

Course-Section: AFST 100 0101
 Title INTRO BLACK EXPERIENCE
 Instructor: WALLACE, BELIND
 Enrollment: 36
 Questionnaires: 25

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 8
 JUN 14, 2005
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	1	1	7	16	4.52	522/1504	4.48	4.24	4.27	4.13	4.52
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	2	2	5	16	4.40	649/1503	4.39	4.22	4.20	4.16	4.40
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	2	6	16	4.58	431/1290	4.57	4.32	4.28	4.19	4.58
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	4	5	16	4.48	470/1453	4.24	4.22	4.21	4.11	4.48
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	2	5	17	4.52	305/1421	4.35	4.08	4.00	3.91	4.52
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	4	8	12	4.24	603/1365	4.21	4.11	4.08	3.96	4.24
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	1	4	19	4.75	200/1485	4.41	4.20	4.16	4.13	4.75
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	22	3	4.12	1368/1504	3.84	4.68	4.69	4.66	4.12
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	8	1	0	1	2	8	5	4.06	815/1483	4.03	4.07	4.06	3.97	4.06
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	2	4	19	4.68	556/1425	4.26	4.41	4.41	4.36	4.68
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	2	23	4.92	401/1426	4.88	4.72	4.69	4.56	4.92
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	2	10	13	4.44	656/1418	4.26	4.29	4.25	4.20	4.44
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	5	20	4.80	255/1416	4.40	4.34	4.26	4.21	4.80
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	7	5	13	4.24	511/1199	4.30	3.95	3.97	3.82	4.24
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	2	8	12	4.45	414/1312	4.27	4.12	4.00	3.69	4.45
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	1	0	3	18	4.73	390/1303	4.36	4.39	4.24	3.93	4.73
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	1	3	18	4.77	333/1299	4.42	4.34	4.25	3.94	4.77
4. Were special techniques successful	3	0	0	2	6	3	11	4.05	382/ 758	4.22	4.05	4.01	3.80	4.05
Laboratory														
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	22	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 244	****	4.12	4.09	4.07	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	22	2	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 227	****	4.49	4.40	4.24	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	23	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 76	****	4.60	4.61	4.64	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	23	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 70	****	4.54	4.35	4.43	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	22	0	0	0	2	0	1	3.67	****/ 67	****	4.32	4.34	3.88	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	23	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 76	****	4.41	4.44	4.51	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	23	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 73	****	4.17	4.17	3.83	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	23	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/ 58	****	3.98	4.43	3.63	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	23	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 56	****	4.12	4.23	4.11	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	23	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 44	****	4.68	4.65	4.60	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	23	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 47	****	4.32	4.29	4.00	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	23	0	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/ 39	****	4.61	4.44	5.00	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	23	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 40	****	4.28	4.53	4.52	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	23	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 35	****	4.43	4.49	4.65	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	23	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/ 36	****	4.38	4.60	4.48	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	23	1	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 20	****	5.00	4.24	4.92	****

Course-Section: AFST 100 0101
 Title INTRO BLACK EXPERIENCE
 Instructor: WALLACE, BELIND
 Enrollment: 36
 Questionnaires: 25

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 8
 JUN 14, 2005
 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	9	Required for Majors	10	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	B	12						
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	5	C	1	General	5	Under-grad	25	Non-major	13
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	8	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	2	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	1				
				?	0						

Course-Section: AFST 100 0201
 Title INTRO BLACK EXPERIENCE
 Instructor: JOHNSON, STEPHA
 Enrollment: 27
 Questionnaires: 17

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 9
 JUN 14, 2005
 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	1	0	2	1	12	4.44	654/1504	4.48	4.24	4.27	4.13	4.44
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	1	0	1	4	10	4.38	692/1503	4.39	4.22	4.20	4.16	4.38
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	1	2	0	13	4.56	450/1290	4.57	4.32	4.28	4.19	4.56
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	1	1	2	1	3	8	4.00	1001/1453	4.24	4.22	4.21	4.11	4.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	2	0	3	10	4.19	605/1421	4.35	4.08	4.00	3.91	4.19
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	2	1	1	11	4.19	654/1365	4.21	4.11	4.08	3.96	4.19
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	2	0	2	3	9	4.06	958/1485	4.41	4.20	4.16	4.13	4.06
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	2	3	11	0	3.56	1476/1504	3.84	4.68	4.69	4.66	3.56
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	2	0	1	3	7	4.00	850/1483	4.03	4.07	4.06	3.97	4.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	2	0	2	3	6	3.85	1236/1425	4.26	4.41	4.41	4.36	3.85
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	0	0	2	11	4.85	643/1426	4.88	4.72	4.69	4.56	4.85
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	1	0	2	4	6	4.08	990/1418	4.26	4.29	4.25	4.20	4.08
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	2	0	1	3	7	4.00	1029/1416	4.40	4.34	4.26	4.21	4.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	6	0	0	1	2	0	8	4.36	403/1199	4.30	3.95	3.97	3.82	4.36
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	2	1	0	1	9	4.08	697/1312	4.27	4.12	4.00	3.69	4.08
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	2	0	1	3	7	4.00	910/1303	4.36	4.39	4.24	3.93	4.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	2	0	2	0	9	4.08	904/1299	4.42	4.34	4.25	3.94	4.08
4. Were special techniques successful	5	7	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	243/ 758	4.22	4.05	4.01	3.80	4.40
Laboratory														
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	16	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 244	****	4.12	4.09	4.07	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	15	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 207	****	4.22	4.09	4.01	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	16	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 76	****	4.60	4.61	4.64	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 58	****	3.98	4.43	3.63	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	16	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 56	****	4.12	4.23	4.11	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	15	1	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 39	****	4.61	4.44	5.00	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 40	****	4.28	4.53	4.52	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 35	****	4.43	4.49	4.65	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	2	0.00-0.99 0	A 11	Required for Majors 9	Graduate 0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99 0	B 3		Major 0
56-83	2	2.00-2.99 4	C 0	General 2	Under-grad 17
					Non-major 5

84-150	3	3.00-3.49	4	D	0		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F	0	Electives	0
				P	0		
				I	0	Other	3
				?	0		

- Means there are not enough responses to be significant

Course-Section: AFST 100 0101
 Title INTRO BLACK EXPERIENCE
 Instructor: WALLACE, BELIND
 Enrollment: 36
 Questionnaires: 25

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 8
 JUN 14, 2005
 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	1	7	16	4.52	522/1504	4.48	4.24	4.27	4.13	4.52
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	2	2	5	16	4.40	649/1503	4.39	4.22	4.20	4.16	4.40
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	2	6	16	4.58	431/1290	4.57	4.32	4.28	4.19	4.58
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	4	5	16	4.48	470/1453	4.24	4.22	4.21	4.11	4.48
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	2	5	17	4.52	305/1421	4.35	4.08	4.00	3.91	4.52
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	4	8	12	4.24	603/1365	4.21	4.11	4.08	3.96	4.24
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	1	4	19	4.75	200/1485	4.41	4.20	4.16	4.13	4.75
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	22	3	4.12	1368/1504	3.84	4.68	4.69	4.66	4.12
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	8	1	0	1	2	8	5	4.06	815/1483	4.03	4.07	4.06	3.97	4.06
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	2	4	19	4.68	556/1425	4.26	4.41	4.41	4.36	4.68
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	2	23	4.92	401/1426	4.88	4.72	4.69	4.56	4.92
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	2	10	13	4.44	656/1418	4.26	4.29	4.25	4.20	4.44
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	5	20	4.80	255/1416	4.40	4.34	4.26	4.21	4.80
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	7	5	13	4.24	511/1199	4.30	3.95	3.97	3.82	4.24
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	2	8	12	4.45	414/1312	4.27	4.12	4.00	3.69	4.45
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	1	0	3	18	4.73	390/1303	4.36	4.39	4.24	3.93	4.73
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	1	3	18	4.77	333/1299	4.42	4.34	4.25	3.94	4.77
4. Were special techniques successful	3	0	0	2	6	3	11	4.05	382/ 758	4.22	4.05	4.01	3.80	4.05
Laboratory														
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	22	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 244	****	4.12	4.09	4.07	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	22	2	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 227	****	4.49	4.40	4.24	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	23	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 76	****	4.60	4.61	4.64	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	23	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 70	****	4.54	4.35	4.43	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	22	0	0	0	2	0	1	3.67	****/ 67	****	4.32	4.34	3.88	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	23	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 76	****	4.41	4.44	4.51	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	23	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 73	****	4.17	4.17	3.83	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	23	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/ 58	****	3.98	4.43	3.63	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	23	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 56	****	4.12	4.23	4.11	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	23	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 44	****	4.68	4.65	4.60	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	23	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 47	****	4.32	4.29	4.00	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	23	0	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/ 39	****	4.61	4.44	5.00	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	23	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 40	****	4.28	4.53	4.52	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	23	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 35	****	4.43	4.49	4.65	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	23	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/ 36	****	4.38	4.60	4.48	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	23	1	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 20	****	5.00	4.24	4.92	****

Course-Section: AFST 100 0101
 Title INTRO BLACK EXPERIENCE
 Instructor: WALLACE, BELIND
 Enrollment: 36
 Questionnaires: 25

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 8
 JUN 14, 2005
 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	9	Required for Majors	10	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	B	12						
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	5	C	1	General	5	Under-grad	25	Non-major	13
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	8	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	2	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	1				
				?	0						

Course-Section: AFST 100 0201
 Title INTRO BLACK EXPERIENCE
 Instructor: JOHNSON, STEPHA
 Enrollment: 27
 Questionnaires: 17

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 9
 JUN 14, 2005
 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	1	0	2	1	12	4.44	654/1504	4.48	4.24	4.27	4.13	4.44
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	1	0	1	4	10	4.38	692/1503	4.39	4.22	4.20	4.16	4.38
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	1	2	0	13	4.56	450/1290	4.57	4.32	4.28	4.19	4.56
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	1	1	2	1	3	8	4.00	1001/1453	4.24	4.22	4.21	4.11	4.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	2	0	3	10	4.19	605/1421	4.35	4.08	4.00	3.91	4.19
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	2	1	1	11	4.19	654/1365	4.21	4.11	4.08	3.96	4.19
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	2	0	2	3	9	4.06	958/1485	4.41	4.20	4.16	4.13	4.06
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	2	3	11	0	3.56	1476/1504	3.84	4.68	4.69	4.66	3.56
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	2	0	1	3	7	4.00	850/1483	4.03	4.07	4.06	3.97	4.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	2	0	2	3	6	3.85	1236/1425	4.26	4.41	4.41	4.36	3.85
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	0	0	2	11	4.85	643/1426	4.88	4.72	4.69	4.56	4.85
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	1	0	2	4	6	4.08	990/1418	4.26	4.29	4.25	4.20	4.08
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	2	0	1	3	7	4.00	1029/1416	4.40	4.34	4.26	4.21	4.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	6	0	0	1	2	0	8	4.36	403/1199	4.30	3.95	3.97	3.82	4.36
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	2	1	0	1	9	4.08	697/1312	4.27	4.12	4.00	3.69	4.08
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	2	0	1	3	7	4.00	910/1303	4.36	4.39	4.24	3.93	4.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	2	0	2	0	9	4.08	904/1299	4.42	4.34	4.25	3.94	4.08
4. Were special techniques successful	5	7	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	243/ 758	4.22	4.05	4.01	3.80	4.40
Laboratory														
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	16	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 244	****	4.12	4.09	4.07	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	15	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 207	****	4.22	4.09	4.01	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	16	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 76	****	4.60	4.61	4.64	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 58	****	3.98	4.43	3.63	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	16	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 56	****	4.12	4.23	4.11	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	15	1	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 39	****	4.61	4.44	5.00	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 40	****	4.28	4.53	4.52	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 35	****	4.43	4.49	4.65	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	A	11	Required for Majors	9	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	3						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	4	C	0	General	2	Under-grad	17	Non-major	5

84-150	3	3.00-3.49	4	D	0		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F	0	Electives	0
				P	0		
				I	0	Other	3
				?	0		

- Means there are not enough responses to be significant

Course-Section: AFST 211 0101
 Title INTRO TO CONTEMP AFRIC
 Instructor: LAMOUSE-SMITH,
 Enrollment: 47
 Questionnaires: 22

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 10
 JUN 14, 2005
 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	2	0	0	1	1	4	14	4.55	482/1504	4.55	4.24	4.27	4.26	4.55
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	1	0	6	6	7	3.90	1136/1503	3.90	4.22	4.20	4.18	3.90
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	0	1	1	2	7	9	4.10	894/1290	4.10	4.32	4.28	4.27	4.10
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	3	6	0	0	1	4	8	4.54	407/1453	4.54	4.22	4.21	4.20	4.54
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	1	3	4	12	4.35	459/1421	4.35	4.08	4.00	3.90	4.35
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	8	2	1	1	4	4	3.58	1113/1365	3.58	4.11	4.08	4.00	3.58
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	2	1	6	3	9	3.76	1170/1485	3.76	4.20	4.16	4.15	3.76
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	1	19	4.95	394/1504	4.95	4.68	4.69	4.68	4.95
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	1	1	0	3	9	5	3.94	933/1483	3.94	4.07	4.06	4.02	3.94
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	0	0	2	4	12	4.56	724/1425	4.56	4.41	4.41	4.40	4.56
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	0	1	2	15	4.78	790/1426	4.78	4.72	4.69	4.71	4.78
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	0	2	4	2	10	4.11	972/1418	4.11	4.29	4.25	4.22	4.11
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	2	2	3	11	4.28	854/1416	4.28	4.34	4.26	4.24	4.28
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	2	2	0	1	2	11	4.25	495/1199	4.25	3.95	3.97	3.95	4.25
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	1	1	4	6	7	3.89	820/1312	3.89	4.12	4.00	3.98	3.89
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	2	3	3	10	4.17	851/1303	4.17	4.39	4.24	4.23	4.17
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	1	2	4	3	8	3.83	1025/1299	3.83	4.34	4.25	4.21	3.83
4. Were special techniques successful	3	15	1	0	0	1	2	3.75	****/ 758	****	4.05	4.01	3.89	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	7	Required for Majors	8	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	4						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	3	C	7	General	1	Under-grad	22	Non-major	6
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	4	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	9				
				?	0						

Course-Section: AFST 212 0101
 Title AFRICAN HISTORY
 Instructor: LAMOUSE-SMITH,
 Enrollment: 16
 Questionnaires: 11

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 11
 JUN 14, 2005
 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	1	4	5	4.18	972/1504	4.18	4.24	4.27	4.26	4.18
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	2	5	2	2	3.36	1358/1503	3.36	4.22	4.20	4.18	3.36
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	3	4	1	3	3.36	1185/1290	3.36	4.32	4.28	4.27	3.36
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	1	1	4	2	2	3.30	1355/1453	3.30	4.22	4.21	4.20	3.30
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	6	4	4.27	532/1421	4.27	4.08	4.00	3.90	4.27
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	6	2	1	1	0	1	2.40	1354/1365	2.40	4.11	4.08	4.00	2.40
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	2	2	5	2	3.64	1234/1485	3.64	4.20	4.16	4.15	3.64
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1504	5.00	4.68	4.69	4.68	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	0	3	3	0	3.50	1233/1483	3.50	4.07	4.06	4.02	3.50
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	1	4	3	3	3.73	1265/1425	3.73	4.41	4.41	4.40	3.73
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	0	10	4.82	714/1426	4.82	4.72	4.69	4.71	4.82
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	1	5	2	3	3.64	1213/1418	3.64	4.29	4.25	4.22	3.64
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	5	3	3	3.82	1140/1416	3.82	4.34	4.26	4.24	3.82
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	1	2	3	4	4.00	636/1199	4.00	3.95	3.97	3.95	4.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	5	4	4.18	638/1312	4.18	4.12	4.00	3.98	4.18
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	2	9	4.82	288/1303	4.82	4.39	4.24	4.23	4.82
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	1	2	4	4	4.00	922/1299	4.00	4.34	4.25	4.21	4.00
4. Were special techniques successful	0	5	1	1	0	2	2	3.50	580/ 758	3.50	4.05	4.01	3.89	3.50

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	0	A	3	Required for Majors	4	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	3						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	3	C	2	General	5	Under-grad	11	Non-major	5
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	4	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	0				
				?	1						

Course-Section: AFST 215 0101
 Title INTRO TO AFRICAN DANCE
 Instructor: SNEED, DELPHINE
 Enrollment: 19
 Questionnaires: 18

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 12
 JUN 14, 2005
 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		

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	3	2	4	9	4.06	1070/1504	4.06	4.24	4.27	4.26	4.06
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	0	1	4	5	6	4.00	1052/1503	4.00	4.22	4.20	4.18	4.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	3	7	7	4.11	887/1290	4.11	4.32	4.28	4.27	4.11
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	1	2	5	9	4.29	729/1453	4.29	4.22	4.21	4.20	4.29
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	9	1	0	0	4	3	4.00	745/1421	4.00	4.08	4.00	3.90	4.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	2	9	6	4.24	603/1365	4.24	4.11	4.08	4.00	4.24
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	0	3	4	9	4.18	854/1485	4.18	4.20	4.16	4.15	4.18
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	1	0	0	0	1	15	4.94	460/1504	4.94	4.68	4.69	4.68	4.94
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	1	0	1	5	3	3	3.67	1170/1483	3.67	4.07	4.06	4.02	3.67
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	0	4	1	4	5	3.71	1267/1425	3.71	4.41	4.41	4.40	3.71
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	5	0	0	0	0	2	11	4.85	643/1426	4.85	4.72	4.69	4.71	4.85
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	5	0	0	1	3	4	5	4.00	1013/1418	4.00	4.29	4.25	4.22	4.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	5	1	0	2	1	4	5	4.00	1029/1416	4.00	4.34	4.26	4.24	4.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	6	1	0	1	4	3	3	3.73	835/1199	3.73	3.95	3.97	3.95	3.73
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	1	2	4	3	3.90	814/1312	3.90	4.12	4.00	3.98	3.90
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	0	0	1	4	5	4.40	675/1303	4.40	4.39	4.24	4.23	4.40
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	0	2	3	2	3	3.60	1092/1299	3.60	4.34	4.25	4.21	3.60
4. Were special techniques successful	8	3	1	0	2	1	3	3.71	518/ 758	3.71	4.05	4.01	3.89	3.71
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	17	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 76	****	4.60	4.61	4.22	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	17	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 70	****	4.54	4.35	4.30	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 67	****	4.32	4.34	4.50	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 76	****	4.41	4.44	4.21	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	17	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 73	****	4.17	4.17	4.24	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	12	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	3						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	3	C	0	General	8	Under-grad	18	Non-major	7
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	4	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	1				
				?	0						

Course-Section: AFST 260 0101
 Title BLACK LITERATURE TO 19
 Instructor: PETERS, JONATHA
 Enrollment: 35
 Questionnaires: 16

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 13
 JUN 14, 2005
 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	6	2	3	2	3	2.63	1490/1504	2.63	4.24	4.27	4.26	2.63
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	6	3	2	3	2	2.50	1485/1503	2.50	4.22	4.20	4.18	2.50
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	5	1	5	3	2	2.75	1261/1290	2.75	4.32	4.28	4.27	2.75
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	6	2	5	1	2	2.44	1445/1453	2.44	4.22	4.21	4.20	2.44
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	4	1	4	4	3	3.06	1296/1421	3.06	4.08	4.00	3.90	3.06
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	4	2	4	2	3	2.87	1320/1365	2.87	4.11	4.08	4.00	2.87
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	7	1	2	3	2	2.47	1457/1485	2.47	4.20	4.16	4.15	2.47
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	1	0	9	5	4.20	1314/1504	4.20	4.68	4.69	4.68	4.20
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	4	2	2	3	0	2.36	1453/1483	2.36	4.07	4.06	4.02	2.36
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	6	1	4	1	2	2.43	1412/1425	2.43	4.41	4.41	4.40	2.43
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	2	3	10	4.53	1104/1426	4.53	4.72	4.69	4.71	4.53
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	5	0	6	1	2	2.64	1382/1418	2.64	4.29	4.25	4.22	2.64
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	5	1	5	1	2	2.57	1371/1416	2.57	4.34	4.26	4.24	2.57
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	2	3	3	4	1	0	2.27	1168/1199	2.27	3.95	3.97	3.95	2.27
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	4	4	1	3	1	2.46	1252/1312	2.46	4.12	4.00	3.98	2.46
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	1	1	3	5	3	3.62	1092/1303	3.62	4.39	4.24	4.23	3.62
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	1	0	3	3	6	4.00	922/1299	4.00	4.34	4.25	4.21	4.00
4. Were special techniques successful	3	4	1	2	4	1	1	2.89	712/ 758	2.89	4.05	4.01	3.89	2.89
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	14	1	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 233	****	4.07	4.09	4.30	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	15	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 244	****	4.12	4.09	4.24	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	12	0	1	1	1	0	1	2.75	75/ 76	2.75	4.60	4.61	4.22	2.75
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	12	0	1	1	1	1	0	2.50	66/ 70	2.50	4.54	4.35	4.30	2.50
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	12	1	2	0	1	0	0	1.67	****/ 67	****	4.32	4.34	4.50	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	12	0	1	1	2	0	0	2.25	75/ 76	2.25	4.41	4.44	4.21	2.25
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	12	1	2	0	0	1	0	2.00	****/ 73	****	4.17	4.17	4.24	****

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: AFST 345 0101
 Title BLACK AMERICAN MUSIC
 Instructor: DALILI, EFIA
 Enrollment: 27
 Questionnaires: 13

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 14
 JUN 14, 2005
 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		

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	1	0	1	4	7	4.23	914/1504	4.23	4.24	4.27	4.27	4.23
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	1	1	6	4	4.08	1002/1503	4.08	4.22	4.20	4.22	4.08
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	6	0	0	2	1	4	4.29	758/1290	4.29	4.32	4.28	4.31	4.29
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	2	1	9	4.58	352/1453	4.58	4.22	4.21	4.23	4.58
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	4	0	3	5	3.54	1095/1421	3.54	4.08	4.00	4.01	3.54
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	1	0	5	6	4.08	742/1365	4.08	4.11	4.08	4.08	4.08
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	4	5	4	4.00	990/1485	4.00	4.20	4.16	4.17	4.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	1	0	0	1	10	4.58	1041/1504	4.58	4.68	4.69	4.65	4.58
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	2	7	0	3.78	1111/1483	3.78	4.07	4.06	4.08	3.78
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	1	3	2	7	4.15	1100/1425	4.15	4.41	4.41	4.43	4.15
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	2	10	4.83	667/1426	4.83	4.72	4.69	4.71	4.83
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	2	1	2	8	4.23	867/1418	4.23	4.29	4.25	4.26	4.23
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	1	1	1	1	2	7	4.08	1001/1416	4.08	4.34	4.26	4.27	4.08
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	1	0	2	0	10	4.38	386/1199	4.38	3.95	3.97	4.02	4.38
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	3	2	4	4.11	682/1312	4.11	4.12	4.00	4.09	4.11
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	0	1	3	5	4.44	630/1303	4.44	4.39	4.24	4.27	4.44
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	1	1	0	7	4.44	634/1299	4.44	4.34	4.25	4.30	4.44
4. Were special techniques successful	4	1	0	2	1	2	3	3.75	508/ 758	3.75	4.05	4.01	4.00	3.75

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	A	8	Required for Majors	7	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B	2						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	1	General	2	Under-grad	13	Non-major	1
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	4	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	2	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	1						
				I	0	Other	1				
				?	0						

Course-Section: AFST 350 0101
 Title PSYCHOLOGY OF RACISM
 Instructor: ROBINSON, THOMA
 Enrollment: 32
 Questionnaires: 16

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 15
 JUN 14, 2005
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	7	9	4.56	469/1504	4.56	4.24	4.27	4.27	4.56
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	2	13	4.75	219/1503	4.75	4.22	4.20	4.22	4.75
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	0	5	10	4.50	507/1290	4.50	4.32	4.28	4.31	4.50
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	1	1	1	0	5	7	4.14	901/1453	4.14	4.22	4.21	4.23	4.14
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	1	13	4.69	200/1421	4.69	4.08	4.00	4.01	4.69
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	1	3	1	3	7	3.80	967/1365	3.80	4.11	4.08	4.08	3.80
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	3	12	4.69	270/1485	4.69	4.20	4.16	4.17	4.69
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	1	0	0	0	2	13	4.87	726/1504	4.87	4.68	4.69	4.65	4.87
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	0	0	2	9	4.82	115/1483	4.82	4.07	4.06	4.08	4.82
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	3	12	4.80	331/1425	4.80	4.41	4.41	4.43	4.80
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	15	4.94	351/1426	4.94	4.72	4.69	4.71	4.94
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	3	13	4.81	184/1418	4.81	4.29	4.25	4.26	4.81
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	3	11	4.67	446/1416	4.67	4.34	4.26	4.27	4.67
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	2	2	4	7	4.07	614/1199	4.07	3.95	3.97	4.02	4.07
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	2	12	4.86	137/1312	4.86	4.12	4.00	4.09	4.86
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	0	2	12	4.86	248/1303	4.86	4.39	4.24	4.27	4.86
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	0	1	13	4.93	162/1299	4.93	4.34	4.25	4.30	4.93
4. Were special techniques successful	2	6	0	1	0	2	5	4.38	255/ 758	4.38	4.05	4.01	4.00	4.38
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 58	****	3.98	4.43	4.52	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 56	****	4.12	4.23	4.13	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	14	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 44	****	4.68	4.65	4.77	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 47	****	4.32	4.29	4.14	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 39	****	4.61	4.44	4.47	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 40	****	4.28	4.53	4.74	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 35	****	4.43	4.49	4.36	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 36	****	4.38	4.60	4.63	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 20	****	5.00	4.24	5.00	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 16	****	5.00	4.51	3.95	****

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	2	1.00-1.99	0	B 7			
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	1	C 0	General 6	Under-grad 16	Non-major 8
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	8	D 0			
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F 0	Electives 2	#### - Means there are not enough	

P	0			responses to be significant
I	0	Other	3	
?	2			

Course-Section: AFST 352 0101
 Title AFAM HISTORY TO 1865
 Instructor: MCANDREW, JENNI
 Enrollment: 14
 Questionnaires: 11

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 16
 JUN 14, 2005
 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	2	2	6	4.40	700/1504	4.40	4.24	4.27	4.27	4.40
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	3	7	4.70	279/1503	4.70	4.22	4.20	4.22	4.70
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	2	1	7	4.50	507/1290	4.50	4.32	4.28	4.31	4.50
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	1	1	2	6	4.30	718/1453	4.30	4.22	4.21	4.23	4.30
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	0	2	7	4.50	320/1421	4.50	4.08	4.00	4.01	4.50
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	3	0	0	1	3	3	4.29	547/1365	4.29	4.11	4.08	4.08	4.29
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	1	3	6	4.50	455/1485	4.50	4.20	4.16	4.17	4.50
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1504	5.00	4.68	4.69	4.65	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	2	2	3	4.14	751/1483	4.14	4.07	4.06	4.08	4.14
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	0	3	6	4.67	572/1425	4.67	4.41	4.41	4.43	4.67
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1426	5.00	4.72	4.69	4.71	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	139/1418	4.89	4.29	4.25	4.26	4.89
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	296/1416	4.78	4.34	4.26	4.27	4.78
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	2	2	0	1	3	1	3.14	1032/1199	3.14	3.95	3.97	4.02	3.14
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	3	6	4.67	255/1312	4.67	4.12	4.00	4.09	4.67
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	217/1303	4.89	4.39	4.24	4.27	4.89
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	223/1299	4.89	4.34	4.25	4.30	4.89
4. Were special techniques successful	2	1	0	0	1	1	6	4.63	146/ 758	4.63	4.05	4.01	4.00	4.63

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	4	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	4						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	4	C	1	General	6	Under-grad	11	Non-major	3
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	2				
				?	0						

Course-Section: AFST 353 0101
 Title AFR AMER HIST SINCE 18
 Instructor: SCOTT, MICHELLE
 Enrollment: 31
 Questionnaires: 26

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 17
 JUN 14, 2005
 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	2	4	19	4.68	347/1504	4.68	4.24	4.27	4.27	4.68
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	5	19	4.72	258/1503	4.72	4.22	4.20	4.22	4.72
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	6	19	4.76	240/1290	4.76	4.32	4.28	4.31	4.76
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	1	0	5	19	4.68	260/1453	4.68	4.22	4.21	4.23	4.68
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	1	4	19	4.64	223/1421	4.64	4.08	4.00	4.01	4.64
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	2	1	0	1	8	13	4.39	430/1365	4.39	4.11	4.08	4.08	4.39
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	1	1	4	19	4.64	309/1485	4.64	4.20	4.16	4.17	4.64
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	1	2	22	4.84	760/1504	4.84	4.68	4.69	4.65	4.84
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	1	0	0	0	9	12	4.57	282/1483	4.57	4.07	4.06	4.08	4.57
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	1	3	21	4.80	331/1425	4.80	4.41	4.41	4.43	4.80
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	0	24	5.00	1/1426	5.00	4.72	4.69	4.71	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	1	4	20	4.76	247/1418	4.76	4.29	4.25	4.26	4.76
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	2	22	4.92	127/1416	4.92	4.34	4.26	4.27	4.92
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	0	0	0	0	8	16	4.67	177/1199	4.67	3.95	3.97	4.02	4.67
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	1	0	0	2	19	4.73	215/1312	4.73	4.12	4.00	4.09	4.73
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	0	1	3	18	4.77	333/1303	4.77	4.39	4.24	4.27	4.77
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	0	1	1	20	4.86	243/1299	4.86	4.34	4.25	4.30	4.86
4. Were special techniques successful	4	6	0	2	0	3	11	4.44	225/ 758	4.44	4.05	4.01	4.00	4.44
Field Work														
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	25	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 39	****	4.61	4.44	4.47	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	10	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	9						
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	4	C	0	General	9	Under-grad	26	Non-major	6
84-150	7	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	6	F	0	Electives	2	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	2						
				I	0	Other	11				
				?	2						

Course-Section: AFST 362 0101
 Title STUDIES IN BLACK POETR
 Instructor: PETERS, JONATHA
 Enrollment: 16
 Questionnaires: 11

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 18
 JUN 14, 2005
 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	2	2	3	2	2	3.00	1453/1504	3.00	4.24	4.27	4.27	3.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	2	3	3	1	2	2.82	1451/1503	2.82	4.22	4.20	4.22	2.82
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	7	0	0	2	1	1	3.75	1078/1290	3.75	4.32	4.28	4.31	3.75
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	2	5	1	2	1	2.55	1442/1453	2.55	4.22	4.21	4.23	2.55
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	1	4	3	1	3.00	1305/1421	3.00	4.08	4.00	4.01	3.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	2	3	4	1	3.18	1266/1365	3.18	4.11	4.08	4.08	3.18
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	3	3	1	2	1	2.50	1452/1485	2.50	4.20	4.16	4.17	2.50
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	1	0	0	6	4	4.09	1386/1504	4.09	4.68	4.69	4.65	4.09
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	2	1	3	1	0	2.43	1451/1483	2.43	4.07	4.06	4.08	2.43
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	3	0	5	1	2	2.91	1386/1425	2.91	4.41	4.41	4.43	2.91
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	2	8	4.64	1008/1426	4.64	4.72	4.69	4.71	4.64
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	2	3	4	1	1	2.64	1383/1418	2.64	4.29	4.25	4.26	2.64
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	4	1	3	1	2	2.64	1365/1416	2.64	4.34	4.26	4.27	2.64
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	4	2	2	1	0	2	2.71	1119/1199	2.71	3.95	3.97	4.02	2.71
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	2	0	3	2	3	3.40	1051/1312	3.40	4.12	4.00	4.09	3.40
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	2	2	6	4.40	675/1303	4.40	4.39	4.24	4.27	4.40
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	1	3	1	5	4.00	922/1299	4.00	4.34	4.25	4.30	4.00
4. Were special techniques successful	1	2	2	2	2	1	1	2.63	730/ 758	2.63	4.05	4.01	4.00	2.63
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	9	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 233	****	4.07	4.09	4.12	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	9	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 244	****	4.12	4.09	4.20	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	9	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 227	****	4.49	4.40	4.46	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	9	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 225	****	4.40	4.23	4.29	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	9	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 207	****	4.22	4.09	4.14	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	9	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 76	****	4.60	4.61	4.84	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	9	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 70	****	4.54	4.35	4.24	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 67	****	4.32	4.34	3.98	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 76	****	4.41	4.44	4.51	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	9	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 73	****	4.17	4.17	4.25	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 58	****	3.98	4.43	4.52	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	9	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 56	****	4.12	4.23	4.13	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	9	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 44	****	4.68	4.65	4.77	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	10	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 47	****	4.32	4.29	4.14	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	9	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 39	****	4.61	4.44	4.47	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 40	****	4.28	4.53	4.74	****

2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	9	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/	35	****	4.43	4.49	4.36	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	10	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/	36	****	4.38	4.60	4.63	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	9	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/	20	****	5.00	4.24	5.00	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	9	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/	16	****	5.00	4.51	3.95	****

Course-Section: AFST 362 0101
 Title STUDIES IN BLACK POETR
 Instructor: PETERS, JONATHA
 Enrollment: 16
 Questionnaires: 11

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 18
 JUN 14, 2005
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	5	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	4						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	5	C	0	General	6	Under-grad	11	Non-major	2
84-150	3	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	3				
				?	0						

Course-Section: AFST 362W 0101
 Title ADVANCED WRITING IN AF
 Instructor: TEMPLE, CHRISTE
 Enrollment: 1
 Questionnaires: 1

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 19
 JUN 14, 2005
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1504	5.00	4.24	4.27	4.27	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	1419/1503	3.00	4.22	4.20	4.22	3.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1453	5.00	4.22	4.21	4.23	5.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1421	5.00	4.08	4.00	4.01	5.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1365	5.00	4.11	4.08	4.08	5.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	990/1485	4.00	4.20	4.16	4.17	4.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1504	5.00	4.68	4.69	4.65	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1483	5.00	4.07	4.06	4.08	5.00

Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1312	5.00	4.12	4.00	4.09	5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1303	5.00	4.39	4.24	4.27	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1299	5.00	4.34	4.25	4.30	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 758	5.00	4.05	4.01	4.00	5.00

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors

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

Course-Section: AFST 370 0101
 Title BLK WOMEN:CROSS-CULT P
 Instructor: TEMPLE, CHRISTE
 Enrollment: 28
 Questionnaires: 23

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 20
 JUN 14, 2005
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	4	19	4.83	191/1504	4.83	4.24	4.27	4.27	4.83
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	8	13	4.55	449/1503	4.55	4.22	4.20	4.22	4.55
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	13	1	0	0	4	5	4.20	832/1290	4.20	4.32	4.28	4.31	4.20
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	3	4	15	4.55	396/1453	4.55	4.22	4.21	4.23	4.55
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	5	16	4.68	200/1421	4.68	4.08	4.00	4.01	4.68
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	7	15	4.68	175/1365	4.68	4.11	4.08	4.08	4.68
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	1	5	6	10	4.14	902/1485	4.14	4.20	4.16	4.17	4.14
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	17	4	4.19	1314/1504	4.19	4.68	4.69	4.65	4.19
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	1	10	9	4.40	457/1483	4.40	4.07	4.06	4.08	4.40
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	5	3	13	4.38	920/1425	4.38	4.41	4.41	4.43	4.38
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	22	5.00	1/1426	5.00	4.72	4.69	4.71	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	3	5	13	4.48	617/1418	4.48	4.29	4.25	4.26	4.48
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	2	5	15	4.59	534/1416	4.59	4.34	4.26	4.27	4.59
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	1	0	1	2	4	14	4.48	300/1199	4.48	3.95	3.97	4.02	4.48
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	2	4	14	4.60	297/1312	4.60	4.12	4.00	4.09	4.60
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	1	2	0	17	4.65	460/1303	4.65	4.39	4.24	4.27	4.65
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	3	2	15	4.60	504/1299	4.60	4.34	4.25	4.30	4.60
4. Were special techniques successful	3	2	1	0	2	6	9	4.22	315/ 758	4.22	4.05	4.01	4.00	4.22
Laboratory														
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 244	****	4.12	4.09	4.20	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	22	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 76	****	4.60	4.61	4.84	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	22	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 70	****	4.54	4.35	4.24	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	22	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 67	****	4.32	4.34	3.98	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 73	****	4.17	4.17	4.25	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	22	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 58	****	3.98	4.43	4.52	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 56	****	4.12	4.23	4.13	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	22	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 44	****	4.68	4.65	4.77	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 47	****	4.32	4.29	4.14	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 39	****	4.61	4.44	4.47	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	22	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 40	****	4.28	4.53	4.74	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 36	****	4.38	4.60	4.63	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades Reasons Type Majors

Grade	Count	Score Range	Count	Category	Count	Requirement	Count	Level	Count	Requirement	Count
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	17	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	5	1.00-1.99	0	B	5						
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	6	Under-grad	23	Non-major	4
84-150	6	3.00-3.49	7	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	7	F	0	Electives	4	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	13				
				?	0						

Course-Section: AFST 390 0101
 Title AMER HLTH CARE & BLK C
 Instructor: REEDER, IRMA C
 Enrollment: 14
 Questionnaires: 10

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 21
 JUN 14, 2005
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	206/1504	4.80	4.24	4.27	4.27	4.80
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	3	6	4.50	495/1503	4.50	4.22	4.20	4.22	4.50
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1290	5.00	4.32	4.28	4.31	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	7	4.70	240/1453	4.70	4.22	4.21	4.23	4.70
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	127/1421	4.80	4.08	4.00	4.01	4.80
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	3	7	4.70	169/1365	4.70	4.11	4.08	4.08	4.70
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	2	2	6	4.40	591/1485	4.40	4.20	4.16	4.17	4.40
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	7	3	4.30	1242/1504	4.30	4.68	4.69	4.65	4.30
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	1	0	0	0	3	2	4.40	457/1483	4.40	4.07	4.06	4.08	4.40
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	3	7	4.70	525/1425	4.70	4.41	4.41	4.43	4.70
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1426	5.00	4.72	4.69	4.71	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	191/1418	4.80	4.29	4.25	4.26	4.80
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1416	5.00	4.34	4.26	4.27	5.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	4	1	0	1	0	3	3.80	795/1199	3.80	3.95	3.97	4.02	3.80
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1312	5.00	4.12	4.00	4.09	5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1303	5.00	4.39	4.24	4.27	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1299	5.00	4.34	4.25	4.30	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	4	1	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/ 758	5.00	4.05	4.01	4.00	5.00
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 233	****	4.07	4.09	4.12	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 244	****	4.12	4.09	4.20	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 227	****	4.49	4.40	4.46	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 225	****	4.40	4.23	4.29	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 207	****	4.22	4.09	4.14	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 76	****	4.60	4.61	4.84	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 70	****	4.54	4.35	4.24	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 67	****	4.32	4.34	3.98	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 76	****	4.41	4.44	4.51	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 73	****	4.17	4.17	4.25	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 58	****	3.98	4.43	4.52	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 56	****	4.12	4.23	4.13	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 44	****	4.68	4.65	4.77	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 47	****	4.32	4.29	4.14	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 39	****	4.61	4.44	4.47	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 40	****	4.28	4.53	4.74	****

2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/	35	****	4.43	4.49	4.36	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/	36	****	4.38	4.60	4.63	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/	20	****	5.00	4.24	5.00	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/	16	****	5.00	4.51	3.95	****

Course-Section: AFST 390 0101
 Title AMER HLTH CARE & BLK C
 Instructor: REEDER, IRMA C
 Enrollment: 14
 Questionnaires: 10

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 21
 JUN 14, 2005
 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	3	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	2						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	3	C	0	General	2	Under-grad	10	Non-major	2
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	2				
				?	0						

Course-Section: AFST 440 0101
 Title TOPICS AFST STUDIES
 Instructor: KING, SHARON
 Enrollment: 10
 Questionnaires: 8

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 22
 JUN 14, 2005
 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	1	6	4.63	396/1504	4.63	4.24	4.27	4.33	4.63
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	0	1	3	3	3.88	1150/1503	3.88	4.22	4.20	4.18	3.88
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	3	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	507/1290	4.50	4.32	4.28	4.32	4.50
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	0	3	4	4.25	775/1453	4.25	4.22	4.21	4.22	4.25
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	101/1421	4.88	4.08	4.00	4.02	4.88
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	1	6	4.63	211/1365	4.63	4.11	4.08	4.09	4.63
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	2	1	0	2	3	3.38	1319/1485	3.38	4.20	4.16	4.14	3.38
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1504	5.00	4.68	4.69	4.73	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	258/1483	4.60	4.07	4.06	4.11	4.60
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	0	7	4.75	420/1425	4.75	4.41	4.41	4.38	4.75
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1426	5.00	4.72	4.69	4.72	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	1	0	1	6	4.50	578/1418	4.50	4.29	4.25	4.25	4.50
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	0	0	7	4.63	498/1416	4.63	4.34	4.26	4.26	4.63
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	1	1	6	4.63	201/1199	4.63	3.95	3.97	4.05	4.63
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1312	5.00	4.12	4.00	4.07	5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1303	5.00	4.39	4.24	4.34	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	233/1299	4.88	4.34	4.25	4.38	4.88
4. Were special techniques successful	0	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	68/ 758	4.88	4.05	4.01	4.17	4.88
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 76	****	4.60	4.61	4.63	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	7	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 70	****	4.54	4.35	4.63	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 67	****	4.32	4.34	4.34	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 76	****	4.41	4.44	4.51	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 73	****	4.17	4.17	4.29	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 58	****	3.98	4.43	4.83	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	7	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 56	****	4.12	4.23	4.37	****

Frequency Distribution

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