

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	1	22	18	4.41	740/1639	4.53	4.57	4.27	4.35	4.41	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	6	5	30	4.59	435/1639	4.49	4.42	4.22	4.27	4.59	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	13	0	0	2	9	17	4.54	487/1397	4.45	4.52	4.28	4.39	4.54	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	9	32	4.78	207/1583	4.45	4.48	4.19	4.28	4.78	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	11	29	4.68	223/1532	4.54	4.54	4.01	4.09	4.68	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	10	31	4.76	182/1504	4.32	4.39	4.05	4.09	4.76	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	2	9	30	4.68	293/1612	4.52	4.55	4.16	4.21	4.68	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	4	37	4.90	662/1635	4.83	4.78	4.65	4.63	4.90	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	3	19	16	4.34	559/1579	4.23	4.31	4.08	4.14	4.34	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	2	12	26	4.60	684/1518	4.67	4.65	4.43	4.48	4.60	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	2	38	4.95	328/1520	4.96	4.86	4.70	4.78	4.95	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	2	17	21	4.47	635/1517	4.48	4.51	4.27	4.34	4.47	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	1	12	26	4.57	556/1550	4.61	4.64	4.22	4.33	4.57	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	1	0	0	5	9	24	4.50	265/1295	4.45	4.03	3.94	4.07	4.50	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	4	7	14	4.40	511/1398	4.45	4.49	4.07	4.14	4.40	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	16	0	0	0	3	3	19	4.64	507/1391	4.60	4.64	4.30	4.35	4.64	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	16	0	0	0	0	4	21	4.84	286/1388	4.79	4.75	4.28	4.37	4.84	
4. Were special techniques successful	16	5	1	2	2	7	8	3.95	493/ 958	3.88	3.86	3.93	4.00	3.95	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	40	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 224	****	****	4.10	4.33	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	40	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 240	****	****	4.11	4.47	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	40	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 219	****	****	4.44	4.61	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	40	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 215	****	****	4.35	4.43	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	40	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 198	****	****	4.18	4.08	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	40	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 85	****	****	4.58	4.00	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	40	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 82	****	****	4.52	3.00	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	40	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 78	****	****	4.47	****	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	40	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 80	****	****	4.47	2.00	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	40	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 82	****	****	4.16	4.00	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	40	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.04	4.78	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	40	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 53	****	****	4.05	4.28	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	40	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 42	****	****	4.75	****	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	40	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 37	****	****	4.58	****	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	40	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 32	****	****	4.56	****	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	40	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 50	****	****	4.45	3.24	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	40	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 32	****	****	4.51	4.33	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	40	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 43	****	****	4.69	****	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	40	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 32	****	****	4.37	1.00	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	40	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 21	****	****	4.52	3.00	****	

Course-Section: ANTH 211 0101
 Title CULTURAL ANTHROPOLOGY
 Instructor: CHAPIN, BAMBI
 Enrollment: 43
 Questionnaires: 41

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 90
 FEB 13, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	27	Required for Majors	22	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	0	B	10						
56-83	7	2.00-2.99	4	C	2	General	4	Under-grad	41	Non-major	41
84-150	10	3.00-3.49	5	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	12	F	0	Electives	3	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	10				
				?	0						

Course-Section: ANTH 211 0201
 Title CULTURAL ANTHROPOLOGY
 Instructor: FRANKOWSKI, ANN
 Enrollment: 40
 Questionnaires: 28

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 91
 FEB 13, 2008
 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	2	10	16	4.50	615/1639	4.53	4.57	4.27	4.35	4.50	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	2	2	12	12	4.21	895/1639	4.49	4.42	4.22	4.27	4.21	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	2	3	12	11	4.14	897/1397	4.45	4.52	4.28	4.39	4.14	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	1	0	2	2	15	7	4.04	988/1583	4.45	4.48	4.19	4.28	4.04	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	0	11	16	4.50	335/1532	4.54	4.54	4.01	4.09	4.50	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	1	2	0	7	11	6	3.73	1067/1504	4.32	4.39	4.05	4.09	3.73	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	2	3	8	15	4.29	779/1612	4.52	4.55	4.16	4.21	4.29	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	12	16	4.57	1087/1635	4.83	4.78	4.65	4.63	4.57	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	0	3	18	2	3.96	972/1579	4.23	4.31	4.08	4.14	3.96	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	7	20	4.68	588/1518	4.67	4.65	4.43	4.48	4.68	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	27	4.96	219/1520	4.96	4.86	4.70	4.78	4.96	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	14	14	4.50	597/1517	4.48	4.51	4.27	4.34	4.50	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	3	7	18	4.54	603/1550	4.61	4.64	4.22	4.33	4.54	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	1	2	5	20	4.57	234/1295	4.45	4.03	3.94	4.07	4.57	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	1	4	7	12	4.25	625/1398	4.45	4.49	4.07	4.14	4.25	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	0	2	7	15	4.54	586/1391	4.60	4.64	4.30	4.35	4.54	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	0	0	3	21	4.88	255/1388	4.79	4.75	4.28	4.37	4.88	
4. Were special techniques successful	4	1	1	1	8	8	5	3.65	662/ 958	3.88	3.86	3.93	4.00	3.65	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	A 8	Required for Majors	16
28-55	5	1.00-1.99	B 12	Graduate	0
56-83	6	2.00-2.99	C 6	Under-grad	28
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	D 1	Non-major	26
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	
			P 0		
			I 0		
			? 0		
			Other		9

Course-Section: ANTH 211 0301
 Title CULTURAL ANTHROPOLOGY
 Instructor: CHARD, SARAH
 Enrollment: 54
 Questionnaires: 48

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 92
 FEB 13, 2008
 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	7	17	24	4.35	797/1639	4.53	4.57	4.27	4.35	4.35	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	2	8	12	26	4.29	822/1639	4.49	4.42	4.22	4.27	4.29	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	9	11	28	4.40	669/1397	4.45	4.52	4.28	4.39	4.40	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	2	4	17	25	4.35	669/1583	4.45	4.48	4.19	4.28	4.35	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	1	3	18	24	4.34	497/1532	4.54	4.54	4.01	4.09	4.34	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	1	0	1	5	21	19	4.26	603/1504	4.32	4.39	4.05	4.09	4.26	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	8	12	27	4.40	632/1612	4.52	4.55	4.16	4.21	4.40	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	8	39	4.83	781/1635	4.83	4.78	4.65	4.63	4.83	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	9	0	0	0	7	22	10	4.08	847/1579	4.23	4.31	4.08	4.14	4.08	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	1	6	9	30	4.48	849/1518	4.67	4.65	4.43	4.48	4.48	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	4	42	4.91	491/1520	4.96	4.86	4.70	4.78	4.91	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	1	2	4	15	23	4.27	875/1517	4.48	4.51	4.27	4.34	4.27	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	0	3	10	32	4.57	568/1550	4.61	4.64	4.22	4.33	4.57	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	0	2	2	4	16	22	4.17	521/1295	4.45	4.03	3.94	4.07	4.17	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	28	0	0	1	3	4	12	4.35	546/1398	4.45	4.49	4.07	4.14	4.35	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	28	0	0	1	1	5	13	4.50	616/1391	4.60	4.64	4.30	4.35	4.50	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	28	0	0	0	2	3	15	4.65	509/1388	4.79	4.75	4.28	4.37	4.65	
4. Were special techniques successful	28	5	1	1	8	3	2	3.27	803/ 958	3.88	3.86	3.93	4.00	3.27	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	45	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 52	****	****	4.04	4.78	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	45	0	0	0	0	3	0	4.00	****/ 53	****	****	4.05	4.28	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	44	2	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 42	****	****	4.75	****	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	44	1	0	0	2	1	0	3.33	****/ 37	****	****	4.58	****	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	44	3	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 32	****	****	4.56	****	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors		
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	A 14	Required for Majors 25	Graduate 0	Major 0
28-55	9	1.00-1.99	1	B 21			
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	6	C 6	General 7	Under-grad 48	Non-major 48
84-150	8	3.00-3.49	7	D 1			
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	9	F 0	Electives 0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	
				P 0			
				I 0	Other 9		
				? 0			

Course-Section: ANTH 211 8020
 Title CULTURAL ANTHROPOLOGY
 Instructor: PHANSTIEHL, CYN
 Enrollment: 21
 Questionnaires: 14

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 93
 FEB 13, 2008
 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	0	2	12	4.86	214/1639	4.53	4.57	4.27	4.35	4.86	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	0	13	4.86	163/1639	4.49	4.42	4.22	4.27	4.86	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	2	11	4.71	323/1397	4.45	4.52	4.28	4.39	4.71	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	3	10	4.64	339/1583	4.45	4.48	4.19	4.28	4.64	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	1	11	4.64	249/1532	4.54	4.54	4.01	4.09	4.64	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	1	1	10	4.54	344/1504	4.32	4.39	4.05	4.09	4.54	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	2	11	4.71	259/1612	4.52	4.55	4.16	4.21	4.71	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	14	5.00	1/1635	4.83	4.78	4.65	4.63	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	6	7	4.54	352/1579	4.23	4.31	4.08	4.14	4.54	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	1	12	4.92	170/1518	4.67	4.65	4.43	4.48	4.92	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	13	5.00	1/1520	4.96	4.86	4.70	4.78	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	1	2	10	4.69	371/1517	4.48	4.51	4.27	4.34	4.69	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	3	10	4.77	338/1550	4.61	4.64	4.22	4.33	4.77	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	0	3	0	10	4.54	251/1295	4.45	4.03	3.94	4.07	4.54	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	1	12	4.79	234/1398	4.45	4.49	4.07	4.14	4.79	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	1	0	1	12	4.71	441/1391	4.60	4.64	4.30	4.35	4.71	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	1	1	12	4.79	351/1388	4.79	4.75	4.28	4.37	4.79	
4. Were special techniques successful	1	2	0	0	2	0	9	4.64	167/ 958	3.88	3.86	3.93	4.00	4.64	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	11	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 224	****	****	4.10	4.33	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	11	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 240	****	****	4.11	4.47	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	11	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/ 219	****	****	4.44	4.61	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	11	0	1	0	0	0	2	3.67	****/ 215	****	****	4.35	4.43	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	11	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 198	****	****	4.18	4.08	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	11	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 85	****	****	4.58	4.00	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	11	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 82	****	****	4.52	3.00	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 78	****	****	4.47	****	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 80	****	****	4.47	2.00	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	11	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 82	****	****	4.16	4.00	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.04	4.78	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	11	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 53	****	****	4.05	4.28	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	11	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 42	****	****	4.75	****	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	11	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 37	****	****	4.58	****	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	11	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 32	****	****	4.56	****	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 50	****	****	4.45	3.24	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	11	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 32	****	****	4.51	4.33	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	11	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 43	****	****	4.69	****	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	11	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 32	****	****	4.37	1.00	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	11	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 21	****	****	4.52	3.00	****	

Course-Section: ANTH 211 8020
 Title CULTURAL ANTHROPOLOGY
 Instructor: PHANSTIEHL, CYN
 Enrollment: 21
 Questionnaires: 14

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 93
 FEB 13, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: ANTH 302 0101
 Title EVOLUTION/PHYS ANTH/AR
 Instructor: DONATO, PAUL
 Enrollment: 38
 Questionnaires: 15

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 94
 FEB 13, 2008
 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	1	3	2	9	4.27	880/1639	4.27	4.57	4.27	4.28	4.27	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	6	5	4	3.87	1287/1639	3.87	4.42	4.22	4.20	3.87	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	5	8	4.40	661/1397	4.40	4.52	4.28	4.26	4.40	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	3	7	4	4.07	960/1583	4.07	4.48	4.19	4.24	4.07	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	4	2	8	4.13	677/1532	4.13	4.54	4.01	4.05	4.13	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	7	0	2	0	3	2	3.71	1083/1504	3.71	4.39	4.05	4.12	3.71	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	2	2	11	4.60	388/1612	4.60	4.55	4.16	4.12	4.60	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	4	11	4.73	913/1635	4.73	4.78	4.65	4.66	4.73	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	1	7	5	4.31	601/1579	4.31	4.31	4.08	4.07	4.31	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	2	2	10	4.57	720/1518	4.57	4.65	4.43	4.39	4.57	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	3	1	10	4.50	1188/1520	4.50	4.86	4.70	4.68	4.50	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	1	2	4	8	4.27	875/1517	4.27	4.51	4.27	4.23	4.27	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	1	1	2	10	4.50	638/1550	4.50	4.64	4.22	4.20	4.50	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	3	1	1	2	3	5	3.83	783/1295	3.83	4.03	3.94	3.95	3.83	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	2	2	5	4.33	560/1398	4.33	4.49	4.07	4.13	4.33	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	0	3	0	6	4.33	752/1391	4.33	4.64	4.30	4.35	4.33	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	0	1	0	1	7	4.56	609/1388	4.56	4.75	4.28	4.34	4.56	
4. Were special techniques successful	6	5	0	1	2	0	1	3.25	806/ 958	3.25	3.86	3.93	3.97	3.25	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	A 7	Required for Majors	6
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	B 6		Graduate 0
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	C 1	General	4
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	D 0		15
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	2
			P 0		### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	2
			? 0		

Course-Section: ANTH 304 0101
 Title KIN, COMMUNITYÐNICI
 Instructor: CHAPIN, BAMBI
 Enrollment: 40
 Questionnaires: 28

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 95
 FEB 13, 2008
 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	1	2	4	21	4.61	508/1639	4.61	4.57	4.27	4.28	4.61	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	8	18	4.57	445/1639	4.57	4.42	4.22	4.20	4.57	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	21	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	323/1397	4.71	4.52	4.28	4.26	4.71	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	5	22	4.75	239/1583	4.75	4.48	4.19	4.24	4.75	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	3	23	4.81	141/1532	4.81	4.54	4.01	4.05	4.81	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	2	5	20	4.67	245/1504	4.67	4.39	4.05	4.12	4.67	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	3	4	21	4.64	340/1612	4.64	4.55	4.16	4.12	4.64	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	27	4.96	265/1635	4.96	4.78	4.65	4.66	4.96	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	1	2	6	15	4.46	439/1579	4.46	4.31	4.08	4.07	4.46	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	2	7	19	4.61	684/1518	4.61	4.65	4.43	4.39	4.61	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	3	25	4.89	571/1520	4.89	4.86	4.70	4.68	4.89	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	1	1	6	20	4.61	474/1517	4.61	4.51	4.27	4.23	4.61	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	0	6	21	4.64	478/1550	4.64	4.64	4.22	4.20	4.64	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	10	2	1	4	4	7	3.72	858/1295	3.72	4.03	3.94	3.95	3.72	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	1	6	14	4.62	362/1398	4.62	4.49	4.07	4.13	4.62	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	0	0	1	0	20	4.90	227/1391	4.90	4.64	4.30	4.35	4.90	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	0	0	1	2	18	4.81	328/1388	4.81	4.75	4.28	4.34	4.81	
4. Were special techniques successful	7	2	2	1	2	7	7	3.84	558/ 958	3.84	3.86	3.93	3.97	3.84	
Self Paced															
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	27	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 32	****	****	4.51	5.00	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	27	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 43	****	****	4.69	5.00	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	27	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 32	****	****	4.37	5.00	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	27	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 21	****	****	4.52	5.00	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	17
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B	10
56-83	5	2.00-2.99	3	C	0
84-150	9	3.00-3.49	3	D	0
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	11	F	0
				P	0
				I	0
				?	0
				Required for Majors	0
				General	16
				Electives	0
				Other	11
				Graduate	0
				Under-grad	28
				Major	11
				Non-major	17
				#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	

Course-Section: ANTH 312 0101
 Title MEDICAL ANTHROPOLOGY
 Instructor: MESSINGER, SETH
 Enrollment: 38
 Questionnaires: 21

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 96
 FEB 13, 2008
 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	2	1	18	4.76	305/1639	4.76	4.57	4.27	4.28	4.76	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	0	2	1	17	4.57	445/1639	4.57	4.42	4.22	4.20	4.57	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	5	1	0	0	3	12	4.56	457/1397	4.56	4.52	4.28	4.26	4.56	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	5	14	4.52	455/1583	4.52	4.48	4.19	4.24	4.52	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	3	4	14	4.52	323/1532	4.52	4.54	4.01	4.05	4.52	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	1	3	16	4.62	283/1504	4.62	4.39	4.05	4.12	4.62	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	0	0	5	15	4.57	418/1612	4.57	4.55	4.16	4.12	4.57	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	2	11	8	4.29	1326/1635	4.29	4.78	4.65	4.66	4.29	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	1	0	0	7	13	4.48	416/1579	4.48	4.31	4.08	4.07	4.48	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	1	1	1	17	4.70	561/1518	4.70	4.65	4.43	4.39	4.70	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	1	0	0	19	4.85	674/1520	4.85	4.86	4.70	4.68	4.85	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	3	1	16	4.65	417/1517	4.65	4.51	4.27	4.23	4.65	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	0	0	1	18	4.75	351/1550	4.75	4.64	4.22	4.20	4.75	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	16	2	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/1295	****	4.03	3.94	3.95	****	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	1	1	2	12	4.56	391/1398	4.56	4.49	4.07	4.13	4.56	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	1	0	1	1	13	4.56	572/1391	4.56	4.64	4.30	4.35	4.56	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	1	1	3	11	4.50	647/1388	4.50	4.75	4.28	4.34	4.50	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: ANTH 314 0101
 Title PSYCH ANTHROPOLOGY
 Instructor: RUBINSTEIN, ROB
 Enrollment: 40
 Questionnaires: 20

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 97
 FEB 13, 2008
 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	1	4	14	4.50	615/1639	4.50	4.57	4.27	4.28	4.50	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	3	5	11	4.42	650/1639	4.42	4.42	4.22	4.20	4.42	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	6	14	4.70	342/1397	4.70	4.52	4.28	4.26	4.70	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	6	14	4.70	299/1583	4.70	4.48	4.19	4.24	4.70	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	2	1	15	4.58	293/1532	4.58	4.54	4.01	4.05	4.58	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	3	1	15	4.63	268/1504	4.63	4.39	4.05	4.12	4.63	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	0	1	5	12	4.61	376/1612	4.61	4.55	4.16	4.12	4.61	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	19	5.00	1/1635	5.00	4.78	4.65	4.66	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	1	9	6	4.31	590/1579	4.31	4.31	4.08	4.07	4.31	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	2	4	13	4.58	720/1518	4.58	4.65	4.43	4.39	4.58	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	2	3	14	4.63	1074/1520	4.63	4.86	4.70	4.68	4.63	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	2	4	13	4.58	510/1517	4.58	4.51	4.27	4.23	4.58	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	2	3	14	4.63	489/1550	4.63	4.64	4.22	4.20	4.63	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	5	0	1	4	3	5	3.92	709/1295	3.92	4.03	3.94	3.95	3.92	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	0	2	10	4.83	200/1398	4.83	4.49	4.07	4.13	4.83	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	0	0	0	2	10	4.83	300/1391	4.83	4.64	4.30	4.35	4.83	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	201/1388	4.92	4.75	4.28	4.34	4.92	
4. Were special techniques successful	8	0	0	0	2	3	7	4.42	260/ 958	4.42	3.86	3.93	3.97	4.42	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 11	Required for Majors	4
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	B 2		Graduate 0
56-83	5	2.00-2.99	C 2	General	4
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad 20
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	4
			? 0		

Course-Section: ANTH 400 0101
 Title ANTHROPOLOGICAL THEORY
 Instructor: DONATO, PAUL
 Enrollment: 27
 Questionnaires: 18

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 98
 FEB 13, 2008
 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	1	1	16	4.83	231/1639	4.83	4.57	4.27	4.42	4.83	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	6	10	4.39	709/1639	4.39	4.42	4.22	4.29	4.39	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	4	12	4.50	517/1397	4.50	4.52	4.28	4.38	4.50	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	5	11	4.50	476/1583	4.50	4.48	4.19	4.31	4.50	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	1	2	14	4.61	269/1532	4.61	4.54	4.01	4.07	4.61	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	6	11	4.56	329/1504	4.56	4.39	4.05	4.20	4.56	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	1	7	9	4.47	532/1612	4.47	4.55	4.16	4.18	4.47	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	4	13	4.76	869/1635	4.76	4.78	4.65	4.72	4.76	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	1	7	6	4.36	548/1579	4.36	4.31	4.08	4.21	4.36	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	3	14	4.72	510/1518	4.72	4.65	4.43	4.51	4.72	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	18	5.00	1/1520	5.00	4.86	4.70	4.75	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	6	11	4.56	535/1517	4.56	4.51	4.27	4.34	4.56	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	4	14	4.78	325/1550	4.78	4.64	4.22	4.24	4.78	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	12	1	1	2	1	1	3.00	1158/1295	3.00	4.03	3.94	4.01	3.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	2	6	6	4.29	599/1398	4.29	4.49	4.07	4.23	4.29	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	1	0	1	12	4.71	441/1391	4.71	4.64	4.30	4.48	4.71	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	0	0	2	12	4.86	276/1388	4.86	4.75	4.28	4.50	4.86	
4. Were special techniques successful	4	10	1	0	0	0	3	4.00	****/ 958	****	3.86	3.93	4.24	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 9	Required for Majors	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	B 6		Graduate
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	C 1	General	1
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	1
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	14
			? 0		