

Course-Section: ANTH 211 0101
 Title CULTURAL ANTHROPOLOGY
 Instructor: CHAPIN, BAMBI
 Enrollment: 44
 Questionnaires: 32

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2008

Page 71
 AUG 6, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	1	1	2	9	18	4.35	876/1670	4.04	4.35	4.31	4.32	4.35
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	1	0	4	13	13	4.19	1037/1666	3.70	4.16	4.27	4.27	4.19
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	11	0	0	2	3	15	4.65	435/1406	4.39	4.39	4.32	4.39	4.65
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	1	0	1	1	7	21	4.60	446/1615	4.20	4.34	4.24	4.29	4.60
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	2	6	22	4.67	295/1566	4.48	4.39	4.07	4.00	4.67
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	1	1	5	23	4.67	300/1528	4.35	4.37	4.12	4.11	4.67
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	2	1	3	24	4.63	395/1650	3.90	4.25	4.22	4.20	4.63
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	19	11	4.37	1287/1667	4.07	4.18	4.67	4.64	4.37
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	7	1	0	0	3	17	4	4.04	931/1626	3.84	4.18	4.11	4.06	4.04
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	1	1	3	10	13	4.18	1211/1559	3.97	4.30	4.46	4.40	4.18
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	0	0	2	26	4.93	477/1560	4.83	4.83	4.72	4.73	4.93
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	2	0	2	10	14	4.21	1010/1549	3.94	4.25	4.31	4.25	4.21
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	1	0	2	9	16	4.39	859/1546	4.12	4.34	4.32	4.30	4.39
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	0	1	0	7	10	10	4.00	692/1323	4.04	3.98	4.00	4.08	4.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	12	0	1	1	2	5	11	4.20	712/1384	4.13	4.22	4.10	4.07	4.20
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	12	0	0	1	3	3	13	4.40	718/1378	4.47	4.62	4.29	4.25	4.40
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	12	0	0	0	1	3	16	4.75	439/1378	4.65	4.75	4.31	4.26	4.75
4. Were special techniques successful	12	5	0	0	4	3	8	4.27	367/ 904	3.63	3.90	4.03	4.01	4.27

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors				
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	A 17	Required for Majors 18	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	7	1.00-1.99	0	B 11					
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	2	C 0	General	4	Under-grad	32	Non-major 32
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	6	D 0					
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	7	F 0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant		
				P 0					
				I 0	Other	4			
				? 0					

Course-Section: ANTH 211 0201
 Title CULTURAL ANTHROPOLOGY
 Instructor: MESSINGER, SETH
 Enrollment: 44
 Questionnaires: 26

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2008

Page 72
 AUG 6, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	0	1	4	7	13	4.28	964/1670	4.04	4.35	4.31	4.32	4.28
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	2	3	11	9	4.08	1148/1666	3.70	4.16	4.27	4.27	4.08
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	11	0	0	1	3	9	4.62	483/1406	4.39	4.39	4.32	4.39	4.62
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	1	0	1	3	6	14	4.38	724/1615	4.20	4.34	4.24	4.29	4.38
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	2	2	2	19	4.52	379/1566	4.48	4.39	4.07	4.00	4.52
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	1	0	1	2	4	17	4.54	391/1528	4.35	4.37	4.12	4.11	4.54
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	3	4	6	12	4.08	1090/1650	3.90	4.25	4.22	4.20	4.08
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	2	5	15	3	3.76	1631/1667	4.07	4.18	4.67	4.64	3.76
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	1	2	10	9	4.23	762/1626	3.84	4.18	4.11	4.06	4.23
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	0	1	3	6	12	4.32	1112/1559	3.97	4.30	4.46	4.40	4.32
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	0	1	0	21	4.91	596/1560	4.83	4.83	4.72	4.73	4.91
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	0	1	3	7	11	4.27	960/1549	3.94	4.25	4.31	4.25	4.27
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	2	1	4	15	4.45	782/1546	4.12	4.34	4.32	4.30	4.45
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	14	11	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1323	4.04	3.98	4.00	4.08	****
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	2	1	1	6	4.10	796/1384	4.13	4.22	4.10	4.07	4.10
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	16	0	0	0	1	2	7	4.60	525/1378	4.47	4.62	4.29	4.25	4.60
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	16	0	0	0	0	4	6	4.60	590/1378	4.65	4.75	4.31	4.26	4.60
4. Were special techniques successful	16	8	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/ 904	3.63	3.90	4.03	4.01	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors				
00-27	4	0.00-0.99	1	A 15	Required for Majors 13	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	6	1.00-1.99	0	B 8					
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	5	C 0	General	4	Under-grad	26	Non-major 25
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	5	D 0					
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F 0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant		
				P 0					
				I 0	Other	6			
				? 0					

Course-Section: ANTH 211 0301
 Title CULTURAL ANTHROPOLOGY
 Instructor: DAPUEZ, ANDRES
 Enrollment: 20
 Questionnaires: 12

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2008

Page 73
 AUG 6, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	1	0	5	4	2	3.50	1537/1670	4.04	4.35	4.31	4.32	3.50
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	3	5	3	0	2.83	1633/1666	3.70	4.16	4.27	4.27	2.83
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	1	2	4	3	3.90	1131/1406	4.39	4.39	4.32	4.39	3.90
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	6	3	2	3.64	1399/1615	4.20	4.34	4.24	4.29	3.64
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	2	2	7	4.25	643/1566	4.48	4.39	4.07	4.00	4.25
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	4	6	2	3.83	1097/1528	4.35	4.37	4.12	4.11	3.83
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	2	0	3	5	1	1	3.00	1580/1650	3.90	4.25	4.22	4.20	3.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	11	1	4.08	1482/1667	4.07	4.18	4.67	4.64	4.08
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	1	0	1	4	3	0	3.25	1491/1626	3.84	4.18	4.11	4.06	3.25
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	1	6	4	1	3.42	1479/1559	3.97	4.30	4.46	4.40	3.42
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	2	9	4.67	1090/1560	4.83	4.83	4.72	4.73	4.67
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	1	6	5	0	3.33	1443/1549	3.94	4.25	4.31	4.25	3.33
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	7	4	1	3.50	1379/1546	4.12	4.34	4.32	4.30	3.50
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	3	5	4	4.08	663/1323	4.04	3.98	4.00	4.08	4.08
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	1	1	4	4	4.10	796/1384	4.13	4.22	4.10	4.07	4.10
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	1	1	1	7	4.40	718/1378	4.47	4.62	4.29	4.25	4.40
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	2	0	8	4.60	590/1378	4.65	4.75	4.31	4.26	4.60
4. Were special techniques successful	2	5	1	0	3	0	1	3.00	820/ 904	3.63	3.90	4.03	4.01	3.00

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors		
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	0	A 6	Required for Majors 6	Graduate 0	Major 0
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B 3			
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	1	C 0	General 2	Under-grad 12	Non-major 12
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	4	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 1		
				? 1			

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	3	1	2	5	4	3.40	1566/1670	3.40	4.35	4.31	4.24	3.40	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	5	4	3	2	3.00	1603/1666	3.00	4.16	4.27	4.18	3.00	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	2	3	5	3	2	3.00	1343/1406	3.00	4.39	4.32	4.22	3.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	2	5	4	3	3.40	1496/1615	3.40	4.34	4.24	4.18	3.40	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	1	5	4	3	3.33	1373/1566	3.33	4.39	4.07	4.04	3.33	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	5	4	2	3	3.07	1442/1528	3.07	4.37	4.12	4.07	3.07	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	1	2	8	3	3.73	1370/1650	3.73	4.25	4.22	4.12	3.73	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	15	5.00	1/1667	5.00	4.18	4.67	4.67	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	7	0	1	0	4	3	0	3.13	1525/1626	3.13	4.18	4.11	4.06	3.13	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	1	0	4	7	3	3.73	1413/1559	3.73	4.30	4.46	4.40	3.73	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	1	1	7	6	4.20	1427/1560	4.20	4.83	4.72	4.67	4.20	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	2	0	8	3	2	3.20	1469/1549	3.20	4.25	4.31	4.25	3.20	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	2	8	2	1	2.87	1500/1546	2.87	4.34	4.32	4.24	2.87	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	1	2	2	4	3	2	3.08	1174/1323	3.08	3.98	4.00	3.99	3.08	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	2	1	1	4	2	3.30	1185/1384	3.30	4.22	4.10	4.12	3.30	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	1	0	3	1	5	3.90	1057/1378	3.90	4.62	4.29	4.30	3.90	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	1	0	1	3	5	4.10	948/1378	4.10	4.75	4.31	4.33	4.10	
4. Were special techniques successful	5	2	1	1	3	1	2	3.25	794/ 904	3.25	3.90	4.03	4.03	3.25	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	14	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 87	****	****	4.65	4.30	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	14	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 79	****	****	4.64	4.53	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 75	****	****	4.57	4.50	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 79	****	****	4.45	3.68	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	14	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 80	****	****	3.97	3.76	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 41	****	****	4.50	4.44	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	13	0	1	1	0	0	0	1.50	****/ 38	****	****	4.19	3.96	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	13	0	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	****/ 38	****	****	4.62	4.68	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	13	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.27	4.38	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	13	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.47	4.51	****	

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 8
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B 7	
56-83	5	2.00-2.99	2	C 5	General 0 Under-grad 15 Non-major 7
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	6	D 0	
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F 0	
				P 0	
				I 0	
				Other 10	
				? 1	

- Means there are not enough responses to be significant

Course-Section: ANTH 310 0101
 Title ETHNOGRAPHIC FILM
 Instructor: DONATO, PAUL
 Enrollment: 50
 Questionnaires: 30

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2008

Page 75
 AUG 6, 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	Mean

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	2	1	8	19	4.47	722/1670	4.47	4.35	4.31	4.24	4.47
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	4	5	20	4.55	556/1666	4.55	4.16	4.27	4.18	4.55
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	7	20	4.53	566/1406	4.53	4.39	4.32	4.22	4.53
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	12	2	0	2	3	9	4.06	1050/1615	4.06	4.34	4.24	4.18	4.06
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	2	1	8	4	14	3.93	962/1566	3.93	4.39	4.07	4.04	3.93
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	15	0	0	0	5	8	4.62	338/1528	4.62	4.37	4.12	4.07	4.62
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	0	5	1	22	4.61	429/1650	4.61	4.25	4.22	4.12	4.61
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	22	6	4.21	1395/1667	4.21	4.18	4.67	4.67	4.21
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	10	0	0	1	2	7	10	4.30	670/1626	4.30	4.18	4.11	4.06	4.30
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	5	0	0	0	1	4	20	4.76	503/1559	4.76	4.30	4.46	4.40	4.76
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	0	1	1	24	4.88	647/1560	4.88	4.83	4.72	4.67	4.88
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	5	0	0	0	1	2	22	4.84	257/1549	4.84	4.25	4.31	4.25	4.84
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	1	1	3	21	4.69	482/1546	4.69	4.34	4.32	4.24	4.69
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	6	0	0	1	0	1	22	4.83	144/1323	4.83	3.98	4.00	3.99	4.83
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	13	0	1	0	0	4	12	4.53	421/1384	4.53	4.22	4.10	4.12	4.53
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	13	0	0	0	1	2	14	4.76	389/1378	4.76	4.62	4.29	4.30	4.76
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	13	0	0	0	0	1	16	4.94	169/1378	4.94	4.75	4.31	4.33	4.94
4. Were special techniques successful	14	11	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	****/ 904	****	3.90	4.03	4.03	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	28	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 232	****	****	4.19	4.04	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	29	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 239	****	****	4.21	3.99	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	29	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 230	****	****	4.44	4.25	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	29	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 231	****	****	4.31	4.11	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	29	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 218	****	****	4.18	3.93	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	28	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 87	****	****	4.65	4.30	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	28	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 79	****	****	4.64	4.53	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	28	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 75	****	****	4.57	4.50	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	28	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 79	****	****	4.45	3.68	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	29	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 80	****	****	3.97	3.76	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	29	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 41	****	****	4.50	4.44	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	29	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 38	****	****	4.19	3.96	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	29	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 38	****	****	4.62	4.68	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	29	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.27	4.38	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	29	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.47	4.51	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	29	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 28	****	****	4.64	3.33	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	29	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 16	****	****	4.67	4.00	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	29	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 27	****	****	4.54	2.63	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	29	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 10	****	****	4.84	****	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	29	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 6	****	****	4.92	****	****

Course-Section: ANTH 310 0101
 Title ETHNOGRAPHIC FILM
 Instructor: DONATO, PAUL
 Enrollment: 50
 Questionnaires: 30

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2008

Page 75
 AUG 6, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	12	Required for Majors	11	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	7						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	5	C	0	General	5	Under-grad	30	Non-major	30
84-150	11	3.00-3.49	7	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	4				
				?	0						

Course-Section: ANTH 318 0101
 Title ANTHROPOLOGY OF SCIENC
 Instructor: MESSINGER, SETH
 Enrollment: 43
 Questionnaires: 30

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2008

Page 76
 AUG 6, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	1	2	9	18	4.47	722/1670	4.47	4.35	4.31	4.24	4.47
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	8	19	4.53	582/1666	4.53	4.16	4.27	4.18	4.53
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	6	0	0	2	5	17	4.63	471/1406	4.63	4.39	4.32	4.22	4.63
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	6	23	4.73	308/1615	4.73	4.34	4.24	4.18	4.73
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	11	18	4.57	359/1566	4.57	4.39	4.07	4.04	4.57
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	6	23	4.73	240/1528	4.73	4.37	4.12	4.07	4.73
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	2	11	17	4.50	570/1650	4.50	4.25	4.22	4.12	4.50
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	4	21	4	4.00	1524/1667	4.00	4.18	4.67	4.67	4.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	0	4	22	4.85	146/1626	4.85	4.18	4.11	4.06	4.85
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	2	10	17	4.52	883/1559	4.52	4.30	4.46	4.40	4.52
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	1	28	4.97	239/1560	4.97	4.83	4.72	4.67	4.97
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	3	9	16	4.46	736/1549	4.46	4.25	4.31	4.25	4.46
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	2	26	4.86	276/1546	4.86	4.34	4.32	4.24	4.86
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	16	10	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	****/1323	****	3.98	4.00	3.99	****
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	0	6	15	4.71	285/1384	4.71	4.22	4.10	4.12	4.71
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	9	0	0	0	1	1	19	4.86	295/1378	4.86	4.62	4.29	4.30	4.86
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	0	0	0	0	21	5.00	1/1378	5.00	4.75	4.31	4.33	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	10	16	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	****/ 904	****	3.90	4.03	4.03	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	28	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 232	****	****	4.19	4.04	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	29	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 239	****	****	4.21	3.99	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	29	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 230	****	****	4.44	4.25	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	29	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 231	****	****	4.31	4.11	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	29	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 218	****	****	4.18	3.93	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	28	0	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	****/ 87	****	****	4.65	4.30	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	28	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 79	****	****	4.64	4.53	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	28	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 75	****	****	4.57	4.50	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	28	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 79	****	****	4.45	3.68	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	28	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 80	****	****	3.97	3.76	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	29	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 41	****	****	4.50	4.44	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	29	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 38	****	****	4.19	3.96	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	29	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 38	****	****	4.62	4.68	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	29	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.27	4.38	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	29	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.47	4.51	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	29	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 28	****	****	4.64	3.33	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	29	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 16	****	****	4.67	4.00	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	29	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 27	****	****	4.54	2.63	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	29	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 10	****	****	4.84	****	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	29	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 6	****	****	4.92	****	****

Course-Section: ANTH 318 0101
 Title ANTHROPOLOGY OF SCIENC
 Instructor: MESSINGER, SETH
 Enrollment: 43
 Questionnaires: 30

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2008

Page 76
 AUG 6, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	1	A	24	Required for Majors	6	Graduate	0	Major	8
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	B	4						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	2	C	0	General	11	Under-grad	30	Non-major	22
84-150	9	3.00-3.49	9	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	6	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	10				
				?	0						

Course-Section: ANTH 326 8620
 Title AMERICAN INDIAN CULTUR
 Instructor: EDWARDS-HEWITT,
 Enrollment: 24
 Questionnaires: 23

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2008

Page 77
 AUG 6, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	4	0	0	0	0	4	15	4.79	325/1670	4.79	4.35	4.31	4.24	4.79
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	5	0	0	0	2	2	14	4.67	415/1666	4.67	4.16	4.27	4.18	4.67
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	4	0	0	1	1	4	13	4.53	576/1406	4.53	4.39	4.32	4.22	4.53
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	4	0	0	0	4	2	13	4.47	592/1615	4.47	4.34	4.24	4.18	4.47
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	1	4	2	12	4.32	579/1566	4.32	4.39	4.07	4.04	4.32
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	1	6	12	4.58	368/1528	4.58	4.37	4.12	4.07	4.58
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	4	0	0	0	2	7	10	4.42	690/1650	4.42	4.25	4.22	4.12	4.42
8. How many times was class cancelled	5	0	0	0	0	14	4	4.22	1388/1667	4.22	4.18	4.67	4.67	4.22
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	9	1	0	0	3	4	6	4.23	751/1626	4.23	4.18	4.11	4.06	4.23
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	0	0	2	5	12	4.53	871/1559	4.53	4.30	4.46	4.40	4.53
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	0	0	0	19	5.00	1/1560	5.00	4.83	4.72	4.67	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	0	0	2	5	12	4.53	658/1549	4.53	4.25	4.31	4.25	4.53
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	1	5	13	4.63	557/1546	4.63	4.34	4.32	4.24	4.63
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	5	0	0	1	5	0	12	4.28	529/1323	4.28	3.98	4.00	3.99	4.28
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	1	3	5	0	9	3.72	1009/1384	3.72	4.22	4.10	4.12	3.72
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	1	1	2	14	4.61	517/1378	4.61	4.62	4.29	4.30	4.61
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	0	1	2	15	4.78	417/1378	4.78	4.75	4.31	4.33	4.78
4. Were special techniques successful	5	7	2	0	1	1	7	4.00	461/ 904	4.00	3.90	4.03	4.03	4.00

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors		

00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	7	Required for Majors		6	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	7							
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	1	C	0	General		5	Under-grad	23	Non-major	23
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	4	D	0							
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives		0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0							
				I	0	Other		3				
				?	0							

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	3	0	0	0	2	7	11	4.45	751/1670	4.45	4.35	4.31	4.24	4.45
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	3	0	0	0	7	4	9	4.10	1136/1666	4.10	4.16	4.27	4.18	4.10
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	3	0	0	1	3	3	13	4.40	715/1406	4.40	4.39	4.32	4.22	4.40
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	3	0	1	1	1	5	12	4.30	813/1615	4.30	4.34	4.24	4.18	4.30
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	1	4	15	4.70	273/1566	4.70	4.39	4.07	4.04	4.70
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	1	4	2	13	4.35	611/1528	4.35	4.37	4.12	4.07	4.35
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	3	0	3	3	2	3	9	3.60	1430/1650	3.60	4.25	4.22	4.12	3.60
8. How many times was class cancelled	4	0	1	4	11	3	0	2.84	1664/1667	2.84	4.18	4.67	4.67	2.84
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	1	0	1	3	8	6	4.06	926/1626	4.06	4.18	4.11	4.06	4.06
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	2	5	4	9	4.00	1280/1559	4.00	4.30	4.46	4.40	4.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	1	0	2	17	4.75	948/1560	4.75	4.83	4.72	4.67	4.75
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	1	4	6	9	4.15	1061/1549	4.15	4.25	4.31	4.25	4.15
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	1	6	3	10	4.10	1103/1546	4.10	4.34	4.32	4.24	4.10
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	10	2	0	1	2	5	3.80	894/1323	3.80	3.98	4.00	3.99	3.80
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	9	0	1	0	1	2	10	4.43	519/1384	4.43	4.22	4.10	4.12	4.43
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	9	0	0	0	1	1	12	4.79	368/1378	4.79	4.62	4.29	4.30	4.79
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	1	0	0	0	13	4.71	481/1378	4.71	4.75	4.31	4.33	4.71
4. Were special techniques successful	9	11	1	0	1	0	1	3.00	****/ 904	****	3.90	4.03	4.03	****
Laboratory														
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 239	****	****	4.21	3.99	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 87	****	****	4.65	4.30	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 79	****	****	4.45	3.68	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 80	****	****	3.97	3.76	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	22	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 41	****	****	4.50	4.44	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 38	****	****	4.19	3.96	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 38	****	****	4.62	4.68	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	22	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.27	4.38	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 28	****	****	4.64	3.33	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 16	****	****	4.67	4.00	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 27	****	****	4.54	2.63	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	11	Required for Majors	2	Graduate	0	Major	4
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B	5						
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	1	C	1	General	6	Under-grad	23	Non-major	19
84-150	8	3.00-3.49	5	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	8	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	9				

Course-Section: ANTH 397A 0101
 Title ECONOMIC ANTHROPOLOGY
 Instructor: DONATO, PAUL
 Enrollment: 19
 Questionnaires: 11

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2008

Page 79
 AUG 6, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	2	9	4.82	290/1670	4.82	4.35	4.31	4.24	4.82
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	0	0	0	10	4.64	452/1666	4.64	4.16	4.27	4.18	4.64
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	0	1	9	4.64	459/1406	4.64	4.39	4.32	4.22	4.64
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	0	10	4.82	238/1615	4.82	4.34	4.24	4.18	4.82
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	0	1	9	4.64	317/1566	4.64	4.39	4.07	4.04	4.64
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	1	0	1	1	7	4.30	662/1528	4.30	4.37	4.12	4.07	4.30
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	159/1650	4.90	4.25	4.22	4.12	4.90
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	7	3	4.30	1334/1667	4.30	4.18	4.67	4.67	4.30
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	239/1626	4.71	4.18	4.11	4.06	4.71
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	1	1	0	9	4.55	846/1559	4.55	4.30	4.46	4.40	4.55
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1560	5.00	4.83	4.72	4.67	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	1	0	0	1	9	4.55	634/1549	4.55	4.25	4.31	4.25	4.55
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	231/1546	4.91	4.34	4.32	4.24	4.91
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	6	1	0	1	0	3	3.80	894/1323	3.80	3.98	4.00	3.99	3.80
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	2	0	7	4.56	403/1384	4.56	4.22	4.10	4.12	4.56
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	264/1378	4.89	4.62	4.29	4.30	4.89
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1378	5.00	4.75	4.31	4.33	5.00
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 87	****	****	4.65	4.30	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 79	****	****	4.64	4.53	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 75	****	****	4.57	4.50	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 79	****	****	4.45	3.68	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	10	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 80	****	****	3.97	3.76	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	6	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	5						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	7	Under-grad	11	Non-major	11
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	3	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	3				
				?	0						

Course-Section: ANTH 497 0101
 Title ADV TOP IN ANTHROPOLOG
 Instructor: CHAPIN, BAMBI
 Enrollment: 6
 Questionnaires: 2

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2008

Page 80
 AUG 6, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1670	5.00	4.35	4.31	4.45	5.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1666	5.00	4.16	4.27	4.35	5.00	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1406	5.00	4.39	4.32	4.48	5.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1615	5.00	4.34	4.24	4.37	5.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1566	5.00	4.39	4.07	4.17	5.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1528	5.00	4.37	4.12	4.26	5.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1650	5.00	4.25	4.22	4.28	5.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1667	5.00	4.18	4.67	4.73	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1626	5.00	4.18	4.11	4.28	5.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1559	5.00	4.30	4.46	4.58	5.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1560	5.00	4.83	4.72	4.80	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1549	5.00	4.25	4.31	4.43	5.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1546	5.00	4.34	4.32	4.43	5.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	434/1384	4.50	4.22	4.10	4.32	4.50	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1378	5.00	4.62	4.29	4.55	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1378	5.00	4.75	4.31	4.60	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 904	5.00	3.90	4.03	4.22	5.00	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	

00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	2	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	0						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	2	Non-major	1
84-150	2	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						