AFST 369 1
 Title Black Families In U.S.
 Instructor: King, Sharon M.
 Enrollment: 18
 Questionnaires: 15

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2009

Page 22
 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	5	Required for Majors	2	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	4						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	4	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	15	Non-major	15
84-150	6	3.00-3.49	4	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	0	F	0	Electives	7	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	0						

Course-Section: AFST 385 1
 Title Prob Solv Urban Blk Co
 Instructor: Hickey, Terrence
 Enrollment: 24
 Questionnaires: 18

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2009

Page 23
 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	1	0	0	0	0	1	16	4.94	95/1509	4.94	4.41	4.31	4.32	4.94
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	2	14	4.76	245/1509	4.76	4.27	4.26	4.25	4.76
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	11	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	183/1287	4.83	4.25	4.30	4.33	4.83
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	5	12	4.61	335/1459	4.61	4.19	4.22	4.26	4.61
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	3	5	10	4.39	462/1406	4.39	4.23	4.09	4.12	4.39
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	3	14	4.72	174/1384	4.72	4.17	4.11	4.15	4.72
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	2	2	14	4.67	276/1489	4.67	4.15	4.17	4.14	4.67
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	3	14	4.82	742/1506	4.82	4.63	4.67	4.67	4.82
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	1	0	0	4	8	4.38	489/1463	4.38	3.85	4.09	4.08	4.38

Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	3	14	4.82	334/1438	4.82	4.34	4.46	4.43	4.82
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	17	5.00	1/1421	5.00	4.76	4.73	4.73	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	1	2	14	4.76	291/1411	4.76	4.29	4.31	4.29	4.76
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	2	15	4.88	194/1405	4.88	4.29	4.32	4.32	4.88
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	5	7	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	176/1236	4.67	4.28	4.00	4.07	4.67

Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	122/1260	4.92	4.23	4.14	4.22	4.92
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	184/1255	4.92	4.37	4.33	4.37	4.92
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	212/1258	4.92	4.44	4.38	4.42	4.92
4. Were special techniques successful	6	1	1	0	2	5	3	3.82	580/ 873	3.82	3.88	4.03	4.08	3.82

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors				
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	A 12	Required for Majors 13	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B 5					
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	0	C 0	General	2	Under-grad	18	Non-major 18
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	5	D 0					
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5	F 0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant		
				P 0					
				I 0	Other	0			
				? 1					