```
                                                 Frequencies      Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
                   Questions                 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   4   0  0  0  1  5 16  4.68   404/1639  4.58 4.52  4.27 4.35  4.68
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    4   0  0  0  3  8 11  4.36   735/1639  4.53 4.38  4.22 4.27  4.36
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   5   0  0  0  6  4 11  4.24   813/1397  4.19 4.47  4.28 4.39  4.24
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    5   3  0  1  7  2  8  3.94  1098/1583  4.14 4.08  4.19 4.28  3.94
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 4  0  0  0  5  2 15  4.45   388/1532  4.39 4.19  4.01 4.09  4.45
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 4 8 1  2  2  2  7  3.86   977/1504  4.10 4.29  4.05 4.09  3.86
7. Was the grading system clearly explained            3   1  1  0  7  5  9  3.95  1109/1612  4.22 4.00  4.16 4.21  3.95
8. How many times was class cancelled                  3   0  0  0  1 14  8  4.30  1311/1635  4.51 4.70  4.65 4.63  4.30
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 7 0 0 0  2 11  6  4.21   702/1579  4.15 4.06  4.08 4.14  4.21


                   Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        4   0  0  0  3  2 17  4.64   643/1518  4.63 4.45  4.43 4.48  4.64
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   5   0  0  0  2  0 19  4.81   802/1520  4.74 4.76  4.70 4.78  4.81
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 3  0  1  0  2  4 16  4.48   635/1517  4.55 4.38  4.27 4.34  4.48
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     4   1  1  0  1  3 16  4.57   556/1550  4.54 4.42  4.22 4.33  4.57
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 3 0 0  1  4  3 15  4.39   353/1295  4.35 4.15  3.94 4.07  4.39


                   Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 8  0  0  0  0  3 15  4.83   200/1398  4.73 4.59  4.07 4.14  4.83
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 7  0  0  0  1  2 16  4.79   356/1391  4.70 4.81  4.30 4.35  4.79
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 7 0 0  0  0  2 17  4.89   234/1388  4.83 4.77  4.28 4.37  4.89
4. Were special techniques successful                  8   3  1  1  2  3  8  4.07   444/ 958  4.09 4.13  3.93 4.00  4.07


                   Laboratory
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material 24   0  1  0  0  0  1  3.00  ****/ 224  **** ****  4.10 4.33  ****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information 25 0 0 0  0  0  1  5.00  ****/ 240  **** ****  4.11 4.47  ****


                   Seminar
5. Were criteria for grading made clear               25   0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00  ****/  82  **** 4.33  4.16 4.00  ****
```

                                              Frequency Distribution

```
Credits Earned          Cum. GPA          Expected Grades            Reasons                    Type                    Majors
--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
 00-27     10        0.00-0.99   0         A   6          Required for Majors  3        Graduate      0       Major       3
 28-55      2        1.00-1.99   0         B   9
 56-83      1        2.00-2.99   2         C   0          General              6        Under-grad   26       Non-major  23
 84-150     2        3.00-3.49   0         D   0
 Grad.      0        3.50-4.00   5         F   0          Electives            1        #### - Means there are not enough
                                          P   0                                        responses to be significant
                                          I   0          Other                6
                                          ?   0
```

```
Course-Section: AGNG 200  0201                University of Maryland                                    Page   43
Title      THE AGING EXPERIENCE                  Baltimore County                                     FEB 13, 2008
Instructor:    MAJESKI, ROBIN                    Fall   2007                                          Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:    53
Questionnaires:  29                       Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire
```

```
                                                        Frequencies        Instructor    Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
                    Questions                   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   6  20  4.48  642/1639  4.58  4.52  4.27  4.35  4.48
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals      0   0   0   0   2   5  22  4.69  327/1639  4.53  4.38  4.22  4.27  4.69
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals     0   0   2   1   2  10  14  4.14  906/1397  4.19  4.47  4.28  4.39  4.14
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals      0   0   0   3   2   6  18  4.34  683/1583  4.14  4.08  4.19  4.28  4.34
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned  0   1   1   2   1   7  17  4.32  516/1532  4.39  4.19  4.01  4.09  4.32
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0  0   0   1   5   6  17  4.34  537/1504  4.10  4.29  4.05  4.09  4.34
7. Was the grading system clearly explained              0   0   0   3   2   2  22  4.48  518/1612  4.22  4.00  4.16  4.21  4.48
8. How many times was class cancelled                    0   0   0   0   0   8  21  4.72  928/1635  4.51  4.70  4.65  4.63  4.72
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 6  1   0   0   3  14   5  4.09  835/1579  4.15  4.06  4.08  4.14  4.09

                    Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared          3   0   1   1   0   3  21  4.62  670/1518  4.63  4.45  4.43  4.48  4.62
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject     4   0   0   1   2   1  21  4.68 1019/1520  4.74  4.76  4.70  4.78  4.68
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly  5   0   0   1   1   4  18  4.63  451/1517  4.55  4.38  4.27  4.34  4.63
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned       5   0   1   0   2   4  17  4.50  638/1550  4.54  4.42  4.22  4.33  4.50
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 6   0   1   2   2   2  16  4.30  421/1295  4.35  4.15  3.94  4.07  4.30

                    Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned  8   0   0   0   2   4  15  4.62  362/1398  4.73  4.59  4.07  4.14  4.62
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate  8   0   0   0   2   4  15  4.62  534/1391  4.70  4.81  4.30  4.35  4.62
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 8   0   0   0   0   5  16  4.76  375/1388  4.83  4.77  4.28  4.37  4.76
4. Were special techniques successful                    8   3   0   1   4   5   8  4.11  430/ 958  4.09  4.13  3.93  4.00  4.11

                    Laboratory
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material   25   2   0   0   0   0   2  5.00 ****/ 224  ****  ****  4.10  4.33  ****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information 26  0   0   0   0   1   2  4.67 ****/ 240  ****  ****  4.11  4.47  ****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 26   1   0   0   0   0   2  5.00 ****/ 219  ****  ****  4.44  4.61  ****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance            26   1   0   0   0   0   2  5.00 ****/ 215  ****  ****  4.35  4.43  ****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified  26   1   0   0   0   0   2  5.00 ****/ 198  ****  ****  4.18  4.08  ****

                    Seminar
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 25   1   0   0   0   0   3  5.00 ****/  85  ****  4.44  4.58  4.00  ****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 25  1   0   0   0   0   3  5.00 ****/  82  ****  3.28  4.52  3.00  ****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 25   1   0   0   0   0   3  5.00 ****/  78  ****  3.44  4.47  ****  ****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned     25   1   0   0   0   0   3  5.00 ****/  80  ****  5.00  4.47  2.00  ****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear                 25   1   0   0   0   0   3  5.00 ****/  82  ****  4.33  4.16  4.00  ****

                    Field Work
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned  25   0   0   0   0   0   4  5.00 ****/  52  ****  ****  4.04  4.78  ****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria  25   0   0   0   0   0   4  5.00 ****/  53  ****  ****  4.05  4.28  ****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation        25   1   0   0   0   0   3  5.00 ****/  42  ****  ****  4.75  ****  ****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations    25   1   0   0   0   0   3  5.00 ****/  37  ****  ****  4.58  ****  ****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities  25   1   0   0   0   0   3  5.00 ****/  32  ****  ****  4.56  ****  ****

                    Self  Paced
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 25   0   0   0   0   1   3  4.75 ****/  50  ****  ****  4.45  3.24  ****
```

```
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal     25  1  0  0  0  0  3  5.00 ****/  32  ****  ****  4.51  4.33  ****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful       25  1  0  0  0  0  3  5.00 ****/  43  ****  ****  4.69  ****  ****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful        25  1  0  0  0  0  3  5.00 ****/  32  ****  ****  4.37  1.00  ****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students      25  1  0  0  0  0  3  5.00 ****/  21  ****  ****  4.52  3.00  ****
```

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	5	0.00-0.99	0	A	17	Required for Majors	10	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B	6						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	0	C	1	General	6	Under-grad	29	Non-major	29
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough			
				P	0			responses to be significant			
				I	0	Other	8				
				?	0						

Enrollment: 11
Questionnaires: 7   Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

```
                                              Frequencies        Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
              Questions                  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   2   5  4.71  366/1639  4.71  4.52  4.27  4.28  4.71
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals     1   0   0   0   0   4   2  4.33  774/1639  4.33  4.38  4.22  4.20  4.33
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals    0   0   0   0   1   2   4  4.43  632/1397  4.43  4.47  4.28  4.26  4.43
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals     0   0   0   0   0   3   4  4.57  402/1583  4.57  4.08  4.19  4.24  4.57
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0   0   1   1   0   4   1  3.43 1288/1532  3.43  4.19  4.01  4.05  3.43
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 0   0   0   1   3   3  4.29  585/1504  4.29  4.29  4.05  4.12  4.29
7. Was the grading system clearly explained             2   0   0   0   0   3   2  4.40  632/1612  4.40  4.00  4.16  4.12  4.40
8. How many times was class cancelled                   1   0   0   0   0   0   6  5.00    1/1635  5.00  4.70  4.65  4.66  5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 1 0   0   0   3   1   2  3.83 1109/1579  4.17  4.06  4.08  4.07  4.17

                    Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared         0   0   0   0   2   2   3  4.14 1175/1518  4.40  4.45  4.43  4.39  4.40
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject    0   0   0   0   0   2   5  4.71  961/1520  4.77  4.76  4.70  4.68  4.77
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 1   0   0   1   1   2   2  3.83 1223/1517  4.25  4.38  4.27  4.23  4.25
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned      1   0   0   0   2   2   2  4.00 1077/1550  4.33  4.42  4.22  4.20  4.33
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 0  0   0   0   0   4   3  4.43  329/1295  4.38  4.15  3.94  3.95  4.38

                    Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 2   0   0   0   0   2   3  4.60  369/1398  4.60  4.59  4.07  4.13  4.60
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 2   0   0   0   0   2   3  4.60  543/1391  4.60  4.81  4.30  4.35  4.60
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 2  0   0   0   0   2   3  4.60  571/1388  4.60  4.77  4.28  4.34  4.60
4. Were special techniques successful                   2   1   0   0   0   3   1  4.25  349/ 958  4.25  4.13  3.93  3.97  4.25
```

Frequency Distribution

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

```
Course-Section: AGNG 300  0101              University of Maryland                                    Page   45
Title      OVERVIEW: AGING SERVIC             Baltimore County                                    FEB 13, 2008
Instructor:              (Instr. B)          Fall   2007                                         Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:     11
Questionnaires:  7                      Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire


                                        Frequencies       Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
              Questions              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  2  5  4.71  366/1639   4.71  4.52  4.27 4.28  4.71
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals     1  0  0  0  0  4  2  4.33  774/1639   4.33  4.38  4.22 4.20  4.33
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals    0  0  0  0  1  2  4  4.43  632/1397   4.43  4.47  4.28 4.26  4.43
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals     0  0  0  0  0  3  4  4.57  402/1583   4.57  4.08  4.19 4.24  4.57
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0  0  1  1  0  4  1  3.43 1288/1532   3.43  4.19  4.01 4.05  3.43
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 0  0  0  1  3  3  4.29  585/1504   4.29  4.29  4.05 4.12  4.29
7. Was the grading system clearly explained             2  0  0  0  0  3  2  4.40  632/1612   4.40  4.00  4.16 4.12  4.40
8. How many times was class cancelled                   1  0  0  0  0  0  6  5.00    1/1635   5.00  4.70  4.65 4.66  5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 1 0  0  0  0  3  3  4.50  382/1579   4.17  4.06  4.08 4.07  4.17


                    Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared         1  0  0  0  0  2  4  4.67  602/1518   4.40  4.45  4.43 4.39  4.40
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject    1  0  0  0  0  1  5  4.83  725/1520   4.77  4.76  4.70 4.68  4.77
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 1  0  0  0  0  2  4  4.67  405/1517   4.25  4.38  4.27 4.23  4.25
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned      1  0  0  0  0  2  4  4.67  457/1550   4.33  4.42  4.22 4.20  4.33
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 1 0  0  0  0  4  2  4.33  398/1295   4.38  4.15  3.94 3.95  4.38


                    Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 2  0  0  0  0  2  3  4.60  369/1398   4.60  4.59  4.07 4.13  4.60
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 2  0  0  0  0  2  3  4.60  543/1391   4.60  4.81  4.30 4.35  4.60
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 2 0  0  0  0  2  3  4.60  571/1388   4.60  4.77  4.28 4.34  4.60
4. Were special techniques successful                   2  1  0  0  0  3  1  4.25  349/ 958   4.25  4.13  3.93 3.97  4.25

                                  Frequency Distribution


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

```
                                              Frequencies       Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
            Questions                 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   4   5  4.56   561/1639  4.56  4.52  4.27  4.42  4.56
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals   0   0   0   0   0   5   4  4.44   617/1639  4.44  4.38  4.22  4.29  4.44
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals  0   2   0   0   1   3   3  4.29   767/1397  4.29  4.47  4.28  4.38  4.29
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals   0   0   0   1   2   3   3  3.89  1171/1583  3.89  4.08  4.19  4.31  3.89
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0  0   0   0   0   3   6  4.67   236/1532  4.67  4.19  4.01  4.07  4.67
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 0 0   0   1   3   5  4.44   441/1504  4.44  4.29  4.05  4.20  4.44
7. Was the grading system clearly explained           1   0   0   0   0   5   3  4.38   669/1612  4.38  4.00  4.16  4.18  4.38
8. How many times was class cancelled                 0   0   0   0   0   7   2  4.22  1374/1635  4.22  4.70  4.65  4.72  4.22
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 2 0 0 0   0   4   3  4.43   473/1579  4.43  4.06  4.08  4.21  4.43

                  Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared       0   0   0   0   0   3   6  4.67   602/1518  4.67  4.45  4.43  4.51  4.67
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject  0   0   0   0   0   1   8  4.89   597/1520  4.89  4.76  4.70  4.75  4.89
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0 0  0   0   0   4   5  4.56   535/1517  4.56  4.38  4.27  4.34  4.56
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned    0   0   0   0   0   3   6  4.67   457/1550  4.67  4.42  4.22  4.24  4.67
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 0 1 0   3   1   3   1  3.25  1101/1295  3.25  4.15  3.94  4.01  3.25

                  Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 1 0  0   0   0   0   8  5.00     1/1398  5.00  4.59  4.07  4.23  5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 1 0  0   0   0   0   8  5.00     1/1391  5.00  4.81  4.30  4.48  5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 1 0 0  0   1   2   5  4.50   647/1388  4.50  4.77  4.28  4.50  4.50
4. Were special techniques successful                 1   1   1   0   1   2   3  3.86   554/ 958  3.86  4.13  3.93  4.24  3.86
```

                              Frequency Distribution

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

Title   RESEARCH APPLICATIONS   Baltimore County   FEB 13, 2008
Instructor: MAJESKI, ROBIN (Instr. A)   Fall   2007   Job IRBR3029
Enrollment: 9
Questionnaires: 6   Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

```
                                                  Frequencies       Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
              Questions                    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  1  2  2  3.67 1416/1639  3.67  4.52  4.27  4.42  3.67
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals   0   0  0  1  2  1  2  3.67 1410/1639  3.67  4.38  4.22  4.29  3.67
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals  0   0  0  0  1  3  2  4.17  878/1397  4.17  4.47  4.28  4.38  4.17
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals   0   0  1  0  4  0  1  3.00 1532/1583  3.00  4.08  4.19  4.31  3.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0 0  0  0  2  2  2  4.00  774/1532  4.00  4.19  4.01  4.07  4.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 0 1  0  1  2  2  3.67 1116/1504  3.67  4.29  4.05  4.20  3.67
7. Was the grading system clearly explained           1   0  0  1  2  1  1  3.40 1441/1612  3.40  4.00  4.16  4.18  3.40
8. How many times was class cancelled                 1   0  0  0  0  2  3  4.60 1067/1635  4.60  4.70  4.65  4.72  4.60
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 1 0 0 0  5  0  0  3.00 1477/1579  3.50  4.06  4.08  4.21  3.50

                  Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared       1   0  0  1  1  3  0  3.40 1442/1518  4.00  4.45  4.43  4.51  4.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject  1   0  0  0  2  1  2  4.00 1414/1520  4.50  4.76  4.70  4.75  4.50
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 1 0  0  3  0  2  0  2.80 1482/1517  3.70  4.38  4.27  4.34  3.70
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned    1   0  0  1  1  2  1  3.60 1297/1550  4.20  4.42  4.22  4.24  4.20
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 1 3 1 1  0  0  0  1.50 1290/1295  1.50  4.15  3.94  4.01  1.50

                  Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 3 0 1  0  0  0  2  3.67 1030/1398  3.67  4.59  4.07  4.23  3.67
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 3 0 0  0  0  0  3  5.00    1/1391  5.00  4.81  4.30  4.48  5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 3 0 0 0  0  1  2  4.67  496/1388  4.67  4.77  4.28  4.50  4.67
4. Were special techniques successful                 3   1  0  0  2  0  0  3.00  841/ 958  3.00  4.13  3.93  4.24  3.00
```

Frequency Distribution

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

```
                                              Frequencies        Instructor    Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
              Questions                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   1   2   2  3.67 1416/1639  3.67 4.52  4.27 4.42  3.67
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals   0   0   0   1   2   1   2  3.67 1410/1639  3.67 4.38  4.22 4.29  3.67
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals  0   0   0   0   1   3   2  4.17  878/1397  4.17 4.47  4.28 4.38  4.17
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals   0   0   1   0   4   0   1  3.00 1532/1583  3.00 4.08  4.19 4.31  3.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned  0   0   0   0   2   2   2  4.00  774/1532  4.00 4.19  4.01 4.07  4.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned  0  0  1  0  1  2  2  3.67 1116/1504  3.67 4.29  4.05 4.20  3.67
7. Was the grading system clearly explained           1   0   0   1   2   1   1  3.40 1441/1612  3.40 4.00  4.16 4.18  3.40
8. How many times was class cancelled                 1   0   0   0   0   2   3  4.60 1067/1635  4.60 4.70  4.65 4.72  4.60
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness  1  0  0  1  0  2  2  4.00  889/1579  3.50 4.06  4.08 4.21  3.50


                Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared       1   0   0   0   0   2   3  4.60  684/1518  4.00 4.45  4.43 4.51  4.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject  1   0   0   0   0   0   5  5.00    1/1520  4.50 4.76  4.70 4.75  4.50
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly  1  0  0  0  0  2  3  4.60  474/1517  3.70 4.38  4.27 4.34  3.70
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned    1   0   0   0   0   1   4  4.80  288/1550  4.20 4.42  4.22 4.24  4.20
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding  1  4  0  0  1  0  0  3.00 ****/1295  1.50 4.15  3.94 4.01  1.50


                Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned  3  0  1  0  0  0  2  3.67 1030/1398  3.67 4.59  4.07 4.23  3.67
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate  3  0  0  0  0  0  3  5.00    1/1391  5.00 4.81  4.30 4.48  5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion  3  0  0  0  0  1  2  4.67  496/1388  4.67 4.77  4.28 4.50  4.67
4. Were special techniques successful                 3   1   0   0   2   0   0  3.00  841/ 958  3.00 4.13  3.93 4.24  3.00
```

Frequency Distribution

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

```
Course-Section: AGNG 440  0101                University of Maryland                          Page   49
Title        DIVERSITY - AGING SVCS            Baltimore County                            FEB 13, 2008
Instructor:  FRANKOWSKI, ANN                   Fall   2007                                 Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:    5
Questionnaires:  4                     Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire
```

```
                                              Frequencies       Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
               Questions                 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   2   2  4.50   615/1639  4.50  4.52  4.27  4.42  4.50
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    0   0   0   0   1   0   3  4.50   517/1639  4.50  4.38  4.22  4.29  4.50
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   0   0   0   0   0   0   4  5.00     1/1397  5.00  4.47  4.28  4.38  5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    0   2   0   0   0   1   1  4.50   476/1583  4.50  4.08  4.19  4.31  4.50
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0  0   0   0   0   1   3  4.75   178/1532  4.75  4.19  4.01  4.07  4.75
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 1  0   0   0   0   3  5.00     1/1504  5.00  4.29  4.05  4.20  5.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained            0   0   0   0   1   3   0  3.75  1279/1612  3.75  4.00  4.16  4.18  3.75
8. How many times was class cancelled                  0   0   0   0   0   0   4  5.00     1/1635  5.00  4.70  4.65  4.72  5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 0 0  0   0   0   4   0  4.00   889/1579  4.00  4.06  4.08  4.21  4.00


                Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        0   0   0   0   0   2   2  4.50   807/1518  4.50  4.45  4.43  4.51  4.50
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   0   0   0   0   0   0   4  5.00     1/1520  5.00  4.76  4.70  4.75  5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0  0   0   0   0   0   4  5.00     1/1517  5.00  4.38  4.27  4.34  5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     0   0   0   0   0   0   4  5.00     1/1550  5.00  4.42  4.22  4.24  5.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 0 0  0   0   0   0   4  5.00     1/1295  5.00  4.15  3.94  4.01  5.00


                Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 1  0   0   0   0   2   1  4.33   560/1398  4.33  4.59  4.07  4.23  4.33
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 1  0   0   0   0   1   2  4.67   489/1391  4.67  4.81  4.30  4.48  4.67
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 1 0  0   0   0   0   3  5.00     1/1388  5.00  4.77  4.28  4.50  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       3
 28-55      0        1.00-1.99    0         B    2
 56-83      0        2.00-2.99    0         C    0        General               0       Under-grad     4        Non-major   1
 84-150     1        3.00-3.49    1         D    0
 Grad.      0        3.50-4.00    0         F    0        Electives             1       #### - Means there are not enough
                                            P    0                                      responses to be significant
                                            I    0        Other                 3
                                            ?    0
```

```
                                                  Frequencies     Instructor    Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
                    Questions                NR  NA  1  2  3  4  5  Mean   Rank    Mean Mean  Mean Mean  Mean
----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
                   General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course   0   0   0   0   0   1   9   4.90  171/1639  4.90 4.52  4.27 4.42  4.90
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    0   0   0   0   1   2   7   4.60  415/1639  4.60 4.38  4.22 4.29  4.60
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   0   0   0   0   1   3   6   4.50  517/1397  4.50 4.47  4.28 4.38  4.50
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    0   0   0   0   0   1   9   4.90  143/1583  4.90 4.08  4.19 4.31  4.90
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned  0   0   0   0   0   0  10   5.00    1/1532  5.00 4.19  4.01 4.07  5.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0   0   0   0   0   1   9   4.90  111/1504  4.90 4.29  4.05 4.20  4.90
7. Was the grading system clearly explained            0   0   0   0   1   0   9   4.80  166/1612  4.80 4.00  4.16 4.18  4.80
8. How many times was class cancelled                  0   0   0   0   0   2   8   4.80  811/1635  4.80 4.70  4.65 4.72  4.80
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 1  0   0   0   0   2   7   4.78  159/1579  4.78 4.06  4.08 4.21  4.78

                   Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        0   0   0   0   0   0  10   5.00    1/1518  5.00 4.45  4.43 4.51  5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   0   0   0   0   0   0  10   5.00    1/1520  5.00 4.76  4.70 4.75  5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0  0   0   0   0   1   9   4.90  157/1517  4.90 4.38  4.27 4.34  4.90
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     0   0   0   0   0   0  10   5.00    1/1550  5.00 4.42  4.22 4.24  5.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 1  0   0   0   1   0   8   4.78  124/1295  4.78 4.15  3.94 4.01  4.78

                   Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned  2   0   0   0   0   0   8   5.00    1/1398  5.00 4.59  4.07 4.23  5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate  2   0   0   0   1   0   7   4.75  393/1391  4.75 4.81  4.30 4.48  4.75
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 2   0   0   0   0   1   7   4.88  255/1388  4.88 4.77  4.28 4.50  4.88
4. Were special techniques successful                  3   0   0   0   1   2   4   4.43  253/ 958  4.43 4.13  3.93 4.24  4.43

                   Seminar
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme  1   0   0   0   0   1   8   4.89   38/  85  4.89 4.44  4.58 4.83  4.89
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 1   0   0   0   2   0   7   4.56   45/  82  4.56 3.28  4.52 4.49  4.56
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned  1   0   0   0   0   1   8   4.89   36/  78  4.89 3.44  4.47 4.56  4.89
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned    1   0   0   0   0   0   9   5.00    1/  80  5.00 5.00  4.47 4.59  5.00
5. Were criteria for grading made clear                1   0   0   0   2   2   5   4.33   42/  82  4.33 4.33  4.16 4.02  4.33
```

                                                 Frequency Distribution

```
Credits Earned        Cum. GPA         Expected Grades            Reasons                   Type                    Majors
------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
 00-27     0      0.00-0.99   0        A    3       Required for Majors   0      Graduate      0      Major        2
 28-55     0      1.00-1.99   0        B    6
 56-83     3      2.00-2.99   5        C    1       General               2      Under-grad   10      Non-major    8
 84-150    5      3.00-3.49   3        D    0
 Grad.     0      3.50-4.00   2        F    0       Electives             0      #### - Means there are not enough
                                       P    0                                    responses to be significant
                                       I    0       Other                 7
                                       ?    0
```

Enrollment: 2
Questionnaires: 1   Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

```
                                              Frequencies      Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
             Questions                NR  NA   1  2  3  4  5  Mean   Rank    Mean Mean  Mean Mean  Mean
--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
             General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course  0   0   0  0  0  1  0  4.00 1138/1639  4.00  4.52  4.27  4.42  4.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals   0   0   0  0  0  1  0  4.00 1090/1639  4.00  4.38  4.22  4.29  4.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals   0   0   0  1  0  0  0  2.00 1578/1583  2.00  4.08  4.19  4.31  2.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned  0   0   0  1  0  0  0  2.00 1524/1532  2.00  4.19  4.01  4.07  2.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned  0   0   0  0  1  0  0  3.00 1415/1504  3.00  4.29  4.05  4.20  3.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained           0   0   1  0  0  0  0  1.00 1606/1612  1.00  4.00  4.16  4.18  1.00
8. How many times was class cancelled                 0   0   0  0  0  1  0  4.00 1497/1635  4.00  4.70  4.65  4.72  4.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness  0   0   0  0  1  0  0  3.00 1477/1579  3.00  4.06  4.08  4.21  3.00

             Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared       0   0   0  0  1  0  0  3.00 1481/1518  3.00  4.45  4.43  4.51  3.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject  0   0   0  0  0  1  0  4.00 1414/1520  4.00  4.76  4.70  4.75  4.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly  0   0   0  0  1  0  0  3.00 1453/1517  3.00  4.38  4.27  4.34  3.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned    0   0   0  1  0  0  0  2.00 1518/1550  2.00  4.42  4.22  4.24  2.00

             Seminar
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme  0   0   0  0  0  1  0  4.00   69/  85  4.00  4.44  4.58  4.83  4.00
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention  0   0   0  1  0  0  0  2.00   82/  82  2.00  3.28  4.52  4.49  2.00
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned  0   0   0  1  0  0  0  2.00   78/  78  2.00  3.44  4.47  4.56  2.00
```

Frequency Distribution

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

```
Course-Section: AGNG 610  0101              University of Maryland                              Page   52
Title          LEADERSHIP & ORG CHG I           Baltimore County                              FEB 13, 2008
Instructor:    SACHS, DAVID    (Instr. A)       Fall   2007                                   Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:    28
Questionnaires: 26                      Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire
```

```
                                             Frequencies      Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
            Questions                  NR  NA  1  2  3  4  5  Mean   Rank   Mean  Mean  Mean Mean  Mean
-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
                General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course   0   0  0  0  0  1  25  4.96   69/1639  4.96  4.52  4.27  4.42  4.96
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    1   0  0  0  1  3  21  4.80  199/1639  4.80  4.38  4.22  4.26  4.80
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   0  14  0  0  0  3   9  4.75  282/1397  4.75  4.47  4.28  4.37  4.75
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    0   4  0  0  1  3  18  4.77  217/1583  4.77  4.08  4.19  4.31  4.77
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 2  0  0  0  1  3  20  4.79  152/1532  4.79  4.19  4.01  4.10  4.79
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 2 0  0  0  1  3  20  4.79  156/1504  4.79  4.29  4.05  4.29  4.79
7. Was the grading system clearly explained            2   0  0  0  2  4  18  4.67  317/1612  4.67  4.00  4.16  4.27  4.67
8. How many times was class cancelled                  2   0  0  0  0  1  23  4.96  331/1635  4.96  4.70  4.65  4.81  4.96
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 7 0 0  0  0  7  12  4.63  262/1579  4.31  4.06  4.08  4.17  4.31

                Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        1   0  0  0  0  0  25  5.00    1/1518  4.87  4.45  4.43  4.49  4.87
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   1   0  0  0  0  0  25  5.00    1/1520  4.99  4.76  4.70  4.79  4.99
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 1  0  0  0  0  0  25  5.00    1/1517  4.82  4.38  4.27  4.32  4.82
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     1   0  0  0  0  1  24  4.96   70/1550  4.88  4.42  4.22  4.23  4.88
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 0  0  1  0  3  3  19  4.50  265/1295  4.55  4.15  3.94  3.95  4.55

                Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 1  0  0  0  1  0  24  4.92  129/1398  4.92  4.59  4.07  4.22  4.92
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 1  0  0  0  0  3  22  4.88  248/1391  4.88  4.81  4.30  4.47  4.88
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 1 0  0  0  0  3  22  4.88  244/1388  4.88  4.77  4.28  4.49  4.88
4. Were special techniques successful                  1   0  0  0  1  2  22  4.84   89/ 958  4.84  4.13  3.93  4.01  4.84

                Laboratory
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material  20  4  0  0  0  0   2  5.00 ****/ 224  ****  ****  4.10  4.43  ****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information 22 0 0  0  0  0   4  5.00 ****/ 240  ****  ****  4.11  3.96  ****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 21 3 0  0  0  0   2  5.00 ****/ 219  ****  ****  4.44  4.23  ****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance           21  3  0  0  0  0   2  5.00 ****/ 215  ****  ****  4.35  4.72  ****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 21  3  0  0  0  0   2  5.00 ****/ 198  ****  ****  4.18  4.74  ****

                Seminar
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 21 1  0  0  0  0   4  5.00 ****/  85  ****  4.44  4.58  4.58  ****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 21 1 0  0  0  0   4  5.00 ****/  82  ****  3.28  4.52  4.74  ****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 21 2  0  0  0  0   3  5.00 ****/  78  ****  3.44  4.47  4.52  ****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned    21  1  0  0  0  1   3  4.75 ****/  80  ****  5.00  4.47  4.50  ****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear                21  1  0  0  0  0   4  5.00 ****/  82  ****  4.33  4.16  4.37  ****

                Field Work
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 23  0  0  0  0  0   3  5.00 ****/  52  ****  ****  4.04  3.64  ****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 25  0  0  0  0  0   1  5.00 ****/  53  ****  ****  4.05  4.03  ****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation       24  1  0  0  0  0   1  5.00 ****/  42  ****  ****  4.75  4.78  ****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations   24  1  0  0  0  0   1  5.00 ****/  37  ****  ****  4.58  4.33  ****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities 24  1  0  0  0  0   1  5.00 ****/  32  ****  ****  4.56  4.59  ****

                Self  Paced
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 23 0  0  0  0  0   3  5.00 ****/  50  ****  ****  4.45  4.39  ****
```

```
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal    23  0  0  0  0  0  3  5.00 ****/  32  ****  ****  4.51  4.50  ****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful      23  0  0  0  1  0  2  4.33 ****/  43  ****  ****  4.69  4.61  ****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful       23  1  0  0  0  0  2  5.00 ****/  32  ****  ****  4.37  4.31  ****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students     23  1  0  0  0  0  2  5.00 ****/  21  ****  ****  4.52  4.42  ****
```

Enrollment: 28
Questionnaires: 26   Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

                                          Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned   Cum. GPA   Expected Grades   Reasons   Type   Majors
----
00-27   0   0.00-0.99   1   A   9   Required for Majors   0   Graduate   12   Major   25
28-55   0   1.00-1.99   0   B   2
56-83   0   2.00-2.99   0   C   0   General   0   Under-grad 14   Non-major   1
84-150   0   3.00-3.49   0   D   0
Grad.   12   3.50-4.00   0   F   0   Electives   2   #### - Means there are not enough
                                        P   0   responses to be significant
                                        I   0   Other   14
                                        ?   0

```
Course-Section: AGNG 610  0101            University of Maryland                                          Page   53
Title         LEADERSHIP & ORG CHG I       Baltimore County                                            FEB 13, 2008
Instructor:              (Instr. B)        Fall   2007                                                 Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:      28
Questionnaires: 26                       Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire
```

```
                                                  Frequencies       Instructor    Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
               Questions                    NR  NA  1   2   3   4   5  Mean    Rank     Mean  Mean  Mean  Mean  Mean
---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
               General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course    0   0   0   0   0   1  25  4.96   69/1639   4.96  4.52  4.27  4.42  4.96
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals     1   0   0   0   1   3  21  4.80  199/1639   4.80  4.38  4.22  4.26  4.80
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals    0  14   0   0   0   3   9  4.75  282/1397   4.75  4.47  4.28  4.37  4.75
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals     0   4   0   0   1   3  18  4.77  217/1583   4.77  4.08  4.19  4.31  4.77
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 2   0   0   0   1   3  20  4.79  152/1532   4.79  4.19  4.01  4.10  4.79
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 2 0   0   0   1   3  20  4.79  156/1504   4.79  4.29  4.05  4.29  4.79
7. Was the grading system clearly explained             2   0   0   0   2   4  18  4.67  317/1612   4.67  4.00  4.16  4.27  4.67
8. How many times was class cancelled                   2   0   0   0   0   1  23  4.96  331/1635   4.96  4.70  4.65  4.81  4.96
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 5 0   0   0   2  13   6  4.19  725/1579   4.31  4.06  4.08  4.17  4.31

               Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared         0   0   0   0   1   3  22  4.81  360/1518   4.87  4.45  4.43  4.49  4.87
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject    0   0   0   0   0   1  25  4.96  219/1520   4.99  4.76  4.70  4.79  4.99
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 1   0   0   0   2   4  19  4.68  394/1517   4.82  4.38  4.27  4.32  4.82
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned      0   0   0   0   0   3  23  4.88  196/1550   4.88  4.42  4.22  4.23  4.88
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 0  1   2   0   1   4  18  4.44  313/1295   4.55  4.15  3.94  3.95  4.55

               Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 1   0   0   0   1   0  24  4.92  129/1398   4.92  4.59  4.07  4.22  4.92
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 1   0   0   0   0   3  22  4.88  248/1391   4.88  4.81  4.30  4.47  4.88
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 1  0   0   0   0   3  22  4.88  244/1388   4.88  4.77  4.28  4.49  4.88
4. Were special techniques successful                   1   0   0   0   1   2  22  4.84   89/ 958   4.84  4.13  3.93  4.01  4.84

               Laboratory
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material  20   4   0   0   0   0   2  5.00 ****/ 224   ****  ****  4.10  4.43  ****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information 22 0  0   0   0   0   4  5.00 ****/ 240   ****  ****  4.11  3.96  ****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 21 3  0   0   0   0   2  5.00 ****/ 219   ****  ****  4.44  4.23  ****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance           21   3   0   0   0   0   2  5.00 ****/ 215   ****  ****  4.35  4.72  ****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified  21   3   0   0   0   0   2  5.00 ****/ 198   ****  ****  4.18  4.74  ****

               Seminar
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 21   1   0   0   0   0   4  5.00 ****/  85   ****  4.44  4.58  4.58  ****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 21  1   0   0   0   0   4  5.00 ****/  82   ****  3.28  4.52  4.74  ****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 21   2   0   0   0   0   3  5.00 ****/  78   ****  3.44  4.47  4.52  ****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned     21   1   0   0   0   1   3  4.75 ****/  80   ****  5.00  4.47  4.50  ****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear                 21   1   0   0   0   0   4  5.00 ****/  82   ****  4.33  4.16  4.37  ****

               Field Work
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned  23   0   0   0   0   0   3  5.00 ****/  52   ****  ****  4.04  3.64  ****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria  25   0   0   0   0   0   1  5.00 ****/  53   ****  ****  4.05  4.03  ****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation        24   1   0   0   0   0   1  5.00 ****/  42   ****  ****  4.75  4.78  ****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations    24   1   0   0   0   0   1  5.00 ****/  37   ****  ****  4.58  4.33  ****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities  24   1   0   0   0   0   1  5.00 ****/  32   ****  ****  4.56  4.59  ****

               Self  Paced
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 23   0   0   0   0   0   3  5.00 ****/  50   ****  ****  4.45  4.39  ****
```

```
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal      23  0  0  0  0  0  3  5.00 ****/  32  ****  ****  4.51  4.50  ****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful        23  0  0  0  1  0  2  4.33 ****/  43  ****  ****  4.69  4.61  ****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful         23  1  0  0  0  0  2  5.00 ****/  32  ****  ****  4.37  4.31  ****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students       23  1  0  0  0  0  2  5.00 ****/  21  ****  ****  4.52  4.42  ****
```

                                            Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	1	A	9	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	12	Major	25
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	2						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	14	Non-major	1
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D	0						
Grad.	12	3.50-4.00	0	F	0	Electives	2	#### - Means there are not enough			
				P	0			responses to be significant			
				I	0	Other	14				
				?	0						

```
Course-Section: AGNG 610  0101              University of Maryland                                    Page   54
Title       LEADERSHIP & ORG CHG I             Baltimore County                                    FEB 13, 2008
Instructor:              (Instr. C)            Fall   2007                                          Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:      28
Questionnaires: 26                      Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire
```

```
                                               Frequencies      Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
               Questions                 NR  NA  1  2  3  4  5  Mean   Rank   Mean  Mean  Mean Mean  Mean
-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
               General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course   0   0   0  0  0  1 25  4.96   69/1639  4.96  4.52  4.27 4.42  4.96
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    1   0   0  0  1  3 21  4.80  199/1639  4.80  4.38  4.22 4.26  4.80
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   0  14   0  0  0  3  9  4.75  282/1397  4.75  4.47  4.28 4.37  4.75
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    0   4   0  0  1  3 18  4.77  217/1583  4.77  4.08  4.19 4.31  4.77
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 2  0   0  0  1  3 20  4.79  152/1532  4.79  4.19  4.01 4.10  4.79
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 2 0  0  0  1  3 20  4.79  156/1504  4.79  4.29  4.05 4.29  4.79
7. Was the grading system clearly explained            2   0   0  0  2  4 18  4.67  317/1612  4.67  4.00  4.16 4.27  4.67
8. How many times was class cancelled                  2   0   0  0  0  1 23  4.96  331/1635  4.96  4.70  4.65 4.81  4.96
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 5 0 0  0  5  9  7  4.10  835/1579  4.31  4.06  4.08 4.17  4.31

               Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        0   0   0  0  2  1 23  4.81  360/1518  4.87  4.45  4.43 4.49  4.87
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   0   0   0  0  0  0 26  5.00    1/1520  4.99  4.76  4.70 4.79  4.99
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 2  0   0  0  2  1 21  4.79  251/1517  4.82  4.38  4.27 4.32  4.82
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     0   0   0  0  1  3 22  4.81  288/1550  4.88  4.42  4.22 4.23  4.88
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 1 0  0  1  1  2 21  4.72  155/1295  4.55  4.15  3.94 3.95  4.55

               Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 1  0   0  0  1  0 24  4.92  129/1398  4.92  4.59  4.07 4.22  4.92
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 1  0   0  0  0  3 22  4.88  248/1391  4.88  4.81  4.30 4.47  4.88
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 1 0  0  0  0  3 22  4.88  244/1388  4.88  4.77  4.28 4.49  4.88
4. Were special techniques successful                  1   0   0  0  1  2 22  4.84   89/ 958  4.84  4.13  3.93 4.01  4.84

               Laboratory
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material  20   4   0  0  0  0  2  5.00 ****/ 224  ****  ****  4.10 4.43  ****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information 22 0 0  0  0  0  4  5.00 ****/ 240  ****  ****  4.11 3.96  ****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 21 3 0  0  0  0  2  5.00 ****/ 219  ****  ****  4.44 4.23  ****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance           21   3   0  0  0  0  2  5.00 ****/ 215  ****  ****  4.35 4.72  ****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified  21   3   0  0  0  0  2  5.00 ****/ 198  ****  ****  4.18 4.74  ****

               Seminar
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 21  1   0  0  0  0  4  5.00 ****/  85  ****  4.44  4.58 4.58  ****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 21 1  0  0  0  0  4  5.00 ****/  82  ****  3.28  4.52 4.74  ****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 21  2   0  0  0  0  3  5.00 ****/  78  ****  3.44  4.47 4.52  ****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned    21   1   0  0  0  1  3  4.75 ****/  80  ****  5.00  4.47 4.50  ****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear                21   1   0  0  0  0  4  5.00 ****/  82  ****  4.33  4.16 4.37  ****

               Field Work
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 23   0   0  0  0  0  3  5.00 ****/  52  ****  ****  4.04 3.64  ****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria  25   0   0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  53  ****  ****  4.05 4.03  ****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation       24   1   0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  42  ****  ****  4.75 4.78  ****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations   24   1   0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  37  ****  ****  4.58 4.33  ****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities  24   1   0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  32  ****  ****  4.56 4.59  ****

               Self  Paced
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 23   0   0  0  0  0  3  5.00 ****/  50  ****  ****  4.45 4.39  ****
```

```
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal      23  0  0  0  0  0  3  5.00 ****/  32  ****  ****  4.51  4.50  ****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful        23  0  0  0  1  0  2  4.33 ****/  43  ****  ****  4.69  4.61  ****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful         23  1  0  0  0  0  2  5.00 ****/  32  ****  ****  4.37  4.31  ****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students       23  1  0  0  0  0  2  5.00 ****/  21  ****  ****  4.52  4.42  ****
```