

Course-Section: AFST 100 0201  
 Title INTRO BLACK EXPERIENCE  
 Instructor: TEMPLE, CHRISTE  
 Enrollment: 44  
 Questionnaires: 35

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2007

Page 27  
 FEB 13, 2008  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies		Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	6	28	4.77	293/1639	4.89	4.61	4.27	4.08	4.77
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	15	17	4.37	722/1639	4.60	4.46	4.22	4.17	4.37
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	1	3	6	12	12	3.91	1074/1397	4.26	4.58	4.28	4.18	3.91
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	2	3	18	11	4.12	929/1583	4.23	4.42	4.19	4.01	4.12
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	4	12	19	4.43	419/1532	4.71	4.48	4.01	3.88	4.43
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	1	2	17	14	4.29	576/1504	4.56	4.54	4.05	3.78	4.29
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	1	3	12	9	9	3.65	1338/1612	3.82	4.29	4.16	4.10	3.65
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	1	0	0	8	26	4.66	1012/1635	4.83	4.71	4.65	4.56	4.66
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	14	1	1	0	2	11	6	4.05	859/1579	4.19	4.34	4.08	3.95	4.05
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	1	4	7	22	4.47	849/1518	4.74	4.56	4.43	4.38	4.47
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	1	0	1	32	4.88	597/1520	4.94	4.84	4.70	4.61	4.88
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	1	0	7	9	17	4.21	939/1517	4.44	4.51	4.27	4.20	4.21
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	1	0	1	4	9	19	4.39	778/1550	4.61	4.58	4.22	4.17	4.39
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	3	6	6	19	4.21	497/1295	4.52	4.12	3.94	3.84	4.21
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	1	0	2	12	13	4.29	599/1398	4.48	4.63	4.07	3.85	4.29
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	1	0	3	7	17	4.39	702/1391	4.53	4.74	4.30	4.07	4.39
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	0	1	1	5	20	4.63	546/1388	4.51	4.66	4.28	4.01	4.63
4. Were special techniques successful	8	2	1	1	4	12	7	3.92	516/ 958	4.36	4.07	3.93	3.71	3.92
Laboratory														
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	34	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 240	****	****	4.11	4.01	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	34	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 215	****	****	4.35	4.43	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	30	1	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	****/ 85	****	4.50	4.58	4.50	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	30	0	0	0	2	1	2	4.00	****/ 82	****	5.00	4.52	4.12	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	31	2	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 78	****	5.00	4.47	4.25	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	30	0	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	****/ 80	****	5.00	4.47	4.39	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	30	1	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	****/ 82	****	4.00	4.16	3.90	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	33	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 52	****	****	4.04	3.61	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	32	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 53	****	****	4.05	3.51	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	32	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 42	****	****	4.75	4.79	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	33	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 37	****	****	4.58	5.00	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	32	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/ 50	****	****	4.45	4.54	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	32	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 32	****	****	4.51	4.67	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	32	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 43	****	****	4.69	4.69	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	33	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 32	****	****	4.37	4.67	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	32	2	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 21	****	****	4.52	5.00	****

Course-Section: AFST 100 0201  
 Title INTRO BLACK EXPERIENCE  
 Instructor: TEMPLE, CHRISTE  
 Enrollment: 44  
 Questionnaires: 35

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2007

Page 27  
 FEB 13, 2008  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	5	0.00-0.99	3	A	10	Required for Majors	10	Graduate	0	Major	2
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	B	15						
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	4	C	2	General	13	Under-grad	35	Non-major	33
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	3	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	3				
				?	0						

Course-Section: AFST 100 0301  
 Title INTRO BLACK EXPERIENCE  
 Instructor: SMITH, IRENE  
 Enrollment: 9  
 Questionnaires: 6

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2007

Page 28  
 FEB 13, 2008  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies		Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1639	4.89	4.61	4.27	4.08	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	177/1639	4.60	4.46	4.22	4.17	4.83
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	417/1397	4.26	4.58	4.28	4.18	4.60
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	4	2	4.33	697/1583	4.23	4.42	4.19	4.01	4.33
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1532	4.71	4.48	4.01	3.88	5.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	138/1504	4.56	4.54	4.05	3.78	4.83
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	1	1	3	4.00	1044/1612	3.82	4.29	4.16	4.10	4.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1635	4.83	4.71	4.65	4.56	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	569/1579	4.19	4.34	4.08	3.95	4.33
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1518	4.74	4.56	4.43	4.38	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1520	4.94	4.84	4.70	4.61	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	0	5	4.67	405/1517	4.44	4.51	4.27	4.20	4.67
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	253/1550	4.61	4.58	4.22	4.17	4.83
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	100/1295	4.52	4.12	3.94	3.84	4.83
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	0	5	4.67	329/1398	4.48	4.63	4.07	3.85	4.67
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	489/1391	4.53	4.74	4.30	4.07	4.67
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	740/1388	4.51	4.66	4.28	4.01	4.40
4. Were special techniques successful	0	1	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	99/ 958	4.36	4.07	3.93	3.71	4.80
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 224	****	****	4.10	3.90	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 240	****	****	4.11	4.01	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 219	****	****	4.44	4.44	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 215	****	****	4.35	4.43	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 198	****	****	4.18	4.25	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 85	****	4.50	4.58	4.50	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 82	****	5.00	4.52	4.12	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 78	****	5.00	4.47	4.25	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 80	****	5.00	4.47	4.39	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 82	****	4.00	4.16	3.90	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.04	3.61	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 53	****	****	4.05	3.51	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 42	****	****	4.75	4.79	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 37	****	****	4.58	5.00	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 32	****	****	4.56	4.60	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 50	****	****	4.45	4.54	****

2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/	32	****	****	4.51	4.67	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/	43	****	****	4.69	4.69	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/	32	****	****	4.37	4.67	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/	21	****	****	4.52	5.00	****

Course-Section: AFST 100 0301  
 Title INTRO BLACK EXPERIENCE  
 Instructor: SMITH, IRENE  
 Enrollment: 9  
 Questionnaires: 6

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2007

Page 28  
 FEB 13, 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	2	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	3						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	1	C	0	General	1	Under-grad	6	Non-major	6
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	0	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	1				
				?	0						

Course-Section: AFST 206 0101  
 Title AFRO-AMER HIST SURVEY  
 Instructor: SUTTON, KAREN E  
 Enrollment: 16  
 Questionnaires: 12

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2007

Page 29  
 FEB 13, 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	3	1	8	4.42	740/1639	4.42	4.61	4.27	4.35	4.42
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	3	7	4.42	667/1639	4.42	4.46	4.22	4.27	4.42
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	2	9	4.67	367/1397	4.67	4.58	4.28	4.39	4.67
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	5	5	4.25	792/1583	4.25	4.42	4.19	4.28	4.25
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	2	1	8	4.33	506/1532	4.33	4.48	4.01	4.09	4.33
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	4	6	4.33	544/1504	4.33	4.54	4.05	4.09	4.33
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	2	4	6	4.33	718/1612	4.33	4.29	4.16	4.21	4.33
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	1	0	4	7	4.42	1225/1635	4.42	4.71	4.65	4.63	4.42
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	2	7	2	4.00	889/1579	4.00	4.34	4.08	4.14	4.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	1	0	1	4	6	4.17	1162/1518	4.17	4.56	4.43	4.48	4.17
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	1	10	4.75	890/1520	4.75	4.84	4.70	4.78	4.75
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	1	1	0	1	9	4.33	800/1517	4.33	4.51	4.27	4.34	4.33
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	1	2	8	4.42	755/1550	4.42	4.58	4.22	4.33	4.42
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	1	2	1	8	4.33	398/1295	4.33	4.12	3.94	4.07	4.33
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	1	0	1	6	4.50	426/1398	4.50	4.63	4.07	4.14	4.50
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	0	1	1	6	4.63	525/1391	4.63	4.74	4.30	4.35	4.63
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	1	0	2	5	4.38	758/1388	4.38	4.66	4.28	4.37	4.38
4. Were special techniques successful	4	1	0	0	2	3	2	4.00	456/ 958	4.00	4.07	3.93	4.00	4.00

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	8	Required for Majors	4	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	3						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	1	C	1	General	2	Under-grad	12	Non-major	12
84-150	0	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	5				
				?	0						

Course-Section: AFST 213 0101  
 Title AFRICA: CULT/DEVELOPMN  
 Instructor: BADRU, LATEEF  
 Enrollment: 27  
 Questionnaires: 20

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2007

Page 30  
 FEB 13, 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	1	0	0	0	1	2	16	4.79	281/1639	4.79	4.61	4.27	4.35	4.79
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	1	3	4	11	4.32	800/1639	4.32	4.46	4.22	4.27	4.32
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	7	0	0	1	3	9	4.62	408/1397	4.62	4.58	4.28	4.39	4.62
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	6	12	4.58	402/1583	4.58	4.42	4.19	4.28	4.58
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	2	6	11	4.47	366/1532	4.47	4.48	4.01	4.09	4.47
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	4	1	14	4.53	351/1504	4.53	4.54	4.05	4.09	4.53
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	0	7	5	6	3.79	1263/1612	3.79	4.29	4.16	4.21	3.79
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	1	9	9	4.42	1215/1635	4.42	4.71	4.65	4.63	4.42
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	0	0	1	2	4	7	4.21	702/1579	4.21	4.34	4.08	4.14	4.21
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	1	0	0	2	17	4.70	561/1518	4.70	4.56	4.43	4.48	4.70
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	1	17	4.94	328/1520	4.94	4.84	4.70	4.78	4.94
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	1	0	3	15	4.68	382/1517	4.68	4.51	4.27	4.34	4.68
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	3	17	4.85	231/1550	4.85	4.58	4.22	4.33	4.85
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	2	1	0	4	5	8	4.06	600/1295	4.06	4.12	3.94	4.07	4.06
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	3	2	12	4.53	414/1398	4.53	4.63	4.07	4.14	4.53
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	0	5	12	4.71	454/1391	4.71	4.74	4.30	4.35	4.71
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	1	1	15	4.82	307/1388	4.82	4.66	4.28	4.37	4.82
4. Were special techniques successful	3	5	0	0	5	2	5	4.00	456/ 958	4.00	4.07	3.93	4.00	4.00
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	17	1	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/ 224	****	****	4.10	4.33	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	18	0	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/ 240	****	****	4.11	4.47	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	17	1	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 219	****	****	4.44	4.61	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	18	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 215	****	****	4.35	4.43	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	17	1	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/ 198	****	****	4.18	4.08	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	18	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 85	****	4.50	4.58	4.00	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	18	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 82	****	5.00	4.52	3.00	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	17	0	1	0	1	0	1	3.00	****/ 78	****	5.00	4.47	****	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/ 80	****	5.00	4.47	2.00	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	18	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 82	****	4.00	4.16	4.00	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	18	0	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.04	4.78	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	18	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 53	****	****	4.05	4.28	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	18	0	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/ 42	****	****	4.75	****	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	18	0	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/ 37	****	****	4.58	****	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	18	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 32	****	****	4.56	****	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 50	****	****	4.45	3.24	****

2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	18	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/	32	****	****	4.51	4.33	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	18	0	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/	43	****	****	4.69	****	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	18	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/	32	****	****	4.37	1.00	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	18	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/	21	****	****	4.52	3.00	****



Course-Section: AFST 213 0101  
 Title AFRICA: CULT/DEVELOPMN  
 Instructor: BADRU, LATEEF  
 Enrollment: 27  
 Questionnaires: 20

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2007

Page 30  
 FEB 13, 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	17	Required for Majors	7	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B	1						
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	2	C	0	General	4	Under-grad	20	Non-major	19
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	7	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	2	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	7				
				?	0						

Course-Section: AFST 230 0101  
 Title COMP AFRICAN RELIGIONS  
 Instructor: ANSAHBREW, KWAM  
 Enrollment: 30  
 Questionnaires: 25

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2007

Page 31  
 FEB 13, 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	1	6	17	4.56	550/1639	4.56	4.61	4.27	4.35	4.56
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	2	2	6	15	4.36	735/1639	4.36	4.46	4.22	4.27	4.36
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	1	0	2	4	17	4.50	517/1397	4.50	4.58	4.28	4.39	4.50
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	6	0	0	4	6	8	4.22	822/1583	4.22	4.42	4.19	4.28	4.22
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	5	19	4.79	152/1532	4.79	4.48	4.01	4.09	4.79
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	1	1	0	5	4	13	4.22	647/1504	4.22	4.54	4.05	4.09	4.22
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	1	6	5	11	4.13	944/1612	4.13	4.29	4.16	4.21	4.13
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	0	23	5.00	1/1635	5.00	4.71	4.65	4.63	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	4	7	10	4.29	623/1579	4.29	4.34	4.08	4.14	4.29
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	3	6	13	4.45	877/1518	4.45	4.56	4.43	4.48	4.45
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	1	23	4.96	273/1520	4.96	4.84	4.70	4.78	4.96
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	2	0	5	16	4.52	572/1517	4.52	4.51	4.27	4.34	4.52
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	0	3	1	18	4.52	614/1550	4.52	4.58	4.22	4.33	4.52
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	1	2	2	2	5	10	3.90	731/1295	3.90	4.12	3.94	4.07	3.90
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	0	4	13	4.76	251/1398	4.76	4.63	4.07	4.14	4.76
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	0	0	0	2	15	4.88	248/1391	4.88	4.74	4.30	4.35	4.88
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	0	0	0	2	15	4.88	244/1388	4.88	4.66	4.28	4.37	4.88
4. Were special techniques successful	8	13	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	****/ 958	****	4.07	3.93	4.00	****
Laboratory														
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	23	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 240	****	****	4.11	4.47	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	23	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 219	****	****	4.44	4.61	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	24	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 215	****	****	4.35	4.43	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	24	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 198	****	****	4.18	4.08	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	23	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 85	****	4.50	4.58	4.00	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	23	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 82	****	5.00	4.52	3.00	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	23	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 78	****	5.00	4.47	****	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	23	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 80	****	5.00	4.47	2.00	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	23	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 82	****	4.00	4.16	4.00	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	24	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.04	4.78	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	24	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 53	****	****	4.05	4.28	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	24	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 42	****	****	4.75	****	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	24	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 37	****	****	4.58	****	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	24	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 32	****	****	4.56	****	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	23	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 50	****	****	4.45	3.24	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	23	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 32	****	****	4.51	4.33	****

3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	23	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/	43	****	****	4.69	****	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	23	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/	32	****	****	4.37	1.00	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	23	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/	21	****	****	4.52	3.00	****

Course-Section: AFST 230 0101  
 Title COMP AFRICAN RELIGIONS  
 Instructor: ANSAHBREW, KWAM  
 Enrollment: 30  
 Questionnaires: 25

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2007

Page 31  
 FEB 13, 2008  
 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	14	Required for Majors	10	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	1						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	5	Under-grad	25	Non-major	25
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	2	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	4				
				?	1						

Course-Section: AFST 255 0101  
 Title PSYC OF BLACK EXPERIEN  
 Instructor: MANCE, GISHAWN  
 Enrollment: 16  
 Questionnaires: 13

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2007

Page 32  
 FEB 13, 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	2	4	7	4.38	771/1639	4.38	4.61	4.27	4.35	4.38
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	0	10	4.46	583/1639	4.46	4.46	4.22	4.27	4.46
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	1	11	4.77	271/1397	4.77	4.58	4.28	4.39	4.77
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	2	4	6	4.33	697/1583	4.33	4.42	4.19	4.28	4.33
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	3	0	10	4.54	317/1532	4.54	4.48	4.01	4.09	4.54
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	11	4.85	134/1504	4.85	4.54	4.05	4.09	4.85
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	1	2	9	4.46	546/1612	4.46	4.29	4.16	4.21	4.46
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	3	10	4.77	869/1635	4.77	4.71	4.65	4.63	4.77
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	2	2	7	4.45	439/1579	4.45	4.34	4.08	4.14	4.45
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	3	10	4.77	435/1518	4.77	4.56	4.43	4.48	4.77
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	12	4.92	437/1520	4.92	4.84	4.70	4.78	4.92
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	1	3	8	4.58	498/1517	4.58	4.51	4.27	4.34	4.58
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	1	11	4.77	338/1550	4.77	4.58	4.22	4.33	4.77
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	3	0	10	4.54	251/1295	4.54	4.12	3.94	4.07	4.54
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	2	10	4.83	200/1398	4.83	4.63	4.07	4.14	4.83
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/1391	5.00	4.74	4.30	4.35	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	2	0	10	4.67	496/1388	4.67	4.66	4.28	4.37	4.67
4. Were special techniques successful	2	0	0	0	2	1	8	4.55	192/ 958	4.55	4.07	3.93	4.00	4.55
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	12	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 224	****	****	4.10	4.33	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	12	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 240	****	****	4.11	4.47	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	12	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 219	****	****	4.44	4.61	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	12	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 215	****	****	4.35	4.43	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	12	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 198	****	****	4.18	4.08	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	12	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 85	****	4.50	4.58	4.00	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	12	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 82	****	5.00	4.52	3.00	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 78	****	5.00	4.47	****	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 80	****	5.00	4.47	2.00	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	12	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 82	****	4.00	4.16	4.00	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.04	4.78	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	12	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 53	****	****	4.05	4.28	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	12	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 42	****	****	4.75	****	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	12	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 37	****	****	4.58	****	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	12	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 32	****	****	4.56	****	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 50	****	****	4.45	3.24	****

2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	12	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/	32	****	****	4.51	4.33	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	12	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/	43	****	****	4.69	****	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	12	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/	32	****	****	4.37	1.00	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	12	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/	21	****	****	4.52	3.00	****

Course-Section: AFST 255 0101  
 Title PSYC OF BLACK EXPERIEN  
 Instructor: MANCE, GISHAWN  
 Enrollment: 16  
 Questionnaires: 13

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2007

Page 32  
 FEB 13, 2008  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	1	A	8	Required for Majors	3	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	4						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	1	C	0	General	10	Under-grad	13	Non-major	13
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	0	D	1						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	2	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	0						

Course-Section: AFST 271 0101  
 Title INTRO COMMUNITY INVOLV  
 Instructor: SMITH, IRENE  
 Enrollment: 9  
 Questionnaires: 7

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2007

Page 33  
 FEB 13, 2008  
 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	
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	366/1639	4.71	4.61	4.27	4.35	4.71
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	163/1639	4.86	4.46	4.22	4.27	4.86
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	2	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	282/1397	4.75	4.58	4.28	4.39	4.75
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	281/1583	4.71	4.42	4.19	4.28	4.71
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	1	1	0	4	4.17	655/1532	4.17	4.48	4.01	4.09	4.17
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	2	4	4.43	466/1504	4.43	4.54	4.05	4.09	4.43
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	418/1612	4.57	4.29	4.16	4.21	4.57
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	736/1635	4.86	4.71	4.65	4.63	4.86
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1579	5.00	4.34	4.08	4.14	5.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	286/1518	4.86	4.56	4.43	4.48	4.86
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	674/1520	4.86	4.84	4.70	4.78	4.86
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	198/1517	4.86	4.51	4.27	4.34	4.86
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	231/1550	4.86	4.58	4.22	4.33	4.86
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	1	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	100/1295	4.83	4.12	3.94	4.07	4.83
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	217/1398	4.80	4.63	4.07	4.14	4.80
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	332/1391	4.80	4.74	4.30	4.35	4.80
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	571/1388	4.60	4.66	4.28	4.37	4.60
4. Were special techniques successful	2	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	179/ 958	4.60	4.07	3.93	4.00	4.60

Frequency Distribution

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



Course-Section: AFST 275 0101  
 Title CRIM JUST & BLACK AMER  
 Instructor: BROOKS, GARY M  
 Enrollment: 12  
 Questionnaires: 8

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2007

Page 34  
 FEB 13, 2008  
 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	
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	1	6	4.63	482/1639	4.63	4.61	4.27	4.35	4.63
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	5	4.63	393/1639	4.63	4.46	4.22	4.27	4.63
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	3	4	4.38	687/1397	4.38	4.58	4.28	4.39	4.38
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	852/1583	4.20	4.42	4.19	4.28	4.20
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	2	4	4.25	580/1532	4.25	4.48	4.01	4.09	4.25
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	3	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	150/1504	4.80	4.54	4.05	4.09	4.80
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	3	5	4.63	364/1612	4.63	4.29	4.16	4.21	4.63
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	3	5	4.63	1045/1635	4.63	4.71	4.65	4.63	4.63
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	1	0	1	4	4.33	569/1579	4.33	4.34	4.08	4.14	4.33
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	1	1	5	4.57	720/1518	4.57	4.56	4.43	4.48	4.57
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	1	6	4.63	1087/1520	4.63	4.84	4.70	4.78	4.63
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	347/1517	4.71	4.51	4.27	4.34	4.71
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	2	4	4.43	742/1550	4.43	4.58	4.22	4.33	4.43
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	2	0	1	1	2	1	3.60	929/1295	3.60	4.12	3.94	4.07	3.60
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	260/1398	4.75	4.63	4.07	4.14	4.75
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	258/1391	4.88	4.74	4.30	4.35	4.88
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1388	5.00	4.66	4.28	4.37	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	0	4	0	2	0	0	2	3.50	725/ 958	3.50	4.07	3.93	4.00	3.50

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	1	A	2	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	4						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	1	C	0	General	3	Under-grad	8	Non-major	7
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	0	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	4				
				?	2						

Course-Section: AFST 320 0101  
 Title CONTEMP AFRICAN POLITI  
 Instructor: BADRU, LATEEF  
 Enrollment: 19  
 Questionnaires: 14

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2007

Page 35  
 FEB 13, 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	1	2	1	9	4.14	1016/1639	4.14	4.61	4.27	4.28	4.14
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	2	4	3	5	3.79	1338/1639	3.79	4.46	4.22	4.20	3.79
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	0	2	3	6	4.36	696/1397	4.36	4.58	4.28	4.26	4.36
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	7	1	6	3.93	1128/1583	3.93	4.42	4.19	4.24	3.93
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	2	3	8	4.29	553/1532	4.29	4.48	4.01	4.05	4.29
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	2	1	3	8	4.21	647/1504	4.21	4.54	4.05	4.12	4.21
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	5	3	3	3	3.29	1466/1612	3.29	4.29	4.16	4.12	3.29
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	3	11	4.79	840/1635	4.79	4.71	4.65	4.66	4.79
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	3	3	5	4.18	737/1579	4.18	4.34	4.08	4.07	4.18
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	3	3	8	4.36	1000/1518	4.36	4.56	4.43	4.39	4.36
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	2	11	4.71	961/1520	4.71	4.84	4.70	4.68	4.71
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	2	5	7	4.36	779/1517	4.36	4.51	4.27	4.23	4.36
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	4	0	9	4.21	927/1550	4.21	4.58	4.22	4.20	4.21
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	3	0	3	2	2	3	3.50	978/1295	3.50	4.12	3.94	3.95	3.50
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	2	1	9	4.58	380/1398	4.58	4.63	4.07	4.13	4.58
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	1	0	2	1	8	4.25	816/1391	4.25	4.74	4.30	4.35	4.25
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	3	2	7	4.33	783/1388	4.33	4.66	4.28	4.34	4.33
4. Were special techniques successful	2	5	2	0	1	1	3	3.43	760/ 958	3.43	4.07	3.93	3.97	3.43

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	11	Required for Majors	3	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	0						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	5	Under-grad	14	Non-major	13
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	4	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	4				
				?	1						

Course-Section: AFST 350 0101  
 Title PSYCHOLOGY OF RACISM  
 Instructor: ROBINSON, THOMA  
 Enrollment: 17  
 Questionnaires: 14

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2007

Page 36  
 FEB 13, 2008  
 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	
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	1	13	4.93	137/1639	4.93	4.61	4.27	4.28	4.93
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	13	4.93	102/1639	4.93	4.46	4.22	4.20	4.93
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	14	5.00	1/1397	5.00	4.58	4.28	4.26	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	0	13	5.00	1/1583	5.00	4.42	4.19	4.24	5.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	13	4.93	84/1532	4.93	4.48	4.01	4.05	4.93
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	13	4.93	89/1504	4.93	4.54	4.05	4.12	4.93
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	2	12	4.86	139/1612	4.86	4.29	4.16	4.12	4.86
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	14	5.00	1/1635	5.00	4.71	4.65	4.66	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	116/1579	4.88	4.34	4.08	4.07	4.88
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	14	5.00	1/1518	5.00	4.56	4.43	4.39	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	14	5.00	1/1520	5.00	4.84	4.70	4.68	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	0	14	5.00	1/1517	5.00	4.51	4.27	4.23	5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	14	5.00	1/1550	5.00	4.58	4.22	4.20	5.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	82/1295	4.91	4.12	3.94	3.95	4.91
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	0	0	1	10	4.58	380/1398	4.58	4.63	4.07	4.13	4.58
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	1	1	10	4.75	393/1391	4.75	4.74	4.30	4.35	4.75
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	1	1	9	4.73	423/1388	4.73	4.66	4.28	4.34	4.73
4. Were special techniques successful	2	7	1	0	2	0	2	3.40	769/ 958	3.40	4.07	3.93	3.97	3.40

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	4	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	2
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	4						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	1	C	0	General	6	Under-grad	14	Non-major	12
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	1				
				?	0						

Course-Section: AFST 353 0101  
 Title AFR AMER HIST SINCE 18  
 Instructor: SUTTON, KAREN E  
 Enrollment: 9  
 Questionnaires: 8

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2007

Page 37  
 FEB 13, 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	1	2	1	3	3.50	1497/1639	3.50	4.61	4.27	4.28	3.50
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	2	1	1	2	2	3.13	1572/1639	3.13	4.46	4.22	4.20	3.13
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	2	0	0	2	4	3.75	1175/1397	3.75	4.58	4.28	4.26	3.75
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	1	2	1	3	3.50	1406/1583	3.50	4.42	4.19	4.24	3.50
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	0	0	2	4	4.14	670/1532	4.14	4.48	4.01	4.05	4.14
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	0	2	2	2	3.57	1171/1504	3.57	4.54	4.05	4.12	3.57
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	0	1	1	4	4.00	1044/1612	4.00	4.29	4.16	4.12	4.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	766/1635	4.83	4.71	4.65	4.66	4.83
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	1	1	3	1	1	3.00	1477/1579	3.00	4.34	4.08	4.07	3.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	4	0	2	1	1	2.38	1506/1518	2.38	4.56	4.43	4.39	2.38
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	1	1	3	3	4.00	1414/1520	4.00	4.84	4.70	4.68	4.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	3	0	1	2	2	3.00	1453/1517	3.00	4.51	4.27	4.23	3.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	3	1	1	1	2	2.75	1476/1550	2.75	4.58	4.22	4.20	2.75
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	1	0	1	3	3	3.88	753/1295	3.88	4.12	3.94	3.95	3.88
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	1	0	0	1	3	4.00	770/1398	4.00	4.63	4.07	4.13	4.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	332/1391	4.80	4.74	4.30	4.35	4.80
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	1	0	0	0	4	4.20	872/1388	4.20	4.66	4.28	4.34	4.20
4. Were special techniques successful	3	3	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	841/ 958	3.00	4.07	3.93	3.97	3.00
Laboratory														
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	7	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 240	****	****	4.11	4.08	****
Seminar														
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	7	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 82	****	5.00	4.52	4.59	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	7	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.04	4.78	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	7	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 53	****	****	4.05	4.31	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 50	****	****	4.45	5.00	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	7	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 32	****	****	4.51	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	1 Graduate 0 Major 0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	B 1		
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	C 1	General	5 Under-grad 8 Non-major 8
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	D 0		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	0 #### - Means there are not enough

P	0			responses to be significant
I	0	Other	1	
?	0			

Course-Section: AFST 363 0101  
 Title LIT/SOC/BLACKS:REGIONA  
 Instructor: TEMPLE, CHRISTE  
 Enrollment: 4  
 Questionnaires: 2

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2007

Page 38  
 FEB 13, 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	2	5.00	1/1639	5.00	4.61	4.27	4.28	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	517/1639	4.50	4.46	4.22	4.20	4.50
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1397	5.00	4.58	4.28	4.26	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	476/1583	4.50	4.42	4.19	4.24	4.50
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	774/1532	4.00	4.48	4.01	4.05	4.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	367/1504	4.50	4.54	4.05	4.12	4.50
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1612	5.00	4.29	4.16	4.12	5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	1135/1635	4.50	4.71	4.65	4.66	4.50
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1579	5.00	4.34	4.08	4.07	5.00
-----														
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1518	5.00	4.56	4.43	4.39	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1520	5.00	4.84	4.70	4.68	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1517	5.00	4.51	4.27	4.23	5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1550	5.00	4.58	4.22	4.20	5.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	1158/1295	3.00	4.12	3.94	3.95	3.00

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: AFST 369 0101  
 Title BLACK FAMILIES IN U.S.  
 Instructor: KING, SHARON  
 Enrollment: 11  
 Questionnaires: 8

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2007

Page 39  
 FEB 13, 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	7	4.88	196/1639	4.88	4.61	4.27	4.28	4.88
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	149/1639	4.88	4.46	4.22	4.20	4.88
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	182/1397	4.88	4.58	4.28	4.26	4.88
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	155/1583	4.88	4.42	4.19	4.24	4.88
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	1	6	4.63	262/1532	4.63	4.48	4.01	4.05	4.63
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	122/1504	4.88	4.54	4.05	4.12	4.88
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	218/1612	4.75	4.29	4.16	4.12	4.75
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	884/1635	4.75	4.71	4.65	4.66	4.75
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	0	3	3	4.50	382/1579	4.50	4.34	4.08	4.07	4.50
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	454/1518	4.75	4.56	4.43	4.39	4.75
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1520	5.00	4.84	4.70	4.68	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	3	4	4.38	758/1517	4.38	4.51	4.27	4.23	4.38
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	1	6	4.63	500/1550	4.63	4.58	4.22	4.20	4.63
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1295	5.00	4.12	3.94	3.95	5.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	0	6	4.71	294/1398	4.71	4.63	4.07	4.13	4.71
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	279/1391	4.86	4.74	4.30	4.35	4.86
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	276/1388	4.86	4.66	4.28	4.34	4.86
4. Were special techniques successful	1	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/ 958	5.00	4.07	3.93	3.97	5.00
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	7	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 224	****	****	4.10	4.06	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	7	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 240	****	****	4.11	4.08	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	7	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 219	****	****	4.44	4.44	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	6	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	52/ 85	4.50	4.50	4.58	4.50	4.50
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	6	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 82	5.00	5.00	4.52	4.59	5.00
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 78	5.00	5.00	4.47	4.60	5.00
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 80	5.00	5.00	4.47	4.65	5.00
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	6	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	49/ 82	4.00	4.00	4.16	4.08	4.00
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	7	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.04	4.78	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	7	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 53	****	****	4.05	4.31	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	7	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 42	****	****	4.75	4.63	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	7	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 37	****	****	4.58	4.52	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 50	****	****	4.45	5.00	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	7	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 32	****	****	4.51	5.00	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	7	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 32	****	****	4.37	5.00	****

Course-Section: AFST 369 0101  
 Title BLACK FAMILIES IN U.S.  
 Instructor: KING, SHARON  
 Enrollment: 11  
 Questionnaires: 8

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2007

Page 39  
 FEB 13, 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	3	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	1						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	1	C	0	General	2	Under-grad	8	Non-major	8
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	1	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	1				
				?	0						



Course-Section: AFST 381 0101  
 Title URBAN HOUSING POLICY  
 Instructor: SMITH, IRENE  
 Enrollment: 6  
 Questionnaires: 4

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2007

Page 40  
 FEB 13, 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	3	4.50	615/1639	4.50	4.61	4.27	4.28	4.50
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	517/1639	4.50	4.46	4.22	4.20	4.50
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1397	5.00	4.58	4.28	4.26	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	239/1583	4.75	4.42	4.19	4.24	4.75
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	0	0	3	4.25	580/1532	4.25	4.48	4.01	4.05	4.25
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1504	5.00	4.54	4.05	4.12	5.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	0	0	3	4.25	814/1612	4.25	4.29	4.16	4.12	4.25
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1635	5.00	4.71	4.65	4.66	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	382/1579	4.50	4.34	4.08	4.07	4.50
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1518	5.00	4.56	4.43	4.39	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1520	5.00	4.84	4.70	4.68	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	597/1517	4.50	4.51	4.27	4.23	4.50
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1550	5.00	4.58	4.22	4.20	5.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	135/1295	4.75	4.12	3.94	3.95	4.75
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1398	5.00	4.63	4.07	4.13	5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	393/1391	4.75	4.74	4.30	4.35	4.75
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	387/1388	4.75	4.66	4.28	4.34	4.75
4. Were special techniques successful	0	1	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	155/ 958	4.67	4.07	3.93	3.97	4.67

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: AFST 385 0101  
 Title PROB SOLV URBAN BLK CO  
 Instructor: HICKEY, TERRY  
 Enrollment: 10  
 Questionnaires: 10

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2007

Page 41  
 FEB 13, 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	10	5.00	1/1639	5.00	4.61	4.27	4.28	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	128/1639	4.90	4.46	4.22	4.20	4.90
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	9	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1397	****	4.58	4.28	4.26	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1583	5.00	4.42	4.19	4.24	5.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1532	5.00	4.48	4.01	4.05	5.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	150/1504	4.80	4.54	4.05	4.12	4.80
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	2	7	4.60	388/1612	4.60	4.29	4.16	4.12	4.60
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	9	1	4.10	1454/1635	4.10	4.71	4.65	4.66	4.10
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	1	0	0	1	7	4.44	450/1579	4.44	4.34	4.08	4.07	4.44
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	213/1518	4.90	4.56	4.43	4.39	4.90
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1520	5.00	4.84	4.70	4.68	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	157/1517	4.90	4.51	4.27	4.23	4.90
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1550	5.00	4.58	4.22	4.20	5.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	6	1	2	0	0	1	2.50	1247/1295	2.50	4.12	3.94	3.95	2.50
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	177/1398	4.88	4.63	4.07	4.13	4.88
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1391	5.00	4.74	4.30	4.35	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1388	5.00	4.66	4.28	4.34	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	2	6	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/ 958	****	4.07	3.93	3.97	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors		
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A 4	Required for Majors 2	Graduate 0	Major 0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B 4			
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	2	C 0	General 6	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 1		