

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	7	18	4.65	443/1522	4.48	4.57	4.30	4.14	4.65	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	7	18	4.65	371/1522	4.25	4.33	4.26	4.18	4.65	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	12	13	4.46	578/1285	4.13	4.42	4.30	4.22	4.46	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	14	0	0	0	4	8	4.67	316/1476	4.35	4.38	4.22	4.09	4.67	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	2	0	8	16	4.46	375/1412	4.45	4.63	4.06	4.01	4.46	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	17	1	0	1	3	4	4.00	806/1381	3.80	4.29	4.08	3.93	4.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	3	4	19	4.62	374/1500	4.29	4.33	4.18	4.16	4.62	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	1	21	4	4.12	1349/1517	4.41	4.61	4.65	4.62	4.12	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	2	9	13	4.46	445/1497	4.36	4.28	4.11	4.02	4.46	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	7	19	4.73	492/1440	4.50	4.48	4.45	4.40	4.73	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	26	5.00	1/1448	5.00	4.85	4.71	4.63	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	10	15	4.54	564/1436	4.23	4.38	4.29	4.24	4.54	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	4	22	4.85	240/1432	4.58	4.43	4.29	4.23	4.85	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	2	2	0	6	3	13	4.04	592/1221	3.65	3.85	3.93	3.86	4.04	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	3	20	4.87	156/1280	4.63	4.58	4.10	3.92	4.87	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	0	2	21	4.91	205/1277	4.73	4.72	4.34	4.13	4.91	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	1	0	1	0	21	4.74	400/1269	4.75	4.68	4.31	4.04	4.74	
4. Were special techniques successful	4	5	4	2	2	5	4	3.18	754/ 854	3.68	4.08	4.02	3.87	3.18	
Laboratory															
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	25	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 228	****	****	4.35	4.33	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	23	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 79	****	****	4.58	4.13	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	24	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 78	****	****	4.45	3.88	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	24	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 80	****	****	4.11	3.79	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	25	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 47	****	4.50	4.41	3.90	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	25	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 45	****	4.00	4.30	3.90	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	25	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 34	****	3.33	4.30	4.11	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	25	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 37	****	****	4.63	4.53	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	25	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 23	****	****	4.41	4.19	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	5	0.00-0.99	0	A 9	Required for Majors 15
28-55	7	1.00-1.99	0	B 9	
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	3	C 4	General 5
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	2	D 0	Under-grad 26
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	6	F 0	Non-major 26
				P 0	
				I 0	
				? 0	
					Other 0
					#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant

Course-Section: AFST 100 0201  
 Title INTRO BLACK EXPERIENCE  
 Instructor: TEMPLE, CHRISTE  
 Enrollment: 32  
 Questionnaires: 26

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2007

Page 11  
 JUN 26, 2007  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	1	4	7	14	4.31	849/1522	4.48	4.57	4.30	4.14	4.31	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	2	8	8	8	3.85	1222/1522	4.25	4.33	4.26	4.18	3.85	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	4	3	9	9	3.81	1065/1285	4.13	4.42	4.30	4.22	3.81	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	1	1	1	5	6	11	4.04	987/1476	4.35	4.38	4.22	4.09	4.04	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	1	0	3	1	2	17	4.43	402/1412	4.45	4.63	4.06	4.01	4.43	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	1	3	3	3	5	9	3.61	1130/1381	3.80	4.29	4.08	3.93	3.61	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	1	0	3	4	7	9	3.96	1038/1500	4.29	4.33	4.18	4.16	3.96	
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	7	17	4.71	891/1517	4.41	4.61	4.65	4.62	4.71	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	7	0	0	1	1	9	8	4.26	643/1497	4.36	4.28	4.11	4.02	4.26	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	1	5	4	13	4.26	1039/1440	4.50	4.48	4.45	4.40	4.26	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	0	0	0	22	5.00	1/1448	5.00	4.85	4.71	4.63	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	1	7	8	7	3.91	1147/1436	4.23	4.38	4.29	4.24	3.91	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	1	1	0	9	12	4.30	847/1432	4.58	4.43	4.29	4.23	4.30	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	2	1	4	8	3	4	3.25	1011/1221	3.65	3.85	3.93	3.86	3.25	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	2	4	7	4.38	492/1280	4.63	4.58	4.10	3.92	4.38	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	13	0	0	0	2	2	9	4.54	573/1277	4.73	4.72	4.34	4.13	4.54	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	13	0	0	0	1	1	11	4.77	371/1269	4.75	4.68	4.31	4.04	4.77	
4. Were special techniques successful	13	2	0	0	2	5	4	4.18	369/ 854	3.68	4.08	4.02	3.87	4.18	
Laboratory															
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	25	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 228	****	****	4.35	4.33	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	5	0.00-0.99	0	A	10	Required for Majors	15	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	1	B	10						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	3	C	1	General	5	Under-grad	26	Non-major	26
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	4	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5	F	1	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	0						

Course-Section: AFST 206 0101  
 Title AFRO-AMER HIST SURVEY  
 Instructor: SUTTON, KAREN E  
 Enrollment: 16  
 Questionnaires: 10

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2007

Page 12  
 JUN 26, 2007  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	1	0	5	1	3	3.50	1402/1522	3.50	4.57	4.30	4.34	3.50	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	2	2	2	3	3.40	1404/1522	3.40	4.33	4.26	4.29	3.40	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	2	2	6	4.40	650/1285	4.40	4.42	4.30	4.36	4.40		
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	3	3	3.80	1174/1476	3.80	4.38	4.22	4.20	3.80		
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	4	4	4.20	621/1412	4.20	4.63	4.06	4.00	4.20	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	3	2	4	3.90	938/1381	3.90	4.29	4.08	3.97	3.90	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	1	1	4	3	3.70	1219/1500	3.70	4.33	4.18	4.20	3.70	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	1	0	0	1	7	4.44	1128/1517	4.44	4.61	4.65	4.63	4.44	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	1	0	5	0	2	3.25	1370/1497	3.25	4.28	4.11	4.11	3.25	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	5	0	2	1	1	0	1	2.40	1430/1440	2.40	4.48	4.45	4.42	2.40	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	5	0	0	1	2	0	2	3.60	1417/1448	3.60	4.85	4.71	4.78	3.60	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	6	0	0	1	2	1	0	3.00	1378/1436	3.00	4.38	4.29	4.29	3.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	5	0	3	2	0	0	0	1.40	1428/1432	1.40	4.43	4.29	4.31	1.40	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	5	0	1	0	0	1	3	4.00	606/1221	4.00	3.85	3.93	4.02	4.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	1	2	1	3	3.86	849/1280	3.86	4.58	4.10	4.08	3.86	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	1	1	5	4.57	547/1277	4.57	4.72	4.34	4.33	4.57	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	2	2	3	4.14	836/1269	4.14	4.68	4.31	4.33	4.14	
4. Were special techniques successful	3	3	1	0	1	0	2	3.50	673/ 854	3.50	4.08	4.02	4.00	3.50	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	8	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 215	****	****	4.36	4.62	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	8	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 228	****	****	4.35	4.56	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	8	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 217	****	****	4.51	4.57	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	8	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 216	****	****	4.42	4.72	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	8	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 205	****	****	4.23	4.37	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	8	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 79	****	****	4.58	4.58	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	8	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/ 77	****	****	4.52	5.00	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 65	****	****	4.49	5.00	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 78	****	****	4.45	5.00	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	8	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/ 80	****	****	4.11	4.00	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	8	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 47	****	4.50	4.41	4.83	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	8	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 45	****	4.00	4.30	4.58	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	8	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 39	****	3.40	4.40	4.75	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	8	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 35	****	3.00	4.31	4.75	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	8	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 34	****	3.33	4.30	4.17	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 37	****	****	4.63	****	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 23	****	****	4.41	****	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 33	****	****	4.69	****	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 22	****	****	4.54	****	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 18	****	****	4.49	****	****	

Course-Section: AFST 206 0101  
 Title AFRO-AMER HIST SURVEY  
 Instructor: SUTTON, KAREN E  
 Enrollment: 16  
 Questionnaires: 10

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2007

Page 12  
 JUN 26, 2007  
 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	3	Required for Majors	5	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	B	3						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	2	C	3	General	2	Under-grad	10	Non-major	10
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	2	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	2				
				?	0						

Course-Section: AFST 211 0101  
 Title INTRO TO CONTEMP AFRIC  
 Instructor: LAMOUSE-SMITH,  
 Enrollment: 48  
 Questionnaires: 36

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2007

Page 13  
 JUN 26, 2007  
 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	2	2	3	9	19	4.17	980/1522	4.17	4.57	4.30	4.34	4.17	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	7	1	7	8	11	3.44	1388/1522	3.44	4.33	4.26	4.29	3.44	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	0	5	4	7	6	12	3.47	1172/1285	3.47	4.42	4.30	4.36	3.47	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	3	9	5	2	2	4	11	3.58	1289/1476	3.58	4.38	4.22	4.20	3.58	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	3	0	3	1	2	6	21	4.24	575/1412	4.24	4.63	4.06	4.00	4.24	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	3	14	3	2	5	3	6	3.37	1214/1381	3.37	4.29	4.08	3.97	3.37	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	1	3	2	5	6	18	4.00	988/1500	4.00	4.33	4.18	4.20	4.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	7	27	4.79	731/1517	4.79	4.61	4.65	4.63	4.79	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	9	1	4	0	4	13	5	3.58	1250/1497	3.58	4.28	4.11	4.11	3.58	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	3	3	1	13	13	3.91	1252/1440	3.91	4.48	4.45	4.42	3.91	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	1	4	2	26	4.61	1072/1448	4.61	4.85	4.71	4.78	4.61	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	3	2	5	9	13	3.84	1181/1436	3.84	4.38	4.29	4.29	3.84	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	5	2	4	5	17	3.82	1165/1432	3.82	4.43	4.29	4.31	3.82	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	6	0	4	1	4	10	11	3.77	781/1221	3.77	3.85	3.93	4.02	3.77	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	11	0	4	0	5	5	11	3.76	900/1280	3.76	4.58	4.10	4.08	3.76	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	10	0	1	1	6	3	15	4.15	873/1277	4.15	4.72	4.34	4.33	4.15	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	2	0	3	5	17	4.30	749/1269	4.30	4.68	4.31	4.33	4.30	
4. Were special techniques successful	10	19	0	0	1	1	5	4.57	****/ 854	****	4.08	4.02	4.00	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	35	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 79	****	****	4.58	4.58	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	35	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 77	****	****	4.52	5.00	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	35	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 65	****	****	4.49	5.00	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	35	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 78	****	****	4.45	5.00	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	35	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 80	****	****	4.11	4.00	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	4	0.00-0.99	0	A	6	Required for Majors	6	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	0	B	15						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	7	C	5	General	3	Under-grad	36	Non-major	36
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	4	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	14				
				?	0						

Course-Section: AFST 212 0101  
 Title AFRICAN HISTORY  
 Instructor: LAMOUSE-SMITH,  
 Enrollment: 26  
 Questionnaires: 13

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2007

Page 14  
 JUN 26, 2007  
 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	1	10	4.91	176/1522	4.91	4.57	4.30	4.34	4.91	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	0	1	0	3	7	4.45	623/1522	4.45	4.33	4.26	4.29	4.45	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	0	0	0	2	9	4.82	220/1285	4.82	4.42	4.30	4.36	4.82		
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	3	2	0	2	1	1	4	3.88	1141/1476	3.88	4.38	4.22	4.20	3.88	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1412	5.00	4.63	4.06	4.00	5.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	4	5	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	149/1381	4.75	4.29	4.08	3.97	4.75	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	3	0	0	0	2	1	7	4.50	483/1500	4.50	4.33	4.18	4.20	4.50	
8. How many times was class cancelled	4	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	532/1517	4.89	4.61	4.65	4.63	4.89	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	0	0	0	1	3	3	4.29	622/1497	4.29	4.28	4.11	4.11	4.29	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	0	4	6	4.60	682/1440	4.60	4.48	4.45	4.42	4.60	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	494/1448	4.90	4.85	4.71	4.78	4.90	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	2	1	7	4.50	601/1436	4.50	4.38	4.29	4.29	4.50	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	161/1432	4.90	4.43	4.29	4.31	4.90	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	0	0	0	1	0	8	4.78	114/1221	4.78	3.85	3.93	4.02	4.78	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	151/1280	4.88	4.58	4.10	4.08	4.88	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1277	5.00	4.72	4.34	4.33	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	0	1	1	1	4	4.14	836/1269	4.14	4.68	4.31	4.33	4.14	
4. Were special techniques successful	5	5	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 854	****	4.08	4.02	4.00	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	4	Required for Majors	4	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	1						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	1	General	5	Under-grad	13	Non-major	13
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	1	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	0						

Course-Section: AFST 255 0101  
 Title PSYC OF BLACK EXPERIEN  
 Instructor: MANCE, GISHAWN  
 Enrollment: 13  
 Questionnaires: 12

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2007

Page 15  
 JUN 26, 2007  
 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	12	5.00	1/1522	5.00	4.57	4.30	4.34	5.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	10	4.83	179/1522	4.83	4.33	4.26	4.29	4.83	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	1	9	4.58	446/1285	4.58	4.42	4.30	4.36	4.58	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	9	4.75	226/1476	4.75	4.38	4.22	4.20	4.75	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	10	4.83	126/1412	4.83	4.63	4.06	4.00	4.83	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	3	9	4.75	149/1381	4.75	4.29	4.08	3.97	4.75	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	2	9	4.67	312/1500	4.67	4.33	4.18	4.20	4.67	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	7	5	4.42	1152/1517	4.42	4.61	4.65	4.63	4.42	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	1	1	0	0	4	3	4.00	898/1497	4.00	4.28	4.11	4.11	4.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	2	9	4.82	336/1440	4.82	4.48	4.45	4.42	4.82	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	494/1448	4.91	4.85	4.71	4.78	4.91	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	123/1436	4.91	4.38	4.29	4.29	4.91	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	161/1432	4.91	4.43	4.29	4.31	4.91	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	0	0	2	9	4.82	96/1221	4.82	3.85	3.93	4.02	4.82	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	1	1	7	4.67	286/1280	4.67	4.58	4.10	4.08	4.67	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	245/1277	4.89	4.72	4.34	4.33	4.89	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1269	5.00	4.68	4.31	4.33	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	3	2	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	81/ 854	4.86	4.08	4.02	4.00	4.86	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	2	0.00-0.99 0	A 4	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 1	General 3	Under-grad 12 Non-major 12
84-150	3	3.00-3.49 3	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 2	
			? 0		

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	0	0	8	10	4.56	548/1522	4.56	4.57	4.30	4.34	4.56	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	2	7	8	4.35	763/1522	4.35	4.33	4.26	4.29	4.35	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	8	0	0	1	3	5	4.44	602/1285	4.44	4.42	4.30	4.36	4.44	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	6	3	8	4.12	945/1476	4.12	4.38	4.22	4.20	4.12	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	6	12	4.67	231/1412	4.67	4.63	4.06	4.00	4.67	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	3	5	9	4.35	495/1381	4.35	4.29	4.08	3.97	4.35	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	1	5	1	9	4.13	913/1500	4.13	4.33	4.18	4.20	4.13	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	4	11	2	3.88	1453/1517	3.88	4.61	4.65	4.63	3.88	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	1	6	7	4.43	481/1497	4.43	4.28	4.11	4.11	4.43	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	3	2	11	4.50	798/1440	4.50	4.48	4.45	4.42	4.50	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	1	15	4.94	346/1448	4.94	4.85	4.71	4.78	4.94	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	1	5	9	4.53	564/1436	4.53	4.38	4.29	4.29	4.53	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	1	1	2	11	4.53	600/1432	4.53	4.43	4.29	4.31	4.53	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	6	4	0	2	4	0	2.60	1154/1221	2.60	3.85	3.93	4.02	2.60	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	3	12	4.80	184/1280	4.80	4.58	4.10	4.08	4.80	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	1	2	3	9	4.33	743/1277	4.33	4.72	4.34	4.33	4.33	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	0	2	13	4.87	266/1269	4.87	4.68	4.31	4.33	4.87	
4. Were special techniques successful	3	9	2	1	0	1	2	3.00	779/ 854	3.00	4.08	4.02	4.00	3.00	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	15	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 215	****	****	4.36	4.62	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	16	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 228	****	****	4.35	4.56	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	16	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 217	****	****	4.51	4.57	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	16	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 216	****	****	4.42	4.72	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	16	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 205	****	****	4.23	4.37	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	16	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 79	****	****	4.58	4.58	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	16	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 77	****	****	4.52	5.00	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 65	****	****	4.49	5.00	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	16	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 78	****	****	4.45	5.00	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	16	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 80	****	****	4.11	4.00	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 47	****	4.50	4.41	4.83	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 45	****	4.00	4.30	4.58	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 39	****	3.40	4.40	4.75	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 35	****	3.00	4.31	4.75	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 34	****	3.33	4.30	4.17	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 37	****	****	4.63	****	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	16	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 23	****	****	4.41	****	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	16	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 33	****	****	4.69	****	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	16	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 22	****	****	4.54	****	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	16	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 18	****	****	4.49	****	****	



Course-Section: AFST 260 0101  
 Title BLACK LITERATURE TO 19  
 Instructor: WALLACE, BELIND  
 Enrollment: 26  
 Questionnaires: 18

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2007

Page 16  
 JUN 26, 2007  
 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	7	Required for Majors	9	Graduate	1	Major	0
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	B	4						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	3	C	4	General	4	Under-grad	17	Non-major	18
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	5	D	0						
Grad.	1	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 345 0101  
 Title BLACK AMERICAN MUSIC  
 Instructor: DALILI, EFIA  
 Enrollment: 26  
 Questionnaires: 12

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2007

Page 17  
 JUN 26, 2007  
 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	1	4	6	4.45	669/1522	4.45	4.57	4.30	4.34	4.45	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	3	8	4.73	288/1522	4.73	4.33	4.26	4.25	4.73	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	2	0	0	1	2	5	4.50	531/1285	4.50	4.42	4.30	4.30	4.50	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	0	10	4.82	172/1476	4.82	4.38	4.22	4.26	4.82	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	4	7	4.64	257/1412	4.64	4.63	4.06	4.03	4.64	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	3	8	4.73	168/1381	4.73	4.29	4.08	4.13	4.73	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	1	4	6	4.45	556/1500	4.45	4.33	4.18	4.13	4.45	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	3	8	4.73	855/1517	4.73	4.61	4.65	4.62	4.73	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	0	0	0	1	2	3	4.33	573/1497	4.33	4.28	4.11	4.13	4.33	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	3	8	4.73	512/1440	4.73	4.48	4.45	4.46	4.73	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1448	5.00	4.85	4.71	4.71	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	1	1	9	4.73	341/1436	4.73	4.38	4.29	4.30	4.73	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	2	9	4.82	280/1432	4.82	4.43	4.29	4.29	4.82	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	1	2	1	7	4.27	448/1221	4.27	3.85	3.93	3.94	4.27	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	4	6	4.60	324/1280	4.60	4.58	4.10	4.14	4.60	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	2	1	7	4.50	594/1277	4.50	4.72	4.34	4.38	4.50	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1269	5.00	4.68	4.31	4.39	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	2	2	0	0	2	0	6	4.50	194/ 854	4.50	4.08	4.02	4.00	4.50	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: AFST 352 0101  
 Title AFAM HISTORY TO 1865  
 Instructor: MCANDREW, JENNI  
 Enrollment: 13  
 Questionnaires: 9

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2007

Page 18  
 JUN 26, 2007  
 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	3	6	4.67	433/1522	4.67	4.57	4.30	4.34	4.67	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	3	5	4.44	639/1522	4.44	4.33	4.26	4.25	4.44	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	165/1285	4.89	4.42	4.30	4.30	4.89	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	1	7	4.67	316/1476	4.67	4.38	4.22	4.26	4.67	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	108/1412	4.89	4.63	4.06	4.03	4.89	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	4	3	4.11	743/1381	4.11	4.29	4.08	4.13	4.11	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	124/1500	4.88	4.33	4.18	4.13	4.88	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	4	5	4.56	1037/1517	4.56	4.61	4.65	4.62	4.56	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	223/1497	4.71	4.28	4.11	4.13	4.71	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	240/1440	4.88	4.48	4.45	4.46	4.88	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1448	5.00	4.85	4.71	4.71	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	295/1436	4.75	4.38	4.29	4.30	4.75	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	200/1432	4.88	4.43	4.29	4.29	4.88	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	2	1	0	2	1	1	3.20	1028/1221	3.20	3.85	3.93	3.94	3.20	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	3	2	4.40	477/1280	4.40	4.58	4.10	4.14	4.40	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	317/1277	4.80	4.72	4.34	4.38	4.80	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	332/1269	4.80	4.68	4.31	4.39	4.80	
4. Were special techniques successful	4	0	0	0	0	3	2	4.40	252/ 854	4.40	4.08	4.02	4.00	4.40	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: AFST 362 0101  
 Title: STUDIES IN BLACK POETR  
 Instructor: WALLACE, BELIND  
 Enrollment: 14  
 Questionnaires: 8

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2007

Page 19  
 JUN 26, 2007  
 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	3	5	4.63	472/1522	4.63	4.57	4.30	4.34	4.63	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	4	4	4.50	545/1522	4.50	4.33	4.26	4.25	4.50	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	6	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1285	****	4.42	4.30	4.30	****	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	4	4	4.50	473/1476	4.50	4.38	4.22	4.26	4.50	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1412	5.00	4.63	4.06	4.03	5.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	2	1	4	4.29	575/1381	4.29	4.29	4.08	4.13	4.29	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	252/1500	4.71	4.33	4.18	4.13	4.71	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1517	5.00	4.61	4.65	4.62	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	312/1497	4.60	4.28	4.11	4.13	4.60	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	3	5	4.63	656/1440	4.63	4.48	4.45	4.46	4.63	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1448	5.00	4.85	4.71	4.71	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	1	0	1	0	6	4.25	876/1436	4.25	4.38	4.29	4.30	4.25	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	1	6	4.63	502/1432	4.63	4.43	4.29	4.29	4.63	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	6	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	1064/1221	3.00	3.85	3.93	3.94	3.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1280	5.00	4.58	4.10	4.14	5.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1277	5.00	4.72	4.34	4.38	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	255/1269	4.88	4.68	4.31	4.39	4.88	
4. Were special techniques successful	0	4	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	194/ 854	4.50	4.08	4.02	4.00	4.50	
Laboratory															
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 228	****	****	4.35	4.29	****	

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	0	1.00-1.99	B 3		Graduate 0
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	C 0	General	8
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	D 0		Major
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	2
			P 0		### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	4
			? 0		

Course-Section: AFST 370 0101  
 Title BLK WOMEN:CROSS-CULT P  
 Instructor: TEMPLE, CHRISTE  
 Enrollment: 36  
 Questionnaires: 29

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2007

Page 20  
 JUN 26, 2007  
 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	3	0	5	6	15	4.03	1101/1522	4.03	4.57	4.30	4.34	4.03	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	3	5	2	10	8	3.54	1352/1522	3.54	4.33	4.26	4.25	3.54	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	14	1	3	2	8	0	3.21	1233/1285	3.21	4.42	4.30	4.30	3.21	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	2	1	3	5	10	7	3.73	1207/1476	3.73	4.38	4.22	4.26	3.73	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	3	3	5	16	4.03	741/1412	4.03	4.63	4.06	4.03	4.03	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	2	4	1	7	8	7	3.48	1161/1381	3.48	4.29	4.08	4.13	3.48	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	1	6	7	5	8	3.48	1309/1500	3.48	4.33	4.18	4.13	3.48	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	1	18	10	4.31	1233/1517	4.31	4.61	4.65	4.62	4.31	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	2	1	4	8	9	3.88	1057/1497	3.88	4.28	4.11	4.13	3.88	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	2	3	2	9	12	3.93	1238/1440	3.93	4.48	4.45	4.46	3.93	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	2	26	4.93	395/1448	4.93	4.85	4.71	4.71	4.93	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	1	3	7	8	9	3.75	1212/1436	3.75	4.38	4.29	4.30	3.75	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	2	3	4	6	13	3.89	1130/1432	3.89	4.43	4.29	4.29	3.89	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	6	1	4	5	7	4	3.43	944/1221	3.43	3.85	3.93	3.94	3.43	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	2	1	3	6	13	4.08	690/1280	4.08	4.58	4.10	4.14	4.08	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	2	1	7	16	4.42	672/1277	4.42	4.72	4.34	4.38	4.42	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	1	3	2	2	18	4.27	770/1269	4.27	4.68	4.31	4.39	4.27	
4. Were special techniques successful	3	8	4	2	5	3	4	3.06	775/ 854	3.06	4.08	4.02	4.00	3.06	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99 0	A 9	Required for Majors 2	Graduate 1 Major 2
28-55	2	1.00-1.99 0	B 13		
56-83	3	2.00-2.99 4	C 2	General 5	Under-grad 28 Non-major 27
84-150	13	3.00-3.49 7	D 0		
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00 5	F 2	Electives 0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 18	
			? 2		

Course-Section: AFST 385 0101  
 Title PROB SOLV URBAN BLK CO  
 Instructor: HICKEY, TERRY  
 Enrollment: 14  
 Questionnaires: 11

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2007

Page 21  
 JUN 26, 2007  
 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	1	10	4.91	176/1522	4.91	4.57	4.30	4.34	4.91	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	3	7	4.55	499/1522	4.55	4.33	4.26	4.25	4.55	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	0	0	3	5	4.63	405/1285	4.63	4.42	4.30	4.30	4.63	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	4	7	4.64	347/1476	4.64	4.38	4.22	4.26	4.64	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	3	8	4.73	185/1412	4.73	4.63	4.06	4.03	4.73	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	1	9	4.73	168/1381	4.73	4.29	4.08	4.13	4.73	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	4	7	4.64	349/1500	4.64	4.33	4.18	4.13	4.64	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	7	4	4.36	1193/1517	4.36	4.61	4.65	4.62	4.36	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	1	3	5	4.44	457/1497	4.44	4.28	4.11	4.13	4.44	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	2	9	4.82	336/1440	4.82	4.48	4.45	4.46	4.82	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	2	9	4.82	737/1448	4.82	4.85	4.71	4.71	4.82	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	5	6	4.55	551/1436	4.55	4.38	4.29	4.30	4.55	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	3	7	4.70	418/1432	4.70	4.43	4.29	4.29	4.70	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	1	1	2	2	4	3.70	814/1221	3.70	3.85	3.93	3.94	3.70	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	1	8	4.70	267/1280	4.70	4.58	4.10	4.14	4.70	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	0	3	7	4.70	442/1277	4.70	4.72	4.34	4.38	4.70	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	332/1269	4.80	4.68	4.31	4.39	4.80	
4. Were special techniques successful	1	2	0	0	2	2	4	4.25	330/ 854	4.25	4.08	4.02	4.00	4.25	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 6	Required for Majors	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	B 1		Graduate 0
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	C 0	General	3
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad 11
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 440A 0101  
 Title EDUC AND BLACK FAMILIE  
 Instructor: KING, SHARON  
 Enrollment: 15  
 Questionnaires: 9

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2007

Page 22  
 JUN 26, 2007  
 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	9	5.00	1/1522	5.00	4.57	4.30	4.42	5.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	2	6	4.56	488/1522	4.56	4.33	4.26	4.34	4.56	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	189/1285	4.86	4.42	4.30	4.42	4.86	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	207/1476	4.78	4.38	4.22	4.31	4.78	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	108/1412	4.89	4.63	4.06	4.11	4.89	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	2	6	4.56	289/1381	4.56	4.29	4.08	4.21	4.56	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	2	1	1	1	4	3.44	1333/1500	3.44	4.33	4.18	4.25	3.44	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1517	5.00	4.61	4.65	4.71	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	2	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	312/1497	4.60	4.28	4.11	4.21	4.60	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1440	5.00	4.48	4.45	4.52	5.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1448	5.00	4.85	4.71	4.75	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	1	7	4.67	415/1436	4.67	4.38	4.29	4.32	4.67	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	187/1432	4.89	4.43	4.29	4.34	4.89	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	2	1	6	4.44	327/1221	4.44	3.85	3.93	4.04	4.44	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1280	5.00	4.58	4.10	4.28	5.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1277	5.00	4.72	4.34	4.50	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1269	5.00	4.68	4.31	4.49	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	0	1	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/ 854	5.00	4.08	4.02	4.31	5.00	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	25/ 47	4.50	4.50	4.41	4.51	4.50	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	3	0	0	1	0	3	2	4.00	30/ 45	4.00	4.00	4.30	4.22	4.00	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	3	1	1	1	0	1	2	3.40	34/ 39	3.40	3.40	4.40	4.03	3.40	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	3	2	1	0	2	0	1	3.00	32/ 35	3.00	3.00	4.31	4.13	3.00	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	3	3	0	1	1	0	1	3.33	30/ 34	3.33	3.33	4.30	4.11	3.33	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: AFST 440B 0101  
 Title 20TH CENT CIVIL RIGHTS  
 Instructor: SMITH, IRENE  
 Enrollment: 5  
 Questionnaires: 4

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2007

Page 23  
 JUN 26, 2007  
 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	4	5.00	1/1522	5.00	4.57	4.30	4.42	5.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1522	5.00	4.33	4.26	4.34	5.00	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1285	5.00	4.42	4.30	4.42	5.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1476	5.00	4.38	4.22	4.31	5.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1412	5.00	4.63	4.06	4.11	5.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1381	5.00	4.29	4.08	4.21	5.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1500	5.00	4.33	4.18	4.25	5.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1517	5.00	4.61	4.65	4.71	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	189/1497	4.75	4.28	4.11	4.21	4.75	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1440	5.00	4.48	4.45	4.52	5.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1448	5.00	4.85	4.71	4.75	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1436	5.00	4.38	4.29	4.32	5.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1432	5.00	4.43	4.29	4.34	5.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	124/1221	4.75	3.85	3.93	4.04	4.75	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1280	5.00	4.58	4.10	4.28	5.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1277	5.00	4.72	4.34	4.50	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1269	5.00	4.68	4.31	4.49	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	0	2	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	194/ 854	4.50	4.08	4.02	4.31	4.50	

Frequency Distribution

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

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



Course-Section: AFST 495 0101  
 Title FIELD RESEARCH AFR STU  
 Instructor: ROBINSON, THOMA  
 Enrollment: 5  
 Questionnaires: 5

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2007

Page 24  
 JUN 26, 2007  
 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	1	4	4.80	246/1522	4.80	4.57	4.30	4.42	4.80	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	432/1522	4.60	4.33	4.26	4.34	4.60	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	228/1285	4.80	4.42	4.30	4.42	4.80	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	178/1476	4.80	4.38	4.22	4.31	4.80	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	430/1412	4.40	4.63	4.06	4.11	4.40	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	118/1381	4.80	4.29	4.08	4.21	4.80	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	160/1500	4.80	4.33	4.18	4.25	4.80	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1517	5.00	4.61	4.65	4.71	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	264/1497	4.67	4.28	4.11	4.21	4.67	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1440	5.00	4.48	4.45	4.52	5.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1448	5.00	4.85	4.71	4.75	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	295/1436	4.75	4.38	4.29	4.32	4.75	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1432	5.00	4.43	4.29	4.34	5.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	1	0	0	2	1	1	3.75	786/1221	3.75	3.85	3.93	4.04	3.75	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	222/1280	4.75	4.58	4.10	4.28	4.75	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1277	5.00	4.72	4.34	4.50	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	586/1269	4.50	4.68	4.31	4.49	4.50	

Frequency Distribution

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