```
Course Section: ANTH 211  0101              University of Maryland                              Page   47
Title       CULTURAL ANTHROPOLOGY             Baltimore County                              JAN 18, 2007
Instructor:    CHAPIN, BAMBI                      Fall  2006                                Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:     43
Questionnaires:  28                     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   1   4  13  10  4.14 1052/1669  4.41  4.46  4.23  4.34  4.14
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    0   0   0   1   5  10  12  4.18  975/1666  4.37  4.31  4.19  4.29  4.18
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   0  19   0   0   0   5   4  4.44  632/1421  4.48  4.53  4.24  4.35  4.44
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    0   0   0   0   6   6  16  4.36  695/1617  4.23  4.47  4.15  4.24  4.36
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0   0   0   0   1   5  22  4.75  171/1555  4.55  4.68  4.00  3.96  4.75
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0  0  0  0  1  2  25  4.86  123/1543  4.29  4.42  4.06  4.10  4.86
7. Was the grading system clearly explained            0   0   0   0   4   9  15  4.39  666/1647  4.41  4.29  4.12  4.19  4.39
8. How many times was class cancelled                  0   0   0   0   0   9  19  4.68 1058/1668  4.68  4.49  4.67  4.59  4.68
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 3  1  0  0  6  14  4  3.92 1074/1605  4.26  4.33  4.07  4.15  3.92


             Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        1   0   0   2   5  12   8  3.96 1227/1514  4.51  4.49  4.39  4.39  3.96
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   1   0   0   0   0   3  24  4.89  567/1551  4.93  4.76  4.66  4.72  4.89
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 1  0  0  2  5  11  9  4.00 1066/1503  4.37  4.38  4.24  4.29  4.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     1   0   0   0   4  12  11  4.26  909/1506  4.45  4.55  4.26  4.33  4.26
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 1  1  2  0 11 10  3  3.46  961/1311  4.21  4.11  3.85  3.96  3.46


             Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 6  0  0  0  6  6  10  4.18  749/1490  4.33  4.43  4.05  4.11  4.18
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 6  0  0  0  0  7  15  4.68  468/1502  4.43  4.56  4.26  4.31  4.68
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 6  0  0  0  0  2  20  4.91  280/1489  4.86  4.82  4.29  4.36  4.91
4. Were special techniques successful                  6   8   0   1   9   3   1  3.29  862/1006  3.73  3.84  4.00  3.99  3.29


             Self  Paced
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 27  0  0  0  1  0  0  3.00 ****/  55  ****  ****  4.34  4.67  ****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal    27   0   0   0   1   0   0  3.00 ****/  42  ****  ****  4.31  5.00  ****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful      27   0   0   0   1   0   0  3.00 ****/  46  ****  ****  4.45  5.00  ****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful       27   0   0   0   1   0   0  3.00 ****/  33  ****  ****  4.25  5.00  ****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students     27   0   0   0   1   0   0  3.00 ****/  29  ****  ****  4.34  5.00  ****


                                    Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned        Cum. GPA        Expected Grades       Reasons              Type              Majors
--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
 00-27     3       0.00-0.99    0      A   17        Required for Majors  13    Graduate    0      Major       1
 28-55     2       1.00-1.99    1      B    8
 56-83     5       2.00-2.99    3      C    1        General               8    Under-grad  28     Non-major  27
 84-150    5       3.00-3.49    6      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                 6
                                       ?    0
```

```
Course Section: ANTH 211  0201             University of Maryland                      Page   48
Title        CULTURAL ANTHROPOLOGY              Baltimore County                        JAN 18, 2007
Instructor:    FRANKOWSKI, ANN                   Fall   2006                             Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:      39
Questionnaires:  32                    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  3 13 15  4.28  876/1669  4.41  4.46  4.23  4.34  4.28
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals   0   0  0  2  7 10 13  4.06 1059/1666  4.37  4.31  4.19  4.29  4.06
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals  0   0  1  2  4  9 16  4.16  894/1421  4.48  4.53  4.24  4.35  4.16
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals   0   1  1  3 10 12  5  3.55 1356/1617  4.23  4.47  4.15  4.24  3.55
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned  0  0  0  1  4  6 21  4.47  379/1555  4.55  4.68  4.00  3.96  4.47
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned  1  0  2  2 10  9  8  3.61 1220/1543  4.29  4.42  4.06  4.10  3.61
7. Was the grading system clearly explained           0   0  0  3  1  8 20  4.41  651/1647  4.41  4.29  4.12  4.19  4.41
8. How many times was class cancelled                 0   0  0  0  0 27  5  4.16 1444/1668  4.68  4.49  4.67  4.59  4.16
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness  4  1  0  0  5 18  4  3.96  987/1605  4.26  4.33  4.07  4.15  3.96

              Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared       1   0  0  1  2  8 20  4.52  787/1514  4.51  4.49  4.39  4.39  4.52
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject  1   0  0  0  0  1 30  4.97  205/1551  4.93  4.76  4.66  4.72  4.97
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly  2  0  1  2  2 12 13  4.13  987/1503  4.37  4.38  4.24  4.29  4.13
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned    1   1  1  2  2 10 15  4.20  958/1506  4.45  4.55  4.26  4.33  4.20
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding  2  0  1  1  2  6 20  4.43  312/1311  4.21  4.11  3.85  3.96  4.43

              Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned  6  0  0  1  2 10 13  4.35  613/1490  4.33  4.43  4.05  4.11  4.35
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate  6  0  1  1  5  6 13  4.12  968/1502  4.43  4.56  4.26  4.31  4.12
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion  6  0  0  1  1  4 20  4.65  543/1489  4.86  4.82  4.29  4.36  4.65
4. Were special techniques successful                 6  10  4  1  3  3  5  3.25  873/1006  3.73  3.84  4.00  3.99  3.25

              Laboratory
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material  24  6  0  0  0  2  0  4.00 ****/ 226  ****  ****  4.20  4.42  ****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information  26  0  4  0  1  0  1  2.00 ****/ 233  ****  ****  4.19  4.36  ****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities  27  4  0  0  0  1  0  4.00 ****/ 225  ****  ****  4.50  4.74  ****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance          28  3  0  0  1  0  0  3.00 ****/ 223  ****  ****  4.35  4.71  ****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified  28  3  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/ 206  ****  ****  4.15  4.59  ****

              Seminar
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme  27  3  0  0  0  0  2  5.00 ****/ 112  ****  ****  4.38  4.59  ****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention  27  1  0  0  2  1  1  3.75 ****/  97  ****  ****  4.36  4.60  ****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned  28  1  0  0  0  3  0  4.00 ****/  92  ****  ****  4.22  4.50  ****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned   28  1  1  0  0  2  0  3.00 ****/ 105  ****  ****  4.20  4.63  ****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear               28  1  0  0  0  1  2  4.67 ****/  98  ****  ****  3.95  4.20  ****

              Field Work
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned  29  0  1  0  0  1  1  3.33 ****/  58  ****  ****  4.22  4.20  ****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria  29  0  1  0  0  0  2  3.67 ****/  52  ****  ****  4.06  5.00  ****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation      29  1  0  0  1  1  0  3.50 ****/  39  ****  ****  4.39  5.00  ****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations  29  1  0  1  0  1  0  3.00 ****/  40  ****  ****  3.97  5.00  ****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities  29  2  0  0  0  1  0  4.00 ****/  30  ****  ****  4.33  5.00  ****

              Self  Paced
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned  29  0  1  0  0  0  2  3.67 ****/  55  ****  ****  4.34  4.67  ****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal   28  1  0  0  0  1  2  4.67 ****/  42  ****  ****  4.31  5.00  ****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful     28  2  0  0  1  1  0  3.50 ****/  46  ****  ****  4.45  5.00  ****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful      29  2  0  0  1  0  0  3.00 ****/  33  ****  ****  4.25  5.00  ****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students    29  1  0  2  0  0  0  2.00 ****/  29  ****  ****  4.34  5.00  ****
```

                                           Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	6	0.00-0.99	0	A	6	Required for Majors	20	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	1	B	15						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	4	C	6	General	6	Under-grad	32	Non-major	31
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	3	#### - Means there are not enough			
				P	0			responses to be significant			
				I	0	Other	3				
				?	2						

```
Course Section: ANTH 211  0301              University of Maryland                          Page   49
Title         CULTURAL ANTHROPOLOGY             Baltimore County                          JAN 18, 2007
Instructor:   CHARD, SARAH                        Fall   2006                             Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:      42
Questionnaires: 30                    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   9  20  4.63  433/1669  4.41  4.46  4.23  4.34  4.63
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    0   0   0   1   1   8  20  4.57  483/1666  4.37  4.31  4.19  4.29  4.57
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   0   0   0   1   0   9  20  4.60  466/1421  4.48  4.53  4.24  4.35  4.60
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    0   0   0   1   2  10  17  4.43  597/1617  4.23  4.47  4.15  4.24  4.43
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 1   0   0   1   4   8  16  4.34  484/1555  4.55  4.68  4.00  3.96  4.34
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 1  0   0   2   3  12  12  4.17  747/1543  4.29  4.42  4.06  4.10  4.17
7. Was the grading system clearly explained            1   0   0   2   4   2  21  4.45  583/1647  4.41  4.29  4.12  4.19  4.45
8. How many times was class cancelled                  1   0   0   0   0   0  29  5.00    1/1668  4.68  4.49  4.67  4.59  5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 1  0   0   0   1  16  12  4.38  538/1605  4.26  4.33  4.07  4.15  4.38


              Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        1   0   0   0   1   2  26  4.86  257/1514  4.51  4.49  4.39  4.39  4.86
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   1   0   0   0   1   0  28  4.93  358/1551  4.93  4.76  4.66  4.72  4.93
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 1  0   0   2   1   3  23  4.62  438/1503  4.37  4.38  4.24  4.29  4.62
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     2   0   1   0   1   5  21  4.61  547/1506  4.45  4.55  4.26  4.33  4.61
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 2  0   0   1   2   8  17  4.46  291/1311  4.21  4.11  3.85  3.96  4.46


              Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 11  0   1   1   4   4   9  4.00  849/1490  4.33  4.43  4.05  4.11  4.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 10  0   2   1   2   2  13  4.15  944/1502  4.43  4.56  4.26  4.31  4.15
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 11  0   0   0   0   1  18  4.95  168/1489  4.86  4.82  4.29  4.36  4.95
4. Were special techniques successful                  11   4   0   0   4   6   5  4.07  467/1006  3.73  3.84  4.00  3.99  4.07

              Laboratory
2. Were you provided with adequate background information 28  0  1   0   0   1   0  2.50 ****/ 233  **** ****  4.19  4.36  ****


                                       Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned        Cum. GPA       Expected Grades           Reasons              Type              Majors
------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
00-27      3      0.00-0.99   0      A   14        Required for Majors  17     Graduate     0      Major        1
28-55      6      1.00-1.99   0      B   11
56-83      2      2.00-2.99   6      C    1        General               4     Under-grad  30      Non-major   29
84-150     4      3.00-3.49   4      D    0
Grad.      0      3.50-4.00   6      F    0        Electives             3     #### - Means there are not enough
                                     P    0                                   responses to be significant
                                     I    0        Other                 7
                                     ?    2
```

```
Course Section: ANTH 211  8020                 University of Maryland                              Page   50
Title        CULTURAL ANTHROPOLOGY             Baltimore County                                   JAN 18, 2007
Instructor:  PFANSTIEHL, CYN                   Fall  2006                                          Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:      15
Questionnaires:  15                       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  9  4.60  478/1669  4.41  4.46  4.23  4.34  4.60
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    0  0  0  0  0  5 10  4.67  359/1666  4.37  4.31  4.19  4.29  4.67
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   0  0  0  0  0  4 11  4.73  305/1421  4.48  4.53  4.24  4.35  4.73
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    0  0  0  0  0  6  9  4.60  394/1617  4.23  4.47  4.15  4.24  4.60
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 1  0  0  0  1  3 10  4.64  237/1555  4.55  4.68  4.00  3.96  4.64
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0  0  0  0  1  5  9  4.53  362/1543  4.29  4.42  4.06  4.10  4.53
7. Was the grading system clearly explained            0  0  0  0  2  5  8  4.40  651/1647  4.41  4.29  4.12  4.19  4.40
8. How many times was class cancelled                  0  0  0  0  1  0 14  4.87  788/1668  4.68  4.49  4.67  4.59  4.87
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 5  0  0  0  0  2  8  4.80  139/1605  4.26  4.33  4.07  4.15  4.80

                Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        1  0  0  0  0  4 10  4.71  505/1514  4.51  4.49  4.39  4.39  4.71
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   1  0  0  0  0  1 13  4.93  409/1551  4.93  4.76  4.66  4.72  4.93
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 1  0  0  0  0  4 10  4.71  323/1503  4.37  4.38  4.24  4.29  4.71
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     1  0  0  0  0  4 10  4.71  407/1506  4.45  4.55  4.26  4.33  4.71
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 2  0  0  0  1  5  7  4.46  291/1311  4.21  4.11  3.85  3.96  4.46

                Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 1  0  0  0  0  3 11  4.79  232/1490  4.33  4.43  4.05  4.11  4.79
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 1  0  0  0  0  3 11  4.79  358/1502  4.43  4.56  4.26  4.31  4.79
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 2  0  0  0  0  1 12  4.92  224/1489  4.86  4.82  4.29  4.36  4.92
4. Were special techniques successful                  2  0  0  0  2  5  6  4.31  360/1006  3.73  3.84  4.00  3.99  4.31

                Laboratory
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material  14  0  0  0  0  1  0  4.00 ****/ 226  ****  ****  4.20  4.42  ****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information 14  0  0  0  0  1  0  4.00 ****/ 233  ****  ****  4.19  4.36  ****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 14  0  0  0  0  1  0  4.00 ****/ 225  ****  ****  4.50  4.74  ****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance           14  0  0  0  0  1  0  4.00 ****/ 223  ****  ****  4.35  4.71  ****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 14  0  0  0  0  1  0  4.00 ****/ 206  ****  ****  4.15  4.59  ****

                Seminar
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 14  0  0  0  1  0  0  3.00 ****/  97  ****  ****  4.36  4.60  ****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 14  0  0  0  0  1  0  4.00 ****/  92  ****  ****  4.22  4.50  ****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned    14  0  0  0  0  1  0  4.00 ****/ 105  ****  ****  4.20  4.63  ****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear                14  0  0  0  0  1  0  4.00 ****/  98  ****  ****  3.95  4.20  ****

                Field Work
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 14  0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  58  ****  ****  4.22  4.20  ****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 14  0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  52  ****  ****  4.06  5.00  ****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation       14  0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  39  ****  ****  4.39  5.00  ****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations   14  0  0  0  0  1  0  4.00 ****/  40  ****  ****  3.97  5.00  ****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities 14  0  0  0  0  1  0  4.00 ****/  30  ****  ****  4.33  5.00  ****

                Self  Paced
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 14  0  0  0  0  1  0  4.00 ****/  55  ****  ****  4.34  4.67  ****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal    14  0  0  0  1  0  0  3.00 ****/  42  ****  ****  4.31  5.00  ****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful      14  0  0  0  0  1  0  4.00 ****/  46  ****  ****  4.45  5.00  ****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful       14  0  0  0  0  1  0  4.00 ****/  33  ****  ****  4.25  5.00  ****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students     14  0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  29  ****  ****  4.34  5.00  ****
```

Enrollment: 15
Questionnaires: 15   Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

                                         Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned   Cum. GPA   Expected Grades   Reasons   Type   Majors
----
 00-27   0   0.00-0.99   0   A   5   Required for Majors   3   Graduate   0   Major   0
 28-55   0   1.00-1.99   0   B   2
 56-83   1   2.00-2.99   0   C   0   General   2   Under-grad 15   Non-major   15
 84-150   1   3.00-3.49   1   D   1
 Grad.   0   3.50-4.00   2   F   0   Electives   0   #### - Means there are not enough
                                         P   0   responses to be significant
                                         I   0   Other   5
                                         ?   0

```
Course Section: ANTH 297B 0101             University of Maryland                        Page   51
Title       MAGIC AND WITCHCRAFT            Baltimore County                           JAN 18, 2007
Instructor:  RUBINSTEIN, ROB               Fall   2006                                 Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:     40
Questionnaires: 25                   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  3  0  0  0  1  4 17 4.73  306/1669  4.73 4.46 4.23 4.34 4.73
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals   1  0  0  0  1 13 10 4.38  727/1666  4.38 4.31 4.19 4.29 4.38
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals  4  0  0  0  0  9 12 4.57  493/1421  4.57 4.53 4.24 4.35 4.57
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals   4  1  0  0  0  6 14 4.70  288/1617  4.70 4.47 4.15 4.24 4.70
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 5 0 0 0 0  3 17 4.85  120/1555  4.85 4.68 4.00 3.96 4.85
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 2 0 0 0 1 6 16 4.65 258/1543  4.65 4.42 4.06 4.10 4.65
7. Was the grading system clearly explained           7  0  0  0  2  7  9 4.39  682/1647  4.39 4.29 4.12 4.19 4.39
8. How many times was class cancelled                 5  0  0  0  0 19  1 4.05 1503/1668  4.05 4.49 4.67 4.59 4.05
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 5 0 0 0 2 11 7 4.25 690/1605 4.25 4.33 4.07 4.15 4.25

             Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared       4  0  0  0  0  8 13 4.62  663/1514  4.62 4.49 4.39 4.39 4.62
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject  2  0  0  0  0  2 21 4.91  460/1551  4.91 4.76 4.66 4.72 4.91
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 4 0 0 0 1  9 11 4.48  604/1503  4.48 4.38 4.24 4.29 4.48
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned    4  0  0  0  0  6 15 4.71  407/1506  4.71 4.55 4.26 4.33 4.71
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 2 2 1 0 5 6  9 4.05  567/1311  4.05 4.11 3.85 3.96 4.05

             Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 7 0 0 1 1  7  9 4.33  622/1490  4.33 4.43 4.05 4.11 4.33
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 7 0 0 0 0  3 15 4.83  306/1502  4.83 4.56 4.26 4.31 4.83
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 7 0 0 0 0 2 16 4.89  299/1489  4.89 4.82 4.29 4.36 4.89
4. Were special techniques successful                 7 12  0  0  1  3  2 4.17 ****/1006  **** 3.84 4.00 3.99 ****

             Laboratory
2. Were you provided with adequate background information 24 0 1 0 0 0 0 1.00 ****/ 233 **** **** 4.19 4.36 ****

                                    Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned      Cum. GPA        Expected Grades         Reasons              Type                  Majors
---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
00-27    2          0.00-0.99   1    A  18        Required for Majors  1     Graduate      0      Major       0
28-55    2          1.00-1.99   0    B   2
56-83    2          2.00-2.99   5    C   0        General             11     Under-grad   25      Non-major  25
84-150   5          3.00-3.49   6    D   0
Grad.    0          3.50-4.00   2    F   0        Electives            2     #### - Means there are not enough
                                     P   0                                  responses to be significant
                                     I   0        Other                5
                                     ?   0
```

Enrollment: 40
Questionnaires: 28   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  1  0  6 20  4.67  389/1669  4.67  4.46  4.23 4.28  4.67
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals   1  0  1  0  3 12 11  4.19  966/1666  4.19  4.31  4.19 4.20  4.19
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals  1  0  0  1  9  3 14  4.11  924/1421  4.11  4.53  4.24 4.25  4.11
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals   1  1  0  1  3 12 10  4.19  863/1617  4.19  4.47  4.15 4.22  4.19
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 1 0 0 0 1 10 16  4.56  301/1555  4.56  4.68  4.00 4.03  4.56
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 1 7 0 1 5 6 8  4.05  863/1543  4.05  4.42  4.06 4.14  4.05
7. Was the grading system clearly explained           1  0  1  2  4  3 17  4.22  896/1647  4.22  4.29  4.12 4.14  4.22
8. How many times was class cancelled                 1  0  0  0  0 20  7  4.26 1382/1668  4.26  4.49  4.67 4.68  4.26
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 3 0 0 0 1 13 11  4.40  499/1605  4.40  4.33  4.07 4.09  4.40

                   Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared       1  0  0  1  2  4 20  4.59  691/1514  4.59  4.49  4.39 4.46  4.59
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject  1  0  0  0  0  2 25  4.93  409/1551  4.93  4.76  4.66 4.70  4.93
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 1 0 0 1 1 11 14  4.41  719/1503  4.41  4.38  4.24 4.28  4.41
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned    1  0  0  1  1  3 22  4.70  421/1506  4.70  4.55  4.26 4.30  4.70
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 1 2 0 2 5 7 11  4.08  547/1311  4.08  4.11  3.85 3.97  4.08

                   Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 6 0 0 0 3 4 15  4.55  422/1490  4.55  4.43  4.05 4.11  4.55
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 6 0 0 1 2 3 16  4.55  595/1502  4.55  4.56  4.26 4.28  4.55
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 6 0 0 0 1 3 18  4.77  411/1489  4.77  4.82  4.29 4.35  4.77
4. Were special techniques successful                 6 13  1  2  1  3  2  3.33  841/1006  3.33  3.84  4.00 4.10  3.33
```

Frequency Distribution

```
Credits Earned        Cum. GPA         Expected Grades         Reasons                 Type               Majors
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
00-27     2       0.00-0.99    1        A    9         Required for Majors  6    Graduate    0      Major       3
28-55     2       1.00-1.99    0        B   10
56-83     3       2.00-2.99    2        C    8         General             10    Under-grad 28      Non-major  25
84-150    3       3.00-3.49    4        D    0
Grad.     0       3.50-4.00    3        F    0         Electives            1    #### - Means there are not enough
                                        P    0                                  responses to be significant
                                        I    0         Other                9
                                        ?    0
```

```
Course Section: ANTH 304  0101              University of Maryland                                    Page   53
Title       KIN, COMMUNITY&ETHNICI          Baltimore County                                         JAN 18, 2007
Instructor:    CHAPIN, BAMBI                     Fall   2006                                          Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:     24
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  0  1  2 10  6  4.11 1103/1669   4.11  4.46  4.23  4.28  4.11
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    0   0  0  2  5  6  6  3.84 1280/1666   3.84  4.31  4.19  4.20  3.84
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   0  14  0  0  0  1  4  4.80  217/1421   4.80  4.53  4.24  4.25  4.80
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    0   1  0  0  4  5  9  4.28  780/1617   4.28  4.47  4.15  4.22  4.28
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0  0  0  0  1  4 14  4.68  213/1555   4.68  4.68  4.00  4.03  4.68
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 0 0 0  2  6 11  4.47  427/1543   4.47  4.42  4.06  4.14  4.47
7. Was the grading system clearly explained            0   1  0  2  2  3 11  4.28  839/1647   4.28  4.29  4.12  4.14  4.28
8. How many times was class cancelled                  0   0  0  0  0  5 14  4.74  991/1668   4.74  4.49  4.67  4.68  4.74
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 5 0 0 0  1 11  2  4.07  871/1605   4.07  4.33  4.07  4.09  4.07

             Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        1   0  0  1  7  5  5  3.78 1317/1514   3.78  4.49  4.39  4.46  3.78
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   1   0  0  0  0  2 16  4.89  567/1551   4.89  4.76  4.66  4.70  4.89
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 1  0  0  1  2  8  7  4.17  959/1503   4.17  4.38  4.24  4.28  4.17
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     1   0  0  0  1  8  9  4.44  718/1506   4.44  4.55  4.26  4.30  4.44
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 1 10 1  1  1  3  2  3.50  939/1311   3.50  4.11  3.85  3.97  3.50

             Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 2  0  0  0  1  6 10  4.53  433/1490   4.53  4.43  4.05  4.11  4.53
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 2  0  0  1  0  3 13  4.65  504/1502   4.65  4.56  4.26  4.28  4.65
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 2 0 0  0  0  3 14  4.82  358/1489   4.82  4.82  4.29  4.35  4.82
4. Were special techniques successful                  2   7  0  1  1  3  5  4.20  407/1006   4.20  3.84  4.00  4.10  4.20

             Laboratory
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material 18   0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/ 226   ****  ****  4.20  4.17  ****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information 18 0 0 0 0  0  1  5.00 ****/ 233   ****  ****  4.19  4.13  ****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 18 0 0 0 0  0  1  5.00 ****/ 225   ****  ****  4.50  4.45  ****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance          18   0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/ 223   ****  ****  4.35  4.27  ****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 18  0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/ 206   ****  ****  4.15  4.08  ****

             Seminar
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 18 0 0 0 0  0  1  5.00 ****/ 112   ****  ****  4.38  4.53  ****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 18 0 0 0 0  0  1  5.00 ****/  97   ****  ****  4.36  4.12  ****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 18 0 0 0 0  0  1  5.00 ****/  92   ****  ****  4.22  4.47  ****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned   18   0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/ 105   ****  ****  4.20  4.45  ****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear               18   0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  98   ****  ****  3.95  4.15  ****

             Field Work
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 18  0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  58   ****  ****  4.22  4.29  ****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 18  0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  52   ****  ****  4.06  3.59  ****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation      18   0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  39   ****  ****  4.39  3.82  ****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations  18   0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  40   ****  ****  3.97  3.34  ****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities 18  0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  30   ****  ****  4.33  3.49  ****

             Self  Paced
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 18 0 0 0 0  0  1  5.00 ****/  55   ****  ****  4.34  4.03  ****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal   18   0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  42   ****  ****  4.31  4.13  ****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful     18   0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  46   ****  ****  4.45  4.13  ****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful      18   0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  33   ****  ****  4.25  3.00  ****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students    18   0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  29   ****  ****  4.34  4.13  ****
```

```
                                         Frequency Distribution


Credits Earned          Cum. GPA          Expected Grades           Reasons                    Type                       Majors
------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
 00-27     0          0.00-0.99    0       A   11          Required for Majors  2      Graduate     0         Major        2
 28-55     2          1.00-1.99    0       B    5
 56-83     4          2.00-2.99    5       C    2          General              4      Under-grad  19         Non-major   17
 84-150    5          3.00-3.49    3       D    0
 Grad.     0          3.50-4.00    6       F    0          Electives            2      #### - Means there are not enough
                                           P    0                                      responses to be significant
                                           I    0          Other               11
                                           ?    0
```

```
Course Section: ANTH 311  0101                University of Maryland                          Page   54
Title        URBAN ANTHROPOLOGY                Baltimore County                               JAN 18, 2007
Instructor:  CHARD, SARAH                      Fall   2006                                    Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:      40
Questionnaires:  28                       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   1   5  21  4.74  281/1669  4.74  4.46  4.23  4.28  4.74
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals     0   0   0   0   1   3  24  4.82  165/1666  4.82  4.31  4.19  4.20  4.82
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals    1   0   0   0   2   4  21  4.70  344/1421  4.70  4.53  4.24  4.25  4.70
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals     1   0   0   1   0   4  22  4.74  230/1617  4.74  4.47  4.15  4.22  4.74
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 2   0   0   0   1   5  20  4.73  183/1555  4.73  4.68  4.00  4.03  4.73
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 3  0   0   0   1   6  18  4.68  242/1543  4.68  4.42  4.06  4.14  4.68
7. Was the grading system clearly explained             2   0   0   0   1   4  21  4.77  204/1647  4.77  4.29  4.12  4.14  4.77
8. How many times was class cancelled                   2   0   0   1   0   5  20  4.69 1039/1668  4.69  4.49  4.67  4.68  4.69
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 4  1   0   0   1   6  16  4.65  249/1605  4.65  4.33  4.07  4.09  4.65

            Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared         2   0   0   0   0   4  22  4.85  291/1514  4.85  4.49  4.39  4.46  4.85
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject    1   0   0   0   0   2  25  4.93  409/1551  4.93  4.76  4.66  4.70  4.93
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 1   0   0   0   1   6  20  4.70  335/1503  4.70  4.38  4.24  4.28  4.70
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned      1   0   0   1   1   3  22  4.70  421/1506  4.70  4.55  4.26  4.30  4.70
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 2  1   0   0   2   7  16  4.56  237/1311  4.56  4.11  3.85  3.97  4.56

            Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 8   0   0   0   3   4  13  4.50  445/1490  4.50  4.43  4.05  4.11  4.50
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 8   0   0   0   0   5  15  4.75  393/1502  4.75  4.56  4.26  4.28  4.75
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 8  0   0   0   0   3  17  4.85  329/1489  4.85  4.82  4.29  4.35  4.85
4. Were special techniques successful                   7   8   3   1   0   6   3  3.38  819/1006  3.38  3.84  4.00  4.10  3.38

            Laboratory
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material   24  3   0   0   0   0   1  5.00 ****/ 226  ****  ****  4.20  4.17  ****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information 26 0   1   0   0   0   1  3.00 ****/ 233  ****  ****  4.19  4.13  ****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 26 1   0   0   0   0   1  5.00 ****/ 225  ****  ****  4.50  4.45  ****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance            27  0   0   0   0   0   1  5.00 ****/ 223  ****  ****  4.35  4.27  ****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified  27  0   0   0   0   0   1  5.00 ****/ 206  ****  ****  4.15  4.08  ****

            Seminar
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 24  1   0   0   0   0   3  5.00 ****/ 112  ****  ****  4.38  4.53  ****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 25 0   1   0   0   0   2  3.67 ****/  97  ****  ****  4.36  4.12  ****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 26  0   0   0   0   0   2  5.00 ****/  92  ****  ****  4.22  4.47  ****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned     26  0   0   0   0   0   2  5.00 ****/ 105  ****  ****  4.20  4.45  ****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear                 26  0   0   0   0   0   2  5.00 ****/  98  ****  ****  3.95  4.15  ****

            Field Work
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned  22  0   0   0   0   2   4  4.67 ****/  58  ****  ****  4.22  4.29  ****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria  22  0   0   0   0   3   3  4.50 ****/  52  ****  ****  4.06  3.59  ****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation        22  0   0   0   0   2   4  4.67 ****/  39  ****  ****  4.39  3.82  ****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations    22  2   0   0   0   1   3  4.75 ****/  40  ****  ****  3.97  3.34  ****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities  22  1   0   1   1   0   3  4.00 ****/  30  ****  ****  4.33  3.49  ****

            Self  Paced
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 27  0   0   0   0   0   1  5.00 ****/  55  ****  ****  4.34  4.03  ****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal     27  0   0   0   0   0   1  5.00 ****/  42  ****  ****  4.31  4.13  ****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful       27  0   0   0   0   0   1  5.00 ****/  46  ****  ****  4.45  4.13  ****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful        27  0   0   0   0   0   1  5.00 ****/  33  ****  ****  4.25  3.00  ****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students      27  0   0   0   0   0   1  5.00 ****/  29  ****  ****  4.34  4.13  ****
```

Enrollment: 40
Questionnaires: 28   Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

                                              Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned   Cum. GPA   Expected Grades   Reasons   Type   Majors
----
  00-27   0   0.00-0.99   0   A   9   Required for Majors   3   Graduate   1   Major   8
  28-55   2   1.00-1.99   1   B   15
  56-83   3   2.00-2.99   3   C   0   General   8   Under-grad 27   Non-major   20
  84-150   8   3.00-3.49   6   D   0
  Grad.   1   3.50-4.00   7   F   0   Electives   1   #### - Means there are not enough
                                           P   0   responses to be significant
                                           I   0   Other   11
                                           ?   0

Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Instructor Mean	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	1	9	13	4.52	567/1669	4.52	4.46	4.23	4.28	4.52
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	9	12	4.43	648/1666	4.43	4.31	4.19	4.20	4.43
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	6	0	0	3	3	11	4.47	594/1421	4.47	4.53	4.24	4.25	4.47
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	1	0	0	2	6	13	4.52	475/1617	4.52	4.47	4.15	4.22	4.52
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	4	17	4.73	189/1555	4.73	4.68	4.00	4.03	4.73
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	9	12	4.43	478/1543	4.43	4.42	4.06	4.14	4.43
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	6	9	8	4.09	1002/1647	4.09	4.29	4.12	4.14	4.09
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	2	7	14	4.52	1177/1668	4.52	4.49	4.67	4.68	4.52
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	1	0	1	3	14	4.53	358/1605	4.53	4.33	4.07	4.09	4.53
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	4	18	4.74	473/1514	4.74	4.49	4.39	4.46	4.74
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	2	21	4.91	460/1551	4.91	4.76	4.66	4.70	4.91
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	2	8	13	4.48	604/1503	4.48	4.38	4.24	4.28	4.48
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	3	5	15	4.52	623/1506	4.52	4.55	4.26	4.30	4.52
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	8	11	1	1	1	0	1	2.75	****/1311	****	4.11	3.85	3.97	****
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	127/1490	4.92	4.43	4.05	4.11	4.92
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	10	0	1	1	0	1	10	4.38	772/1502	4.38	4.56	4.26	4.28	4.38
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	11	0	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	252/1489	4.92	4.82	4.29	4.35	4.92
4. Were special techniques successful	12	9	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/1006	****	3.84	4.00	4.10	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	14	Required for Majors	5	Graduate	0	Major	2
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	5						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	2	C	1	General	7	Under-grad	23	Non-major	21
84-150	9	3.00-3.49	7	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough			
				P	1			responses to be significant			
				I	0	Other	7				
				?	0						

```
Course Section: ANTH 314  0101              University of Maryland                    Page   56
Title          PSYCH ANTHROPOLOGY            Baltimore County                         JAN 18, 2007
Instructor:    RUBINSTEIN, ROB (Instr. A)         Fall  2006                          Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:      27
Questionnaires: 15                    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  1  3  4  6  4.07 1124/1669  4.07  4.46  4.23  4.28  4.07
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals   1   0  0  1  2  6  5  4.07 1054/1666  4.07  4.31  4.19  4.20  4.07
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals  1   0  0  1  0  1 12  4.71  331/1421  4.71  4.53  4.24  4.25  4.71
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals   2   0  0  0  0  3 10  4.77  207/1617  4.77  4.47  4.15  4.22  4.77
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 2 0 0  0  0  4  9  4.69  207/1555  4.69  4.68  4.00  4.03  4.69
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 2 0 0 0  0  6  7  4.54  362/1543  4.54  4.42  4.06  4.14  4.54
7. Was the grading system clearly explained           2   0  0  3  1  3  6  3.92 1137/1647  3.92  4.29  4.12  4.14  3.92
8. How many times was class cancelled                 3   0  0  0  0 11  1  4.08 1487/1668  4.08  4.49  4.67  4.68  4.08
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 3 0 0 1 2  5  4  4.00  918/1605  4.00  4.33  4.07  4.09  4.00


                 Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared       1   0  0  1  3  4  6  4.07 1180/1514  4.07  4.49  4.39  4.46  4.07
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject  1   0  0  0  0  3 11  4.79  825/1551  3.89  4.76  4.66  4.70  3.89
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 1 0 1  0  2  4  7  4.14  978/1503  4.14  4.38  4.24  4.28  4.14
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned    2   0  0  0  4  2  7  4.23  926/1506  4.23  4.55  4.26  4.30  4.23
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 1 4 1 1  2  5  1  3.40  995/1311  3.40  4.11  3.85  3.97  3.40


               Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 4 0 0 0  3  2  6  4.27  675/1490  4.27  4.43  4.05  4.11  4.27
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 1 0 0 2  0  2 10  4.43  729/1502  4.43  4.56  4.26  4.28  4.43
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 3 0 0 0  1  2  9  4.67  532/1489  4.67  4.82  4.29  4.35  4.67
4. Were special techniques successful                 3   2  0  0  1  4  5  4.40  307/1006  4.40  3.84  4.00  4.10  4.40


               Field Work
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 14 0 0 0  0  1  0  4.00 ****/  58  ****  ****  4.22  4.29  ****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 14 0 0 0  1  0  0  3.00 ****/  52  ****  ****  4.06  3.59  ****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation      14  0  0  0  0  1  0  4.00 ****/  39  ****  ****  4.39  3.82  ****


                                   Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned        Cum. GPA       Expected Grades       Reasons              Type              Majors
--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
 00-27      1       0.00-0.99    0     A   9      Required for Majors  1    Graduate     0    Major       2
 28-55      0       1.00-1.99    0     B   3
 56-83      6       2.00-2.99    5     C   1      General              3    Under-grad  15    Non-major  13
 84-150     3       3.00-3.49    5     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                8
                                       ?   0
```

```
Course Section: ANTH 314  0101            University of Maryland                              Page   57
Title      PSYCH ANTHROPOLOGY                 Baltimore County                              JAN 18, 2007
Instructor:              (Instr. C)              Fall   2006                                Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:     27
Questionnaires:  15                    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  1  3  4  6  4.07 1124/1669  4.07  4.46  4.23  4.28  4.07
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    1   0   0  1  2  6  5  4.07 1054/1666  4.07  4.31  4.19  4.20  4.07
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   1   0   0  1  0  1 12  4.71  331/1421  4.71  4.53  4.24  4.25  4.71
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    2   0   0  0  0  3 10  4.77  207/1617  4.77  4.47  4.15  4.22  4.77
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 2  0   0  0  0  4  9  4.69  207/1555  4.69  4.68  4.00  4.03  4.69
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 2 0  0  0  0  6  7  4.54  362/1543  4.54  4.42  4.06  4.14  4.54
7. Was the grading system clearly explained            2   0   0  3  1  3  6  3.92 1137/1647  3.92  4.29  4.12  4.14  3.92
8. How many times was class cancelled                  3   0   0  0  0 11  1  4.08 1487/1668  4.08  4.49  4.67  4.68  4.08
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 13 0 0  0  0  0  2  5.00 ****/1605  4.00  4.33  4.07  4.09  4.00


            Lecture
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   14  0   0  0  1  0  0  3.00 ****/1551  3.89  4.76  4.66  4.70  3.89
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 12 0  3  0  0  0  0  1.00 ****/1311  3.40  4.11  3.85  3.97  3.40


            Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned  4  0   0  0  3  2  6  4.27  675/1490  4.27  4.43  4.05  4.11  4.27
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate  1  0   0  2  0  2 10  4.43  729/1502  4.43  4.56  4.26  4.28  4.43
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 3  0   0  0  1  2  9  4.67  532/1489  4.67  4.82  4.29  4.35  4.67
4. Were special techniques successful                    3  2   0  0  1  4  5  4.40  307/1006  4.40  3.84  4.00  4.10  4.40


            Field Work
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned  14  0   0  0  0  1  0  4.00 ****/  58  ****  ****  4.22  4.29  ****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria  14  0   0  0  1  0  0  3.00 ****/  52  ****  ****  4.06  3.59  ****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation        14  0   0  0  0  1  0  4.00 ****/  39  ****  ****  4.39  3.82  ****


                                    Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned        Cum. GPA         Expected Grades          Reasons              Type                 Majors
-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
  00-27     1      0.00-0.99   0        A   9        Required for Majors  1    Graduate     0       Major       2
  28-55     0      1.00-1.99   0        B   3
  56-83     6      2.00-2.99   5        C   1        General              3    Under-grad  15       Non-major  13
  84-150    3      3.00-3.49   5        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                8
                                        ?   0
```

```
Course Section: ANTH 397A 0101            University of Maryland                                    Page   58
Title         ANTH. OF FOOD AND EATI       Baltimore County                                       JAN 18, 2007
Instructor:   KAVANAGH, KATHR                  Fall  2006                                         Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:     32
Questionnaires:  18                       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  5 12  4.61  463/1669  4.61  4.46  4.23 4.28  4.61
 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals     0   0  1  0  2  3 12  4.39  715/1666  4.39  4.31  4.19 4.20  4.39
 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals    0   0  0  0  2  5 11  4.50  557/1421  4.50  4.53  4.24 4.25  4.50
 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals     0   3  0  0  0  4 11  4.73  242/1617  4.73  4.47  4.15 4.22  4.73
 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0   0  0  0  0  2 16  4.89  108/1555  4.89  4.68  4.00 4.03  4.89
 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0  6  0  0  0  3  9  4.75  180/1543  4.75  4.42  4.06 4.14  4.75
 7. Was the grading system clearly explained             0   0  0  1  3  1 13  4.44  583/1647  4.44  4.29  4.12 4.14  4.44
 8. How many times was class cancelled                   0   0  0  0  0  1 17  4.94  428/1668  4.94  4.49  4.67 4.68  4.94
 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 4  0  0  0  0  9  5  4.36  565/1605  4.36  4.33  4.07 4.09  4.36

            Lecture
 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared         2   0  0  0  2  1 13  4.69  553/1514  4.69  4.49  4.39 4.46  4.69
 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject    2   0  0  0  0  1 15  4.94  358/1551  4.94  4.76  4.66 4.70  4.94
 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 2   0  0  0  1  5 10  4.56  500/1503  4.56  4.38  4.24 4.28  4.56
 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned      2   0  0  0  1  1 14  4.81  273/1506  4.81  4.55  4.26 4.30  4.81
 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 3  0  0  0  0  5 10  4.67  189/1311  4.67  4.11  3.85 3.97  4.67

            Discussion
 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 3   0  1  0  0  4 10  4.47  490/1490  4.47  4.43  4.05 4.11  4.47
 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 3   0  0  0  1  2 12  4.73  415/1502  4.73  4.56  4.26 4.28  4.73
 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 3  0  0  0  0  4 11  4.73  456/1489  4.73  4.82  4.29 4.35  4.73
 4. Were special techniques successful                   3  13  0  0  0  1  1  4.50 ****/1006  ****  3.84  4.00 4.10  ****
```

Frequency Distribution

```
Credits Earned        Cum. GPA          Expected Grades          Reasons              Type                 Majors
------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
 00-27      0        0.00-0.99   0       A   12        Required for Majors  4    Graduate    0       Major       0
 28-55      0        1.00-1.99   0       B    6
 56-83      2        2.00-2.99   2       C    0        General              7    Under-grad  18      Non-major  18
 84-150     3        3.00-3.49   0       D    0
 Grad.      0        3.50-4.00   5       F    0        Electives            0    #### - Means there are not enough
                                         P    0                                 responses to be significant
                                         I    0        Other                6
                                         ?    0
```

```
Course Section: ANTH 400  0101              University of Maryland                          Page  59
Title        ANTHROPOLOGICAL THEORY          Baltimore County                              JAN 18, 2007
Instructor:  DONATO, PAUL                     Fall   2006                                   Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:     26
Questionnaires: 15                     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  1  1 12  4.79  231/1669  4.79 4.46  4.23 4.39  4.79
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals     1   0  0  0  2  5  7  4.36  752/1666  4.36 4.31  4.19 4.22  4.36
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals    1   0  0  1  0  6  7  4.36  728/1421  4.36 4.53  4.24 4.38  4.36
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals     1   1  0  0  2  3  8  4.46  554/1617  4.46 4.47  4.15 4.22  4.46
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 1   0  0  0  0  3 11  4.79  153/1555  4.79 4.68  4.00 4.08  4.79
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 1 0  0  1  2  4  7  4.21  700/1543  4.21 4.42  4.06 4.18  4.21
7. Was the grading system clearly explained             1   0  0  1  3  3  7  4.14  962/1647  4.14 4.29  4.12 4.14  4.14
8. How many times was class cancelled                   1   0  0  0  0 10  4  4.29 1364/1668  4.29 4.49  4.67 4.70  4.29
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 2 0  0  0  0  5  8  4.62  288/1605  4.62 4.33  4.07 4.16  4.62


                Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared         2   0  0  0  1  4  8  4.54  763/1514  4.54 4.49  4.39 4.45  4.54
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject    2   0  0  0  0  2 11  4.85  677/1551  4.85 4.76  4.66 4.73  4.85
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 2   0  0  1  2  4  6  4.15  969/1503  4.15 4.38  4.24 4.27  4.15
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned      2   0  0  0  0  4  9  4.69  433/1506  4.69 4.55  4.26 4.29  4.69
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 3 10  1  0  0  0  1  3.00 ****/1311  **** 4.11  3.85 3.88  ****


                Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 3   0  0  0  1  5  6  4.42  546/1490  4.42 4.43  4.05 4.26  4.42
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 3   0  0  0  0  3  9  4.75  393/1502  4.75 4.56  4.26 4.46  4.75
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 3  0  0  0  0  1 11  4.92  252/1489  4.92 4.82  4.29 4.52  4.92
4. Were special techniques successful                   3   8  1  0  0  1  2  3.75  657/1006  3.75 3.84  4.00 4.21  3.75


                               Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned         Cum. GPA        Expected Grades        Reasons              Type                 Majors
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
 00-27      0      0.00-0.99    0       A    6      Required for Majors  0     Graduate      0     Major       2
 28-55      0      1.00-1.99    0       B    7
 56-83      3      2.00-2.99    0       C    0      General              2     Under-grad   15     Non-major  13
 84-150     5      3.00-3.49    5       D    0
 Grad.      0      3.50-4.00    5       F    0      Electives            0     #### - Means there are not enough
                                        P    0                                responses to be significant
                                        I    0      Other               12
                                        ?    1
```