

Course-Section: GERO 672 0101
 Title ISSUES IN AGING POLICY
 Instructor: QUINN, CHARLENE
 Enrollment: 10
 Questionnaires: 10

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2008

Page 874
 AUG 6, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR		Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	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	3	7	4.70	440/1670	4.70	4.70	4.31	4.46	4.70
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	2	7	4.60	490/1666	4.60	4.25	4.27	4.34	4.60
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	2	0	0	1	4	2	4.14	964/1406	4.14	4.14	4.32	4.36	4.14
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	5	4	4.44	633/1615	4.44	4.37	4.24	4.33	4.44
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	0	1	8	4.60	339/1566	4.60	4.60	4.07	4.20	4.60
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	3	7	4.70	277/1528	4.70	4.65	4.12	4.33	4.70
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	1	1	7	4.40	720/1650	4.40	4.13	4.22	4.30	4.40
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1667	5.00	4.90	4.67	4.74	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	0	5	3	4.38	595/1626	4.38	4.31	4.11	4.20	4.38
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	435/1559	4.80	4.46	4.46	4.49	4.80
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1560	5.00	5.00	4.72	4.81	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	202/1549	4.90	4.67	4.31	4.37	4.90
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	2	7	4.60	595/1546	4.60	4.36	4.32	4.40	4.60
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	3	1	0	2	3	1	3.43	1073/1323	3.43	3.43	4.00	4.03	3.43
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	4	4	4.33	608/1384	4.33	4.50	4.10	4.21	4.33
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	379/1378	4.78	4.83	4.29	4.42	4.78
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1378	5.00	4.94	4.31	4.51	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	1	4	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	202/ 904	4.60	4.13	4.03	4.04	4.60
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 232	****	****	4.19	4.30	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 239	****	****	4.21	4.53	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 230	****	****	4.44	4.69	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 231	****	****	4.31	4.58	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 218	****	****	4.18	4.47	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 87	****	****	4.65	4.61	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 79	****	****	4.64	4.67	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 75	****	****	4.57	4.66	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 79	****	****	4.45	4.58	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 80	****	****	3.97	4.32	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 41	****	****	4.50	4.65	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 38	****	****	4.19	4.58	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	9	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 38	****	****	4.62	4.65	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	9	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.27	4.59	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	9	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.47	4.59	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 28	****	****	4.64	4.82	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 16	****	****	4.67	4.60	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	9	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 10	****	****	4.84	4.90	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	9	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 6	****	****	4.92	5.00	****

Course-Section: GERO 672 0101
 Title ISSUES IN AGING POLICY
 Instructor: QUINN, CHARLENE
 Enrollment: 10
 Questionnaires: 10

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2008

Page 874
 AUG 6, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	0	A	8	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	6	Major	8
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	1						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	1	Under-grad	4	Non-major	2
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D	0						
Grad.	6	3.50-4.00	8	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	8				
				?	0						

Course-Section: GERO 700 0101
 Title SOCIOCULT GERO
 Instructor: RUBINSTEIN, ROB
 Enrollment: 10
 Questionnaires: 10

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2008

Page 875
 AUG 6, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean		
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5						Mean	Rank

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	1	0	0	9	4.70	440/1670	4.70	4.70	4.31	4.46	4.70
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	0	1	5	3	3.90	1318/1666	3.90	4.25	4.27	4.34	3.90
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	9	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1406	****	4.14	4.32	4.36	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	3	1	0	0	1	5	4.29	837/1615	4.29	4.37	4.24	4.33	4.29
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	2	7	4.60	339/1566	4.60	4.60	4.07	4.20	4.60
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	0	0	9	4.60	346/1528	4.60	4.65	4.12	4.33	4.60
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	3	0	1	1	3	2	3.86	1304/1650	3.86	4.13	4.22	4.30	3.86
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	861/1667	4.80	4.90	4.67	4.74	4.80
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	1	4	3	4.25	728/1626	4.25	4.31	4.11	4.20	4.25

Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	1	1	0	1	6	4.11	1249/1559	4.11	4.46	4.46	4.49	4.11
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1560	5.00	5.00	4.72	4.81	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	1	0	0	1	7	4.44	762/1549	4.44	4.67	4.31	4.37	4.44
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	1	0	1	6	4.11	1095/1546	4.11	4.36	4.32	4.40	4.11
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	7	2	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/1323	****	3.43	4.00	4.03	****

Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	0	0	8	4.67	324/1384	4.67	4.50	4.10	4.21	4.67
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	264/1378	4.89	4.83	4.29	4.42	4.89
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	302/1378	4.89	4.94	4.31	4.51	4.89
4. Were special techniques successful	1	6	0	0	2	0	1	3.67	671/ 904	3.67	4.13	4.03	4.04	3.67

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors					
00-27	7	0.00-0.99	0	A 10	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	10
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B 0						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C 0	General	1	Under-grad	10	Non-major	0
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D 0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	7	F 0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P 0						
				I 0	Other	8				
				? 0						