Course-Section: ANTH 211 0101 University of Maryland CULTURAL ANTHROPOLOGY Baltimore County

Title Fall 2005 Instructor: SAN ANTONIO, PA

Enrollment: 45 Questionnaires: 30

	Evaluation	

Page 58

JAN 21, 2006

Job IRBR3029

				eque	ncie		_		tructor	Course	_		Level	
Questions		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 learn	ed 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 effectivene	ss 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	a 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	n 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	****
Fr	equency	/ Dis	strib	utio	n									
Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grad	2.5			Do	ason	<b>a</b>			т.				Majors	
creates same call. GPA Expected Grad	=5 				a5011	.o 			Ту	 he			S	
00-27 2 0.00-0.99 0 A 12		Re	equir	ed f	or M	ajor	s 1	.2	Graduat	е	0	Majo	r	2
28-55 8 1.00-1.99 0 B 11								_	TT		_			20

Credits E	Earned	Cum. GPA		Expecte	d Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	 А	12	Required for Majors	12	Graduate	0	Major	2
28-55	8	1.00-1.99	0	В	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	n
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	9	_			
				2	2						

Course-Section: ANTH 211 0201

Title CULTURAL ANTHROPOLOGY

Instructor: MESSINGER, SETH

Enrollment: 4

MESSINGER, SETH Fall 2005

P 0

I

?

0

1

Page 59 JAN 21, 2006 Job IRBR3029

responses to be significant

8

DILL OTTINCITE .	
Questionnaires:	27

#### Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

University of Maryland

Baltimore County

						eque		S		Inst	tructor	Course	e Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect		
		Questions	3		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		Genera:	 l															
1. Did y	ou gain ne	ew insights,ski	lls from	this course	0	0	0	0	2	7	18	4.59	497/1674	4.34	4.58	4.27	4.32	4.59
		ctor make clear			0	0	0	1	4	7	15	4.33	830/1674	4.35	4.55	4.23	4.26	4.33
3. Did t	he exam q	uestions reflect	t the exp	ected goals	0	3	0	0	2	4	18	4.67	376/1423	4.38	4.62	4.27	4.36	4.67
4. Did o	ther eval	uations reflect	the expe	cted goals	0	0	0	0	3	9	15	4.44	583/1609	4.23	4.49	4.22	4.23	4.44
5. Did a	ssigned re	eadings contribu	ute to wh	at 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 w	ritten as:	signments contr	ibute 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 t	he grading	g system clearly	y explain	ed	0	2	1	0	5	4	15	4.28	832/1651	4.40	4.52	4.18	4.20	4.28
8. How ma	any times	was class cance	elled		1	0	0	0	5	13	8	4.12	1518/1673	4.41	4.52	4.69	4.67	4.12
9. How w	ould you	grade the overa	ll teachi	ng effectiveness	5	0	0	0	1	8	13	4.55	352/1656	4.28	4.49	4.07	4.10	4.55
		Lecture	e															
1. Were	the instr	uctor's lectures	s well pr	epared	0	0	0	0	0	4	23	4.85	301/1586	4.73	4.78	4.43	4.48	4.85
2. Did t	he instru	ctor seem intere	ested 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 1	ecture mat	terial presented	d and exp	lained clearly	0	0	1	0	1	8	17	4.48	661/1582	4.47	4.61	4.26	4.35	4.48
4. Did t	he lecture	es contribute to	o what yo	u learned	0	0	0	0	2	4	21	4.70	440/1575	4.68	4.73	4.27	4.39	4.70
5. Did a	udiovisua	l techniques enl	nance you	r understanding	16	9	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/1380	4.22	4.19	3.94	4.03	****
		Discus	aion															
1 Did d	lace diec	ussions contrib		at vou learned	6	0	0	0	4	3	14	4.48	431/1520	4.28	4.30	4.01	4.03	4.48
		nts actively end			6	0	0	1	0	2	18	4.76	372/1515		4.56	4.24	4.28	4.76
		ctor encourage			6	0	0	0	1	2	18	4.81	358/1511		4.64	4.27	4.28	4.81
		echniques succes		open arboabbron	8	14	0	1	1	0	3		****/ 994		3.94	3.94	3.98	****
1		Semina			0.0	0	0	0	^	^	1	F 00	4444 / 100		****	4 41	4 07	****
	-	topics relevant			26	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 103 ****/ 101	****	****	4.41	4.07	****
		ctor available i			26	0	0	-	-	0	Τ	5.00	, =0=		****	4.48	4.45	****
	_	rojects contrib		at you rearned	26	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 95 ****/ 97		****	4.31	4.33	****
5. Were	criteria :	for grading made	e clear		26	Ü	U	U	0	Ü	1	5.00	****/ 97	****	****	4.14	4.63	***
1 5'1	1.5	Self			0.5	0	0	0		-	0	4 00		4.4.4.4.	ate ate ate ate	4 00	4 00	****
		system contribu			26	0	0	0	0	Τ.	0	4.00	****/ 61		~ ~ ~ ~	4.09	4.23	****
		tions make clear			26 26	0 0	0	0	0	0	1 1	5.00	****/ 52 ****/ 50		****	4.26	4.53	****
3. were	your conta	acts with the in	nstructor	neipiui	26	U	U	U	U	U	Τ	5.00	^^^^/ 50	***	* * * *	4.44	4.42	* * * *
				Frequ	iency	/ Dis	trib	utio	n									
Credits 1	Earned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	ason	s			Ту	pe			Majors	;
00-27	4	0.00-0.99	1	A 16		Re	quir	ed f	or M	 ajor	s 1	0	Graduat	е е	0	Majo	 or	0
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	В 9														
56-83	6	2.00-2.99	3	C 0		Gei	nera	1				4	Under-g	rad 2	27	Non-	-major	27
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	4	D 0													-	
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F 0		Ele	ecti	ves				1	#### -	Means t	there a		enoug	ŗh

Other

Course-Section: ANTH 211 8020

CULTURAL ANTHROPOLOGY

Title Pfanstiehl, Cyn

Instructor:

Enrollment: 22 Questionnaires: 19

#### University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2005

Page 60 JAN 21, 2006 Job IRBR3029

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

			Fre	eauei	ncies	3		Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Ouestions	NR	NA	1	_	3	4	5	Mean	Rank		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		4.44		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
Logturo														
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	4.73	4.76	4.43	4.46	4.84
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	4	_		4.37	819/1582	4.47	4.61	4.26	4.76	4.37
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	4		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		4.41			4.19	3.94		
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	Τ	Τ	U	Τ	2	3	ΤŢ	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		****/ 260	****	****	4.46	4.51	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	17	1	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 259	****	****	4.33	4.42	****
4. Did the lab institution provide assistance	1/	1	U	U	U		U	4.00	/ 233			4.55	1.12	
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		****/ 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		****/ 31	****	****	4.34	4.50	****
o. Here there charge proceeds for all the betweents	± /	_	J	3	5	_	J	1.00	, 31			1.51	1.50	

Course-Section: ANTH 211 8020

Title CULTURAL ANTHROPOLOGY

Instructor: Pfanstiehl, Cyn

Enrollment: 22
Questionnaires: 19

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2005 Page 60 JAN 21, 2006 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	l Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	 А	3	Required for Majors	5	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	8						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	2	С	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	n
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	5				
				?	0						

#### Course-Section: ANTH 304 0101 University of Maryland Baltimore County Title KIN, COMMUNITY&ETHNICI

Instructor: SAN ANTONIO, PA

Enrollment: 27 Questionnaires: 17

Grad.

0

3.50-4.00

3

Ρ

I

0

0

Fall 2005 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire Page 61

JAN 21, 2006

Job IRBR3029

#### - Means there are not enough

responses to be significant

Questions								Fr	equer	ncie	s		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals 3. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 7. Was the grading system clearly explained 8. How many times was class cancelled 9. Did outly ou			Question	3		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals 3. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 7. Was the grading system clearly explained 8. How many times was class cancelled 9. Did outly ou			Genera	 I															
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 1 1 1 5 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 4.88 687/1609 4.38 4.49 4.22 4.27 4.38 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0 0 0 0 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 4.55 7. Was the grading system clearly explained 0 0 0 1 1 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 0 0 2 11 4 4.12 1518/1673 4.12 4.52 4.69 4.68 4.15 4.59 4.69 4.69 4.69 4.69 4.69 4.69 4.69 4.6	1. Did you	ı gain ne		_	om this course	0	0	0	0	0	7	10	4.59	509/1674	4.59	4.58	4.27	4.26	4.59
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	_	_				0	0	1	0	1	3	12	4.47	625/1674	4.47	4.55	4.23	4.21	4.47
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0 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 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 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 0 2 6 7 4.33 615/1656 4.33 4.12 4.52 4.69 4.68 4.12 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 2 0 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's lectures well prepared 0 0 0 0 0 1 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 1 6 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 4.74 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	3. Did the	e exam qu	estions reflec	the e	expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	1	15	4.82	188/1423	4.82	4.62	4.27	4.27	4.82
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 4.15 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 2 0 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 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 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 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	4. Did oth	ner evalu	ations reflect	the ex	spected goals	0	1	0	1	2	3	10	4.38	687/1609	4.38	4.49	4.22	4.27	4.38
7. Was the grading system clearly explained 0 0 1 0 1 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 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 0 2 6 7 4.33 615/1656 4.33 4.49 4.07 4.07 4.33    Lecture	5. Did ass	signed re	adings contrib	ite 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
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 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 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 3.00 1 1 1 4 11 4.77 675/1582 4.47 4.61 4.26 4.26 4.47 4.01 4.01 4.01 4.02 4.02 4.02 4.03 4.03 4.01 4.02 4.05 4.03 4.01	6. Did wri	itten ass	signments contr	ibute t	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
New would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness   2	7. Was the	e grading	system clearly	expla	ained	0	0	1	0	1	1	14	4.59	419/1651	4.59	4.52	4.18	4.16	4.59
Lecture  1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared  2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject  3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly  4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned  5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding  6. Discussion  1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned  2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject  6. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding  7. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding  8. Discussion  1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned  9. Discussion  1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned  9. Discussion  1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned  9. Discussion  1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned  9. Discussion  1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned  9. Discussion  1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned  9. Discussion  1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned  9. Discussion  1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned  9. Discussion  1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned  9. Discussion  1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned  9. Discussion  1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned  9. Discussion  1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned  9. Discussion  1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned  1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned  1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned  1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned  1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned  1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned  1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned  1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned  1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned  1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned  1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned  1. Did class discus	8. How man	ny times	was class cance	elled		0	0	0	0	2	11	4	4.12	1518/1673	4.12	4.52	4.69	4.68	4.12
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 4.64 Were special techniques successful  Frequency Distribution  Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades Reasons Type Majors  Frequency Distribution  Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades Reasons Type Majors 4 28-55 2 1.00-1.99 2 B 5 5 56-83 1 2.00-2.99 2 C 1 General 5 Under-grad 17 Non-major 13	9. How wou	ıld you g	rade the overa	ll tead	ching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	2	6	7	4.33	615/1656	4.33	4.49	4.07	4.07	4.33
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 4.64 Were special techniques successful  Frequency Distribution  Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades Reasons Type Majors  Frequency Distribution  Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades Reasons Type Majors 4 28-55 2 1.00-1.99 2 B 5 5 56-83 1 2.00-2.99 2 C 1 General 5 Under-grad 17 Non-major 13			Logtur																
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 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 4 28-55 2 1.00-1.99 2 B 5 5 56-83 1 2.00-2.99 2 C 1 General 5 Under-grad 17 Non-major 13	1 Ware th	ne instru			nrenared	Λ	Ω	Λ	Λ	1	2	12	4 71	603/1586	<i>A</i> 71	4 78	4 43	4 42	4 71
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 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  O0-27 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 5 Under-grad 17 Non-major 13						٥	-	-	-	0	1								
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					-	0	-	-	-	-	_			,					
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 1 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			_			0		-			2								
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 5 Under-grad 17 Non-major 13					-	0	_	3	1	1	4			- ,					
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 5 Under-grad 17 Non-major 13			1	2	,														
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			Discus	sion															
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						2	-		2	2	5	6	4.00	810/1520	4.00	4.30	4.01	4.09	4.00
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			_	_		2		-	-	3	2			,					4.47
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			_		nd open discussion			0	_	0	2	12		, -					4.67
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	4. Were sp	pecial te	chniques succe	ssful		2	5	1	0	2	6	1	3.60	699/ 994	3.60	3.94	3.94	3.96	3.60
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					Frequ	ency	, Dist	trib	utior	า									
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		1																	
28-55	Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	ason	s			Ту	pe			Majors	3
56-83 1 2.00-2.99 2 C 1 General 5 Under-grad 17 Non-major 13	00-27	27 1 0.00-0.99 0 A 11					Red	quir	ed fo	or M	 ajor	s	3	Graduat	e	0	Majo	r )r	4
· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	28-55	2	1.00-1.99	2	В 5			_			-						_		
84-150 7 3.00-3.49 3 D 0	56-83	1	2.00-2.99	2	C 1		Ger	nera	1				5	Under-g	rad 1	.7	Non-	major	13
	84-150	7	3.00-3.49	3	D 0														

Electives

9

Other

Course-Section: ANTH 311 0101

URBAN ANTHROPOLOGY

Title Instructor: CHARD, SARAH

Enrollment: 41 Questionnaires: 26

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

University of Maryland

Baltimore County

Fall 2005

Page 62 JAN 21, 2006 Job IRBR3029

							Fre	equer	ncies	3		Inst	ructo	<u>-</u>	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
		Questions	5		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rar	ık	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		General	 I																
1. Did vo	u gain new	insights,ski		this course	0	0	0	0	0	6	20	4.77	287/1	1674	4.77	4.58	4.27	4.26	4.77
_	_	or make clear			1	0	0	0	2	9	14	4.48	609/1		4.48	4.55	4.23	4.21	4.48
		estions reflect	_	_	0	0	0	0	1	10	15	4.54	540/1		4.54	4.62	4.27	4.27	4.54
	_	tions reflect	_	-	0	0	0	0	0	11	15	4.58	408/1		4.58	4.49	4.22	4.27	4.58
			_	nat you learned	0	0	0	0	2	4	20	4.69	204/1	L585	4.69	4.48	3.96	3.95	4.69
	_	_		what you learned	1	0	0	0	2	6	17	4.60	283/1	L535	4.60	4.42	4.08	4.15	4.60
		system clearly		_	2	0	0	0	3	10	11	4.33	768/1	L651	4.33	4.52	4.18	4.16	4.33
8. How ma	ny times v	as class cance	elled		2	0	0	0	0	16	8	4.33	1361/1	L673	4.33	4.52	4.69	4.68	4.33
9. How wo	uld you gr	ade the overal	ll teach:	ing effectiveness	4	0	0	0	2	11	9	4.32	641/1	L656	4.32	4.49	4.07	4.07	4.32
		Lecture	<u> </u>																
1. Were t	he instruc	tor's lectures		repared	1	0	0	0	1	4	20	4.76	474/1	1586	4.76	4.78	4.43	4.42	4.76
		or seem inter	_	_	1	0	0	0	1	1	23	4.88	615/1		4.88	4.90	4.69	4.66	4.88
				plained clearly	2	0	0	0	1	7	16	4.63	496/1		4.63	4.61	4.26	4.26	4.63
		contribute to			1	0	0	0	1	3	21	4.80	279/1		4.80	4.73	4.27		4.80
			_	ır understanding	1	0	0	4	1	6	14	4.20	540/1	L380	4.20	4.19	3.94	4.01	4.20
1 541		Discus			_	0	0	1	_	2	1 -	4 50	205/2		4 50	4 20	4 01	4 00	4 50
				nat you learned	5	0	0	1	2	3	15	4.52	385/1		4.52	4.30	4.01	4.09	4.52
	e all students actively encouraged to participa the instructor encourage fair and open discuss				5	0	0	1	1	4	15	4.57	568/1		4.57	4.56	4.24	4.32	4.57
	the instructor encourage fair and open discuss: e special techniques successful				5 5	0 2	0	0 2	1 4	2 6	18 7	4.81	358/1 530/		4.81 3.95	4.64 3.94	4.27	4.34 3.96	4.81
4. Were S	pecial tec	milques succes	SSIUI		5	4	U	4	4	O	,	3.95	530/	994	3.95	3.94	3.94	3.90	3.95
		Laborat	_																
		ease understar	_		25	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/	265	****	****	4.23	4.26	****
_	_	_	_	round information	25	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/	_ , 0	****	****	4.19	4.24	****
3. Were n	ecessary m	naterials avai.	lable for	r lab activities	25	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/	260	****	****	4.46	4.49	****
		Semina																	
				announced theme	25	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/		****	****	4.41	4.10	****
				vidual attention	25	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/		****	****	4.48	4.30	****
	_	-		nat you learned	25	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/	95	****	****	4.31	3.91	****
_		ns contribute t	-	you learned	25	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/	99	****	****	4.39	4.29	****
5. Were c	riteria fo	or grading made	e clear		25	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/	97	****	****	4.14	3.48	****
	1						ribu	ution	1										
Credits E	redits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Gra							Rea	sons	3				Тур	pe			Majors	<b>;</b>
00-27 28-55	0 2	0.00-0.99 1.00-1.99	0	A 14 B 9		Rec	quire	ed fo	or Ma	ajor	s	2	Grad	duate	9	0	Majo	r	4
28-55 56-83	12	2.00-2.99	3	C 0		Ger	neral	ı				7	IInda	er-gi	rad ?	6	Non-	-major	22
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	9	D 0		Gel	ıcıdı	_				,	UIIG	-r -91	Luu Z	U	11011-	iiia jui	22
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5	F 0		Ele	ectiv	zes				3	####	± _ 1	Means t	here a	re not	enoug	rh
craa.	P 0											-			es to b			_	,
	I 0					Oth	ner				1	2	1001						
				? 0															

Course-Section: ANTH 312 0101 University of Maryland MEDICAL ANTHROPOLOGY Baltimore County

Title Instructor: MESSINGER, SETH Fall 2005

Enrollment: 33 Questionnaires: 21

4. Were special techniques successful

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Page 63 JAN 21, 2006

Job IRBR3029

			Fre	equer	ncie	s		Inst	ructor	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
1. III and open around the	-	•	-	-	_	_			,					

## Frequency Distribution

5 14 1 0 0 0 1 3.00 \*\*\*\*/ 994 \*\*\*\* 3.94 3.94 3.96 \*\*\*\*

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expecte	d Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	А	13	Required for Majors	2	Graduate	1	Major	2
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	В	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	n
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	7	_			
				?	2						

Course-Section: ANTH 397 0101

Title SEL TOPICS:ANTHROPOLOG

Instructor: DONATO, PAUL

Enrollment: 16
Questionnaires: 10

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2005 Page 64 JAN 21, 2006 Job IRBR3029

#### Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

				_	ncies	3	_		ructor	Course	_	UMBC		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		****/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	Ο	0	1	5 00	****/ 103	****	****	4.41	4.10	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	9	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 101	****	****	4.48	4.30	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 95	****	****	4.31	3.91	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 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	****
J J	-	-	-	-	-	-			,			- <del>-</del>		

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	d Grades	Reasons		Туре	Majors		
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	 А	7	Required for Majors	2	Graduate	0	Major	5
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	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 sig	mificant	
				I	0	Other	4	-			
				2	0						

Course-Section: ANTH 397A 0101

University of Maryland INDIGENOUS HEALING TRA Baltimore County

Title Instructor: KAVANAGH, KATHR

Enrollment:

32

Questionnaires: 17

Fall 2005 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Page 65 JAN 21, 2006 Job IRBR3029

Questions	NR	NA	Fre	equer 2	ncies 3	4	5	Inst Mean	ructor Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect 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		4.52	4.18	4.16	5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	2 5	0	0	0	0	6 4	9 8	4.60	1135/1673	4.60	4.52	4.69	4.68	4.60 4.67
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	U	U	U	U	4	8	4.07	257/1656	4.67	4.49	4.07	4.07	4.0/
Lecture	_	_	6	6		_	1 -	F 05	4 /4 = 6 =	F 00	4 = 0	4 40	4 40	F 60
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 1	17 16	5.00 4.94	1/1585 91/1582	5.00 4.94	4.90 4.61	4.69 4.26	4.66 4.26	5.00 4.94
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	16	4.94	103/1575	4.94		4.26	4.25	4.94
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	0	2	15	4.88	86/1380	4.88	4.73	3.94		4.88
	U	U	U	U	U	2	13	4.00	80/1380	4.00	4.13	3.94	4.01	4.00
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 11	4.85	277/1515	4.85	4.56	4.24	4.32	4.85 4.85
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 4. Were special techniques successful	4 4	0 3	0	0	0 2	2	11	4.85	312/1511 287/ 994	4.85 4.40	4.64 3.94	4.27 3.94		4.85
4. Were special techniques successful	7	3	U	U	۷	2	0	4.40	201/ 994	4.40	3.94	3.94	3.90	4.40
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	16	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 265	****	****	4.23	4.26	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	16	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 278	****	****	4.19	4.24	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	16 16	0	0	0	0	0	1 1		****/ 260 ****/ 259	****	****	4.46	4.49 4.33	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	16	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 233	****	****	4.33	4.18	****
	10	U	U	U	U	U	1	3.00	/ 233			1.20	4.10	
Seminar	1.0	0	0	•	•	0	-	F 00	**** / 100	de de de de	ale ale ale ale	4 41	4 10	***
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 3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	16 16	0	0	0	0	0	1 1	5.00	****/ 101 ****/ 95	****	****	4.48 4.31	4.30 3.91	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 99	****	****	4.31	4.29	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	16	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 97	****	****	4.14	3.48	****
		Ü	Ü	Ü	Ü	Ü	-	3.00	, ,,			1.11	3.10	
Field Work	1.0	0	0	•	•	0	-	F 00	****	de de de de	F 00	2 00	4 00	****
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 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 ****/ 53	****	5.00	3.93	3.70	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation 4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	16 16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.45 4.12	3.87 3.67	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	16	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 49	****	5.00	4.12	3.07	****
	10	J	U	U	J	U	_	3.00	, 10		5.00	1.4/	5.27	
Self Paced								- 0-						
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	0.00	****/ 61	****	****	4.09	3.20	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	16	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 52 ****/ 35	****	****	4.26	3.50	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful 5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	16 16	0	0	0	0	0	1 1	5.00	****/ 35 ****/ 31	****	****	4.36 4.34	3.29 4.29	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	Τ0	U	U	U	U	U	Τ	5.00	/ 31			4.34	4.49	

Course-Section: ANTH 397A 0101

Title INDIGENOUS HEALING TRA

Instructor:

KAVANAGH, KATHR

Enrollment:

32 Questionnaires: 17 University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2005

Page 65 JAN 21, 2006 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expecte	d Grades	Reasons		Type	Majors		
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	 А	12	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	3
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	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	h
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	6				
				?	0						

Course-Section: ANTH 397B 0101

Title ANTHROPOLOGY OF ART

Instructor: Frankowski, Ann

Enrollment: 12
Questionnaires: 8

#### University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2005

Page 66 JAN 21, 2006 Job IRBR3029

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions NR NA 1 2 3 4 5 Mean Rank Mean Mean Mean Mean Mean Mean Mean Mean
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
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 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
1. Note special committees successful
Field Work
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 7 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 1 5.00 ****/ 77 **** 5.00 3.93 3.70 ****

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected	d Grades	Reasons		Type	Majors		
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	 А	5	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	5
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	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	Electives 1 #### - Means there are n		are not enough		
			P 0				responses to be significant				
				I	0	Other	4				
				?	0						

Course-Section: ANTH 400 0101

Title ANTHROPOLOGICAL THEORY

Instructor: DONATO, PAUL

Enrollment: 16

D, PAUL Fall 2005

Page 67 JAN 21, 2006 Job IRBR3029

Questionnaires: 13	Student	Course	Evaluation	Questionnaire
--------------------	---------	--------	------------	---------------

			Fr	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		4.77
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	Ο	0	0	Ο	1	5 00	****/ 103	****	****	4.41	4.42	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	12	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 101	****	****	4.48	4.65	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 95	****	****	4.31	4.60	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 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	***

University of Maryland

Baltimore County

Credits E	Carned	Cum. GPA		Expected	d Grades	Reasons		Туре	Majors		
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	 А	4	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	10
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	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	h
				P	0			responses to	be sig	nificant	
				I	0	Other	11	-			
				?	0						

#### Course-Section: ANTH 497B 0101 University of Maryland Page 68 Title CTR FOR AGING INTERNSH Baltimore County JAN 21, 2006 Job IRBR3029

Instructor: FRANKOWSKI, ANN Fall 2005

Enrollment:	2	
Questionnaires:	1	Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

			Frequencies					Instr	uctor	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 Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	d 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	В	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	L
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	1	-	_		
				?	0						