

Course-Section: POLI 100 0101
 Title AMER GOVT & POLITICS
 Instructor: CROATTI, MARK
 Enrollment: 46
 Questionnaires: 41

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 1339
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	1	1	3	10	25	4.43	735/1674	4.30	4.44	4.27	4.07	4.43
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	2	1	11	10	16	3.92	1246/1674	4.04	4.23	4.23	4.16	3.92
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	4	0	8	13	15	3.88	1121/1423	4.05	4.41	4.27	4.16	3.88
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	1	3	5	18	13	3.97	1133/1609	4.02	4.28	4.22	4.05	3.97
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	2	2	4	8	5	18	3.89	916/1585	4.01	4.27	3.96	3.88	3.89
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	5	3	4	7	10	10	3.59	1251/1535	3.68	4.17	4.08	3.89	3.59
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	1	0	2	3	5	28	4.55	458/1651	4.28	4.27	4.18	4.10	4.55
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	1	0	21	17	4.38	1325/1673	4.63	4.58	4.69	4.67	4.38
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	13	1	1	0	2	22	2	3.89	1139/1656	4.04	4.20	4.07	3.96	3.89
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	2	2	5	8	23	4.20	1191/1586	4.55	4.49	4.43	4.37	4.20
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	1	2	37	4.90	567/1585	4.85	4.84	4.69	4.60	4.90
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	2	1	1	9	26	4.44	733/1582	4.25	4.40	4.26	4.17	4.44
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	4	1	5	6	23	4.10	1100/1575	4.34	4.46	4.27	4.17	4.10
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	8	1	1	12	5	13	3.88	817/1380	3.18	3.80	3.94	3.78	3.88
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	9	0	1	3	6	8	14	3.97	855/1520	3.88	4.23	4.01	3.76	3.97
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	9	0	0	2	7	4	19	4.25	898/1515	4.14	4.50	4.24	3.97	4.25
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	0	1	2	5	24	4.63	544/1511	4.27	4.49	4.27	4.00	4.63
4. Were special techniques successful	9	15	1	0	4	2	10	4.18	402/ 994	3.48	3.97	3.94	3.73	4.18
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	39	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 265	****	****	4.23	3.97	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	39	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 278	****	****	4.19	3.97	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	39	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 260	****	****	4.46	4.41	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	39	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 259	****	****	4.33	4.19	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	39	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 233	****	****	4.20	4.00	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	39	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 103	****	5.00	4.41	4.33	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	39	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 101	****	5.00	4.48	4.18	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	39	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 95	****	5.00	4.31	3.99	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	39	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 99	****	5.00	4.39	4.10	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	39	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 97	****	4.33	4.14	3.69	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	39	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 76	****	5.00	3.98	3.32	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	39	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 77	****	5.00	3.93	3.42	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	39	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 53	****	5.00	4.45	4.34	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	39	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 48	****	5.00	4.12	4.00	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	39	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 49	****	5.00	4.27	4.30	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	39	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 61	****	5.00	4.09	3.87	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	39	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 52	****	5.00	4.26	3.91	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	39	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 50	****	5.00	4.44	4.39	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	39	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 35	****	5.00	4.36	3.92	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	39	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 31	****	5.00	4.34	3.88	****

Course-Section: POLI 100 0101
 Title AMER GOVT & POLITICS
 Instructor: CROATTI, MARK
 Enrollment: 46
 Questionnaires: 41

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 1339
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	9	0.00-0.99	1	A	16	Required for Majors	11	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B	11						
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	3	C	6	General	5	Under-grad	41	Non-major	40
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	5	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	2	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	18				
				?	0						

Course-Section: POLI 100 0201
 Title AMER GOVT & POLITICS
 Instructor: MELCAVAGE, EUGE
 Enrollment: 50
 Questionnaires: 40

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 1340
 JAN 21, 2006
 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	1	2	11	26	4.55	546/1674	4.30	4.44	4.27	4.07	4.55	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	0	3	14	22	4.40	737/1674	4.04	4.23	4.23	4.16	4.40	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	3	6	30	4.63	431/1423	4.05	4.41	4.27	4.16	4.63	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	19	1	0	2	6	12	4.33	743/1609	4.02	4.28	4.22	4.05	4.33	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	1	6	2	8	10	12	3.53	1211/1585	4.01	4.27	3.96	3.88	3.53	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	26	1	2	1	2	7	3.92	991/1535	3.68	4.17	4.08	3.89	3.92	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	1	0	2	0	9	27	4.61	393/1651	4.28	4.27	4.18	4.10	4.61	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	3	37	4.93	565/1673	4.63	4.58	4.69	4.67	4.93	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	11	3	0	0	1	7	18	4.65	266/1656	4.04	4.20	4.07	3.96	4.65	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	0	3	35	4.92	171/1586	4.55	4.49	4.43	4.37	4.92	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	2	37	4.95	340/1585	4.85	4.84	4.69	4.60	4.95	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	1	38	4.97	46/1582	4.25	4.40	4.26	4.17	4.97	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	4	34	4.85	235/1575	4.34	4.46	4.27	4.17	4.85	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	26	2	2	0	0	8	3.83	845/1380	3.18	3.80	3.94	3.78	3.83	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	2	4	8	23	4.41	512/1520	3.88	4.23	4.01	3.76	4.41	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	0	4	4	28	4.67	483/1515	4.14	4.50	4.24	3.97	4.67	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	1	4	32	4.84	323/1511	4.27	4.49	4.27	4.00	4.84	
4. Were special techniques successful	3	22	1	0	1	6	7	4.20	390/ 994	3.48	3.97	3.94	3.73	4.20	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	8	0.00-0.99	A 19	Required for Majors	13
28-55	11	1.00-1.99	B 15	Graduate	0
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	C 1	General	7
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	D 0	Under-grad	40
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	2
			P 0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	
			I 0	Other	17
			? 3		

Course-Section: POLI 100 0301
 Title AMER GOVT & POLITICS
 Instructor: KING-MEADOWS, T
 Enrollment: 34
 Questionnaires: 16

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 1341
 JAN 21, 2006
 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	1	1	3	11	4.50	607/1674	4.30	4.44	4.27	4.07	4.50	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	2	2	4	7	3.88	1291/1674	4.04	4.23	4.23	4.16	3.88	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	3	2	2	2	7	3.50	1268/1423	4.05	4.41	4.27	4.16	3.50	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	3	2	6	4	3.56	1427/1609	4.02	4.28	4.22	4.05	3.56	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	2	2	3	8	4.13	672/1585	4.01	4.27	3.96	3.88	4.13	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	1	5	4	4	3.60	1240/1535	3.68	4.17	4.08	3.89	3.60	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	2	2	4	6	3.80	1289/1651	4.28	4.27	4.18	4.10	3.80	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	1	0	0	0	1	13	4.93	565/1673	4.63	4.58	4.69	4.67	4.93	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	1	1	1	4	5	3.92	1107/1656	4.04	4.20	4.07	3.96	3.92	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	2	2	0	12	4.38	1034/1586	4.55	4.49	4.43	4.37	4.38	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	1	0	2	13	4.69	1047/1585	4.85	4.84	4.69	4.60	4.69	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	2	2	3	3	6	3.56	1385/1582	4.25	4.40	4.26	4.17	3.56	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	1	2	3	9	4.13	1080/1575	4.34	4.46	4.27	4.17	4.13	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	12	1	2	1	0	0	2.00	1359/1380	3.18	3.80	3.94	3.78	2.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	1	0	2	5	3	3.82	979/1520	3.88	4.23	4.01	3.76	3.82	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	1	1	1	2	6	4.00	1024/1515	4.14	4.50	4.24	3.97	4.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	1	3	1	6	4.09	1021/1511	4.27	4.49	4.27	4.00	4.09	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	5	0.00-0.99 1	A 3	Required for Majors 3	Graduate 0 Major 6
28-55	1	1.00-1.99 0	B 0		
56-83	0	2.00-2.99 1	C 5	General 2	Under-grad 16 Non-major 10
84-150	1	3.00-3.49 1	D 3		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 2	F 0	Electives 1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 8	
			? 2		

Course-Section: POLI 100 0401
 Title AMER GOVT & POLITICS
 Instructor: KING-MEADOWS, T
 Enrollment: 38
 Questionnaires: 25

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 1342
 JAN 21, 2006
 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	1	5	6	13	4.24	979/1674	4.30	4.44	4.27	4.07	4.24	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	3	1	10	10	4.00	1146/1674	4.04	4.23	4.23	4.16	4.00	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	2	3	6	13	4.12	943/1423	4.05	4.41	4.27	4.16	4.12	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	3	2	7	12	4.17	963/1609	4.02	4.28	4.22	4.05	4.17	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	3	20	4.72	191/1585	4.01	4.27	3.96	3.88	4.72	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	1	10	8	5	3.60	1240/1535	3.68	4.17	4.08	3.89	3.60	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	2	3	7	13	4.24	889/1651	4.28	4.27	4.18	4.10	4.24	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	9	15	4.63	1114/1673	4.63	4.58	4.69	4.67	4.63	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	1	1	1	5	5	8	3.90	1124/1656	4.04	4.20	4.07	3.96	3.90	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	4	20	4.76	474/1586	4.55	4.49	4.43	4.37	4.76	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	25	5.00	1/1585	4.85	4.84	4.69	4.60	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	1	2	3	8	11	4.04	1109/1582	4.25	4.40	4.26	4.17	4.04	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	3	7	15	4.48	717/1575	4.34	4.46	4.27	4.17	4.48	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	10	4	1	5	3	2	2.87	1274/1380	3.18	3.80	3.94	3.78	2.87	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	4	5	7	8	3.79	994/1520	3.88	4.23	4.01	3.76	3.79	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	1	4	8	11	4.21	939/1515	4.14	4.50	4.24	3.97	4.21	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	1	7	6	10	4.04	1037/1511	4.27	4.49	4.27	4.00	4.04	
4. Were special techniques successful	1	17	4	0	0	2	1	2.43	972/ 994	3.48	3.97	3.94	3.73	2.43	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	22	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 265	****	****	4.23	3.97	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	23	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 278	****	****	4.19	3.97	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	23	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 260	****	****	4.46	4.41	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	23	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 259	****	****	4.33	4.19	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	23	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 233	****	****	4.20	4.00	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	23	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 103	****	5.00	4.41	4.33	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	23	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 101	****	5.00	4.48	4.18	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	23	0	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	****/ 95	****	5.00	4.31	3.99	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	23	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 99	****	5.00	4.39	4.10	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	23	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 97	****	4.33	4.14	3.69	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	24	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 76	****	5.00	3.98	3.32	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	24	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 77	****	5.00	3.93	3.42	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	24	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 53	****	5.00	4.45	4.34	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	24	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 48	****	5.00	4.12	4.00	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	24	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 49	****	5.00	4.27	4.30	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	24	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 61	****	5.00	4.09	3.87	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	24	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 52	****	5.00	4.26	3.91	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	24	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 50	****	5.00	4.44	4.39	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	24	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 35	****	5.00	4.36	3.92	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	24	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 31	****	5.00	4.34	3.88	****	

Course-Section: POLI 100 0401
 Title AMER GOVT & POLITICS
 Instructor: KING-MEADOWS, T
 Enrollment: 38
 Questionnaires: 25

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 1342
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	9	0.00-0.99 0	A 2	Required for Majors 7	Graduate 0 Major 9
28-55	2	1.00-1.99 0	B 8		
56-83	1	2.00-2.99 1	C 11	General 3	Under-grad 25 Non-major 16
84-150	0	3.00-3.49 1	D 3		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 0	F 0	Electives 0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 15	
			? 1		

Course-Section: POLI 100 0501
 Title AMER GOVT & POLITICS
 Instructor: MILLER, NICHOLA
 Enrollment: 44
 Questionnaires: 35

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 1343
 JAN 21, 2006
 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	1	3	8	13	10	3.80	1385/1674	4.30	4.44	4.27	4.07	3.80	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	2	3	5	8	17	4.00	1146/1674	4.04	4.23	4.23	4.16	4.00	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	0	7	12	15	4.14	929/1423	4.05	4.41	4.27	4.16	4.14	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	2	7	12	14	4.09	1042/1609	4.02	4.28	4.22	4.05	4.09	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	3	2	7	9	13	3.79	1014/1585	4.01	4.27	3.96	3.88	3.79	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	4	11	7	11	3.68	1201/1535	3.68	4.17	4.08	3.89	3.68	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	1	7	10	16	4.21	924/1651	4.28	4.27	4.18	4.10	4.21	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	1	0	0	1	22	10	4.27	1405/1673	4.63	4.58	4.69	4.67	4.27	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	2	0	1	6	16	4	3.85	1162/1656	4.04	4.20	4.07	3.96	3.85	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	3	11	19	4.48	887/1586	4.55	4.49	4.43	4.37	4.48	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	10	23	4.70	1035/1585	4.85	4.84	4.69	4.60	4.70	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	8	9	16	4.24	946/1582	4.25	4.40	4.26	4.17	4.24	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	1	5	11	15	4.15	1050/1575	4.34	4.46	4.27	4.17	4.15	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	9	2	3	7	9	3	3.33	1127/1380	3.18	3.80	3.94	3.78	3.33	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	1	5	9	6	6	3.41	1221/1520	3.88	4.23	4.01	3.76	3.41	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	1	3	10	6	7	3.56	1288/1515	4.14	4.50	4.24	3.97	3.56	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	3	2	3	10	9	3.74	1227/1511	4.27	4.49	4.27	4.00	3.74	
4. Were special techniques successful	8	17	1	2	4	1	2	3.10	874/ 994	3.48	3.97	3.94	3.73	3.10	
Laboratory															
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	34	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 278	****	****	4.19	3.97	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	32	2	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 103	****	5.00	4.41	4.33	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	32	2	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 99	****	5.00	4.39	4.10	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	31	3	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 97	****	4.33	4.14	3.69	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	34	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 76	****	5.00	3.98	3.32	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	34	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 77	****	5.00	3.93	3.42	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	34	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 53	****	5.00	4.45	4.34	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	34	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 48	****	5.00	4.12	4.00	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	34	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 61	****	5.00	4.09	3.87	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	34	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 52	****	5.00	4.26	3.91	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	34	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 50	****	5.00	4.44	4.39	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	13	0.00-0.99	4	A	5	Required for Majors	15	Graduate	0	Major	4
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	19						
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	2	C	6	General	3	Under-grad	35	Non-major	31
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	2	D	2						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	6	F	0	Electives	3	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0						
							Other		10		

Course-Section: POLI 100H 0101
 Title AMER GOVT/POLITICS-HON
 Instructor: KING-MEADOWS, T (Instr. A)
 Enrollment: 9
 Questionnaires: 8

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 1344
 JAN 21, 2006
 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	7	4.88	176/1674	4.88	4.44	4.27	4.07	4.88	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	2	0	2	4	4.00	1146/1674	4.00	4.23	4.23	4.16	4.00	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	1	1	5	4.57	493/1423	4.57	4.41	4.27	4.16	4.57	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	2	5	4.50	490/1609	4.50	4.28	4.22	4.05	4.50	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	101/1585	4.88	4.27	3.96	3.88	4.88	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	2	1	4	3.88	1048/1535	3.88	4.17	4.08	3.89	3.88	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	1	1	3	1	1	3.00	1562/1651	3.00	4.27	4.18	4.10	3.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1673	5.00	4.58	4.69	4.67	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	185/1656	4.46	4.20	4.07	3.96	4.46	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1586	5.00	4.49	4.43	4.37	5.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1585	5.00	4.84	4.69	4.60	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	7	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1582	4.57	4.40	4.26	4.17	4.57	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1575	4.86	4.46	4.27	4.17	4.86	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	7	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/1380	5.00	3.80	3.94	3.78	5.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	151/1520	4.88	4.23	4.01	3.76	4.88	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	384/1515	4.75	4.50	4.24	3.97	4.75	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	3	0	5	4.25	896/1511	4.25	4.49	4.27	4.00	4.25	
4. Were special techniques successful	0	6	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	732/ 994	3.50	3.97	3.94	3.73	3.50	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	7	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 103	****	5.00	4.41	4.33	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 99	****	5.00	4.39	4.10	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	7	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 97	****	4.33	4.14	3.69	****	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: POLI 100H 0101
 Title AMER GOVT/POLITICS-HON
 Instructor: KING-MEADOWS, T (Instr. B)
 Enrollment: 9
 Questionnaires: 8

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 1345
 JAN 21, 2006
 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	7	4.88	176/1674	4.88	4.44	4.27	4.07	4.88	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	2	0	2	4	4.00	1146/1674	4.00	4.23	4.23	4.16	4.00	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	1	1	5	4.57	493/1423	4.57	4.41	4.27	4.16	4.57	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	2	5	4.50	490/1609	4.50	4.28	4.22	4.05	4.50	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	101/1585	4.88	4.27	3.96	3.88	4.88	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	2	1	4	3.88	1048/1535	3.88	4.17	4.08	3.89	3.88	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	1	1	3	1	1	3.00	1562/1651	3.00	4.27	4.18	4.10	3.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1673	5.00	4.58	4.69	4.67	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	1	3	2	4.17	827/1656	4.46	4.20	4.07	3.96	4.46	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1586	5.00	4.49	4.43	4.37	5.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1585	5.00	4.84	4.69	4.60	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	1	1	5	4.57	557/1582	4.57	4.40	4.26	4.17	4.57	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	225/1575	4.86	4.46	4.27	4.17	4.86	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	5	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1380	5.00	3.80	3.94	3.78	5.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	151/1520	4.88	4.23	4.01	3.76	4.88	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	384/1515	4.75	4.50	4.24	3.97	4.75	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	3	0	5	4.25	896/1511	4.25	4.49	4.27	4.00	4.25	
4. Were special techniques successful	0	6	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	732/ 994	3.50	3.97	3.94	3.73	3.50	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	7	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 103	****	5.00	4.41	4.33	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 99	****	5.00	4.39	4.10	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	7	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 97	****	4.33	4.14	3.69	****	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: POLI 210 0101
 Title POLITICAL PHILOSOPHY
 Instructor: Stacey, Simon
 Enrollment: 44
 Questionnaires: 43

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 1346
 JAN 21, 2006
 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	2	9	32	4.70	367/1674	4.59	4.44	4.27	4.32	4.70	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	5	12	26	4.49	609/1674	4.46	4.23	4.23	4.26	4.49	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	3	9	30	4.64	404/1423	4.49	4.41	4.27	4.36	4.64	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	23	0	0	3	4	12	4.47	536/1609	4.43	4.28	4.22	4.23	4.47	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	10	32	4.72	185/1585	4.67	4.27	3.96	3.91	4.72	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	28	0	0	1	6	8	4.47	427/1535	4.43	4.17	4.08	4.03	4.47	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	2	7	9	13	12	3.60	1403/1651	4.01	4.27	4.18	4.20	3.60	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	1	0	16	25	4.55	1175/1673	4.47	4.58	4.69	4.67	4.55	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	9	1	0	0	0	18	15	4.45	451/1656	4.33	4.20	4.07	4.10	4.45	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	11	32	4.74	517/1586	4.74	4.49	4.43	4.48	4.74	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	4	39	4.91	567/1585	4.88	4.84	4.69	4.76	4.91	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	1	0	1	13	28	4.56	578/1582	4.61	4.40	4.26	4.35	4.56	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	1	1	0	0	9	32	4.69	453/1575	4.75	4.46	4.27	4.39	4.69	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	33	1	1	0	0	5	4.00	****/1380	3.53	3.80	3.94	4.03	****	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	1	0	5	9	20	4.34	563/1520	4.34	4.23	4.01	4.03	4.34	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	1	0	1	8	25	4.60	543/1515	4.71	4.50	4.24	4.28	4.60	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	0	1	0	3	31	4.83	335/1511	4.84	4.49	4.27	4.28	4.83	
4. Were special techniques successful	8	29	1	0	0	2	3	4.00	****/ 994	4.22	3.97	3.94	3.98	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	40	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 265	****	****	4.23	4.34	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	41	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 278	****	****	4.19	4.36	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	41	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 260	****	****	4.46	4.51	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	41	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 259	****	****	4.33	4.42	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	41	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 233	****	****	4.20	4.48	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	41	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 103	****	5.00	4.41	4.07	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	41	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 101	****	5.00	4.48	4.45	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	41	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 95	****	5.00	4.31	4.33	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	41	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 99	****	5.00	4.39	4.22	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	41	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 97	****	4.33	4.14	4.63	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	41	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 76	****	5.00	3.98	3.97	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	41	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 77	****	5.00	3.93	4.20	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	41	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 53	****	5.00	4.45	4.50	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	41	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 48	****	5.00	4.12	4.50	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	41	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 49	****	5.00	4.27	4.82	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	42	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 61	****	5.00	4.09	4.23	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	42	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 50	****	5.00	4.44	4.42	****	

Course-Section: POLI 210 0101
 Title POLITICAL PHILOSOPHY
 Instructor: Stacey, Simon
 Enrollment: 44
 Questionnaires: 43

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 1346
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	6	0.00-0.99	0	A	15	Required for Majors	3	Graduate	0	Major	21
28-55	12	1.00-1.99	1	B	22						
56-83	6	2.00-2.99	2	C	1	General	3	Under-grad	43	Non-major	22
84-150	7	3.00-3.49	6	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	16	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	34				
				?	2						

Course-Section: POLI 210 0201
 Title POLITICAL PHILOSOPHY
 Instructor: Stacey, Simon
 Enrollment: 56
 Questionnaires: 38

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 1347
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sept
	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	1	0	0	7	30	4.71	342/1674	4.59	4.44	4.27	4.32	4.71	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	12	23	4.53	554/1674	4.46	4.23	4.23	4.26	4.53	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	8	29	4.74	286/1423	4.49	4.41	4.27	4.27	4.36	4.74	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	11	0	0	3	3	21	4.67	312/1609	4.43	4.28	4.22	4.23	4.67	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	5	32	4.82	131/1585	4.67	4.27	3.96	3.91	4.82	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	15	0	1	3	6	13	4.35	568/1535	4.43	4.17	4.08	4.03	4.35	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	2	9	9	17	4.11	1031/1651	4.01	4.27	4.18	4.20	4.11	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	14	24	4.63	1103/1673	4.47	4.58	4.69	4.67	4.63	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	1	1	0	13	21	4.44	465/1656	4.33	4.20	4.07	4.10	4.44	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	3	34	4.92	192/1586	4.74	4.49	4.43	4.48	4.92	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	1	36	4.97	170/1585	4.88	4.84	4.69	4.76	4.97	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	1	0	5	31	4.78	272/1582	4.61	4.40	4.26	4.35	4.78	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	1	3	32	4.78	311/1575	4.75	4.46	4.27	4.39	4.78	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	29	2	0	0	1	5	3.88	****/1380	3.53	3.80	3.94	4.03	****	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	1	2	15	14	4.31	589/1520	4.34	4.23	4.01	4.03	4.31	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	0	0	8	24	4.75	384/1515	4.71	4.50	4.24	4.28	4.75	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	0	0	1	3	28	4.84	312/1511	4.84	4.49	4.27	4.28	4.84	
4. Were special techniques successful	6	27	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	****/ 994	4.22	3.97	3.94	3.98	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	35	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 265	****	****	4.23	4.34	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	36	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 278	****	****	4.19	4.36	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	37	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 260	****	****	4.46	4.51	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	37	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 259	****	****	4.33	4.42	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	37	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 233	****	****	4.20	4.48	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	34	1	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 103	****	5.00	4.41	4.07	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	35	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 101	****	5.00	4.48	4.45	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	35	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 95	****	5.00	4.31	4.33	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	35	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 99	****	5.00	4.39	4.22	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	35	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 97	****	4.33	4.14	4.63	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	37	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 76	****	5.00	3.98	3.97	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	36	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 77	****	5.00	3.93	4.20	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	36	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 53	****	5.00	4.45	4.50	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	36	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 48	****	5.00	4.12	4.50	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	36	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 49	****	5.00	4.27	4.82	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	35	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 61	****	5.00	4.09	4.23	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	35	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 52	****	5.00	4.26	4.53	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	35	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 50	****	5.00	4.44	4.42	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	35	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 35	****	5.00	4.36	4.63	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	35	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 31	****	5.00	4.34	4.50	****	

Course-Section: POLI 210 0201
 Title POLITICAL PHILOSOPHY
 Instructor: Stacey, Simon
 Enrollment: 56
 Questionnaires: 38

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 1347
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	6	0.00-0.99	0	A	16	Required for Majors	2	Graduate	0	Major	19
28-55	8	1.00-1.99	0	B	21						
56-83	8	2.00-2.99	5	C	0	General	4	Under-grad	38	Non-major	19
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	8	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	12	F	0	Electives	2	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	30				
				?	0						

Course-Section: POLI 210 0301
 Title POLITICAL PHILOSOPHY
 Instructor: SAULS, SHANAYSH
 Enrollment: 46
 Questionnaires: 34

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 1348
 JAN 21, 2006
 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	2	0	1	1	3	7	20	4.38	804/1674	4.59	4.44	4.27	4.32	4.38	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	0	0	3	14	15	4.38	776/1674	4.46	4.23	4.23	4.26	4.38	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	1	3	3	11	15	4.09	962/1423	4.49	4.41	4.27	4.36	4.09	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	13	0	0	5	7	8	4.15	974/1609	4.43	4.28	4.22	4.23	4.15	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	1	0	10	21	4.48	343/1585	4.67	4.27	3.96	3.91	4.48	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	18	0	0	2	4	9	4.47	427/1535	4.43	4.17	4.08	4.03	4.47	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	5	13	15	4.30	809/1651	4.01	4.27	4.18	4.20	4.30	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	25	8	4.24	1427/1673	4.47	4.58	4.69	4.67	4.24	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	11	1	0	1	2	13	6	4.09	900/1656	4.33	4.20	4.07	4.10	4.09	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	2	10	20	4.56	795/1586	4.74	4.49	4.43	4.48	4.56	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	1	6	26	4.76	917/1585	4.88	4.84	4.69	4.76	4.76	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	3	10	19	4.50	632/1582	4.61	4.40	4.26	4.35	4.50	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	1	0	0	1	5	25	4.77	327/1575	4.75	4.46	4.27	4.39	4.77	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	18	3	1	3	1	7	3.53	1024/1380	3.53	3.80	3.94	4.03	3.53	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	1	2	3	1	20	4.37	537/1520	4.34	4.23	4.01	4.03	4.37	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	0	0	1	4	22	4.78	360/1515	4.71	4.50	4.24	4.28	4.78	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	0	0	1	2	24	4.85	301/1511	4.84	4.49	4.27	4.28	4.85	
4. Were special techniques successful	7	4	1	1	3	5	13	4.22	379/ 994	4.22	3.97	3.94	3.98	4.22	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	32	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/ 265	****	****	4.23	4.34	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	32	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 278	****	****	4.19	4.36	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	32	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 260	****	****	4.46	4.51	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	33	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 103	****	5.00	4.41	4.07	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	33	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 101	****	5.00	4.48	4.45	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	33	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 99	****	5.00	4.39	4.22	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	33	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 76	****	5.00	3.98	3.97	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	33	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 77	****	5.00	3.93	4.20	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	33	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 53	****	5.00	4.45	4.50	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	33	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 48	****	5.00	4.12	4.50	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	33	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 61	****	5.00	4.09	4.23	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	33	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 52	****	5.00	4.26	4.53	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	33	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 50	****	5.00	4.44	4.42	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	33	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 35	****	5.00	4.36	4.63	****	

Course-Section: POLI 210 0301
 Title POLITICAL PHILOSOPHY
 Instructor: SAULS, SHANAYSH
 Enrollment: 46
 Questionnaires: 34

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 1348
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	6	0.00-0.99	1	A	13	Required for Majors	4	Graduate	0	Major	20
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	1	B	10						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	2	C	3	General	3	Under-grad	34	Non-major	14
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F	1	Electives	2	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	19				
				?	2						

Course-Section: POLI 233 0101
 Title COMMON LAW&LEGAL ANALY
 Instructor: BARNER-BARRY, C
 Enrollment: 31
 Questionnaires: 23

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 1349
 JAN 21, 2006
 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	3	1	19	4.70	367/1674	4.70	4.44	4.27	4.32	4.70	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	5	15	4.52	554/1674	4.52	4.23	4.23	4.26	4.52	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	2	1	1	19	4.61	459/1423	4.61	4.41	4.27	4.36	4.61	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	1	2	1	4	14	4.27	825/1609	4.27	4.28	4.22	4.23	4.27	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	2	3	2	16	4.39	422/1585	4.39	4.27	3.96	3.91	4.39	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	1	2	1	3	15	4.32	598/1535	4.32	4.17	4.08	4.03	4.32	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	2	3	4	13	4.27	843/1651	4.27	4.27	4.18	4.20	4.27	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	12	11	4.48	1235/1673	4.48	4.58	4.69	4.67	4.48	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	9	0	0	0	3	5	6	4.21	770/1656	4.21	4.20	4.07	4.10	4.21	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	4	3	14	4.48	901/1586	4.48	4.49	4.43	4.48	4.48	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	2	2	18	4.73	981/1585	4.73	4.84	4.69	4.76	4.73	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	1	2	5	14	4.45	704/1582	4.45	4.40	4.26	4.35	4.45	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	1	2	4	14	4.48	730/1575	4.48	4.46	4.27	4.39	4.48	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	14	0	1	1	2	3	4.00	666/1380	4.00	3.80	3.94	4.03	4.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	1	0	1	3	14	4.53	385/1520	4.53	4.23	4.01	4.03	4.53	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	1	2	1	15	4.58	568/1515	4.58	4.50	4.24	4.28	4.58	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	1	1	0	17	4.74	436/1511	4.74	4.49	4.27	4.28	4.74	
4. Were special techniques successful	4	0	1	2	0	1	15	4.42	270/ 994	4.42	3.97	3.94	3.98	4.42	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	22	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 265	****	****	4.23	4.34	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	22	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 278	****	****	4.19	4.36	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	22	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 260	****	****	4.46	4.51	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	22	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 259	****	****	4.33	4.42	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	22	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 233	****	****	4.20	4.48	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	22	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 103	****	5.00	4.41	4.07	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	22	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 101	****	5.00	4.48	4.45	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	22	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 95	****	5.00	4.31	4.33	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	22	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 99	****	5.00	4.39	4.22	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	22	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 97	****	4.33	4.14	4.63	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	22	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 76	****	5.00	3.98	3.97	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	22	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 77	****	5.00	3.93	4.20	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	22	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 53	****	5.00	4.45	4.50	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	22	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 48	****	5.00	4.12	4.50	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	22	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 49	****	5.00	4.27	4.82	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	22	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 61	****	5.00	4.09	4.23	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	22	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 52	****	5.00	4.26	4.53	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	22	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 50	****	5.00	4.44	4.42	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	22	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 35	****	5.00	4.36	4.63	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	22	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 31	****	5.00	4.34	4.50	****	

Course-Section: POLI 233 0101
 Title COMMON LAW&LEGAL ANALY
 Instructor: BARNER-BARRY, C
 Enrollment: 31
 Questionnaires: 23

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 1349
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	11	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	3
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B	9						
56-83	5	2.00-2.99	1	C	0	General	2	Under-grad	23	Non-major	20
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	7	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	6	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	16				
				?	0						

Course-Section: POLI 233H 0101
 Title
 Instructor: BARNER-BARRY, C
 Enrollment: 6
 Questionnaires: 6

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 1350
 JAN 21, 2006
 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	406/1674	4.67	4.44	4.27	4.32	4.67	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	4	2	4.33	830/1674	4.33	4.23	4.23	4.26	4.33	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	2	3	4.33	771/1423	4.33	4.41	4.27	4.36	4.33	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	3	4.50	490/1609	4.50	4.28	4.22	4.23	4.50	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	2	3	4.33	482/1585	4.33	4.27	3.96	3.91	4.33	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	3	3	4.50	373/1535	4.50	4.17	4.08	4.03	4.50	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	2	3	4.33	768/1651	4.33	4.27	4.18	4.20	4.33	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	4	2	4.33	1361/1673	4.33	4.58	4.69	4.67	4.33	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	2	1	3	4.17	827/1656	4.17	4.20	4.07	4.10	4.17	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	1	0	2	3	4.17	1211/1586	4.17	4.49	4.43	4.48	4.17	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	737/1585	4.83	4.84	4.69	4.76	4.83	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	3	3	4.50	632/1582	4.50	4.40	4.26	4.35	4.50	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	2	3	4.33	886/1575	4.33	4.46	4.27	4.39	4.33	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	3	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	200/1380	4.67	3.80	3.94	4.03	4.67	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1520	5.00	4.23	4.01	4.03	5.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1515	5.00	4.50	4.24	4.28	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	1	0	0	0	3	4.00	1050/1511	4.00	4.49	4.27	4.28	4.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	2	0	1	0	0	0	3	4.00	474/ 994	4.00	3.97	3.94	3.98	4.00	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 4	Required for Majors	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	B 1		Graduate 0
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	C 0	General	1
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad 6
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		
			I 0		
			? 1	Other	5

- Means there are not enough responses to be significant

Course-Section: POLI 240 0101
 Title STATE & LOCAL POLITICS
 Instructor: CROATTI, MARK
 Enrollment: 38
 Questionnaires: 29

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 1351
 JAN 21, 2006
 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	1	3	6	19	4.48	639/1674	4.48	4.44	4.27	4.32	4.48	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	4	6	9	10	3.86	1298/1674	3.86	4.23	4.23	4.26	3.86	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	3	1	4	9	12	3.90	1111/1423	3.90	4.41	4.27	4.36	3.90	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	3	2	1	5	7	11	3.92	1198/1609	3.92	4.28	4.22	4.23	3.92	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	3	3	8	13	4.04	748/1585	4.04	4.27	3.96	3.91	4.04	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	5	0	2	6	5	10	4.00	870/1535	4.00	4.17	4.08	4.03	4.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	2	2	2	21	4.43	643/1651	4.43	4.27	4.18	4.20	4.43	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	5	23	4.82	850/1673	4.82	4.58	4.69	4.67	4.82	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	2	0	1	5	12	7	4.00	955/1656	4.00	4.20	4.07	4.10	4.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	3	7	6	13	4.00	1300/1586	4.00	4.49	4.43	4.48	4.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	1	27	4.90	591/1585	4.90	4.84	4.69	4.76	4.90	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	3	2	7	17	4.31	871/1582	4.31	4.40	4.26	4.35	4.31	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	1	3	5	19	4.38	847/1575	4.38	4.46	4.27	4.39	4.38	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	16	2	0	2	2	6	3.83	845/1380	3.83	3.80	3.94	4.03	3.83	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	10	0	1	1	3	3	11	4.16	734/1520	4.16	4.23	4.01	4.03	4.16	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	9	0	0	2	1	4	13	4.40	759/1515	4.40	4.50	4.24	4.28	4.40	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	0	0	2	6	12	4.50	642/1511	4.50	4.49	4.27	4.28	4.50	
4. Were special techniques successful	10	10	1	0	2	2	4	3.89	577/ 994	3.89	3.97	3.94	3.98	3.89	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	27	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 103	****	5.00	4.41	4.07	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	27	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 101	****	5.00	4.48	4.45	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	27	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 95	****	5.00	4.31	4.33	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	27	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 99	****	5.00	4.39	4.22	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	27	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 97	****	4.33	4.14	4.63	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	28	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 76	****	5.00	3.98	3.97	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	28	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 77	****	5.00	3.93	4.20	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	28	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 53	****	5.00	4.45	4.50	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	28	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 48	****	5.00	4.12	4.50	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	28	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 49	****	5.00	4.27	4.82	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	28	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 61	****	5.00	4.09	4.23	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	28	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 52	****	5.00	4.26	4.53	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	28	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 50	****	5.00	4.44	4.42	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	28	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 35	****	5.00	4.36	4.63	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	28	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 31	****	5.00	4.34	4.50	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors		
00-27	4	0.00-0.99	0	A 19	Required for Majors 1	Graduate 0	Major 23
28-55	7	1.00-1.99	0	B 8			
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	5	C 1	General 3	Under-grad 29	Non-major 6
84-150	6	3.00-3.49	5	D 0			
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	8	F 0	Electives 1	#### - Means there are not enough	

P	0			responses to be significant
I	0	Other	22	
?	0			

Course-Section: POLI 250 0101
 Title INTRO TO PUBLIC ADMIN
 Instructor: CROATTI, MARK
 Enrollment: 45
 Questionnaires: 37

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 1352
 JAN 21, 2006
 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	1	0	3	2	11	10	10	3.61	1474/1674	3.61	4.44	4.27	4.32	3.61	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	3	4	9	14	6	3.44	1523/1674	3.44	4.23	4.23	4.26	3.44	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	3	6	10	9	8	3.36	1309/1423	3.36	4.41	4.27	4.36	3.36	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	1	1	5	11	10	8	3.54	1435/1609	3.54	4.28	4.22	4.23	3.54	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	6	8	10	5	7	2.97	1455/1585	2.97	4.27	3.96	3.91	2.97	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	9	4	4	9	5	4	3.04	1432/1535	3.04	4.17	4.08	4.03	3.04	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	1	7	10	17	4.14	998/1651	4.14	4.27	4.18	4.20	4.14	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	36	5.00	1/1673	5.00	4.58	4.69	4.67	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	7	0	2	2	8	8	10	3.73	1252/1656	3.73	4.20	4.07	4.10	3.73	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	2	2	7	16	8	3.74	1418/1586	3.74	4.49	4.43	4.48	3.74	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	1	1	2	8	24	4.47	1250/1585	4.47	4.84	4.69	4.76	4.47	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	1	5	10	12	7	3.54	1392/1582	3.54	4.40	4.26	4.35	3.54	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	7	3	5	11	10	3.39	1408/1575	3.39	4.46	4.27	4.39	3.39	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	4	4	4	7	8	9	3.44	1076/1380	3.44	3.80	3.94	4.03	3.44	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	9	0	3	2	5	7	11	3.75	1027/1520	3.75	4.23	4.01	4.03	3.75	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	9	0	0	3	9	3	13	3.93	1114/1515	3.93	4.50	4.24	4.28	3.93	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	1	5	6	6	10	3.68	1261/1511	3.68	4.49	4.27	4.28	3.68	
4. Were special techniques successful	9	14	2	3	5	1	3	3.00	881/ 994	3.00	3.97	3.94	3.98	3.00	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	1	0.00-0.99 0	A 20	Required for Majors 2	Graduate 0 Major 13
28-55	8	1.00-1.99 0	B 10		
56-83	5	2.00-2.99 2	C 1	General 4	Under-grad 37 Non-major 24
84-150	4	3.00-3.49 6	D 0		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 6	F 0	Electives 1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 26	
			? 2		

Course-Section: POLI 260 0101
 Title: COMPARATIVE POLITICS
 Instructor: CROATTI, MARK
 Enrollment: 47
 Questionnaires: 32

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 1353
 JAN 21, 2006
 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	1	0	0	2	2	12	15	4.29	903/1674	4.29	4.44	4.27	4.32	4.29	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	3	3	6	8	11	3.68	1416/1674	3.68	4.23	4.23	4.26	3.68	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	3	4	6	8	10	3.58	1252/1423	3.58	4.41	4.27	4.36	3.58	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	2	3	3	5	5	13	3.76	1320/1609	3.76	4.28	4.22	4.23	3.76	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	3	3	7	7	11	3.65	1135/1585	3.65	4.27	3.96	3.91	3.65	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	4	4	2	6	6	9	3.52	1289/1535	3.52	4.17	4.08	4.03	3.52	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	4	2	8	16	4.10	1037/1651	4.10	4.27	4.18	4.20	4.10	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	3	28	4.90	706/1673	4.90	4.58	4.69	4.67	4.90	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	11	0	0	1	6	8	6	3.90	1124/1656	3.90	4.20	4.07	4.10	3.90	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	2	5	2	7	13	3.83	1394/1586	3.83	4.49	4.43	4.48	3.83	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	1	2	2	24	4.69	1047/1585	4.69	4.84	4.69	4.76	4.69	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	5	4	7	13	3.97	1164/1582	3.97	4.40	4.26	4.35	3.97	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	2	2	5	6	14	3.97	1169/1575	3.97	4.46	4.27	4.39	3.97	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	9	1	2	2	7	7	3.89	803/1380	3.89	3.80	3.94	4.03	3.89	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	5	4	6	6	3.62	1122/1520	3.62	4.23	4.01	4.03	3.62	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	11	0	2	3	3	4	9	3.71	1233/1515	3.71	4.50	4.24	4.28	3.71	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	11	0	2	3	4	4	8	3.62	1286/1511	3.62	4.49	4.27	4.28	3.62	
4. Were special techniques successful	12	9	0	1	5	1	4	3.73	652/ 994	3.73	3.97	3.94	3.98	3.73	
Self Paced															
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	31	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 50	****	5.00	4.44	4.42	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	31	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 35	****	5.00	4.36	4.63	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	3	0.00-0.99 0	A 14	Required for Majors	0
28-55	7	1.00-1.99 0	B 13		Graduate 0
56-83	3	2.00-2.99 5	C 1	General	2
84-150	1	3.00-3.49 6	D 0		Under-grad 32
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 4	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	25
			? 1		

Course-Section: POLI 280 0101
 Title INTERNATIONAL RELATION
 Instructor: HAGERTY, DEVIN
 Enrollment: 37
 Questionnaires: 22

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 1354
 JAN 21, 2006
 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	1	0	1	0	2	6	12	4.33	854/1674	4.45	4.44	4.27	4.32	4.33	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	1	1	3	5	11	4.14	1043/1674	4.28	4.23	4.23	4.26	4.14	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	1	0	0	2	3	15	4.65	390/1423	4.55	4.41	4.27	4.36	4.65	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	14	0	1	1	0	5	4.29	812/1609	4.29	4.28	4.22	4.23	4.29	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	1	0	1	7	5	7	3.90	907/1585	4.02	4.27	3.96	3.91	3.90	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	18	1	0	2	0	0	2.33	****/1535	****	4.17	4.08	4.03	****	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	2	0	2	1	6	10	4.26	855/1651	4.32	4.27	4.18	4.20	4.26	
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	2	0	0	1	17	0	3.94	1600/1673	3.96	4.58	4.69	4.67	3.94	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	1	0	0	2	8	6	4.25	719/1656	4.30	4.20	4.07	4.10	4.25	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	1	0	1	2	17	4.62	738/1586	4.72	4.49	4.43	4.48	4.62	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	1	0	0	4	16	4.62	1130/1585	4.78	4.84	4.69	4.76	4.62	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	1	0	1	4	15	4.52	610/1582	4.64	4.40	4.26	4.35	4.52	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	1	1	0	0	2	17	4.70	453/1575	4.81	4.46	4.27	4.39	4.70	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	17	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/1380	****	3.80	3.94	4.03	****	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	2	3	4	6	4	3.37	1239/1520	3.15	4.23	4.01	4.03	3.37	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	2	4	5	5	3	3.16	1403/1515	3.25	4.50	4.24	4.28	3.16	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	1	1	4	4	9	4.00	1050/1511	3.84	4.49	4.27	4.28	4.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	3	17	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/ 994	****	3.97	3.94	3.98	****	
Laboratory															
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	21	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 278	****	****	4.19	4.36	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	21	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 103	****	5.00	4.41	4.07	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 101	****	5.00	4.48	4.45	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	21	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 99	****	5.00	4.39	4.22	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	21	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 97	****	4.33	4.14	4.63	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	21	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 76	****	5.00	3.98	3.97	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 77	****	5.00	3.93	4.20	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 53	****	5.00	4.45	4.50	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	21	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 48	****	5.00	4.12	4.50	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	21	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 61	****	5.00	4.09	4.23	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	0	A 7	Required for Majors 0
28-55	6	1.00-1.99	0	B 9	
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	4	C 1	General 1
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	3	D 0	
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5	F 0	
				P 0	
				I 0	
				? 1	
					Electives 1
					Other 16

- Means there are not enough responses to be significant

Course-Section: POLI 280 0201
 Title INTERNATIONAL RELATION
 Instructor: HAGERTY, DEVIN
 Enrollment: 45
 Questionnaires: 36

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 1355
 JAN 21, 2006
 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	2	0	0	0	3	9	22	4.56	546/1674	4.45	4.44	4.27	4.32	4.56	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	0	0	2	16	16	4.41	721/1674	4.28	4.23	4.23	4.26	4.41	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	0	1	1	2	8	22	4.44	648/1423	4.55	4.41	4.27	4.36	4.44	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	32	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/1609	4.29	4.28	4.22	4.23	****	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	2	6	11	15	4.15	662/1585	4.02	4.27	3.96	3.91	4.15	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	31	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/1535	****	4.17	4.08	4.03	****	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	1	1	3	8	21	4.38	700/1651	4.32	4.27	4.18	4.20	4.38	
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	1	33	0	3.97	1583/1673	3.96	4.58	4.69	4.67	3.97	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	2	17	13	4.34	601/1656	4.30	4.20	4.07	4.10	4.34	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	0	6	28	4.82	354/1586	4.72	4.49	4.43	4.48	4.82	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	2	32	4.94	340/1585	4.78	4.84	4.69	4.76	4.94	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	1	6	27	4.76	299/1582	4.64	4.40	4.26	4.35	4.76	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	3	31	4.91	154/1575	4.81	4.46	4.27	4.39	4.91	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	30	1	1	1	0	0	2.00	****/1380	****	3.80	3.94	4.03	****	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	7	5	5	7	5	2.93	1396/1520	3.15	4.23	4.01	4.03	2.93	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	3	4	8	8	6	3.34	1358/1515	3.25	4.50	4.24	4.28	3.34	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	3	2	8	4	12	3.69	1257/1511	3.84	4.49	4.27	4.28	3.69	
4. Were special techniques successful	7	28	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 994	****	3.97	3.94	3.98	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	35	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 76	****	5.00	3.98	3.97	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	35	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 77	****	5.00	3.93	4.20	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	35	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 53	****	5.00	4.45	4.50	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	35	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 48	****	5.00	4.12	4.50	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	35	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 61	****	5.00	4.09	4.23	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	3	0.00-0.99 0	A 15	Required for Majors	2
28-55	13	1.00-1.99 0	B 13		
56-83	6	2.00-2.99 9	C 5	General	1
84-150	7	3.00-3.49 5	D 0	Under-grad	36
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 10	F 0		
			P 0		
			I 0	Electives	2
			? 0	Other	29
				#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	

Course-Section: POLI 300 0101
 Title QUANT RESEARCH METHODS
 Instructor: MILLER, NICHOLA
 Enrollment: 51
 Questionnaires: 26

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 1356
 JAN 21, 2006
 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	6	7	7	6	3.50	1511/1674	3.50	4.44	4.27	4.26	3.50	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	6	6	13	4.19	1001/1674	4.19	4.23	4.23	4.21	4.19	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	8	15	4.46	623/1423	4.46	4.41	4.27	4.27	4.46	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	6	7	11	4.21	919/1609	4.21	4.28	4.22	4.27	4.21	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	1	7	2	4	7	3	2.87	1497/1585	2.87	4.27	3.96	3.95	2.87	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	3	1	1	4	7	9	4.00	870/1535	4.00	4.17	4.08	4.15	4.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	6	7	13	4.27	855/1651	4.27	4.27	4.18	4.16	4.27	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	20	6	4.23	1434/1673	4.23	4.58	4.69	4.68	4.23	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	1	0	5	7	9	2	3.35	1441/1656	3.35	4.20	4.07	4.07	3.35	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	5	7	14	4.35	1064/1586	4.35	4.49	4.43	4.42	4.35	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	1	9	15	4.56	1175/1585	4.56	4.84	4.69	4.66	4.56	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	3	6	6	11	3.96	1164/1582	3.96	4.40	4.26	4.26	3.96	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	5	7	7	5	3.31	1432/1575	3.31	4.46	4.27	4.25	3.31	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	2	0	1	8	5	10	4.00	666/1380	4.00	3.80	3.94	4.01	4.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	9	0	5	1	6	4	1	2.71	1445/1520	2.71	4.23	4.01	4.09	2.71	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	9	0	3	0	3	2	9	3.82	1171/1515	3.82	4.50	4.24	4.32	3.82	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	10	0	0	5	1	3	7	3.75	1221/1511	3.75	4.49	4.27	4.34	3.75	
4. Were special techniques successful	10	11	1	0	2	0	2	3.40	****/ 994	****	3.97	3.94	3.96	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	23	1	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 265	****	****	4.23	4.26	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	24	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 278	****	****	4.19	4.24	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	24	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 260	****	****	4.46	4.49	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	24	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 259	****	****	4.33	4.33	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	24	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 233	****	****	4.20	4.18	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	24	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 103	****	5.00	4.41	4.10	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	24	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 101	****	5.00	4.48	4.30	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	24	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 95	****	5.00	4.31	3.91	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	24	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 99	****	5.00	4.39	4.29	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	24	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 97	****	4.33	4.14	3.48	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	25	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 76	****	5.00	3.98	4.03	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	25	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 77	****	5.00	3.93	3.70	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	24	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 53	****	5.00	4.45	3.87	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	24	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 48	****	5.00	4.12	3.67	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	24	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 49	****	5.00	4.27	3.27	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	24	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 61	****	5.00	4.09	3.20	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	24	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 52	****	5.00	4.26	3.50	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	24	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 50	****	5.00	4.44	3.82	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	24	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 35	****	5.00	4.36	3.29	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	24	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 31	****	5.00	4.34	4.29	****	

Course-Section: POLI 300 0101
 Title QUANT RESEARCH METHODS
 Instructor: MILLER, NICHOLA
 Enrollment: 51
 Questionnaires: 26

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 1356
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	1	A	7	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	23
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	5						
56-83	8	2.00-2.99	4	C	11	General	0	Under-grad	26	Non-major	3
84-150	8	3.00-3.49	8	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	23				
				?	1						

Course-Section: POLI 309 0101
 Title SELECTED TOPICS IN POL
 Instructor: MIKHAIL, NABIL
 Enrollment: 39
 Questionnaires: 25

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 1357
 JAN 21, 2006
 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	12	13	4.52	582/1674	4.52	4.44	4.27	4.26	4.52	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	8	14	4.44	673/1674	4.44	4.23	4.23	4.21	4.44	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	1	6	17	4.67	376/1423	4.67	4.41	4.27	4.27	4.67	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	0	3	3	16	4.59	385/1609	4.59	4.28	4.22	4.27	4.59	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	7	17	4.64	238/1585	4.64	4.27	3.96	3.95	4.64	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	7	0	0	0	5	13	4.72	192/1535	4.72	4.17	4.08	4.15	4.72	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	0	4	7	13	4.24	889/1651	4.24	4.27	4.18	4.16	4.24	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	13	12	4.48	1224/1673	4.48	4.58	4.69	4.68	4.48	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	10	0	0	0	2	7	6	4.27	706/1656	4.27	4.20	4.07	4.07	4.27	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	2	6	16	4.58	774/1586	4.58	4.49	4.43	4.42	4.58	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	1	2	21	4.83	737/1585	4.83	4.84	4.69	4.66	4.83	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	1	9	14	4.54	589/1582	4.54	4.40	4.26	4.26	4.54	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	2	5	17	4.63	551/1575	4.63	4.46	4.27	4.25	4.63	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	14	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1380	5.00	3.80	3.94	4.01	5.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	1	6	8	4.47	443/1520	4.47	4.23	4.01	4.09	4.47	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	10	0	0	1	0	2	12	4.67	483/1515	4.67	4.50	4.24	4.32	4.67	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	10	0	0	0	1	3	11	4.67	507/1511	4.67	4.49	4.27	4.34	4.67	
4. Were special techniques successful	10	7	0	0	1	1	6	4.63	160/ 994	4.63	3.97	3.94	3.96	4.63	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99 0	A 15	Required for Majors 3	Graduate 0 Major 17
28-55	1	1.00-1.99 0	B 6		
56-83	9	2.00-2.99 3	C 0	General 7	Under-grad 25 Non-major 8
84-150	6	3.00-3.49 10	D 0		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 5	F 0	Electives 0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 11	
			? 0		

Course-Section: POLI 319 0101
 Title SEL TOPICS IN POLI PHI
 Instructor: Stacey, Simon
 Enrollment: 19
 Questionnaires: 11

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 1358
 JAN 21, 2006
 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	1	3	7	4.55	558/1674	4.55	4.44	4.27	4.26	4.55	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	0	2	8	4.55	530/1674	4.55	4.23	4.23	4.21	4.55	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	7	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	845/1423	4.25	4.41	4.27	4.27	4.25	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	2	0	1	8	4.36	701/1609	4.36	4.28	4.22	4.27	4.36	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	3	8	4.73	185/1585	4.73	4.27	3.96	3.95	4.73	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	1	3	6	4.50	373/1535	4.50	4.17	4.08	4.15	4.50	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	0	2	8	4.55	471/1651	4.55	4.27	4.18	4.16	4.55	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	7	4	4.36	1339/1673	4.36	4.58	4.69	4.68	4.36	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	0	7	1	4.13	871/1656	4.13	4.20	4.07	4.07	4.13	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	389/1586	4.80	4.49	4.43	4.42	4.80	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1585	5.00	4.84	4.69	4.66	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	1	0	3	6	4.40	777/1582	4.40	4.40	4.26	4.26	4.40	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	3	7	4.70	453/1575	4.70	4.46	4.27	4.25	4.70	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	6	1	0	0	0	2	3.67	962/1380	3.67	3.80	3.94	4.01	3.67	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	3	6	4.50	397/1520	4.50	4.23	4.01	4.09	4.50	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	207/1515	4.90	4.50	4.24	4.32	4.90	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	244/1511	4.90	4.49	4.27	4.34	4.90	
4. Were special techniques successful	1	8	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 994	****	3.97	3.94	3.96	****	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: POLI 323 0101
 Title THE PRESIDENCY
 Instructor: Eberly, Todd
 Enrollment: 33
 Questionnaires: 19

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 1359
 JAN 21, 2006
 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	1	3	15	4.74	320/1674	4.74	4.44	4.27	4.26	4.74	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	3	13	4.53	554/1674	4.53	4.23	4.23	4.21	4.53	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	1	17	4.84	174/1423	4.84	4.41	4.27	4.27	4.84	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	4	13	4.58	408/1609	4.58	4.28	4.22	4.27	4.58	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	7	10	4.42	395/1585	4.42	4.27	3.96	3.95	4.42	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	6	11	4.47	413/1535	4.47	4.17	4.08	4.15	4.47	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	1	18	4.95	70/1651	4.95	4.27	4.18	4.16	4.95	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	9	10	4.53	1189/1673	4.53	4.58	4.69	4.68	4.53	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	0	6	9	4.60	310/1656	4.60	4.20	4.07	4.07	4.60	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	1	1	15	4.82	354/1586	4.82	4.49	4.43	4.42	4.82	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	0	17	5.00	1/1585	5.00	4.84	4.69	4.66	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	1	1	15	4.82	227/1582	4.82	4.40	4.26	4.26	4.82	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	1	2	14	4.76	343/1575	4.76	4.46	4.27	4.25	4.76	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	0	0	1	3	6	7	4.12	612/1380	4.12	3.80	3.94	4.01	4.12	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	6	11	4.65	309/1520	4.65	4.23	4.01	4.09	4.65	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	1	2	14	4.76	372/1515	4.76	4.50	4.24	4.32	4.76	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	0	1	16	4.94	146/1511	4.94	4.49	4.27	4.34	4.94	
4. Were special techniques successful	3	6	0	0	2	4	4	4.20	390/ 994	4.20	3.97	3.94	3.96	4.20	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 6	Required for Majors	1
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	B 8		Graduate 0
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	C 3	General	4
84-150	6	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad 19
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	12
			? 0		

Course-Section: POLI 327 0101
 Title INTEREST GROUPS & LOBB
 Instructor: Bagwell, Tim
 Enrollment: 24
 Questionnaires: 14

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 1360
 JAN 21, 2006
 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	2	1	5	6	4.07	1139/1674	4.07	4.44	4.27	4.26	4.07	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	2	4	7	4.38	763/1674	4.38	4.23	4.23	4.21	4.38	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	3	10	4.64	404/1423	4.64	4.41	4.27	4.27	4.64	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	5	7	4.46	552/1609	4.46	4.28	4.22	4.27	4.46	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	4	8	4.43	395/1585	4.43	4.27	3.96	3.95	4.43	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	6	6	4.29	631/1535	4.29	4.17	4.08	4.15	4.29	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	1	1	11	4.77	220/1651	4.77	4.27	4.18	4.16	4.77	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	2	12	4.86	796/1673	4.86	4.58	4.69	4.68	4.86	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	4	6	3	3.92	1090/1656	3.92	4.20	4.07	4.07	3.92	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	1	2	5	6	4.14	1224/1586	4.14	4.49	4.43	4.42	4.14	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	13	4.93	453/1585	4.93	4.84	4.69	4.66	4.93	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	1	2	4	7	4.21	978/1582	4.21	4.40	4.26	4.26	4.21	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	2	3	8	4.29	932/1575	4.29	4.46	4.27	4.25	4.29	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	5	2	1	1	1	3	3.25	1160/1380	3.25	3.80	3.94	4.01	3.25	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	3	2	4	4.11	768/1520	4.11	4.23	4.01	4.09	4.11	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	0	2	3	4	4.22	922/1515	4.22	4.50	4.24	4.32	4.22	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	1	0	3	5	4.33	816/1511	4.33	4.49	4.27	4.34	4.33	
4. Were special techniques successful	5	4	0	1	2	0	2	3.60	699/ 994	3.60	3.97	3.94	3.96	3.60	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99 0	A 14	Required for Majors 2	Graduate 0 Major 8
28-55	2	1.00-1.99 0	B 0		
56-83	3	2.00-2.99 3	C 0	General 1	Under-grad 14 Non-major 6
84-150	5	3.00-3.49 5	D 0		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 4	F 0	Electives 0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 12	
			? 0		

Course-Section: POLI 328 0101
 Title WOMEN AND POLITICS
 Instructor: MILLER, JENNIFE
 Enrollment: 35
 Questionnaires: 21

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 1361
 JAN 21, 2006
 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	1	5	6	4	5	3.33	1563/1674	3.33	4.44	4.27	4.26	3.33	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	5	5	5	5	3.38	1544/1674	3.38	4.23	4.23	4.21	3.38	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	4	1	6	3	7	3.38	1304/1423	3.38	4.41	4.27	4.27	3.38	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	2	2	5	6	6	3.57	1423/1609	3.57	4.28	4.22	4.27	3.57	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	6	4	3	5	3	2.76	1515/1585	2.76	4.27	3.96	3.95	2.76	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	4	1	7	4	5	3.24	1394/1535	3.24	4.17	4.08	4.15	3.24	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	2	6	9	3	3.52	1434/1651	3.52	4.27	4.18	4.16	3.52	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	1	0	16	4	4.10	1529/1673	4.10	4.58	4.69	4.68	4.10	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	4	2	6	7	1	2.95	1560/1656	2.95	4.20	4.07	4.07	2.95	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	5	1	4	6	5	3.24	1524/1586	3.24	4.49	4.43	4.42	3.24	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	1	3	0	6	11	4.10	1456/1585	4.10	4.84	4.69	4.66	4.10	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	1	6	2	3	9	3.62	1367/1582	3.62	4.40	4.26	4.26	3.62	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	5	4	2	3	7	3.14	1467/1575	3.14	4.46	4.27	4.25	3.14	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	3	3	5	4	5	3.25	1160/1380	3.25	3.80	3.94	4.01	3.25	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	3	2	5	1	6	3.29	1269/1520	3.29	4.23	4.01	4.09	3.29	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	1	0	5	5	6	3.88	1145/1515	3.88	4.50	4.24	4.32	3.88	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	1	1	4	6	5	3.76	1216/1511	3.76	4.49	4.27	4.34	3.76	
4. Were special techniques successful	4	10	2	1	3	0	1	2.57	959/ 994	2.57	3.97	3.94	3.96	2.57	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99 0	A 5	Required for Majors 3	Graduate 0 Major 16
28-55	2	1.00-1.99 0	B 11		
56-83	6	2.00-2.99 3	C 3	General 1	Under-grad 21 Non-major 5
84-150	7	3.00-3.49 6	D 0		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 5	F 0	Electives 1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 15	
			? 1		

Course-Section: POLI 353 0101
 Title GOVERNMENTAL BUDGETING
 Instructor: MEYERS, ROY T.
 Enrollment: 31
 Questionnaires: 28

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 1362
 JAN 21, 2006
 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	3	8	17	4.50	607/1674	4.50	4.44	4.27	4.26	4.50	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	3	2	10	13	4.18	1018/1674	4.18	4.23	4.23	4.21	4.18	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	16	0	0	0	3	9	4.75	262/1423	4.75	4.41	4.27	4.27	4.75	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	1	2	5	19	4.56	432/1609	4.56	4.28	4.22	4.27	4.56	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	7	4	17	4.36	462/1585	4.36	4.27	3.96	3.95	4.36	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	7	20	4.68	230/1535	4.68	4.17	4.08	4.15	4.68	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	1	2	5	19	4.43	643/1651	4.43	4.27	4.18	4.16	4.43	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	15	13	4.46	1246/1673	4.46	4.58	4.69	4.68	4.46	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	0	2	14	7	4.22	770/1656	4.22	4.20	4.07	4.07	4.22	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	5	22	4.81	371/1586	4.81	4.49	4.43	4.42	4.81	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	1	26	4.96	227/1585	4.96	4.84	4.69	4.66	4.96	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	3	10	14	4.41	777/1582	4.41	4.40	4.26	4.26	4.41	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	3	7	17	4.52	680/1575	4.52	4.46	4.27	4.25	4.52	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	2	1	1	2	10	8	4.05	648/1380	4.05	3.80	3.94	4.01	4.05	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	3	5	11	4.42	489/1520	4.42	4.23	4.01	4.09	4.42	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	9	0	0	1	0	4	14	4.63	513/1515	4.63	4.50	4.24	4.32	4.63	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	0	0	2	4	13	4.58	586/1511	4.58	4.49	4.27	4.34	4.58	
4. Were special techniques successful	9	2	0	0	2	6	9	4.41	278/ 994	4.41	3.97	3.94	3.96	4.41	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 9	Required for Majors	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	B 18		Graduate 0
56-83	5	2.00-2.99	C 0	General	1
84-150	15	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad 28
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	24
			? 0		

Course-Section: POLI 354 0101
 Title PUBL MGMNT/PERSONNEL S
 Instructor: ADLER, JOSEPH
 Enrollment: 22
 Questionnaires: 15

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 1363
 JAN 21, 2006
 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	3	5	7	4.27	941/1674	4.27	4.44	4.27	4.26	4.27	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	0	1	6	7	4.20	1001/1674	4.20	4.23	4.23	4.21	4.20	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	2	0	3	10	4.40	697/1423	4.40	4.41	4.27	4.27	4.40	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	0	0	8	6	4.20	930/1609	4.20	4.28	4.22	4.27	4.20	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	3	3	8	4.20	612/1585	4.20	4.27	3.96	3.95	4.20	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	4	6	4	3.80	1110/1535	3.80	4.17	4.08	4.15	3.80	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	0	0	4	10	4.47	583/1651	4.47	4.27	4.18	4.16	4.47	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	14	4.93	494/1673	4.93	4.58	4.69	4.68	4.93	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	1	0	0	6	6	4.23	744/1656	4.23	4.20	4.07	4.07	4.23	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	1	0	0	0	14	4.73	538/1586	4.73	4.49	4.43	4.42	4.73	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	1	0	0	0	14	4.73	960/1585	4.73	4.84	4.69	4.66	4.73	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	1	0	1	2	11	4.47	690/1582	4.47	4.40	4.26	4.26	4.47	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	0	4	10	4.53	658/1575	4.53	4.46	4.27	4.25	4.53	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	9	1	0	1	2	2	3.67	962/1380	3.67	3.80	3.94	4.01	3.67	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	1	0	3	6	4.40	512/1520	4.40	4.23	4.01	4.09	4.40	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	1	0	2	7	4.50	629/1515	4.50	4.50	4.24	4.32	4.50	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	1	0	0	0	9	4.60	563/1511	4.60	4.49	4.27	4.34	4.60	
4. Were special techniques successful	6	1	1	0	1	1	5	4.13	432/ 994	4.13	3.97	3.94	3.96	4.13	
Laboratory															
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	14	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 278	****	****	4.19	4.24	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	14	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 76	****	5.00	3.98	4.03	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	14	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 77	****	5.00	3.93	3.70	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 61	****	5.00	4.09	3.20	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	14	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 52	****	5.00	4.26	3.50	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	14	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 50	****	5.00	4.44	3.82	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	14	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 35	****	5.00	4.36	3.29	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	14	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 31	****	5.00	4.34	4.29	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 6	Required for Majors 1 Graduate 0 Major 8
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B 7	
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	0	C 1	General 0 Under-grad 15 Non-major 7
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	3	D 0	
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	6	F 0	Electives 0
				P 0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
				I 0	Other 15
				? 1	

Course-Section: POLI 360 0101
 Title COMPRTIVE POLI ANALYSI
 Instructor: Mikhail, Nabil
 Enrollment: 31
 Questionnaires: 23

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 1364
 JAN 21, 2006
 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	3	6	14	4.48	655/1674	4.48	4.44	4.27	4.26	4.48	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	2	0	6	15	4.48	625/1674	4.48	4.23	4.23	4.21	4.48	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	5	17	4.70	335/1423	4.70	4.41	4.27	4.27	4.70	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	3	1	0	0	5	14	4.55	432/1609	4.55	4.28	4.22	4.27	4.55	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	1	3	2	16	4.35	472/1585	4.35	4.27	3.96	3.95	4.35	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	3	0	2	2	2	13	4.37	548/1535	4.37	4.17	4.08	4.15	4.37	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	3	2	17	4.52	497/1651	4.52	4.27	4.18	4.16	4.52	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	12	11	4.48	1235/1673	4.48	4.58	4.69	4.68	4.48	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	1	6	12	4.58	331/1656	4.58	4.20	4.07	4.07	4.58	

Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	0	7	14	4.67	663/1586	4.67	4.49	4.43	4.42	4.67	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	3	18	4.86	689/1585	4.86	4.84	4.69	4.66	4.86	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	1	1	3	16	4.62	510/1582	4.62	4.40	4.26	4.26	4.62	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	1	0	4	16	4.67	495/1575	4.67	4.46	4.27	4.25	4.67	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	1	1	1	2	3	13	4.30	447/1380	4.30	3.80	3.94	4.01	4.30	

Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	2	0	2	2	14	4.30	598/1520	4.30	4.23	4.01	4.09	4.30	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	1	2	2	15	4.55	586/1515	4.55	4.50	4.24	4.32	4.55	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	2	3	15	4.65	516/1511	4.65	4.49	4.27	4.34	4.65	
4. Were special techniques successful	3	7	0	0	0	2	11	4.85	88/ 994	4.85	3.97	3.94	3.96	4.85	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 16	Required for Majors	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	B 3		Graduate 0
56-83	5	2.00-2.99	C 0	General	3
84-150	6	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad 23
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	1
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	18
			? 2		

Course-Section: POLI 373 0101
 Title COMP MID-EAST/N AFR PO
 Instructor: MIKHAIL, NABIL
 Enrollment: 50
 Questionnaires: 35

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 1365
 JAN 21, 2006
 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	2	0	0	0	3	6	24	4.64	445/1674	4.64	4.44	4.27	4.26	4.64	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	0	0	3	10	20	4.52	566/1674	4.52	4.23	4.23	4.21	4.52	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	4	1	0	0	2	9	19	4.57	505/1423	4.57	4.41	4.27	4.27	4.57	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	3	2	0	2	2	6	20	4.47	552/1609	4.47	4.28	4.22	4.27	4.47	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	1	1	9	20	4.55	301/1585	4.55	4.27	3.96	3.95	4.55	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	4	6	0	0	1	9	15	4.56	319/1535	4.56	4.17	4.08	4.15	4.56	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	4	0	0	0	6	8	17	4.35	741/1651	4.35	4.27	4.18	4.16	4.35	
8. How many times was class cancelled	4	0	0	0	0	17	14	4.45	1257/1673	4.45	4.58	4.69	4.68	4.45	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	10	0	1	0	3	7	14	4.32	628/1656	4.32	4.20	4.07	4.07	4.32	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	5	0	0	0	1	8	21	4.67	663/1586	4.67	4.49	4.43	4.42	4.67	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	5	0	0	0	0	3	27	4.90	567/1585	4.90	4.84	4.69	4.66	4.90	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	6	0	0	0	1	9	19	4.62	496/1582	4.62	4.40	4.26	4.26	4.62	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	1	7	22	4.70	453/1575	4.70	4.46	4.27	4.25	4.70	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	6	7	0	1	1	3	17	4.64	220/1380	4.64	3.80	3.94	4.01	4.64	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	11	0	1	1	1	5	16	4.42	500/1520	4.42	4.23	4.01	4.09	4.42	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	11	0	0	2	1	1	20	4.63	523/1515	4.63	4.50	4.24	4.32	4.63	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	11	0	0	1	1	3	19	4.67	507/1511	4.67	4.49	4.27	4.34	4.67	
4. Were special techniques successful	11	9	1	0	1	3	10	4.40	287/ 994	4.40	3.97	3.94	3.96	4.40	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	34	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 265	****	****	4.23	4.26	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	34	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 278	****	****	4.19	4.24	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	34	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 260	****	****	4.46	4.49	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	34	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 259	****	****	4.33	4.33	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	34	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 103	****	5.00	4.41	4.10	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	34	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 101	****	5.00	4.48	4.30	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	34	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 95	****	5.00	4.31	3.91	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	34	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 99	****	5.00	4.39	4.29	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	34	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 76	****	5.00	3.98	4.03	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	34	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 77	****	5.00	3.93	3.70	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	34	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 53	****	5.00	4.45	3.87	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	34	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 48	****	5.00	4.12	3.67	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	34	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 49	****	5.00	4.27	3.27	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	34	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 61	****	5.00	4.09	3.20	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	34	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 52	****	5.00	4.26	3.50	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	34	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 50	****	5.00	4.44	3.82	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	34	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 35	****	5.00	4.36	3.29	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	34	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 31	****	5.00	4.34	4.29	****	

Course-Section: POLI 373 0101
 Title COMP MID-EAST/N AFR PO
 Instructor: MIKHAIL, NABIL
 Enrollment: 50
 Questionnaires: 35

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 1365
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	20	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	23
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	8						
56-83	5	2.00-2.99	3	C	0	General	6	Under-grad	35	Non-major	12
84-150	12	3.00-3.49	11	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	7	F	0	Electives	4	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	18				
				?	1						

Course-Section: POLI 380 0101
 Title INTERNATIONAL RELATION
 Instructor: HODY, CYNTHIA
 Enrollment: 30
 Questionnaires: 24

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 1366
 JAN 21, 2006
 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	1	0	4	19	4.71	354/1674	4.71	4.44	4.27	4.26	4.71	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	11	12	4.46	657/1674	4.46	4.23	4.23	4.21	4.46	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	0	2	7	12	4.48	611/1423	4.48	4.41	4.27	4.27	4.48	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	0	6	16	4.73	252/1609	4.73	4.28	4.22	4.27	4.73	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	0	1	22	4.83	121/1585	4.83	4.27	3.96	3.95	4.83	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	3	0	0	0	7	14	4.67	238/1535	4.67	4.17	4.08	4.15	4.67	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	0	4	19	4.71	288/1651	4.71	4.27	4.18	4.16	4.71	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	13	10	4.43	1278/1673	4.43	4.58	4.69	4.68	4.43	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	1	0	0	0	7	13	4.65	266/1656	4.65	4.20	4.07	4.07	4.65	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	4	20	4.83	336/1586	4.83	4.49	4.43	4.42	4.83	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	24	5.00	1/1585	5.00	4.84	4.69	4.66	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	3	1	19	4.70	394/1582	4.70	4.40	4.26	4.26	4.70	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	0	5	18	4.67	495/1575	4.67	4.46	4.27	4.25	4.67	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	17	1	0	1	1	2	3.60	****/1380	****	3.80	3.94	4.01	****	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	4	16	4.80	191/1520	4.80	4.23	4.01	4.09	4.80	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	0	0	0	20	5.00	1/1515	5.00	4.50	4.24	4.32	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	0	0	0	20	5.00	1/1511	5.00	4.49	4.27	4.34	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	4	5	0	0	2	4	9	4.47	237/ 994	4.47	3.97	3.94	3.96	4.47	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	23	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 265	****	****	4.23	4.26	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	23	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 278	****	****	4.19	4.24	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	23	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 260	****	****	4.46	4.49	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	23	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 259	****	****	4.33	4.33	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	23	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 233	****	****	4.20	4.18	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	8	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	20
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	14						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	5	C	1	General	7	Under-grad	24	Non-major	4
84-150	7	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	17				
				?	0						

Course-Section: POLI 384L 0101
 Title MODEL UNITED NATIONS
 Instructor: MILLER, JENNIFE
 Enrollment: 20
 Questionnaires: 16

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 1367
 JAN 21, 2006
 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	3	4	3	1	5	3.06	1620/1674	3.06	4.44	4.27	4.26	3.06	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	4	2	3	4	3	3.00	1608/1674	3.00	4.23	4.23	4.21	3.00	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	15	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1423	****	4.41	4.27	4.27	****	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	3	1	6	2	2	2.93	1573/1609	2.93	4.28	4.22	4.27	2.93	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	2	3	6	4	3.63	1149/1585	3.63	4.27	3.96	3.95	3.63	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	4	2	2	4	3	3.00	1435/1535	3.00	4.17	4.08	4.15	3.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	4	3	1	8	3.81	1282/1651	3.81	4.27	4.18	4.16	3.81	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	2	14	0	3.88	1627/1673	3.88	4.58	4.69	4.68	3.88	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	3	4	2	6	0	2.73	1602/1656	2.73	4.20	4.07	4.07	2.73	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	5	3	2	5	1	2.63	1568/1586	2.63	4.49	4.43	4.42	2.63	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	3	12	4.69	1047/1585	4.69	4.84	4.69	4.66	4.69	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	3	4	2	3	4	3.06	1498/1582	3.06	4.40	4.26	4.26	3.06	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	3	3	3	3	4	3.13	1470/1575	3.13	4.46	4.27	4.25	3.13	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	7	5	1	0	2	1	2.22	1349/1380	2.22	3.80	3.94	4.01	2.22	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	2	5	2	5	3.53	1157/1520	3.53	4.23	4.01	4.09	3.53	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	1	3	11	4.67	483/1515	4.67	4.50	4.24	4.32	4.67	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	2	1	3	9	4.27	886/1511	4.27	4.49	4.27	4.34	4.27	
4. Were special techniques successful	1	5	1	0	3	4	2	3.60	699/ 994	3.60	3.97	3.94	3.96	3.60	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99 1	A 11	Required for Majors 1	Graduate 0 Major 12
28-55	1	1.00-1.99 0	B 3		
56-83	4	2.00-2.99 1	C 0	General 4	Under-grad 16 Non-major 4
84-150	4	3.00-3.49 2	D 0		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 9	F 0	Electives 4	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 7	
			? 0		

Course-Section: POLI 385 0101
 Title INTERNATIONAL SECURITY
 Instructor: HAGERTY, DEVIN
 Enrollment: 40
 Questionnaires: 22

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 1368
 JAN 21, 2006
 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	1	5	16	4.68	380/1674	4.68	4.44	4.27	4.26	4.68	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	8	12	4.45	657/1674	4.45	4.23	4.23	4.21	4.45	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	5	15	4.55	528/1423	4.55	4.41	4.27	4.27	4.55	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	4	0	2	3	4	9	4.11	1018/1609	4.11	4.28	4.22	4.27	4.11	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	1	7	5	8	3.82	996/1585	3.82	4.27	3.96	3.95	3.82	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	2	2	6	10	4.20	737/1535	4.20	4.17	4.08	4.15	4.20	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	1	2	3	15	4.36	727/1651	4.36	4.27	4.18	4.16	4.36	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	4	17	1	3.86	1628/1673	3.86	4.58	4.69	4.68	3.86	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	0	1	2	14	4.76	178/1656	4.76	4.20	4.07	4.07	4.76	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	1	2	18	4.81	389/1586	4.81	4.49	4.43	4.42	4.81	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	1	1	19	4.86	689/1585	4.86	4.84	4.69	4.66	4.86	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	1	3	17	4.76	299/1582	4.76	4.40	4.26	4.26	4.76	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	3	17	4.85	225/1575	4.85	4.46	4.27	4.25	4.85	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	13	1	1	2	0	4	3.63	986/1380	3.63	3.80	3.94	4.01	3.63	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	3	4	10	4.41	500/1520	4.41	4.23	4.01	4.09	4.41	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	0	1	3	13	4.71	444/1515	4.71	4.50	4.24	4.32	4.71	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	0	0	2	15	4.88	266/1511	4.88	4.49	4.27	4.34	4.88	
4. Were special techniques successful	5	12	2	1	0	0	2	2.80	****/ 994	****	3.97	3.94	3.96	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	20	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 265	****	****	4.23	4.26	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	20	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 278	****	****	4.19	4.24	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	20	1	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 260	****	****	4.46	4.49	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	20	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 103	****	5.00	4.41	4.10	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	20	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 101	****	5.00	4.48	4.30	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	20	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 95	****	5.00	4.31	3.91	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	20	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 99	****	5.00	4.39	4.29	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	20	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 97	****	4.33	4.14	3.48	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	21	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 76	****	5.00	3.98	4.03	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	21	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 77	****	5.00	3.93	3.70	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 53	****	5.00	4.45	3.87	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 48	****	5.00	4.12	3.67	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	21	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 49	****	5.00	4.27	3.27	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 61	****	5.00	4.09	3.20	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 52	****	5.00	4.26	3.50	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	21	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 50	****	5.00	4.44	3.82	****	

Course-Section: POLI 385 0101
 Title INTERNATIONAL SECURITY
 Instructor: HAGERTY, DEVIN
 Enrollment: 40
 Questionnaires: 22

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 1368
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	5	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	19
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	11						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	1	C	0	General	4	Under-grad	22	Non-major	3
84-150	12	3.00-3.49	5	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	8	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	15				
				?	0						

Course-Section: POLI 409A 0101
 Title: MOCK TRIAL
 Instructor: DAVIS, JEFFREY
 Enrollment: 23
 Questionnaires: 18

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 1369
 JAN 21, 2006
 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	5	13	4.72	331/1674	4.72	4.44	4.27	4.42	4.72	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	6	12	4.67	379/1674	4.67	4.23	4.23	4.31	4.67	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	1	3	13	4.71	322/1423	4.71	4.41	4.27	4.34	4.71	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	7	11	4.61	363/1609	4.61	4.28	4.22	4.30	4.61	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	5	12	4.61	258/1585	4.61	4.27	3.96	4.01	4.61	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	5	13	4.72	192/1535	4.72	4.17	4.08	4.18	4.72	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	0	2	4	11	4.33	768/1651	4.33	4.27	4.18	4.23	4.33	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	1	13	4	4.17	1484/1673	4.17	4.58	4.69	4.67	4.17	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	1	0	0	0	4	9	4.69	230/1656	4.69	4.20	4.07	4.19	4.69	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	3	14	4.72	560/1586	4.72	4.49	4.43	4.46	4.72	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	3	15	4.83	737/1585	4.83	4.84	4.69	4.76	4.83	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	4	13	4.67	438/1582	4.67	4.40	4.26	4.31	4.67	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	16	4.89	192/1575	4.89	4.46	4.27	4.35	4.89	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	9	0	1	1	0	6	4.38	399/1380	4.38	3.80	3.94	4.04	4.38	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	1	13	4.93	107/1520	4.93	4.23	4.01	4.18	4.93	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	0	0	2	12	4.86	266/1515	4.86	4.50	4.24	4.40	4.86	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	0	0	2	12	4.86	301/1511	4.86	4.49	4.27	4.45	4.86	
4. Were special techniques successful	4	2	0	0	1	4	7	4.50	205/ 994	4.50	3.97	3.94	4.19	4.50	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 103	****	5.00	4.41	4.42	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 101	****	5.00	4.48	4.65	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 95	****	5.00	4.31	4.60	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 99	****	5.00	4.39	4.57	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 97	****	4.33	4.14	4.46	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	A 12	Required for Majors	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	B 3		Graduate 0
56-83	5	2.00-2.99	C 0	General	4
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad 18
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	11
			? 1		

Course-Section: POLI 433 0101
 Title FIRST AMENDMENT FREEDO
 Instructor: L'ANOUE, GEORGE
 Enrollment: 33
 Questionnaires: 24

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 1370
 JAN 21, 2006
 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	3	21	4.88	176/1674	4.88	4.44	4.27	4.42	4.88	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	7	16	4.63	433/1674	4.63	4.23	4.23	4.31	4.63	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	8	15	4.58	482/1423	4.58	4.41	4.27	4.34	4.58	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	10	13	4.50	490/1609	4.50	4.28	4.22	4.30	4.50	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	0	3	20	4.75	167/1585	4.75	4.27	3.96	4.01	4.75	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	3	0	0	1	7	13	4.57	310/1535	4.57	4.17	4.08	4.18	4.57	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	6	17	4.67	330/1651	4.67	4.27	4.18	4.23	4.67	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	1	0	0	0	0	23	5.00	1/1673	5.00	4.58	4.69	4.67	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	0	8	12	4.60	310/1656	4.60	4.20	4.07	4.19	4.60	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	3	20	4.87	284/1586	4.87	4.49	4.43	4.46	4.87	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	23	5.00	1/1585	5.00	4.84	4.69	4.76	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	1	7	14	4.59	535/1582	4.59	4.40	4.26	4.31	4.59	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	5	17	4.70	453/1575	4.70	4.46	4.27	4.35	4.70	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	10	2	2	3	2	4	3.31	1142/1380	3.31	3.80	3.94	4.04	3.31	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	9	13	4.52	385/1520	4.52	4.23	4.01	4.18	4.52	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	0	4	19	4.83	301/1515	4.83	4.50	4.24	4.40	4.83	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	1	0	3	19	4.74	436/1511	4.74	4.49	4.27	4.45	4.74	
4. Were special techniques successful	1	3	0	1	2	3	14	4.50	205/ 994	4.50	3.97	3.94	4.19	4.50	
Laboratory															
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	23	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 278	****	****	4.19	4.21	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	23	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 103	****	5.00	4.41	4.42	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	23	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 101	****	5.00	4.48	4.65	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	23	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 95	****	5.00	4.31	4.60	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	23	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 99	****	5.00	4.39	4.57	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	23	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 97	****	4.33	4.14	4.46	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	23	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 76	****	5.00	3.98	4.86	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	23	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 77	****	5.00	3.93	4.24	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	23	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 53	****	5.00	4.45	4.86	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	23	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 48	****	5.00	4.12	4.13	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	23	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 61	****	5.00	4.09	5.00	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	23	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 52	****	5.00	4.26	5.00	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	23	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 50	****	5.00	4.44	5.00	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	23	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 35	****	5.00	4.36	5.00	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	23	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 31	****	5.00	4.34	5.00	****	

Course-Section: POLI 433 0101
 Title FIRST AMENDMENT FREEDO
 Instructor: LANOUE, GEORGE
 Enrollment: 33
 Questionnaires: 24

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 1370
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	12	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	19
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	8						
56-83	5	2.00-2.99	2	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	24	Non-major	5
84-150	11	3.00-3.49	5	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	10	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	22				
				?	3						

Course-Section: POLI 435 0101
 Title LEGAL REASONING
 Instructor: BARNER-BARRY, C
 Enrollment: 15
 Questionnaires: 13

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 1371
 JAN 21, 2006
 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	1	0	0	0	2	0	10	4.67	406/1674	4.67	4.44	4.27	4.42	4.67	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	4	8	4.54	542/1674	4.54	4.23	4.23	4.31	4.54	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	0	2	9	4.82	195/1423	4.82	4.41	4.27	4.34	4.82	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	1	3	8	4.58	397/1609	4.58	4.28	4.22	4.30	4.58	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	2	10	4.69	204/1585	4.69	4.27	3.96	4.01	4.69	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	2	10	4.69	215/1535	4.69	4.17	4.08	4.18	4.69	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	2	0	10	4.46	583/1651	4.46	4.27	4.18	4.23	4.46	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	3	10	4.77	944/1673	4.77	4.58	4.69	4.67	4.77	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	1	0	6	3	4.10	894/1656	4.10	4.20	4.07	4.19	4.10	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	9	0	1	0	1	0	2	3.50	1480/1586	3.50	4.49	4.43	4.46	3.50	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	10	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/1585	****	4.84	4.69	4.76	****	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	9	0	0	2	0	0	2	3.50	1406/1582	3.50	4.40	4.26	4.31	3.50	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	1	0	0	2	4.00	****/1575	****	4.46	4.27	4.35	****	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	7	3	2	0	0	0	1	2.33	****/1380	****	3.80	3.94	4.04	****	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	12	4.92	107/1520	4.92	4.23	4.01	4.18	4.92	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	2	11	4.85	277/1515	4.85	4.50	4.24	4.40	4.85	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	1	12	4.92	195/1511	4.92	4.49	4.27	4.45	4.92	
4. Were special techniques successful	1	1	0	0	2	0	9	4.64	157/ 994	4.64	3.97	3.94	4.19	4.64	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	1	0.00-0.99 0	A 9	Required for Majors	1
28-55	0	1.00-1.99 0	B 2		Graduate 0
56-83	1	2.00-2.99 1	C 1	General	13
84-150	9	3.00-3.49 4	D 0		Non-major 5
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 4	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	10
			? 0		

Course-Section: POLI 445 0101
 Title LAW/POLITICS/AMER EDUC
 Instructor: LANOUE, GEORGE
 Enrollment: 15
 Questionnaires: 14

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 1372
 JAN 21, 2006
 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	1	0	0	0	2	5	6	4.31	891/1674	4.31	4.44	4.27	4.42	4.31	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	2	6	5	4.23	956/1674	4.23	4.23	4.23	4.31	4.23	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	11	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/1423	****	4.41	4.27	4.34	****	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	1	0	0	1	6	5	4.33	743/1609	4.33	4.28	4.22	4.30	4.33	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	7	5	4.31	512/1585	4.31	4.27	3.96	4.01	4.31	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	2	4	6	4.15	777/1535	4.15	4.17	4.08	4.18	4.15	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	1	1	2	2	3	4	3.58	1410/1651	3.58	4.27	4.18	4.23	3.58	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	2	11	4.85	814/1673	4.85	4.58	4.69	4.67	4.85	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	1	7	5	4.31	655/1656	4.31	4.20	4.07	4.19	4.31	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	4	9	4.69	618/1586	4.69	4.49	4.43	4.46	4.69	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	1	12	4.92	453/1585	4.92	4.84	4.69	4.76	4.92	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	5	8	4.62	510/1582	4.62	4.40	4.26	4.31	4.62	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	5	8	4.62	565/1575	4.62	4.46	4.27	4.35	4.62	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	3	1	2	2	3	2	3.30	1142/1380	3.30	3.80	3.94	4.04	3.30	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	1	1	6	4.63	323/1520	4.63	4.23	4.01	4.18	4.63	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	242/1515	4.88	4.50	4.24	4.40	4.88	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	414/1511	4.75	4.49	4.27	4.45	4.75	
4. Were special techniques successful	6	0	0	0	1	2	5	4.50	205/ 994	4.50	3.97	3.94	4.19	4.50	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 103	****	5.00	4.41	4.42	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	12	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 101	****	5.00	4.48	4.65	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 95	****	5.00	4.31	4.60	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 99	****	5.00	4.39	4.57	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	12	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 97	****	4.33	4.14	4.46	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	A	6	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	1	Major	6
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	4						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	3	Under-grad	13	Non-major	8
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	6	D	0						
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00	5	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	9				
				?	2						

Course-Section: POLI 446 0101
 Title THE POLITICS OF POVERT
 Instructor: MILLER, CHERYL
 Enrollment: 14
 Questionnaires: 11

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 1373
 JAN 21, 2006
 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	6	5	4.45	687/1674	4.45	4.44	4.27	4.42	4.45	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	6	3	4.09	1083/1674	4.09	4.23	4.23	4.31	4.09	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	8	3	4.27	828/1423	4.27	4.41	4.27	4.34	4.27	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	7	3	4.30	786/1609	4.30	4.28	4.22	4.30	4.30	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	6	5	4.45	369/1585	4.45	4.27	3.96	4.01	4.45	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	6	4	4.27	643/1535	4.27	4.17	4.08	4.18	4.27	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	0	2	2	6	4.09	1037/1651	4.09	4.27	4.18	4.23	4.09	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1673	5.00	4.58	4.69	4.67	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	0	5	3	4.38	561/1656	4.38	4.20	4.07	4.19	4.38	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	214/1586	4.90	4.49	4.43	4.46	4.90	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1585	5.00	4.84	4.69	4.76	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	5	5	4.50	632/1582	4.50	4.40	4.26	4.31	4.50	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	4	6	4.60	579/1575	4.60	4.46	4.27	4.35	4.60	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	2	1	1	2	2	1	3.14	1196/1380	3.14	3.80	3.94	4.04	3.14	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	5	2	4.29	616/1520	4.29	4.23	4.01	4.18	4.29	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	266/1515	4.86	4.50	4.24	4.40	4.86	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	458/1511	4.71	4.49	4.27	4.45	4.71	
4. Were special techniques successful	4	2	0	2	2	1	0	2.80	937/ 994	2.80	3.97	3.94	4.19	2.80	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 4	Required for Majors	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	B 5		Graduate 0
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	C 0	General	11
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	D 0		Non-major 4
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	9
			? 0		

Course-Section: POLI 469A 0101
 Title: COMPARATIVE JUSTICE
 Instructor: DAVIS, JEFFREY
 Enrollment: 21
 Questionnaires: 14

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 1374
 JAN 21, 2006
 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	1	3	10	4.64	432/1674	4.64	4.44	4.27	4.42	4.64	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	0	7	6	4.29	894/1674	4.29	4.23	4.23	4.31	4.29	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	1	12	4.79	226/1423	4.79	4.41	4.27	4.34	4.79	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	1	0	6	6	4.31	786/1609	4.31	4.28	4.22	4.30	4.31	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	6	7	4.43	395/1585	4.43	4.27	3.96	4.01	4.43	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	3	6	5	4.14	787/1535	4.14	4.17	4.08	4.18	4.14	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	3	10	4.64	351/1651	4.64	4.27	4.18	4.23	4.64	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	13	4.93	565/1673	4.93	4.58	4.69	4.67	4.93	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	1	6	5	4.33	615/1656	4.33	4.20	4.07	4.19	4.33	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	2	11	4.71	581/1586	4.71	4.49	4.43	4.46	4.71	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	14	5.00	1/1585	5.00	4.84	4.69	4.76	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	2	3	9	4.50	632/1582	4.50	4.40	4.26	4.31	4.50	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	2	11	4.71	423/1575	4.71	4.46	4.27	4.35	4.71	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	1	0	0	1	3	9	4.62	234/1380	4.62	3.80	3.94	4.04	4.62	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	1	0	4	4	4.22	673/1520	4.22	4.23	4.01	4.18	4.22	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1515	5.00	4.50	4.24	4.40	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1511	5.00	4.49	4.27	4.45	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	5	7	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 994	****	3.97	3.94	4.19	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 103	****	5.00	4.41	4.42	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 101	****	5.00	4.48	4.65	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 95	****	5.00	4.31	4.60	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 99	****	5.00	4.39	4.57	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 97	****	4.33	4.14	4.46	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 6	Required for Majors	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	B 4		Graduate 0
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	C 1	General	2
84-150	6	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad 14
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	10
			? 0		

Course-Section: POLI 469B 0101
 Title DEMOCRATIC CONSOL AFRI
 Instructor: KING-MEADOWS, T
 Enrollment: 13
 Questionnaires: 10

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 1375
 JAN 21, 2006
 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	3	7	4.70	367/1674	4.70	4.44	4.27	4.42	4.70	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	4	6	4.60	460/1674	4.60	4.23	4.23	4.31	4.60	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	8	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/1423	****	4.41	4.27	4.34	****	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	1	1	7	4.67	312/1609	4.67	4.28	4.22	4.30	4.67	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	3	7	4.70	204/1585	4.70	4.27	3.96	4.01	4.70	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	1	0	0	0	3	5	4.63	268/1535	4.63	4.17	4.08	4.18	4.63	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	0	0	1	1	7	4.67	330/1651	4.67	4.27	4.18	4.23	4.67	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	5	5	4.50	1203/1673	4.50	4.58	4.69	4.67	4.50	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	1	0	2	5	4.38	561/1656	4.38	4.20	4.07	4.19	4.38	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	389/1586	4.80	4.49	4.43	4.46	4.80	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	567/1585	4.90	4.84	4.69	4.76	4.90	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	246/1582	4.80	4.40	4.26	4.31	4.80	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	279/1575	4.80	4.46	4.27	4.35	4.80	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	4	2	1	1	2	0	2.50	1324/1380	2.50	3.80	3.94	4.04	2.50	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	0	0	1	6	4.38	537/1520	4.38	4.23	4.01	4.18	4.38	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	242/1515	4.88	4.50	4.24	4.40	4.88	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	414/1511	4.75	4.49	4.27	4.45	4.75	
4. Were special techniques successful	2	6	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/ 994	****	3.97	3.94	4.19	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	1	0.00-0.99 0	A 4	Required for Majors	1 Graduate 0 Major 8
28-55	0	1.00-1.99 0	B 3		
56-83	0	2.00-2.99 0	C 0	General	0 Under-grad 10 Non-major 2
84-150	5	3.00-3.49 2	D 0		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 5	F 0	Electives	1 #### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 0		
			I 0	Other	6
			? 1		

Course-Section: POLI 473 0101
 Title GANHI POL EXPMT TRUTH
 Instructor: LEVY, HAROLD L
 Enrollment: 10
 Questionnaires: 3

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 1376
 JAN 21, 2006
 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	0	3	5.00	1/1674	5.00	4.44	4.27	4.42	5.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	830/1674	4.33	4.23	4.23	4.31	4.33	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1423	5.00	4.41	4.27	4.34	5.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	312/1609	4.67	4.28	4.22	4.30	4.67	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1585	5.00	4.27	3.96	4.01	5.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1535	5.00	4.17	4.08	4.18	5.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	768/1651	4.33	4.27	4.18	4.23	4.33	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1673	5.00	4.58	4.69	4.67	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1656	5.00	4.20	4.07	4.19	5.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1586	5.00	4.49	4.43	4.46	5.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1585	5.00	4.84	4.69	4.76	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1582	5.00	4.40	4.26	4.31	5.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	495/1575	4.67	4.46	4.27	4.35	4.67	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1380	5.00	3.80	3.94	4.04	5.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	295/1520	4.67	4.23	4.01	4.18	4.67	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1515	5.00	4.50	4.24	4.40	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1511	5.00	4.49	4.27	4.45	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	0	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 994	5.00	3.97	3.94	4.19	5.00	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/ 103	5.00	5.00	4.41	4.42	5.00	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/ 101	5.00	5.00	4.48	4.65	5.00	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/ 95	5.00	5.00	4.31	4.60	5.00	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/ 99	5.00	5.00	4.39	4.57	5.00	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	0	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	44/ 97	4.33	4.33	4.14	4.46	4.33	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 76	5.00	5.00	3.98	4.86	5.00	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 77	5.00	5.00	3.93	4.24	5.00	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 53	5.00	5.00	4.45	4.86	5.00	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 48	5.00	5.00	4.12	4.13	5.00	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 49	5.00	5.00	4.27	4.48	5.00	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 61	5.00	5.00	4.09	5.00	5.00	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 52	5.00	5.00	4.26	5.00	5.00	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 50	5.00	5.00	4.44	5.00	5.00	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 35	5.00	5.00	4.36	5.00	5.00	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 31	5.00	5.00	4.34	5.00	5.00	

Frequency Distribution

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

P	0			responses to be significant
I	0	Other	2	
?	1			

Course-Section: POLI 482 0101
 Title INTERNATIONAL LAW
 Instructor: MELCAVAGE, EUGE
 Enrollment: 22
 Questionnaires: 17

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 1377
 JAN 21, 2006
 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	2	3	12	4.59	509/1674	4.59	4.44	4.27	4.42	4.59	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	6	8	4.29	882/1674	4.29	4.23	4.23	4.31	4.29	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	9	8	4.47	611/1423	4.47	4.41	4.27	4.34	4.47	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	7	7	4.18	952/1609	4.18	4.28	4.22	4.30	4.18	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	1	4	5	6	3.82	986/1585	3.82	4.27	3.96	4.01	3.82	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	2	5	6	3	3.63	1229/1535	3.63	4.17	4.08	4.18	3.63	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	2	4	11	4.53	497/1651	4.53	4.27	4.18	4.23	4.53	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	16	4.94	424/1673	4.94	4.58	4.69	4.67	4.94	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	5	5	7	4.12	882/1656	4.12	4.20	4.07	4.19	4.12	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	4	13	4.76	474/1586	4.76	4.49	4.43	4.46	4.76	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	3	13	4.71	1024/1585	4.71	4.84	4.69	4.76	4.71	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	2	8	7	4.29	892/1582	4.29	4.40	4.26	4.31	4.29	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	4	11	4.53	669/1575	4.53	4.46	4.27	4.35	4.53	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	13	1	1	2	0	0	2.25	****/1380	****	3.80	3.94	4.04	****	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	5	3	3	3.82	979/1520	3.82	4.23	4.01	4.18	3.82	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	0	2	2	7	4.45	694/1515	4.45	4.50	4.24	4.40	4.45	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	0	0	2	3	6	4.36	788/1511	4.36	4.49	4.27	4.45	4.36	
4. Were special techniques successful	6	8	1	1	0	1	0	2.33	****/ 994	****	3.97	3.94	4.19	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	16	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 265	****	****	4.23	4.53	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	16	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 278	****	****	4.19	4.21	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	16	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 259	****	****	4.33	4.31	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	16	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 233	****	****	4.20	4.10	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 103	****	5.00	4.41	4.42	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	16	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 101	****	5.00	4.48	4.65	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 95	****	5.00	4.31	4.60	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 99	****	5.00	4.39	4.57	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	16	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 97	****	4.33	4.14	4.46	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 76	****	5.00	3.98	4.86	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	16	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 77	****	5.00	3.93	4.24	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	16	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 53	****	5.00	4.45	4.86	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	16	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 48	****	5.00	4.12	4.13	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	16	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 49	****	5.00	4.27	4.48	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 61	****	5.00	4.09	5.00	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	16	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 52	****	5.00	4.26	5.00	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	16	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 50	****	5.00	4.44	5.00	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	16	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 35	****	5.00	4.36	5.00	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	16	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 31	****	5.00	4.34	5.00	****	

Course-Section: POLI 482 0101
 Title INTERNATIONAL LAW
 Instructor: MELCAVAGE, EUGE
 Enrollment: 22
 Questionnaires: 17

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 1377
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	9	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	16
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	5						
56-83	8	2.00-2.99	4	C	2	General	3	Under-grad	17	Non-major	1
84-150	6	3.00-3.49	5	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	6	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	13				
				?	1						

Course-Section: POLI 489 0101
 Title SEL TOPICS:INTERNATL R
 Instructor: MIKHAIL, NABIL
 Enrollment: 23
 Questionnaires: 19

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 1378
 JAN 21, 2006
 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	2	6	11	4.47	655/1674	4.47	4.44	4.27	4.42	4.47	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	5	11	4.42	705/1674	4.42	4.23	4.23	4.31	4.42	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	4	13	4.58	493/1423	4.58	4.41	4.27	4.34	4.58	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	3	5	9	4.35	715/1609	4.35	4.28	4.22	4.30	4.35	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	4	4	10	4.21	593/1585	4.21	4.27	3.96	4.01	4.21	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	4	0	0	1	5	9	4.53	346/1535	4.53	4.17	4.08	4.18	4.53	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	3	4	12	4.47	568/1651	4.47	4.27	4.18	4.23	4.47	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	14	5	4.26	1412/1673	4.26	4.58	4.69	4.67	4.26	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	5	3	9	4.24	744/1656	4.24	4.20	4.07	4.19	4.24	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	1	6	2	10	4.11	1250/1586	4.11	4.49	4.43	4.46	4.11	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	3	16	4.84	713/1585	4.84	4.84	4.69	4.76	4.84	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	1	0	4	13	4.61	510/1582	4.61	4.40	4.26	4.31	4.61	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	1	3	14	4.58	612/1575	4.58	4.46	4.27	4.35	4.58	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	13	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	200/1380	4.67	3.80	3.94	4.04	4.67	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	1	0	2	10	4.62	330/1520	4.62	4.23	4.01	4.18	4.62	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	1	0	1	0	11	4.54	603/1515	4.54	4.50	4.24	4.40	4.54	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	0	1	0	0	12	4.77	402/1511	4.77	4.49	4.27	4.45	4.77	
4. Were special techniques successful	6	8	1	0	0	3	1	3.60	699/ 994	3.60	3.97	3.94	4.19	3.60	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 265	****	****	4.23	4.53	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 278	****	****	4.19	4.21	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 260	****	****	4.46	4.24	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 259	****	****	4.33	4.31	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 233	****	****	4.20	4.10	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 13	Required for Majors	1
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	B 4		Graduate 0
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	C 0	General	5
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad 19
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	2
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	12
			? 1		

Course-Section: POLI 623 0101
 Title GOVERNMENTAL BUDGETING
 Instructor: MEYERS, ROY T.
 Enrollment: 15
 Questionnaires: 12

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 1379
 JAN 21, 2006
 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	5	7	4.58	509/1674	4.58	4.44	4.27	4.44	4.58	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	6	6	4.50	578/1674	4.50	4.23	4.23	4.34	4.50	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	11	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1423	****	4.41	4.27	4.28	****	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	1	4	6	4.45	567/1609	4.45	4.28	4.22	4.34	4.45	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	5	7	4.58	277/1585	4.58	4.27	3.96	4.23	4.58	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	4	8	4.67	238/1535	4.67	4.17	4.08	4.27	4.67	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	2	3	7	4.42	658/1651	4.42	4.27	4.18	4.32	4.42	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	2	10	4.83	832/1673	4.83	4.58	4.69	4.78	4.83	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	0	5	5	4.50	381/1656	4.50	4.20	4.07	4.15	4.50	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	4	8	4.67	663/1586	4.67	4.49	4.43	4.50	4.67	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	1	10	4.75	917/1585	4.75	4.84	4.69	4.79	4.75	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	6	5	4.45	704/1582	4.45	4.40	4.26	4.33	4.45	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	5	6	4.55	646/1575	4.55	4.46	4.27	4.30	4.55	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	4	1	1	0	1	4	3.86	831/1380	3.86	3.80	3.94	3.85	3.86	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	1	9	4.58	349/1520	4.58	4.23	4.01	4.19	4.58	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	2	10	4.83	289/1515	4.83	4.50	4.24	4.47	4.83	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	4	8	4.67	507/1511	4.67	4.49	4.27	4.49	4.67	
4. Were special techniques successful	0	5	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	131/ 994	4.71	3.97	3.94	4.07	4.71	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	1	A	9	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	9	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	3						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	3	Under-grad	3	Non-major	12
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	9	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	9				
				?	0						

Course-Section: POLI 648 0101
 Title URBAN POLITICS
 Instructor: NORRIS, DONALD
 Enrollment: 8
 Questionnaires: 8

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 1380
 JAN 21, 2006
 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	7	4.88	176/1674	4.88	4.44	4.27	4.44	4.88	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	0	2	5	4.38	776/1674	4.38	4.23	4.23	4.34	4.38	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	262/1423	4.75	4.41	4.27	4.28	4.75	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	4	3	4.43	614/1609	4.43	4.28	4.22	4.34	4.43	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	167/1585	4.75	4.27	3.96	4.23	4.75	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	4	4	4.50	373/1535	4.50	4.17	4.08	4.27	4.50	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	231/1651	4.75	4.27	4.18	4.32	4.75	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	760/1673	4.88	4.58	4.69	4.78	4.88	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	4	3	4.43	493/1656	4.43	4.20	4.07	4.15	4.43	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	496/1586	4.75	4.49	4.43	4.50	4.75	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1585	5.00	4.84	4.69	4.79	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	313/1582	4.75	4.40	4.26	4.33	4.75	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	359/1575	4.75	4.46	4.27	4.30	4.75	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	4	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	489/1380	4.25	3.80	3.94	3.85	4.25	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	355/1520	4.57	4.23	4.01	4.19	4.57	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	266/1515	4.86	4.50	4.24	4.47	4.86	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	586/1511	4.57	4.49	4.27	4.49	4.57	
4. Were special techniques successful	1	4	0	0	2	0	1	3.67	676/ 994	3.67	3.97	3.94	4.07	3.67	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 103	****	5.00	4.41	4.56	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	7	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 101	****	5.00	4.48	4.62	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 95	****	5.00	4.31	4.43	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 99	****	5.00	4.39	4.54	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	7	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 97	****	4.33	4.14	4.26	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	6	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	5	Major	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	1						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	1	General	2	Under-grad	3	Non-major	8
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	5	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	6				
				?	0						