Course-Section: GERO 672 1 University of Maryland Title Issues In Aging Policy Baltimore County

Instructor: Quinn,Charlene

Enrollment: 8 Questionnaires: 8

Fall 2009 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire Page 809

MAR 22, 2010

Job IRBR3029

| | Frequencies | | | | | | | Inst | ructor | Course Dept | | UMBC Level | | Sect |
|---|------------------------|----|---|---|---|---|---|------|-----------|-------------|------|------------|------|------|
| Questions | NR | NA | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Mean | Rank | | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean |
| General | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 2 | 4.17 | 976/1509 | 4.17 | 4.71 | 4.31 | 4.39 | 4.17 |
| 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals | 2 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 1 | | 1419/1509 | 3.33 | 3.96 | 4.26 | 4.25 | 3.33 |
| 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals | 2 | 3 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | | 1281/1287 | 2.67 | 3.83 | 4.30 | 4.22 | 2.67 |
| 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals | 2 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 2 | 0 | 3.17 | 1402/1459 | 3.17 | 3.54 | 4.22 | 4.16 | 3.17 |
| 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned | 2 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 0 | 3.33 | 1258/1406 | 3.33 | 4.50 | 4.09 | 4.12 | 3.33 |
| 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned | 2 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 2.83 | 1350/1384 | 2.83 | 3.83 | 4.11 | 4.16 | 2.83 |
| 7. Was the grading system clearly explained | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 3 | 4.17 | 854/1489 | 4.17 | 3.54 | 4.17 | 4.14 | 4.17 |
| 8. How many times was class cancelled | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 3.00 | 1502/1506 | 3.00 | 4.00 | 4.67 | 4.71 | 3.00 |
| 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness | 4 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 2.75 | 1427/1463 | 2.75 | 3.83 | 4.09 | 4.15 | 2.75 |
| Lecture | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared | 2 | Ω | Λ | 1 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 3 83 | 1288/1438 | 3.83 | 4.21 | 4.46 | 4.49 | 3.83 |
| 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 5.00 | 1/1421 | 5.00 | 5.00 | 4.73 | 4.78 | 5.00 |
| 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly | 2 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 4 | 1 | | 1174/1411 | 3.83 | 4.21 | 4.31 | 4.33 | 3.83 |
| 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned | 2 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 0 | | 1348/1405 | 3.00 | 4.25 | 4.32 | 4.33 | 3.00 |
| 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding | 2 | 3 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | | 1209/1236 | 2.33 | 2.11 | 4.00 | 3.98 | 2.33 |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Discussion | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 1 | 4.00 | 746/1260 | 4.00 | 4.50 | 4.14 | 4.21 | 4.00 |
| 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 4 | 4.67 | 443/1255 | 4.67 | 4.92 | 4.33 | 4.43 | 4.67 |
| 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 3 | 4.50 | 620/1258 | 4.50 | 4.71 | 4.38 | 4.50 | 4.50 |
| 4. Were special techniques successful | 2 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 3.00 | ****/ 873 | **** | 5.00 | 4.03 | 4.01 | **** |
| Freque | Frequency Distribution | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

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

University of Maryland Baltimore County

Fall 2009

Course-Section: GERO 700 1

Sociocult Gero

Rubinstein, Robe

7

Title

Instructor:

Enrollment:

Questionnaires: 7

Page 810 MAR 22, 2010 Job IRBR3029

| Student Course Evaluation | Questionnaire |
|---------------------------|---------------|
|---------------------------|---------------|

| | | | | | | | Ezo | ~~~ | | | | Tnat | - milaton | Courac | Dont | t UMBC Level | | Coat |
|------------|---|------------------|--------|--------------------|-----------|--------|--------|------------|------------|------|--------|------|----------------|----------------|------|--------------|--------|--------------|
| | | Questions | 5 | | NR | NA | 1 | equei 2 | ncies 3 | 4 | 5 | Mean | ructor Rank | Course Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean | Sect Mean |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | General | _ | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| _ | _ | ew insights,ski | | | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 4.67 | 410/1509 | 4.67 | 4.71 | | 4.39 | 4.67 |
| | | ctor make clear | | | 4 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 1 | | 1463/1509 | 3.00 | 3.96 | 4.26 | 4.25 | 3.00 |
| | | uestions reflect | | | 4 5 | 1 0 | 0 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 4.00 | 924/1287 | 4.00 | 3.83 | 4.30 | 4.22 | 4.00 |
| | 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned | | | | | | | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | | 1457/1459 | 2.00 | 3.54 | 4.22 | 4.16 | 2.00 |
| | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 4.67 | | 4.67 | 4.50 | 4.09 | 4.12 | 4.67 | | | | |
| 6. Did wri | 4 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 3.00 | 1322/1384 | 3.00 | 3.83 | 4.11 | 4.16 | 3.00 | | | | |
| 7. Was the | 4 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 0 | | 1450/1489 | 2.67 | 3.54 | 4.17 | 4.14 | 2.67 | | | | |
| 8. How man | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 5.00 | 1/1506 | 5.00 | 4.00 | 4.67 | 4.71 | 5.00 | | | | |
| 9. How wou | 5 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 4.00 | ****/1463 | **** | 3.83 | 4.09 | 4.15 | **** | | | | |
| | | Lecture | = | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were th | ne instru | actor's lectures | s well | prepared | 5 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 3.00 | 1406/1438 | 3.00 | 4.21 | 4.46 | 4.49 | 3.00 |
| | | ctor seem intere | | | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 5.00 | 1/1421 | 5.00 | 5.00 | 4.73 | 4.78 | 5.00 |
| | | | | explained clearly | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 3.50 | 1277/1411 | 3.50 | 4.21 | 4.31 | 4.33 | 3.50 |
| | | es contribute to | | - | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | | 1047/1405 | 4.00 | 4.25 | 4.32 | 4.33 | 4.00 |
| | | Discus | ai on | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1 Did ala | | | | what you learned | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 4.00 | 746/1260 | 4.00 | 4.50 | 4.14 | 4.21 | 4.00 |
| | | | | ed to participate | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 5.00 | 1/1255 | 5.00 | 4.92 | 4.14 | 4.43 | 5.00 |
| | | - | _ | | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 2 | | | | | | | 4.33 |
| | | _ | | nd open discussion | 4 | - | 0 | 0 | U | 1 | _ | 4.33 | 770/1258 | 4.33 | 4.71 | 4.38 | 4.50 | 4.33 |
| 4. Were sp | pecial te | echniques succes | ssiul | | 4 | 2 | U | U | 0 | Т | 0 | 4.00 | ****/ 873 | **** | 5.00 | 4.03 | 4.01 | **** |
| | | | | Frequ | ency | Dist | trib | ution | า | | | | | | | | | |
| Credits Ea | arned | Cum. GPA | | Expected Grades | | | | Rea | asons | : | | | Туј | ne. | | | Majors | |
| | | | | | | | , | | | | ,. | | | | | | | |
| 00-27 | 27 0 0.00-0.99 0 A 2 | | | | | | | ed fo | or Ma | jors | 3 | 2 | Graduat | е | 3 | Majo | r | 0 |
| 28-55 | 0 | 1.00-1.99 | 0 | в 0 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 56-83 | 0 | 2.00-2.99 | 0 | C 0 | General | | | | | | | 0 | Under-g | rad | 4 | Non- | major | 7 |
| 84-150 | 0 | 3.00-3.49 | 0 | D 0 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Grad. | 3 | 3.50-4.00 | 1 | F 0 | Electives | | | | | | | 1 | #### - 1 | Means t | | re not | enoug | ŗh |

Other

0

responses to be significant

0

0

1

Ρ

Ι

Course-Section: GERO 750 1 University of Maryland Title Baltimore County Theory/Methods I Fall 2009

Instructor: Morgan,Leslie A (Instr. A)

Enrollment: 4 Questionnaires: 4

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Page 811

MAR 22, 2010

Job IRBR3029

| | | | Frequencies | | | | | 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 | 4 | 5.00 | 1/1509 | 5.00 | 4.71 | 4.31 | 4.39 | 5.00 |
| 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 4.75 | 256/1509 | 4.75 | 3.96 | 4.26 | 4.25 | 4.75 |
| 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 4.33 | 708/1287 | 4.33 | 3.83 | 4.30 | 4.22 | 4.33 |
| 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 4.50 | 454/1459 | 4.50 | 3.54 | 4.22 | 4.16 | 4.50 |
| 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 5.00 | 1/1406 | 5.00 | 4.50 | 4.09 | 4.12 | 5.00 |
| 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 4.75 | 149/1384 | 4.75 | 3.83 | 4.11 | 4.16 | 4.75 |
| 7. Was the grading system clearly explained | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 3.67 | 1236/1489 | 3.67 | 3.54 | 4.17 | 4.14 | 3.67 |
| 8. How many times was class cancelled | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 4.00 | 1383/1506 | 4.00 | 4.00 | 4.67 | 4.71 | 4.00 |
| 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 4.00 | 853/1463 | 4.38 | 3.83 | 4.09 | 4.15 | 4.38 |
| Lecture | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 5.00 | 1/1438 | 5.00 | 4.21 | 4.46 | 4.49 | 5.00 |
| 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 5.00 | 1/1421 | 5.00 | 5.00 | 4.73 | 4.78 | 5.00 |
| 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 4.75 | 303/1411 | 4.75 | 4.21 | 4.31 | 4.33 | 4.75 |
| 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 5.00 | 1/1405 | 5.00 | 4.25 | 4.32 | 4.33 | 5.00 |
| 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding | 1 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2.00 | 1219/1236 | 2.00 | 2.11 | 4.00 | 3.98 | 2.00 |
| Discussion | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | Ο | 4 | 5.00 | 1/1260 | 5.00 | 4.50 | 4.14 | 4.21 | 5.00 |
| . Were all students actively encouraged to participate | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 5.00 | 1/1255 | 5.00 | 4.92 | 4.33 | 4.43 | 5.00 |
| 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 5.00 | 1/1258 | 5.00 | 4.71 | 4.38 | 4.50 | 5.00 |
| 4. Were special techniques successful | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | 1/ 873 | 5.00 | 5.00 | 4.03 | 4.01 | 5.00 |
| | - | - | - | - | - | - | _ | | _, 3,3 | | | | | |

Frequency Distribution

| Credits Ea | arned | Cum. GPA | | Expected | Grades | Reasons | | Type | | Majors | |
|------------|-------|-----------|---|----------|--------|---------------------|---|--------------|--------|----------------|---|
| 00-27 | 1 | 0.00-0.99 | 2 | А | 1 | Required for Majors | 4 | Graduate | 3 | Major | 3 |
| 28-55 | 0 | 1.00-1.99 | 0 | В | 3 | | | | | | |
| 56-83 | 0 | 2.00-2.99 | 0 | C | 0 | General | | Under-grad | 1 | Non-major | 1 |
| 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 | L |
| | | | | P | 0 | | | responses to | be sig | nificant | |
| | | | | I | 0 | Other | 0 | | | | |
| | | | | ? | 0 | | | | | | |

Course-Section: GERO 750 1 University of Maryland Page 812
Title Theory/Methods I Baltimore County MAR 22, 2010

Instructor: (Instr. B)

Enrollment: 4
Questionnaires: 4

Fall 2009

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Job IRBR3029

| | | | | | | | | Fre | Frequencies | | | | Tnet | ructor | Course | nent | TIMBC | Level | Sect |
|--|-----------|-----------------------------|------|-------------|----------|-------|-----------------------|------|-------------|-------|----------------|---|---------|-----------|--------|------|-------|--------|------|
| | | Questions | 5 | | | NR | NA | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Mean | Rank | | Mean | | Mean | Mean |
| | | General | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1 Did vo | u gain na | General ew insights,skil | _ | m this cou | rge | Λ | 0 | 0 | Λ | 0 | Λ | 4 | 5.00 | 1/1509 | 5.00 | 4.71 | 4.31 | 4.39 | 5.00 |
| _ | _ | ctor make clear | | | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 4.75 | 256/1509 | 4.75 | 3.96 | 4.26 | 4.25 | 4.75 |
| | | uestions reflect | | _ | | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 4.33 | 708/1287 | 4.33 | 3.83 | 4.30 | 4.22 | 4.33 |
| | _ | uations reflect | | | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 4.50 | 454/1459 | 4.50 | 3.54 | 4.22 | 4.16 | 4.50 |
| | | eadings contribu | | _ | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 5.00 | 1/1406 | 5.00 | 4.50 | 4.09 | 4.12 | 5.00 |
| | _ | signments contri | | - | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 4.75 | 149/1384 | 4.75 | 3.83 | 4.11 | 4.16 | 4.75 |
| | | g system clearly | | - | IOUIIIOU | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 0 | | 1236/1489 | 3.67 | 3.54 | 4.17 | 4.14 | 3.67 |
| | - | was class cance | _ | 11100 | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 0 | | 1383/1506 | 4.00 | 4.00 | 4.67 | 4.71 | 4.00 |
| 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectivenes | | | | | | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 4.75 | 151/1463 | | 3.83 | 4.09 | 4.15 | 4.38 |
| | | Lecture | 2 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared | | | | | | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | Ο | 3 | 5.00 | 1/1438 | 5.00 | 4.21 | 4.46 | 4.49 | 5.00 |
| | | ctor seem intere | | | ect | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 5.00 | 1/1421 | 5.00 | 5.00 | 4.73 | 4.78 | 5.00 |
| | | terial presented | | _ | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 4.75 | 303/1411 | 4.75 | 4.21 | 4.31 | 4.33 | 4.75 |
| | | es contribute to | | - | - | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 5.00 | 1/1405 | 5.00 | 4.25 | 4.32 | 4.33 | 5.00 |
| | | l techniques enh | | - | | 1 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | | 1219/1236 | | 2.11 | 4.00 | 3.98 | 2.00 |
| | | Discuss | sion | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did cl | ass disci | ussions contribu | | what you le | earned | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 5.00 | 1/1260 | 5.00 | 4.50 | 4.14 | 4.21 | 5.00 |
| | | nts actively end | | - | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 5.00 | 1/1255 | 5.00 | 4.92 | 4.33 | 4.43 | 5.00 |
| | | ctor encourage f | _ | _ | _ | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | | 1/1258 | 5.00 | 4.71 | 4.38 | 4.50 | 5.00 |
| | | echniques succes | | - or | | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | 1/ 873 | 5.00 | 5.00 | 4.03 | 4.01 | 5.00 |
| | | | | | Frequ | ıency | Dis | trib | ution | n | | | | | | | | | |
| Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades | | | | | | | | | Re: | asons | | | | Ty | ne | | | Majors | : |
| creates samed cum. GPA expected Grades | | | | | | | | | | | , . – – – - | | | ту. | | | | | |
| 00-27 | 1 | 0.00-0.99 | 2 | A | 1 | | Required for Majors 4 | | | | | 4 | Graduat | е | 3 | Majo | or | 3 | |
| 28-55 | 0 | 1.00-1.99 | 0 | В | 3 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

| Credits Earned | | Cum. GPA | | Expecte | d Grades | Reasons | | Type | Majors | | |
|----------------|---|-----------|---|---------|----------|---------------------|---|--------------|--------|----------------|---|
| 00-27 | 1 | 0.00-0.99 | 2 | A | 1 | Required for Majors | 4 | Graduate | 3 | Major | 3 |
| 28-55 | 0 | 1.00-1.99 | 0 | В | 3 | | | | | | |
| 56-83 | 0 | 2.00-2.99 | 0 | С | 0 | General | 0 | Under-grad | 1 | Non-major | 1 |
| 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 | ı |
| | | | | P | 0 | | | responses to | be sig | nificant | |
| | | | | I | 0 | Other | 0 | - | _ | | |
| | | | | 2 | 0 | | | | | | |