

Course-Section: AFST 100 0101
 Title INTRO BLACK EXPERIENCE
 Instructor: MACK-SHELTON, K
 Enrollment: 27
 Questionnaires: 16

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2008

Page 23
 AUG 6, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean		
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5						Mean	Rank

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	1	15	4.94	144/1670	4.46	4.60	4.31	4.23	4.94
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	13	4.81	250/1666	4.38	4.48	4.27	4.30	4.81
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	15	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1406	4.23	4.55	4.32	4.31	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	4	11	4.63	423/1615	4.34	4.47	4.24	4.17	4.63
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	4	12	4.75	226/1566	4.46	4.56	4.07	4.03	4.75
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	5	11	4.69	285/1528	4.34	4.45	4.12	4.00	4.69
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	3	12	4.69	338/1650	4.27	4.27	4.22	4.28	4.69
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	1	6	9	4.50	1157/1667	4.45	4.64	4.67	4.61	4.50
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	3	13	4.81	161/1626	4.23	4.36	4.11	4.07	4.81
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	16	5.00	1/1559	4.37	4.62	4.46	4.47	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	16	5.00	1/1560	4.70	4.91	4.72	4.68	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	1	15	4.94	141/1549	4.41	4.55	4.31	4.32	4.94
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	15	4.94	162/1546	4.41	4.68	4.32	4.32	4.94
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	1	2	4	9	4.31	498/1323	4.42	4.19	4.00	3.91	4.31
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	0	3	12	4.63	356/1384	4.44	4.58	4.10	3.92	4.63
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	1	0	15	4.88	274/1378	4.64	4.73	4.29	4.09	4.88
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	0	16	5.00	1/1378	4.69	4.69	4.31	4.08	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	0	9	5	2	0	0	0	1.29	898/ 904	3.38	3.97	4.03	3.94	1.29

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors				
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	A 6	Required for Majors	11	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	B 6						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	C 4	General	2	Under-grad	16	Non-major	15
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	D 0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
			P 0						
			I 0	Other	2				
			? 0						

Course-Section: AFST 100 0201
 Title INTRO BLACK EXPERIENCE
 Instructor: SUTTON, KAREN E
 Enrollment: 38
 Questionnaires: 22

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2008

Page 24
 AUG 6, 2008
 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	5	2	2	4	9	3.45	1551/1670	4.46	4.60	4.31	4.23	3.45
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	4	3	5	2	8	3.32	1570/1666	4.38	4.48	4.27	4.30	3.32
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	4	1	4	7	6	3.45	1291/1406	4.23	4.55	4.32	4.31	3.45
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	2	2	6	8	3	3.38	1500/1615	4.34	4.47	4.24	4.17	3.38
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	2	4	7	7	3.68	1190/1566	4.46	4.56	4.07	4.03	3.68
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	2	2	2	6	5	5	3.45	1301/1528	4.34	4.45	4.12	4.00	3.45
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	3	3	5	6	5	3.32	1527/1650	4.27	4.27	4.22	4.28	3.32
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	1	2	10	9	4.23	1388/1667	4.45	4.64	4.67	4.61	4.23
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	0	3	2	7	2	2	2.88	1564/1626	4.23	4.36	4.11	4.07	2.88
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	5	3	3	3	6	3.10	1515/1559	4.37	4.62	4.46	4.47	3.10
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	2	0	0	10	8	4.10	1461/1560	4.70	4.91	4.72	4.68	4.10
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	5	2	3	2	8	3.30	1449/1549	4.41	4.55	4.31	4.32	3.30
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	6	1	2	3	8	3.30	1432/1546	4.41	4.68	4.32	4.32	3.30
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	0	2	1	1	5	9	4.00	692/1323	4.42	4.19	4.00	3.91	4.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	3	1	1	4	8	3.76	992/1384	4.44	4.58	4.10	3.92	3.76
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	1	3	7	6	4.06	951/1378	4.64	4.73	4.29	4.09	4.06
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	1	1	4	1	10	4.06	962/1378	4.69	4.69	4.31	4.08	4.06
4. Were special techniques successful	5	4	2	0	2	3	6	3.85	591/ 904	3.38	3.97	4.03	3.94	3.85
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	18	1	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/ 232	****	****	4.19	4.25	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	19	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/ 239	****	****	4.21	4.35	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	19	1	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 230	****	****	4.44	4.58	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 231	****	****	4.31	4.45	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	20	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 218	****	****	4.18	4.47	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	20	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 87	****	3.75	4.65	4.67	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	20	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 79	****	4.25	4.64	4.72	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	20	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 75	****	4.00	4.57	4.46	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 79	****	3.80	4.45	4.59	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	20	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/ 80	****	3.40	3.97	3.99	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/ 41	****	4.33	4.50	3.91	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	19	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 38	****	3.60	4.19	4.07	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	19	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 38	****	3.60	4.62	4.63	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	19	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 39	****	4.00	4.27	4.42	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	19	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 31	****	4.00	4.47	4.28	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	20	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 28	****	4.00	4.64	4.59	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	20	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 16	****	****	4.67	4.83	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	20	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 27	****	3.25	4.54	4.46	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	20	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 10	****	****	4.84	4.75	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	20	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 6	****	****	4.92	4.83	****

Course-Section: AFST 100 0201
 Title INTRO BLACK EXPERIENCE
 Instructor: SUTTON, KAREN E
 Enrollment: 38
 Questionnaires: 22

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2008

Page 24
 AUG 6, 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	3	Required for Majors	9	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	9						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	4	C	2	General	2	Under-grad	22	Non-major	22
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	1	D	1						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	0	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	1				
				?	0						

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	0	0	0	0	16	5.00	1/1670	4.46	4.60	4.31	4.23	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	16	5.00	1/1666	4.38	4.48	4.27	4.30	5.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	16	5.00	1/1406	4.23	4.55	4.32	4.31	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	16	5.00	1/1615	4.34	4.47	4.24	4.17	5.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	15	4.94	92/1566	4.46	4.56	4.07	4.03	4.94
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	14	4.88	136/1528	4.34	4.45	4.12	4.00	4.88
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	3	13	4.81	222/1650	4.27	4.27	4.22	4.28	4.81
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	6	10	4.63	1062/1667	4.45	4.64	4.67	4.61	4.63
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	0	0	13	5.00	1/1626	4.23	4.36	4.11	4.07	5.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	16	5.00	1/1559	4.37	4.62	4.46	4.47	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	16	5.00	1/1560	4.70	4.91	4.72	4.68	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	0	16	5.00	1/1549	4.41	4.55	4.31	4.32	5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	16	5.00	1/1546	4.41	4.68	4.32	4.32	5.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	0	1	15	4.94	83/1323	4.42	4.19	4.00	3.91	4.94
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	1	13	4.93	135/1384	4.44	4.58	4.10	3.92	4.93
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	0	0	14	5.00	1/1378	4.64	4.73	4.29	4.09	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	0	0	14	5.00	1/1378	4.69	4.69	4.31	4.08	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	2	1	0	0	0	0	13	5.00	1/ 904	3.38	3.97	4.03	3.94	5.00
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 87	****	3.75	4.65	4.67	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 79	****	4.25	4.64	4.72	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 75	****	4.00	4.57	4.46	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 79	****	3.80	4.45	4.59	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 80	****	3.40	3.97	3.99	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 41	****	4.33	4.50	3.91	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	14	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 38	****	3.60	4.19	4.07	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	14	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 38	****	3.60	4.62	4.63	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	14	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 39	****	4.00	4.27	4.42	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	14	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 31	****	4.00	4.47	4.28	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 28	****	4.00	4.64	4.59	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 16	****	****	4.67	4.83	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 27	****	3.25	4.54	4.46	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 10	****	****	4.84	4.75	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 6	****	****	4.92	4.83	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors					
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	0	A 13	Required for Majors	4	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	B 1						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	1	C 0	General	7	Under-grad	16	Non-major	16
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D 0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F 0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough			

P	0			responses to be significant
I	0	Other	2	
?	0			

Course-Section: AFST 201 0101
 Title INTRO METHODS/RSRCH AF
 Instructor: ROBINSON, THOMA
 Enrollment: 8
 Questionnaires: 7

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2008

Page 26
 AUG 6, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					5	Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	Mean		Rank						

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	253/1670	4.86	4.60	4.31	4.32	4.86	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1666	5.00	4.48	4.27	4.27	5.00	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1406	5.00	4.55	4.32	4.39	5.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	290/1615	4.75	4.47	4.24	4.29	4.75	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1566	5.00	4.56	4.07	4.00	5.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	3	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1528	5.00	4.45	4.12	4.11	5.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	194/1650	4.86	4.27	4.22	4.20	4.86	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1667	5.00	4.64	4.67	4.64	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	239/1626	4.71	4.36	4.11	4.06	4.71	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1559	5.00	4.62	4.46	4.40	5.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1560	5.00	4.91	4.72	4.73	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1549	5.00	4.55	4.31	4.25	5.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1546	5.00	4.68	4.32	4.30	5.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	1	0	0	1	0	5	4.67	235/1323	4.67	4.19	4.00	4.08	4.67	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	195/1384	4.86	4.58	4.10	4.07	4.86	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	295/1378	4.86	4.73	4.29	4.25	4.86	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	333/1378	4.86	4.69	4.31	4.26	4.86	
4. Were special techniques successful	0	3	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	146/ 904	4.75	3.97	4.03	4.01	4.75	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 87	****	3.75	4.65	5.00	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 79	****	4.25	4.64	4.75	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 79	****	3.80	4.45	3.95	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 80	****	3.40	3.97	4.30	****	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: AFST 211 0101
 Title INTRO TO CONTEMP AFRIC
 Instructor: BADRU, LATEEF
 Enrollment: 50
 Questionnaires: 26

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2008

Page 27
 AUG 6, 2008
 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	2	0	2	0	3	5	14	4.21	1049/1670	4.21	4.60	4.31	4.32	4.21
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	2	2	4	8	8	3.75	1409/1666	3.75	4.48	4.27	4.27	3.75
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	5	2	1	4	3	9	3.84	1164/1406	3.84	4.55	4.32	4.39	3.84
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	1	1	2	2	10	8	3.96	1158/1615	3.96	4.47	4.24	4.29	3.96
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	1	4	1	3	4	11	3.74	1159/1566	3.74	4.56	4.07	4.00	3.74
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	0	3	0	2	7	12	4.04	876/1528	4.04	4.45	4.12	4.11	4.04
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	5	4	4	3	8	3.21	1553/1650	3.21	4.27	4.22	4.20	3.21
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	2	20	2	4.00	1524/1667	4.00	4.64	4.67	4.64	4.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	1	0	5	8	7	3.95	1038/1626	3.95	4.36	4.11	4.06	3.95
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	3	3	17	4.61	772/1559	4.61	4.62	4.46	4.40	4.61
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	0	0	1	21	4.95	298/1560	4.95	4.91	4.72	4.73	4.95
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	1	2	2	6	11	4.09	1108/1549	4.09	4.55	4.31	4.25	4.09
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	2	0	1	5	14	4.32	939/1546	4.32	4.68	4.32	4.30	4.32
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	1	1	3	2	6	9	3.90	820/1323	3.90	4.19	4.00	4.08	3.90
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	1	1	3	2	14	4.29	651/1384	4.29	4.58	4.10	4.07	4.29
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	1	1	2	2	15	4.38	740/1378	4.38	4.73	4.29	4.25	4.38
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	2	1	0	5	13	4.24	877/1378	4.24	4.69	4.31	4.26	4.24
4. Were special techniques successful	5	11	3	1	3	1	2	2.80	852/ 904	2.80	3.97	4.03	4.01	2.80
Laboratory														
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	25	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 239	****	****	4.21	4.33	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	25	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 230	****	****	4.44	4.61	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	25	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 231	****	****	4.31	4.52	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	25	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 218	****	****	4.18	4.25	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	24	0	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/ 87	****	3.75	4.65	5.00	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	24	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 79	****	4.25	4.64	4.75	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	24	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 75	****	4.00	4.57	4.25	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	24	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 79	****	3.80	4.45	3.95	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	24	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 80	****	3.40	3.97	4.30	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	25	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 41	****	4.33	4.50	2.00	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	25	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 38	****	3.60	4.19	2.50	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	25	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 38	****	3.60	4.62	4.50	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	25	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 39	****	4.00	4.27	4.00	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	25	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 31	****	4.00	4.47	4.00	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	24	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 28	****	4.00	4.64	****	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	25	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 16	****	****	4.67	****	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	24	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 27	****	3.25	4.54	****	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	24	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 10	****	****	4.84	****	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	24	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/ 6	****	****	4.92	****	****

Course-Section: AFST 211 0101
 Title INTRO TO CONTEMP AFRIC
 Instructor: BADRU, LATEEF
 Enrollment: 50
 Questionnaires: 26

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2008

Page 27
 AUG 6, 2008
 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	15	Required for Majors	10	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	5	1.00-1.99	0	B	6						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	3	C	0	General	3	Under-grad	26	Non-major	26
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	5	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	6				
				?	0						

Course-Section: AFST 215 0101
 Title INTRO TO AFRICAN DANCE
 Instructor: ANSAHBREW, KWAM
 Enrollment: 13
 Questionnaires: 12

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2008

Page 28
 AUG 6, 2008
 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	1	0	1	10	4.67	479/1670	4.67	4.60	4.31	4.32	4.67
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	1	1	0	3	6	4.09	1142/1666	4.09	4.48	4.27	4.27	4.09
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	8	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1406	5.00	4.55	4.32	4.39	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	6	1	0	0	1	4	4.17	972/1615	4.17	4.47	4.24	4.29	4.17
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	10	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1566	****	4.56	4.07	4.00	****
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	2	0	1	1	7	4.00	899/1528	4.00	4.45	4.12	4.11	4.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	3	1	0	1	3	4	4.00	1135/1650	4.00	4.27	4.22	4.20	4.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	6	6	4.50	1157/1667	4.50	4.64	4.67	4.64	4.50
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	2	3	4	4.22	762/1626	4.22	4.36	4.11	4.06	4.22
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	6	0	0	0	1	0	5	4.67	673/1559	4.67	4.62	4.46	4.40	4.67
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	5	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1560	5.00	4.91	4.72	4.73	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	6	0	0	1	0	1	4	4.33	900/1549	4.33	4.55	4.31	4.25	4.33
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1546	5.00	4.68	4.32	4.30	5.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	5	1	2	0	1	1	2	3.17	1155/1323	3.17	4.19	4.00	4.08	3.17
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	670/1384	4.25	4.58	4.10	4.07	4.25
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1378	5.00	4.73	4.29	4.25	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	653/1378	4.50	4.69	4.31	4.26	4.50
4. Were special techniques successful	7	2	0	0	2	0	1	3.67	671/ 904	3.67	3.97	4.03	4.01	3.67
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 41	****	4.33	4.50	2.00	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 28	****	4.00	4.64	****	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	10	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	0						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	6	Under-grad	12	Non-major	12
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	0	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	1				
				?	0						

Course-Section: AFST 261 0101
 Title 20TH CENTURY BLACK LIT
 Instructor: TEMPLE, CHRISTE
 Enrollment: 30
 Questionnaires: 20

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2008

Page 29
 AUG 6, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean		
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5						Mean	Rank

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	1	0	5	14	4.60	557/1670	4.60	4.60	4.31	4.32	4.60
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	5	3	12	4.35	846/1666	4.35	4.48	4.27	4.27	4.35
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	5	13	4.50	597/1406	4.50	4.55	4.32	4.39	4.50
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	2	0	1	1	6	9	4.35	750/1615	4.35	4.47	4.24	4.29	4.35
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	3	17	4.85	159/1566	4.85	4.56	4.07	4.00	4.85
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	3	0	0	2	6	9	4.41	546/1528	4.41	4.45	4.12	4.11	4.41
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	3	2	9	6	3.90	1278/1650	3.90	4.27	4.22	4.20	3.90
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	5	15	4.75	922/1667	4.75	4.64	4.67	4.64	4.75
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	1	0	0	2	7	7	4.31	659/1626	4.31	4.36	4.11	4.06	4.31
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	1	0	5	13	4.58	809/1559	4.58	4.62	4.46	4.40	4.58
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	1	0	0	0	19	4.80	855/1560	4.80	4.91	4.72	4.73	4.80
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	1	7	11	4.53	658/1549	4.53	4.55	4.31	4.25	4.53
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	3	15	4.83	310/1546	4.83	4.68	4.32	4.30	4.83
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	14	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	****/1323	****	4.19	4.00	4.08	****
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	1	1	0	2	11	4.40	541/1384	4.40	4.58	4.10	4.07	4.40
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	0	2	2	11	4.60	525/1378	4.60	4.73	4.29	4.25	4.60
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	0	2	1	12	4.67	531/1378	4.67	4.69	4.31	4.26	4.67
4. Were special techniques successful	5	2	1	2	1	2	7	3.92	548/ 904	3.92	3.97	4.03	4.01	3.92
Laboratory														
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	18	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 239	****	****	4.21	4.33	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	18	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 231	****	****	4.31	4.52	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	18	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 87	****	3.75	4.65	5.00	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	18	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 79	****	4.25	4.64	4.75	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	18	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 75	****	4.00	4.57	4.25	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	18	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 79	****	3.80	4.45	3.95	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	18	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 80	****	3.40	3.97	4.30	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	18	0	2	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 41	****	4.33	4.50	2.00	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	18	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 38	****	3.60	4.19	2.50	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	18	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 38	****	3.60	4.62	4.50	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	18	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 39	****	4.00	4.27	4.00	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	18	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 31	****	4.00	4.47	4.00	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	18	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 28	****	4.00	4.64	****	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	18	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 16	****	****	4.67	****	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	18	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 27	****	3.25	4.54	****	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	18	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 10	****	****	4.84	****	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	18	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 6	****	****	4.92	****	****

Course-Section: AFST 261 0101
 Title 20TH CENTURY BLACK LIT
 Instructor: TEMPLE, CHRISTE
 Enrollment: 30
 Questionnaires: 20

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2008

Page 29
 AUG 6, 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	1	A	10	Required for Majors	10	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	B	7						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	3	C	0	General	3	Under-grad	20	Non-major	20
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	4	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	4				
				?	1						

Course-Section: AFST 271 0101
 Title INTRO COMMUNITY INVOLV
 Instructor: SMITH, IRENE
 Enrollment: 12
 Questionnaires: 10

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2008

Page 30
 AUG 6, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean		
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5						Mean	Rank

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1670	5.00	4.60	4.31	4.32	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	173/1666	4.90	4.48	4.27	4.27	4.90
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	4	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1406	5.00	4.55	4.32	4.39	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1615	5.00	4.47	4.24	4.29	5.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	143/1566	4.89	4.56	4.07	4.00	4.89
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	131/1528	4.89	4.45	4.12	4.11	4.89
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1650	5.00	4.27	4.22	4.20	5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	675/1667	4.90	4.64	4.67	4.64	4.90
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	1	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	167/1626	4.80	4.36	4.11	4.06	4.80
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1559	5.00	4.62	4.46	4.40	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1560	5.00	4.91	4.72	4.73	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1549	5.00	4.55	4.31	4.25	5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1546	5.00	4.68	4.32	4.30	5.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	126/1323	4.89	4.19	4.00	4.08	4.89
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1384	5.00	4.58	4.10	4.07	5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1378	5.00	4.73	4.29	4.25	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1378	5.00	4.69	4.31	4.26	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	4	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/ 904	5.00	3.97	4.03	4.01	5.00
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 232	****	****	4.19	4.35	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 239	****	****	4.21	4.33	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 230	****	****	4.44	4.61	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 231	****	****	4.31	4.52	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 218	****	****	4.18	4.25	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 87	****	3.75	4.65	5.00	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 79	****	4.25	4.64	4.75	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 75	****	4.00	4.57	4.25	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 79	****	3.80	4.45	3.95	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 80	****	3.40	3.97	4.30	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 41	****	4.33	4.50	2.00	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 38	****	3.60	4.19	2.50	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 38	****	3.60	4.62	4.50	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 39	****	4.00	4.27	4.00	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 31	****	4.00	4.47	4.00	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 28	****	4.00	4.64	****	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 16	****	****	4.67	****	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 27	****	3.25	4.54	****	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 10	****	****	4.84	****	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 6	****	****	4.92	****	****

Course-Section: AFST 271 0101
 Title INTRO COMMUNITY INVOLV
 Instructor: SMITH, IRENE
 Enrollment: 12
 Questionnaires: 10

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2008

Page 30
 AUG 6, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	9	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B	0						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	1	C	0	General	6	Under-grad	10	Non-major	10
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	0	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	0				
				?	0						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean		
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5						Mean	Rank

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	1	0	2	4	11	4.33	902/1670	4.33	4.60	4.31	4.24	4.33
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	4	6	8	4.22	1003/1666	4.22	4.48	4.27	4.18	4.22
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	4	0	0	3	4	7	4.29	852/1406	4.29	4.55	4.32	4.22	4.29
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	2	3	12	4.59	467/1615	4.59	4.47	4.24	4.18	4.59
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	10	8	4.44	450/1566	4.44	4.56	4.07	4.04	4.44
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	7	11	4.61	338/1528	4.61	4.45	4.12	4.07	4.61
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	2	2	5	3	6	3.50	1460/1650	3.50	4.27	4.22	4.12	3.50
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	17	1	4.06	1498/1667	4.06	4.64	4.67	4.67	4.06
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	1	0	1	4	4	4	3.85	1181/1626	3.85	4.36	4.11	4.06	3.85
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	1	0	3	3	11	4.28	1143/1559	4.28	4.62	4.46	4.40	4.28
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	18	5.00	1/1560	5.00	4.91	4.72	4.67	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	3	4	10	4.41	802/1549	4.41	4.55	4.31	4.25	4.41
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	1	4	12	4.44	795/1546	4.44	4.68	4.32	4.24	4.44
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	5	1	1	1	7	3	3.77	912/1323	3.77	4.19	4.00	3.99	3.77
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	2	3	10	4.53	415/1384	4.53	4.58	4.10	4.12	4.53
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	0	6	9	4.60	525/1378	4.60	4.73	4.29	4.30	4.60
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	1	0	0	4	10	4.47	692/1378	4.47	4.69	4.31	4.33	4.47
4. Were special techniques successful	3	8	2	1	1	0	3	3.14	812/ 904	3.14	3.97	4.03	4.03	3.14
Laboratory														
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	16	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 239	****	****	4.21	3.99	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	17	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 87	****	3.75	4.65	4.30	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 79	****	4.25	4.64	4.53	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 75	****	4.00	4.57	4.50	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 79	****	3.80	4.45	3.68	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	17	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 80	****	3.40	3.97	3.76	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 41	****	4.33	4.50	4.44	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	17	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 38	****	3.60	4.19	3.96	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 38	****	3.60	4.62	4.68	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	17	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 39	****	4.00	4.27	4.38	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	17	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 31	****	4.00	4.47	4.51	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 28	****	4.00	4.64	3.33	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	17	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 16	****	****	4.67	4.00	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	17	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 27	****	3.25	4.54	2.63	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	17	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 10	****	****	4.84	****	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	17	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 6	****	****	4.92	****	****

Course-Section: AFST 323 0101
 Title ECON DEVELOP IN AFRICA
 Instructor: BADRU, LATEEF
 Enrollment: 27
 Questionnaires: 18

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2008

Page 31
 AUG 6, 2008
 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	12	Required for Majors	6	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	3						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	2	C	0	General	5	Under-grad	18	Non-major	17
84-150	7	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
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	3				
				?	0						

Course-Section: AFST 344 0101
 Title BLACK FOLKLORE
 Instructor: TEMPLE, CHRISTE
 Enrollment: 11
 Questionnaires: 6

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2008

Page 32
 AUG 6, 2008
 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	0	6	5.00	1/1670	5.00	4.60	4.31	4.24	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	259/1666	4.80	4.48	4.27	4.18	4.80
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1406	5.00	4.55	4.32	4.22	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1615	5.00	4.47	4.24	4.18	5.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	0	5	4.67	295/1566	4.67	4.56	4.07	4.04	4.67
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	0	5	4.67	300/1528	4.67	4.45	4.12	4.07	4.67
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	361/1650	4.67	4.27	4.22	4.12	4.67
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1667	5.00	4.64	4.67	4.67	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	207/1626	4.75	4.36	4.11	4.06	4.75
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1559	5.00	4.62	4.46	4.40	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1560	5.00	4.91	4.72	4.67	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1549	5.00	4.55	4.31	4.25	5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1546	5.00	4.68	4.32	4.24	5.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1323	5.00	4.19	4.00	3.99	5.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1384	5.00	4.58	4.10	4.12	5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1378	****	4.73	4.29	4.30	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1378	****	4.69	4.31	4.33	****
4. Were special techniques successful	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 904	****	3.97	4.03	4.03	****

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: AFST 375 0101
 Title THE BLACK CHURCH
 Instructor: KING, SHARON
 Enrollment: 18
 Questionnaires: 15

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2008

Page 33
 AUG 6, 2008
 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	1	0	0	3	11	4.53	632/1670	4.53	4.60	4.31	4.24	4.53
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	2	1	2	9	4.07	1161/1666	4.07	4.48	4.27	4.18	4.07
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	2	0	2	4	7	3.93	1108/1406	3.93	4.55	4.32	4.22	3.93
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	2	1	0	3	9	4.07	1050/1615	4.07	4.47	4.24	4.18	4.07
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	2	2	3	8	4.13	762/1566	4.13	4.56	4.07	4.04	4.13
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	1	0	1	3	9	4.36	611/1528	4.36	4.45	4.12	4.07	4.36
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	2	3	1	8	3.87	1298/1650	3.87	4.27	4.22	4.12	3.87
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	1	13	4.93	540/1667	4.93	4.64	4.67	4.67	4.93
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	2	0	1	4	5	3.83	1191/1626	3.83	4.36	4.11	4.06	3.83
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	1	0	2	3	9	4.27	1150/1559	4.27	4.62	4.46	4.40	4.27
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	14	4.93	417/1560	4.93	4.91	4.72	4.67	4.93
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	1	1	2	4	6	3.93	1218/1549	3.93	4.55	4.31	4.25	3.93
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	1	3	10	4.40	849/1546	4.40	4.68	4.32	4.24	4.40
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	1	0	1	1	12	4.53	310/1323	4.53	4.19	4.00	3.99	4.53
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	0	3	10	4.57	390/1384	4.57	4.58	4.10	4.12	4.57
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	1	0	0	0	13	4.71	441/1378	4.71	4.73	4.29	4.30	4.71
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	1	0	0	13	4.79	407/1378	4.79	4.69	4.31	4.33	4.79
4. Were special techniques successful	2	0	1	0	0	1	11	4.62	198/ 904	4.62	3.97	4.03	4.03	4.62
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	11	3	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 232	****	****	4.19	4.04	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	12	0	0	1	1	0	1	3.33	****/ 239	****	****	4.21	3.99	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	11	3	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 230	****	****	4.44	4.25	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	11	1	1	0	1	0	1	3.00	****/ 231	****	****	4.31	4.11	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	11	2	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 218	****	****	4.18	3.93	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	10	1	1	0	0	1	2	3.75	82/ 87	3.75	3.75	4.65	4.30	3.75
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	11	0	0	1	0	0	3	4.25	66/ 79	4.25	4.25	4.64	4.53	4.25
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	10	0	1	0	0	1	3	4.00	58/ 75	4.00	4.00	4.57	4.50	4.00
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	10	0	1	0	1	0	3	3.80	68/ 79	3.80	3.80	4.45	3.68	3.80
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	10	0	1	1	0	1	2	3.40	59/ 80	3.40	3.40	3.97	3.76	3.40
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	9	0	1	0	0	0	5	4.33	32/ 41	4.33	4.33	4.50	4.44	4.33
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	10	0	0	2	0	1	2	3.60	31/ 38	3.60	3.60	4.19	3.96	3.60
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	10	0	1	0	1	1	2	3.60	36/ 38	3.60	3.60	4.62	4.68	3.60
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	10	1	1	0	0	0	3	4.00	25/ 39	4.00	4.00	4.27	4.38	4.00
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	10	1	1	0	0	0	3	4.00	21/ 31	4.00	4.00	4.47	4.51	4.00
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	1	0	1	2	4.00	23/ 28	4.00	4.00	4.64	3.33	4.00
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	11	1	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/ 16	****	****	4.67	4.00	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	11	0	0	2	0	1	1	3.25	25/ 27	3.25	3.25	4.54	2.63	3.25
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	11	2	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 10	****	****	4.84	****	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	11	2	1	1	0	0	0	1.50	****/ 6	****	****	4.92	****	****

Course-Section: AFST 375 0101
 Title THE BLACK CHURCH
 Instructor: KING, SHARON
 Enrollment: 18
 Questionnaires: 15

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2008

Page 33
 AUG 6, 2008
 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	7	Required for Majors	3	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	2						
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	1	C	0	General	3	Under-grad	15	Non-major	15
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	4	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	2				
				?	0						

Course-Section: AFST 385 0101
 Title PROB SOLV URBAN BLK CO
 Instructor: HICKEY, TERRY
 Enrollment: 15
 Questionnaires: 8

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2008

Page 34
 AUG 6, 2008
 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	1	0	7	4.75	363/1670	4.75	4.60	4.31	4.24	4.75
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	198/1666	4.88	4.48	4.27	4.18	4.88
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	5	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1406	5.00	4.55	4.32	4.22	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	0	7	4.75	290/1615	4.75	4.47	4.24	4.18	4.75
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	148/1566	4.88	4.56	4.07	4.04	4.88
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	2	5	4.50	421/1528	4.50	4.45	4.12	4.07	4.50
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	1	6	4.63	406/1650	4.63	4.27	4.22	4.12	4.63
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	922/1667	4.75	4.64	4.67	4.67	4.75
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	151/1626	4.83	4.36	4.11	4.06	4.83
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	1	1	5	4.57	809/1559	4.57	4.62	4.46	4.40	4.57
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1560	5.00	4.91	4.72	4.67	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	424/1549	4.71	4.55	4.31	4.25	4.71
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	288/1546	4.86	4.68	4.32	4.24	4.86
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	1	0	0	2	0	4	4.33	481/1323	4.33	4.19	4.00	3.99	4.33
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1384	5.00	4.58	4.10	4.12	5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	1	0	5	4.67	481/1378	4.67	4.73	4.29	4.30	4.67
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1378	5.00	4.69	4.31	4.33	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	2	2	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/ 904	5.00	3.97	4.03	4.03	5.00

Frequency Distribution

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

- Means there are not enough responses to be significant

Course-Section: AFST 440 0101
 Title TOPICS AFST STUDIES
 Instructor: MACK-SHELTON, K
 Enrollment: 20
 Questionnaires: 12

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2008

Page 35
 AUG 6, 2008
 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	3	9	4.75	363/1670	4.75	4.60	4.31	4.45	4.75
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	4	8	4.67	415/1666	4.67	4.48	4.27	4.35	4.67
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	3	7	4.33	799/1406	4.33	4.55	4.32	4.48	4.33
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	3	7	4.42	673/1615	4.42	4.47	4.24	4.37	4.42
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	118/1566	4.92	4.56	4.07	4.17	4.92
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	5	6	4.42	546/1528	4.42	4.45	4.12	4.26	4.42
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	4	8	4.67	361/1650	4.67	4.27	4.22	4.28	4.67
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	607/1667	4.92	4.64	4.67	4.73	4.92
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	5	7	4.58	339/1626	4.58	4.36	4.11	4.28	4.58
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	4	8	4.67	673/1559	4.67	4.62	4.46	4.58	4.67
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/1560	5.00	4.91	4.72	4.80	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	3	9	4.75	366/1549	4.75	4.55	4.31	4.43	4.75
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	3	9	4.75	407/1546	4.75	4.68	4.32	4.43	4.75
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	2	3	0	3	3	1	2.90	1227/1323	2.90	4.19	4.00	4.10	2.90
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	152/1384	4.92	4.58	4.10	4.32	4.92
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	2	10	4.83	316/1378	4.83	4.73	4.29	4.55	4.83
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	1	2	9	4.67	531/1378	4.67	4.69	4.31	4.60	4.67
4. Were special techniques successful	0	2	1	2	1	2	4	3.60	698/ 904	3.60	3.97	4.03	4.22	3.60
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 87	****	3.75	4.65	4.80	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 79	****	3.80	4.45	4.53	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 80	****	3.40	3.97	3.67	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99 0	A 2	Required for Majors 3	Graduate 0 Major 1
28-55	0	1.00-1.99 0	B 7		
56-83	0	2.00-2.99 0	C 2	General 5	Under-grad 12 Non-major 11
84-150	4	3.00-3.49 4	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 3	
			? 1		

Course-Section: AFST 495 0101
 Title FIELD RESEARCH AFR STU
 Instructor: ROBINSON, THOMA
 Enrollment: 10
 Questionnaires: 8

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2008

Page 36
 AUG 6, 2008
 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	1	1	0	6	4.38	849/1670	4.38	4.60	4.31	4.45	4.38
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	198/1666	4.88	4.48	4.27	4.35	4.88
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	0	7	4.75	318/1406	4.75	4.55	4.32	4.48	4.75
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	0	6	4.50	552/1615	4.50	4.47	4.24	4.37	4.50
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	2	0	5	4.43	470/1566	4.43	4.56	4.07	4.17	4.43
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	1	0	1	4	4.33	631/1528	4.33	4.45	4.12	4.26	4.33
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	3	5	4.63	406/1650	4.63	4.27	4.22	4.28	4.63
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	730/1667	4.88	4.64	4.67	4.73	4.88
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	1	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	403/1626	4.50	4.36	4.11	4.28	4.50
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1559	5.00	4.62	4.46	4.58	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1560	5.00	4.91	4.72	4.80	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	0	7	4.75	366/1549	4.75	4.55	4.31	4.43	4.75
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	1	6	4.63	570/1546	4.63	4.68	4.32	4.43	4.63
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	3	0	1	0	2	2	4.00	692/1323	4.00	4.19	4.00	4.10	4.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	0	1	1	4	4.00	820/1384	4.00	4.58	4.10	4.32	4.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	295/1378	4.86	4.73	4.29	4.55	4.86
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	481/1378	4.71	4.69	4.31	4.60	4.71
4. Were special techniques successful	1	5	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 904	5.00	3.97	4.03	4.22	5.00

Frequency Distribution

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