

Course-Section: AMST 100 0101
 Title IDEAS/IMAGES:AMER CULT
 Instructor: BRYAN, KATHY
 Enrollment: 38
 Questionnaires: 26

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 59
 FEB 11, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	0	0	3	9	13	4.40	776/1649	4.25	4.50	4.28	4.11	4.40	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	7	17	4.64	388/1648	4.43	4.53	4.23	4.16	4.64	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	15	0	0	0	4	6	4.60	464/1375	4.51	4.50	4.27	4.10	4.60	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	1	1	0	1	7	15	4.46	566/1595	4.28	4.56	4.20	4.03	4.46	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	1	10	13	4.40	476/1533	4.34	4.48	4.04	3.87	4.40	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	9	16	4.64	279/1512	4.28	4.50	4.10	3.86	4.64	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	1	0	8	16	4.56	437/1623	4.62	4.48	4.16	4.08	4.56	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	18	7	4.28	1377/1646	4.30	4.53	4.69	4.67	4.28	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	3	12	7	4.18	766/1621	3.97	4.39	4.06	3.96	4.18	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	5	0	0	0	0	3	18	4.86	316/1568	4.59	4.70	4.43	4.39	4.86	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	5	0	0	0	0	2	19	4.90	591/1572	4.80	4.83	4.70	4.64	4.90	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	5	0	0	0	0	4	17	4.81	263/1564	4.60	4.74	4.28	4.20	4.81	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	1	3	17	4.76	376/1559	4.51	4.70	4.29	4.20	4.76	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	6	0	0	0	3	4	13	4.50	303/1352	4.10	4.31	3.98	3.86	4.50	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	0	3	9	4.75	247/1384	4.47	4.63	4.08	3.86	4.75	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	14	0	1	0	0	2	9	4.50	616/1382	4.54	4.68	4.29	4.03	4.50	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	14	0	0	0	0	2	10	4.83	337/1368	4.83	4.80	4.30	4.01	4.83	
4. Were special techniques successful	14	6	1	1	0	1	3	3.67	****/ 948	4.05	4.34	3.95	3.75	****	
Laboratory															
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	6	0	0	0	0	0	20	5.00	1/ 555	5.00	4.94	4.29	4.14	5.00	
Field Work															
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	24	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 312	****	4.25	3.68	3.51	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	A	17	Required for Majors	12	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	5						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	2	C	0	General	6	Under-grad	26	Non-major	25
84-150	8	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	6	F	0	Electives	2	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	2				
				?	0						

Course-Section: AMST 100 0201
 Title IDEAS/IMAGES:AMER CULT
 Instructor: KING, PAULA
 Enrollment: 21
 Questionnaires: 12

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 60
 FEB 11, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	0	1	1	2	7	4.36	830/1649	4.25	4.50	4.28	4.11	4.36	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	2	8	4.64	401/1648	4.43	4.53	4.23	4.16	4.64	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	3	8	4.73	334/1375	4.51	4.50	4.27	4.10	4.73	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	1	1	3	6	4.27	794/1595	4.28	4.56	4.20	4.03	4.27	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	1	2	7	4.60	288/1533	4.34	4.48	4.04	3.87	4.60	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	1	0	3	5	4.33	595/1512	4.28	4.50	4.10	3.86	4.33	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	1	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	130/1623	4.62	4.48	4.16	4.08	4.89	
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	3	7	4.70	1004/1646	4.30	4.53	4.69	4.67	4.70	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	0	0	6	1	4.14	812/1621	3.97	4.39	4.06	3.96	4.14	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	1	1	7	4.67	636/1568	4.59	4.70	4.43	4.39	4.67	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	640/1572	4.80	4.83	4.70	4.64	4.89	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	0	3	6	4.67	473/1564	4.60	4.74	4.28	4.20	4.67	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	1	1	7	4.67	512/1559	4.51	4.70	4.29	4.20	4.67	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	5	0	0	0	3	1	3	4.00	690/1352	4.10	4.31	3.98	3.86	4.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	201/1384	4.47	4.63	4.08	3.86	4.80	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1382	4.54	4.68	4.29	4.03	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1368	4.83	4.80	4.30	4.01	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	7	1	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	203/ 948	4.05	4.34	3.95	3.75	4.50	
Laboratory															
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	2	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/ 555	5.00	4.94	4.29	4.14	5.00	
Field Work															
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	11	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 312	****	4.25	3.68	3.51	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	6	Required for Majors	5	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	3						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	1	C	1	General	1	Under-grad	12	Non-major	11
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	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	1	1	7	15	11	3.97	1209/1649	4.25	4.50	4.28	4.11	3.97	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	1	6	16	11	4.00	1124/1648	4.43	4.53	4.23	4.16	4.00	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	1	7	7	19	4.20	855/1375	4.51	4.50	4.27	4.10	4.20	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	1	7	10	16	4.11	996/1595	4.28	4.56	4.20	4.03	4.11	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	2	4	12	15	4.03	801/1533	4.34	4.48	4.04	3.87	4.03	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	2	10	10	12	3.86	1055/1512	4.28	4.50	4.10	3.86	3.86	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	1	3	8	22	4.40	635/1623	4.62	4.48	4.16	4.08	4.40	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	5	28	2	3.91	1598/1646	4.30	4.53	4.69	4.67	3.91	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	1	2	1	10	10	6	3.59	1310/1621	3.97	4.39	4.06	3.96	3.59	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	1	1	4	11	18	4.26	1121/1568	4.59	4.70	4.43	4.39	4.26	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	1	0	2	6	26	4.60	1146/1572	4.80	4.83	4.70	4.64	4.60	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	1	0	3	13	17	4.32	865/1564	4.60	4.74	4.28	4.20	4.32	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	1	2	3	0	13	15	4.09	1079/1559	4.51	4.70	4.29	4.20	4.09	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	4	2	1	7	11	9	3.80	879/1352	4.10	4.31	3.98	3.86	3.80	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	2	3	5	8	13	3.87	901/1384	4.47	4.63	4.08	3.86	3.87	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	2	2	3	7	17	4.13	911/1382	4.54	4.68	4.29	4.03	4.13	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	1	0	2	3	25	4.65	541/1368	4.83	4.80	4.30	4.01	4.65	
4. Were special techniques successful	4	1	2	2	8	12	6	3.60	678/ 948	4.05	4.34	3.95	3.75	3.60	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	34	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 221	****	****	4.16	4.05	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	34	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 243	****	****	4.12	4.08	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	34	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 212	****	****	4.40	4.43	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	34	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 209	****	****	4.35	4.38	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	3	0	0	0	0	0	32	5.00	1/ 555	5.00	4.94	4.29	4.14	5.00	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	33	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 88	****	5.00	4.54	4.31	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	33	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 85	****	5.00	4.47	4.30	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	34	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 81	****	4.75	4.43	4.39	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	34	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 92	****	5.00	4.35	4.01	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	33	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 288	****	4.58	3.68	3.54	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	33	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.06	3.72	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	34	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.09	3.65	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	34	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.47	4.36	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	34	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.38	4.37	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	34	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 312	****	4.25	3.68	3.51	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	32	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 53	****	****	4.30	4.17	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	33	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.16	4.06	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	33	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 41	****	****	4.43	4.27	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	33	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 24	****	****	4.42	4.24	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	33	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 110	****	****	3.99	3.83	****	

Course-Section: AMST 100 0301
 Title IDEAS/IMAGES:AMER CULT
 Instructor: CRASE, KIRSTEN
 Enrollment: 41
 Questionnaires: 35

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 61
 FEB 11, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	13	0.00-0.99	2	A	24	Required for Majors	22	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	6						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	0	C	2	General	7	Under-grad	35	Non-major	35
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	4				
				?	0						

Course-Section: AMST 100Y 0101
 Title IDEAS/IMAGES:AMER CULT
 Instructor: KING, PAULA
 Enrollment: 17
 Questionnaires: 14

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 62
 FEB 11, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	4	9	4.57	550/1649	4.57	4.50	4.28	4.11	4.57	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	6	7	4.43	672/1648	4.43	4.53	4.23	4.16	4.43	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	4	7	4.29	780/1375	4.29	4.50	4.27	4.10	4.29	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	2	10	4.57	417/1595	4.57	4.56	4.20	4.03	4.57	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	0	1	2	9	4.38	495/1533	4.38	4.48	4.04	3.87	4.38	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	2	1	9	4.38	543/1512	4.38	4.50	4.10	3.86	4.38	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	0	5	8	4.62	382/1623	4.62	4.48	4.16	4.08	4.62	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	3	10	4.77	897/1646	4.77	4.53	4.69	4.67	4.77	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	0	6	5	4.45	442/1621	4.45	4.39	4.06	3.96	4.45	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	1	12	4.79	424/1568	4.79	4.70	4.43	4.39	4.79	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	13	4.93	473/1572	4.93	4.83	4.70	4.64	4.93	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	0	13	4.86	216/1564	4.86	4.74	4.28	4.20	4.86	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	0	1	12	4.71	448/1559	4.71	4.70	4.29	4.20	4.71	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	1	0	4	9	4.50	303/1352	4.50	4.31	3.98	3.86	4.50	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	0	1	11	4.69	302/1384	4.69	4.63	4.08	3.86	4.69	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	1	0	3	9	4.54	593/1382	4.54	4.68	4.29	4.03	4.54	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	1	0	1	11	4.69	493/1368	4.69	4.80	4.30	4.01	4.69	
4. Were special techniques successful	1	2	0	1	1	4	5	4.18	370/ 948	4.18	4.34	3.95	3.75	4.18	
Laboratory															
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	3	1	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/ 555	5.00	4.94	4.29	4.14	5.00	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 88	****	5.00	4.54	4.31	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 85	****	5.00	4.47	4.30	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 81	****	4.75	4.43	4.39	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 92	****	5.00	4.35	4.01	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	11	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 288	****	4.58	3.68	3.54	****	
Field Work															
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.09	3.65	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	12	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.47	4.36	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.38	4.37	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	12	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 312	****	4.25	3.68	3.51	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 53	****	****	4.30	4.17	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.16	4.06	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 41	****	****	4.43	4.27	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	12	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 110	****	****	3.99	3.83	****	

Course-Section: AMST 100Y 0101
 Title IDEAS/IMAGES:AMER CULT
 Instructor: KING, PAULA
 Enrollment: 17
 Questionnaires: 14

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 62
 FEB 11, 2009
 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	5	Required for Majors	7	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	4						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	1	General	0	Under-grad	14	Non-major	14
84-150	0	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	2				
				?	0						

Course-Section: AMST 200 0101
 Title MULTICULTURAL AMERICA
 Instructor: MOFFITT, KIMBER
 Enrollment: 38
 Questionnaires: 28

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 63
 FEB 11, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	1	1	1	8	17	4.39	789/1649	4.39	4.50	4.28	4.29	4.39	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	0	4	7	16	4.32	811/1648	4.32	4.53	4.23	4.25	4.32	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	2	0	4	5	17	4.25	806/1375	4.25	4.50	4.27	4.37	4.25	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	1	1	2	6	17	4.37	672/1595	4.37	4.56	4.20	4.22	4.37	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	1	1	6	18	4.32	555/1533	4.32	4.48	4.04	4.04	4.32	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	1	2	6	18	4.39	532/1512	4.39	4.50	4.10	4.14	4.39	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	7	6	14	4.18	904/1623	4.18	4.48	4.16	4.21	4.18	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	3	22	3	4.00	1544/1646	4.00	4.53	4.69	4.63	4.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	1	1	1	2	7	11	4.18	766/1621	4.18	4.39	4.06	4.01	4.18	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	1	0	0	7	18	4.58	767/1568	4.58	4.70	4.43	4.39	4.58	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	2	24	4.92	473/1572	4.92	4.83	4.70	4.73	4.92	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	1	0	1	6	18	4.54	620/1564	4.54	4.74	4.28	4.27	4.54	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	0	0	8	17	4.54	662/1559	4.54	4.70	4.29	4.33	4.54	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	1	0	3	5	5	10	3.96	754/1352	3.96	4.31	3.98	4.07	3.96	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	1	1	1	11	4.57	394/1384	4.57	4.63	4.08	3.99	4.57	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	14	0	0	0	1	2	11	4.71	435/1382	4.71	4.68	4.29	4.19	4.71	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	14	0	0	0	0	2	12	4.86	316/1368	4.86	4.80	4.30	4.21	4.86	
4. Were special techniques successful	14	2	0	0	2	1	9	4.58	176/ 948	4.58	4.34	3.95	3.89	4.58	
Laboratory															
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	7	0	0	0	0	0	21	5.00	1/ 555	5.00	4.94	4.29	4.33	5.00	
Seminar															
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	26	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 288	****	4.58	3.68	3.65	****	
Field Work															
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	26	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 312	****	4.25	3.68	3.59	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	9	Required for Majors	13	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	0	B	9						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	3	C	4	General	2	Under-grad	28	Non-major	28
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	3	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	6				
				?	1						

Course-Section: AMST 290 0101
 Title APPROACH IN AMER STUDI
 Instructor: BRYAN, KATHY
 Enrollment: 24
 Questionnaires: 15

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 64
 FEB 11, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor Mean	Instructor Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5								
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	5	10	4.67	433/1649	4.67	4.50	4.28	4.29	4.67	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	6	8	4.47	614/1648	4.47	4.53	4.23	4.25	4.47	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	7	0	0	1	3	4	4.38	694/1375	4.38	4.50	4.27	4.37	4.38	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	3	11	4.67	321/1595	4.67	4.56	4.20	4.22	4.67	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	7	8	4.53	342/1533	4.53	4.48	4.04	4.04	4.53	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	5	10	4.67	263/1512	4.67	4.50	4.10	4.14	4.67	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	2	13	4.87	140/1623	4.87	4.48	4.16	4.21	4.87	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	9	6	4.40	1287/1646	4.40	4.53	4.69	4.63	4.40	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	1	4	6	4.45	442/1621	4.45	4.39	4.06	4.01	4.45	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	2	12	4.86	316/1568	4.86	4.70	4.43	4.39	4.86	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	1	1	12	4.79	876/1572	4.79	4.83	4.70	4.73	4.79	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	5	9	4.64	498/1564	4.64	4.74	4.28	4.27	4.64	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	4	10	4.71	448/1559	4.71	4.70	4.29	4.33	4.71	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	1	0	0	4	5	3	3.92	805/1352	3.92	4.31	3.98	4.07	3.92	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	1	2	6	4.56	406/1384	4.56	4.63	4.08	3.99	4.56	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	262/1382	4.89	4.68	4.29	4.19	4.89	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	285/1368	4.89	4.80	4.30	4.21	4.89	
4. Were special techniques successful	6	1	0	0	2	1	5	4.38	293/ 948	4.38	4.34	3.95	3.89	4.38	
Laboratory															
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	7	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/ 555	5.00	4.94	4.29	4.33	5.00	
Field Work															
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 312	****	4.25	3.68	3.59	****	
Self Paced															
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	14	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 110	****	****	3.99	3.72	****	

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	3	1.00-1.99	B 5		Graduate
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	C 0	General	0
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad 15
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 1	Electives	0
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	12
			? 0		

Course-Section: AMST 303 0101
 Title ETHNOGRAPHY IN AMERICA
 Instructor: HUMMEL, MICHAEL
 Enrollment: 25
 Questionnaires: 16

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 65
 FEB 11, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	4	11	4.63	484/1649	4.63	4.50	4.28	4.27	4.63	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	4	12	4.75	263/1648	4.75	4.53	4.23	4.18	4.75	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	6	9	4.50	546/1375	4.50	4.50	4.27	4.22	4.50	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	15	4.94	93/1595	4.94	4.56	4.20	4.21	4.94	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	5	10	4.56	319/1533	4.56	4.48	4.04	4.05	4.56	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	6	10	4.63	294/1512	4.63	4.50	4.10	4.11	4.63	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	4	12	4.75	220/1623	4.75	4.48	4.16	4.08	4.75	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	5	10	4.67	1037/1646	4.67	4.53	4.69	4.67	4.67	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	1	0	0	0	7	6	4.46	428/1621	4.46	4.39	4.06	4.02	4.46	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	1	4	9	4.57	767/1568	4.57	4.70	4.43	4.39	4.57	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	1	14	4.93	414/1572	4.93	4.83	4.70	4.64	4.93	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	2	0	13	4.73	374/1564	4.73	4.74	4.28	4.25	4.73	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	2	0	13	4.73	419/1559	4.73	4.70	4.29	4.23	4.73	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	4	0	2	0	1	8	4.36	432/1352	4.36	4.31	3.98	3.97	4.36	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	1	2	10	4.69	302/1384	4.69	4.63	4.08	4.11	4.69	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	1	0	12	4.85	302/1382	4.85	4.68	4.29	4.37	4.85	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	0	1	12	4.92	211/1368	4.92	4.80	4.30	4.39	4.92	
4. Were special techniques successful	3	2	0	0	0	4	7	4.64	161/ 948	4.64	4.34	3.95	4.00	4.64	
Laboratory															
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	3	0	0	0	0	0	13	5.00	1/ 555	5.00	4.94	4.29	4.22	5.00	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 88	****	5.00	4.54	4.63	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 85	****	5.00	4.47	4.55	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 81	****	4.75	4.43	4.30	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 92	****	5.00	4.35	4.46	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 288	****	4.58	3.68	3.58	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.06	3.59	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	15	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.09	4.21	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.47	4.43	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.38	4.32	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	14	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 312	****	4.25	3.68	3.60	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 53	****	****	4.30	4.32	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.16	4.44	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 41	****	****	4.43	5.00	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 24	****	****	4.42	5.00	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 110	****	****	3.99	4.05	****	

Course-Section: AMST 303 0101
 Title ETHNOGRAPHY IN AMERICA
 Instructor: HUMMEL, MICHAEL
 Enrollment: 25
 Questionnaires: 16

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 65
 FEB 11, 2009
 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	2	Graduate	0	Major	5
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	7						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	4	C	1	General	5	Under-grad	16	Non-major	11
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	8				
				?	0						

Course-Section: AMST 320 0101
 Title TV IN AMERICAN CULTURE
 Instructor: HUMMEL, MICHAEL
 Enrollment: 40
 Questionnaires: 31

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 66
 FEB 11, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor Mean	Instructor Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5								
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	1	0	4	8	18	4.35	844/1649	4.35	4.50	4.28	4.27	4.35	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	12	17	4.45	629/1648	4.45	4.53	4.23	4.18	4.45	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	7	24	24	4.77	271/1375	4.77	4.50	4.27	4.22	4.77	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	9	20	4.58	405/1595	4.58	4.56	4.20	4.21	4.58	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	1	8	9	12	3.97	855/1533	3.97	4.48	4.04	4.05	3.97	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	0	11	19	4.52	373/1512	4.52	4.50	4.10	4.11	4.52	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	1	0	0	0	8	21	4.72	251/1623	4.72	4.48	4.16	4.08	4.72	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	8	23	4.74	929/1646	4.74	4.53	4.69	4.67	4.74	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	1	1	1	15	8	4.08	875/1621	4.08	4.39	4.06	4.02	4.08	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	1	10	17	4.57	767/1568	4.57	4.70	4.43	4.39	4.57	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	0	5	23	4.82	790/1572	4.82	4.83	4.70	4.64	4.82	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	1	3	24	4.82	244/1564	4.82	4.74	4.28	4.25	4.82	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	1	7	20	4.68	499/1559	4.68	4.70	4.29	4.23	4.68	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	0	1	0	1	1	25	4.75	157/1352	4.75	4.31	3.98	3.97	4.75	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	14	0	1	1	1	4	10	4.24	685/1384	4.24	4.63	4.08	4.11	4.24	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	14	0	0	0	3	4	10	4.41	706/1382	4.41	4.68	4.29	4.37	4.41	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	14	0	0	0	2	1	14	4.71	484/1368	4.71	4.80	4.30	4.39	4.71	
4. Were special techniques successful	14	2	1	1	3	1	9	4.07	417/ 948	4.07	4.34	3.95	4.00	4.07	
Laboratory															
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	4	0	0	0	0	0	27	5.00	1/ 555	5.00	4.94	4.29	4.22	5.00	
Seminar															
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	30	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 288	****	4.58	3.68	3.58	****	
Field Work															
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	28	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	****/ 312	****	4.25	3.68	3.60	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 16	Required for Majors	13
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	B 12		
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	C 2	General	12
84-150	16	3.00-3.49	D 0	Under-grad	31
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0		
			P 0		
			I 0	Electives	1
			? 0	Other	4
				#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	

Course-Section: AMST 344 0101
 Title MATERIAL CULTURE IN US
 Instructor: KING, PAULA
 Enrollment: 32
 Questionnaires: 22

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 67
 FEB 11, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	2	1	5	14	4.41	776/1649	4.41	4.50	4.28	4.27	4.41	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	4	16	4.64	401/1648	4.64	4.53	4.23	4.18	4.64	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	1	0	3	17	4.71	347/1375	4.71	4.50	4.27	4.22	4.71	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	4	17	4.73	263/1595	4.73	4.56	4.20	4.21	4.73	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	1	5	15	4.55	334/1533	4.55	4.48	4.04	4.05	4.55	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	3	5	13	4.48	422/1512	4.48	4.50	4.10	4.11	4.48	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	2	5	15	4.59	405/1623	4.59	4.48	4.16	4.08	4.59	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	4	17	4.81	833/1646	4.81	4.53	4.69	4.67	4.81	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	0	2	4	11	4.53	356/1621	4.53	4.39	4.06	4.02	4.53	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	1	3	16	4.75	480/1568	4.75	4.70	4.43	4.39	4.75	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	0	20	5.00	1/1572	5.00	4.83	4.70	4.64	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	0	3	17	4.85	216/1564	4.85	4.74	4.28	4.25	4.85	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	1	1	17	4.84	272/1559	4.84	4.70	4.29	4.23	4.84	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	5	0	0	2	3	9	4.50	303/1352	4.50	4.31	3.98	3.97	4.50	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	1	1	3	12	4.53	424/1384	4.53	4.63	4.08	4.11	4.53	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	0	1	2	14	4.76	383/1382	4.76	4.68	4.29	4.37	4.76	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	0	1	1	15	4.82	348/1368	4.82	4.80	4.30	4.39	4.82	
4. Were special techniques successful	5	3	0	1	1	3	9	4.43	265/ 948	4.43	4.34	3.95	4.00	4.43	
Laboratory															
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	1	0	0	0	0	0	21	5.00	1/ 555	5.00	4.94	4.29	4.22	5.00	
Seminar															
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	21	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 288	****	4.58	3.68	3.58	****	
Field Work															
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	19	0	0	0	0	3	0	4.00	****/ 312	****	4.25	3.68	3.60	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	6	Required for Majors	3	Graduate	0	Major	3
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	0	B	9						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	2	C	4	General	5	Under-grad	22	Non-major	19
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	6	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	9				
				?	1						

Course-Section: AMST 352 0101
 Title AMER CULTURE:GLOBAL PE
 Instructor: CAMPBELL, DUNCA
 Enrollment: 39
 Questionnaires: 22

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 68
 FEB 11, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	8	13	4.55	590/1649	4.55	4.50	4.28	4.27	4.55	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	5	3	14	4.41	702/1648	4.41	4.53	4.23	4.18	4.41	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	1	2	5	11	4.37	704/1375	4.37	4.50	4.27	4.22	4.37	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	5	15	4.55	451/1595	4.55	4.56	4.20	4.21	4.55	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	4	17	4.73	198/1533	4.73	4.48	4.04	4.05	4.73	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	2	1	5	14	4.41	522/1512	4.41	4.50	4.10	4.11	4.41	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	2	1	3	15	4.32	744/1623	4.32	4.48	4.16	4.08	4.32	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	1	0	13	8	4.27	1384/1646	4.27	4.53	4.69	4.67	4.27	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	0	0	0	1	7	8	4.44	469/1621	4.44	4.39	4.06	4.02	4.44	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	1	0	1	19	4.81	387/1568	4.81	4.70	4.43	4.39	4.81	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	1	1	18	4.85	715/1572	4.85	4.83	4.70	4.64	4.85	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	1	3	16	4.75	342/1564	4.75	4.74	4.28	4.25	4.75	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	2	18	4.81	318/1559	4.81	4.70	4.29	4.23	4.81	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	3	0	2	1	1	12	4.44	370/1352	4.44	4.31	3.98	3.97	4.44	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	2	14	4.88	165/1384	4.88	4.63	4.08	4.11	4.88	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	0	1	1	14	4.81	332/1382	4.81	4.68	4.29	4.37	4.81	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	0	0	0	1	15	4.94	185/1368	4.94	4.80	4.30	4.39	4.94	
4. Were special techniques successful	6	10	0	0	2	0	4	4.33	310/ 948	4.33	4.34	3.95	4.00	4.33	
Laboratory															
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	3	0	0	0	0	0	19	5.00	1/ 555	5.00	4.94	4.29	4.22	5.00	
Field Work															
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	21	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 312	****	4.25	3.68	3.60	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	3	Required for Majors	2	Graduate	1	Major	5
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	10						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	2	C	0	General	5	Under-grad	21	Non-major	17
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	5				
				?	0						

Course-Section: AMST 357 0101
 Title SP TOPICS:COMM,MEDIA,A
 Instructor: MOFFITT, KIMBER
 Enrollment: 38
 Questionnaires: 32

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 69
 FEB 11, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	2	1	6	23	4.56	563/1649	4.56	4.50	4.28	4.27	4.56	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	0	12	19	4.53	521/1648	4.53	4.53	4.23	4.18	4.53	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	0	5	26	4.75	296/1375	4.75	4.50	4.27	4.22	4.75	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	0	1	11	19	4.47	552/1595	4.47	4.56	4.20	4.21	4.47	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	2	9	19	4.48	388/1533	4.48	4.48	4.04	4.05	4.48	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	4	8	19	4.41	522/1512	4.41	4.50	4.10	4.11	4.41	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	0	11	20	4.56	437/1623	4.56	4.48	4.16	4.08	4.56	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	1	1	22	8	4.16	1469/1646	4.16	4.53	4.69	4.67	4.16	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	11	0	0	0	0	8	13	4.62	279/1621	4.62	4.39	4.06	4.02	4.62	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	1	0	1	7	21	4.57	779/1568	4.57	4.70	4.43	4.39	4.57	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	1	1	1	3	24	4.60	1146/1572	4.60	4.83	4.70	4.64	4.60	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	1	0	1	6	21	4.59	570/1564	4.59	4.74	4.28	4.25	4.59	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	0	1	7	21	4.57	629/1559	4.57	4.70	4.29	4.23	4.57	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	0	1	0	0	4	25	4.73	167/1352	4.73	4.31	3.98	3.97	4.73	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	1	0	1	8	16	4.46	478/1384	4.46	4.63	4.08	4.11	4.46	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	1	0	2	4	19	4.54	593/1382	4.54	4.68	4.29	4.37	4.54	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	1	0	2	5	18	4.50	654/1368	4.50	4.80	4.30	4.39	4.50	
4. Were special techniques successful	6	4	1	2	3	6	10	4.00	431/ 948	4.00	4.34	3.95	4.00	4.00	
Laboratory															
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	6	0	0	0	0	0	26	5.00	1/ 555	5.00	4.94	4.29	4.22	5.00	
Seminar															
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	29	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	****/ 288	****	4.58	3.68	3.58	****	
Field Work															
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	28	0	0	0	0	3	1	4.25	****/ 312	****	4.25	3.68	3.60	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 14	Required for Majors	2
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	B 10		
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	C 2	General	13
84-150	7	3.00-3.49	D 0	Under-grad	32
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	2
			P 0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	
			I 0	Other	11
			? 1		

Course-Section: AMST 380 0101
 Title COMMUNITY IN AMERICA
 Instructor: ORSER, EDWARD W
 Enrollment: 37
 Questionnaires: 31

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 70
 FEB 11, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	1	0	2	9	19	4.45	710/1649	4.45	4.50	4.28	4.27	4.45	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	5	23	4.61	427/1648	4.61	4.53	4.23	4.18	4.61	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	0	1	7	22	4.58	480/1375	4.58	4.50	4.27	4.22	4.58	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	0	1	10	19	4.48	524/1595	4.48	4.56	4.20	4.21	4.48	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	2	6	22	4.67	241/1533	4.67	4.48	4.04	4.05	4.67	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	1	2	5	21	4.47	436/1512	4.47	4.50	4.10	4.11	4.47	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	0	2	8	19	4.47	555/1623	4.47	4.48	4.16	4.08	4.47	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	1	0	0	1	6	22	4.72	961/1646	4.72	4.53	4.69	4.67	4.72	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	7	1	0	0	1	12	10	4.39	523/1621	4.39	4.39	4.06	4.02	4.39	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	0	0	0	5	22	4.81	372/1568	4.81	4.70	4.43	4.39	4.81	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	1	2	25	4.86	715/1572	4.86	4.83	4.70	4.64	4.86	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	0	4	24	4.86	216/1564	4.86	4.74	4.28	4.25	4.86	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	2	3	23	4.75	390/1559	4.75	4.70	4.29	4.23	4.75	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	0	0	0	6	8	15	4.31	473/1352	4.31	4.31	3.98	3.97	4.31	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	1	0	5	16	4.64	351/1384	4.64	4.63	4.08	4.11	4.64	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	9	0	0	0	2	3	17	4.68	464/1382	4.68	4.68	4.29	4.37	4.68	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	0	1	2	3	16	4.55	624/1368	4.55	4.80	4.30	4.39	4.55	
4. Were special techniques successful	9	4	1	0	5	5	7	3.94	492/ 948	3.94	4.34	3.95	4.00	3.94	
Laboratory															
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	30	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 243	****	****	4.12	3.89	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	2	1	0	0	0	0	28	5.00	1/ 555	5.00	4.94	4.29	4.22	5.00	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	30	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 88	****	5.00	4.54	4.63	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	30	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 85	****	5.00	4.47	4.55	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	30	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 81	****	4.75	4.43	4.30	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	30	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 92	****	5.00	4.35	4.46	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	29	0	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/ 288	****	4.58	3.68	3.58	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	30	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.06	3.59	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	30	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.09	4.21	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	30	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.47	4.43	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	30	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.38	4.32	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	24	1	0	0	0	6	0	4.00	****/ 312	****	4.25	3.68	3.60	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	30	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 53	****	****	4.30	4.32	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	30	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.16	4.44	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	30	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 41	****	****	4.43	5.00	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	30	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 24	****	****	4.42	5.00	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	30	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 110	****	****	3.99	4.05	****	

Course-Section: AMST 380 0101
 Title COMMUNITY IN AMERICA
 Instructor: ORSER, EDWARD W
 Enrollment: 37
 Questionnaires: 31

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 70
 FEB 11, 2009
 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	5	Required for Majors	8	Graduate	0	Major	9
28-55	6	1.00-1.99	1	B	16						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	3	C	5	General	4	Under-grad	31	Non-major	22
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	14				
				?	0						

Course-Section: AMST 391 0101
 Title: STUDIES IN AMERICAN CU
 Instructor: CAMPBELL, DUNCA
 Enrollment: 49
 Questionnaires: 27

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 71
 FEB 11, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	0	1	5	9	11	4.15	1067/1649	4.15	4.50	4.28	4.27	4.15	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	2	3	11	10	4.12	1054/1648	4.12	4.53	4.23	4.18	4.12	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	3	0	2	4	7	10	4.09	922/1375	4.09	4.50	4.27	4.22	4.09	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	2	1	2	2	6	13	4.17	930/1595	4.17	4.56	4.20	4.21	4.17	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	3	10	12	4.27	614/1533	4.27	4.48	4.04	4.05	4.27	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	1	1	2	2	8	12	4.12	817/1512	4.12	4.50	4.10	4.11	4.12	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	1	3	5	16	4.31	757/1623	4.31	4.48	4.16	4.08	4.31	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	1	0	0	0	13	12	4.48	1211/1646	4.48	4.53	4.69	4.67	4.48	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	2	1	15	4	3.95	987/1621	3.95	4.39	4.06	4.02	3.95	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	1	2	6	16	4.48	878/1568	4.48	4.70	4.43	4.39	4.48	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	2	7	16	4.56	1184/1572	4.56	4.83	4.70	4.64	4.56	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	3	5	17	4.56	590/1564	4.56	4.74	4.28	4.25	4.56	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	2	2	5	16	4.40	832/1559	4.40	4.70	4.29	4.23	4.40	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	4	2	1	6	3	7	3.63	986/1352	3.63	4.31	3.98	3.97	3.63	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	1	4	13	4.67	326/1384	4.67	4.63	4.08	4.11	4.67	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	10	0	0	0	2	4	11	4.53	600/1382	4.53	4.68	4.29	4.37	4.53	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	0	0	3	1	14	4.61	569/1368	4.61	4.80	4.30	4.39	4.61	
4. Were special techniques successful	9	12	0	1	1	1	3	4.00	****/ 948	****	4.34	3.95	4.00	****	
Laboratory															
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	2	0	0	0	0	0	25	5.00	1/ 555	5.00	4.94	4.29	4.22	5.00	
Seminar															
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	24	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 288	****	4.58	3.68	3.58	****	
Field Work															
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	15	0	0	0	0	9	3	4.25	50/ 312	4.25	4.25	3.68	3.60	4.25	
Self Paced															
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	26	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 110	****	****	3.99	4.05	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	4	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	17
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	13						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	2	C	2	General	1	Under-grad	27	Non-major	10
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	5	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	19				
				?	0						

Course-Section: AMST 406 0201
 Title INTERNSHIP W/SEMINAR
 Instructor: KING, PAULA
 Enrollment: 4
 Questionnaires: 4

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 72
 FEB 11, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1649	5.00	4.50	4.28	4.50	5.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1648	5.00	4.53	4.23	4.36	5.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1595	5.00	4.56	4.20	4.36	5.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1512	5.00	4.50	4.10	4.26	5.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1623	5.00	4.48	4.16	4.27	5.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1646	5.00	4.53	4.69	4.71	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1621	5.00	4.39	4.06	4.24	5.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1568	5.00	4.70	4.43	4.54	5.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1572	5.00	4.83	4.70	4.79	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1564	5.00	4.74	4.28	4.40	5.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1559	5.00	4.70	4.29	4.41	5.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1352	5.00	4.31	3.98	4.07	5.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1384	5.00	4.63	4.08	4.35	5.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1382	5.00	4.68	4.29	4.56	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1368	5.00	4.80	4.30	4.58	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	1	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 948	5.00	4.34	3.95	4.31	5.00	
Laboratory															
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	1	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/ 555	5.00	4.94	4.29	4.41	5.00	
Field Work															
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	1	0	0	0	0	3	0	4.00	68/ 312	4.00	4.25	3.68	3.95	4.00	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 2	Required for Majors	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	B 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 0	Electives	4
			P 1		
			I 0		
			? 0		
					2

- Means there are not enough responses to be significant

Course-Section: AMST 490 0101
 Title SENIOR SEMINAR
 Instructor: ORSER, EDWARD W
 Enrollment: 16
 Questionnaires: 12

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 73
 FEB 11, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	5	7	4.58	536/1649	4.58	4.50	4.28	4.50	4.58	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	9	4.75	263/1648	4.75	4.53	4.23	4.36	4.75	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	6	0	0	1	2	3	4.33	733/1375	4.33	4.50	4.27	4.48	4.33	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	5	7	4.58	405/1595	4.58	4.56	4.20	4.36	4.58	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	4	8	4.67	241/1533	4.67	4.48	4.04	4.14	4.67	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	3	9	4.75	194/1512	4.75	4.50	4.10	4.26	4.75	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	1	7	3	4.00	1029/1623	4.00	4.48	4.16	4.27	4.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/1646	5.00	4.53	4.69	4.71	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	191/1621	4.71	4.39	4.06	4.24	4.71	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	245/1568	4.90	4.70	4.43	4.54	4.90	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	591/1572	4.90	4.83	4.70	4.79	4.90	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	169/1564	4.90	4.74	4.28	4.40	4.90	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	205/1559	4.90	4.70	4.29	4.41	4.90	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	0	0	0	1	2	7	4.60	247/1352	4.60	4.31	3.98	4.07	4.60	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	1	0	9	4.80	201/1384	4.80	4.63	4.08	4.35	4.80	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	243/1382	4.90	4.68	4.29	4.56	4.90	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	264/1368	4.90	4.80	4.30	4.58	4.90	
4. Were special techniques successful	2	1	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	115/ 948	4.78	4.34	3.95	4.31	4.78	
Laboratory															
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	8	0	1	0	0	0	3	4.00	388/ 555	4.00	4.94	4.29	4.41	4.00	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 88	****	5.00	4.54	4.66	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 85	****	5.00	4.47	4.54	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 81	****	4.75	4.43	4.57	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 92	****	5.00	4.35	4.44	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	9	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	31/ 288	4.67	4.58	3.68	3.71	4.67	
Field Work															
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	4	0	0	0	0	6	2	4.25	50/ 312	4.25	4.25	3.68	3.95	4.25	

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	10
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	7						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	2	C	2	General	0	Under-grad	12	Non-major	2
84-150	6	3.00-3.49	3	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	10				
				?	0						

Course-Section: AMST 495 0301
 Title HONORS SEMINAR IN AMST
 Instructor: ORSER, EDWARD W
 Enrollment: 4
 Questionnaires: 4

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 74
 FEB 11, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor Mean	Instructor Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5								
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1649	5.00	4.50	4.28	4.50	5.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	263/1648	4.75	4.53	4.23	4.36	4.75	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1375	5.00	4.50	4.27	4.48	5.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1595	5.00	4.56	4.20	4.36	5.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1533	5.00	4.48	4.04	4.14	5.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1512	5.00	4.50	4.10	4.26	5.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	1	1	1	3.50	1387/1623	3.50	4.48	4.16	4.27	3.50	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	1193/1646	4.50	4.53	4.69	4.71	4.50	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1621	5.00	4.39	4.06	4.24	5.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	636/1568	4.67	4.70	4.43	4.54	4.67	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	1071/1572	4.67	4.83	4.70	4.79	4.67	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1564	5.00	4.74	4.28	4.40	5.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1559	5.00	4.70	4.29	4.41	5.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	1	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	690/1352	4.00	4.31	3.98	4.07	4.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1384	5.00	4.63	4.08	4.35	5.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	483/1382	4.67	4.68	4.29	4.56	4.67	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1368	5.00	4.80	4.30	4.58	5.00	
Laboratory															
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	2	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 555	5.00	4.94	4.29	4.41	5.00	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/ 88	5.00	5.00	4.54	4.66	5.00	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/ 85	5.00	5.00	4.47	4.54	5.00	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	30/ 81	4.75	4.75	4.43	4.57	4.75	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/ 92	5.00	5.00	4.35	4.44	5.00	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	0	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	37/ 288	4.50	4.58	3.68	3.71	4.50	
Field Work															
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	2	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	28/ 312	4.50	4.25	3.68	3.95	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 1		Graduate
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	C 0	General	0
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	4
			P 0		Non-major
			I 0		0
			? 0		
					### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant