```
                                                       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    2   0   0   0   1   4   7  4.50  644/1649  4.50  4.42  4.28  4.11  4.50
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals     2   0   0   0   1   5   6  4.42  687/1648  4.42  4.46  4.23  4.16  4.42
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals    2   0   0   0   2   3   7  4.42  653/1375  4.42  4.51  4.27  4.10  4.42
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals     2   3   0   0   1   3   5  4.44  580/1595  4.44  4.37  4.20  4.03  4.44
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 3   0   0   0   0   3   8  4.73  198/1533  4.73  4.34  4.04  3.87  4.73
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 2  5   1   0   0   2   4  4.14  799/1512  4.14  4.30  4.10  3.86  4.14
7. Was the grading system clearly explained             2   0   0   1   2   3   6  4.17  915/1623  4.17  4.46  4.16  4.08  4.17
8. How many times was class cancelled                   2   0   0   0   0   4   8  4.67 1037/1646  4.67  4.82  4.69  4.67  4.67
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 6  0   0   0   0   2   6  4.75  165/1621  4.75  4.15  4.06  3.96  4.75

          Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared         2   0   0   0   0   3   9  4.75  480/1568  4.75  4.67  4.43  4.39  4.75
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject    2   0   0   0   0   1  11  4.92  532/1572  4.92  4.85  4.70  4.64  4.92
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 2   0   0   0   1   1  10  4.75  342/1564  4.75  4.49  4.28  4.20  4.75
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned      2   0   0   0   1   1  10  4.75  390/1559  4.75  4.55  4.29  4.20  4.75
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 2  0   0   0   1   2   9  4.67  208/1352  4.67  4.46  3.98  3.86  4.67

          Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 9   0   1   0   0   1   3  4.00  795/1384  4.00  4.47  4.08  3.86  4.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 9   0   1   1   0   1   2  3.40 1233/1382  3.40  4.61  4.29  4.03  3.40
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 9  0   1   1   2   0   1  2.80 1326/1368  2.80  4.58  4.30  4.01  2.80
4. Were special techniques successful                   8   5   0   1   0   0   0  2.00 ****/ 948  ****  4.25  3.95  3.75  ****

          Laboratory
2. Were you provided with adequate background information 12  0   0   0   1   0   1  4.00 ****/ 243  ****  ****  4.12  4.08  ****

          Seminar
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 11   1   0   1   0   0   1  3.50 ****/  88  ****  4.44  4.54  4.31  ****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 11  1   1   0   0   0   1  3.00 ****/  85  ****  4.59  4.47  4.30  ****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 11   1   1   0   0   0   1  3.00 ****/  81  ****  4.55  4.43  4.39  ****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned     11   1   0   1   0   0   1  3.50 ****/  92  ****  4.62  4.35  4.01  ****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear                 11   1   0   1   0   0   1  3.50 ****/ 288  ****  4.08  3.68  3.54  ****

          Field Work
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned  11   0   2   0   0   0   1  2.33 ****/  52  ****  ****  4.06  3.72  ****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria  11   0   2   1   0   0   0  1.33 ****/  48  ****  ****  4.09  3.65  ****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation        11   2   0   0   0   0   1  5.00 ****/  39  ****  ****  4.47  4.36  ****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations    11   2   0   0   0   0   1  5.00 ****/  39  ****  ****  4.38  4.37  ****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities  11   2   0   0   1   0   0  3.00 ****/ 312  ****  ****  3.68  3.51  ****

          Self  Paced
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 11   0   0   0   2   0   1  3.67 ****/  53  ****  4.30  4.30  4.17  ****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal     11   1   0   0   1   0   1  4.00 ****/  30  ****  4.30  4.16  4.06  ****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful       11   1   0   0   0   1   1  4.50 ****/  41  ****  4.31  4.43  4.27  ****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful        11   2   0   0   0   1   0  4.00 ****/  24  ****  ****  4.42  4.24  ****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students      11   2   0   0   0   0   1  5.00 ****/ 110  ****  4.71  3.99  3.83  ****
```

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	4	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	2
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B	4						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	1	C	2	General	5	Under-grad	14	Non-major	12
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	0	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough			
				P	0			responses to be significant			
				I	0	Other	2				
				?	0						

```
Course-Section: AGNG 200  0101            University of Maryland                          Page    40
Title          AGNG PEOPLE, POL & MNG      Baltimore County                              FEB 11, 2009
Instructor:    MAJESKI, ROBIN              Fall   2008                                   Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:     42
Questionnaires: 24                  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   4   0   3   2   3   5   7  3.55 1484/1649  3.69  4.42  4.28  4.29  3.55
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    4   0   0   0   4   7   9  4.25  897/1648  4.20  4.46  4.23  4.25  4.25
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   4   2   1   1   2   5   9  4.11  908/1375  4.25  4.51  4.27  4.37  4.11
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    4   0   1   0   3   6  10  4.20  890/1595  4.21  4.37  4.20  4.22  4.20
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 4  0   2   2   4   5   7  3.65 1146/1533  3.71  4.34  4.04  4.04  3.65
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 4 0  1   3   2   7   7  3.80 1089/1512  3.69  4.30  4.10  4.14  3.80
7. Was the grading system clearly explained            4   0   1   0   2   6  11  4.30  757/1623  4.12  4.46  4.16  4.21  4.30
8. How many times was class cancelled                  4   0   0   0   0   0  20  5.00    1/1646  4.97  4.82  4.69  4.63  5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 5 0  3  2   4   8   2  3.21 1460/1621  3.49  4.15  4.06  4.01  3.21


              Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        5   0   0   1   3   4  11  4.32 1070/1568  4.37  4.67  4.43  4.39  4.32
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   5   0   0   0   1   2  16  4.79  876/1572  4.79  4.85  4.70  4.73  4.79
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 5  0   1   0   4   5   9  4.11 1083/1564  4.19  4.49  4.28  4.27  4.11
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     5   0   2   1   2   4  10  4.00 1121/1559  4.18  4.55  4.29  4.33  4.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 6 0  1   2   2   2  11  4.11  624/1352  4.11  4.46  3.98  4.07  4.11


              Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 11 0  1   1   1   3   7  4.08  771/1384  3.96  4.47  4.08  3.99  4.08
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 11 0  1   0   0   4   8  4.38  732/1382  4.21  4.61  4.29  4.19  4.38
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 12 0 0   0   0   4   8  4.67  522/1368  4.57  4.58  4.30  4.21  4.67
4. Were special techniques successful                  12   0   3   0   1   3   5  3.58  682/ 948  3.74  4.25  3.95  3.89  3.58

              Self  Paced
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful       23   0   1   0   0   0   0  1.00 ****/  24  ****  ****  4.42  2.00  ****

                                         Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned        Cum. GPA         Expected Grades          Reasons                 Type                    Majors
-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
  00-27     2      0.00-0.99    0        A    8         Required for Majors  9      Graduate      0       Major        1
  28-55     1      1.00-1.99    0        B    6
  56-83     5      2.00-2.99    3        C    1         General              6      Under-grad   24       Non-major   23
  84-150    0      3.00-3.49    0        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                3
                                         ?    0
```

```
Course-Section: AGNG 200  0201            University of Maryland                              Page   41
Title          AGNG PEOPLE, POL & MNG      Baltimore County                                  FEB 11, 2009
Instructor:    MAJESKI, ROBIN              Fall  2008                                         Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:    48
Questionnaires: 39                   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  4  8 14 12  3.82 1335/1649  3.69  4.42  4.28 4.29  3.82
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals     0   0  0  4  4 13 18  4.15 1010/1648  4.20  4.46  4.23 4.25  4.15
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals    1   0  0  1  4 12 21  4.39  674/1375  4.25  4.51  4.27 4.37  4.39
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals     1   1  0  2  4 15 16  4.22  865/1595  4.21  4.37  4.20 4.22  4.22
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0   0  2  3  9 13 12  3.77 1055/1533  3.71  4.34  4.04 4.04  3.77
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 1  2  4  9 16  7  3.58 1221/1512  3.69  4.30  4.10 4.14  3.58
7. Was the grading system clearly explained             0   0  2  1 10 10 16  3.95 1119/1623  4.12  4.46  4.16 4.21  3.95
8. How many times was class cancelled                   1   0  0  0  0  2 36  4.95  398/1646  4.97  4.82  4.69 4.63  4.95
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 11 2 0  1  8 13  4  3.77 1184/1621  3.49  4.15  4.06 4.01  3.77


                Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared         1   0  0  0  7  8 23  4.42  956/1568  4.37  4.67  4.43 4.39  4.42
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject    2   0  0  0  1  6 30  4.78  876/1572  4.79  4.85  4.70 4.73  4.78
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 2   0  0  0  7 13 17  4.27  918/1564  4.19  4.49  4.28 4.27  4.27
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned      1   1  0  2  3 12 20  4.35  881/1559  4.18  4.55  4.29 4.33  4.35
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 3  0  2  2  5  8 19  4.11  624/1352  4.11  4.46  3.98 4.07  4.11


                Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 5   0  2  2  7 11 12  3.85  911/1384  3.96  4.47  4.08 3.99  3.85
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 5   0  2  1  6 10 15  4.03  941/1382  4.21  4.61  4.29 4.19  4.03
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 5  0  0  1  4  7 22  4.47  683/1368  4.57  4.58  4.30 4.21  4.47
4. Were special techniques successful                   6   4  3  2  4  6 14  3.90  537/ 948  3.74  4.25  3.95 3.89  3.90

                Laboratory
2. Were you provided with adequate background information 38 0 1  0  0  0  0  1.00 ****/ 243  ****  ****  4.12 4.47  ****


                Seminar
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 38 0 0  0  1  0  0  3.00 ****/  85  ****  4.59  4.47 3.33  ****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 38  0  0  0  1  0  0  3.00 ****/  81  ****  4.55  4.43 3.67  ****


                Field Work
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned  38  0  1  0  0  0  0  1.00 ****/  52  ****  ****  4.06 3.93  ****


                Self  Paced
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 37  0  0  1  1  0  0  2.50 ****/  53  ****  4.30  4.30 4.07  ****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal     37  1  1  0  0  0  0  1.00 ****/  30  ****  4.30  4.16 1.50  ****

                                   Frequency Distribution


Credits Earned          Cum. GPA          Expected Grades        Reasons              Type               Majors
------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
  00-27     6       0.00-0.99    1        A   13      Required for Majors  13   Graduate     0      Major        0
  28-55     1       1.00-1.99    0        B    8
  56-83     3       2.00-2.99    0        C    6      General              10   Under-grad  39      Non-major   39
  84-150    1       3.00-3.49    1        D    0
  Grad.     0       3.50-4.00    1        F    0      Electives             3   #### - Means there are not enough
                                          P    0                               responses to be significant
                                          I    0      Other                 3
                                          ?    0
```

```
Course-Section: AGNG 300  0101            University of Maryland                                      Page   42
Title      OVERVIEW: AGING SERVIC         Baltimore County                                           FEB 11, 2009
Instructor:    MAJESKI, ROBIN  (Instr. A)      Fall   2008                                           Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:    22
Questionnaires: 17                        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  1  4 12  4.65  459/1649   4.65  4.42  4.28  4.27  4.65
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    0  0  0  0  2  7  8  4.35  770/1648   4.35  4.46  4.23  4.18  4.35
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   0  0  0  0  3  3 11  4.47  581/1375   4.47  4.51  4.27  4.22  4.47
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    0  0  0  0  4  4  9  4.29  770/1595   4.29  4.37  4.20  4.21  4.29
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0  0  0  0  3  4 10  4.41  465/1533   4.41  4.34  4.04  4.05  4.41
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 0 0 0  2  5 10  4.47  422/1512   4.47  4.30  4.10  4.11  4.47
7. Was the grading system clearly explained            0  0  0  1  4  2 10  4.24  838/1623   4.24  4.46  4.16  4.08  4.24
8. How many times was class cancelled                  1  0  1  1  0  0 14  4.56 1139/1646   4.56  4.82  4.69  4.67  4.56
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 3 0 0 0 5  7  2  3.79 1167/1621   3.73  4.15  4.06  4.02  3.73

              Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        1  0  0  0  2  6  8  4.38 1012/1568   4.41  4.67  4.43  4.39  4.41
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   1  0  0  0  1  5 10  4.56 1184/1572   4.67  4.85  4.70  4.64  4.67
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 1 0 0 0  4  3  9  4.31  876/1564   4.27  4.49  4.28  4.25  4.27
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     1  0  1  0  2  5  8  4.19 1016/1559   4.37  4.55  4.29  4.23  4.37
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 2 0 1 1  3  4  6  3.87  842/1352   4.04  4.46  3.98  3.97  4.04

              Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 1 0 0 0  3  5  8  4.31  633/1384   4.31  4.47  4.08  4.11  4.31
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 1 0 0 0  1  4 11  4.63  521/1382   4.63  4.61  4.29  4.37  4.63
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 1 0 0 0  0  5 11  4.69  503/1368   4.69  4.58  4.30  4.39  4.69
4. Were special techniques successful                  2  1  1  1  3  1  8  4.00  431/ 948   4.00  4.25  3.95  4.00  4.00

              Laboratory
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material  15  0  0  0  1  0  1  4.00 ****/ 221  ****  ****  4.16  4.07  ****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information 15 0 0 0 1  0  1  4.00 ****/ 243  ****  ****  4.12  3.89  ****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 15 0 0 0 1  0  1  4.00 ****/ 212  ****  ****  4.40  4.21  ****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance           15  0  0  0  1  0  1  4.00 ****/ 209  ****  ****  4.35  4.12  ****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified  15  0  0  0  1  0  1  4.00 ****/ 555  ****  ****  4.29  4.22  ****

              Seminar
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 15  0  0  0  1  0  1  4.00 ****/  88  ****  4.44  4.54  4.63  ****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 15 0 0 0 1  0  1  4.00 ****/  85  ****  4.59  4.47  4.55  ****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 15  0  0  0  1  0  1  4.00 ****/  81  ****  4.55  4.43  4.30  ****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned    15  0  0  0  1  0  1  4.00 ****/  92  ****  4.62  4.35  4.46  ****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear                15  0  0  0  1  0  1  4.00 ****/ 288  ****  4.08  3.68  3.58  ****

              Field Work
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 15  0  0  0  1  0  1  4.00 ****/  52  ****  ****  4.06  3.59  ****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 15  0  0  0  1  0  1  4.00 ****/  48  ****  ****  4.09  4.21  ****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation       15  0  0  0  1  0  1  4.00 ****/  39  ****  ****  4.47  4.43  ****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations   15  0  0  0  1  0  1  4.00 ****/  39  ****  ****  4.38  4.32  ****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities 15  0  0  0  1  0  1  4.00 ****/ 312  ****  ****  3.68  3.60  ****

              Self  Paced
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 15 0 0 0  1  0  1  4.00 ****/  53  ****  4.30  4.30  4.32  ****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal    15  0  0  0  1  0  1  4.00 ****/  30  ****  4.30  4.16  4.44  ****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful      15  0  0  0  1  0  1  4.00 ****/  41  ****  4.31  4.43  5.00  ****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful       15  0  0  0  1  0  1  4.00 ****/  24  ****  ****  4.42  5.00  ****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students     15  0  0  0  1  0  1  4.00 ****/ 110  ****  4.71  3.99  4.05  ****
```

```
                                        Frequency Distribution


Credits Earned          Cum. GPA         Expected Grades            Reasons                  Type                    Majors
-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
  00-27    2         0.00-0.99   1        A   9        Required for Majors  0      Graduate    0        Major       9
  28-55    0         1.00-1.99   0        B   5
  56-83    5         2.00-2.99   3        C   0        General              1      Under-grad  17       Non-major   8
  84-150   2         3.00-3.49   4        D   0
  Grad.    0         3.50-4.00   3        F   0        Electives            1      #### - Means there are not enough
                                          P   0                                   responses to be significant
                                          I   0        Other                11
                                          ?   0
```

```
Course-Section: AGNG 300  0101                 University of Maryland                                   Page   43
Title          OVERVIEW: AGING SERVIC          Baltimore County                                        FEB 11, 2009
Instructor:                  (Instr. B)        Fall   2008                                              Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:     22
Questionnaires: 17                         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  1  4 12  4.65  459/1649  4.65  4.42  4.28 4.27  4.65
 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals     0  0  0  0  2  7  8  4.35  770/1648  4.35  4.46  4.23 4.18  4.35
 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals    0  0  0  0  3  3 11  4.47  581/1375  4.47  4.51  4.27 4.22  4.47
 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals     0  0  0  0  4  4  9  4.29  770/1595  4.29  4.37  4.20 4.21  4.29
 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0  0  0  0  3  4 10  4.41  465/1533  4.41  4.34  4.04 4.05  4.41
 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 0 0  0  2  5 10  4.47  422/1512  4.47  4.30  4.10 4.11  4.47
 7. Was the grading system clearly explained             0  0  0  1  4  2 10  4.24  838/1623  4.24  4.46  4.16 4.08  4.24
 8. How many times was class cancelled                   1  0  1  1  0  0 14  4.56 1139/1646  4.56  4.82  4.69 4.67  4.56
 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 8 0 0  2  1  4  2  3.67 1261/1621  3.73  4.15  4.06 4.02  3.73


                 Lecture
 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared         8  0  0  0  1  3  5  4.44  930/1568  4.41  4.67  4.43 4.39  4.41
 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject    8  0  0  0  0  2  7  4.78  894/1572  4.67  4.85  4.70 4.64  4.67
 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 8  0  0  1  1  2  5  4.22  971/1564  4.27  4.49  4.28 4.25  4.27
 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned      8  0  0  0  0  4  5  4.56  640/1559  4.37  4.55  4.29 4.23  4.37
 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 8 0 0  0  2  3  4  4.22  534/1352  4.04  4.46  3.98 3.97  4.04


                 Discussion
 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 1  0  0  0  3  5  8  4.31  633/1384  4.31  4.47  4.08 4.11  4.31
 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 1  0  0  0  1  4 11  4.63  521/1382  4.63  4.61  4.29 4.37  4.63
 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 1 0 0  0  0  5 11  4.69  503/1368  4.69  4.58  4.30 4.39  4.69
 4. Were special techniques successful                   2  1  1  1  3  1  8  4.00  431/ 948  4.00  4.25  3.95 4.00  4.00


                 Laboratory
 1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material  15  0  0  0  1  0  1  4.00 ****/ 221  ****  ****  4.16 4.07  ****
 2. Were you provided with adequate background information 15 0 0 0 1  0  1  4.00 ****/ 243  ****  ****  4.12 3.89  ****
 3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 15 0 0 0  1  0  1  4.00 ****/ 212  ****  ****  4.40 4.21  ****
 4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance           15  0  0  0  1  0  1  4.00 ****/ 209  ****  ****  4.35 4.12  ****
 5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified  15  0  0  0  1  0  1  4.00 ****/ 555  ****  ****  4.29 4.22  ****


                 Seminar
 1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 15  0  0  0  1  0  1  4.00 ****/  88  ****  4.44  4.54 4.63  ****
 2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 15 0 0 0  1  0  1  4.00 ****/  85  ****  4.59  4.47 4.55  ****
 3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 15  0  0  0  1  0  1  4.00 ****/  81  ****  4.55  4.43 4.30  ****
 4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned     15  0  0  0  1  0  1  4.00 ****/  92  ****  4.62  4.35 4.46  ****
 5. Were criteria for grading made clear                 15  0  0  0  1  0  1  4.00 ****/ 288  ****  4.08  3.68 3.58  ****


                 Field Work
 1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 15  0  0  0  1  0  1  4.00 ****/  52  ****  ****  4.06 3.59  ****
 2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria  15  0  0  0  1  0  1  4.00 ****/  48  ****  ****  4.09 4.21  ****
 3. Was the instructor available for consultation        15  0  0  0  1  0  1  4.00 ****/  39  ****  ****  4.47 4.43  ****
 4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations    15  0  0  0  1  0  1  4.00 ****/  39  ****  ****  4.38 4.32  ****
 5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities  15  0  0  0  1  0  1  4.00 ****/ 312  ****  ****  3.68 3.60  ****


                 Self  Paced
 1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 15  0  0  0  1  0  1  4.00 ****/  53  ****  4.30  4.30 4.32  ****
 2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal     15  0  0  0  1  0  1  4.00 ****/  30  ****  4.30  4.16 4.44  ****
 3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful       15  0  0  0  1  0  1  4.00 ****/  41  ****  4.31  4.43 5.00  ****
 4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful        15  0  0  0  1  0  1  4.00 ****/  24  ****  ****  4.42 5.00  ****
 5. Were there enough proctors for all the students      15  0  0  0  1  0  1  4.00 ****/ 110  ****  4.71  3.99 4.05  ****
```

```
                                            Frequency Distribution


Credits Earned          Cum. GPA         Expected Grades              Reasons                Type                    Majors
------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
  00-27    2         0.00-0.99    1        A    9         Required for Majors   0      Graduate      0        Major         9
  28-55    0         1.00-1.99    0        B    5
  56-83    5         2.00-2.99    3        C    0         General               1      Under-grad   17        Non-major     8
  84-150   2         3.00-3.49    4        D    0
  Grad.    0         3.50-4.00    3        F    0         Electives             1      #### - Means there are not enough
                                           P    0                                      responses to be significant
                                           I    0         Other                11
                                           ?    0
```

```
Course-Section: AGNG 401  0101                    University of Maryland                                         Page   44
Title      FOUNDATIONS - AGING SV                 Baltimore County                                              FEB 11, 2009
Instructor:    STEWART, MARGAR                     Fall   2008                                                  Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:    12
Questionnaires: 11                       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   9  4.82   265/1649  4.82  4.42  4.28  4.50  4.82
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    0   0   0   0   0   0  11  5.00     1/1648  5.00  4.46  4.23  4.36  5.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   0   4   0   0   0   1   6  4.86   199/1375  4.86  4.51  4.27  4.48  4.86
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    0   0   0   0   0   4   7  4.64   352/1595  4.64  4.37  4.20  4.36  4.64
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0   0   0   0   0   3   8  4.73   198/1533  4.73  4.34  4.04  4.14  4.73
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0  0   0   0   1   0  10  4.82   151/1512  4.82  4.30  4.10  4.26  4.82
7. Was the grading system clearly explained            0   0   0   0   0   4   7  4.64   358/1623  4.64  4.46  4.16  4.27  4.64
8. How many times was class cancelled                  0   0   0   0   0   4   7  4.64  1070/1646  4.64  4.82  4.69  4.71  4.64
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 2  0   0   0   0   4   5  4.56   331/1621  4.56  4.15  4.06  4.24  4.56


                 Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        0   0   0   0   0   0  11  5.00     1/1568  5.00  4.67  4.43  4.54  5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   0   0   0   0   0   0  11  5.00     1/1572  5.00  4.85  4.70  4.79  5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0  0   0   0   0   1  10  4.91   169/1564  4.91  4.49  4.28  4.40  4.91
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     0   0   0   0   0   1  10  4.91   205/1559  4.91  4.55  4.29  4.41  4.91
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 0  0   0   0   1   1   9  4.73   172/1352  4.73  4.46  3.98  4.07  4.73


                 Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 1  0   0   0   1   1   8  4.70   302/1384  4.70  4.47  4.08  4.35  4.70
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 1  0   0   0   1   0   9  4.80   342/1382  4.80  4.61  4.29  4.56  4.80
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 1  0   0   0   0   1   9  4.90   264/1368  4.90  4.58  4.30  4.58  4.90
4. Were special techniques successful                  1   0   0   1   1   2   6  4.30   323/ 948  4.30  4.25  3.95  4.31  4.30


                 Seminar
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 10  0   0   0   0   1   0  4.00  ****/  85  ****  4.59  4.47  4.54  ****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 10  0   0   0   0   1   0  4.00  ****/  81  ****  4.55  4.43  4.57  ****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned   10   0   0   0   0   1   0  4.00  ****/  92  ****  4.62  4.35  4.44  ****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear              10   0   0   0   0   1   0  4.00  ****/ 288  ****  4.08  3.68  3.71  ****


                 Field Work
3. Was the instructor available for consultation      10   0   0   0   0   1   0  4.00  ****/  39  ****  ****  4.47  4.52  ****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations  10   0   0   0   0   1   0  4.00  ****/  39  ****  ****  4.38  4.59  ****


                 Self  Paced
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful     10   0   0   0   0   1   0  4.00  ****/  41  ****  4.31  4.43  4.84  ****

                                      Frequency Distribution


Credits Earned          Cum. GPA          Expected Grades          Reasons                Type                   Majors
------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
  00-27     1         0.00-0.99   0         A    6         Required for Majors  0      Graduate      0        Major        7
  28-55     0         1.00-1.99   0         B    3                                                            
  56-83     2         2.00-2.99   1         C    1         General              1      Under-grad   11        Non-major    4
  84-150    4         3.00-3.49   3         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               10
                                            ?    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   1   2   4  4.43   749/1649  4.43  4.42  4.28  4.50  4.43
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals     0   0   0   0   1   1   5  4.57   475/1648  4.57  4.46  4.23  4.36  4.57
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals    0   0   0   0   0   3   4  4.57   488/1375  4.57  4.51  4.27  4.48  4.57
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals     0   0   0   0   0   2   5  4.71   272/1595  4.71  4.37  4.20  4.36  4.71
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0   0   0   0   0   2   5  4.71   204/1533  4.71  4.34  4.04  4.14  4.71
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0  0   0   0   0   2   5  4.71   225/1512  4.71  4.30  4.10  4.26  4.71
7. Was the grading system clearly explained             0   0   0   0   0   1   6  4.86   145/1623  4.86  4.46  4.16  4.27  4.86
8. How many times was class cancelled                   0   0   0   0   0   5   2  4.29  1377/1646  4.29  4.82  4.69  4.71  4.29
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 1  0   0   0   1   4   1  4.00   914/1621  4.00  4.15  4.06  4.24  4.00

              Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared         0   0   0   0   0   0   7  5.00     1/1568  5.00  4.67  4.43  4.54  5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject    0   0   0   0   0   1   6  4.86   715/1572  4.86  4.85  4.70  4.79  4.86
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0   0   0   0   0   1   6  4.86   216/1564  4.86  4.49  4.28  4.40  4.86
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned      0   0   0   0   1   0   6  4.71   448/1559  4.71  4.55  4.29  4.41  4.71
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 0  3   0   0   0   1   3  4.75   157/1352  4.75  4.46  3.98  4.07  4.75

              Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 0   0   0   0   0   2   5  4.71   284/1384  4.71  4.47  4.08  4.35  4.71
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 0   0   0   0   0   2   5  4.71   435/1382  4.71  4.61  4.29  4.56  4.71
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 0  0   0   0   0   2   5  4.71   472/1368  4.71  4.58  4.30  4.58  4.71
4. Were special techniques successful                   0   1   0   0   1   2   3  4.33   310/ 948  4.33  4.25  3.95  4.31  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	4
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	3						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	1	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	7	Non-major	3
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	4	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	6				
				?	0						

```
Course-Section: AGNG 440  0101            University of Maryland                                    Page   46
Title       DIVERSITY - AGING SVCS         Baltimore County                                        FEB 11, 2009
Instructor:  FRANKOWSKI, ANN               Fall   2008                                             Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:    14
Questionnaires: 10                      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  3  5  1  3.50 1498/1649  3.50  4.42  4.28 4.50  3.50
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals   0   0  0  0  5  3  2  3.70 1382/1648  3.70  4.46  4.23 4.36  3.70
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals  0   0  0  1  2  5  2  3.80 1087/1375  3.80  4.51  4.27 4.48  3.80
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals   0   1  1  0  3  5  0  3.33 1470/1595  3.33  4.37  4.20 4.36  3.33
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0 0  1  1  2  3  3  3.60 1180/1533  3.60  4.34  4.04 4.14  3.60
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 0 1 1 1 7 0  3.40 1320/1512  3.40  4.30  4.10 4.26  3.40
7. Was the grading system clearly explained           0   0  0  0  3  5  2  3.90 1180/1623  3.90  4.46  4.16 4.27  3.90
8. How many times was class cancelled                 0   0  0  0  0  8  2  4.20 1440/1646  4.20  4.82  4.69 4.71  4.20
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 2 1 0 0 4 3 0  3.43 1393/1621  3.43  4.15  4.06 4.24  3.43

            Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared       0   0  0  0  0  6  4  4.40  983/1568  4.40  4.67  4.43 4.54  4.40
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject  0   0  0  0  0  4  6  4.60 1146/1572  4.60  4.85  4.70 4.79  4.60
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0 0 1 1 1 6 1  3.50 1388/1564  3.50  4.49  4.28 4.40  3.50
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned    0   0  0  2  2  5  1  3.50 1370/1559  3.50  4.55  4.29 4.41  3.50
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 1 0 0 0 2 4 3  4.11  624/1352  4.11  4.46  3.98 4.07  4.11

            Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 2 0 1 1 1 3 2  3.50 1081/1384  3.50  4.47  4.08 4.35  3.50
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 2 0 0 1 1 2 4  4.13  911/1382  4.13  4.61  4.29 4.56  4.13
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 2 0 1 0 0 3 4  4.13  910/1368  4.13  4.58  4.30 4.58  4.13
4. Were special techniques successful                 2   2  0  1  0  4  1  3.83  564/ 948  3.83  4.25  3.95 4.31  3.83

            Laboratory
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material 9   0  0  0  0  1  0  4.00 ****/ 221  ****  ****  4.16 4.73  ****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information 9 0 0 0 0 1 0  4.00 ****/ 243  ****  ****  4.12 4.61  ****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 9 0 0 0 0 1 0  4.00 ****/ 212  ****  ****  4.40 4.57  ****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance          9   0  0  0  0  1  0  4.00 ****/ 209  ****  ****  4.35 4.63  ****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 9  0  0  0  0  1  0  4.00 ****/ 555  ****  ****  4.29 4.41  ****

            Seminar
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 9 0 0 0 0 1 0  4.00 ****/  88  ****  4.44  4.54 4.66  ****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 9 0 0 0 0 1 0  4.00 ****/  85  ****  4.59  4.47 4.54  ****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 9 0 0 0 0 1 0  4.00 ****/  81  ****  4.55  4.43 4.57  ****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned   9   0  0  0  0  1  0  4.00 ****/  92  ****  4.62  4.35 4.44  ****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear               9   0  0  0  0  1  0  4.00 ****/ 288  ****  4.08  3.68 3.71  ****

            Field Work
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 9 0 0 0 0 1 0  4.00 ****/  52  ****  ****  4.06 4.86  ****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 9 0 0 0 0 1 0  4.00 ****/  48  ****  ****  4.09 4.42  ****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation      9   0  0  0  0  1  0  4.00 ****/  39  ****  ****  4.47 4.52  ****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations  9   0  0  0  0  1  0  4.00 ****/  39  ****  ****  4.38 4.59  ****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities 9  0  0  0  0  1  0  4.00 ****/ 312  ****  ****  3.68 3.95  ****

            Self  Paced
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 9 0 0 0 0 1 0  4.00 ****/  53  ****  4.30  4.30 4.64  ****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal   9   0  0  0  0  1  0  4.00 ****/  30  ****  4.30  4.16 4.24  ****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful     9   0  0  0  0  1  0  4.00 ****/  41  ****  4.31  4.43 4.84  ****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful      9   0  0  0  0  1  0  4.00 ****/  24  ****  4.42  4.85 ****  ****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students    9   0  0  0  0  1  0  4.00 ****/ 110  ****  4.71  3.99 4.22  ****
```

                                        Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned   Cum. GPA   Expected Grades   Reasons   Type   Majors
----
 00-27   1   0.00-0.99   0   A   4   Required for Majors   0   Graduate   0   Major   5
 28-55   0   1.00-1.99   0   B   6
 56-83   1   2.00-2.99   1   C   0   General   1   Under-grad 10   Non-major   5
 84-150   5   3.00-3.49   5   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   9
                                             ?   0

```
Course-Section: AGNG 454  0101              University of Maryland                          Page   47
Title       AGING & SOCIAL INSURAN          Baltimore County                               FEB 11, 2009
Instructor:  GRIBBIN, JOSEPH                Fall  2008                                      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  0  0  0  0  6  5.00   1/1649  5.00  4.42  4.28  4.50  5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    0   0  0  0  0  0  6  5.00   1/1648  5.00  4.46  4.23  4.36  5.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   0   0  0  0  0  0  6  5.00   1/1375  5.00  4.51  4.27  4.48  5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    0   1  0  0  0  0  5  5.00   1/1595  5.00  4.37  4.20  4.36  5.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0  0  0  0  0  0  6  5.00   1/1533  5.00  4.34  4.04  4.14  5.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 0 0  0  0  0  6  5.00   1/1512  5.00  4.30  4.10  4.26  5.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained            0   0  0  0  0  0  6  5.00   1/1623  5.00  4.46  4.16  4.27  5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled                  0   0  0  0  0  0  6  5.00   1/1646  5.00  4.82  4.69  4.71  5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 1 0 0  0  0  1  4  4.80 133/1621  4.80  4.15  4.06  4.24  4.80

             Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        2   0  0  0  0  0  4  5.00   1/1568  5.00  4.67  4.43  4.54  5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   2   0  0  0  0  0  4  5.00   1/1572  5.00  4.85  4.70  4.79  5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 2  0  0  0  0  0  4  5.00   1/1564  5.00  4.49  4.28  4.40  5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     2   0  0  0  0  0  4  5.00   1/1559  5.00  4.55  4.29  4.41  5.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 2 0 0  0  0  0  4  5.00   1/1352  5.00  4.46  3.98  4.07  5.00

             Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 2  0  0  0  1  0  3  4.50 437/1384  4.50  4.47  4.08  4.35  4.50
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 2  0  0  0  0  0  4  5.00   1/1382  5.00  4.61  4.29  4.56  5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 2 0 0  0  0  0  4  5.00   1/1368  5.00  4.58  4.30  4.58  5.00
4. Were special techniques successful                  2   2  0  0  0  0  2  5.00   1/ 948  5.00  4.25  3.95  4.31  5.00

             Seminar
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 0  0  0  0  0  0  6  5.00   1/  88  5.00  4.44  4.54  4.66  5.00
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 0 0 0  0  0  0  6  5.00   1/  85  5.00  4.59  4.47  4.54  5.00
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 0  0  0  0  0  0  6  5.00   1/  81  5.00  4.55  4.43  4.57  5.00
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned    0   0  0  0  0  0  6  5.00   1/  92  5.00  4.62  4.35  4.44  5.00
5. Were criteria for grading made clear                0   0  0  1  0  0  5  4.50  37/ 288  4.50  4.08  3.68  3.71  4.50

                                  Frequency Distribution

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

```
Course-Section: AGNG 461  0101            University of Maryland                            Page   48
Title      INTERNSHIP/AGING SVCS           Baltimore County                            FEB 11, 2009
Instructor:    ADLER, DEBORAH                Fall   2008                                 Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:      6
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  0  2  2  1  1 3.17 1580/1649  3.17 4.42 4.28 4.50 3.17
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals   0   0  0  0  1  2  3 4.33  797/1648  4.33 4.46 4.23 4.36 4.33
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals  0   4  0  0  0  2  0 4.00  950/1375  4.00 4.51 4.27 4.48 4.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals   0   0  0  0  2  2  2 4.00 1067/1595  4.00 4.37 4.20 4.36 4.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0  4  0  0  1  1  0 3.50 1249/1533  3.50 4.34 4.04 4.14 3.50
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 0 0  0  2  2  2 4.00  883/1512  4.00 4.30 4.10 4.26 4.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained           1   0  0  0  1  1  3 4.40  635/1623  4.40 4.46 4.16 4.27 4.40
8. How many times was class cancelled                 1   0  0  0  0  0  5 5.00    1/1646  5.00 4.82 4.69 4.71 5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 0 0 0 1 1 3 1 3.67 1261/1621  3.67 4.15 4.06 4.24 3.67


                 Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared       0   0  0  0  0  3  3 4.50  852/1568  4.50 4.67 4.43 4.54 4.50
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject  0   0  0  0  1  1  4 4.50 1241/1572  4.50 4.85 4.70 4.79 4.50
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0  0  0  0  2  1  3 4.17 1028/1564  4.17 4.49 4.28 4.40 4.17
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned    0   0  0  0  1  2  3 4.33  901/1559  4.33 4.55 4.29 4.41 4.33
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 1 4 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/1352  **** 4.46 3.98 4.07 ****


                 Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 0 0 0  0  1  3  2 4.17  726/1384  4.17 4.47 4.08 4.35 4.17
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 0 0 0  0  0  2  4 4.67  483/1382  4.67 4.61 4.29 4.56 4.67
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 1 0 0 0  0  2  3 4.60  579/1368  4.60 4.58 4.30 4.58 4.60
4. Were special techniques successful                 1   2  0  0  2  1  0 3.33  776/ 948  3.33 4.25 3.95 4.31 3.33


                              Frequency Distribution

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

```
Course-Section: AGNG 470  0101                University of Maryland                                    Page   49
Title         CAPSTONE SEMINAR                 Baltimore County                                         FEB 11, 2009
Instructor:   RONCH, JUDAH                     Fall   2008                                              Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:      4
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   644/1649   4.50  4.42  4.28  4.50  4.50
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals     0   0  0  0  0  3  1  4.25   897/1648   4.25  4.46  4.23  4.36  4.25
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals    0   0  0  0  0  3  1  4.25   806/1375   4.25  4.51  4.27  4.48  4.25
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals     0   1  0  0  0  2  1  4.33   722/1595   4.33  4.37  4.20  4.36  4.33
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 1   0  0  0  1  1  1  4.00   815/1533   4.00  4.34  4.04  4.14  4.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 0  0  0  2  1  1  3.75  1119/1512   3.75  4.30  4.10  4.26  3.75
7. Was the grading system clearly explained             0   1  0  0  0  2  1  4.33   720/1623   4.33  4.46  4.16  4.27  4.33
8. How many times was class cancelled                   0   0  0  0  0  1  3  4.75   913/1646   4.75  4.82  4.69  4.71  4.75
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 0 2  0  0  0  2  0  4.00   914/1621   4.00  4.15  4.06  4.24  4.00


               Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared         0   0  0  0  0  1  3  4.75   480/1568   4.75  4.67  4.43  4.54  4.75
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject    0   0  0  0  0  1  3  4.75   931/1572   4.75  4.85  4.70  4.79  4.75
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0   0  0  0  0  1  3  4.75   342/1564   4.75  4.49  4.28  4.40  4.75
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned      0   0  0  0  0  1  3  4.75   390/1559   4.75  4.55  4.29  4.41  4.75
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 0  0  0  0  0  1  3  4.75   157/1352   4.75  4.46  3.98  4.07  4.75


               Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 2   0  0  0  0  0  2  5.00     1/1384   5.00  4.47  4.08  4.35  5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 2   0  0  0  0  0  2  5.00     1/1382   5.00  4.61  4.29  4.56  5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 2  0  0  0  0  1  1  4.50   654/1368   4.50  4.58  4.30  4.58  4.50
4. Were special techniques successful                   2   1  0  0  0  1  0  4.00   431/ 948   4.00  4.25  3.95  4.31  4.00
```

```
                                     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       4
  28-55      0       1.00-1.99    0        B   2                                                          
  56-83      0       2.00-2.99    1        C   0         General              0     Under-grad   4        Non-major   0
  84-150     3       3.00-3.49    2        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                4
                                           ?   0
```

```
Course-Section: AGNG 600  0101              University of Maryland                              Page   50
Title      SOCIAL & ECON CONTEXTS              Baltimore County                                FEB 11, 2009
Instructor:    RONCH, JUDAH    (Instr. A)         Fall   2008                                  Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:     29
Questionnaires: 27                        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  1  6 20  4.70  383/1649  4.70  4.42  4.28 4.46  4.70
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals     0   0  0  0  7  8 12  4.19  977/1648  4.19  4.46  4.23 4.34  4.19
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals    0  15  0  0  3  3  6  4.25  806/1375  4.25  4.51  4.27 4.44  4.25
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals     1   8  0  0  2  9  7  4.28  794/1595  4.28  4.37  4.20 4.35  4.28
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0   0  0  0  6  7 14  4.30  584/1533  4.30  4.34  4.04 4.28  4.30
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0  0  1  0  5 10 11  4.11  826/1512  4.11  4.30  4.10 4.35  4.11
7. Was the grading system clearly explained             0   0  3  0  5  7 12  3.93 1149/1623  3.93  4.46  4.16 4.29  3.93
8. How many times was class cancelled                   0   0  0  0  0  0 27  5.00    1/1646  5.00  4.82  4.69 4.81  5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 7  1  1  0  0  6 12  4.47  415/1621  4.11  4.15  4.06 4.20  4.11

              Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared         0   0  0  0  0  9 18  4.67  636/1568  4.38  4.67  4.43 4.52  4.38
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject    0   0  0  0  0  0 27  5.00    1/1572  5.00  4.85  4.70 4.83  5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 1   0  0  0  0 12 14  4.54  620/1564  4.18  4.49  4.28 4.41  4.18
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned      1   0  0  0  0  6 20  4.77  376/1559  4.66  4.55  4.29 4.41  4.66
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 1  7  0  0  1  8 10  4.47  331/1352  4.52  4.46  3.98 4.10  4.52

              Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 1   0  0  0  1  7 18  4.65  335/1384  4.65  4.47  4.08 4.30  4.65
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 1   0  0  2  1  6 17  4.46  656/1382  4.46  4.61  4.29 4.52  4.46
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 1  0  1  0  2  6 17  4.46  693/1368  4.46  4.58  4.30 4.56  4.46
4. Were special techniques successful                   1   0  0  1  1  9 15  4.46  234/ 948  4.46  4.25  3.95 4.03  4.46

              Seminar
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 5   0  2  0  1 10  9  4.09   72/  88  4.09  4.44  4.54 4.63  4.09
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 5  7  1  0  0  4 10  4.47   50/  85  4.47  4.59  4.47 4.50  4.47
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 5  10  1  0  0  4  7  4.33   51/  81  4.33  4.55  4.43 4.43  4.33
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned     5   0  0  1  0  8 13  4.50   42/  92  4.50  4.62  4.35 4.42  4.50
5. Were criteria for grading made clear                 5   0  3  2  2  5 10  3.77  170/ 288  3.77  4.08  3.68 3.87  3.77

              Field Work
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 26   0  0  0  0  1  0  4.00 ****/  52  ****  ****  4.06 4.51  ****

              Self  Paced
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 9   0  1  0  1  6 10  4.33   30/  53  4.33  4.30  4.30 4.37  4.33
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal     9   4  0  1  2  4  7  4.21   17/  30  4.21  4.30  4.16 4.49  4.21
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful       9   0  1  0  2  6  9  4.22   28/  41  4.22  4.31  4.43 4.43  4.22
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful        9  13  0  0  1  1  3  4.40 ****/  24  ****  ****  4.42 4.67  ****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students      9  13  0  0  0  1  4  4.80 ****/ 110  ****  4.71  3.99 3.92  ****
```

Frequency Distribution

```
Credits Earned        Cum. GPA        Expected Grades         Reasons                 Type                Majors
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
00-27      0      0.00-0.99    1      A    6     Required for Majors   0    Graduate      9    Major       0
28-55      0      1.00-1.99    0      B    1                                                   
56-83      0      2.00-2.99    0      C    0     General               0    Under-grad   18    Non-major  27
84-150     0      3.00-3.49    0      D    0                                                   
Grad.      9      3.50-4.00    0      F    0     Electives             0    #### - Means there are not enough
                                      P    0                               responses to be significant
                                      I    0     Other                13
                                      ?    3
```

```
Course-Section: AGNG 600  0101                 University of Maryland                              Page   51
Title       SOCIAL & ECON CONTEXTS              Baltimore County                                   FEB 11, 2009
Instructor:               (Instr. B)            Fall   2008                                        Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:      29
Questionnaires:  27                    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  1  6  20  4.70  383/1649  4.70  4.42  4.28  4.46  4.70
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    0   0  0  0  7  8  12  4.19  977/1648  4.19  4.46  4.23  4.34  4.19
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   0  15  0  0  3  3   6  4.25  806/1375  4.25  4.51  4.27  4.44  4.25
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    1   8  0  0  2  9   7  4.28  794/1595  4.28  4.37  4.20  4.35  4.28
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0  0  0  0  6  7  14  4.30  584/1533  4.30  4.34  4.04  4.28  4.30
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 0  1  0  5 10 11  4.11  826/1512  4.11  4.30  4.10  4.35  4.11
7. Was the grading system clearly explained            0   0  3  0  5  7  12  3.93 1149/1623  3.93  4.46  4.16  4.29  3.93
8. How many times was class cancelled                  0   0  0  0  0  0  27  5.00    1/1646  5.00  4.82  4.69  4.81  5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 18 1 1 0 2  2   3  3.75 1192/1621  4.11  4.15  4.06  4.20  4.11

                    Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared       16   0  0  1  2  3   5  4.09 1239/1568  4.38  4.67  4.43  4.52  4.38
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject  16   0  0  0  0  0  11  5.00    1/1572  5.00  4.85  4.70  4.83  5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 16 0 1  1  1  4   4  3.82 1267/1564  4.18  4.49  4.28  4.41  4.18
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned    16   0  0  0  2  1   8  4.55  651/1559  4.66  4.55  4.29  4.41  4.66
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 16 4 0 0  1  1   5  4.57  263/1352  4.52  4.46  3.98  4.10  4.52

                    Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 1  0  0  0  1  7  18  4.65  335/1384  4.65  4.47  4.08  4.30  4.65
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 1  0  0  2  1  6  17  4.46  656/1382  4.46  4.61  4.29  4.52  4.46
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 1 0  1  0  2  6  17  4.46  693/1368  4.46  4.58  4.30  4.56  4.46
4. Were special techniques successful                  1   0  0  1  1  9  15  4.46  234/ 948  4.46  4.25  3.95  4.03  4.46

                    Seminar
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 5  0  2  0  1 10   9  4.09   72/  88  4.09  4.44  4.54  4.63  4.09
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 5 7  1  0  0  4  10  4.47   50/  85  4.47  4.59  4.47  4.50  4.47
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 5 10  1  0  0  4   7  4.33   51/  81  4.33  4.55  4.43  4.43  4.33
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned    5   0  0  1  0  8  13  4.50   42/  92  4.50  4.62  4.35  4.42  4.50
5. Were criteria for grading made clear                5   0  3  2  2  5  10  3.77  170/ 288  3.77  4.08  3.68  3.87  3.77

                    Field Work
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 26  0  0  0  0  1   0  4.00 ****/  52  ****  ****  4.06  4.51  ****

                    Self  Paced
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 9  0  1  0  1  6  10  4.33   30/  53  4.33  4.30  4.30  4.37  4.33
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal    9   4  0  1  2  4   7  4.21   17/  30  4.21  4.30  4.16  4.49  4.21
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful      9   0  1  0  2  6   9  4.22   28/  41  4.22  4.31  4.43  4.43  4.22
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful       9  13  0  0  1  1   3  4.40 ****/  24  ****  ****  4.42  4.67  ****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students     9  13  0  0  0  1   4  4.80 ****/ 110  ****  4.71  3.99  3.92  ****
```

                    Frequency Distribution

```
Credits Earned         Cum. GPA        Expected Grades            Reasons                 Type                  Majors
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
 00-27     0        0.00-0.99   1       A   6        Required for Majors  0       Graduate      9       Major        0
 28-55     0        1.00-1.99   0       B   1
 56-83     0        2.00-2.99   0       C   0        General              0       Under-grad   18       Non-major   27
 84-150    0        3.00-3.49   0       D   0
 Grad.     9        3.50-4.00   0       F   0        Electives            0       #### - Means there are not enough
                                        P   0                                     responses to be significant
                                        I   0        Other               13
                                        ?   3
```

```
Course-Section: AGNG 610  0101                University of Maryland                              Page   52
Title       LEADERSHIP & ORG CHG I            Baltimore County                                   FEB 11, 2009
Instructor: SACHS, DAVID                      Fall  2008                                         Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:    29
Questionnaires: 27                      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  2  5 20  4.67  433/1649  4.67  4.42  4.28  4.46  4.67
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals   0   0  0  0  0 10 17  4.63  414/1648  4.63  4.46  4.23  4.34  4.63
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals  2  13  0  0  0  3  9  4.75  296/1375  4.75  4.51  4.27  4.44  4.75
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals   1   3  0  3  3  8  9  4.00 1067/1595  4.00  4.37  4.20  4.35  4.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0 0  0  0  1  9 17  4.59  295/1533  4.59  4.34  4.04  4.28  4.59
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 0 0 1 2 12 12  4.30  639/1512  4.30  4.30  4.10  4.35  4.30
7. Was the grading system clearly explained           0   0  0  2  2  4 19  4.48  528/1623  4.48  4.46  4.16  4.29  4.48
8. How many times was class cancelled                 0   0  0  0  0  0 27  5.00    1/1646  5.00  4.82  4.69  4.81  5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 8 0 0 0 1 15 3  4.11  859/1621  4.11  4.15  4.06  4.20  4.11


           Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared       1   0  0  0  1  4 21  4.77  461/1568  4.77  4.67  4.43  4.52  4.77
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject  1   0  0  0  0  3 23  4.88  640/1572  4.88  4.85  4.70  4.83  4.88
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 1 0 1  0  0  6 19  4.62  537/1564  4.62  4.49  4.28  4.41  4.62
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned    1   0  1  0  0  7 18  4.58  618/1559  4.58  4.55  4.29  4.41  4.58
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 1 4 1 0 2 11  8  4.14  607/1352  4.14  4.46  3.98  4.10  4.14


           Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 2 0 0  0  1  7 17  4.64  343/1384  4.64  4.47  4.08  4.30  4.64
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 2 0 0  1  1  7 16  4.52  600/1382  4.52  4.61  4.29  4.52  4.52
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 2 0 1 0  1  6 17  4.52  639/1368  4.52  4.58  4.30  4.56  4.52
4. Were special techniques successful                 2   1  0  1  4  7 12  4.25  342/ 948  4.25  4.25  3.95  4.03  4.25


           Seminar
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 8 0 0  0  0  8 11  4.58   51/  88  4.58  4.44  4.54  4.63  4.58
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 8 5 0 1  0  5  8  4.43   54/  85  4.43  4.59  4.47  4.50  4.43
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 8 8 0  0  2  1  8  4.55   39/  81  4.55  4.55  4.43  4.43  4.55
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned   8   0  0  0  2  6 11  4.47   45/  92  4.47  4.62  4.35  4.42  4.47
5. Were criteria for grading made clear               8   0  1  0  3  4 11  4.26   65/ 288  4.26  4.08  3.68  3.87  4.26


           Self  Paced
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 9 0 0 0  4  6  8  4.22   32/  53  4.22  4.30  4.30  4.37  4.22
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal   9   1  0  0  1  7  9  4.47   10/  30  4.47  4.30  4.16  4.49  4.47
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful     9   2  0  0  2  4 10  4.50   21/  41  4.50  4.31  4.43  4.43  4.50
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful     10  11  0  0  1  1  4  4.50 ****/  24  ****  ****  4.42  4.67  ****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students    9  11  0  0  0  2  5  4.71   11/ 110  4.71  4.71  3.99  3.92  4.71
```

                              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     9      Major       0
  28-55     0        1.00-1.99    0       B   1
  56-83     0        2.00-2.99    0       C   0      General              0     Under-grad  18      Non-major  27
  84-150    0        3.00-3.49    0       D   0
  Grad.     9        3.50-4.00    0       F   0      Electives            1     #### - Means there are not enough
                                          P   0                                responses to be significant
                                          I   0      Other               12
                                          ?   3
```

```
Course-Section: AGNG 612  0101                University of Maryland                              Page   53
Title          AGING SVC FINAN & ACCT         Baltimore County                                   FEB 11, 2009
Instructor:    SACHS, DAVID   (Instr. A)      Fall   2008                                        Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:      29
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  3 12 12  4.14 1086/1649  4.14  4.42  4.28 4.46  4.14
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    0   0  0  1  6  8 14  4.21  955/1648  4.21  4.46  4.23 4.34  4.21
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   0   0  1  0  2 10 16  4.38  694/1375  4.38  4.51  4.27 4.44  4.38
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    0   1  2  2  3  8 13  4.00 1067/1595  4.00  4.37  4.20 4.35  4.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0  0  2  2  7 11  7  3.66 1146/1533  3.66  4.34  4.04 4.28  3.66
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 3 2 1  3  9 11  4.00  883/1512  4.00  4.30  4.10 4.35  4.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained            1   0  0  0  1  5 22  4.75  220/1623  4.75  4.46  4.16 4.29  4.75
8. How many times was class cancelled                  0   0  0  0  0  0 29  5.00    1/1646  5.00  4.82  4.69 4.81  5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 8 0 0 0  3 15  3  4.00  914/1621  4.00  4.15  4.06 4.20  4.00

                Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        2   0  0  0  1  9 17  4.59  743/1568  4.73  4.67  4.43 4.52  4.73
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   2   0  0  0  0  2 25  4.93  473/1572  4.93  4.85  4.70 4.83  4.93
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 2  0  0  0  6 10 11  4.19 1010/1564  4.19  4.49  4.28 4.41  4.19
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     2   0  1  1  1  7 17  4.41  832/1559  4.41  4.55  4.29 4.41  4.41
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 2 0 2 0  3  8 14  4.19  565/1352  4.19  4.46  3.98 4.10  4.19

                Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 0  0  0  2  2 10 15  4.31  633/1384  4.31  4.47  4.08 4.30  4.31
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 0  0  0  0  0  6 23  4.79  352/1382  4.79  4.61  4.29 4.52  4.79
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 0 0  0  0  3  5 21  4.62  560/1368  4.62  4.58  4.30 4.56  4.62
4. Were special techniques successful                  0   2  1  0  5 14  7  3.96  471/ 948  3.96  4.25  3.95 4.03  3.96

                Laboratory
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material  27  1  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/ 221  ****  ****  4.16 4.27  ****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information 27 0 0 0  0  0  2  5.00 ****/ 243  ****  ****  4.12 4.61  ****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 25  2  1  0  0  0  1  3.00 ****/ 555  ****  ****  4.29 4.66  ****

                Seminar
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 28 0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  88  ****  4.44  4.54 4.63  ****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 28 0 0 0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  85  ****  4.59  4.47 4.50  ****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 28 0  0  0  0  1  0  4.00 ****/  81  ****  4.55  4.43 4.43  ****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned    28  0  0  0  0  1  0  4.00 ****/  92  ****  4.62  4.35 4.42  ****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear                28  0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/ 288  ****  4.08  3.68 3.87  ****
```

Frequency Distribution

```
Credits Earned        Cum. GPA        Expected Grades        Reasons              Type              Majors
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
00-27     1           0.00-0.99   1     A  10      Required for Majors  0      Graduate   16      Major      0
28-55     0           1.00-1.99   0     B   7                                  
56-83     0           2.00-2.99   0     C   1      General              0      Under-grad 13      Non-major 29
84-150    0           3.00-3.49   0     D   0
Grad.    16           3.50-4.00   0     F   0      Electives            0      #### - Means there are not enough
                                        P   0                                 responses to be significant
                                        I   0      Other               21
                                        ?   0
```

```
Course-Section: AGNG 612  0101                University of Maryland                                    Page  54
Title      AGING SVC FINAN & ACCT             Baltimore County                                        FEB 11, 2009
Instructor:               (Instr. B)          Fall  2008                                              Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:      29
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  3 12 12  4.14 1086/1649  4.14  4.42  4.28  4.46  4.14
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals     0   0  0  1  6  8 14  4.21  955/1648  4.21  4.46  4.23  4.34  4.21
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals    0   0  1  0  2 10 16  4.38  694/1375  4.38  4.51  4.27  4.44  4.38
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals     0   1  2  2  3  8 13  4.00 1067/1595  4.00  4.37  4.20  4.35  4.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0   0  2  2  7 11  7  3.66 1146/1533  3.66  4.34  4.04  4.28  3.66
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 3  2  1  3  9 11  4.00  883/1512  4.00  4.30  4.10  4.35  4.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained             1   0  0  0  1  5 22  4.75  220/1623  4.75  4.46  4.16  4.29  4.75
8. How many times was class cancelled                   0   0  0  0  0  0 29  5.00    1/1646  5.00  4.82  4.69  4.81  5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 24 0 0  0  0  4  1  4.20 ****/1621  4.00  4.15  4.06  4.20  4.00

                Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        21   0  0  0  0  1  7  4.88  287/1568  4.73  4.67  4.43  4.52  4.73
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   22   0  0  0  0  0  7  5.00 ****/1572  4.93  4.85  4.70  4.83  4.93
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 22  0  0  0  1  4  2  4.14 ****/1564  4.19  4.49  4.28  4.41  4.19
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     22   0  0  0  0  2  5  4.71 ****/1559  4.41  4.55  4.29  4.41  4.41
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 22 0 0  0  0  4  3  4.43 ****/1352  4.19  4.46  3.98  4.10  4.19

                Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 0   0  0  2  2 10 15  4.31  633/1384  4.31  4.47  4.08  4.30  4.31
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 0   0  0  0  0  6 23  4.79  352/1382  4.79  4.61  4.29  4.52  4.79
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 0  0  0  0  3  5 21  4.62  560/1368  4.62  4.58  4.30  4.56  4.62
4. Were special techniques successful                   0   2  1  0  5 14  7  3.96  471/ 948  3.96  4.25  3.95  4.03  3.96

                Laboratory
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material  27   1  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/ 221  ****  ****  4.16  4.27  ****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information 27 0 0  0  0  0  2  5.00 ****/ 243  ****  ****  4.12  4.61  ****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 25   2  1  0  0  0  1  3.00 ****/ 555  ****  ****  4.29  4.66  ****

                Seminar
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 28  0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  88  ****  4.44  4.54  4.63  ****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 28 0 0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  85  ****  4.59  4.47  4.50  ****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 28  0  0  0  0  1  0  4.00 ****/  81  ****  4.55  4.43  4.43  ****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned    28   0  0  0  0  1  0  4.00 ****/  92  ****  4.62  4.35  4.42  ****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear                28   0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/ 288  ****  4.08  3.68  3.87  ****
```

Frequency Distribution

```
Credits Earned          Cum. GPA        Expected Grades        Reasons                Type                 Majors
-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
 00-27      1     0.00-0.99    1       A   10      Required for Majors  0    Graduate    16      Major         0
 28-55      0     1.00-1.99    0       B    7
 56-83      0     2.00-2.99    0       C    1      General              0    Under-grad  13      Non-major    29
 84-150     0     3.00-3.49    0       D    0
 Grad.     16     3.50-4.00    0       F    0      Electives            0    #### - Means there are not enough
                                       P    0                               responses to be significant
                                       I    0      Other               21
                                       ?    0
```

```
Course-Section: AGNG 641  0101              University of Maryland                          Page   55
Title       ENTREPRE, INNOV & DESI          Baltimore County                               FEB 11, 2009
Instructor:  SACHS, DAVID   (Instr. A)       Fall  2008                                     Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:    22
Questionnaires: 18                      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    3   0  0  0  0  2 13  4.87  221/1649  4.87  4.42  4.28  4.46  4.87
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals     2   0  0  0  0  1 15  4.94  103/1648  4.94  4.46  4.23  4.34  4.94
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals    3   3  0  0  0  0 12  5.00    1/1375  5.00  4.51  4.27  4.44  5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals     2   0  0  0  0  1 15  4.94   93/1595  4.94  4.37  4.20  4.35  4.94
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 2   0  0  0  0  0 16  5.00    1/1533  5.00  4.34  4.04  4.28  5.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 4 1  0  0  0  2 11  4.85  137/1512  4.85  4.30  4.10  4.35  4.85
7. Was the grading system clearly explained             2   0  0  0  0  2 14  4.88  135/1623  4.88  4.46  4.16  4.29  4.88
8. How many times was class cancelled                   3   0  0  0  0  1 14  4.93  465/1646  4.93  4.82  4.69  4.81  4.93
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 5 0  0  0  1  4  8  4.54  348/1621  4.70  4.15  4.06  4.20  4.70

               Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared         2   0  0  0  1  0 15  4.88  287/1568  4.94  4.67  4.43  4.52  4.94
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject    2   0  0  0  0  0 16  5.00    1/1572  5.00  4.85  4.70  4.83  5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 2   0  0  1  0  0 15  4.81  253/1564  4.91  4.49  4.28  4.41  4.91
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned      2   0  1  0  0  1 14  4.69  487/1559  4.78  4.55  4.29  4.41  4.78
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 2  0  0  1  0  2 13  4.69  195/1352  4.72  4.46  3.98  4.10  4.72

               Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 2   0  0  0  0  1 15  4.94  105/1384  4.94  4.47  4.08  4.30  4.94
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 2   0  0  0  0  1 15  4.94  170/1382  4.94  4.61  4.29  4.52  4.94
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 3  0  0  0  0  1 14  4.93  185/1368  4.93  4.58  4.30  4.56  4.93
4. Were special techniques successful                   3   0  0  0  1  1 13  4.80  104/ 948  4.80  4.25  3.95  4.03  4.80

               Seminar
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 17  0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  88  ****  4.44  4.54  4.63  ****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 17 0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  85  ****  4.59  4.47  4.50  ****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 17  0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  81  ****  4.55  4.43  4.43  ****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned     17  0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  92  ****  4.62  4.35  4.42  ****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear                 17  0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/ 288  ****  4.08  3.68  3.87  ****

               Field Work
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned  17  0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  52  ****  ****  4.06  4.51  ****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria  17  0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  48  ****  ****  4.09  4.47  ****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation        17  0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  39  ****  ****  4.47  4.58  ****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations    17  0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  39  ****  ****  4.38  4.44  ****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities  17  0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/ 312  ****  ****  3.68  3.83  ****
```

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     3      Major       0
  28-55     0        1.00-1.99   0       B    1
  56-83     0        2.00-2.99   0       C    0       General              0    Under-grad  15      Non-major  18
  84-150    0        3.00-3.49   0       D    0
  Grad.     3        3.50-4.00   0       F    0       Electives            0    #### - Means there are not enough
                                         P    0                                 responses to be significant
                                         I    0       Other                5
                                         ?    0
```

```
Course-Section: AGNG 641  0101                University of Maryland                              Page   56
Title         ENTREPRE, INNOV & DESI          Baltimore County                                FEB 11, 2009
Instructor:                   (Instr. B)      Fall   2008                                     Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:      22
Questionnaires: 18                    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  3   0   0   0   0   2  13  4.87  221/1649  4.87  4.42  4.28 4.46 4.87
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals   2   0   0   0   0   1  15  4.94  103/1648  4.94  4.46  4.23 4.34 4.94
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals  3   3   0   0   0   0  12  5.00    1/1375  5.00  4.51  4.27 4.44 5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals   2   0   0   0   0   1  15  4.94   93/1595  4.94  4.37  4.20 4.35 4.94
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 2 0  0   0   0   0  16  5.00    1/1533  5.00  4.34  4.04 4.28 5.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 4 1 0  0   0   2  11  4.85  137/1512  4.85  4.30  4.10 4.35 4.85
7. Was the grading system clearly explained           2   0   0   0   0   2  14  4.88  135/1623  4.88  4.46  4.16 4.29 4.88
8. How many times was class cancelled                 3   0   0   0   0   1  14  4.93  465/1646  4.93  4.82  4.69 4.81 4.93
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 11 0 0 0  0   1   6  4.86  113/1621  4.70  4.15  4.06 4.20 4.70

               Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared      10   0   0   0   0   0   8  5.00    1/1568  4.94  4.67  4.43 4.52 4.94
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 10   0   0   0   0   0   8  5.00    1/1572  5.00  4.85  4.70 4.83 5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 10 0 0  0   0   0   8  5.00    1/1564  4.91  4.49  4.28 4.41 4.91
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned   10   0   0   0   0   1   7  4.88  238/1559  4.78  4.55  4.29 4.41 4.78
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 10 0 0 0 0   2   6  4.75  157/1352  4.72  4.46  3.98 4.10 4.72

               Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 2 0  0   0   0   1  15  4.94  105/1384  4.94  4.47  4.08 4.30 4.94
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 2 0  0   0   0   1  15  4.94  170/1382  4.94  4.61  4.29 4.52 4.94
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 3 0 0  0   0   1  14  4.93  185/1368  4.93  4.58  4.30 4.56 4.93
4. Were special techniques successful                 3   0   0   0   1   1  13  4.80  104/ 948  4.80  4.25  3.95 4.03 4.80

               Seminar
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 17 0 0  0   0   0   1  5.00 ****/  88  ****  4.44  4.54 4.63 ****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 17 0 0 0  0   0   1  5.00 ****/  85  ****  4.59  4.47 4.50 ****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 17 0 0  0   0   0   1  5.00 ****/  81  ****  4.55  4.43 4.43 ****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned  17   0   0   0   0   0   1  5.00 ****/  92  ****  4.62  4.35 4.42 ****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear              17   0   0   0   0   0   1  5.00 ****/ 288  ****  4.08  3.68 3.87 ****

               Field Work
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 17 0  0   0   0   0   1  5.00 ****/  52  ****  ****  4.06 4.51 ****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 17 0  0   0   0   0   1  5.00 ****/  48  ****  ****  4.09 4.47 ****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation     17   0   0   0   0   0   1  5.00 ****/  39  ****  ****  4.47 4.58 ****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations 17   0   0   0   0   0   1  5.00 ****/  39  ****  ****  4.38 4.44 ****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities 17 0  0   0   0   0   1  5.00 ****/ 312  ****  ****  3.68 3.83 ****
```

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     3      Major        0
 28-55     0       1.00-1.99    0        B    1
 56-83     0       2.00-2.99    0        C    0      General              0     Under-grad  15      Non-major   18
 84-150    0       3.00-3.49    0        D    0
 Grad.     3       3.50-4.00    0        F    0      Electives            0     #### - Means there are not enough
                                         P    0                                responses to be significant
                                         I    0      Other                5
                                         ?    0
```

```
Course-Section: AGNG 660  0101            University of Maryland                        Page   57
Title         CAPSTONE IN MAGS            Baltimore County                              FEB 11, 2009
Instructor:   FULMER, WILLIAM (Instr. A)       Fall   2008                              Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:    22
Questionnaires: 18                   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  16  4.89  203/1649  4.89  4.42  4.28  4.46  4.89
 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals     1   0   0  0  1  2  14  4.76  253/1648  4.76  4.46  4.23  4.34  4.76
 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals    0   5   0  0  0  1  12  4.92  133/1375  4.92  4.51  4.27  4.44  4.92
 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals     1   2   0  0  0  3  12  4.80  192/1595  4.80  4.37  4.20  4.35  4.80
 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 2   3   0  0  0  1  12  4.92   85/1533  4.92  4.34  4.04  4.28  4.92
 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 2 1   0  0  0  2  13  4.87  128/1512  4.87  4.30  4.10  4.35  4.87
 7. Was the grading system clearly explained             2   0   0  0  0  3  13  4.81  164/1623  4.81  4.46  4.16  4.29  4.81
 8. How many times was class cancelled                   1   0   0  0  0  0  17  5.00    1/1646  5.00  4.82  4.69  4.81  5.00
 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 2 0   0  0  0  2  14  4.88  105/1621  4.76  4.15  4.06  4.20  4.76


            Lecture
 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared         3   0   0  0  0  1  14  4.93  171/1568  4.77  4.67  4.43  4.52  4.77
 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject    4   0   0  0  0  1  13  4.93  473/1572  4.86  4.85  4.70  4.83  4.86
 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 3   0   0  0  0  1  14  4.93  118/1564  4.78  4.49  4.28  4.41  4.78
 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned      3   0   0  0  0  1  14  4.93  143/1559  4.78  4.55  4.29  4.41  4.78
 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 4  2   0  0  0  4   8  4.67  208/1352  4.56  4.46  3.98  4.10  4.56


            Discussion
 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 3   0   0  0  0  2  13  4.87  170/1384  4.87  4.47  4.08  4.30  4.87
 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 3   0   0  0  0  1  14  4.93  170/1382  4.93  4.61  4.29  4.52  4.93
 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 3  0   0  0  0  1  14  4.93  185/1368  4.93  4.58  4.30  4.56  4.93
 4. Were special techniques successful                   3   1   0  0  0  1  13  4.93   73/ 948  4.93  4.25  3.95  4.03  4.93


                              Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned        Cum. GPA       Expected Grades        Reasons               Type              Majors
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
  00-27      0     0.00-0.99    0      A    5      Required for Majors   1    Graduate      5     Major       0
  28-55      0     1.00-1.99    0      B    1
  56-83      0     2.00-2.99    0      C    0      General               0    Under-grad   13     Non-major  18
  84-150     0     3.00-3.49    0      D    0
  Grad.      5     3.50-4.00    0      F    0      Electives             0    #### - Means there are not enough
                                       P    0                                responses to be significant
                                       I    0      Other                 9
                                       ?    0
```

```
Enrollment:     22
Questionnaires: 18                      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  16  4.89   203/1649  4.89  4.42  4.28  4.46  4.89
 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    1   0   0   0   1   2  14  4.76   253/1648  4.76  4.46  4.23  4.34  4.76
 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   0   5   0   0   0   1  12  4.92   133/1375  4.92  4.51  4.27  4.44  4.92
 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    1   2   0   0   0   3  12  4.80   192/1595  4.80  4.37  4.20  4.35  4.80
 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 2  3   0   0   0   1  12  4.92    85/1533  4.92  4.34  4.04  4.28  4.92
 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 2 1  0   0   0   2  13  4.87   128/1512  4.87  4.30  4.10  4.35  4.87
 7. Was the grading system clearly explained            2   0   0   0   0   3  13  4.81   164/1623  4.81  4.46  4.16  4.29  4.81
 8. How many times was class cancelled                  1   0   0   0   0   0  17  5.00     1/1646  5.00  4.82  4.69  4.81  5.00
 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 7 0  0   0   1   2   8  4.64   261/1621  4.76  4.15  4.06  4.20  4.76

                Lecture
 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        8   0   0   0   1   2   7  4.60   731/1568  4.77  4.67  4.43  4.52  4.77
 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   8   0   0   0   0   2   8  4.80   840/1572  4.86  4.85  4.70  4.83  4.86
 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 7  0   0   0   0   4   7  4.64   511/1564  4.78  4.49  4.28  4.41  4.78
 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     7   0   0   0   1   2   8  4.64   549/1559  4.78  4.55  4.29  4.41  4.78
 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 8 1  0   0   1   3   5  4.44   360/1352  4.56  4.46  3.98  4.10  4.56

                Discussion
 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 3  0   0   0   0   2  13  4.87   170/1384  4.87  4.47  4.08  4.30  4.87
 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 3  0   0   0   0   1  14  4.93   170/1382  4.93  4.61  4.29  4.52  4.93
 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 3 0  0   0   0   1  14  4.93   185/1368  4.93  4.58  4.30  4.56  4.93
 4. Were special techniques successful                  3   1   0   0   0   1  13  4.93    73/ 948  4.93  4.25  3.95  4.03  4.93


                              Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned        Cum. GPA         Expected Grades        Reasons              Type              Majors
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
 00-27      0      0.00-0.99    0       A    5       Required for Majors   1    Graduate     5     Major      0
 28-55      0      1.00-1.99    0       B    1
 56-83      0      2.00-2.99    0       C    0       General               0    Under-grad  13     Non-major 18
 84-150     0      3.00-3.49    0       D    0
 Grad.      5      3.50-4.00    0       F    0       Electives             0    #### - Means there are not enough
                                        P    0                                  responses to be significant
                                        I    0       Other                 9
                                        ?    0
```