

Course-Section: ANTH 211 0101  
 Title CULTURAL ANTHROPOLOGY  
 Instructor: SAN ANTONIO, PA  
 Enrollment: 50  
 Questionnaires: 30

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2005

Page 46  
 JUN 14, 2005  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	3	0	0	0	3	8	16	4.48	579/1504	4.40	4.53	4.27	4.26	4.48
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	3	0	0	1	3	12	11	4.22	880/1503	4.11	4.20	4.20	4.18	4.22
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	3	0	0	2	0	15	10	4.22	809/1290	4.48	4.32	4.28	4.27	4.22
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	3	4	1	1	3	7	11	4.13	912/1453	4.35	4.31	4.21	4.20	4.13
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	3	11	13	4.37	439/1421	4.31	4.17	4.00	3.90	4.37
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	3	4	3	3	6	5	6	3.35	1222/1365	3.85	4.12	4.08	4.00	3.35
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	3	0	0	2	2	3	20	4.52	444/1485	4.35	4.31	4.16	4.15	4.52
8. How many times was class cancelled	4	0	0	0	0	10	16	4.62	1022/1504	4.34	4.73	4.69	4.68	4.62
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	0	1	0	3	14	6	4.00	850/1483	4.07	4.24	4.06	4.02	4.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	0	0	2	5	19	4.65	587/1425	4.79	4.62	4.41	4.40	4.65
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	0	1	0	25	4.92	401/1426	4.93	4.92	4.69	4.71	4.92
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	0	1	2	9	14	4.38	727/1418	4.43	4.35	4.25	4.22	4.38
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	5	0	1	1	0	8	15	4.40	754/1416	4.53	4.56	4.26	4.24	4.40
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	7	1	1	6	5	7	3.80	795/1199	3.40	4.05	3.97	3.95	3.80
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	17	0	5	2	1	3	2	2.62	1231/1312	2.76	3.74	4.00	3.98	2.62
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	17	0	3	1	2	2	5	3.38	1143/1303	3.60	4.21	4.24	4.23	3.38
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	17	0	1	1	2	1	8	4.08	904/1299	4.31	4.56	4.25	4.21	4.08
4. Were special techniques successful	17	11	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/ 758	2.60	3.54	4.01	3.89	****
Laboratory														
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	29	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 244	****	****	4.09	4.24	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	29	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 225	****	****	4.23	4.52	****
Seminar														
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	29	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 70	****	****	4.35	4.30	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	29	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 76	****	****	4.44	4.21	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	29	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 73	****	****	4.17	4.24	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	29	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 58	****	4.75	4.43	4.41	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	29	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 47	****	****	4.29	4.65	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	28	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 40	****	****	4.53	4.44	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	28	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 36	****	****	4.60	4.13	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	28	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 20	****	****	4.24	5.00	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	28	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 16	****	****	4.51	5.00	****

Frequency Distribution

-----  
 Credits Earned          Cum. GPA          Expected Grades          Reasons          Type          Majors  
 -----

00-27	6	0.00-0.99	1	A	11	Required for Majors	15	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	B	6						
56-83	7	2.00-2.99	3	C	6	General	1	Under-grad	30	Non-major	29
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	8	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	11				
				?	1						

Course-Section: ANTH 211 0201  
 Title CULTURAL ANTHROPOLOGY  
 Instructor: MESSINGER, SETH  
 Enrollment: 38  
 Questionnaires: 17

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2005

Page 47  
 JUN 14, 2005  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	0	0	3	5	8	4.31	813/1504	4.40	4.53	4.27	4.26	4.31
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	1	3	7	5	4.00	1052/1503	4.11	4.20	4.20	4.18	4.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	1	0	0	0	4	11	4.73	270/1290	4.48	4.32	4.28	4.27	4.73
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	2	0	0	0	6	8	4.57	363/1453	4.35	4.31	4.21	4.20	4.57
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	3	3	9	4.25	548/1421	4.31	4.17	4.00	3.90	4.25
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	2	0	0	3	3	8	4.36	472/1365	3.85	4.12	4.08	4.00	4.36
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	5	3	8	4.19	842/1485	4.35	4.31	4.16	4.15	4.19
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	1	0	0	1	12	2	4.07	1394/1504	4.34	4.73	4.69	4.68	4.07
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	2	8	4	4.14	751/1483	4.07	4.24	4.06	4.02	4.14
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	0	1	14	4.93	125/1425	4.79	4.62	4.41	4.40	4.93
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	1	14	4.93	351/1426	4.93	4.92	4.69	4.71	4.93
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	0	8	7	4.47	630/1418	4.43	4.35	4.25	4.22	4.47
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	1	3	11	4.67	446/1416	4.53	4.56	4.26	4.24	4.67
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	9	0	3	1	1	1	3.00	1050/1199	3.40	4.05	3.97	3.95	3.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	3	0	4	1	2	2.90	1186/1312	2.76	3.74	4.00	3.98	2.90
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	2	2	3	4	3.82	1028/1303	3.60	4.21	4.24	4.23	3.82
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	0	0	1	3	7	4.55	543/1299	4.31	4.56	4.25	4.21	4.55
4. Were special techniques successful	7	5	1	2	1	0	1	2.60	731/ 758	2.60	3.54	4.01	3.89	2.60

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	4	0.00-0.99 0	A 12	Required for Majors	8
28-55	2	1.00-1.99 0	B 4		
56-83	1	2.00-2.99 0	C 0	General	3
84-150	1	3.00-3.49 4	D 0		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 4	F 0	Electives	1
			P 0		
			I 0		
			? 0		
				Other	3

#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant

Course-Section: ANTH 302 0101  
 Title EVOLUTION/PHYS ANTH/AR  
 Instructor: DONATO, PAUL  
 Enrollment: 34  
 Questionnaires: 21

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2005

Page 48  
 JUN 14, 2005  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies		Instructor		Course		Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect				
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4					5	Mean	Rank	Mean
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	1	0	9	11	4.43	669/1504	4.43	4.53	4.27	4.27	4.43
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	2	9	4	6	3.67	1247/1503	3.67	4.20	4.20	4.22	3.67
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	3	5	9	4	3.67	1109/1290	3.67	4.32	4.28	4.31	3.67
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	1	4	7	7	4.05	974/1453	4.05	4.31	4.21	4.23	4.05
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	5	8	8	4.14	642/1421	4.14	4.17	4.00	4.01	4.14
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	7	1	1	6	4	2	3.36	1218/1365	3.36	4.12	4.08	4.08	3.36
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	5	4	11	4.19	830/1485	4.19	4.31	4.16	4.17	4.19
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	2	19	4.90	657/1504	4.90	4.73	4.69	4.65	4.90
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	3	6	8	4.29	591/1483	4.29	4.24	4.06	4.08	4.29
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	4	5	11	4.35	951/1425	4.35	4.62	4.41	4.43	4.35
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	2	18	4.90	502/1426	4.90	4.92	4.69	4.71	4.90
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	1	5	11	3	3.80	1141/1418	3.80	4.35	4.25	4.26	3.80
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	0	0	6	13	4.50	623/1416	4.50	4.56	4.26	4.27	4.50
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	3	1	3	4	7	2	3.35	980/1199	3.35	4.05	3.97	4.02	3.35
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	2	4	6	7	3.95	774/1312	3.95	3.74	4.00	4.09	3.95
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	1	2	4	12	4.42	652/1303	4.42	4.21	4.24	4.27	4.42
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	1	2	16	4.79	323/1299	4.79	4.56	4.25	4.30	4.79
4. Were special techniques successful	2	17	2	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 758	****	3.54	4.01	4.00	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	20	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 76	****	****	4.61	4.84	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	20	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 76	****	****	4.44	4.51	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	19	0	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/ 73	****	****	4.17	4.25	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors		
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	0	A 5	Required for Majors 6	Graduate 0	Major 1
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	B 10			
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	5	C 1	General 4	Under-grad 21	Non-major 20
84-150	6	3.00-3.49	5	D 0			
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	6	F 0	Electives 4	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	
				P 1			
				I 0	Other 8		
				? 1			

Course-Section: ANTH 303 0101  
 Title ANTHRPLGCL RSRCH MTHDS  
 Instructor: FRANKOWSKI, ANN  
 Enrollment: 16  
 Questionnaires: 12

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2005

Page 49  
 JUN 14, 2005  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	118/1504	4.92	4.53	4.27	4.27	4.92
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	7	5	4.42	633/1503	4.42	4.20	4.20	4.22	4.42
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	3	7	4.33	711/1290	4.33	4.32	4.28	4.31	4.33
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	9	4.75	194/1453	4.75	4.31	4.21	4.23	4.75
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	1	2	8	4.42	401/1421	4.42	4.17	4.00	4.01	4.42
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	3	9	4.75	139/1365	4.75	4.12	4.08	4.08	4.75
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	2	5	5	4.25	761/1485	4.25	4.31	4.16	4.17	4.25
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	2	10	4.83	778/1504	4.83	4.73	4.69	4.65	4.83
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	5	6	4.55	306/1483	4.55	4.24	4.06	4.08	4.55
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	2	9	4.82	315/1425	4.82	4.62	4.41	4.43	4.82
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1426	5.00	4.92	4.69	4.71	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	4	7	4.64	414/1418	4.64	4.35	4.25	4.26	4.64
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	2	9	4.82	243/1416	4.82	4.56	4.26	4.27	4.82
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	1	0	0	3	1	6	4.30	455/1199	4.30	4.05	3.97	4.02	4.30
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	2	8	4.64	276/1312	4.64	3.74	4.00	4.09	4.64
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	197/1303	4.91	4.21	4.24	4.27	4.91
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	2	9	4.82	293/1299	4.82	4.56	4.25	4.30	4.82
4. Were special techniques successful	1	0	0	0	2	2	7	4.45	214/ 758	4.45	3.54	4.01	4.00	4.45
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 76	****	****	4.61	4.84	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 70	****	****	4.35	4.24	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 67	****	****	4.34	3.98	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 76	****	****	4.44	4.51	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 73	****	****	4.17	4.25	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	34/ 58	4.75	4.75	4.43	4.52	4.75
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	9	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	36/ 56	4.33	4.33	4.23	4.13	4.33
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	9	1	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 44	****	****	4.65	4.77	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	9	1	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 47	****	****	4.29	4.14	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	9	1	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.44	4.47	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 40	****	****	4.53	4.74	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 8	Required for Majors 0
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B 2	Graduate 0
					Major 7

56-83	4	2.00-2.99	1	C	1	General	1	Under-grad	12	Non-major	5
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	5	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	11				
				?	0						

Course-Section: ANTH 310 0101  
 Title ETHNOGRAPHIC FILM  
 Instructor: DONATO, PAUL  
 Enrollment: 41  
 Questionnaires: 22

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2005

Page 50  
 JUN 14, 2005  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies		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	1	1	8	11	4.38	725/1504	4.38	4.53	4.27	4.27	4.38
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	3	7	11	4.38	678/1503	4.38	4.20	4.20	4.22	4.38
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	1	0	2	7	11	4.29	758/1290	4.29	4.32	4.28	4.31	4.29
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	5	1	0	2	5	7	4.13	912/1453	4.13	4.31	4.21	4.23	4.13
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	3	1	6	10	4.00	745/1421	4.00	4.17	4.00	4.01	4.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	2	1	1	3	6	7	3.94	854/1365	3.94	4.12	4.08	4.08	3.94
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	1	2	7	10	4.14	890/1485	4.14	4.31	4.16	4.17	4.14
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	2	19	4.90	657/1504	4.90	4.73	4.69	4.65	4.90
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	7	1	0	0	1	4	9	4.57	282/1483	4.57	4.24	4.06	4.08	4.57
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	1	0	4	16	4.67	572/1425	4.67	4.62	4.41	4.43	4.67
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	1	20	4.95	251/1426	4.95	4.92	4.69	4.71	4.95
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	3	6	12	4.43	682/1418	4.43	4.35	4.25	4.26	4.43
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	5	15	4.67	446/1416	4.67	4.56	4.26	4.27	4.67
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	0	0	22	5.00	1/1199	5.00	4.05	3.97	4.02	5.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	1	0	4	7	6	3.94	774/1312	3.94	3.74	4.00	4.09	3.94
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	1	2	4	11	4.39	692/1303	4.39	4.21	4.24	4.27	4.39
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	0	0	2	16	4.89	223/1299	4.89	4.56	4.25	4.30	4.89
4. Were special techniques successful	4	12	0	1	3	1	1	3.33	630/ 758	3.33	3.54	4.01	4.00	3.33

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	8	Required for Majors	9	Graduate	0	Major	2
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	11						
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	5	Under-grad	22	Non-major	20
84-150	6	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	5				
				?	1						

Course-Section: ANTH 316 0101  
 Title ANTHROPOLOGY OF RELIGI  
 Instructor: FRANKOWSKI, ANN  
 Enrollment: 35  
 Questionnaires: 20

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2005

Page 51  
 JUN 14, 2005  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	5	3	12	4.35	763/1504	4.35	4.53	4.27	4.27	4.35
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	8	6	6	3.90	1136/1503	3.90	4.20	4.20	4.22	3.90
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	6	5	8	4.00	937/1290	4.00	4.32	4.28	4.31	4.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	1	10	1	7	3.60	1253/1453	3.60	4.31	4.21	4.23	3.60
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	0	9	3	6	3.55	1084/1421	3.55	4.17	4.00	4.01	3.55
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	1	8	3	7	3.84	941/1365	3.84	4.12	4.08	4.08	3.84
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	1	6	1	11	4.00	990/1485	4.00	4.31	4.16	4.17	4.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	2	17	4.89	674/1504	4.89	4.73	4.69	4.65	4.89
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	1	0	0	5	8	2	3.80	1093/1483	3.80	4.24	4.06	4.08	3.80
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	5	5	9	4.21	1064/1425	4.21	4.62	4.41	4.43	4.21
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	2	2	16	4.70	926/1426	4.70	4.92	4.69	4.71	4.70
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	1	5	6	8	4.05	997/1418	4.05	4.35	4.25	4.26	4.05
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	3	7	9	4.20	921/1416	4.20	4.56	4.26	4.27	4.20
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	0	0	1	4	5	7	4.06	618/1199	4.06	4.05	3.97	4.02	4.06
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	1	2	3	7	4	3.65	956/1312	3.65	3.74	4.00	4.09	3.65
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	1	0	2	4	10	4.29	770/1303	4.29	4.21	4.24	4.27	4.29
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	0	2	3	11	4.56	530/1299	4.56	4.56	4.25	4.30	4.56
4. Were special techniques successful	3	0	0	3	5	4	5	3.65	542/ 758	3.65	3.54	4.01	4.00	3.65
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 233	****	****	4.09	4.12	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 244	****	****	4.09	4.20	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 227	****	****	4.40	4.46	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 225	****	****	4.23	4.29	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 207	****	****	4.09	4.14	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 76	****	****	4.61	4.84	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 70	****	****	4.35	4.24	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 67	****	****	4.34	3.98	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 76	****	****	4.44	4.51	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 73	****	****	4.17	4.25	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 58	****	****	4.75	4.43	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	17	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/ 56	****	****	4.33	4.13	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	17	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 44	****	****	4.65	4.77	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	17	1	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 47	****	****	4.29	4.14	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	17	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.44	4.47	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 40	****	****	4.53	4.74	****



2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/	35	****	****	4.49	4.36	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/	36	****	****	4.60	4.63	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/	20	****	****	4.24	5.00	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/	16	****	****	4.51	3.95	****

Course-Section: ANTH 316 0101  
 Title ANTHROPOLOGY OF RELIGI  
 Instructor: FRANKOWSKI, ANN  
 Enrollment: 35  
 Questionnaires: 20

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2005

Page 51  
 JUN 14, 2005  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	0	A	2	Required for Majors	4	Graduate	0	Major	5
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	B	10						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	5	C	4	General	7	Under-grad	20	Non-major	15
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	5	D	1						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	7				
				?	1						

Course-Section: ANTH 326 0101  
 Title AMERICAN INDIAN CULTUR  
 Instructor: KAVANAGH, KATHR  
 Enrollment: 42  
 Questionnaires: 28

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2005

Page 52  
 JUN 14, 2005  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	6	22	4.79	228/1504	4.70	4.53	4.27	4.27	4.79
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	6	19	4.57	414/1503	4.52	4.20	4.20	4.22	4.57
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	4	5	18	4.43	615/1290	4.67	4.32	4.28	4.31	4.43
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	4	3	21	4.61	331/1453	4.64	4.31	4.21	4.23	4.61
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	3	5	19	4.46	356/1421	4.33	4.17	4.00	4.01	4.46
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	1	9	17	4.50	297/1365	4.68	4.12	4.08	4.08	4.50
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	2	3	23	4.75	200/1485	4.60	4.31	4.16	4.17	4.75
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	28	5.00	1/1504	4.80	4.73	4.69	4.65	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	1	2	11	10	4.25	635/1483	4.29	4.24	4.06	4.08	4.25
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	4	23	4.79	366/1425	4.65	4.62	4.41	4.43	4.79
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	27	4.96	201/1426	4.98	4.92	4.69	4.71	4.96
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	1	0	2	6	19	4.50	578/1418	4.54	4.35	4.25	4.26	4.50
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	0	0	5	21	4.54	593/1416	4.63	4.56	4.26	4.27	4.54
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	1	0	2	6	18	4.48	290/1199	4.46	4.05	3.97	4.02	4.48
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	3	1	5	3	9	3.67	947/1312	4.10	3.74	4.00	4.09	3.67
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	1	0	6	4	10	4.05	900/1303	4.21	4.21	4.24	4.27	4.05
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	1	0	2	5	13	4.38	696/1299	4.38	4.56	4.25	4.30	4.38
4. Were special techniques successful	7	14	1	1	1	0	4	3.71	518/ 758	3.61	3.54	4.01	4.00	3.71
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	27	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 233	****	****	4.09	4.12	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	27	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 244	****	****	4.09	4.20	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	27	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 227	****	****	4.40	4.46	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	27	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 225	****	****	4.23	4.29	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	27	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 207	****	****	4.09	4.14	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	27	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 76	****	****	4.61	4.84	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	27	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 70	****	****	4.35	4.24	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	27	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 67	****	****	4.34	3.98	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	27	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 76	****	****	4.44	4.51	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	27	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 73	****	****	4.17	4.25	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	26	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 58	****	****	4.75	4.43	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	26	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 56	****	****	4.33	4.13	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	26	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 44	****	****	4.65	4.77	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	26	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 47	****	****	4.29	4.14	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	26	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.44	4.47	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	27	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 40	****	****	4.53	4.74	****

2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	27	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/	35	****	****	4.49	4.36	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	27	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/	36	****	****	4.60	4.63	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	27	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/	20	****	****	4.24	5.00	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	27	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/	16	****	****	4.51	3.95	****

Course-Section: ANTH 326 0101  
 Title AMERICAN INDIAN CULTUR  
 Instructor: KAVANAGH, KATHR  
 Enrollment: 42  
 Questionnaires: 28

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2005

Page 52  
 JUN 14, 2005  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	A	24	Required for Majors	6	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	B	4						
56-83	5	2.00-2.99	7	C	0	General	17	Under-grad	28	Non-major	28
84-150	12	3.00-3.49	5	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	12	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	3				
				?	0						

Course-Section: ANTH 326 8020  
 Title AMERICAN INDIAN CULTUR  
 Instructor: EDWARDS-HEWITT,  
 Enrollment: 27  
 Questionnaires: 21

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2005

Page 53  
 JUN 14, 2005  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies		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	4	15	4.62	406/1504	4.70	4.53	4.27	4.27	4.62
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	6	13	4.48	541/1503	4.52	4.20	4.20	4.22	4.48
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	19	4.90	131/1290	4.67	4.32	4.28	4.31	4.90
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	5	15	4.67	270/1453	4.64	4.31	4.21	4.23	4.67
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	1	1	7	10	4.20	596/1421	4.33	4.17	4.00	4.01	4.20
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	3	17	4.85	100/1365	4.68	4.12	4.08	4.08	4.85
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	1	2	4	13	4.45	536/1485	4.60	4.31	4.16	4.17	4.45
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	8	12	4.60	1030/1504	4.80	4.73	4.69	4.65	4.60
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	1	10	7	4.33	543/1483	4.29	4.24	4.06	4.08	4.33
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	3	4	14	4.52	760/1425	4.65	4.62	4.41	4.43	4.52
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	21	5.00	1/1426	4.98	4.92	4.69	4.71	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	2	5	14	4.57	488/1418	4.54	4.35	4.25	4.26	4.57
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	0	3	17	4.71	380/1416	4.63	4.56	4.26	4.27	4.71
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	4	0	1	1	4	10	4.44	339/1199	4.46	4.05	3.97	4.02	4.44
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	1	5	14	4.52	350/1312	4.10	3.74	4.00	4.09	4.52
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	2	0	1	3	15	4.38	692/1303	4.21	4.21	4.24	4.27	4.38
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	2	0	2	1	16	4.38	696/1299	4.38	4.56	4.25	4.30	4.38
4. Were special techniques successful	0	15	2	0	0	1	3	3.50	580/ 758	3.61	3.54	4.01	4.00	3.50
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	17	3	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 233	****	****	4.09	4.12	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	19	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 244	****	****	4.09	4.20	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	19	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 227	****	****	4.40	4.46	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	19	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 225	****	****	4.23	4.29	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	19	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 207	****	****	4.09	4.14	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	17	3	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 76	****	****	4.61	4.84	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	19	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 70	****	****	4.35	4.24	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 67	****	****	4.34	3.98	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 76	****	****	4.44	4.51	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	19	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 73	****	****	4.17	4.25	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	19	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 58	****	4.75	4.43	4.52	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	19	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 56	****	4.33	4.23	4.13	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	19	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 44	****	****	4.65	4.77	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	19	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 47	****	****	4.29	4.14	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	19	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.44	4.47	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	19	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 40	****	****	4.53	4.74	****

2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	19	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/	35	****	****	4.49	4.36	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	19	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/	36	****	****	4.60	4.63	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	19	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/	20	****	****	4.24	5.00	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	19	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/	16	****	****	4.51	3.95	****

Course-Section: ANTH 326 8020  
 Title AMERICAN INDIAN CULTUR  
 Instructor: EDWARDS-HEWITT,  
 Enrollment: 27  
 Questionnaires: 21

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2005

Page 53  
 JUN 14, 2005  
 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	17	Required for Majors	7	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	3						
56-83	5	2.00-2.99	1	C	0	General	7	Under-grad	21	Non-major	21
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	8	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	6				
				?	0						