

Course-Section: GERO 742 0101
 Title ECONAGING GERO
 Instructor: SILVA, AJITH
 Enrollment: 6
 Questionnaires: 5

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 881
 FEB 13, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	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	4	4.80	257/1639	4.80	4.73	4.27	4.42	4.80	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	915/1639	4.20	4.27	4.22	4.26	4.20	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	4	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1397	****	****	4.28	4.37	****	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	3	1	4.00	1010/1583	4.00	4.33	4.19	4.31	4.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	276/1532	4.60	4.63	4.01	4.10	4.60	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	291/1504	4.60	4.80	4.05	4.29	4.60	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	2	2	1	3.80	1253/1612	3.80	4.32	4.16	4.27	3.80	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	811/1635	4.80	4.82	4.65	4.81	4.80	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	4	0	4.00	889/1579	4.00	4.33	4.08	4.17	4.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	360/1518	4.80	4.90	4.43	4.49	4.80	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	802/1520	4.80	4.90	4.70	4.79	4.80	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	239/1517	4.80	4.82	4.27	4.32	4.80	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	522/1550	4.60	4.72	4.22	4.23	4.60	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	2	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	185/1295	4.67	4.17	3.94	3.95	4.67	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	217/1398	4.80	4.80	4.07	4.22	4.80	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	332/1391	4.80	4.80	4.30	4.47	4.80	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	328/1388	4.80	4.80	4.28	4.49	4.80	
4. Were special techniques successful	0	3	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 958	5.00	5.00	3.93	4.01	5.00	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: GERO 750 0101
 Title THEORY/METHODS I
 Instructor: MORGAN, LESLIE
 Enrollment: 6
 Questionnaires: 6

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 882
 FEB 13, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	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	4	4.67	430/1639	4.67	4.73	4.27	4.42	4.67	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	4	2	4.33	774/1639	4.33	4.27	4.22	4.26	4.33	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	5	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1397	****	****	4.28	4.37	****	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	323/1583	4.67	4.33	4.19	4.31	4.67	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	236/1532	4.67	4.63	4.01	4.10	4.67	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1504	5.00	4.80	4.05	4.29	5.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	150/1612	4.83	4.32	4.16	4.27	4.83	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	766/1635	4.83	4.82	4.65	4.81	4.83	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	241/1579	4.67	4.33	4.08	4.17	4.67	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1518	5.00	4.90	4.43	4.49	5.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1520	5.00	4.90	4.70	4.79	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	214/1517	4.83	4.82	4.27	4.32	4.83	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	253/1550	4.83	4.72	4.22	4.23	4.83	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	3	1	0	0	0	2	3.67	894/1295	3.67	4.17	3.94	3.95	3.67	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1398	****	4.80	4.07	4.22	****	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1391	****	4.80	4.30	4.47	****	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1388	****	4.80	4.28	4.49	****	
4. Were special techniques successful	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 958	****	5.00	3.93	4.01	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	A 6	Required for Majors	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	B 0		Graduate 4
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	C 0	General	0
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	D 0		2
Grad.	4	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		
			I 0		
			? 0	Other	6

- Means there are not enough responses to be significant