

Course-Section: AFST 100 0101  
 Title INTRO BLACK EXPERIENCE  
 Instructor: WALLACE, BELIND  
 Enrollment: 30  
 Questionnaires: 22

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2006

Page 13  
 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	1	1	5	15	4.55	513/1481	4.45	4.26	4.29	4.14	4.55	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	0	8	13	4.50	517/1481	4.42	4.26	4.23	4.18	4.50	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	0	5	16	4.64	369/1249	4.36	4.37	4.27	4.14	4.64	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	1	0	6	13	4.55	385/1424	4.25	4.27	4.21	4.06	4.55	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	2	4	15	4.50	297/1396	4.27	4.07	3.98	3.89	4.50	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	7	0	2	4	4	5	3.80	956/1342	3.58	4.12	4.07	3.88	3.80	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	1	1	3	15	4.60	344/1459	4.12	4.19	4.16	4.17	4.60	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	1	1	5	14	4.52	1034/1480	4.54	4.64	4.68	4.64	4.52	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	1	0	2	9	7	4.11	781/1450	4.11	4.10	4.09	3.97	4.11	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	1	1	3	14	4.58	682/1409	4.52	4.46	4.42	4.36	4.58	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	1	1	17	4.84	636/1407	4.81	4.77	4.69	4.57	4.84	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	0	0	3	2	13	4.56	513/1399	4.37	4.30	4.26	4.23	4.56	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	1	1	3	14	4.58	521/1400	4.48	4.35	4.27	4.19	4.58	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	3	0	0	1	5	11	4.59	218/1179	4.29	3.94	3.96	3.85	4.59	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	1	2	3	10	4.38	467/1262	4.38	4.18	4.05	3.77	4.38	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	0	1	4	11	4.63	489/1259	4.49	4.40	4.29	4.06	4.63	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	0	2	0	2	12	4.50	571/1256	4.62	4.34	4.30	4.08	4.50	
4. Were special techniques successful	6	7	0	0	3	4	2	3.89	492/ 788	4.02	4.03	4.00	3.80	3.89	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	20	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 246	****	4.26	4.20	3.93	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	20	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 249	****	4.08	4.11	3.95	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	20	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 242	****	4.45	4.40	4.33	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	20	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 240	****	4.37	4.20	4.20	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	20	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 217	****	4.42	4.04	4.02	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	20	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 68	****	4.66	4.49	4.54	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	20	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 69	****	4.26	4.53	4.18	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	20	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 63	****	4.24	4.44	4.17	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	20	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 69	****	4.19	4.35	4.14	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	20	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 68	****	3.98	3.92	3.80	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	20	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 59	****	3.92	4.30	4.00	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	20	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 51	****	4.04	4.00	3.44	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	20	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 36	****	5.00	4.60	5.00	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	20	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 41	****	3.68	4.26	****	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	20	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 31	****	3.50	4.42	****	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	20	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 55	****	3.90	4.55	4.48	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	20	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 31	****	4.28	4.75	4.42	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	20	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 51	****	4.42	4.65	4.63	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	20	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 34	****	4.50	4.83	4.67	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	20	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 24	****	4.50	4.82	4.58	****	

Course-Section: AFST 100 0101  
 Title INTRO BLACK EXPERIENCE  
 Instructor: WALLACE, BELIND  
 Enrollment: 30  
 Questionnaires: 22

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2006

Page 13  
 JUN 13, 2006  
 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	4	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	4	C	4	General	5	Under-grad	22	Non-major	12
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	1	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	5				
				?	0						

Course-Section: AFST 100 0201  
 Title INTRO BLACK EXPERIENCE  
 Instructor: TEMPLE, CHRISTE  
 Enrollment: 37  
 Questionnaires: 23

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2006

Page 14  
 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	1	0	2	7	13	4.35	739/1481	4.45	4.26	4.29	4.14	4.35	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	3	6	13	4.35	725/1481	4.42	4.26	4.23	4.18	4.35	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	0	6	5	11	4.09	861/1249	4.36	4.37	4.27	4.14	4.09	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	1	1	6	4	10	3.95	1023/1424	4.25	4.27	4.21	4.06	3.95	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	2	5	6	10	4.04	681/1396	4.27	4.07	3.98	3.89	4.04	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	2	4	6	4	6	3.36	1177/1342	3.58	4.12	4.07	3.88	3.36	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	3	6	5	7	3.64	1214/1459	4.12	4.19	4.16	4.17	3.64	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	2	6	15	4.57	1015/1480	4.54	4.64	4.68	4.64	4.57	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	0	3	10	5	4.11	771/1450	4.11	4.10	4.09	3.97	4.11	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	4	4	14	4.45	826/1409	4.52	4.46	4.42	4.36	4.45	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	2	1	20	4.78	766/1407	4.81	4.77	4.69	4.57	4.78	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	6	6	10	4.18	892/1399	4.37	4.30	4.26	4.23	4.18	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	1	2	6	12	4.38	729/1400	4.48	4.35	4.27	4.19	4.38	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	0	1	0	5	7	8	4.00	590/1179	4.29	3.94	3.96	3.85	4.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	3	8	12	4.39	447/1262	4.38	4.18	4.05	3.77	4.39	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	5	5	13	4.35	722/1259	4.49	4.40	4.29	4.06	4.35	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	1	4	18	4.74	382/1256	4.62	4.34	4.30	4.08	4.74	
4. Were special techniques successful	0	2	1	0	4	6	10	4.14	347/ 788	4.02	4.03	4.00	3.80	4.14	
Laboratory															
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	22	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 249	****	4.08	4.11	3.95	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 68	****	4.66	4.49	4.54	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 69	****	4.26	4.53	4.18	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 63	****	4.24	4.44	4.17	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 69	****	4.19	4.35	4.14	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 68	****	3.98	3.92	3.80	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 59	****	3.92	4.30	4.00	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 51	****	4.04	4.00	3.44	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 36	****	5.00	4.60	5.00	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	22	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 41	****	3.68	4.26	****	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 55	****	3.90	4.55	4.48	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 31	****	4.28	4.75	4.42	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	7	0.00-0.99	0	A 12	Required for Majors 13
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B 6	Graduate 0
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	4	C 1	Under-grad 23
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	2	D 0	Non-major 1
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F 0	Electives 0
				P 0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant

I	0	Other	3
?	0		

Course-Section: AFST 206 0101  
 Title AFRO-AMER HIST SURVEY  
 Instructor: SUTTON, KAREN E  
 Enrollment: 17  
 Questionnaires: 7

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2006

Page 15  
 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		
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	1	0	2	1	3	3.71	1277/1481	3.71	4.26	4.29	4.40	3.71
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	3	2	4.00	1000/1481	4.00	4.26	4.23	4.29	4.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	1	4	4.14	824/1249	4.14	4.37	4.27	4.36	4.14
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	2	1	2	2	3.57	1251/1424	3.57	4.27	4.21	4.28	3.57
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	1	3	2	3.86	839/1396	3.86	4.07	3.98	3.94	3.86
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	3	1	2	3.43	1155/1342	3.43	4.12	4.07	4.05	3.43
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	1	3	2	3.86	1086/1459	3.86	4.19	4.16	4.17	3.86
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	912/1480	4.71	4.64	4.68	4.68	4.71
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	0	3	1	4.25	630/1450	4.25	4.10	4.09	4.15	4.25
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	3	3	1	3.71	1261/1409	3.71	4.46	4.42	4.47	3.71
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	1	5	4.57	1053/1407	4.57	4.77	4.69	4.78	4.57
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	3	2	2	3.86	1120/1399	3.86	4.30	4.26	4.29	3.86
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	2	0	1	4	4.00	1017/1400	4.00	4.35	4.27	4.34	4.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	2	2	2	0	3.00	1041/1179	3.00	3.94	3.96	4.05	3.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	0	5	4.67	264/1262	4.67	4.18	4.05	4.11	4.67
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	276/1259	4.83	4.40	4.29	4.34	4.83
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	272/1256	4.83	4.34	4.30	4.28	4.83
4. Were special techniques successful	1	2	2	0	1	1	0	2.25	777/ 788	2.25	4.03	4.00	3.98	2.25

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	A 6	Required for Majors	2
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	B 1		Graduate
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	C 0	General	0
84-150	0	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	3
			? 0		

Course-Section: AFST 211 0101  
 Title INTRO TO CONTEMP AFRIC  
 Instructor: LAMOUSE-SMITH,  
 Enrollment: 54  
 Questionnaires: 28

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2006

Page 16  
 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	2	2	4	20	4.50	549/1481	4.50	4.26	4.29	4.40	4.50	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	4	9	4	10	3.64	1264/1481	3.64	4.26	4.23	4.29	3.64	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	3	1	5	3	16	4.00	893/1249	4.00	4.37	4.27	4.36	4.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	6	1	3	3	6	9	3.86	1116/1424	3.86	4.27	4.21	4.28	3.86	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	1	1	3	22	4.57	257/1396	4.57	4.07	3.98	3.94	4.57	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	11	0	3	2	4	7	3.94	845/1342	3.94	4.12	4.07	4.05	3.94	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	4	3	5	7	9	3.50	1256/1459	3.50	4.19	4.16	4.17	3.50	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	1	26	4.96	281/1480	4.96	4.64	4.68	4.68	4.96	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	7	2	2	1	3	5	8	3.84	1022/1450	3.84	4.10	4.09	4.15	3.84	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	2	3	9	13	4.22	1049/1409	4.22	4.46	4.42	4.47	4.22	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	2	3	22	4.74	842/1407	4.74	4.77	4.69	4.78	4.74	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	2	5	5	15	4.22	855/1399	4.22	4.30	4.26	4.29	4.22	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	2	2	4	6	13	3.96	1045/1400	3.96	4.35	4.27	4.34	3.96	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	2	0	4	5	16	4.22	464/1179	4.22	3.94	3.96	4.05	4.22	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	2	3	8	5	8	3.54	983/1262	3.54	4.18	4.05	4.11	3.54	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	2	6	3	5	10	3.58	1083/1259	3.58	4.40	4.29	4.34	3.58	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	4	2	6	6	8	3.46	1113/1256	3.46	4.34	4.30	4.28	3.46	
4. Were special techniques successful	2	20	1	1	1	1	2	3.33	****/ 788	****	4.03	4.00	3.98	****	
Laboratory															
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	27	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 249	****	4.08	4.11	4.32	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	4	0.00-0.99	0	A	9	Required for Majors	10	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	10						
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	3	C	3	General	4	Under-grad	28	Non-major	4
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	6	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	7	F	0	Electives	2	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	11				
				?	2						

Course-Section: AFST 212 0101  
 Title AFRICAN HISTORY  
 Instructor: LAMOUSE-SMITH,  
 Enrollment: 23  
 Questionnaires: 11

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2006

Page 17  
 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	1	1	9	4.73	328/1481	4.73	4.26	4.29	4.40	4.73	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	5	6	4.55	469/1481	4.55	4.26	4.23	4.29	4.55	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	0	2	8	4.55	460/1249	4.55	4.37	4.27	4.36	4.55	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	1	2	2	5	4.10	908/1424	4.10	4.27	4.21	4.28	4.10	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1396	5.00	4.07	3.98	3.94	5.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	2	0	2	1	5	3.70	1018/1342	3.70	4.12	4.07	4.05	3.70	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	4	7	4.64	310/1459	4.64	4.19	4.16	4.17	4.64	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	702/1480	4.90	4.64	4.68	4.68	4.90	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	0	6	2	4.25	630/1450	4.25	4.10	4.09	4.15	4.25	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	1	0	0	0	8	4.56	705/1409	4.56	4.46	4.42	4.47	4.56	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1407	5.00	4.77	4.69	4.78	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1399	5.00	4.30	4.26	4.29	5.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	166/1400	4.89	4.35	4.27	4.34	4.89	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	0	1	3	6	4.50	259/1179	4.50	3.94	3.96	4.05	4.50	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	0	0	1	7	4.44	400/1262	4.44	4.18	4.05	4.11	4.44	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	1	1	1	6	4.33	729/1259	4.33	4.40	4.29	4.34	4.33	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	332/1256	4.78	4.34	4.30	4.28	4.78	
4. Were special techniques successful	2	5	1	0	1	0	2	3.50	604/ 788	3.50	4.03	4.00	3.98	3.50	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	10	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 246	****	4.26	4.20	4.51	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	10	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 249	****	4.08	4.11	4.32	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	10	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 242	****	4.45	4.40	4.63	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	10	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 240	****	4.37	4.20	4.58	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	10	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 217	****	4.42	4.04	4.28	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	10	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 68	****	4.66	4.49	5.00	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	10	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 69	****	4.26	4.53	4.83	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 63	****	4.24	4.44	4.00	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 69	****	4.19	4.35	4.72	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	10	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 68	****	3.98	3.92	3.55	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 59	****	3.92	4.30	4.67	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	10	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 51	****	4.04	4.00	4.07	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	10	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 36	****	5.00	4.60	4.64	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	10	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 41	****	3.68	4.26	4.69	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	10	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 31	****	3.50	4.42	4.80	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 55	****	3.90	4.55	4.44	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	10	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 31	****	4.28	4.75	4.50	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	10	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 51	****	4.42	4.65	4.66	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	10	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 34	****	4.50	4.83	4.43	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	10	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 24	****	4.50	4.82	5.00	****	

Course-Section: AFST 212 0101  
 Title AFRICAN HISTORY  
 Instructor: LAMOUSE-SMITH,  
 Enrollment: 23  
 Questionnaires: 11

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2006

Page 17  
 JUN 13, 2006  
 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	4	Required for Majors	5	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	3						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	1	C	1	General	1	Under-grad	11	Non-major	2
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	0	F	0	Electives	4	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	1						



Course-Section: AFST 245 0101  
 Title INTRO TO BLACK MUSIC  
 Instructor: DALILI, EFIA  
 Enrollment: 22  
 Questionnaires: 14

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2006

Page 18  
 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	4	7	4.29	805/1481	4.29	4.26	4.29	4.40	4.29	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	6	5	4.14	925/1481	4.14	4.26	4.23	4.29	4.14	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	3	8	4.36	663/1249	4.36	4.37	4.27	4.36	4.36	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	1	4	8	4.54	406/1424	4.54	4.27	4.21	4.28	4.54	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	2	4	7	4.21	536/1396	4.21	4.07	3.98	3.94	4.21	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	3	3	7	4.14	649/1342	4.14	4.12	4.07	4.05	4.14	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	1	2	2	8	4.31	732/1459	4.31	4.19	4.16	4.17	4.31	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	12	2	4.14	1295/1480	4.14	4.64	4.68	4.68	4.14	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	1	0	0	2	4	3	4.11	771/1450	4.11	4.10	4.09	4.15	4.11	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	3	5	6	4.21	1055/1409	4.21	4.46	4.42	4.47	4.21	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	3	10	4.64	986/1407	4.64	4.77	4.69	4.78	4.64	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	3	5	6	4.21	864/1399	4.21	4.30	4.26	4.29	4.21	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	3	5	6	4.21	898/1400	4.21	4.35	4.27	4.34	4.21	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	1	4	9	4.57	223/1179	4.57	3.94	3.96	4.05	4.57	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	236/1262	4.71	4.18	4.05	4.11	4.71	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	257/1259	4.86	4.40	4.29	4.34	4.86	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	406/1256	4.71	4.34	4.30	4.28	4.71	
4. Were special techniques successful	7	1	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	176/ 788	4.50	4.03	4.00	3.98	4.50	
Laboratory															
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	13	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 249	****	4.08	4.11	4.32	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	13	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 68	****	4.66	4.49	5.00	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	13	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 69	****	4.26	4.53	4.83	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 63	****	4.24	4.44	4.00	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 69	****	4.19	4.35	4.72	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 68	****	3.98	3.92	3.55	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	13	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 59	****	3.92	4.30	4.67	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	13	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 51	****	4.04	4.00	4.07	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 55	****	3.90	4.55	4.44	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 31	****	4.28	4.75	4.50	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 51	****	4.42	4.65	4.66	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 34	****	4.50	4.83	4.43	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 24	****	4.50	4.82	5.00	****	

Frequency Distribution

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

P	0			responses to be significant
I	0	Other	5	
?	0			

Course-Section: AFST 260 0101  
 Title BLACK LITERATURE TO 19  
 Instructor: PETERS, JONATHA  
 Enrollment: 29  
 Questionnaires: 19

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2006

Page 19  
 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	4	7	1	5	3.16	1434/1481	3.16	4.26	4.29	4.40	3.16	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	4	5	6	3	1	2.58	1466/1481	2.58	4.26	4.23	4.29	2.58	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	1	1	3	5	7	2	3.33	1147/1249	3.33	4.37	4.27	4.36	3.33	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	1	3	6	7	1	3.22	1339/1424	3.22	4.27	4.21	4.28	3.22	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	2	2	8	6	3.84	846/1396	3.84	4.07	3.98	3.94	3.84	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	2	8	6	2	3.32	1192/1342	3.32	4.12	4.07	4.05	3.32	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	7	3	5	2	2	2.42	1432/1459	2.42	4.19	4.16	4.17	2.42	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	1	0	0	0	6	11	4.65	966/1480	4.65	4.64	4.68	4.68	4.65	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	2	1	5	4	4	1	2.93	1376/1450	2.93	4.10	4.09	4.15	2.93	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	8	3	3	4	1	2.32	1401/1409	2.32	4.46	4.42	4.47	2.32	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	4	3	12	4.42	1168/1407	4.42	4.77	4.69	4.78	4.42	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	4	3	4	6	1	2.83	1354/1399	2.83	4.30	4.26	4.29	2.83	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	4	1	4	7	2	3.11	1306/1400	3.11	4.35	4.27	4.34	3.11	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	1	4	1	1	7	4	3.35	964/1179	3.35	3.94	3.96	4.05	3.35	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	4	1	3	4	3	3.07	1138/1262	3.07	4.18	4.05	4.11	3.07	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	3	3	3	6	3.80	1027/1259	3.80	4.40	4.29	4.34	3.80	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	1	5	4	5	3.87	1000/1256	3.87	4.34	4.30	4.28	3.87	
4. Were special techniques successful	4	4	2	3	3	1	2	2.82	739/ 788	2.82	4.03	4.00	3.98	2.82	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	4	0.00-0.99 1	A 2	Required for Majors 10	Graduate 0 Major 0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99 0	B 12		
56-83	2	2.00-2.99 3	C 2	General 3	Under-grad 19 Non-major 10
84-150	1	3.00-3.49 1	D 0		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 1	F 0	Electives 0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 3	
			? 0		

Course-Section: AFST 301 0101  
 Title RSRCH DESIGN/DOCUMENTA  
 Instructor: ROBINSON, THOMA  
 Enrollment: 7  
 Questionnaires: 5

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2006

Page 20  
 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	0	0	5	5.00	1/1481	5.00	4.26	4.29	4.29	5.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1481	5.00	4.26	4.23	4.23	5.00	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1249	5.00	4.37	4.27	4.28	5.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1424	5.00	4.27	4.21	4.27	5.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	111/1396	4.80	4.07	3.98	4.00	4.80	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	135/1342	4.75	4.12	4.07	4.12	4.75	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1459	5.00	4.19	4.16	4.17	5.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1480	5.00	4.64	4.68	4.65	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	164/1450	4.75	4.10	4.09	4.10	4.75	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1409	5.00	4.46	4.42	4.43	5.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1407	5.00	4.77	4.69	4.67	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1399	5.00	4.30	4.26	4.27	5.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1400	5.00	4.35	4.27	4.28	5.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	1	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	177/1179	4.67	3.94	3.96	4.02	4.67	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1262	5.00	4.18	4.05	4.14	5.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1259	5.00	4.40	4.29	4.34	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1256	5.00	4.34	4.30	4.34	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	0	4	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 788	****	4.03	4.00	4.07	****	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: AFST 314 0101  
 Title ISLAM IN AFRICA  
 Instructor: LAMOUSE-SMITH,  
 Enrollment: 32  
 Questionnaires: 13

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2006

Page 21  
 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	1	5	3	3	3.46	1369/1481	3.46	4.26	4.29	4.29	3.46	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	1	5	2	4	3.54	1309/1481	3.54	4.26	4.23	4.23	3.54	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	3	6	1	3	3.31	1153/1249	3.31	4.37	4.27	4.28	3.31	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	3	5	1	3	3.15	1348/1424	3.15	4.27	4.21	4.27	3.15	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	1	5	3	2	3.15	1245/1396	3.15	4.07	3.98	4.00	3.15	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	2	0	6	2	2	3.17	1234/1342	3.17	4.12	4.07	4.12	3.17	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	0	4	1	7	4.00	961/1459	4.00	4.19	4.16	4.17	4.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	1	0	11	4.83	797/1480	4.83	4.64	4.68	4.65	4.83	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	1	4	5	1	3.55	1209/1450	3.55	4.10	4.09	4.10	3.55	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	4	5	3	3.92	1211/1409	3.92	4.46	4.42	4.43	3.92	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	1	3	8	4.58	1046/1407	4.58	4.77	4.69	4.67	4.58	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	1	5	2	4	3.75	1163/1399	3.75	4.30	4.26	4.27	3.75	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	6	2	3	3.58	1209/1400	3.58	4.35	4.27	4.28	3.58	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	1	1	0	1	5	4	4.00	590/1179	4.00	3.94	3.96	4.02	4.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	1	3	4	3	3.82	855/1262	3.82	4.18	4.05	4.14	3.82	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	2	3	6	4.36	708/1259	4.36	4.40	4.29	4.34	4.36	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	3	3	5	4.18	815/1256	4.18	4.34	4.30	4.34	4.18	
4. Were special techniques successful	3	6	0	1	2	0	1	3.25	690/ 788	3.25	4.03	4.00	4.07	3.25	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: AFST 352 0101  
 Title AFAM HISTORY TO 1865  
 Instructor: MCANDREW, JENNI  
 Enrollment: 9  
 Questionnaires: 4

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2006

Page 22  
 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	1	0	3	4.50	549/1481	4.50	4.26	4.29	4.29	4.50	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	1	4.25	822/1481	4.25	4.26	4.23	4.23	4.25	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	245/1249	4.75	4.37	4.27	4.28	4.75	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	740/1424	4.25	4.27	4.21	4.27	4.25	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	297/1396	4.50	4.07	3.98	4.00	4.50	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	2	0	1	3.67	1039/1342	3.67	4.12	4.07	4.12	3.67	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	0	0	3	4.25	775/1459	4.25	4.19	4.16	4.17	4.25	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1480	5.00	4.64	4.68	4.65	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	1	0	0	1	1	3.33	1285/1450	3.33	4.10	4.09	4.10	3.33	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	762/1409	4.50	4.46	4.42	4.43	4.50	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1407	5.00	4.77	4.69	4.67	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	267/1399	4.75	4.30	4.26	4.27	4.75	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	312/1400	4.75	4.35	4.27	4.28	4.75	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	3	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1179	5.00	3.94	3.96	4.02	5.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	205/1262	4.75	4.18	4.05	4.14	4.75	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1259	5.00	4.40	4.29	4.34	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1256	5.00	4.34	4.30	4.34	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	105/ 788	4.75	4.03	4.00	4.07	4.75	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 246	5.00	4.26	4.20	4.20	5.00	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 249	5.00	4.08	4.11	4.23	5.00	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 242	5.00	4.45	4.40	4.36	5.00	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 240	5.00	4.37	4.20	3.96	5.00	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 217	5.00	4.42	4.04	4.11	5.00	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 68	5.00	4.66	4.49	4.70	5.00	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 69	5.00	4.26	4.53	4.66	5.00	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 63	5.00	4.24	4.44	4.56	5.00	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 69	5.00	4.19	4.35	4.48	5.00	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 68	5.00	3.98	3.92	4.43	5.00	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 59	5.00	3.92	4.30	4.48	5.00	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 51	5.00	4.04	4.00	4.13	5.00	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 36	5.00	5.00	4.60	4.33	5.00	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 41	5.00	3.68	4.26	3.90	5.00	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 31	5.00	3.50	4.42	4.00	5.00	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 55	5.00	3.90	4.55	4.88	5.00	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 31	5.00	4.28	4.75	4.67	5.00	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 51	5.00	4.42	4.65	4.88	5.00	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 34	5.00	4.50	4.83	4.67	5.00	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 24	5.00	4.50	4.82	4.67	5.00	

Course-Section: AFST 352 0101  
 Title AFAM HISTORY TO 1865  
 Instructor: MCANDREW, JENNI  
 Enrollment: 9  
 Questionnaires: 4

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2006

Page 22  
 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	1	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	1						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	0	C	1	General	3	Under-grad	4	Non-major	2
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	1						

Course-Section: AFST 362 0101  
 Title STUDIES IN BLACK POETR  
 Instructor: PETERS, JONATHA  
 Enrollment: 29  
 Questionnaires: 15

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2006

Page 23  
 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	3	0	7	2	2	3.00	1451/1481	3.00	4.26	4.29	4.29	3.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	3	3	6	0	1	2.46	1472/1481	2.46	4.26	4.23	4.23	2.46	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	6	2	0	3	0	3	3.25	1163/1249	3.25	4.37	4.27	4.28	3.25	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	1	2	6	4	0	1	2.38	1419/1424	2.38	4.27	4.21	4.27	2.38	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	3	1	5	1	4	3.14	1250/1396	3.14	4.07	3.98	4.00	3.14	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	4	3	5	2	0	2.36	1334/1342	2.36	4.12	4.07	4.12	2.36	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	1	6	3	2	0	1	1.92	1446/1459	1.92	4.19	4.16	4.17	1.92	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	1	0	0	6	4	3	3.77	1438/1480	3.77	4.64	4.68	4.65	3.77	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	4	1	2	2	1	2.50	1429/1450	2.50	4.10	4.09	4.10	2.50	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	5	3	4	1	1	2.29	1402/1409	2.29	4.46	4.42	4.43	2.29	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	1	1	0	4	8	4.21	1272/1407	4.21	4.77	4.69	4.67	4.21	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	5	1	5	2	0	2.31	1394/1399	2.31	4.30	4.26	4.27	2.31	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	3	5	2	2	1	2.46	1368/1400	2.46	4.35	4.27	4.28	2.46	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	2	6	2	2	0	1	1.91	1172/1179	1.91	3.94	3.96	4.02	1.91	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	4	1	3	1	2	2.64	1209/1262	2.64	4.18	4.05	4.14	2.64	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	3	2	3	1	2	2.73	1215/1259	2.73	4.40	4.29	4.34	2.73	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	3	1	3	1	3	3.00	1167/1256	3.00	4.34	4.30	4.34	3.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	4	3	3	0	3	1	1	2.63	753/ 788	2.63	4.03	4.00	4.07	2.63	
Laboratory															
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	14	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 249	****	4.08	4.11	4.23	****	

Frequency Distribution

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



Course-Section: AFST 370 0101  
 Title BLK WOMEN:CROSS-CULT P  
 Instructor: TEMPLE, CHRISTE  
 Enrollment: 36  
 Questionnaires: 25

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2006

Page 24  
 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	2	9	13	4.46	613/1481	4.46	4.26	4.29	4.29	4.46	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	1	7	9	7	3.92	1106/1481	3.92	4.26	4.23	4.23	3.92	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	2	1	2	6	6	7	3.73	1061/1249	3.73	4.37	4.27	4.28	3.73	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	1	1	7	5	10	3.92	1074/1424	3.92	4.27	4.21	4.27	3.92	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	7	16	4.63	225/1396	4.63	4.07	3.98	4.00	4.63	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	2	1	12	9	4.17	626/1342	4.17	4.12	4.07	4.12	4.17	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	3	7	5	8	3.67	1201/1459	3.67	4.19	4.16	4.17	3.67	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	4	17	3	3.96	1384/1480	3.96	4.64	4.68	4.65	3.96	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	2	2	5	12	4.29	599/1450	4.29	4.10	4.09	4.10	4.29	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	0	1	2	7	11	4.33	968/1409	4.33	4.46	4.42	4.43	4.33	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	5	0	0	0	0	0	20	5.00	1/1407	5.00	4.77	4.69	4.67	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	6	0	0	1	1	10	7	4.21	864/1399	4.21	4.30	4.26	4.27	4.21	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	1	1	4	13	4.53	571/1400	4.53	4.35	4.27	4.28	4.53	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	6	0	0	1	1	9	8	4.26	434/1179	4.26	3.94	3.96	4.02	4.26	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	1	0	5	14	4.60	295/1262	4.60	4.18	4.05	4.14	4.60	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	1	3	2	14	4.45	643/1259	4.45	4.40	4.29	4.34	4.45	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	1	1	1	2	15	4.45	636/1256	4.45	4.34	4.30	4.34	4.45	
4. Were special techniques successful	5	6	0	2	2	5	5	3.93	468/ 788	3.93	4.03	4.00	4.07	3.93	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99 0	A 10	Required for Majors 6	Graduate 0 Major 0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99 0	B 12		
56-83	4	2.00-2.99 4	C 0	General 3	Under-grad 25 Non-major 2
84-150	9	3.00-3.49 5	D 0		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 6	F 0	Electives 3	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 10	
			? 2		

Course-Section: AFST 390 0101  
 Title AMER HLTH CARE & BLK C  
 Instructor: REEDER, IRMA C  
 Enrollment: 18  
 Questionnaires: 12

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2006

Page 25  
 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	0	4	8	4.67	395/1481	4.67	4.26	4.29	4.29	4.67	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	1	9	4.73	255/1481	4.73	4.26	4.23	4.23	4.73	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	0	1	10	4.67	334/1249	4.67	4.37	4.27	4.28	4.67	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	0	0	2	9	4.50	437/1424	4.50	4.27	4.21	4.27	4.50	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	0	3	8	4.42	371/1396	4.42	4.07	3.98	4.00	4.42	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	1	3	7	4.33	474/1342	4.33	4.12	4.07	4.12	4.33	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	3	8	4.58	367/1459	4.58	4.19	4.16	4.17	4.58	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	5	7	4.58	1006/1480	4.58	4.64	4.68	4.65	4.58	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	1	0	1	5	3	3.90	973/1450	3.90	4.10	4.09	4.10	3.90	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	2	9	4.82	319/1409	4.82	4.46	4.42	4.43	4.82	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	500/1407	4.91	4.77	4.69	4.67	4.91	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	1	1	9	4.73	300/1399	4.73	4.30	4.26	4.27	4.73	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	2	9	4.82	239/1400	4.82	4.35	4.27	4.28	4.82	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	7	1	0	2	0	1	3.00	1041/1179	3.00	3.94	3.96	4.02	3.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	1	0	2	5	4.38	467/1262	4.38	4.18	4.05	4.14	4.38	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	0	1	1	6	4.63	489/1259	4.63	4.40	4.29	4.34	4.63	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	1	0	0	7	4.63	496/1256	4.63	4.34	4.30	4.34	4.63	
4. Were special techniques successful	4	2	0	0	1	2	3	4.33	254/ 788	4.33	4.03	4.00	4.07	4.33	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: AFST 440 0101  
 Title TOPICS AFST STUDIES  
 Instructor: KING, SHARON  
 Enrollment: 20  
 Questionnaires: 13

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2006

Page 26  
 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	0	10	4.54	522/1481	4.54	4.26	4.29	4.45	4.54	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	3	3	6	4.08	971/1481	4.08	4.26	4.23	4.32	4.08	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	0	4	8	4.46	548/1249	4.46	4.37	4.27	4.44	4.46	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	3	4	5	4.00	959/1424	4.00	4.27	4.21	4.35	4.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	0	3	9	4.54	280/1396	4.54	4.07	3.98	4.09	4.54	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	2	2	0	2	6	3.67	1039/1342	3.67	4.12	4.07	4.21	3.67	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	0	1	6	5	4.08	924/1459	4.08	4.19	4.16	4.25	4.08	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	4	9	4.69	928/1480	4.69	4.64	4.68	4.74	4.69	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	0	5	5	4.50	334/1450	4.50	4.10	4.09	4.28	4.50	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	2	1	4	5	4.00	1152/1409	4.00	4.46	4.42	4.51	4.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	1	1	10	4.75	823/1407	4.75	4.77	4.69	4.79	4.75	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	1	2	2	7	4.25	828/1399	4.25	4.30	4.26	4.36	4.25	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	2	3	7	4.42	692/1400	4.42	4.35	4.27	4.38	4.42	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	1	1	0	4	6	4.08	563/1179	4.08	3.94	3.96	4.07	4.08	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	1	1	10	4.54	330/1262	4.54	4.18	4.05	4.33	4.54	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	2	1	10	4.62	499/1259	4.62	4.40	4.29	4.57	4.62	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	1	1	11	4.77	345/1256	4.77	4.34	4.30	4.60	4.77	
4. Were special techniques successful	1	1	1	0	0	4	6	4.27	282/ 788	4.27	4.03	4.00	4.26	4.27	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 59	****	3.92	4.30	4.93	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	11	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 51	****	4.04	4.00	4.56	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	11	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 36	****	5.00	4.60	4.91	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	11	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 41	****	3.68	4.26	4.72	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	11	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 31	****	3.50	4.42	4.83	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	A 8	Required for Majors	3
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	B 2		Graduate 0
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	C 1	General	2
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad 13
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	3
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	3
			? 0		

Course-Section: AFST 495 0101  
 Title FIELD RESEARCH AFR STU  
 Instructor: ROBINSON, THOMA  
 Enrollment: 15  
 Questionnaires: 11

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2006

Page 27  
 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	1	5	5	4.36	718/1481	4.36	4.26	4.29	4.45	4.36	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	1	9	4.73	255/1481	4.73	4.26	4.23	4.32	4.73	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	3	7	4.55	460/1249	4.55	4.37	4.27	4.44	4.55	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	2	4	4	4.20	807/1424	4.20	4.27	4.21	4.35	4.20	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	1	1	1	7	4.09	649/1396	4.09	4.07	3.98	4.09	4.09	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	3	1	0	2	1	4	3.88	905/1342	3.88	4.12	4.07	4.21	3.88	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	0	10	4.82	155/1459	4.82	4.19	4.16	4.25	4.82	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1480	5.00	4.64	4.68	4.74	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	1	0	0	0	5	2	4.29	599/1450	4.29	4.10	4.09	4.28	4.29	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	2	1	8	4.55	716/1409	4.55	4.46	4.42	4.51	4.55	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	2	8	4.64	997/1407	4.64	4.77	4.69	4.79	4.64	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	1	9	4.73	300/1399	4.73	4.30	4.26	4.36	4.73	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	3	6	4.36	754/1400	4.36	4.35	4.27	4.38	4.36	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	3	0	0	4	1	3	3.88	712/1179	3.88	3.94	3.96	4.07	3.88	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	2	3	3	4.13	659/1262	4.13	4.18	4.05	4.33	4.13	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	358/1259	4.75	4.40	4.29	4.57	4.75	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	2	1	5	4.38	698/1256	4.38	4.34	4.30	4.60	4.38	
4. Were special techniques successful	3	5	0	0	2	0	1	3.67	564/ 788	3.67	4.03	4.00	4.26	3.67	

Frequency Distribution

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