### Course-Section: AGNG 200 0101 University of Maryland Page 37 Title THE AGING EXPERIENCE Baltimore County AUG 6, 2008 Spring 2008 Job IRBR3029

Instructor: MAJESKI, ROBIN

Enrollment: 33 Questionnaires: 12

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

							Fr	emiei	ncies			Tngt	tructor	Course	Dent	TIMBC	Level	Sect
		Question	3		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	_		Mean	Mean
		Genera	 1															
1. Did	you gain n	ew insights,ski	_	om this course	0	0	0	1	1	5	5	4.17	1094/1670	4.25	4.49	4.31	4.32	4.17
		ctor make clear			0	0	0	1	2	6	3	3.92	1306/1666	4.17	4.46	4.27	4.27	3.92
3. Did	the exam q	uestions reflect	t the e	expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	4	6	4.33	799/1406	4.38	4.73	4.32	4.39	4.33
4. Did	other eval	uations reflect	the ex	xpected goals	0	1	0	1	1	5	4	4.09	1033/1615	4.28	4.43	4.24	4.29	4.09
5. Did	assigned r	eadings contrib	ute to	what you learned	0	0	1	1	3	4	3	3.58	1241/1566	3.92	4.58	4.07	4.00	3.58
6. Did	written as	signments contr	ibute 1	to what you learned	0	0	1	0	1	4	6	4.17	787/1528	4.16	4.48	4.12	4.11	4.17
7. Was	the grading	g system clearly	y expla	ained	0	0	0	2	2	3	5	3.92	1263/1650	4.28	4.57	4.22	4.20	3.92
8. How	many times	was class cance	elled		0	0	0	1	0	2	9	4.58	1097/1667	4.45	4.80	4.67	4.64	4.58
9. How	would you	grade the overa	ll tead	ching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	5	1	2	3.63	1335/1626	3.97	4.18	4.11	4.06	3.63
		Lectur	2															
1. Were	Were the instructor's lectures well prepared					0	0	0	1	8	3	4.17	1218/1559	4.44	4.60	4.46	4.40	4.17
2. Did	. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared . Did the instructor seem interested in the subject				0	0	0	0	1	3	8	4.58	1180/1560	4.70	4.65	4.72	4.73	4.58
				explained clearly	0	0	0	0	2	6	4	4.17	1053/1549	4.44	4.24	4.31	4.25	4.17
4. Did	the lectur	es contribute to	o what	you learned	1	0	0	0	2	5	4	4.18	1040/1546	4.52	4.59	4.32	4.30	4.18
5. Did	audiovisua	l techniques en	nance y	your understanding	1	1	0	0	1	4	5	4.40	423/1323	4.40	4.06	4.00	4.08	4.40
		Discus	sion															
1. Did	class disc			what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	6	2	4.25	670/1384	4.55	4.58	4.10	4.07	4.25
2. Were	all stude	nts actively en	courage	ed to participate	4	0	0	0	0	4	4	4.50	603/1378	4.54	4.77	4.29	4.25	4.50
		_	_	nd open discussion	4	0	0	0	1	3	4	4.38	777/1378	4.58	4.79	4.31	4.26	4.38
		echniques succe		-	4	1	0	1	0	4	2	4.00	461/ 904	4.00	4.40	4.03	4.01	4.00
	Frequ	iency	Dis	trib	ution	า												
Condition Foundation Company Company								_					_					
Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades							Rea	asons				Ту	pe 			Majors 		
00-27 0 0.00-0.99 0 A 8						Re	quir	ed fo	or Ma	jors		5	Graduat	е	1	Majo	or	0
28-55																		
56-83							nera	1				1	Under-q	rad 1	1	Non-	-major	12

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	 А	8	Required for Majors	5	Graduate	1	Major	0
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	В	2						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	3	C	0	General	1	Under-grad	11	Non-major	12
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	0	D	0						
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00	0	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means	there	are not enough	n
				P	0			responses to	be sig	nificant	
				I	0	Other	2	_			
				2	Λ						

Course-Section: AGNG 200 0201

Title THE AGING EXPERIENCE

Instructor: DE MEDEIROS, KA

Enrollment: 34 Questionnaires: 25

### University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2008

Page 38 AUG 6, 2008 Job IRBR3029

### Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

			Fre	equer	cies	3		Ins	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Ouestions	NR	NA	1	_	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	_		Mean	
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	4	0	0	2	3	2	14	4.33	902/1670	4.25	4.49	4.31	4.32	4.33
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	4	0	0	0	3	6	12	4.43	751/1666	4.17	4.46	4.27	4.27	4.43
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	4	0	0	0	3	6	12	4.43	691/1406	4.38	4.73	4.32	4.39	4.43
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	4	0	0	1	2	4	14	4.48	592/1615	4.28	4.43	4.24	4.29	4.48
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	1	4	3	11	4.26	632/1566	3.92	4.58	4.07	4.00	4.26
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	1	4	6	9	4.15	796/1528	4.16	4.48	4.12	4.11	4.15
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	5	0	0	0	2	3	15	4.65	372/1650	4.28	4.57	4.22	4.20	4.65
8. How many times was class cancelled	6	0	1	0	0	9	9	4.32	1326/1667	4.45	4.80	4.67	4.64	4.32
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	12	0	0	0	3	3	7	4.31	670/1626		4.18	4.11	4.06	4.31
Lecture				_		_								
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	0	1	0	3	17	4.71	589/1559	4.44	4.60	4.46	4.40	4.71
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	0	1	2	18	4.81	855/1560	4.70	4.65	4.72	4.73	4.81
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	0	0	2		17	4.71	424/1549		4.24	4.31	4.25	4.71
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	3	18	4.86	288/1546		4.59	4.32	4.30	4.86
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	5	0	0	0	3	6	11	4.40	423/1323	4.40	4.06	4.00	4.08	4.40
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	1	0	13	4.86	195/1384	4.55	4.58	4.10	4.07	4.86
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	11	0	0	0	3	0	11	4.57	548/1378	4.54	4.77	4.29	4.25	4.57
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	11	0	0	0	1	1	12	4.79	407/1378	4.58	4.77	4.31	4.26	4.79
4. Were special techniques successful	11	8	1	1	0	1			****/ 904		4.79	4.03	4.20	****
4. Were special techniques successiul	TT	0	1	1	U	1	3	3.07	/ 904	4.00	4.40	4.03	4.01	
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	23	1	0	0	0	1	0	4 00	****/ 232	****	****	4.19	4.35	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	23	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 239	****	****	4.21	4.33	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	23	1	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 231	****	****	4.31	4.52	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	23	1	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 218	****	****	4.18	4.25	****
3. Were requirements for tab reports crearry specifical	23	_	O	O	O	_	O	1.00	/ 210			1.10	1.25	
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	23	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 87	****	4.20	4.65	5.00	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	23	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 79	****	3.75	4.64	4.75	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	23	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 75	****	3.33	4.57	4.25	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	23	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 79	****	2.80	4.45	3.95	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	23	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 80	****	3.75	3.97	4.30	****
Field Work						_	_							****
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	23	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 41	****	****	4.50	2.00	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	23	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 38	****	****	4.19	2.50	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	23	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 38	****	****	4.62	4.50	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	23	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.27	4.00	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	23	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.47	4.00	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	23	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 28	****	****	4.64	****	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	23	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 16	****	****	4.67	****	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	23	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 27	****	****	4.54	****	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	23	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 10	****	****	4.84	****	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	23	1	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 6	****	****	4.92	****	****
onder ondagn products for all one beautiful	23	_	3	3	3	_	J	1.00	, 0			1.72		

Course-Section: AGNG 200 0201

Title THE AGING EXPERIENCE

Instructor: DE MEDEIROS, KA

Enrollment: 34
Questionnaires: 25

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2008 Page 38 AUG 6, 2008 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expecte	d Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	0	 А	11	Required for Majors	2	Graduate	0	Major	6
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	3						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	1	C	0	General	5	Under-grad	25	Non-major	19
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	h
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	6				
				?	0						

Course-Section: AGNG 300 0101 University of Maryland Page 39
Title OVERVIEW: AGING SERVIC Baltimore County AUG 6, 2008

Instructor: MAJESKI, ROBIN

Enrollment: 22
Questionnaires: 10

Spring 2008
Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Job IRBR3029

			Fre	quer	ncies	3		Inst	ructor	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	1	0	0	0	0	3	6	4.67	479/1670	4.67	4.49	4.31	4.24	4.67
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	2	6	4.56	556/1666	4.56	4.46	4.27	4.18	4.56
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	0	8	4.78	295/1406	4.78	4.73	4.32	4.22	4.78
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	2	6	4.56	499/1615	4.56	4.43	4.24	4.18	4.56
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	1	7	4.67	295/1566	4.67	4.58	4.07	4.04	4.67
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	3	6	4.67	300/1528	4.67	4.48	4.12	4.07	4.67
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	0	0	2	6	4.33	806/1650	4.33	4.57	4.22	4.12	4.33
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1667	5.00	4.80	4.67	4.67	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	1	0	2	1	4	3.88	1152/1626	3.88	4.18	4.11	4.06	3.88
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	486/1559	4.78	4.60	4.46	4.40	4.78
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	673/1560	4.88	4.65	4.72	4.67	4.88
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	229/1549	4.88	4.24	4.31	4.25	4.88
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	407/1546	4.75	4.59	4.32	4.24	4.75
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	0	0	0	1	1	6	4.63	260/1323	4.63	4.06	4.00	3.99	4.63
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	285/1384		4.58	4.10	4.12	4.71
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	441/1378	4.71	4.77	4.29	4.30	4.71
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	333/1378	4.86	4.79	4.31	4.33	4.86
4. Were special techniques successful	3	1	0	0	1	0	5	4.67	179/ 904	4.67	4.40	4.03	4.03	4.67

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

Course-Section: AGNG 401 0101 University of Maryland Title FOUNDATIONS - AGING SV Baltimore County

Instructor: WEPPRECHT, MARI Spring 2008

Enrollment: 16

Questionnaires: 15 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

			Fre	equei	ncies	9		Tnst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	_	Mean		Mean
Geneval														
General	1	0	0	0	2	1	0	4 55	601/1670	4 55	4 40	1 21	4 45	4 55
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	4	0	0	0	1	1	8	4.55	621/1670		4.49	4.31	4.45	4.55
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	4	0	0	0	Ţ	4	6	4.45	703/1666		4.46	4.27	4.35	4.45
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	4	0	0	0	0	4	/	4.64	459/1406		4.73	4.32	4.48	4.64
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	4	0	0	0	0	4	7	4.64	412/1615		4.43	4.24	4.37	4.64
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	2	9	4.82	181/1566		4.58	4.07	4.17	4.82
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	1	0	2	8	4.55	391/1528		4.48	4.12	4.26	4.55
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	4	0	0	0	1	3	./	4.55	513/1650		4.57	4.22	4.28	4.55
8. How many times was class cancelled	4	0	0	0	0	2	9	4.82	842/1667	4.82	4.80	4.67	4.73	4.82
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	0	0	0	1	4	4	4.33	637/1626	4.33	4.18	4.11	4.28	4.33
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	0	2	0	1	8	4.36	1062/1559	4.36	4.60	4.46	4.58	4.36
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1560		4.65	4.72	4.80	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	0	0	1	2	8	4.64	525/1549		4.24	4.31	4.43	4.64
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	1	0	1	3	6		1040/1546		4.59	4.32	4.43	4.18
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	6	0	0	1	1	2	5	4.22	567/1323		4.06	4.00	4.10	4.22
J. Did additivistal teelmiques elmanee your anderstanding	O	O	U	_	_	2	J	1.22	307/1323	1.22	1.00	1.00	1.10	1.22
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	1	0	0	4	5	4.20	712/1384	4.20	4.58	4.10	4.32	4.20
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	1	0	0	9	4.70	459/1378	4.70	4.77	4.29	4.55	4.70
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	1	0	0	9	4.70	501/1378	4.70	4.79	4.31	4.60	4.70
4. Were special techniques successful	5	1	0	1	3	1	4	3.89	577/ 904	3.89	4.40	4.03	4.22	3.89
Frequ	ency.	Dist	ribu	ution	ı									
Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades				P.C.	asons	-			Tv	ne			Maiors	

Page 40

AUG 6, 2008

Job IRBR3029

Credits I	Earned	Cum. GPA		Expected	Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	 А	9	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	4
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	В	1						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	2	Under-grad	15	Non-major	11
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	5	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means	there	are not enough	n
				P	0			responses to	be sig	nificant	
				I	0	Other	6				
				?	0						

### Course-Section: AGNG 422 0101 University of Maryland Page 41 Title RESEARCH APPLICATIONS Baltimore County AUG 6, 2008 Spring 2008 Job IRBR3029

Instructor: ASH, JEFFREY R

Enrollment: 7

Questionnaires: 4 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

			Fre	equer	ncies	3		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	363/1670	4.75	4.49	4.31	4.45	4.75
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	312/1666	4.75	4.46	4.27	4.35	4.75
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	318/1406	4.75	4.73	4.32	4.48	4.75
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	1	4.25	874/1615	4.25	4.43	4.24	4.37	4.25
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	389/1566	4.50	4.58	4.07	4.17	4.50
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	421/1528	4.50	4.48	4.12	4.26	4.50
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1650	5.00	4.57	4.22	4.28	5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	3	1	4.25	1368/1667	4.25	4.80	4.67	4.73	4.25
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	278/1626	4.67	4.18	4.11	4.28	4.67
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	521/1559	4.75	4.60	4.46	4.58	4.75
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	948/1560	4.75	4.65	4.72	4.80	4.75
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1549	5.00	4.24	4.31	4.43	5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1546	5.00	4.59	4.32	4.43	5.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	3	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	1295/1323	2.00	4.06	4.00	4.10	2.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	257/1384	4.75	4.58	4.10	4.32	4.75
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1378	5.00	4.77	4.29	4.55	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1378	5.00	4.79	4.31	4.60	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	0	0	0	1	0	1	2	4.00	461/ 904	4.00	4.40	4.03	4.22	4.00

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

Course-Section: AGNG 461 0101 University of Maryland Title INTERNSHIP/AGING SVCS Instructor:

Page 42 Baltimore County Spring 2008 AUG 6, 2008 Job IRBR3029 ADLER, DEBORAH

Enrollment:	5	
Questionnaires:	5	Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questionnaires: 5		Scudenc Cou	ILSE	Eval	uati	OII Q	uest.	101111	alle	:						
					Fr	eque	ncie	s		Ins	tructor	Cours	se Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	Questions			NA	1	2			5	Mean	Rank		n Mean			
	General															
1. Did you gain new i			0	0	1	1	2	0	1	2.80	1640/167	0 2.80				2.80
2. Did the instructor			0	0	1	1	1	1			1603/166			4.27		3.00
4. Did other evaluati			1	0	0	1	2	1			1565/161				4.37	
6. Did written assign		_	0	0	0	-					1233/152			4.12	4.26	3.60
7. Was the grading sy		ained	1	0	-	2	0	0			1460/165		4.57		4.28	3.50
8. How many times was			1	0	0	0	0	0		5.00	,				4.73	
9. How would you grad	e the overall tea	ching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	4	0	0	3.00	1534/162	6 3.00	4.18	4.11	4.28	3.00
	Lecture															
1. Were the instructo			4	0		0	0	0			****/155					
2. Did the instructor			3	0	-	1	-				1524/156		4.65			
3. Was lecture materi			3		0	2	-				1534/154			4.31		2.00
4. Did the lectures c	you learned	3	1	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/154	6 ***	4.59	4.32	4.43	****	
	Discussion															
1. Did class discussi		_	3	0	-	1	0	0			1103/138					
2. Were all students			3		0	0	0				603/137					
3. Did the instructor	encourage fair a	nd open discussion	3	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	653/137	8 4.50	4.79	4.31	4.60	4.50
	Seminar															
1. Were assigned topi			0	0	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	70/ 8	7 4.20	4.20	4.65	4.80	4.20
<ol><li>Was the instructor</li></ol>			0		0	0		1		3.75	74/ 7				4.60	3.75
<ol><li>Did research proje</li></ol>		_	0	_		0	2			3.33	- ,		3.33			3.33
4. Did presentations		•	0	0	1	1	1	2	0		,		2.80		4.53	
5. Were criteria for	grading made clea	r	0	1	0	1	1	0	2	3.75	51/ 8	0 3.75	3.75	3.97	3.67	3.75
		Frequ	ency	/ Dis	trib	utio	n									
Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades				Rea	ason	s			Т	ype			Majors	\$

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

Course-Section: AGNG 470 0101 University of Maryland Page 43 Title CAPSTONE SEMINAR Baltimore County AUG 6, 2008

Instructor: RONCH, JUDAH (Instr. A)

Enrollment:

Spring 2008

2 Questionnaires: 2

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Job IRBR3029

			Fre	equer	ncies	3		Inst	ructor	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	2	5.00	1/1670	5.00	4.49	4.31	4.45	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1666	5.00	4.46	4.27	4.35	5.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1406	5.00	4.73	4.32	4.48	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1615	5.00	4.43	4.24	4.37	5.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1566	5.00	4.58	4.07	4.17	5.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1528	5.00	4.48	4.12	4.26	5.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1650	5.00	4.57	4.22	4.28	5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1667	5.00	4.80	4.67	4.73	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	403/1626	4.50	4.18	4.11	4.28	4.50
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1384	5.00	4.58	4.10	4.32	5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1378	5.00	4.77	4.29	4.55	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	0		5.00	1/1378	5.00	4.79	4.31	4.60	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	0	0	0	0	0	0	2		1/ 904		4.40	4.03	4.22	5.00
-														
Frequ	ency	Dist	cribu	ıtior	n									
Credita Farned Cum CDA Ermosted Credes				Dor	2000				т				Modera	

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	l Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	 А	1	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	2
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	0						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	1	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	2	Non-major	0
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	0	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	0	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	Ĺ
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	1	_			
				2	Λ						

# Course-Section: AGNG 470 0101 University of Maryland Page 44 Title CAPSTONE SEMINAR Baltimore County AUG 6, 2008

Instructor: (Instr. B)

Enrollment: 2
Questionnaires: 2

Spring 2008
Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Job IRBR3029

			Fre	equer	ncies	3		Inst	ructor	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	2	5.00	1/1670	5.00	4.49	4.31	4.45	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1666	5.00	4.46	4.27	4.35	5.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1406	5.00	4.73	4.32	4.48	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1615	5.00	4.43	4.24	4.37	5.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1566	5.00	4.58	4.07	4.17	5.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1528	5.00	4.48	4.12	4.26	5.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1650	5.00	4.57	4.22	4.28	5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1667	5.00	4.80	4.67	4.73	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	403/1626	4.50	4.18	4.11	4.28	4.50
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1384	5.00	4.58	4.10	4.32	5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1378	5.00	4.77	4.29	4.55	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1378	5.00	4.79	4.31	4.60	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 904	5.00	4.40	4.03	4.22	5.00

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

## Course-Section: AGNG 470 0101 University of Maryland Page 45 Title CAPSTONE SEMINAR Baltimore County AUG 6, 2008

Instructor: (Instr. C)

Enrollment: 2
Questionnaires: 2

Spring 2008
Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Job IRBR3029

			Fre	equer	ncies	5		Inst	ructor	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	2	5.00	1/1670	5.00	4.49	4.31	4.45	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1666	5.00	4.46	4.27	4.35	5.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1406	5.00	4.73	4.32	4.48	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1615	5.00	4.43	4.24	4.37	5.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1566	5.00	4.58	4.07	4.17	5.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1528	5.00	4.48	4.12	4.26	5.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1650	5.00	4.57	4.22	4.28	5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1667	5.00	4.80	4.67	4.73	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	403/1626	4.50	4.18	4.11	4.28	4.50
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1384	5.00	4.58	4.10	4.32	5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1378	5.00	4.77	4.29	4.55	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1378	5.00	4.79	4.31	4.60	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 904	5.00	4.40	4.03	4.22	5.00

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	l Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	 А	1	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	2
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	0						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	1	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	2	Non-major	0
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	0	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	0	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	1
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	1				
				2	0						

Course-Section: AGNG 600 0101 University of Maryland Title Social & Econ. Contexts

Ronch, Judah (Instr. A)

Instructor:

Baltimore County Spring 2008

Page 19 AUG 6, 2008

Job IRBR3029

Enrollment: 0 Questionnaires: 27 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questionnair	res. 21			Student Cot	ırse	Evalu	uatio	on Qu	uesti	.Om	aire	2							
								_	ncies				tructor		Course	_			
	) 	uestion	s 		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Ranl	ς	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		Genera	1																
1. Did you g	gain new insig	hts,ski	lls fr	om this course	1	0	0	0	0	1	25	4.96	83/16	570	****	4.51	4.31	4.23	4.96
2. Did the i	instructor mak	e clear	the ex	xpected goals	1	0	0	0	2	3	21	4.73	333/16	566	****	4.52	4.27	4.30	4.73
				expected goals	1	6	0	0	0	2	18	4.90	191/14	406	****	4.52	4.32	4.31	4.90
	evaluations				2	0	0	0	0	3	22	4.88	189/16	515	****	4.45	4.24	4.17	4.88
				what you learned	1	0	1	1	1	1	22	4.62	331/15	566	****	4.39	4.07	4.03	4.62
				to what you learned	1	1	0	0	2	2	21	4.76	211/15	528	****	4.40	4.12	4.00	4.76
	grading system			ained	1	0	0	1	0	4	21	4.73	289/16	550	****	4.51	4.22	4.28	4.73
_	times was cla				3	0	0	0	0	0	24	5.00	1/16	567	****	4.86	4.67	4.61	5.00
9. How would	d you grade th	ne overa	ll tead	ching effectiveness	6	0	0	0	0	5	16	4.76	199/16	526	****	4.34	4.11	4.07	4.81
		Lectur	e																
1. Were the	instructor's	lecture	s well	prepared	1	0	0	0	0	2	24	4.92	221/15	559	****	4.65	4.46	4.47	4.92
2. Did the i	instructor see	em inter	ested :	in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	26	5.00	1/15	560	****	4.87	4.72	4.68	5.00
3. Was lectu	are material p	resente	d and	explained clearly	1	0	0	0	2	4	20	4.69	451/15	549	****	4.48	4.31	4.32	4.6
4. Did the l	lectures conti	ribute t	o what	you learned	1	0	1	0	1	1	23	4.73	432/15	546	****	4.51	4.32	4.32	4.8
5. Did audic	ovisual techni	ques en	hance y	your understanding	1	1	3	0	4	5	13	4.00	692/13	323	***	4.13	4.00	3.91	4.00
		Discus	sion																
1. Did class	discussions	contrib	ute to	what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	1	24	4.96	68/13	384	****	4.63	4.10	3.92	4.96
				ed to participate	2	0	0	0	1	0	24	4.92	194/13	378	****	4.75	4.29	4.09	4.92
				nd open discussion	2	0	0	0	0	1	24	4.96	113/13	378	****	4.89	4.31	4.08	4.96
	cial technique			-	3	0	0	0	0	2	22	4.92	100/ 9	904	***	4.22	4.03	3.94	4.92
		Semina	r																
1. Were assi	igned topics i			e announced theme	26	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/	87	****	4.95	4.65	4.67	***
				what you learned	26	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/	75	****	4.97	4.57	4.46	***
				t you learned	26	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/	79	****	4.72	4.45	4.59	***
	eria for grad				26	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/	80	****		3.97	3.99	***
				Frequ	iency	/ Dist	tribu	ution	n										
Credits Earn	ned (	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Po:	asons					Тур	20			Majors	,
										, 									· 
		0-0.99	0	A 3		Red	quire	ed fo	or Ma	jor	s	0	Gradı	uate	e 2	6	Majo	or	0
		)-1.99 )-2.99	0 0	В 4 С 0		Gei	neral	l				0	Unde	r-gi	rad	1	Non-	-major	0
		-3.49	0	D 0														-	
Grad. 2		0-4.00	0	F 0		Ele	ectiv	ves				0			Means t			_	յh
				P 0 I 0		Ot.ì	ner				2	27	respo	onse	es to b	e sign	ıııcar	ıt	
				- 0		001					_								

0

Course-Section: AGNG 600 0101 University of Maryland Title Social & Econ. Contexts Baltimore County

Social & Econ. Contexts Baltimore County for: (Instr. B) Spring 2008

Instructor:
Enrollment: 0

Questionnaires: 27

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Page 20 AUG 6, 2008 Job IRBR3029

~								~										
							Fre	equer	ncie	S		Ins	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
		Question	s		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank		Mean		Mean	Mean
		Genera	1															
		w insights,ski			1	0	0	0	0	1	25	4.96	83/1670	****	4.51	4.31	4.23	4.96
2. Did th	ne instruc	tor make clear	the exp	pected goals	1	0	0	0	2	3	21	4.73	333/1666	5 ****	4.52	4.27	4.30	4.73
3. Did th	ne exam qu	estions reflec	t the ex	xpected goals	1	6	0	0	0	2	18	4.90	191/1406	5 ****	4.52	4.32	4.31	4.90
4. Did ot	her evalu	ations reflect	the exp	pected goals	2	0	0	0	0	3	22	4.88	189/161	****	4.45	4.24	4.17	4.88
5. Did as	signed re	adings contrib	ute to	what you learned	1	0	1	1	1	1	22	4.62	331/1566	****	4.39	4.07	4.03	4.62
6. Did wr	ritten ass	ignments contr	ibute to	what you learned	1	1	0	0	2	2	21	4.76	211/1528	****	4.40	4.12	4.00	4.76
7. Was th	ne grading	system clearly	y expla:	ined	1	0	0	1	0	4	21	4.73	289/1650	****	4.51	4.22	4.28	4.73
8. How ma	ny times	was class canc	elled		3	0	0	0	0	0	24	5.00	1/166	7 ****	4.86	4.67	4.61	5.00
9. How wo	uld you g	rade the overa	ll teacl	ning effectiveness	6	0	0	0	0	3	18	4.86	141/1626	5 ****	4.34	4.11	4.07	4.81
		Lectur	e															
1. Were t	he instru	ctor's lecture	s well 1	orepared	4	0	0	0	0	2	21	4.91	248/1559	****	4.65	4.46	4.47	4.92
		tor seem inter			4	0	0	0	0	0	23	5.00	1/1560	) ****	4.87	4.72	4.68	5.00
				xplained clearly	4	0	0	1	0	5	17	4.65	500/1549	****	4.48	4.31	4.32	4.67
		s contribute t			4	0	0	0	0	1	22	4.96			4.51	4.32	4.32	4.84
				our understanding	4	1	3	0	3	4	12	4.00	692/1323	****	4.13	4.00	3.91	4.00
		Discus	sion															
1 Did cl	ass discu			what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	1	24	4.96	68/1384	1 ****	4.63	4.10	3.92	4.96
				d to participate	2	0	0	0	1	0	24	4.92	194/1378		4.75	4.29	4.09	4.92
				d open discussion	2	0	0	0	0	1		4.96	113/1378		4.89	4.31	4.08	4.96
		chniques succe		a open discussion	3	0	0	0	0	2	22		100/ 904		4.22	4.03		4.92
i. Were b	peciai ce	emiiques succe	DDIGI		3	Ü	Ü	J	Ü	_	22	1.72	100/ 30	•	1.22	1.03	3.71	1.72
		Semina																
				announced theme	26	0	0	0	1	0	0		****/ 8		4.95	4.65	4.67	****
	_	-		what you learned	26	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 75		4.97	4.57	4.46	****
_		ns contribute		you learned	26	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 79		4.72	4.45	4.59	****
5. Were c	riteria f	or grading mad	e clear		26	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 80	) ****	4.22	3.97	3.99	****
				Frequ	ıency	Dis	trib	ution	n									
Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	asons	S			Т	<i>т</i> ре			Majors	<b>:</b>
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 3		Re	quir	ed fo	or Ma	ajor	s	0	Graduat	te 2	26	Majo	or	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В 4		_									_			
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C 0		Ge	nera	L				0	Under-	grad	1	Non-	-major	0
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D 0								0			,			,
Grad.	26	3.50-4.00	0	F 0		EI	ecti	ves				0		Means t			_	ın
				P 0			,				_		respons	ses to b	e sign	ıııcar	1T	
				I 0		Ot.	her				2	27						
				? 0														

Course-Section: AGNG 605 0101
Title MANAG & POLI ECONOMICS

Instructor: GRIBBIN, JOSEPH

Enrollment: 27
Questionnaires: 23

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2008 Page 46 AUG 6, 2008 Job IRBR3029

### Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

				_	ncies	3		Inst	ructor	Course	_	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	16	4.65	492/1670	4.65	4.49	4.31	4.46	4.65
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	9	13	4.52	595/1666	4.52	4.46	4.27	4.34	4.52
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	0	0	0	1	6	14	4.62	483/1406	4.62	4.73	4.32	4.36	4.62
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	1	3	7	11	4.27	849/1615	4.27	4.43	4.24	4.33	4.27
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	1	8	13	4.39	500/1566	4.39	4.58	4.07	4.20	4.39
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	5	7	10	4.13	814/1528	4.13	4.48	4.12	4.33	4.13
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	6	17	4.74	289/1650	4.74	4.57	4.22	4.30	4.74
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	23	5.00	1/1667	5.00	4.80	4.67	4.74	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	1	0	0	0	9	10	4.53	387/1626	4.53	4.18	4.11	4.20	4.53
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	2	0	21	4.83	403/1559	4.83	4.60	4.46	4.49	4.83
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	23	5.00	1/1560	5.00	4.65	4.72	4.81	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	1	1	10	10	4.32	924/1549	4.32	4.24	4.31	4.37	4.32
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	8	14	4.57	643/1546	4.57	4.59	4.32	4.40	4.57
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	0	0	0	0	6	15	4.71	205/1323	4.71	4.06	4.00	4.03	4.71
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	2	1	2	17	4.55	409/1384	4.55	4.58	4.10	4.21	4.55
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	1	1	1	19	4.73	431/1378	4.73	4.77	4.29	4.42	4.73
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	1	4	17	4.73	470/1378	4.73	4.79	4.31	4.51	4.73
4. Were special techniques successful	1	3	1	3	4	4	7	3.68	662/ 904	3.68	4.40	4.03	4.04	3.68
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	22	0	0	0	0	Λ	1	5 00	****/ 87	****	4.20	4.65	4.61	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	22	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 79	****	3.75	4.64	4.67	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	22	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 75	****	3.73	4.57	4.66	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	22	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 79	****	2.80	4.45	4.58	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	22	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 80	****	3.75	3.97	4.32	****
5. Note officer a for grading made officer	22	J	J	J	J	J	_	3.00	, 00		3.73	3.57	1.52	

Credits E	Carned	Cum. GPA		Expected	d Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	А	2	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	22	Major	22
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	7						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	1	Non-major	1
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D	0						
Grad.	22	3.50-4.00	0	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	n
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	11	_		_	
				?	0						

Course-Section: AGNG 624 0101 University of Maryland Title Strategy & Marketing Baltimore County Instructor: Fulmer, William Spring 2008

Enrollment:

0

rsity of Maryland Page 21 ltimore County AUG 6, 2008 Spring 2008 Job IRBR3029

Questionnaires: 26 Student Course Eva
---------------------------------------

			Frequencies			Instructor		Course Dept		UMBC Level		Sect		
Ouestions	NR	NA	1	-		4	5	Mean	Rank		_		Mean	
**************************************														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	2	24	4.92	165/1670	****	4.51	4.31	4.23	4.92
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	4	22	4.85	224/1666	****	4.52	4.27	4.30	4.85
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	12	0	0	0	2	12	4.86	226/1406	****	4.52	4.32	4.31	4.86
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	5	0	0	2	3	15	4.65	390/1615	****	4.45	4.24	4.17	4.65
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	25	4.96	53/1566	****	4.39	4.07	4.03	4.96
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	2	3	20	4.62	338/1528	****	4.40	4.12	4.00	4.62
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	3	3	20	4.65	372/1650	****	4.51	4.22	4.28	4.65
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	25	5.00	1/1667	****	4.86	4.67	4.61	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	8	1	0	0	0	2	15	4.88	126/1626	****	4.34	4.11	4.07	4.88
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	26	5.00	1/1559	****	4.65	4.46	4.47	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	26	5.00	1/1560	****	4.87	4.72	4.68	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	0	26	5.00	1/1549	****	4.48	4.31	4.32	5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	24	4.92	185/1546	****	4.51	4.32	4.32	4.92
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	4	2	20	4.62	266/1323	****	4.13	4.00	3.91	4.62
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	0	2	23	4.81	221/1384	****	4.63	4.10	3.92	4.81
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	1	2	23	4.85	306/1378	****	4.75	4.29	4.09	4.85
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	1	0	25	4.92	225/1378	****	4.89	4.31	4.08	4.92
4. Were special techniques successful	0	4	0	2	0	3	17	4.59	206/ 904	****	4.22	4.03	3.94	4.59
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	25	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 232	****	3.79	4.19	4.25	***
Frequ	iency	Dis	rib	utio	n									
Credita Formed Cum CDA Firmested Credes			Doogong					Tropo				Majorg		

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