| | | | Frequencies | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Dept | UMBC | Level | Sect |
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	1	1	5	8	15	4.17	1056/1674	4.34	4.58	4.27	4.32	4.17
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	7	7	16	4.30	870/1674	4.35	4.55	4.23	4.26	4.30
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	8	19	4.53	540/1423	4.38	4.62	4.27	4.36	4.53
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	5	1	2	3	7	11	4.04	1068/1609	4.23	4.49	4.22	4.23	4.04
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	1	11	17	4.47	360/1585	4.36	4.48	3.96	3.91	4.47
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	7	1	2	6	6	8	3.78	1125/1535	4.20	4.42	4.08	4.03	3.78
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	5	3	21	4.47	583/1651	4.40	4.52	4.18	4.20	4.47
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	2	23	5	4.10	1525/1673	4.41	4.52	4.69	4.67	4.10
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	0	6	12	7	4.04	930/1656	4.28	4.49	4.07	4.10	4.04
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	6	23	4.73	538/1586	4.73	4.78	4.43	4.48	4.73
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	5	25	4.83	737/1585	4.89	4.90	4.69	4.76	4.83
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	3	7	20	4.57	567/1582	4.47	4.61	4.26	4.35	4.57
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	6	22	4.67	495/1575	4.68	4.73	4.27	4.39	4.67
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	1	1	2	5	8	13	4.03	652/1380	4.22	4.19	3.94	4.03	4.03
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	2	4	6	7	3.95	878/1520	4.28	4.30	4.01	4.03	3.95
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	11	0	0	3	5	3	8	3.84	1162/1515	4.32	4.56	4.24	4.28	3.84
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	11	0	0	1	6	3	9	4.05	1034/1511	4.39	4.64	4.27	4.28	4.05
4. Were special techniques successful	11	17	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 994	4.33	3.94	3.94	3.98	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	A	12	Required for Majors	12	Graduate	0	Major	2
28-55	8	1.00-1.99	0	B	11						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	3	C	3	General	6	Under-grad	30	Non-major	28
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	6	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough			
				P	0			responses to be significant			
				I	0	Other	9				
				?	2						

```
Enrollment:      41
Questionnaires:  27                      Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire
```

```
                                           Frequencies        Instructor    Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
           Questions                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  7 18  4.59   497/1674  4.34  4.58  4.27  4.32  4.59
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    0  0  0  1  4  7 15  4.33   830/1674  4.35  4.55  4.23  4.26  4.33
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   0  3  0  0  2  4 18  4.67   376/1423  4.38  4.62  4.27  4.36  4.67
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    0  0  0  0  3  9 15  4.44   583/1609  4.23  4.49  4.22  4.23  4.44
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0  0  1  0  5  5 16  4.30   521/1585  4.36  4.48  3.96  3.91  4.30
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 2  0  2  2  5 16  4.40   508/1535  4.20  4.42  4.08  4.03  4.40
7. Was the grading system clearly explained            0  2  1  0  5  4 15  4.28   832/1651  4.40  4.52  4.18  4.20  4.28
8. How many times was class cancelled                  1  0  0  0  5 13  8  4.12  1518/1673  4.41  4.52  4.69  4.67  4.12
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 5 0  0  0  1  8 13  4.55   352/1656  4.28  4.49  4.07  4.10  4.55


           Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        0  0  0  0  0  4 23  4.85   301/1586  4.73  4.78  4.43  4.48  4.85
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   0  0  0  0  0  0 27  5.00     1/1585  4.89  4.90  4.69  4.76  5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0 0  1  0  1  8 17  4.48   661/1582  4.47  4.61  4.26  4.35  4.48
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     0  0  0  0  2  4 21  4.70   440/1575  4.68  4.73  4.27  4.39  4.70
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 16 9 0 1  0  0  1  3.50  ****/1380  4.22  4.19  3.94  4.03  ****


           Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 6 0  0  0  4  3 14  4.48   431/1520  4.28  4.30  4.01  4.03  4.48
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 6 0  0  1  0  2 18  4.76   372/1515  4.32  4.56  4.24  4.28  4.76
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 6 0  0  0  1  2 18  4.81   358/1511  4.39  4.64  4.27  4.28  4.81
4. Were special techniques successful                  8 14  0  1  1  0  3  4.00  ****/ 994  4.33  3.94  3.94  3.98  ****


           Seminar
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 26 0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00  ****/ 103  ****  ****  4.41  4.07  ****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 26 0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00  ****/ 101  ****  ****  4.48  4.45  ****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 26 0  0  0  0  1  0  4.00  ****/  95  ****  ****  4.31  4.33  ****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear                26 0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00  ****/  97  ****  ****  4.14  4.63  ****


           Self  Paced
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 26 0  0  0  0  1  0  4.00  ****/  61  ****  ****  4.09  4.23  ****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal     26 0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00  ****/  52  ****  ****  4.26  4.53  ****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful       26 0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00  ****/  50  ****  ****  4.44  4.42  ****
```

```
                                        Frequency Distribution
```

```
Credits Earned         Cum. GPA        Expected Grades           Reasons                 Type                    Majors
--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
 00-27      4        0.00-0.99    1       A   16         Required for Majors  10     Graduate      0        Major        0
 28-55      3        1.00-1.99    0       B    9
 56-83      6        2.00-2.99    3       C    0         General               4     Under-grad   27        Non-major   27
 84-150     3        3.00-3.49    4       D    0
 Grad.      0        3.50-4.00    4       F    0         Electives             1     #### - Means there are not enough
                                         P    0                                      responses to be significant
                                         I    0         Other                 8
                                         ?    1
```

```
Course-Section: ANTH 211  8020                University of Maryland                              Page    60
Title          CULTURAL ANTHROPOLOGY              Baltimore County                              JAN 21, 2006
Instructor:    Pfanstiehl, Cyn                    Fall   2005                                   Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:      22
Questionnaires:  19                       Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire
```

```
                                                   Frequencies       Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
                  Questions                 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  8  9  4.26  941/1674   4.34  4.58  4.27 4.32  4.26
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    0  0  0  1  0  8 10  4.42  705/1674   4.35  4.55  4.23 4.26  4.42
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   0  0  1  1  3  7  7  3.95 1070/1423   4.38  4.62  4.27 4.36  3.95
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    0  0  0  1  2  8  8  4.21  905/1609   4.23  4.49  4.22 4.23  4.21
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0  0  0  1  2  6 10  4.32  502/1585   4.36  4.48  3.96 3.91  4.32
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 0 0 1  2  4 12  4.42  481/1535   4.20  4.42  4.08 4.03  4.42
7. Was the grading system clearly explained            1  0  0  1  1  5 11  4.44  613/1651   4.40  4.52  4.18 4.20  4.44
8. How many times was class cancelled                  1  0  0  0  0  0 18  5.00    1/1673   4.41  4.52  4.69 4.67  5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 3 0 1  0  1  6  8  4.25  719/1656   4.28  4.49  4.07 4.10  4.25

                  Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        1  0  0  1  0  4 13  4.61  738/1586   4.73  4.78  4.43 4.48  4.61
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   0  0  0  0  1  1 17  4.84  713/1585   4.89  4.90  4.69 4.76  4.84
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0 0  0  0  4  4 11  4.37  819/1582   4.47  4.61  4.26 4.35  4.37
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     1  0  0  0  1  4 13  4.67  495/1575   4.68  4.73  4.27 4.39  4.67
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 1 1 0  1  2  3 11  4.41  371/1380   4.22  4.19  3.94 4.03  4.41

                  Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 2 0  0  0  1  8  8  4.41  500/1520   4.28  4.30  4.01 4.03  4.41
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 2 0  1  0  1  5 10  4.35  808/1515   4.32  4.56  4.24 4.28  4.35
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 2 0 2  0  0  4 11  4.29  855/1511   4.39  4.64  4.27 4.28  4.29
4. Were special techniques successful                  3  1  0  0  3  4  8  4.33  322/ 994   4.33  3.94  3.94 3.98  4.33

                  Laboratory
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material  16  1  0  0  2  0  0  3.00 ****/ 265   ****  ****  4.23 4.34  ****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information 17 0 0  0  0  1  1  4.50 ****/ 278   ****  ****  4.19 4.36  ****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 17 1 0  0  0  1  0  4.00 ****/ 260   ****  ****  4.46 4.51  ****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance           17  1  0  0  0  1  0  4.00 ****/ 259   ****  ****  4.33 4.42  ****

                  Seminar
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 16 1 0  0  0  2  0  4.00 ****/ 103   ****  ****  4.41 4.07  ****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 17 0 0  0  0  1  1  4.50 ****/ 101   ****  ****  4.48 4.45  ****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 17 0  0  0  0  1  1  4.50 ****/  95   ****  ****  4.31 4.33  ****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned    17  0  0  0  1  0  1  4.00 ****/  99   ****  ****  4.39 4.22  ****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear                17  0  0  0  0  1  1  4.50 ****/  97   ****  ****  4.14 4.63  ****

                  Field Work
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 17 0  0  0  0  1  1  4.50 ****/  76   ****  5.00  3.98 3.97  ****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 17  0  0  0  0  2  0  4.00 ****/  77   ****  5.00  3.93 4.20  ****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation       17  0  0  0  0  1  1  4.50 ****/  53   ****  5.00  4.45 4.50  ****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations   17  0  0  0  1  1  0  3.50 ****/  48   ****  ****  4.12 4.50  ****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities 17  1  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  49   ****  5.00  4.27 4.82  ****

                  Self  Paced
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 17 0  0  0  1  1  0  3.50 ****/  61   ****  ****  4.09 4.23  ****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal    17  0  0  0  1  1  0  3.50 ****/  52   ****  ****  4.26 4.53  ****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful      17  0  0  0  0  1  1  4.50 ****/  50   ****  ****  4.44 4.42  ****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful       18  0  0  0  0  1  0  4.00 ****/  35   ****  ****  4.36 4.63  ****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students     17  1  0  0  0  1  0  4.00 ****/  31   ****  ****  4.34 4.50  ****
```

```
Course-Section: ANTH 211  8020                    University of Maryland                          Page   60
Title           CULTURAL ANTHROPOLOGY             Baltimore County                              JAN 21, 2006
Instructor:     Pfanstiehl, Cyn                   Fall   2005                                   Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:     22
Questionnaires: 19                       Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire
```

```
                                        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    8
56-83      3        2.00-2.99    2        C    2        General              3     Under-grad  19        Non-major 19
84-150     1        3.00-3.49    1        D    0
Grad.      0        3.50-4.00    1        F    0        Electives            0     #### - Means there are not enough
                                         P    0                                   responses to be significant
                                         I    0        Other                5
                                         ?    0
```

```
Title      KIN, COMMUNITY&ETHNICI                 Baltimore County                                         JAN 21, 2006
Instructor:  SAN ANTONIO, PA                      Fall   2005                                              Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:    27
Questionnaires:  17                       Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire
```

| | | Frequencies | | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Dept | UMBC | Level | Sect |
Questions	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	7	10	4.59	509/1674	4.59	4.58	4.27	4.26	4.59
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	0	1	3	12	4.47	625/1674	4.47	4.55	4.23	4.21	4.47
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	1	15	4.82	188/1423	4.82	4.62	4.27	4.27	4.82
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	1	2	3	10	4.38	687/1609	4.38	4.49	4.22	4.27	4.38
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	3	12	4.59	277/1585	4.59	4.48	3.96	3.95	4.59
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	5	0	0	3	3	6	4.25	667/1535	4.25	4.42	4.08	4.15	4.25
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	0	1	1	14	4.59	419/1651	4.59	4.52	4.18	4.16	4.59
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	2	11	4	4.12	1518/1673	4.12	4.52	4.69	4.68	4.12
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	2	6	7	4.33	615/1656	4.33	4.49	4.07	4.07	4.33
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	3	13	4.71	603/1586	4.71	4.78	4.43	4.42	4.71
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	16	4.94	340/1585	4.94	4.90	4.69	4.66	4.94
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	1	1	4	11	4.47	675/1582	4.47	4.61	4.26	4.26	4.47
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	1	0	2	13	4.69	467/1575	4.69	4.73	4.27	4.25	4.69
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	6	3	1	1	4	2	3.09	1208/1380	3.09	4.19	3.94	4.01	3.09
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	2	2	5	6	4.00	810/1520	4.00	4.30	4.01	4.09	4.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	3	2	10	4.47	681/1515	4.47	4.56	4.24	4.32	4.47
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	1	0	2	12	4.67	507/1511	4.67	4.64	4.27	4.34	4.67
4. Were special techniques successful	2	5	1	0	2	6	1	3.60	699/ 994	3.60	3.94	3.94	3.96	3.60

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	11	Required for Majors	3	Graduate	0	Major	4
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	2	B	5						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	2	C	1	General	5	Under-grad	17	Non-major	13
84-150	7	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough			
				P	0			responses to be significant			
				I	0	Other	9				
				?	0						

```
Course-Section: ANTH 311  0101              University of Maryland                        Page   62
Title       URBAN ANTHROPOLOGY               Baltimore County                            JAN 21, 2006
Instructor:    CHARD, SARAH                      Fall   2005                              Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:      41
Questionnaires:  26                   Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire
```

```
                                        Frequencies        Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
            Questions                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  6 20  4.77  287/1674  4.77  4.58  4.27 4.26  4.77
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    1  0  0  0  2  9 14  4.48  609/1674  4.48  4.55  4.23 4.21  4.48
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   0  0  0  0  1 10 15  4.54  540/1423  4.54  4.62  4.27 4.27  4.54
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    0  0  0  0  0 11 15  4.58  408/1609  4.58  4.49  4.22 4.27  4.58
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0 0  0  0  2  4 20  4.69  204/1585  4.69  4.48  3.96 3.95  4.69
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 1 0 0 0 2 6 17 4.60  283/1535  4.60  4.42  4.08 4.15  4.60
7. Was the grading system clearly explained            2  0  0  0  3 10 11  4.33  768/1651  4.33  4.52  4.18 4.16  4.33
8. How many times was class cancelled                  2  0  0  0  0 16  8  4.33 1361/1673  4.33  4.52  4.69 4.68  4.33
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 4 0 0 0 2 11 9  4.32  641/1656  4.32  4.49  4.07 4.07  4.32

            Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        1  0  0  0  1  4 20  4.76  474/1586  4.76  4.78  4.43 4.42  4.76
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   1  0  0  0  1  1 23  4.88  615/1585  4.88  4.90  4.69 4.66  4.88
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 2 0  0  0  1  7 16  4.63  496/1582  4.63  4.61  4.26 4.26  4.63
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     1  0  0  0  1  3 21  4.80  279/1575  4.80  4.73  4.27 4.25  4.80
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 1 0 0 4 1 6 14  4.20  540/1380  4.20  4.19  3.94 4.01  4.20

            Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 5 0  0  1  2  3 15  4.52  385/1520  4.52  4.30  4.01 4.09  4.52
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 5 0  0  1  1  4 15  4.57  568/1515  4.57  4.56  4.24 4.32  4.57
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 5 0 0 0 1 2 18  4.81  358/1511  4.81  4.64  4.27 4.34  4.81
4. Were special techniques successful                  5  2  0  2  4  6  7  3.95  530/ 994  3.95  3.94  3.94 3.96  3.95

            Laboratory
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material  25  0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/ 265  ****  ****  4.23 4.26  ****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information 25 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 278  ****  ****  4.19 4.24  ****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 25 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 260  ****  ****  4.46 4.49  ****

            Seminar
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 25 0 0 0 0 1 0  4.00 ****/ 103  ****  ****  4.41 4.10  ****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 25 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 101  ****  ****  4.48 4.30  ****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 25 0 0 0 0 1 0  4.00 ****/  95  ****  ****  4.31 3.91  ****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned    25  0  0  0  0  1  0  4.00 ****/  99  ****  ****  4.39 4.29  ****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear                25  0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  97  ****  ****  4.14 3.48  ****
```

```
                                    Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned        Cum. GPA       Expected Grades        Reasons              Type                  Majors
--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
00-27      0      0.00-0.99   0     A  14      Required for Majors  2     Graduate     0      Major      4
28-55      2      1.00-1.99   0     B   9
56-83     12      2.00-2.99   3     C   0      General              7     Under-grad  26      Non-major 22
84-150     3      3.00-3.49   9     D   0
Grad.      0      3.50-4.00   5     F   0      Electives            3     #### - Means there are not enough
                                    P   0                                responses to be significant
                                    I   0      Other               12
                                    ?   0
```

Enrollment: 33
Questionnaires: 21   Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

```
                                                  Frequencies          Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
            Questions                      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  17  4.76  287/1674  4.76  4.58  4.27  4.26  4.76
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    0   0   0   0   3   6  12  4.43  705/1674  4.43  4.55  4.23  4.21  4.43
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   0   0   0   0   2   1  18  4.76  250/1423  4.76  4.62  4.27  4.27  4.76
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    0   1   0   0   3   3  14  4.55  432/1609  4.55  4.49  4.22  4.27  4.55
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 1  0   0   3   0   4  13  4.35  462/1585  4.35  4.48  3.96  3.95  4.35
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 1 1 1   0   1   1  16  4.63  260/1535  4.63  4.42  4.08  4.15  4.63
7. Was the grading system clearly explained            1   1   0   0   3   5  11  4.42  643/1651  4.42  4.52  4.18  4.16  4.42
8. How many times was class cancelled                  1   0   0   0   2  14   4  4.10 1525/1673  4.10  4.52  4.69  4.68  4.10
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 1 0  0   0   2   5  13  4.55  345/1656  4.55  4.49  4.07  4.07  4.55

            Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        0   0   0   0   2   1  18  4.76  474/1586  4.76  4.78  4.43  4.42  4.76
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   0   0   0   0   0   1  20  4.95  284/1585  4.95  4.90  4.69  4.66  4.95
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0  0   0   2   0   5  14  4.48  675/1582  4.48  4.61  4.26  4.26  4.48
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     0   0   0   1   1   2  17  4.67  495/1575  4.67  4.73  4.27  4.25  4.67
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 6 12 0   0   2   0   1  3.67 ****/1380  ****  4.19  3.94  4.01  ****

            Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 4  0   0   0   2   4  11  4.53  385/1520  4.53  4.30  4.01  4.09  4.53
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 4  0   0   0   0   3  14  4.82  301/1515  4.82  4.56  4.24  4.32  4.82
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 4 0  0   0   1   2  14  4.76  402/1511  4.76  4.64  4.27  4.34  4.76
4. Were special techniques successful                  5  14   1   0   0   0   1  3.00 ****/ 994  ****  3.94  3.94  3.96  ****
```

Frequency Distribution

```
Credits Earned          Cum. GPA          Expected Grades          Reasons                    Type                     Majors
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
 00-27      0        0.00-0.99    0        A   13        Required for Majors   2      Graduate      1       Major        2
 28-55      1        1.00-1.99    0        B    2                                                                    
 56-83      4        2.00-2.99    2        C    1        General               7      Under-grad   20       Non-major   19
 84-150     5        3.00-3.49    2        D    0                                                                    
 Grad.      1        3.50-4.00    5        F    0        Electives             3      #### - Means there are not enough
                                           P    0                                     responses to be significant
                                           I    0        Other                 7
                                           ?    2
```

```
Course-Section: ANTH 397  0101              University of Maryland                            Page  64
Title          SEL TOPICS:ANTHROPOLOG       Baltimore County                                 JAN 21, 2006
Instructor:    DONATO, PAUL                 Fall  2005                                        Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:      16
Questionnaires: 10                       Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

                                           Frequencies        Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
           Questions               NR  NA  1  2  3  4  5  Mean     Rank     Mean   Mean  Mean Mean  Mean
----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
               General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course    1   0   0   0   2   1   6   4.44   703/1674   4.44   4.58   4.27   4.26   4.44
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals     1   0   0   0   0   4   5   4.56   519/1674   4.56   4.55   4.23   4.21   4.56
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals    1   0   0   0   0   2   7   4.78   238/1423   4.78   4.62   4.27   4.27   4.78
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals     1   0   0   0   0   2   7   4.78   202/1609   4.78   4.49   4.22   4.27   4.78
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 1   0   1   0   0   2   6   4.33   482/1585   4.33   4.48   3.96   3.95   4.33
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 1  0   0   0   2   1   6   4.44   454/1535   4.44   4.42   4.08   4.15   4.44
7. Was the grading system clearly explained             1   0   0   0   0   3   6   4.67   330/1651   4.67   4.52   4.18   4.16   4.67
8. How many times was class cancelled                   2   0   0   0   0   3   5   4.63  1114/1673   4.63   4.52   4.69   4.68   4.63
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 3 0   0   0   0   1   6   4.86   127/1656   4.86   4.49   4.07   4.07   4.86

               Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared         3   0   0   0   0   0   7   5.00     1/1586   5.00   4.78   4.43   4.42   5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject    3   0   0   0   0   1   6   4.86   689/1585   4.86   4.90   4.69   4.66   4.86
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 3   0   0   0   0   1   6   4.86   199/1582   4.86   4.61   4.26   4.26   4.86
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned      3   0   0   0   0   0   7   5.00     1/1575   5.00   4.73   4.27   4.25   5.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 4  5   0   0   0   0   1   5.00  ****/1380   ****   4.19   3.94   4.01   ****

               Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 4   0   0   0   0   4   2   4.33   572/1520   4.33   4.30   4.01   4.09   4.33
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 4   0   0   0   0   1   5   4.83   289/1515   4.83   4.56   4.24   4.32   4.83
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 4  0   0   0   0   1   5   4.83   323/1511   4.83   4.64   4.27   4.34   4.83
4. Were special techniques successful                   4   4   0   0   1   0   1   4.00  ****/ 994   ****   3.94   3.94   3.96   ****

               Seminar
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 9   0   0   0   0   0   1   5.00  ****/ 103   ****   ****   4.41   4.10   ****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 9  0   0   0   0   0   1   5.00  ****/ 101   ****   ****   4.48   4.30   ****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 9   0   0   0   0   0   1   5.00  ****/  95   ****   ****   4.31   3.91   ****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned     9   0   0   0   0   0   1   5.00  ****/  99   ****   ****   4.39   4.29   ****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear                 9   0   0   0   0   0   1   5.00  ****/  97   ****   ****   4.14   3.48   ****

                                    Frequency Distribution

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

```
Course-Section: ANTH 397A 0101          University of Maryland                              Page   65
Title           INDIGENOUS HEALING TRA   Baltimore County                                  JAN 21, 2006
Instructor:     KAVANAGH, KATHR          Fall  2005                                         Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:     32
Questionnaires: 17                      Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire
```

```
                                             Frequencies      Instructor    Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
            Questions                  NR  NA  1  2  3  4  5  Mean    Rank    Mean  Mean  Mean Mean  Mean
---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
            General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course   0  0  0  0  0  1 16  4.94    89/1674  4.94  4.58  4.27  4.26  4.94
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    0  0  0  0  0  0 17  5.00     1/1674  5.00  4.55  4.23  4.21  5.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   0  0  0  0  0  2 15  4.88   146/1423  4.88  4.62  4.27  4.27  4.88
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    0  2  0  0  0  3 12  4.80   173/1609  4.80  4.49  4.22  4.27  4.80
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0 0  0  0  1  3 13  4.71   198/1585  4.71  4.48  3.96  3.95  4.71
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 0 0 0 0 6 11  4.65   253/1535  4.65  4.42  4.08  4.15  4.65
7. Was the grading system clearly explained            0  0  0  0  0  0 17  5.00     1/1651  5.00  4.52  4.18  4.16  5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled                  2  0  0  0  0  6  9  4.60  1135/1673  4.60  4.52  4.69  4.68  4.60
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 5 0 0 0 0 4  8  4.67   257/1656  4.67  4.49  4.07  4.07  4.67

            Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        0  0  0  0  0  0 17  5.00     1/1586  5.00  4.78  4.43  4.42  5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   0  0  0  0  0  0 17  5.00     1/1585  5.00  4.90  4.69  4.66  5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0 0  0  0  0  1 16  4.94    91/1582  4.94  4.61  4.26  4.26  4.94
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     0  0  0  0  0  1 16  4.94   103/1575  4.94  4.73  4.27  4.25  4.94
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 0 0 0 0 0 2 15  4.88    86/1380  4.88  4.19  3.94  4.01  4.88

            Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 4 0  0  0  1  3  9  4.62   330/1520  4.62  4.30  4.01  4.09  4.62
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 4 0  0  0  0  2 11  4.85   277/1515  4.85  4.56  4.24  4.32  4.85
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 4 0 0 0 0 2 11  4.85   312/1511  4.85  4.64  4.27  4.34  4.85
4. Were special techniques successful                  4  3  0  0  2  2  6  4.40   287/ 994  4.40  3.94  3.94  3.96  4.40

            Laboratory
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material  16  0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00  ****/ 265  ****  ****  4.23  4.26  ****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information 16 0 0 0 0 0 1  5.00  ****/ 278  ****  ****  4.19  4.24  ****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 16 0 0 0 0 0 1  5.00  ****/ 260  ****  ****  4.46  4.49  ****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance           16  0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00  ****/ 259  ****  ****  4.33  4.33  ****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified  16 0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00  ****/ 233  ****  ****  4.20  4.18  ****

            Seminar
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 16 0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00  ****/ 103  ****  ****  4.41  4.10  ****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 16 0 0 0 0 0 1  5.00  ****/ 101  ****  ****  4.48  4.30  ****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 16 0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00  ****/  95  ****  ****  4.31  3.91  ****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned    16  0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00  ****/  99  ****  ****  4.39  4.29  ****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear                16  0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00  ****/  97  ****  ****  4.14  3.48  ****

            Field Work
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 16  0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00  ****/  76  ****  5.00  3.98  4.03  ****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 16  0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00  ****/  77  ****  5.00  3.93  3.70  ****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation       16  0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00  ****/  53  ****  5.00  4.45  3.87  ****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations   16  0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00  ****/  48  ****  ****  4.12  3.67  ****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities 16  0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00  ****/  49  ****  5.00  4.27  3.27  ****

            Self  Paced
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 16 0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00  ****/  61  ****  ****  4.09  3.20  ****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal    16  0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00  ****/  52  ****  ****  4.26  3.50  ****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful       16  0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00  ****/  35  ****  ****  4.36  3.29  ****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students     16  0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00  ****/  31  ****  ****  4.34  4.29  ****
```

```
                                       Frequency Distribution


Credits Earned          Cum. GPA          Expected Grades            Reasons                  Type                  Majors
--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
 00-27     0          0.00-0.99    0        A   12         Required for Majors  1      Graduate     0        Major       3
 28-55     0          1.00-1.99    0        B    4
 56-83     2          2.00-2.99    2        C    0         General              6      Under-grad  17        Non-major  14
 84-150    5          3.00-3.49    5        D    0
 Grad.     0          3.50-4.00    2        F    0         Electives            3      #### - Means there are not enough
                                            P    0                                     responses to be significant
                                            I    0         Other                6
                                            ?    0
```

Enrollment: 12
Questionnaires: 8   Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

```
                                                   Frequencies        Instructor   Course Dept UMBC Level  Sect
          Questions                         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  3  2  3  4.00 1196/1674  4.00  4.58  4.27  4.26  4.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals   0  0  0  0  1  4  3  4.25  931/1674  4.25  4.55  4.23  4.21  4.25
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals  0  0  0  0  0  3  5  4.63  431/1423  4.63  4.62  4.27  4.27  4.63
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals   0  0  0  0  1  3  4  4.38  687/1609  4.38  4.49  4.22  4.27  4.38
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0 0  0  0  1  4  3  4.25  557/1585  4.25  4.48  3.96  3.95  4.25
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 0 0 0 0 4 4  4.50  373/1535  4.50  4.42  4.08  4.15  4.50
7. Was the grading system clearly explained           0  0  0  0  1  2  5  4.50  524/1651  4.50  4.52  4.18  4.16  4.50
8. How many times was class cancelled                 0  0  0  0  0  2  6  4.75  958/1673  4.75  4.52  4.69  4.68  4.75
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 1 0 0 0 1 5 1  4.00  955/1656  4.00  4.49  4.07  4.07  4.00

                  Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared       0  0  0  0  0  3  5  4.63  723/1586  4.63  4.78  4.43  4.42  4.63
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject  0  0  0  0  0  1  7  4.88  640/1585  4.88  4.90  4.69  4.66  4.88
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0 0  0  0  1  2  5  4.50  632/1582  4.50  4.61  4.26  4.26  4.50
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned    0  0  0  0  1  2  5  4.50  692/1575  4.50  4.73  4.27  4.25  4.50
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 0 0 0 0 1 2 5  4.50  303/1380  4.50  4.19  3.94  4.01  4.50

                  Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 0 0 0 2 1 3 2  3.63 1116/1520  3.63  4.30  4.01  4.09  3.63
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 0 0 0 1 0 2 5  4.38  788/1515  4.38  4.56  4.24  4.32  4.38
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 0 0 0 0 0 2 6  4.75  414/1511  4.75  4.64  4.27  4.34  4.75
4. Were special techniques successful                 0  1  1  1  1  2  2  3.43  773/ 994  3.43  3.94  3.94  3.96  3.43

                  Field Work
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 7 0 0 0 0 0 1  5.00 ****/  76  ****  5.00  3.98  4.03  ****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 7 0 0 0 0 0 1  5.00 ****/  77  ****  5.00  3.93  3.70  ****
```

Frequency Distribution

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

```
Course-Section: ANTH 400  0101           University of Maryland                          Page   67
Title      ANTHROPOLOGICAL THEORY           Baltimore County                            JAN 21, 2006
Instructor:   DONATO, PAUL                      Fall   2005                              Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:     16
Questionnaires: 13                    Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire
```

```
                                                  Frequencies        Instructor    Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
              Questions                     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  0 12  4.85  205/1674  4.85  4.58  4.27  4.42  4.85
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals     0   0  0  0  1  1 11  4.77  259/1674  4.77  4.55  4.23  4.31  4.77
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals    0   0  0  0  2  1 10  4.62  445/1423  4.62  4.62  4.27  4.34  4.62
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals     0   0  0  0  1  1 11  4.77  212/1609  4.77  4.49  4.22  4.30  4.77
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0   0  0  0  0  2 11  4.85  116/1585  4.85  4.48  3.96  4.01  4.85
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0  0  0  1  1  1 10  4.54  346/1535  4.54  4.42  4.08  4.18  4.54
7. Was the grading system clearly explained             0   0  1  0  0  2 10  4.54  484/1651  4.54  4.52  4.18  4.23  4.54
8. How many times was class cancelled                   0   0  0  0  0  0 13  5.00    1/1673  5.00  4.52  4.69  4.67  5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 1  0  0  0  0  2 10  4.83  136/1656  4.83  4.49  4.07  4.19  4.83

              Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared         0   0  0  0  0  3 10  4.77  474/1586  4.77  4.78  4.43  4.46  4.77
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject    0   0  0  1  0  0 12  4.77  896/1585  4.77  4.90  4.69  4.76  4.77
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0   0  0  0  1  1 11  4.77  299/1582  4.77  4.61  4.26  4.31  4.77
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned      0   0  0  0  1  2 10  4.69  453/1575  4.69  4.73  4.27  4.35  4.69
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 0  10  0  0  1  1  1  4.00  ****/1380  ****  4.19  3.94  4.04  ****

              Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 3   0  0  1  0  2  7  4.50  397/1520  4.50  4.30  4.01  4.18  4.50
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 3   0  0  0  1  1  8  4.70  453/1515  4.70  4.56  4.24  4.40  4.70
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 3  0  0  1  0  1  8  4.60  563/1511  4.60  4.64  4.27  4.45  4.60
4. Were special techniques successful                   3   7  0  0  0  0  3  5.00  ****/ 994  ****  3.94  3.94  4.19  ****

              Seminar
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 12  0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00  ****/ 103  ****  ****  4.41  4.42  ****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 12  0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00  ****/ 101  ****  ****  4.48  4.65  ****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 12  0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00  ****/  95  ****  ****  4.31  4.60  ****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned     12  0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00  ****/  99  ****  ****  4.39  4.57  ****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear                 12  0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00  ****/  97  ****  ****  4.14  4.46  ****

                                   Frequency Distribution
```

```
Credits Earned        Cum. GPA         Expected Grades        Reasons              Type               Majors
-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
  00-27     0      0.00-0.99    0       A    4       Required for Majors   1    Graduate      0      Major      10
  28-55     0      1.00-1.99    0       B    7
  56-83     1      2.00-2.99    1       C    1       General               0    Under-grad   13      Non-major   3
  84-150    4      3.00-3.49    2       D    0
  Grad.     0      3.50-4.00    3       F    0       Electives             0    #### - Means there are not enough
                                        P    0                                  responses to be significant
                                        I    0       Other                11
                                        ?    0
```

Enrollment: 2
Questionnaires: 1   Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

```
                                              Frequencies      Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
              Questions                   NR  NA  1  2  3  4  5  Mean   Rank    Mean  Mean  Mean  Mean  Mean
---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
                    General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course   0   0   0  0  0  0  1  5.00   1/1674   5.00  4.58  4.27  4.42  5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    0   0   0  0  0  0  1  5.00   1/1674   5.00  4.55  4.23  4.31  5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled                  0   0   0  0  0  0  1  5.00   1/1673   5.00  4.52  4.69  4.67  5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 0 0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00   1/1656   5.00  4.49  4.07  4.19  5.00


                    Lecture
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   0   0   0  0  0  0  1  5.00   1/1585   5.00  4.90  4.69  4.76  5.00


                    Field Work
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 0   0   0  0  0  0  1  5.00   1/  76   5.00  5.00  3.98  4.86  5.00
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 0   0   0  0  0  0  1  5.00   1/  77   5.00  5.00  3.93  4.24  5.00
3. Was the instructor available for consultation       0   0   0  0  0  0  1  5.00   1/  53   5.00  5.00  4.45  4.86  5.00
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities 0   0   0  0  0  0  1  5.00   1/  49   5.00  5.00  4.27  4.48  5.00
```

Frequency Distribution

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