

Course-Section: AFST 100 0101
 Title INTRO BLACK EXPERIENCE
 Instructor: MACK-SHELTON, K
 Enrollment: 45
 Questionnaires: 32

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 5
 JUL 2, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	5	7	20	4.47	697/1576	3.65	4.36	4.30	4.11	4.47	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	9	5	17	4.19	1005/1576	3.62	4.26	4.27	4.18	4.19	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	2	4	8	18	4.31	788/1342	3.69	4.30	4.32	4.19	4.31	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	5	7	19	4.45	597/1520	3.78	4.23	4.25	4.09	4.45	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	1	5	5	20	4.31	587/1465	3.72	4.34	4.12	4.02	4.31	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	3	1	3	2	6	16	4.18	768/1434	3.59	3.97	4.14	3.94	4.18	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	5	6	20	4.41	690/1547	3.94	4.05	4.19	4.10	4.41	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	31	4.97	188/1574	4.73	4.65	4.64	4.59	4.97	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	9	23	4.72	222/1554	3.50	4.02	4.10	4.01	4.72	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	2	9	21	4.59	762/1488	3.66	4.33	4.47	4.41	4.59	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	1	30	4.91	557/1493	4.32	4.77	4.73	4.65	4.91	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	2	6	23	4.68	453/1486	3.91	4.29	4.32	4.26	4.68	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	2	5	24	4.71	448/1489	3.72	4.36	4.32	4.22	4.71	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	2	0	0	5	2	22	4.59	268/1277	4.26	3.99	4.03	3.91	4.59	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	3	7	22	4.59	387/1279	4.00	4.19	4.17	3.96	4.59	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	4	7	21	4.53	612/1270	4.17	4.56	4.35	4.09	4.53	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	1	2	4	25	4.66	543/1269	4.18	4.52	4.35	4.09	4.66	
4. Were special techniques successful	1	13	3	1	9	2	3	3.06	796/ 878	3.15	3.79	4.05	3.91	3.06	
Laboratory															
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	29	0	1	0	0	0	2	3.67	****/ 240	****	****	4.35	4.29	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	29	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 232	****	****	4.29	4.27	****	
Seminar															
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	29	1	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 79	****	****	4.69	4.52	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	25	2	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	****/ 375	****	5.00	4.01	3.78	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	30	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 52	****	****	4.48	4.20	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	30	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 48	****	****	4.40	4.11	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	30	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 44	****	****	4.73	4.71	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	30	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 45	****	****	4.57	4.72	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	28	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	****/ 326	****	5.00	4.03	3.64	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	30	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 40	****	****	4.60	4.44	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	30	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 24	****	****	4.83	4.71	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	30	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 35	****	****	4.67	4.68	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	30	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 28	****	****	4.78	4.65	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	26	1	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	****/ 382	****	5.00	4.08	3.86	****	

Course-Section: AFST 100 0101
 Title INTRO BLACK EXPERIENCE
 Instructor: MACK-SHELTON, K
 Enrollment: 45
 Questionnaires: 32

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 5
 JUL 2, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	7	0.00-0.99 0	A 14	Required for Majors 23	Graduate 0 Major 0
28-55	6	1.00-1.99 0	B 11		
56-83	4	2.00-2.99 6	C 7	General 6	Under-grad 32 Non-major 32
84-150	0	3.00-3.49 4	D 0		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 5	F 0	Electives 1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 2	
			? 0		

Course-Section: AFST 100 0201
 Title INTRO BLACK EXPERIENCE
 Instructor: SUTTON, KAREN E
 Enrollment: 35
 Questionnaires: 18

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 6
 JUL 2, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sept
	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	6	1	6	0	5	2.83	1554/1576	3.65	4.36	4.30	4.11	2.83	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	4	1	7	2	4	3.06	1519/1576	3.62	4.26	4.27	4.18	3.06	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	1	3	3	6	0	5	3.06	1290/1342	3.69	4.30	4.32	4.19	3.06	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	2	4	5	2	4	3.12	1461/1520	3.78	4.23	4.25	4.09	3.12	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	4	2	4	2	5	3.12	1366/1465	3.72	4.34	4.12	4.02	3.12	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	4	2	5	2	4	3.00	1380/1434	3.59	3.97	4.14	3.94	3.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	1	2	8	0	6	3.47	1356/1547	3.94	4.05	4.19	4.10	3.47	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	9	9	4.50	1079/1574	4.73	4.65	4.64	4.59	4.50	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	1	4	1	5	1	0	2.27	1541/1554	3.50	4.02	4.10	4.01	2.27	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	6	1	3	1	4	2.73	1471/1488	3.66	4.33	4.47	4.41	2.73	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	1	1	4	4	5	3.73	1456/1493	4.32	4.77	4.73	4.65	3.73	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	2	2	7	0	4	3.13	1407/1486	3.91	4.29	4.32	4.26	3.13	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	6	1	3	1	4	2.73	1456/1489	3.72	4.36	4.32	4.22	2.73	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	0	2	0	2	3	7	3.93	780/1277	4.26	3.99	4.03	3.91	3.93	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	1	2	2	2	3	3.40	1106/1279	4.00	4.19	4.17	3.96	3.40	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	2	1	0	1	6	3.80	1033/1270	4.17	4.56	4.35	4.09	3.80	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	2	1	1	0	6	3.70	1055/1269	4.18	4.52	4.35	4.09	3.70	
4. Were special techniques successful	8	2	2	2	0	0	4	3.25	770/ 878	3.15	3.79	4.05	3.91	3.25	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	16	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 234	****	****	4.23	4.08	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	16	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 240	****	****	4.35	4.29	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 229	****	****	4.51	4.43	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 232	****	****	4.29	4.27	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 379	****	****	4.20	4.15	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	15	0	1	0	0	0	2	3.67	****/ 85	****	****	4.72	4.52	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	16	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 79	****	****	4.69	4.52	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/ 72	****	****	4.64	4.43	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 80	****	****	4.61	4.55	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	16	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 375	****	5.00	4.01	3.78	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.48	4.20	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.40	4.11	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 44	****	****	4.73	4.71	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 45	****	****	4.57	4.72	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 326	****	5.00	4.03	3.64	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 40	****	****	4.60	4.44	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 24	****	****	4.83	4.71	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 35	****	****	4.67	4.68	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 28	****	****	4.78	4.65	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 382	****	5.00	4.08	3.86	****	

Course-Section: AFST 100 0201
 Title INTRO BLACK EXPERIENCE
 Instructor: SUTTON, KAREN E
 Enrollment: 35
 Questionnaires: 18

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 6
 JUL 2, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	4	0.00-0.99	1	A	6	Required for Majors	9	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	1	B	6						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	2	C	0	General	2	Under-grad	18	Non-major	18
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	5	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	2				
				?	2						

Course-Section: AFST 201 0101
 Title INTRO METHODS/RSRCH AF
 Instructor: ROBINSON, THOMA
 Enrollment: 13
 Questionnaires: 10

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 7
 JUL 2, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	2	4	4	4.20	1019/1576	4.20	4.36	4.30	4.35	4.20	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	222/1576	4.80	4.26	4.27	4.32	4.80	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	179/1342	4.90	4.30	4.32	4.41	4.90	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	249/1520	4.75	4.23	4.25	4.26	4.75	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	3	3	3	3.80	1067/1465	3.80	4.34	4.12	4.09	3.80	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	3	1	1	0	3	2	3.57	1181/1434	3.57	3.97	4.14	4.06	3.57	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	3	7	4.70	303/1547	4.70	4.05	4.19	4.22	4.70	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1574	5.00	4.65	4.64	4.62	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	0	0	0	0	3	1	4.25	712/1554	4.25	4.02	4.10	4.05	4.25	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	401/1488	4.80	4.33	4.47	4.44	4.80	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	1	8	4.70	1017/1493	4.70	4.77	4.73	4.75	4.70	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	2	7	4.60	561/1486	4.60	4.29	4.32	4.29	4.60	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	4	6	4.60	579/1489	4.60	4.36	4.32	4.31	4.60	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	1	1	1	2	2	3	3.56	997/1277	3.56	3.99	4.03	4.01	3.56	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	1	1	3	3	4.00	802/1279	4.00	4.19	4.17	4.14	4.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	1	1	6	4.63	541/1270	4.63	4.56	4.35	4.30	4.63	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	2	1	5	4.38	747/1269	4.38	4.52	4.35	4.29	4.38	
4. Were special techniques successful	2	6	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/ 878	****	3.79	4.05	3.92	****	
Seminar															
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	7	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/ 375	5.00	5.00	4.01	4.21	5.00	
Field Work															
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 326	****	5.00	4.03	4.43	****	
Self Paced															
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 382	****	5.00	4.08	4.39	****	

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 4		
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	C 2	General	1
84-150	2	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		
			? 1	Other	5

Course-Section: AFST 206 0101
 Title AFRICAN-AMER HIST SURV
 Instructor: SUTTON, KAREN E
 Enrollment: 25
 Questionnaires: 8

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 8
 JUL 2, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	2	5	4.50	637/1576	4.50	4.36	4.30	4.35	4.50	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	1	4	4.13	1058/1576	4.13	4.26	4.27	4.32	4.13	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	2	4	4.25	835/1342	4.25	4.30	4.32	4.41	4.25	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	3	0	4	4.14	961/1520	4.14	4.23	4.25	4.26	4.14	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	3	4	4.38	537/1465	4.38	4.34	4.12	4.09	4.38	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	1	3	3	4.00	878/1434	4.00	3.97	4.14	4.06	4.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	2	2	3	3.88	1167/1547	3.88	4.05	4.19	4.22	3.88	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	758/1574	4.75	4.65	4.64	4.62	4.75	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	0	3	0	0	3.00	1448/1554	3.00	4.02	4.10	4.05	3.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	1	1	1	1	4	3.75	1353/1488	3.75	4.33	4.47	4.44	3.75	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	908/1493	4.75	4.77	4.73	4.75	4.75	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	2	5	4.50	678/1486	4.50	4.29	4.32	4.29	4.50	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	2	1	4	3.88	1205/1489	3.88	4.36	4.32	4.31	3.88	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	1	1	0	0	2	3	4.00	692/1277	4.00	3.99	4.03	4.01	4.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	0	2	1	3	3.71	981/1279	3.71	4.19	4.17	4.14	3.71	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	1	0	1	0	4	4.00	928/1270	4.00	4.56	4.35	4.30	4.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	1	0	0	1	4	4.17	870/1269	4.17	4.52	4.35	4.29	4.17	
4. Were special techniques successful	2	3	0	1	0	0	2	4.00	464/ 878	4.00	3.79	4.05	3.92	4.00	
Seminar															
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	6	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 375	5.00	5.00	4.01	4.21	5.00	
Field Work															
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	6	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 326	5.00	5.00	4.03	4.43	5.00	
Self Paced															
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	5	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/ 382	5.00	5.00	4.08	4.39	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	2	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	3						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	1	Under-grad	8	Non-major	8
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	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	2				
				?	1						

Course-Section: AFST 211 0101
 Title INTRO TO CONTEMP AFRIC
 Instructor: BADRU, LATEEF
 Enrollment: 61
 Questionnaires: 49

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 9
 JUL 2, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	2	1	4	9	32	4.42	772/1576	4.42	4.36	4.30	4.35	4.42	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	2	4	7	14	21	4.00	1138/1576	4.00	4.26	4.27	4.32	4.00	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	1	2	7	9	5	23	3.87	1084/1342	3.87	4.30	4.32	4.41	3.87	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	1	1	2	10	9	25	4.17	937/1520	4.17	4.23	4.25	4.26	4.17	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	3	5	2	4	6	12	17	3.93	961/1465	3.93	4.34	4.12	4.09	3.93	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	3	9	12	23	4.17	768/1434	4.17	3.97	4.14	4.06	4.17	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	1	1	6	9	10	20	3.91	1134/1547	3.91	4.05	4.19	4.22	3.91	
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	2	45	4.96	235/1574	4.96	4.65	4.64	4.62	4.96	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	19	2	1	2	5	14	6	3.79	1145/1554	3.79	4.02	4.10	4.05	3.79	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	8	0	1	3	7	7	23	4.17	1165/1488	4.17	4.33	4.47	4.44	4.17	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	6	0	0	0	2	4	37	4.81	784/1493	4.81	4.77	4.73	4.75	4.81	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	8	0	0	4	8	8	21	4.12	1054/1486	4.12	4.29	4.32	4.29	4.12	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	1	8	7	25	4.37	856/1489	4.37	4.36	4.32	4.31	4.37	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	9	0	4	1	8	6	21	3.97	725/1277	3.98	3.99	4.03	4.01	3.97	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	25	0	0	0	4	9	11	4.29	633/1279	4.29	4.19	4.17	4.14	4.29	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	25	0	0	0	3	8	13	4.42	726/1270	4.42	4.56	4.35	4.30	4.42	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	26	0	2	1	4	3	13	4.04	919/1269	4.04	4.52	4.35	4.29	4.04	
4. Were special techniques successful	26	5	1	0	3	7	7	4.06	455/ 878	4.06	3.79	4.05	3.92	4.06	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	45	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	****/ 234	****	****	4.23	4.44	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	45	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	****/ 240	****	****	4.35	4.47	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	45	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	****/ 229	****	****	4.51	4.65	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	46	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 232	****	****	4.29	4.38	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	46	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 379	****	****	4.20	4.29	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	46	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 85	****	****	4.72	4.78	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	47	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 79	****	****	4.69	4.72	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	47	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 72	****	****	4.64	4.83	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	46	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 80	****	****	4.61	4.80	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	41	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	****/ 375	****	5.00	4.01	4.21	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	47	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.48	4.74	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	47	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.40	4.71	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	47	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 44	****	****	4.73	4.69	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	47	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 45	****	****	4.57	4.64	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	42	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	****/ 326	****	5.00	4.03	4.43	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	47	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 40	****	****	4.60	5.00	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	47	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 24	****	****	4.83	5.00	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	47	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 35	****	****	4.67	5.00	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	47	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 28	****	****	4.78	5.00	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	43	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	****/ 382	****	5.00	4.08	4.39	****	

Course-Section: AFST 211 0101
 Title INTRO TO CONTEMP AFRIC
 Instructor: BADRU, LATEEF
 Enrollment: 61
 Questionnaires: 49

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 9
 JUL 2, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	21	Required for Majors	12	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	B	6						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	3	C	0	General	2	Under-grad	49	Non-major	49
84-150	13	3.00-3.49	5	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	7	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	12				
				?	1						

Course-Section: AFST 213 0101
 Title AFRICA: CULT/DEVELOPMN
 Instructor: CHUKU, GLORIA
 Enrollment: 32
 Questionnaires: 23

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 10
 JUL 2, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor Mean	Instructor Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5								
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	1	1	6	15	4.52	609/1576	4.52	4.36	4.30	4.35	4.52	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	2	3	6	12	4.22	978/1576	4.22	4.26	4.27	4.32	4.22	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	3	2	8	10	4.09	944/1342	4.09	4.30	4.32	4.41	4.09	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	2	2	7	11	4.23	891/1520	4.23	4.23	4.25	4.26	4.23	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	3	0	6	5	9	3.74	1116/1465	3.74	4.34	4.12	4.09	3.74	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	3	11	7	4.09	840/1434	4.09	3.97	4.14	4.06	4.09	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	3	0	0	1	0	5	14	4.60	411/1547	4.60	4.05	4.19	4.22	4.60	
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	10	11	4.52	1063/1574	4.52	4.65	4.64	4.62	4.52	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	1	0	0	1	9	7	4.35	597/1554	4.35	4.02	4.10	4.05	4.35	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	1	1	6	13	4.48	907/1488	4.48	4.33	4.47	4.44	4.48	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	1	20	4.95	279/1493	4.95	4.77	4.73	4.75	4.95	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	1	2	6	12	4.38	841/1486	4.38	4.29	4.32	4.29	4.38	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	1	0	0	1	5	14	4.65	513/1489	4.65	4.36	4.32	4.31	4.65	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	0	3	2	3	2	11	3.76	882/1277	3.76	3.99	4.03	4.01	3.76	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	1	6	7	4.43	532/1279	4.43	4.19	4.17	4.14	4.43	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	10	0	0	0	2	2	9	4.54	612/1270	4.54	4.56	4.35	4.30	4.54	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	10	0	0	0	2	3	8	4.46	677/1269	4.46	4.52	4.35	4.29	4.46	
4. Were special techniques successful	11	1	0	2	0	2	7	4.27	355/ 878	4.27	3.79	4.05	3.92	4.27	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	21	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 85	****	****	4.72	4.78	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	21	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 80	****	****	4.61	4.80	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	20	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 375	****	5.00	4.01	4.21	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.48	4.74	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.40	4.71	****	
Self Paced															
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	21	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 382	****	5.00	4.08	4.39	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors					
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	A 10	Required for Majors 15	Graduate	0	Major	0	
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	B 9						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	1	C 2	General	3	Under-grad	23	Non-major	23
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	7	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				
				? 0						

Course-Section: AFST 215 0101
 Title INTRO TO AFRICAN DANCE
 Instructor: ANSAHBREW, KWAM
 Enrollment: 23
 Questionnaires: 13

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 11
 JUL 2, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	2	10	4.69	373/1576	4.69	4.36	4.30	4.35	4.69	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	2	9	4.54	568/1576	4.54	4.26	4.27	4.32	4.54	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	8	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	480/1342	4.60	4.30	4.32	4.41	4.60	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	8	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/1520	****	4.23	4.25	4.26	****	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	11	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/1465	****	4.34	4.12	4.09	****	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	5	2	0	1	1	2	3.17	1339/1434	3.17	3.97	4.14	4.06	3.17	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	2	4	2	1	1	3	2.73	1501/1547	2.73	4.05	4.19	4.22	2.73	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	2	8	3	4.08	1434/1574	4.08	4.65	4.64	4.62	4.08	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	8	0	0	1	3	0	1	3.20	1405/1554	3.20	4.02	4.10	4.05	3.20	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	6	0	0	1	1	1	4	4.14	1181/1488	4.14	4.33	4.47	4.44	4.14	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	5	0	0	0	1	0	7	4.75	908/1493	4.75	4.77	4.73	4.75	4.75	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	6	0	1	0	2	1	3	3.71	1269/1486	3.71	4.29	4.32	4.29	3.71	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	3	0	4	4.14	1035/1489	4.14	4.36	4.32	4.31	4.14	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	5	3	0	0	2	1	2	4.00	692/1277	4.00	3.99	4.03	4.01	4.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	2	0	0	0	3	3.40	1106/1279	3.40	4.19	4.17	4.14	3.40	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1270	5.00	4.56	4.35	4.30	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	386/1269	4.80	4.52	4.35	4.29	4.80	
4. Were special techniques successful	8	0	0	1	1	0	3	4.00	464/ 878	4.00	3.79	4.05	3.92	4.00	
Seminar															
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 79	****	****	4.69	4.72	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	12	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 375	****	5.00	4.01	4.21	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	12	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B	0						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	1	C	0	General	6	Under-grad	13	Non-major	13
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	4	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	2				
				?	0						

Course-Section: AFST 261 0101
 Title 20TH CENTURY BLACK LIT
 Instructor: TEMPLE, CHRISTE
 Enrollment: 30
 Questionnaires: 16

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 12
 JUL 2, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sept
	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	5	11	4.69	387/1576	4.69	4.36	4.30	4.35	4.69	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	5	9	4.53	568/1576	4.53	4.26	4.27	4.32	4.53	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	0	0	0	0	4	10	4.71	345/1342	4.71	4.30	4.32	4.41	4.71	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	2	0	0	1	5	7	4.46	579/1520	4.46	4.23	4.25	4.26	4.46	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	15	5.00	1/1465	5.00	4.34	4.12	4.09	5.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	2	0	1	1	6	5	4.15	787/1434	4.15	3.97	4.14	4.06	4.15	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	3	6	7	4.25	838/1547	4.25	4.05	4.19	4.22	4.25	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	1	8	6	4.33	1262/1574	4.33	4.65	4.64	4.62	4.33	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	1	6	6	4.38	558/1554	4.38	4.02	4.10	4.05	4.38	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	1	2	12	4.73	547/1488	4.73	4.33	4.47	4.44	4.73	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	15	5.00	1/1493	5.00	4.77	4.73	4.75	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	1	1	4	9	4.40	821/1486	4.40	4.29	4.32	4.29	4.40	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	3	1	11	4.53	660/1489	4.53	4.36	4.32	4.31	4.53	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	11	1	0	2	0	1	3.00	1149/1277	3.00	3.99	4.03	4.01	3.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	2	10	4.83	204/1279	4.83	4.19	4.17	4.14	4.83	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	0	2	2	8	4.50	636/1270	4.50	4.56	4.35	4.30	4.50	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	0	0	2	10	4.83	353/1269	4.83	4.52	4.35	4.29	4.83	
4. Were special techniques successful	4	3	0	2	1	4	2	3.67	671/ 878	3.67	3.79	4.05	3.92	3.67	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 234	****	****	4.23	4.44	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 240	****	****	4.35	4.47	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 229	****	****	4.51	4.65	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 232	****	****	4.29	4.38	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 379	****	****	4.20	4.29	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 85	****	****	4.72	4.78	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 79	****	****	4.69	4.72	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 72	****	****	4.64	4.83	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 80	****	****	4.61	4.80	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	14	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 375	****	5.00	4.01	4.21	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.48	4.74	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.40	4.71	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 44	****	****	4.73	4.69	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 45	****	****	4.57	4.64	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	12	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/ 326	5.00	5.00	4.03	4.43	5.00	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 40	****	****	4.60	5.00	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 24	****	****	4.83	5.00	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 35	****	****	4.67	5.00	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 28	****	****	4.78	5.00	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	13	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 382	****	5.00	4.08	4.39	****	

Course-Section: AFST 261 0101
 Title 20TH CENTURY BLACK LIT
 Instructor: TEMPLE, CHRISTE
 Enrollment: 30
 Questionnaires: 16

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 12
 JUL 2, 2009
 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	4	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B	5						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	2	C	0	General	4	Under-grad	16	Non-major	16
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	3	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	0						

Course-Section: AFST 323 0101
 Title ECON DEVELOP IN AFRICA
 Instructor: BADRU, LATEEF
 Enrollment: 30
 Questionnaires: 17

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 13
 JUL 2, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	3	14	4.82	227/1576	4.82	4.36	4.30	4.30	4.82	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	2	13	4.75	279/1576	4.75	4.26	4.27	4.28	4.75	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	4	12	4.75	298/1342	4.75	4.30	4.32	4.30	4.75	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	0	3	13	4.65	357/1520	4.65	4.23	4.25	4.25	4.65	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	3	13	4.71	238/1465	4.71	4.34	4.12	4.09	4.71	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	16	4.94	66/1434	4.94	3.97	4.14	4.15	4.94	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	2	0	1	4	10	4.18	916/1547	4.18	4.05	4.19	4.21	4.18	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	3	14	4.82	625/1574	4.82	4.65	4.64	4.61	4.82	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	10	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	222/1554	4.71	4.02	4.10	4.09	4.71	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	3	13	4.71	610/1488	4.71	4.33	4.47	4.47	4.71	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	17	5.00	1/1493	5.00	4.77	4.73	4.70	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	2	3	12	4.59	584/1486	4.59	4.29	4.32	4.32	4.59	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	1	15	4.82	286/1489	4.82	4.36	4.32	4.34	4.82	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	0	0	0	0	4	11	4.73	170/1277	4.73	3.99	4.03	4.11	4.73	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	1	0	0	12	4.77	253/1279	4.77	4.19	4.17	4.20	4.77	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	0	0	2	11	4.85	317/1270	4.85	4.56	4.35	4.42	4.85	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	0	1	1	10	4.75	444/1269	4.75	4.52	4.35	4.41	4.75	
4. Were special techniques successful	5	3	1	0	2	0	6	4.11	440/ 878	4.11	3.79	4.05	4.09	4.11	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	15	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 234	****	****	4.23	4.24	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	15	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 240	****	****	4.35	4.32	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	15	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 229	****	****	4.51	4.48	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	15	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 232	****	****	4.29	4.16	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 379	****	****	4.20	4.17	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	15	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 85	****	****	4.72	4.67	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	15	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 79	****	****	4.69	4.69	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 72	****	****	4.64	4.53	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 80	****	****	4.61	4.22	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	14	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 375	****	5.00	4.01	4.12	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.48	4.37	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	15	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.40	3.92	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	15	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 44	****	****	4.73	4.63	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	15	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 45	****	****	4.57	4.50	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	12	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/ 326	5.00	5.00	4.03	4.23	5.00	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 40	****	****	4.60	4.83	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 24	****	****	4.83	4.89	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 35	****	****	4.67	5.00	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 28	****	****	4.78	5.00	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	14	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 382	****	5.00	4.08	4.24	****	

Course-Section: AFST 323 0101
 Title ECON DEVELOP IN AFRICA
 Instructor: BADRU, LATEEF
 Enrollment: 30
 Questionnaires: 17

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 13
 JUL 2, 2009
 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	9	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	1						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	1	C	0	General	4	Under-grad	17	Non-major	17
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5	F	0	Electives	2	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	3				
				?	1						

Course-Section: AFST 354 0101
 Title AFRO-AMER WOMENS HISTO
 Instructor: MACK-SHELTON, K
 Enrollment: 14
 Questionnaires: 10

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 14
 JUL 2, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	3	7	4.70	373/1576	4.70	4.36	4.30	4.30	4.70	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	1	8	4.70	350/1576	4.70	4.26	4.27	4.28	4.70	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	1	8	4.70	369/1342	4.70	4.30	4.32	4.30	4.70	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	2	7	4.60	395/1520	4.60	4.23	4.25	4.25	4.60	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	122/1465	4.90	4.34	4.12	4.09	4.90	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	1	7	4.50	398/1434	4.50	3.97	4.14	4.15	4.50	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	2	1	7	4.50	527/1547	4.50	4.05	4.19	4.21	4.50	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1574	5.00	4.65	4.64	4.61	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	160/1554	4.80	4.02	4.10	4.09	4.80	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	401/1488	4.80	4.33	4.47	4.47	4.80	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1493	5.00	4.77	4.73	4.70	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	271/1486	4.80	4.29	4.32	4.32	4.80	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	194/1489	4.90	4.36	4.32	4.34	4.90	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	1	0	5	2	2	3.40	1066/1277	3.40	3.99	4.03	4.11	3.40	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1279	5.00	4.19	4.17	4.20	5.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	1	0	1	8	4.60	559/1270	4.60	4.56	4.35	4.42	4.60	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	1	0	9	4.80	386/1269	4.80	4.52	4.35	4.41	4.80	
4. Were special techniques successful	0	4	0	1	3	0	2	3.50	709/ 878	3.50	3.79	4.05	4.09	3.50	
Seminar															
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 375	****	5.00	4.01	4.12	****	
Field Work															
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 326	****	5.00	4.03	4.23	****	
Self Paced															
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	8	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 382	****	5.00	4.08	4.24	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	2	Required for Majors	4	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	5						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	4	C	3	General	5	Under-grad	10	Non-major	10
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	3	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 361 0101
 Title: STUDIES IN BLACK DRAMA
 Instructor: TEMPLE, CHRISTE
 Enrollment: 17
 Questionnaires: 13

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 15
 JUL 2, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	1	0	1	4	7	4.23	976/1576	4.23	4.36	4.30	4.30	4.23	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	2	3	3	4	3.54	1384/1576	3.54	4.26	4.27	4.28	3.54	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	6	0	2	3	0	2	3.29	1263/1342	3.29	4.30	4.32	4.30	3.29	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	0	6	2	4	3.62	1325/1520	3.62	4.23	4.25	4.25	3.62	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	2	4	6	4.33	571/1465	4.33	4.34	4.12	4.09	4.33	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	2	3	2	5	3.83	1045/1434	3.83	3.97	4.14	4.15	3.83	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	1	5	4	1	3.25	1413/1547	3.25	4.05	4.19	4.21	3.25	
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	5	6	4.55	1048/1574	4.55	4.65	4.64	4.61	4.55	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	1	1	2	6	2	3.58	1274/1554	3.58	4.02	4.10	4.09	3.58	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	1	2	1	2	5	3.73	1359/1488	3.73	4.33	4.47	4.47	3.73	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	501/1493	4.92	4.77	4.73	4.70	4.92	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	1	2	1	3	4	3.64	1296/1486	3.64	4.29	4.32	4.32	3.64	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	2	1	1	0	7	3.82	1231/1489	3.82	4.36	4.32	4.34	3.82	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	0	2	1	2	3	3	3.36	1077/1277	3.36	3.99	4.03	4.11	3.36	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	1	1	2	5	4.22	689/1279	4.22	4.19	4.17	4.20	4.22	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	0	2	1	6	4.44	696/1270	4.44	4.56	4.35	4.42	4.44	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	0	1	2	6	4.56	614/1269	4.56	4.52	4.35	4.41	4.56	
4. Were special techniques successful	4	1	2	1	3	0	2	2.88	829/ 878	2.88	3.79	4.05	4.09	2.88	
Seminar															
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	11	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 375	****	5.00	4.01	4.12	****	
Field Work															
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	10	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 326	****	5.00	4.03	4.23	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	3	Required for Majors	5	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	5						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	2	C	4	General	4	Under-grad	13	Non-major	13
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	3	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	2				
				?	0						

Course-Section: AFST 375 0101
 Title THE BLACK CHURCH
 Instructor: KING, SHARON
 Enrollment: 19
 Questionnaires: 11

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 16
 JUL 2, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	3	7	4.55	582/1576	4.55	4.36	4.30	4.30	4.55	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	2	7	4.60	476/1576	4.60	4.26	4.27	4.28	4.60	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	1	1	4	4	4.10	938/1342	4.10	4.30	4.32	4.30	4.10	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	3	4	3	4.00	1041/1520	4.00	4.23	4.25	4.25	4.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	5	5	4.36	546/1465	4.36	4.34	4.12	4.09	4.36	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	2	2	3	4	3.82	1057/1434	3.82	3.97	4.14	4.15	3.82	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	3	1	6	4.09	978/1547	4.09	4.05	4.19	4.21	4.09	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	3	8	4.73	813/1574	4.73	4.65	4.64	4.61	4.73	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	0	5	4	4.44	477/1554	4.44	4.02	4.10	4.09	4.44	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	1	4	5	4.40	995/1488	4.40	4.33	4.47	4.47	4.40	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1493	5.00	4.77	4.73	4.70	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	1	3	6	4.50	678/1486	4.50	4.29	4.32	4.32	4.50	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	2	7	4.60	579/1489	4.60	4.36	4.32	4.34	4.60	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	1	0	1	0	1	7	4.56	283/1277	4.56	3.99	4.03	4.11	4.56	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	4	5	4.56	413/1279	4.56	4.19	4.17	4.20	4.56	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	389/1270	4.78	4.56	4.35	4.42	4.78	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	1	2	6	4.56	614/1269	4.56	4.52	4.35	4.41	4.56	
4. Were special techniques successful	2	0	0	0	2	3	4	4.22	383/ 878	4.22	3.79	4.05	4.09	4.22	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 85	****	****	4.72	4.67	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 79	****	****	4.69	4.69	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 72	****	****	4.64	4.53	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 80	****	****	4.61	4.22	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 375	****	5.00	4.01	4.12	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.48	4.37	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.40	3.92	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	10	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 44	****	****	4.73	4.63	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 45	****	****	4.57	4.50	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 326	****	5.00	4.03	4.23	****	
Self Paced															
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	8	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/ 382	5.00	5.00	4.08	4.24	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 1	Graduate 0	Major 0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B 5			
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	1	C 1	General 6	Under-grad 11	Non-major 11
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	1	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 2		
				? 0			

Course-Section: AFST 385 0101
 Title PROB SOLV URBAN BLK CO
 Instructor: HICKEY, TERRY
 Enrollment: 19
 Questionnaires: 14

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 17
 JUL 2, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	2	11	4.71	347/1576	4.71	4.36	4.30	4.30	4.71	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	4	10	4.71	324/1576	4.71	4.26	4.27	4.28	4.71	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	10	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	583/1342	4.50	4.30	4.32	4.30	4.50	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	0	3	10	4.57	429/1520	4.57	4.23	4.25	4.25	4.57	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	0	2	11	4.64	277/1465	4.64	4.34	4.12	4.09	4.64	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	3	10	4.64	287/1434	4.64	3.97	4.14	4.15	4.64	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	3	10	4.64	363/1547	4.64	4.05	4.19	4.21	4.64	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	4	9	4.69	866/1574	4.69	4.65	4.64	4.61	4.69	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	2	11	4.85	142/1554	4.85	4.02	4.10	4.09	4.85	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	223/1488	4.92	4.33	4.47	4.47	4.92	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/1493	5.00	4.77	4.73	4.70	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	1	2	9	4.67	468/1486	4.67	4.29	4.32	4.32	4.67	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	174/1489	4.92	4.36	4.32	4.34	4.92	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	4	0	0	1	4	3	4.25	533/1277	4.25	3.99	4.03	4.11	4.25	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	2	9	4.82	214/1279	4.82	4.19	4.17	4.20	4.82	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	0	2	9	4.82	345/1270	4.82	4.56	4.35	4.42	4.82	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	0	2	9	4.82	375/1269	4.82	4.52	4.35	4.41	4.82	
4. Were special techniques successful	3	2	0	0	1	5	3	4.22	383/ 878	4.22	3.79	4.05	4.09	4.22	
Seminar															
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	12	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 375	****	5.00	4.01	4.12	****	
Field Work															
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 326	****	5.00	4.03	4.23	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	10
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	1
56-83	5	2.00-2.99	2	C	0
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	2	D	0
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5	F	0
				P	0
				I	0
				?	1
			Required for Majors	0	Graduate
			General	6	Under-grad
			Electives	0	14
			Other	6	Non-major
					13
					#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant

Course-Section: AFST 440 0101
 Title TOPICS AFST STUDIES
 Instructor: CHUKU, GLORIA
 Enrollment: 7
 Questionnaires: 5

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 18
 JUL 2, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	787/1576	4.40	4.36	4.30	4.46	4.40	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	1	2	4.00	1138/1576	4.00	4.26	4.27	4.35	4.00	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	2	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	583/1342	4.50	4.30	4.32	4.46	4.50	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	921/1520	4.20	4.23	4.25	4.38	4.20	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1465	5.00	4.34	4.12	4.22	5.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	398/1434	4.50	3.97	4.14	4.30	4.50	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	2	1	2	4.00	1041/1547	4.00	4.05	4.19	4.24	4.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	4	1	4.20	1367/1574	4.20	4.65	4.64	4.69	4.20	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	2	3	0	3.60	1267/1554	3.60	4.02	4.10	4.24	3.60	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	750/1488	4.60	4.33	4.47	4.55	4.60	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	1286/1493	4.40	4.77	4.73	4.80	4.40	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	1	0	1	3	4.20	1003/1486	4.20	4.29	4.32	4.41	4.20	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	579/1489	4.60	4.36	4.32	4.38	4.60	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	132/1277	4.80	3.99	4.03	4.04	4.80	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	665/1279	4.25	4.19	4.17	4.31	4.25	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	636/1270	4.50	4.56	4.35	4.53	4.50	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	444/1269	4.75	4.52	4.35	4.55	4.75	
4. Were special techniques successful	1	2	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	464/ 878	4.00	3.79	4.05	4.33	4.00	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 3	Required for Majors	1
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	B 2		Graduate 0
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	C 0	General	3
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	1
			? 0		

Course-Section: AFST 495 0101
 Title FIELD RESEARCH AFR STU
 Instructor: ROBINSON, THOMA
 Enrollment: 6
 Questionnaires: 5

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 19
 JUL 2, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	1	0	1	1	2	3.60	1410/1576	3.60	4.36	4.30	4.46	3.60	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	996/1576	4.20	4.26	4.27	4.35	4.20	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	4	4	4.80	240/1342	4.80	4.30	4.32	4.46	4.80	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	0	1	3	4.20	921/1520	4.20	4.23	4.25	4.38	4.20	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	304/1465	4.60	4.34	4.12	4.22	4.60	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	1	1	0	1	1	3.00	1380/1434	3.00	3.97	4.14	4.30	3.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	0	1	3	4.20	900/1547	4.20	4.05	4.19	4.24	4.20	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	1003/1574	4.60	4.65	4.64	4.69	4.60	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	623/1554	4.33	4.02	4.10	4.24	4.33	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	3	2	4.40	995/1488	4.40	4.33	4.47	4.55	4.40	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	1125/1493	4.60	4.77	4.73	4.80	4.60	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	821/1486	4.40	4.29	4.32	4.41	4.40	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	0	1	3	4.20	997/1489	4.20	4.36	4.32	4.38	4.20	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	0	0	1	0	0	2	4.00	692/1277	4.00	3.99	4.03	4.04	4.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	1249/1279	2.50	4.19	4.17	4.31	2.50	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1270	5.00	4.56	4.35	4.53	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	644/1269	4.50	4.52	4.35	4.55	4.50	
4. Were special techniques successful	3	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 878	****	3.79	4.05	4.33	****	
Self Paced															
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 382	****	5.00	4.08	3.88	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 1	Required for Majors	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	B 3		Graduate
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	C 0	General	0
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	5
			P 0		
			I 0		
			? 0		

- Means there are not enough responses to be significant