

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	1	1	6	11	13	4.06	1031/1481	4.25	4.26	4.29	4.40	4.06	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	1	5	7	18	4.25	822/1481	4.37	4.09	4.23	4.29	4.25	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	4	8	19	4.41	624/1249	4.51	4.21	4.27	4.36	4.41	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	4	1	1	6	7	13	4.07	923/1424	4.23	4.21	4.21	4.28	4.07	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	2	10	19	4.44	355/1396	4.10	4.11	3.98	3.94	4.44	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	3	1	3	10	8	7	3.59	1079/1342	3.99	4.10	4.07	4.05	3.59	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	2	5	24	4.63	321/1459	4.59	4.21	4.16	4.17	4.63	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	1	26	5	4.13	1309/1480	4.39	4.49	4.68	4.68	4.13	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	1	1	6	17	5	3.80	1055/1450	4.20	4.14	4.09	4.15	3.80	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	1	3	6	22	4.53	727/1409	4.76	4.53	4.42	4.47	4.53	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	2	4	26	4.75	823/1407	4.90	4.81	4.69	4.78	4.75	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	1	0	5	7	19	4.34	743/1399	4.58	4.35	4.26	4.29	4.34	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	7	6	18	4.28	844/1400	4.58	4.32	4.27	4.34	4.28	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	3	3	4	2	10	10	3.69	833/1179	4.12	3.84	3.96	4.05	3.69	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	12	0	7	4	4	1	4	2.55	1218/1262	3.61	3.85	4.05	4.11	2.55	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	12	0	8	1	8	1	2	2.40	1232/1259	3.94	4.12	4.29	4.34	2.40	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	12	0	3	2	5	7	3	3.25	1145/1256	4.32	4.40	4.30	4.28	3.25	
4. Were special techniques successful	12	15	1	1	3	0	0	2.40	****/ 788	4.67	4.05	4.00	3.98	****	
Laboratory															
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	31	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 249	****	****	4.11	4.32	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	30	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 68	****	****	4.49	5.00	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	31	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 59	****	4.43	4.30	4.67	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	31	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 51	****	4.00	4.00	4.07	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	30	1	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 36	****	****	4.60	4.64	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	30	1	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 41	****	****	4.26	4.69	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	30	1	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.42	4.80	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	30	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 55	****	****	4.55	4.44	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	30	0	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/ 31	****	****	4.75	4.50	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	30	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 51	****	****	4.65	4.66	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	30	1	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 34	****	****	4.83	4.43	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	31	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 24	****	****	4.82	5.00	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	11	0.00-0.99	0	A 11	Required for Majors 16
28-55	8	1.00-1.99	0	B 17	Graduate 0
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	5	C 1	Under-grad 32
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	6	D 0	Non-major 32
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	9	F 0	Electives 1
				P 0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant

I	0	Other	6
?	0		

Course-Section: ANTH 211 0201  
 Title CULTURAL ANTHROPOLOGY  
 Instructor: MESSINGER, SETH  
 Enrollment: 36  
 Questionnaires: 24

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2006

Page 51  
 JUN 13, 2006  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	6	7	11	4.21	909/1481	4.25	4.26	4.29	4.40	4.21	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	6	6	12	4.25	822/1481	4.37	4.09	4.23	4.29	4.25	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	1	8	14	4.57	442/1249	4.51	4.21	4.27	4.36	4.57	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	2	11	10	4.35	633/1424	4.23	4.21	4.21	4.28	4.35	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	2	2	8	12	4.25	502/1396	4.10	4.11	3.98	3.94	4.25	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	2	13	8	4.26	534/1342	3.99	4.10	4.07	4.05	4.26	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	8	15	4.58	367/1459	4.59	4.21	4.16	4.17	4.58	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	23	1	4.04	1339/1480	4.39	4.49	4.68	4.68	4.04	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	3	5	14	4.50	334/1450	4.20	4.14	4.09	4.15	4.50	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	2	22	4.92	169/1409	4.76	4.53	4.42	4.47	4.92	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	23	5.00	1/1407	4.90	4.81	4.69	4.78	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	1	7	15	4.61	459/1399	4.58	4.35	4.26	4.29	4.61	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	6	16	4.58	511/1400	4.58	4.32	4.27	4.34	4.58	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	18	1	0	0	0	2	3.67	****/1179	4.12	3.84	3.96	4.05	****	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	3	6	6	4.20	610/1262	3.61	3.85	4.05	4.11	4.20	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	10	0	0	0	1	3	10	4.64	470/1259	3.94	4.12	4.29	4.34	4.64	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	0	0	0	3	12	4.80	296/1256	4.32	4.40	4.30	4.28	4.80	
4. Were special techniques successful	9	11	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	****/ 788	4.67	4.05	4.00	3.98	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	2	0.00-0.99 0	A 16	Required for Majors 12	Graduate 0 Major 0
28-55	2	1.00-1.99 0	B 5		
56-83	2	2.00-2.99 2	C 1	General 4	Under-grad 24 Non-major 24
84-150	4	3.00-3.49 6	D 0		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 7	F 0	Electives 0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 6	
			? 1		

Course-Section: ANTH 211 0301  
 Title CULTURAL ANTHROPOLOGY  
 Instructor: CHARD, SARAH  
 Enrollment: 38  
 Questionnaires: 23

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2006

Page 52  
 JUN 13, 2006  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	3	6	14	4.48	587/1481	4.25	4.26	4.29	4.40	4.48	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	2	18	4.61	399/1481	4.37	4.09	4.23	4.29	4.61	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	6	15	4.57	442/1249	4.51	4.21	4.27	4.36	4.57	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	3	10	9	4.27	717/1424	4.23	4.21	4.21	4.28	4.27	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	2	5	8	6	3.61	1025/1396	4.10	4.11	3.98	3.94	3.61	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	2	2	9	9	4.14	660/1342	3.99	4.10	4.07	4.05	4.14	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	2	6	15	4.57	390/1459	4.59	4.21	4.16	4.17	4.57	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	23	5.00	1/1480	4.39	4.49	4.68	4.68	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	1	0	0	3	5	8	4.31	567/1450	4.20	4.14	4.09	4.15	4.31	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	1	0	1	20	4.82	319/1409	4.76	4.53	4.42	4.47	4.82	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	1	21	4.95	250/1407	4.90	4.81	4.69	4.78	4.95	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	1	3	18	4.77	245/1399	4.58	4.35	4.26	4.29	4.77	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	3	19	4.86	187/1400	4.58	4.32	4.27	4.34	4.86	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	0	2	6	14	4.55	238/1179	4.12	3.84	3.96	4.05	4.55	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	10	0	1	1	2	1	8	4.08	684/1262	3.61	3.85	4.05	4.11	4.08	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	10	0	0	0	0	3	10	4.77	347/1259	3.94	4.12	4.29	4.34	4.77	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	10	0	0	0	0	1	12	4.92	173/1256	4.32	4.40	4.30	4.28	4.92	
4. Were special techniques successful	10	1	0	0	1	2	9	4.67	133/ 788	4.67	4.05	4.00	3.98	4.67	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	A 12	Required for Majors	15
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	B 9	Graduate	0
56-83	9	2.00-2.99	C 1	Under-grad	23
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	D 0	Non-major	23
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	
			P 0		
			I 0		
			? 0	Other	2

Course-Section: ANTH 302 0101  
 Title EVOLUTION/PHYS ANTH/AR  
 Instructor: DONATO, PAUL  
 Enrollment: 34  
 Questionnaires: 23

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2006

Page 53  
 JUN 13, 2006  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	1	0	3	5	14	4.35	739/1481	4.35	4.26	4.29	4.29	4.35	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	4	6	13	4.39	671/1481	4.39	4.09	4.23	4.23	4.39	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	5	5	13	4.35	671/1249	4.35	4.21	4.27	4.28	4.35	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	5	0	1	4	5	8	4.11	896/1424	4.11	4.21	4.21	4.27	4.11	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	3	3	3	13	4.04	681/1396	4.04	4.11	3.98	4.00	4.04	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	4	1	2	3	4	9	3.95	832/1342	3.95	4.10	4.07	4.12	3.95	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	0	4	1	17	4.43	565/1459	4.43	4.21	4.16	4.17	4.43	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	1	0	0	0	15	7	4.32	1171/1480	4.32	4.49	4.68	4.65	4.32	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	1	0	0	0	8	10	4.56	296/1450	4.56	4.14	4.09	4.10	4.56	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	1	3	18	4.77	383/1409	4.77	4.53	4.42	4.43	4.77	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	0	22	4.91	450/1407	4.91	4.81	4.69	4.67	4.91	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	6	16	4.65	390/1399	4.65	4.35	4.26	4.27	4.65	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	1	20	4.78	274/1400	4.78	4.32	4.27	4.28	4.78	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	9	1	2	3	4	4	3.57	870/1179	3.57	3.84	3.96	4.02	3.57	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	2	0	2	3	9	4.06	687/1262	4.06	3.85	4.05	4.14	4.06	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	0	2	1	14	4.71	413/1259	4.71	4.12	4.29	4.34	4.71	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	0	0	0	2	15	4.88	232/1256	4.88	4.40	4.30	4.34	4.88	
4. Were special techniques successful	6	15	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 788	****	4.05	4.00	4.07	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	9	Required for Majors	6	Graduate	0	Major	5
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	9						
56-83	5	2.00-2.99	3	C	3	General	7	Under-grad	23	Non-major	18
84-150	7	3.00-3.49	5	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	6	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	7				
				?	0						

Course-Section: ANTH 303 0101  
 Title ANTHRPLGCL RSRCH MTHDS  
 Instructor: FRANKOWSKI, ANN  
 Enrollment: 32  
 Questionnaires: 21

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2006

Page 54  
 JUN 13, 2006  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	1	0	5	9	6	3.90	1162/1481	3.90	4.26	4.29	4.29	3.90	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	2	3	6	9	1	3.19	1395/1481	3.19	4.09	4.23	4.23	3.19	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	2	1	6	11	1	3.38	1139/1249	3.38	4.21	4.27	4.28	3.38	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	1	6	7	6	3.76	1181/1424	3.76	4.21	4.21	4.27	3.76	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	6	7	7	3.95	754/1396	3.95	4.11	3.98	4.00	3.95	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	5	5	7	4	3.48	1130/1342	3.48	4.10	4.07	4.12	3.48	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	3	3	5	4	5	3.25	1337/1459	3.25	4.21	4.16	4.17	3.25	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	1	0	0	0	1	19	4.95	421/1480	4.95	4.49	4.68	4.65	4.95	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	2	1	0	7	6	1	3.40	1267/1450	3.40	4.14	4.09	4.10	3.40	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	1	4	8	8	4.10	1125/1409	4.10	4.53	4.42	4.43	4.10	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	2	5	14	4.57	1053/1407	4.57	4.81	4.69	4.67	4.57	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	1	2	5	8	5	3.67	1196/1399	3.67	4.35	4.26	4.27	3.67	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	4	3	6	6	3.48	1237/1400	3.48	4.32	4.27	4.28	3.48	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	6	3	1	5	3	2	3.00	1041/1179	3.00	3.84	3.96	4.02	3.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	3	5	5	4	3.59	965/1262	3.59	3.85	4.05	4.14	3.59	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	0	6	6	5	3.94	944/1259	3.94	4.12	4.29	4.34	3.94	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	0	4	8	5	4.06	880/1256	4.06	4.40	4.30	4.34	4.06	
4. Were special techniques successful	4	3	0	2	3	7	2	3.64	571/ 788	3.64	4.05	4.00	4.07	3.64	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	20	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 68	****	****	4.49	4.70	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	20	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 69	****	****	4.53	4.66	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	20	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 63	****	****	4.44	4.56	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	20	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 69	****	****	4.35	4.48	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	20	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 68	****	****	3.92	4.43	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	1	2	4	4.43	33/ 59	4.43	4.43	4.30	4.48	4.43	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	14	0	0	1	0	4	2	4.00	28/ 51	4.00	4.00	4.00	4.13	4.00	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	14	4	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/ 36	****	****	4.60	4.33	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	14	6	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 41	****	****	4.26	3.90	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	14	6	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.42	4.00	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors		
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 4	Required for Majors 1	Graduate 0	Major 13
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	1	B 12			
56-83	7	2.00-2.99	1	C 2	General 1	Under-grad 21	Non-major 8
84-150	6	3.00-3.49	5	D 0			
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	7	F 0	Electives 0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	
				P 0			
				I 1	Other 17		
				? 2			

Course-Section: ANTH 310 0101  
 Title ETHNOGRAPHIC FILM  
 Instructor: DONATO, PAUL  
 Enrollment: 37  
 Questionnaires: 24

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2006

Page 55  
 JUN 13, 2006  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	2	1	4	4	13	4.04	1043/1481	4.04	4.26	4.29	4.29	4.04	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	3	3	3	8	7	3.54	1306/1481	3.54	4.09	4.23	4.23	3.54	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	3	3	4	7	7	3.50	1118/1249	3.50	4.21	4.27	4.28	3.50	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	19	0	1	1	0	2	3.75	****/1424	****	4.21	4.21	4.27	****	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	4	2	3	6	9	3.58	1036/1396	3.58	4.11	3.98	4.00	3.58	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	20	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/1342	****	4.10	4.07	4.12	****	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	1	3	2	3	5	9	3.68	1192/1459	3.68	4.21	4.16	4.17	3.68	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	18	6	4.25	1215/1480	4.25	4.49	4.68	4.65	4.25	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	4	2	9	4	3.68	1151/1450	3.68	4.14	4.09	4.10	3.68	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	2	3	6	11	4.18	1074/1409	4.18	4.53	4.42	4.43	4.18	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	1	3	3	15	4.45	1145/1407	4.45	4.81	4.69	4.67	4.45	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	2	2	2	5	11	3.95	1049/1399	3.95	4.35	4.26	4.27	3.95	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	2	0	5	4	10	3.95	1053/1400	3.95	4.32	4.27	4.28	3.95	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	0	1	1	3	0	16	4.38	352/1179	4.38	3.84	3.96	4.02	4.38	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	2	1	3	2	9	3.88	810/1262	3.88	3.85	4.05	4.14	3.88	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	1	2	0	0	13	4.38	701/1259	4.38	4.12	4.29	4.34	4.38	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	0	0	2	1	14	4.71	419/1256	4.71	4.40	4.30	4.34	4.71	
4. Were special techniques successful	7	12	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	****/ 788	****	4.05	4.00	4.07	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	10
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	7
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	4	C	4
84-150	11	3.00-3.49	7	D	0
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	6	F	0
				P	0
				I	0
				?	1
			Required for Majors	10	Graduate
			General	4	Under-grad
			Electives	1	24
			Other	7	Non-major
			#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant		

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	1	0	4	3	25	4.55	513/1481	4.36	4.26	4.29	4.29	4.55	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	10	20	4.48	545/1481	4.13	4.09	4.23	4.23	4.48	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	2	0	3	8	20	4.33	679/1249	4.17	4.21	4.27	4.28	4.33	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	6	5	21	4.47	485/1424	4.32	4.21	4.21	4.27	4.47	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	4	5	24	4.61	241/1396	4.22	4.11	3.98	4.00	4.61	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	5	6	21	4.50	303/1342	4.39	4.10	4.07	4.12	4.50	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	1	6	25	4.75	196/1459	4.29	4.21	4.16	4.17	4.75	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	1	0	32	4.94	491/1480	4.83	4.49	4.68	4.65	4.94	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	7	2	0	0	2	6	16	4.58	274/1450	4.25	4.14	4.09	4.10	4.58	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	3	2	26	4.74	433/1409	4.55	4.53	4.42	4.43	4.74	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	1	1	1	28	4.81	728/1407	4.90	4.81	4.69	4.67	4.81	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	1	2	5	23	4.61	445/1399	4.31	4.35	4.26	4.27	4.61	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	1	3	2	25	4.65	444/1400	4.29	4.32	4.27	4.28	4.65	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	0	1	2	5	4	19	4.23	464/1179	3.83	3.84	3.96	4.02	4.23	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	4	5	17	4.50	345/1262	3.90	3.85	4.05	4.14	4.50	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	0	0	3	6	17	4.54	564/1259	3.64	4.12	4.29	4.34	4.54	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	0	0	1	1	24	4.88	232/1256	4.12	4.40	4.30	4.34	4.88	
4. Were special techniques successful	8	12	2	0	2	1	8	4.00	394/ 788	4.00	4.05	4.00	4.07	4.00	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	32	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 246	****	****	4.20	4.20	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	32	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 68	****	****	4.49	4.70	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	30	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 59	****	4.43	4.30	4.48	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	30	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 51	****	4.00	4.00	4.13	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	31	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 36	****	****	4.60	4.33	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	31	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 41	****	****	4.26	3.90	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	31	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.42	4.00	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	32	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 55	****	****	4.55	4.88	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	32	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.75	4.67	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors		
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 20	Required for Majors 7	Graduate 0	Major 0
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B 10			
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	2	C 0	General 17	Under-grad 33	Non-major 33
84-150	11	3.00-3.49	11	D 0			
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	7	F 0	Electives 1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	
				P 0			
				I 0	Other 12		
				? 2			



Course-Section: ANTH 326 8020  
 Title AMERICAN INDIAN CULTUR  
 Instructor: EDWARDS-HEWITT,  
 Enrollment: 24  
 Questionnaires: 18

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2006

Page 57  
 JUN 13, 2006  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sept
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	5	5	8	4.17	947/1481	4.36	4.26	4.29	4.29	4.17	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	1	5	5	6	3.78	1194/1481	4.13	4.09	4.23	4.23	3.78	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	2	2	8	6	4.00	893/1249	4.17	4.21	4.27	4.27	4.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	4	4	9	4.17	840/1424	4.32	4.21	4.21	4.27	4.17	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	1	2	6	7	3.83	854/1396	4.22	4.11	3.98	4.00	3.83	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	2	6	9	4.28	527/1342	4.39	4.10	4.07	4.12	4.28	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	2	3	5	7	3.83	1101/1459	4.29	4.21	4.16	4.17	3.83	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	5	13	4.72	904/1480	4.83	4.49	4.68	4.65	4.72	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	7	0	0	0	3	6	2	3.91	973/1450	4.25	4.14	4.09	4.10	3.91	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	1	1	6	9	4.35	946/1409	4.55	4.53	4.42	4.43	4.35	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	18	5.00	1/1407	4.90	4.81	4.69	4.67	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	1	4	7	6	4.00	1002/1399	4.31	4.35	4.26	4.27	4.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	2	2	5	8	3.94	1060/1400	4.29	4.32	4.27	4.28	3.94	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	2	2	2	3	5	4	3.44	929/1179	3.83	3.84	3.96	4.02	3.44	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	3	1	5	4	4	3.29	1072/1262	3.90	3.85	4.05	4.14	3.29	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	4	2	5	4	1	2.75	1209/1259	3.64	4.12	4.29	4.34	2.75	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	3	2	2	6	4	3.35	1131/1256	4.12	4.40	4.30	4.34	3.35	
4. Were special techniques successful	1	13	1	1	0	1	1	3.00	****/ 788	4.00	4.05	4.00	4.07	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	16	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 246	****	****	4.20	4.20	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 249	****	****	4.11	4.23	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 242	****	****	4.40	4.36	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 240	****	****	4.20	3.96	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 217	****	****	4.04	4.11	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	16	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 68	****	****	4.49	4.70	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	16	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 69	****	****	4.53	4.66	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/ 63	****	****	4.44	4.56	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 69	****	****	4.35	4.48	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	16	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 68	****	****	3.92	4.43	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 59	****	4.43	4.30	4.48	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 51	****	4.00	4.00	4.13	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 36	****	****	4.60	4.33	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 41	****	****	4.26	3.90	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.42	4.00	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 55	****	****	4.55	4.88	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	16	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.75	4.67	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	16	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 51	****	****	4.65	4.88	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	16	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 34	****	****	4.83	4.67	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	16	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 24	****	****	4.82	4.67	****	

Course-Section: ANTH 326 8020  
 Title AMERICAN INDIAN CULTUR  
 Instructor: EDWARDS-HEWITT,  
 Enrollment: 24  
 Questionnaires: 18

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2006

Page 57  
 JUN 13, 2006  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: ANTH 397A 0101  
 Title ANTHROPOLOGY OF GENDER  
 Instructor: RUBINSTEIN, ROB  
 Enrollment: 36  
 Questionnaires: 21

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2006

Page 58  
 JUN 13, 2006  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	0	0	3	3	14	4.55	505/1481	4.55	4.26	4.29	4.29	4.55	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	1	0	3	4	12	4.30	769/1481	4.30	4.09	4.23	4.23	4.30	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	11	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	228/1249	4.78	4.21	4.27	4.28	4.78	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	1	1	5	13	4.50	437/1424	4.50	4.21	4.21	4.27	4.50	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	0	0	2	17	4.70	169/1396	4.70	4.11	3.98	4.00	4.70	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	2	3	15	4.65	198/1342	4.65	4.10	4.07	4.12	4.65	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	2	2	3	12	4.15	863/1459	4.15	4.21	4.16	4.17	4.15	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	1	17	2	4.05	1336/1480	4.05	4.49	4.68	4.65	4.05	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	1	7	9	4.47	375/1450	4.47	4.14	4.09	4.10	4.47	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	1	0	2	4	12	4.37	935/1409	4.37	4.53	4.42	4.43	4.37	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	3	16	4.84	636/1407	4.84	4.81	4.69	4.67	4.84	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	1	1	0	2	15	4.53	545/1399	4.53	4.35	4.26	4.27	4.53	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	1	1	3	13	4.37	754/1400	4.37	4.32	4.27	4.28	4.37	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	14	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	****/1179	****	3.84	3.96	4.02	****	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	1	0	0	3	11	4.53	330/1262	4.53	3.85	4.05	4.14	4.53	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	0	0	1	15	4.94	148/1259	4.94	4.12	4.29	4.34	4.94	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	0	1	2	13	4.75	357/1256	4.75	4.40	4.30	4.34	4.75	
4. Were special techniques successful	5	6	1	1	1	2	5	3.90	487/ 788	3.90	4.05	4.00	4.07	3.90	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 246	****	****	4.20	4.20	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 249	****	****	4.11	4.23	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 242	****	****	4.40	4.36	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 240	****	****	4.20	3.96	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 217	****	****	4.04	4.11	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 68	****	****	4.49	4.70	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 69	****	****	4.53	4.66	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 63	****	****	4.44	4.56	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 69	****	****	4.35	4.48	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 68	****	****	3.92	4.43	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 59	****	4.43	4.30	4.48	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 51	****	4.00	4.00	4.13	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 36	****	****	4.60	4.33	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 41	****	****	4.26	3.90	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.42	4.00	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 55	****	****	4.55	4.88	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.75	4.67	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 51	****	****	4.65	4.88	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 34	****	****	4.83	4.67	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 24	****	****	4.82	4.67	****	

Course-Section: ANTH 397A 0101  
 Title ANTHROPOLOGY OF GENDER  
 Instructor: RUBINSTEIN, ROB  
 Enrollment: 36  
 Questionnaires: 21

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2006

Page 58  
 JUN 13, 2006  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	10	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	3
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	B	4						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	4	C	2	General	9	Under-grad	21	Non-major	18
84-150	6	3.00-3.49	5	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	6				
				?	1						