Course-Section: GERO 786 0101 Title

PSYC ASPECTS OF AGING

Instructor: GRUBER-BALDINI,

Enrollment: 13 Questionnaires: 11 University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2007

Page 828 JUN 26, 2007 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

			Fre	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	1	0	6	4	4.18	970/1522	4.18	4 18	4.30	4.45	4.18
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	4	5	4.27	854/1522	4.27	4.27	4.26	4.29	4.27
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	9	0	0	0	0	1		****/1285	****	****	4.30	4.31	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	2	5	3	4.10	956/1476	4.10	4.10	4.22	4.31	4.10
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	2	3	5	4.09	703/1412	4.09	4.09	4.06	4.25	4.09
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	2	7	4.45	382/1381	4.45	4.45	4.08	4.25	4.45
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	2	8	4.64	349/1500	4.64	4.64	4.18	4.22	4.64
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	6	5	4.45	1120/1517	4.45	4.45	4.65	4.73	4.45
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	1	1	6	1	3.78	1133/1497	3.78	3.78	4.11	4.21	3.78
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	4	6	4.45	864/1440	4.45	4.45	4.45	4.48	4.45
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	494/1448	4.91	4.91	4.71	4.80	4.91
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	5	5	4.36	762/1436		4.36	4.29	4.37	4.36
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	2	3	5	4.00	1036/1432		4.00	4.29	4.33	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	1	0	1	2	7	4.27	448/1221	4.27	4.27	3.93	3.83	4.27
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	0	6	4	4.18	631/1280	4.18	4.18	4.10	4.24	4.18
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	1	2	8		498/1277		4.16		4.52	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	1	0	10	4.82	321/1269		4.82			4.82
4. Were special techniques successful	0	9	0	0	1	0	1		****/ 854		****		4.08	
-,	_	-	-	-	_	-	_		,					
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 79	****	****	1.50	4.76	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	10	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 77	****	****	4.52	4.70	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 65	****	****	4.49	4.71	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 78	****	****	4.45	4.66	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	10	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 80	****	****	4.11	4.38	****
	-	-	-	-	-		-		,			· -		

Frequency Distribution

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