

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	5	10	17	4.38	752/1447	4.54	4.48	4.31	4.31	4.38
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	4	12	16	4.38	715/1447	4.44	4.29	4.27	4.23	4.38
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	4	0	1	3	13	11	4.21	814/1241	4.66	4.50	4.33	4.35	4.21
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	5	5	22	4.53	459/1402	4.60	4.43	4.24	4.24	4.53
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	1	6	24	4.66	244/1358	4.60	4.53	4.11	4.12	4.66
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	9	22	4.66	248/1316	4.55	4.45	4.14	4.08	4.66
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	5	6	21	4.50	459/1427	4.41	4.24	4.19	4.14	4.50
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	1	0	0	1	2	28	4.87	565/1447	4.42	4.52	4.69	4.70	4.87
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	0	5	15	7	4.07	812/1434	4.28	4.22	4.10	3.97	4.07
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	1	2	9	19	4.48	818/1387	4.68	4.52	4.46	4.42	4.48
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	1	2	28	4.87	604/1387	4.93	4.86	4.73	4.71	4.87
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	5	7	19	4.45	677/1386	4.62	4.49	4.32	4.24	4.45
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	4	9	18	4.45	709/1380	4.69	4.58	4.32	4.30	4.45
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	2	0	0	5	10	13	4.29	455/1193	4.01	4.13	4.02	4.04	4.29
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	10	0	1	0	3	4	14	4.36	496/1172	4.59	4.48	4.15	4.12	4.36
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	10	0	0	0	2	3	17	4.68	410/1182	4.75	4.57	4.35	4.30	4.68
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	10	0	0	0	0	4	18	4.82	316/1170	4.89	4.75	4.38	4.32	4.82
4. Were special techniques successful	10	2	0	1	6	6	7	3.95	467/ 800	4.05	3.88	4.06	4.01	3.95
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	31	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 189	****	****	4.34	4.47	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	31	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 192	****	****	4.34	4.38	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	31	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 186	****	****	4.48	4.57	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	31	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 187	****	****	4.33	4.46	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	31	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 168	****	****	4.20	4.15	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	31	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 66	****	****	4.58	4.43	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	31	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 62	****	****	4.56	4.28	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	31	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 58	****	****	4.41	3.79	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	31	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 65	****	****	4.42	4.36	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	31	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 64	****	****	4.09	3.70	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	30	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 38	****	5.00	4.49	2.25	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	30	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 36	****	4.14	4.25	3.25	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	30	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 28	****	****	4.52	****	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	30	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.30	****	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	30	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 27	****	****	4.43	****	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	31	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.72	****	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	31	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 21	****	****	4.57	****	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	31	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.64	****	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	31	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 20	****	****	4.60	****	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	31	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 15	****	****	4.61	****	****

Course-Section: ANTH 211 01  
 Title Cultural Anthropology  
 Instructor: Chapin, Bambi L  
 Enrollment: 46  
 Questionnaires: 32

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2010

Page 58  
 JUN 28, 2010  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	1	A	14	Required for Majors	9	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B	12						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	4	C	4	General	15	Under-grad	32	Non-major	31
84-150	6	3.00-3.49	4	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	7	F	0	Electives	2	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	0						

Course-Section: ANTH 211 02  
 Title Cultural Anthropology  
 Instructor: Chard, Sarah E  
 Enrollment: 43  
 Questionnaires: 33

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2010

Page 59  
 JUN 28, 2010  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	4	28	4.82	243/1447	4.54	4.48	4.31	4.31	4.82
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	2	6	24	4.69	327/1447	4.44	4.29	4.27	4.23	4.69
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	4	28	4.82	222/1241	4.66	4.50	4.33	4.35	4.82
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	2	4	26	4.75	217/1402	4.60	4.43	4.24	4.24	4.75
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	5	27	4.79	151/1358	4.60	4.53	4.11	4.12	4.79
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	4	27	4.76	166/1316	4.55	4.45	4.14	4.08	4.76
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	2	3	6	22	4.45	527/1427	4.41	4.24	4.19	4.14	4.45
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	32	4.97	194/1447	4.42	4.52	4.69	4.70	4.97
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	2	8	19	4.59	290/1434	4.28	4.22	4.10	3.97	4.59
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	0	3	27	4.90	200/1387	4.68	4.52	4.46	4.42	4.90
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	0	0	30	5.00	1/1387	4.93	4.86	4.73	4.71	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	0	2	28	4.93	95/1386	4.62	4.49	4.32	4.24	4.93
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	1	2	27	4.87	204/1380	4.69	4.58	4.32	4.30	4.87
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	1	1	0	6	8	13	4.14	574/1193	4.01	4.13	4.02	4.04	4.14
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	1	2	11	4.71	247/1172	4.59	4.48	4.15	4.12	4.71
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	19	0	0	0	1	1	12	4.79	320/1182	4.75	4.57	4.35	4.30	4.79
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	19	0	0	0	0	1	13	4.93	178/1170	4.89	4.75	4.38	4.32	4.93
4. Were special techniques successful	19	6	3	0	1	1	3	3.13	****/ 800	4.05	3.88	4.06	4.01	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	3	0.00-0.99 0	A 16	Required for Majors 5	Graduate 0 Major 2
28-55	2	1.00-1.99 0	B 9		
56-83	2	2.00-2.99 4	C 3	General 20	Under-grad 33 Non-major 31
84-150	7	3.00-3.49 1	D 1		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 7	F 0	Electives 3	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 1	
			? 0		

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	11	18	4.29	839/1447	4.54	4.48	4.31	4.31	4.29
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	4	18	13	4.26	853/1447	4.44	4.29	4.27	4.23	4.26
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	10	0	0	1	4	20	4.76	272/1241	4.66	4.50	4.33	4.35	4.76
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	1	12	21	4.59	402/1402	4.60	4.43	4.24	4.24	4.59
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	1	3	10	20	4.34	518/1358	4.60	4.53	4.11	4.12	4.34
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	7	14	14	4.20	671/1316	4.55	4.45	4.14	4.08	4.20
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	1	8	11	13	4.00	971/1427	4.41	4.24	4.19	4.14	4.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	1	1	10	18	4	3.68	1425/1447	4.42	4.52	4.69	4.70	3.68
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	7	0	2	0	7	13	6	3.75	1088/1434	4.28	4.22	4.10	3.97	3.75
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	2	10	23	4.60	656/1387	4.68	4.52	4.46	4.42	4.60
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	2	33	4.94	317/1387	4.93	4.86	4.73	4.71	4.94
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	1	0	2	9	23	4.51	597/1386	4.62	4.49	4.32	4.24	4.51
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	2	8	24	4.54	615/1380	4.69	4.58	4.32	4.30	4.54
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	0	2	2	2	9	18	4.18	536/1193	4.01	4.13	4.02	4.04	4.18
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	2	6	8	4.38	487/1172	4.59	4.48	4.15	4.12	4.38
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	19	0	0	1	0	1	14	4.75	347/1182	4.75	4.57	4.35	4.30	4.75
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	20	0	0	0	0	0	15	5.00	1/1170	4.89	4.75	4.38	4.32	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	19	2	0	0	3	6	5	4.14	389/800	4.05	3.88	4.06	4.01	4.14
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	34	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/38	****	5.00	4.49	2.25	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	34	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/36	****	4.14	4.25	3.25	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	34	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/28	****	****	4.52	****	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	34	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/30	****	****	4.30	****	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	34	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/27	****	****	4.43	****	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors				
00-27	6	0.00-0.99	A 23	Required for Majors	5	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	14	1.00-1.99	B 5						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	C 0	General	21	Under-grad	35	Non-major	34
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	D 0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	2	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
			P 0						
			I 0	Other	0				
			? 1						

Course-Section: ANTH 211 04  
 Title Cultural Anthropology  
 Instructor: Messinger, Seth  
 Enrollment: 46  
 Questionnaires: 22

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2010

Page 61  
 JUN 28, 2010  
 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	2	0	0	0	0	6	14	4.70	375/1447	4.54	4.48	4.31	4.31	4.70
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	0	1	2	4	13	4.45	619/1447	4.44	4.29	4.27	4.23	4.45
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	7	0	0	0	2	11	4.85	195/1241	4.66	4.50	4.33	4.35	4.85
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	0	0	0	2	5	13	4.55	437/1402	4.60	4.43	4.24	4.24	4.55
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	1	1	3	15	4.60	280/1358	4.60	4.53	4.11	4.12	4.60
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	3	2	15	4.60	292/1316	4.55	4.45	4.14	4.08	4.60
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	0	1	4	15	4.70	256/1427	4.41	4.24	4.19	4.14	4.70
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	1	15	4	4.15	1306/1447	4.42	4.52	4.69	4.70	4.15
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	0	5	13	4.72	182/1434	4.28	4.22	4.10	3.97	4.72
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	1	3	16	4.75	429/1387	4.68	4.52	4.46	4.42	4.75
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	2	18	4.90	528/1387	4.93	4.86	4.73	4.71	4.90
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	2	4	14	4.60	510/1386	4.62	4.49	4.32	4.24	4.60
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	2	18	4.90	159/1380	4.69	4.58	4.32	4.30	4.90
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	10	2	0	2	2	3	3.44	983/1193	4.01	4.13	4.02	4.04	3.44
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	124/1172	4.59	4.48	4.15	4.12	4.90
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	12	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	303/1182	4.75	4.57	4.35	4.30	4.80
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	12	0	0	0	1	0	9	4.80	327/1170	4.89	4.75	4.38	4.32	4.80
4. Were special techniques successful	12	8	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 800	4.05	3.88	4.06	4.01	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	15	Required for Majors	4	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	B	2						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	9	Under-grad	22	Non-major	22
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	7	F	0	Electives	3	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	2				
				?	0						

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	3	0	2	5	8	3.83	1214/1447	3.83	4.48	4.31	4.32	3.83
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	2	0	4	5	7	3.83	1189/1447	3.83	4.29	4.27	4.23	3.83
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	2	3	0	8	4	3.53	1137/1241	3.53	4.50	4.33	4.33	3.53
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	1	4	4	8	3.94	1036/1402	3.94	4.43	4.24	4.24	3.94
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	2	1	7	7	3.94	869/1358	3.94	4.53	4.11	4.10	3.94
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	2	1	0	3	5	7	4.06	779/1316	4.06	4.45	4.14	4.13	4.06
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	3	0	4	1	10	3.83	1123/1427	3.83	4.24	4.19	4.15	3.83
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	17	4.94	291/1447	4.94	4.52	4.69	4.65	4.94
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	1	1	1	6	4	4	3.56	1208/1434	3.56	4.22	4.10	4.09	3.56
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	2	1	2	5	6	3.75	1262/1387	3.75	4.52	4.46	4.44	3.75
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	2	1	1	12	4.44	1185/1387	4.44	4.86	4.73	4.71	4.44
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	5	0	0	5	6	3.44	1275/1386	3.44	4.49	4.32	4.30	3.44
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	2	0	1	8	5	3.88	1118/1380	3.88	4.58	4.32	4.32	3.88
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	5	0	0	5	2	4	3.91	759/1193	3.91	4.13	4.02	4.05	3.91
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	2	4	4	4.20	619/1172	4.20	4.48	4.15	4.24	4.20
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	0	1	2	1	6	4.20	767/1182	4.20	4.57	4.35	4.42	4.20
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	1	0	1	2	6	4.20	798/1170	4.20	4.75	4.38	4.49	4.20
4. Were special techniques successful	8	6	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	****/ 800	****	3.88	4.06	4.12	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/ 38	5.00	5.00	4.49	4.73	5.00
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	11	0	0	0	1	4	2	4.14	22/ 36	4.14	4.14	4.25	3.81	4.14
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	11	4	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 28	****	****	4.52	4.46	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	12	4	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 30	****	****	4.30	4.42	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	11	6	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 27	****	****	4.43	4.50	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	A 7	Required for Majors	16
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	B 10	Graduate	0
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	C 1	Under-grad	18
84-150	6	3.00-3.49	D 0	Non-major	5
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	1
			P 0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	
			I 0		
			? 0	Other	0

Course-Section: ANTH 304 01  
 Title Kin, Community&Ethnici  
 Instructor: Chapin,Bambi L  
 Enrollment: 37  
 Questionnaires: 27

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2010

Page 63  
 JUN 28, 2010  
 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	1	3	3	20	4.56	529/1447	4.56	4.48	4.31	4.32	4.56
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	5	4	18	4.48	561/1447	4.48	4.29	4.27	4.23	4.48
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	20	0	0	1	1	5	4.57	478/1241	4.57	4.50	4.33	4.33	4.57
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	5	20	4.67	314/1402	4.67	4.43	4.24	4.24	4.67
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	5	20	4.67	237/1358	4.67	4.53	4.11	4.10	4.67
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	1	6	19	4.56	342/1316	4.56	4.45	4.14	4.13	4.56
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	1	0	5	2	18	4.38	620/1427	4.38	4.24	4.19	4.15	4.38
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	2	25	4.93	388/1447	4.93	4.52	4.69	4.65	4.93
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	2	0	0	5	4	13	4.36	503/1434	4.36	4.22	4.10	4.09	4.36
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	3	6	17	4.54	755/1387	4.54	4.52	4.46	4.44	4.54
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	1	1	24	4.88	579/1387	4.88	4.86	4.73	4.71	4.88
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	2	4	20	4.69	392/1386	4.69	4.49	4.32	4.30	4.69
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	4	21	4.77	326/1380	4.77	4.58	4.32	4.32	4.77
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	6	1	1	3	6	9	4.05	632/1193	4.05	4.13	4.02	4.05	4.05
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	1	2	5	11	4.37	496/1172	4.37	4.48	4.15	4.24	4.37
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	0	0	4	2	13	4.47	578/1182	4.47	4.57	4.35	4.42	4.47
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	0	0	1	2	16	4.79	352/1170	4.79	4.75	4.38	4.49	4.79
4. Were special techniques successful	8	4	2	0	2	4	7	3.93	485/ 800	3.93	3.88	4.06	4.12	3.93

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 4
28-55	0	1.00-1.99 0	B 12		
56-83	3	2.00-2.99 1	C 0	General 4	Under-grad 27 Non-major 23
84-150	7	3.00-3.49 3	D 0		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 8	F 0	Electives 10	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 0	
			? 0		

Course-Section: ANTH 310 01  
 Title Ethnographic Film  
 Instructor: Donato, Paul E  
 Enrollment: 52  
 Questionnaires: 33

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2010

Page 64  
 JUN 28, 2010  
 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	1	5	13	14	4.21	909/1447	4.21	4.48	4.31	4.32	4.21
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	3	3	10	17	4.24	863/1447	4.24	4.29	4.27	4.23	4.24
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	4	8	21	4.52	532/1241	4.52	4.50	4.33	4.33	4.52	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	22	0	0	0	5	6	4.55	448/1402	4.55	4.43	4.24	4.24	4.55
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	4	8	20	4.42	430/1358	4.42	4.53	4.11	4.10	4.42
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	24	0	0	1	1	6	4.63	****/1316	****	4.45	4.14	4.13	****
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	3	1	2	6	20	4.22	823/1427	4.22	4.24	4.19	4.15	4.22
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	2	11	20	4.55	1054/1447	4.55	4.52	4.69	4.65	4.55
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	10	0	0	0	1	12	10	4.39	466/1434	4.39	4.22	4.10	4.09	4.39
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	1	2	9	18	4.47	839/1387	4.47	4.52	4.46	4.44	4.47
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	1	2	2	25	4.70	946/1387	4.70	4.86	4.73	4.71	4.70
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	1	2	8	19	4.50	607/1386	4.50	4.49	4.32	4.30	4.50
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	1	0	0	5	24	4.70	420/1380	4.70	4.58	4.32	4.32	4.70
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	5	0	0	0	0	3	25	4.89	68/1193	4.89	4.13	4.02	4.05	4.89
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	1	0	5	11	4.53	366/1172	4.53	4.48	4.15	4.24	4.53
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	16	0	0	1	2	2	12	4.47	578/1182	4.47	4.57	4.35	4.42	4.47
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	16	0	0	0	1	2	14	4.76	377/1170	4.76	4.75	4.38	4.49	4.76
4. Were special techniques successful	16	11	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	****/ 800	****	3.88	4.06	4.12	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	30	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 189	****	****	4.34	4.26	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	31	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 192	****	****	4.34	4.20	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	31	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 186	****	****	4.48	4.36	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	32	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 187	****	****	4.33	4.11	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	32	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 66	****	****	4.58	4.17	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	32	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 38	****	5.00	4.49	4.73	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors		
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 10	Required for Majors 5	Graduate 0	Major 4
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B 12			
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	4	C 2	General 5	Under-grad 33	Non-major 29
84-150	10	3.00-3.49	6	D 0			
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	6	F 0	Electives 12	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	
				P 0			
				I 0	Other 0		
				? 0			

Course-Section: ANTH 318 01  
 Title Anthropology Of Scienc  
 Instructor: Messinger,Seth  
 Enrollment: 42  
 Questionnaires: 20

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2010

Page 65  
 JUN 28, 2010  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	9	10	4.45	667/1447	4.45	4.48	4.31	4.32	4.45
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	9	9	4.30	805/1447	4.30	4.29	4.27	4.23	4.30
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	11	0	0	1	1	7	4.67	380/1241	4.67	4.50	4.33	4.33	4.67
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	2	6	11	4.47	530/1402	4.47	4.43	4.24	4.24	4.47
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	4	15	4.70	216/1358	4.70	4.53	4.11	4.10	4.70
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	6	14	4.70	212/1316	4.70	4.45	4.14	4.13	4.70
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	3	6	11	4.40	596/1427	4.40	4.24	4.19	4.15	4.40
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	17	3	4.15	1306/1447	4.15	4.52	4.69	4.65	4.15
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	7	12	4.63	254/1434	4.63	4.22	4.10	4.09	4.63
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	2	5	13	4.55	727/1387	4.55	4.52	4.46	4.44	4.55
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	1	18	4.85	656/1387	4.85	4.86	4.73	4.71	4.85
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	2	8	10	4.40	748/1386	4.40	4.49	4.32	4.30	4.40
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	4	15	4.70	420/1380	4.70	4.58	4.32	4.32	4.70
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	15	1	0	1	0	1	3.00	****/1193	****	4.13	4.02	4.05	****
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	3	4	6	4.23	593/1172	4.23	4.48	4.15	4.24	4.23
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	0	0	1	3	9	4.62	480/1182	4.62	4.57	4.35	4.42	4.62
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	0	0	1	1	11	4.77	377/1170	4.77	4.75	4.38	4.49	4.77
4. Were special techniques successful	7	12	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 800	****	3.88	4.06	4.12	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors		
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	A 16	Required for Majors 7	Graduate 0	Major 8
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B 3			
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	1	C 0	General 8	Under-grad 20	Non-major 12
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	2	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		
				? 1			

Course-Section: ANTH 326 01  
 Title American Indian Cultur  
 Instructor: Edwards-Hewitt,  
 Enrollment: 27  
 Questionnaires: 20

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2010

Page 66  
 JUN 28, 2010  
 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	5	15	4.75	309/1447	4.48	4.48	4.31	4.32	4.75
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	4	16	4.80	196/1447	4.17	4.29	4.27	4.23	4.80
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	3	16	4.75	282/1241	4.33	4.50	4.33	4.33	4.75
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	7	12	4.55	437/1402	4.23	4.43	4.24	4.24	4.55
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	3	3	14	4.55	312/1358	4.40	4.53	4.11	4.10	4.55
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	1	7	11	4.40	497/1316	4.16	4.45	4.14	4.13	4.40
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	1	4	14	4.55	398/1427	4.23	4.24	4.19	4.15	4.55
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	5	15	4.75	836/1447	4.88	4.52	4.69	4.65	4.75
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	1	0	0	1	8	10	4.47	374/1434	4.09	4.22	4.10	4.09	4.47
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	6	14	4.70	521/1387	4.33	4.52	4.46	4.44	4.70
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	20	5.00	1/1387	4.90	4.86	4.73	4.71	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	1	3	15	4.74	341/1386	4.39	4.49	4.32	4.30	4.74
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	5	14	4.74	366/1380	4.31	4.58	4.32	4.32	4.74
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	4	3	13	4.45	340/1193	4.45	4.13	4.02	4.05	4.45
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	2	2	6	8	4.11	666/1172	4.14	4.48	4.15	4.24	4.11
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	4	5	9	4.28	727/1182	4.32	4.57	4.35	4.42	4.28
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	0	4	14	4.78	364/1170	4.48	4.75	4.38	4.49	4.78
4. Were special techniques successful	2	9	2	1	1	4	1	3.11	738/ 800	3.17	3.88	4.06	4.12	3.11

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors		
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A 13	Required for Majors 6	Graduate 0	Major 0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B 6			
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	1	C 0	General 5	Under-grad 20	Non-major 20
84-150	7	3.00-3.49	8	D 0			
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F 0	Electives 7	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	
				P 0			
				I 0	Other 0		
				? 0			

Course-Section: ANTH 326 02  
 Title American Indian Cultur  
 Instructor: Grieves, Margare  
 Enrollment: 29  
 Questionnaires: 24

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2010

Page 67  
 JUN 28, 2010  
 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	3	9	11	4.21	919/1447	4.48	4.48	4.31	4.32	4.21
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	2	8	9	4	3.54	1308/1447	4.17	4.29	4.27	4.23	3.54
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	2	7	6	9	3.92	982/1241	4.33	4.50	4.33	4.33	3.92
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	1	8	6	8	3.91	1066/1402	4.23	4.43	4.24	4.24	3.91
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	3	2	5	14	4.25	608/1358	4.40	4.53	4.11	4.10	4.25
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	2	8	4	10	3.92	900/1316	4.16	4.45	4.14	4.13	3.92
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	3	5	7	9	3.92	1066/1427	4.23	4.24	4.19	4.15	3.92
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	24	5.00	1/1447	4.88	4.52	4.69	4.65	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	7	0	0	0	5	12	0	3.71	1125/1434	4.09	4.22	4.10	4.09	3.71

Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	2	3	13	6	3.96	1202/1387	4.33	4.52	4.46	4.44	3.96
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	3	20	4.79	799/1387	4.90	4.86	4.73	4.71	4.79
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	5	12	6	4.04	1030/1386	4.39	4.49	4.32	4.30	4.04
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	2	7	7	8	3.88	1118/1380	4.31	4.58	4.32	4.32	3.88
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	2	0	7	15	4.46	332/1193	4.45	4.13	4.02	4.05	4.46

Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	4	6	7	4.18	631/1172	4.14	4.48	4.15	4.24	4.18
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	0	1	2	4	10	4.35	676/1182	4.32	4.57	4.35	4.42	4.35
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	0	2	1	6	8	4.18	810/1170	4.48	4.75	4.38	4.49	4.18
4. Were special techniques successful	7	8	1	1	3	3	1	3.22	726/ 800	3.17	3.88	4.06	4.12	3.22

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors				
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	A 14	Required for Majors 10	Graduate	0	Major	2
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B 7					
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	2	C 2	General	1	Under-grad	24	Non-major 22
84-150	8	3.00-3.49	5	D 0					
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	11	F 0	Electives	11	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant		
				P 0					
				I 0	Other	1			
				? 0					

Course-Section: ANTH 397 01  
 Title Sel Topics:Anthropolog  
 Instructor: Rubinstein,Robe  
 Enrollment: 37  
 Questionnaires: 26

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2010

Page 68  
 JUN 28, 2010  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	0	0	4	6	15	4.44	667/1447	4.72	4.48	4.31	4.32	4.44
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	1	1	5	7	11	4.04	1029/1447	4.41	4.29	4.27	4.23	4.04
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	1	0	1	1	2	19	4.70	345/1241	4.74	4.50	4.33	4.33	4.70
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	5	5	15	4.40	616/1402	4.59	4.43	4.24	4.24	4.40
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	3	20	4.87	107/1358	4.71	4.53	4.11	4.10	4.87
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	3	5	15	4.52	372/1316	4.59	4.45	4.14	4.13	4.52
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	2	2	7	4	9	3.67	1201/1427	4.11	4.24	4.19	4.15	3.67
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	1	1	5	5	10	2	3.30	1435/1447	3.93	4.52	4.69	4.65	3.30
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	8	2	0	0	5	7	4	3.94	942/1434	4.47	4.22	4.10	4.09	3.94
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	1	4	6	13	4.29	1007/1387	4.65	4.52	4.46	4.44	4.29
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	0	1	22	4.96	264/1387	4.98	4.86	4.73	4.71	4.96
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	2	7	15	4.54	568/1386	4.77	4.49	4.32	4.30	4.54
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	2	6	15	4.57	593/1380	4.78	4.58	4.32	4.32	4.57
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	17	1	1	0	0	4	3.83	****/1193	****	4.13	4.02	4.05	****
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	2	4	13	4.58	339/1172	4.79	4.48	4.15	4.24	4.58
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	0	0	2	3	14	4.63	460/1182	4.82	4.57	4.35	4.42	4.63
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	0	0	2	0	17	4.79	352/1170	4.89	4.75	4.38	4.49	4.79
4. Were special techniques successful	8	7	1	1	2	2	5	3.82	557/ 800	3.82	3.88	4.06	4.12	3.82

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors		
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	0	A 11	Required for Majors 7	Graduate 0	Major 5
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B 6			
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	4	C 3	General 1	Under-grad 26	Non-major 21
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	2	D 0			
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F 0	Electives 8	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	
				P 0			
				I 0	Other 1		
				? 1			

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1447	4.72	4.48	4.31	4.32	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	228/1447	4.41	4.29	4.27	4.23	4.78
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	261/1241	4.74	4.50	4.33	4.33	4.78
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	196/1402	4.59	4.43	4.24	4.24	4.78
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	2	6	4.56	312/1358	4.71	4.53	4.11	4.10	4.56
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	1	7	4.67	239/1316	4.59	4.45	4.14	4.13	4.67
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	0	4	5	4.56	398/1427	4.11	4.24	4.19	4.15	4.56
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	4	5	4.56	1048/1447	3.93	4.52	4.69	4.65	4.56
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	1	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1434	4.47	4.22	4.10	4.09	5.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1387	4.65	4.52	4.46	4.44	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1387	4.98	4.86	4.73	4.71	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1386	4.77	4.49	4.32	4.30	5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1380	4.78	4.58	4.32	4.32	5.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	7	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1193	****	4.13	4.02	4.05	****
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1172	4.79	4.48	4.15	4.24	5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1182	4.82	4.57	4.35	4.42	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1170	4.89	4.75	4.38	4.49	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	7	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 800	3.82	3.88	4.06	4.12	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 66	****	****	4.58	4.17	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 62	****	****	4.56	4.21	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 58	****	****	4.41	2.87	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 65	****	****	4.42	4.01	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 64	****	****	4.09	3.38	****

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	2
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	1							
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General		0	Under-grad	10	Non-major	8
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	2	D	0							
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives		0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0							
				I	0	Other		0				
				?	0							

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	3	6	4.67	408/1447	4.67	4.48	4.31	4.43	4.67
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	2	4	4.00	1053/1447	4.00	4.29	4.27	4.31	4.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	5	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	541/1241	4.50	4.50	4.33	4.41	4.50
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	1	2	2	3	3.88	1094/1402	3.88	4.43	4.24	4.34	3.88
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	2	6	4.56	312/1358	4.56	4.53	4.11	4.15	4.56
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	2	5	4.33	549/1316	4.33	4.45	4.14	4.27	4.33
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	3	1	4	3.89	1090/1427	3.89	4.24	4.19	4.20	3.89
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	538/1447	4.89	4.52	4.69	4.72	4.89
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	1	0	1	3	2	3.71	1117/1434	3.71	4.22	4.10	4.17	3.71
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	490/1387	4.71	4.52	4.46	4.48	4.71
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	656/1387	4.86	4.86	4.73	4.76	4.86
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	539/1386	4.57	4.49	4.32	4.34	4.57
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	1	1	5	4.57	582/1380	4.57	4.58	4.32	4.34	4.57
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	1	0	1	3	0	2	3.50	960/1193	3.50	4.13	4.02	4.00	3.50
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	282/1172	4.67	4.48	4.15	4.25	4.67
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	1	0	1	4	4.33	691/1182	4.33	4.57	4.35	4.49	4.33
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1170	5.00	4.75	4.38	4.51	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	3	3	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/ 800	5.00	3.88	4.06	4.19	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 5	Graduate 0	Major 0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B 5			
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C 0	General 0	Under-grad 9	Non-major 9
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	2	D 0			
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F 0	Electives 2	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	
				P 0			
				I 0	Other 1		
				? 1			