

Course-Section: ANTH 211 0101
 Title CULTURAL ANTHROPOLOGY
 Instructor: CHAPIN, BAMBI
 Enrollment: 43
 Questionnaires: 33

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 61
 JUL 2, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor Mean	Instructor Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5								
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	1	1	6	4	21	4.30	893/1576	4.33	4.49	4.30	4.35	4.30	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	1	1	7	23	4.63	448/1576	4.55	4.35	4.27	4.32	4.63	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	5	1	1	2	1	21	4.54	552/1342	4.70	4.43	4.32	4.41	4.54	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	1	0	0	3	4	24	4.68	329/1520	4.66	4.45	4.25	4.26	4.68	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	2	4	26	4.67	264/1465	4.65	4.45	4.12	4.09	4.67	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	1	3	28	4.76	193/1434	4.58	4.54	4.14	4.06	4.76	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	3	3	26	4.64	375/1547	4.46	4.24	4.19	4.22	4.64	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	1	0	0	0	17	15	4.47	1128/1574	4.25	4.48	4.64	4.62	4.47	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	1	0	0	4	15	10	4.21	762/1554	4.24	4.28	4.10	4.05	4.21	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	1	0	2	7	21	4.52	858/1488	4.67	4.55	4.47	4.44	4.52	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	2	29	4.94	390/1493	4.95	4.90	4.73	4.75	4.94	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	3	6	22	4.61	545/1486	4.54	4.48	4.32	4.29	4.61	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	3	4	24	4.68	487/1489	4.54	4.55	4.32	4.31	4.68	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	1	0	2	6	6	16	4.20	585/1277	4.49	4.36	4.03	4.01	4.20	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	1	1	6	15	4.52	432/1279	4.47	4.37	4.17	4.14	4.52	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	10	0	0	0	4	3	16	4.52	620/1270	4.67	4.50	4.35	4.30	4.52	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	10	0	0	0	1	7	15	4.61	584/1269	4.80	4.68	4.35	4.29	4.61	
4. Were special techniques successful	10	4	0	1	4	6	8	4.11	446/ 878	3.49	3.81	4.05	3.92	4.11	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	1	0.00-0.99 0	A 21	Required for Majors 19	Graduate 0 Major 1
28-55	1	1.00-1.99 0	B 9		
56-83	6	2.00-2.99 4	C 1	General 6	Under-grad 33 Non-major 32
84-150	6	3.00-3.49 4	D 0		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 10	F 0	Electives 1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 5	
			? 0		

Course-Section: ANTH 211 0201
 Title CULTURAL ANTHROPOLOGY
 Instructor: MESSINGER, SETH
 Enrollment: 43
 Questionnaires: 28

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 62
 JUL 2, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	1	0	4	5	17	4.37	818/1576	4.33	4.49	4.30	4.35	4.37	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	7	18	4.54	568/1576	4.55	4.35	4.27	4.32	4.54	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	14	0	0	3	11	4.79	263/1342	4.70	4.43	4.32	4.41	4.79		
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	7	19	4.61	395/1520	4.66	4.45	4.25	4.26	4.61	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	1	0	7	19	4.50	366/1465	4.65	4.45	4.12	4.09	4.50	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	3	11	14	4.39	534/1434	4.58	4.54	4.14	4.06	4.39	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	5	4	18	4.48	559/1547	4.46	4.24	4.19	4.22	4.48	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	1	0	0	0	21	5	4.19	1367/1574	4.25	4.48	4.64	4.62	4.19	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	2	14	12	4.36	597/1554	4.24	4.28	4.10	4.05	4.36	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	7	20	4.74	526/1488	4.67	4.55	4.47	4.44	4.74	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	27	5.00	1/1493	4.95	4.90	4.73	4.75	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	4	7	16	4.44	763/1486	4.54	4.48	4.32	4.29	4.44	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	4	4	18	4.44	766/1489	4.54	4.55	4.32	4.31	4.44	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	21	1	1	1	0	2	3.20	****/1277	4.49	4.36	4.03	4.01	****	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	2	6	9	4.41	543/1279	4.47	4.37	4.17	4.14	4.41	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	11	0	0	0	0	1	16	4.94	156/1270	4.67	4.50	4.35	4.30	4.94	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	11	0	0	0	0	1	16	4.94	167/1269	4.80	4.68	4.35	4.29	4.94	
4. Were special techniques successful	11	14	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 878	3.49	3.81	4.05	3.92	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	1	0.00-0.99 0	A 21	Required for Majors 15	Graduate 0 Major 2
28-55	3	1.00-1.99 1	B 4		
56-83	5	2.00-2.99 0	C 0	General 3	Under-grad 28 Non-major 26
84-150	6	3.00-3.49 6	D 0		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 7	F 0	Electives 0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 8	
			? 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	Mean	Mean	

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	1	0	3	6	13	4.30	893/1576	4.33	4.49	4.30	4.35	4.30	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	2	0	6	15	4.48	653/1576	4.55	4.35	4.27	4.32	4.48	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	5	17	4.77	275/1342	4.70	4.43	4.32	4.41	4.77		
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	1	0	4	17	4.68	320/1520	4.66	4.45	4.25	4.26	4.68	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	3	18	4.77	193/1465	4.65	4.45	4.12	4.09	4.77	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	2	5	15	4.59	330/1434	4.58	4.54	4.14	4.06	4.59	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	4	8	10	4.27	816/1547	4.46	4.24	4.19	4.22	4.27	
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	1	17	3	4.10	1427/1574	4.25	4.48	4.64	4.62	4.10	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	0	4	7	7	4.17	805/1554	4.24	4.28	4.10	4.05	4.17	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	0	5	15	4.75	505/1488	4.67	4.55	4.47	4.44	4.75	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	0	2	18	4.90	557/1493	4.95	4.90	4.73	4.75	4.90	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	2	5	13	4.55	619/1486	4.54	4.48	4.32	4.29	4.55	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	2	0	4	14	4.50	696/1489	4.54	4.55	4.32	4.31	4.50	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	1	0	0	1	2	15	4.78	148/1277	4.49	4.36	4.03	4.01	4.78	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	1	0	4	8	4.46	488/1279	4.47	4.37	4.17	4.14	4.46	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	10	0	0	0	1	4	8	4.54	612/1270	4.67	4.50	4.35	4.30	4.54	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	10	0	0	0	0	2	11	4.85	342/1269	4.80	4.68	4.35	4.29	4.85	
4. Were special techniques successful	10	5	1	2	3	1	1	2.88	829/ 878	3.49	3.81	4.05	3.92	2.88	
Laboratory															
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	22	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 240	****	****	4.35	4.47	****	
Seminar															
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 79	****	****	4.69	4.72	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 72	****	****	4.64	4.83	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 80	****	****	4.61	4.80	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 375	****	****	4.01	4.21	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	22	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 52	****	4.86	4.48	4.74	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 48	****	3.71	4.40	4.71	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	22	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 40	****	****	4.60	5.00	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 24	****	****	4.83	5.00	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	4	0.00-0.99	1	A	16	Required for Majors	12	Graduate	0	Major	2
28-55	6	1.00-1.99	0	B	4						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	3	C	1	General	5	Under-grad	23	Non-major	21
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	8	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5	F	0	Electives	2	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	4				
				?	1						

Course-Section: ANTH 303 0101
 Title ANTHRPLGCL RSRCH MTHDS
 Instructor: FRANKOWSKI, ANN
 Enrollment: 26
 Questionnaires: 24

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 64
 JUL 2, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	7	9	8	4.04	1124/1576	4.04	4.49	4.30	4.30	4.04	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	2	6	9	6	3.71	1330/1576	3.71	4.35	4.27	4.28	3.71	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	0	6	8	9	4.00	972/1342	4.00	4.43	4.32	4.30	4.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	3	4	7	10	4.00	1041/1520	4.00	4.45	4.25	4.25	4.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	2	8	8	4	3.52	1235/1465	3.52	4.45	4.12	4.09	3.52	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	2	5	6	11	4.08	844/1434	4.08	4.54	4.14	4.15	4.08	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	3	5	7	8	3.75	1239/1547	3.75	4.24	4.19	4.21	3.75	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	19	5	4.21	1361/1574	4.21	4.48	4.64	4.61	4.21	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	1	0	1	7	13	0	3.57	1277/1554	3.57	4.28	4.10	4.09	3.57	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	1	6	8	9	4.04	1221/1488	4.04	4.55	4.47	4.47	4.04	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	4	19	4.75	908/1493	4.75	4.90	4.73	4.70	4.75	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	2	5	6	11	4.08	1075/1486	4.08	4.48	4.32	4.32	4.08	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	3	2	9	9	3.92	1184/1489	3.92	4.55	4.32	4.34	3.92	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	1	0	1	4	7	10	4.18	593/1277	4.18	4.36	4.03	4.11	4.18	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	2	4	3	5	3.79	947/1279	3.79	4.37	4.17	4.20	3.79	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	10	0	1	1	2	4	6	3.93	990/1270	3.93	4.50	4.35	4.42	3.93	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	10	0	0	2	1	2	9	4.29	803/1269	4.29	4.68	4.35	4.41	4.29	
4. Were special techniques successful	10	9	0	1	1	1	2	3.80	****/ 878	****	3.81	4.05	4.09	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	32/ 52	4.86	4.86	4.48	4.37	4.86	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	17	0	1	0	2	1	3	3.71	39/ 48	3.71	3.71	4.40	3.92	3.71	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	17	4	1	0	0	0	2	3.67	****/ 44	****	****	4.73	4.63	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	17	5	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 45	****	****	4.57	4.50	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	17	4	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 326	****	****	4.03	4.23	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	23	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 40	****	****	4.60	4.83	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	23	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 24	****	****	4.83	4.89	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	23	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 35	****	****	4.67	5.00	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	23	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 28	****	****	4.78	5.00	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	23	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 382	****	****	4.08	4.24	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 12	Required for Majors 0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B 5	
56-83	8	2.00-2.99	0	C 4	General 1
84-150	6	3.00-3.49	6	D 0	
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	13	F 0	Electives 0
				P 0	
				I 0	Other 23
				? 2	

- Means there are not enough responses to be significant

Course-Section: ANTH 304 0101
 Title KIN, COMMUNITYÐNICI
 Instructor: CHAPIN, BAMBI
 Enrollment: 35
 Questionnaires: 25

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 65
 JUL 2, 2009
 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	2	8	14	4.40	787/1576	4.40	4.49	4.30	4.30	4.40	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	5	4	15	4.32	864/1576	4.32	4.35	4.27	4.28	4.32	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	21	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/1342	****	4.43	4.32	4.30	****	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	10	13	4.44	614/1520	4.44	4.45	4.25	4.25	4.44	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	4	19	4.68	257/1465	4.68	4.45	4.12	4.09	4.68	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	8	15	4.52	383/1434	4.52	4.54	4.14	4.15	4.52	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	1	7	16	4.52	503/1547	4.52	4.24	4.19	4.21	4.52	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	3	22	4.88	508/1574	4.88	4.48	4.64	4.61	4.88	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	0	2	12	6	4.20	772/1554	4.20	4.28	4.10	4.09	4.20	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	1	6	5	13	4.20	1155/1488	4.20	4.55	4.47	4.47	4.20	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	3	21	4.80	810/1493	4.80	4.90	4.73	4.70	4.80	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	7	4	14	4.28	936/1486	4.28	4.48	4.32	4.32	4.28	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	3	3	19	4.64	526/1489	4.64	4.55	4.32	4.34	4.64	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	11	1	0	6	2	5	3.71	916/1277	3.71	4.36	4.03	4.11	3.71	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	4	9	7	4.15	738/1279	4.15	4.37	4.17	4.20	4.15	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	1	2	2	6	9	4.00	928/1270	4.00	4.50	4.35	4.42	4.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	0	2	2	16	4.70	511/1269	4.70	4.68	4.35	4.41	4.70	
4. Were special techniques successful	5	5	0	0	6	5	4	3.87	575/ 878	3.87	3.81	4.05	4.09	3.87	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	2	0.00-0.99 0	A 16	Required for Majors 3	Graduate 0 Major 10
28-55	3	1.00-1.99 0	B 7		
56-83	2	2.00-2.99 2	C 0	General 6	Under-grad 25 Non-major 15
84-150	9	3.00-3.49 4	D 0		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 7	F 0	Electives 0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 16	
			? 0		

Course-Section: ANTH 310 0101
 Title ETHNOGRAPHIC FILM
 Instructor: DONATO, PAUL
 Enrollment: 48
 Questionnaires: 32

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 66
 JUL 2, 2009
 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	1	3	8	19	4.45	712/1576	4.45	4.49	4.30	4.30	4.45	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	2	2	4	11	12	3.94	1207/1576	3.94	4.35	4.27	4.28	3.94	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	2	3	6	3	17	3.97	1010/1342	3.97	4.43	4.32	4.30	3.97	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	3	20	1	1	2	2	3	3.56	1346/1520	3.56	4.45	4.25	4.25	3.56	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	1	2	3	7	5	12	3.76	1102/1465	3.76	4.45	4.12	4.09	3.76	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	3	25	2	0	0	2	0	2.50	****/1434	****	4.54	4.14	4.15	****	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	4	0	1	2	4	5	16	4.18	916/1547	4.18	4.24	4.19	4.21	4.18	
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	0	0	0	0	0	29	5.00	1/1574	5.00	4.48	4.64	4.61	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	7	1	0	0	5	7	12	4.29	672/1554	4.29	4.28	4.10	4.09	4.29	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	1	0	4	25	4.77	484/1488	4.77	4.55	4.47	4.47	4.77	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	1	1	28	4.90	557/1493	4.90	4.90	4.73	4.70	4.90	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	1	3	7	19	4.47	735/1486	4.47	4.48	4.32	4.32	4.47	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	3	7	20	4.57	625/1489	4.57	4.55	4.32	4.34	4.57	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	0	0	0	0	5	25	4.83	123/1277	4.83	4.36	4.03	4.11	4.83	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	1	3	6	11	4.29	641/1279	4.29	4.37	4.17	4.20	4.29	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	11	0	1	0	1	2	17	4.62	550/1270	4.62	4.50	4.35	4.42	4.62	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	11	0	0	0	2	1	18	4.76	432/1269	4.76	4.68	4.35	4.41	4.76	
4. Were special techniques successful	11	20	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 878	****	3.81	4.05	4.09	****	
Laboratory															
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	29	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	****/ 379	****	****	4.20	4.17	****	
Seminar															
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	29	1	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 375	****	****	4.01	4.12	****	
Field Work															
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	31	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 44	****	****	4.73	4.63	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	31	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 45	****	****	4.57	4.50	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	31	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 40	****	****	4.60	4.83	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	31	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 35	****	****	4.67	5.00	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	9
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	1	B	11
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	7	C	8
84-150	15	3.00-3.49	10	D	0
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	8	F	0
				P	0
				I	0
				?	0
			Required for Majors	7	Graduate
			General	11	Under-grad
			Electives	0	32
			Other	9	Non-major
					27
				#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	

Course-Section: ANTH 318W 0101
 Title ANTH OF SCIENCE & TECH
 Instructor: MESSINGER, SETH
 Enrollment: 23
 Questionnaires: 14

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 67
 JUL 2, 2009
 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	10	4.71	347/1576	4.71	4.49	4.30	4.30	4.71	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	4	10	4.71	324/1576	4.71	4.35	4.27	4.28	4.71	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	3	0	0	1	3	6	4.50	583/1342	4.50	4.43	4.32	4.30	4.50	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	4	10	4.71	291/1520	4.71	4.45	4.25	4.25	4.71	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	0	4	9	4.50	366/1465	4.50	4.45	4.12	4.09	4.50	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	2	11	4.71	226/1434	4.71	4.54	4.14	4.15	4.71	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	2	0	4	8	4.29	805/1547	4.29	4.24	4.19	4.21	4.29	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	9	5	4.36	1245/1574	4.36	4.48	4.64	4.61	4.36	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	0	2	9	4.82	155/1554	4.82	4.28	4.10	4.09	4.82	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	1	0	3	10	4.57	786/1488	4.57	4.55	4.47	4.47	4.57	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	14	5.00	1/1493	5.00	4.90	4.73	4.70	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	5	8	4.62	545/1486	4.62	4.48	4.32	4.32	4.62	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	13	4.93	155/1489	4.93	4.55	4.32	4.34	4.93	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	5	6	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/1277	****	4.36	4.03	4.11	****	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	169/1279	4.90	4.37	4.17	4.20	4.90	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	0	1	0	9	4.80	355/1270	4.80	4.50	4.35	4.42	4.80	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1269	5.00	4.68	4.35	4.41	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	5	4	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	129/ 878	4.80	3.81	4.05	4.09	4.80	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 8	Required for Majors	4 Graduate 0 Major 3
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	B 3		
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	C 0	General	4 Under-grad 14 Non-major 11
84-150	3	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	3
			? 0		

Course-Section: ANTH 326 8620
 Title AMERICAN INDIAN CULTUR
 Instructor: EDWARDS-HEWITT,
 Enrollment: 20
 Questionnaires: 15

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 68
 JUL 2, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	2	3	10	4.53	595/1576	4.53	4.49	4.30	4.30	4.53	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	0	1	1	12	4.53	568/1576	4.53	4.35	4.27	4.28	4.53	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	0	2	3	9	4.27	827/1342	4.27	4.43	4.32	4.30	4.27	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	5	8	4.40	683/1520	4.40	4.45	4.25	4.25	4.40	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	3	4	7	4.29	616/1465	4.29	4.45	4.12	4.09	4.29	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	1	0	2	10	4.36	574/1434	4.36	4.54	4.14	4.15	4.36	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	1	0	4	8	4.21	882/1547	4.21	4.24	4.19	4.21	4.21	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	2	12	4.86	567/1574	4.86	4.48	4.64	4.61	4.86	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	1	0	1	2	7	3	3.92	1032/1554	3.92	4.28	4.10	4.09	3.92	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	2	3	9	4.50	870/1488	4.50	4.55	4.47	4.47	4.50	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	14	4.93	390/1493	4.93	4.90	4.73	4.70	4.93	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	2	1	2	9	4.29	936/1486	4.29	4.48	4.32	4.32	4.29	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	2	3	9	4.27	948/1489	4.27	4.55	4.32	4.34	4.27	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	1	2	4	7	4.21	569/1277	4.21	4.36	4.03	4.11	4.21	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	2	0	2	3	7	3.93	879/1279	3.93	4.37	4.17	4.20	3.93	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	1	4	2	7	4.07	910/1270	4.07	4.50	4.35	4.42	4.07	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	2	3	2	7	4.00	928/1269	4.00	4.68	4.35	4.41	4.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	1	7	1	0	0	3	3	4.00	464/ 878	4.00	3.81	4.05	4.09	4.00	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 40	****	****	4.60	4.83	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	14	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 24	****	****	4.83	4.89	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 6	Required for Majors	4
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	B 4		Graduate 0
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	C 0	General	5
84-150	4	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
			? 1		

Course-Section: ANTH 397 0101
 Title SEL TOPICS:ANTHROPOLOG
 Instructor: RUBINSTEIN, ROB
 Enrollment: 27
 Questionnaires: 21

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 69
 JUL 2, 2009
 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	2	18	4.81	243/1576	4.81	4.49	4.30	4.30	4.81	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	2	3	5	11	4.19	996/1576	4.19	4.35	4.27	4.28	4.19	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	0	2	4	14	4.43	683/1342	4.43	4.43	4.32	4.30	4.43	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	3	4	13	4.50	511/1520	4.50	4.45	4.25	4.25	4.50	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	0	0	19	4.85	148/1465	4.85	4.45	4.12	4.09	4.85	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	0	4	16	4.67	270/1434	4.67	4.54	4.14	4.15	4.67	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	1	2	6	6	5	3.60	1303/1547	3.60	4.24	4.19	4.21	3.60	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	16	5	0	3.24	1564/1574	3.24	4.48	4.64	4.61	3.24	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	1	3	6	8	4.17	805/1554	4.17	4.28	4.10	4.09	4.17	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	1	4	8	8	4.10	1206/1488	4.10	4.55	4.47	4.47	4.10	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	1	0	3	17	4.71	986/1493	4.71	4.90	4.73	4.70	4.71	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	7	13	4.57	596/1486	4.57	4.48	4.32	4.32	4.57	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	0	4	16	4.67	500/1489	4.67	4.55	4.32	4.34	4.67	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	20	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1277	****	4.36	4.03	4.11	****	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	1	4	13	4.67	335/1279	4.67	4.37	4.17	4.20	4.67	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	1	1	2	14	4.61	550/1270	4.61	4.50	4.35	4.42	4.61	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	1	0	2	15	4.72	479/1269	4.72	4.68	4.35	4.41	4.72	
4. Were special techniques successful	3	16	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 878	****	3.81	4.05	4.09	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	1	0.00-0.99 0	A 11	Required for Majors 2	Graduate 0 Major 3
28-55	5	1.00-1.99 0	B 9		
56-83	4	2.00-2.99 3	C 0	General 8	Under-grad 21 Non-major 18
84-150	3	3.00-3.49 1	D 0		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 9	F 0	Electives 0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 12	
			? 0		

Course-Section: ANTH 397A 0101
 Title GLOBALIZATION
 Instructor: CHARD, SARAH
 Enrollment: 25
 Questionnaires: 17

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 70
 JUL 2, 2009
 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	2	14	4.76	289/1576	4.76	4.49	4.30	4.30	4.76	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	3	13	4.71	336/1576	4.71	4.35	4.27	4.28	4.71	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	14	4.82	227/1342	4.82	4.43	4.32	4.30	4.82	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	1	15	4.82	185/1520	4.82	4.45	4.25	4.25	4.82	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	2	14	4.76	200/1465	4.76	4.45	4.12	4.09	4.76	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	3	13	4.71	235/1434	4.71	4.54	4.14	4.15	4.71	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	2	4	11	4.53	503/1547	4.53	4.24	4.19	4.21	4.53	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	17	5.00	1/1574	5.00	4.48	4.64	4.61	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	6	10	4.63	298/1554	4.63	4.28	4.10	4.09	4.63	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	1	16	4.94	149/1488	4.94	4.55	4.47	4.47	4.94	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	17	5.00	1/1493	5.00	4.90	4.73	4.70	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	3	14	4.82	251/1486	4.82	4.48	4.32	4.32	4.82	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	3	14	4.82	286/1489	4.82	4.55	4.32	4.34	4.82	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	2	0	0	1	4	10	4.60	258/1277	4.60	4.36	4.03	4.11	4.60	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	3	10	4.77	253/1279	4.77	4.37	4.17	4.20	4.77	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	0	1	0	12	4.85	317/1270	4.85	4.50	4.35	4.42	4.85	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	0	0	1	12	4.92	222/1269	4.92	4.68	4.35	4.41	4.92	
4. Were special techniques successful	4	8	1	1	0	2	1	3.20	780/ 878	3.20	3.81	4.05	4.09	3.20	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 52	****	4.86	4.48	4.37	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 48	****	3.71	4.40	3.92	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 44	****	****	4.73	4.63	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 45	****	****	4.57	4.50	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	10	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	15
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	6						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	1	C	0	General	8	Under-grad	17	Non-major	2
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	4	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	6	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	8				
				?	1						

Course-Section: ANTH 400 0101
 Title ANTHROPOLOGICAL THEORY
 Instructor: DONATO, PAUL
 Enrollment: 14
 Questionnaires: 10

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 71
 JUL 2, 2009
 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	2	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	301/1576	4.75	4.49	4.30	4.46	4.75	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	0	0	2	3	3	4.13	1058/1576	4.13	4.35	4.27	4.35	4.13	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	0	0	1	0	3	4	4.25	835/1342	4.25	4.43	4.32	4.46	4.25	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	0	0	0	0	4	4	4.50	511/1520	4.50	4.45	4.25	4.38	4.50	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	3	5	4.63	290/1465	4.63	4.45	4.12	4.22	4.63	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	3	5	4.63	305/1434	4.63	4.54	4.14	4.30	4.63	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	1	1	2	4	4.13	955/1547	4.13	4.24	4.19	4.24	4.13	
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1574	5.00	4.48	4.64	4.69	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	160/1554	4.80	4.28	4.10	4.24	4.80	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	293/1488	4.88	4.55	4.47	4.55	4.88	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1493	5.00	4.90	4.73	4.80	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	1	2	5	4.50	678/1486	4.50	4.48	4.32	4.41	4.50	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	1	1	6	4.63	552/1489	4.63	4.55	4.32	4.38	4.63	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	7	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1277	****	4.36	4.03	4.04	****	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	2	1	3	4.17	732/1279	4.17	4.37	4.17	4.31	4.17	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	505/1270	4.67	4.50	4.35	4.53	4.67	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	535/1269	4.67	4.68	4.35	4.55	4.67	
4. Were special techniques successful	4	5	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 878	****	3.81	4.05	4.33	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	1	0.00-0.99 0	A 3	Required for Majors	0 Graduate 0 Major 1
28-55	0	1.00-1.99 0	B 2		
56-83	0	2.00-2.99 1	C 2	General	2 Under-grad 10 Non-major 9
84-150	4	3.00-3.49 3	D 0		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 2	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		
			I 0	Other	6
			? 1		

- Means there are not enough responses to be significant