AMER GOVT & POLITICS

Title

CROATTI, MARK Instructor:

Enrollment: 39 Questionnaires: 39

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

University of Maryland Page 1349 Baltimore County JAN 18, 2007 Job IRBR3029 Fall 2006

			Questions		NR	NA	Fi 1	reque: 2	ncies 3	s 4	5	Ins Mean	tructor Rank	Course Mean	_	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			 General															
1. Di	d you	gain n		s from this course	7	0	1	4	3	6	18	4.13	1077/1669	4.34	4.46	4.23	4.02	4.13
				the expected goals	7	0	3	2	9	8	10	3.63	1417/1666	3.82	4.26	4.19	4.11	3.63
				the expected goals	7	0	3	2	9	7	11	3.66	1170/1421	3.88	4.41	4.24	4.11	3.66
4. Di	d oth	er eval	uations reflect t	the expected goals	8	3	2	3	7	5	11	3.71	1273/1617	4.04	4.27	4.15	3.99	3.71
5. Di	d ass	igned r	eadings contribut	te to what you learned	1 7	1	3	4	6	6	12	3.65	1148/1555	4.15	4.38	4.00	3.92	3.65
6. Di	d wri	tten as:	signments contrib	oute to what you learr	ned 9	4	3	4	6	7	6	3.35	1319/1543	3.87	4.27	4.06	3.86	3.35
7. Wa	s the	grading	g system clearly	explained	8	0	3	4	1	7	16	3.94	1125/1647	4.25	4.25	4.12	4.06	3.94
8. Ho	w man	y times	was class cancel	lled	7	1	0	0	0	2	29	4.94	499/1668	4.59	4.42	4.67	4.62	4.94
9. Ho	w wou	ld you	grade the overall	teaching effectivene	ess 10	1	0	3	8	8	9	3.82	1156/1605	3.94	4.25	4.07	3.96	3.82
			Lecture															
			uctor's lectures		8	0	1	1	4	11	14		1136/1514		4.62	4.39	4.32	4.16
				sted in the subject	8	0	0	0	1	3	27	4.84	705/1551		4.87	4.66	4.55	4.84
			_	and explained clearly		0	0	3	4	7	16	4.20	932/1503		4.46	4.24	4.17	4.20
				what you learned	8	0	1	3	5	8	14		1069/1506		4.49	4.26	4.17	4.00
5. Di	.d aud	iovisua	l techniques enha	ance your understandir	ng 8	9	3	0	4	3	12	3.95	643/1311	2.99	3.77	3.85	3.68	3.95
1 - '		2.	Discussi			6	_		_	_		2 65	1000/1100	4 00	4 22	4 0=	2 0=	2 65
				te to what you learned		0	3	2	5	7	9		1093/1490		4.33	4.05	3.85	3.65
			nts actively enco		0	4	1	1	5	15		1013/1502		4.60	4.26	4.06	4.00	
			ctor encourage fa		0	3	2	0	8	13		1038/1489		4.61	4.29	4.07	4.00	
4. We	ere sp	ecial to	echniques success	stul	12	15	3	0	2	3	4	3.42	804/1006	3.86	3.98	4.00	3.81	3.42
2. We	ere yo	u provi	Laborato ded with adequate	ory e background informati	lon 37	0	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/ 233	****	****	4.19	4.09	****
			Seminar															
1. We	re as	signed		to the announced theme	37	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 112	****	4.80	4.38	4.04	****
				or individual attention		0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 97	****	4.60	4.36	4.19	****
3. Di	d res	earch p	rojects contribut	te to what you learned	38	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 92	****	4.60	4.22	3.79	****
4. Di	d pre	sentati	ons contribute to	what you learned	38	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 105	****	4.20	4.20	3.94	****
5. We	ere cr	iteria	for grading made	clear	38	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 98	****	3.80	3.95	3.90	****
			Field Wo	ork														
				e to what you learned	36	0	1	0	0	0	2	3.67	****/ 58	****	****	4.22	4.00	****
				evaluation criteria	37	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.06	3.81	****
			ctor available fo		37	1	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 39	****	****	4.39	4.30	****
		_	-	ss your evaluations	37	1	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 40		****	3.97	4.00	****
5. Di	.d con	ference	s help you carry	out field activities	37	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.33	4.30	****
				requency	/ Dis	strik	outio:	n										
	ts Ea		Cum. GPA	Expected Grad	les			Re	asons	5			Ту	pe			Majors	}
00-2	 !7	3	0.00-0.99	1 A 6		Re	 equir	red f	or Ma	 ajor	s 1	.3	 Graduat	 e	0	 Мајс	 or	4
28-5	55	1	1.00-1.99	0 B 17			-			-						,		
56-8	13	2	2.00-2.99	3 C 4		Ge	enera	al				4	Under-9	rad 3	39	Non-	-major	35
84-1	.50	2	3.00-3.49	3 D 1														
Grad	l.	0	3.50-4.00	2 F 0		E]	lecti	ives				0	#### -				_	ıh
				P 0 I 0									respons	es to b	oe sigr	nificar	ıt	
					Ot	her				1	.2							
				? 1														

Course Section: POLI 100 0201 Title

AMER GOVT & POLITICS

Instructor: MELCAVAGE, EUGE

Enrollment: 43 Questionnaires: 31 University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2006

Page 1350 JAN 18, 2007 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

			Fre	equer	ncies	5		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Ouestions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank		Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean

General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	2	2	5	22	4.52	578/1669	4.34	4.46	4.23	4.02	4.52
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	3	6	21	4.52	538/1666	3.82	4.26	4.19	4.11	4.52
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	0	0	6	24	4.68	380/1421	3.88	4.41	4.24	4.11	4.68
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	9	1	0	1	3	17	4.59	404/1617	4.04	4.27	4.15	3.99	4.59
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	2	1	6	5	15	4.03	753/1555	4.15	4.38	4.00	3.92	4.03
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	19	0	1	2	0	9	4.42	503/1543	3.87	4.27	4.06	3.86	4.42
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	2	3	25	4.68	292/1647	4.25	4.25	4.12	4.06	4.68
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	12	19		1115/1668	4.59	4.42	4.67	4.62	4.61
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	10	1	0	1	2	6	11	4.35	565/1605		4.25	4.07	3.96	4.35
7. now would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	10	_	U	_	2	O		1.33	303/1003	3.71	1.23	1.07	3.70	1.33
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	1	0	0	0	29	4.87	257/1514	4.62	4.62	4.39	4.32	4.87
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	1	0	0	29	4.90	512/1551	4.91	4.87	4.66	4.55	4.90
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	2	4	24	4.73	300/1503	4.16	4.46	4.24	4.17	4.73
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	2	0	2	26	4.73	380/1506	4.16		4.24	4.17	4.73
_											4.49			
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	16	4	4	3	1	2	2.50	1227/1311	2.99	3.77	3.85	3.68	2.50
~														
Discussion	-	0	-	-	-	_	1.0	1 16	400/1400	4 00	4 22	4 05	2 05	4 46
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	1	1	1	5	18	4.46	490/1490	4.03	4.33	4.05	3.85	4.46
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	0	3	4	19	4.62	531/1502	4.20	4.60	4.26	4.06	4.62
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	1	0	4	21	4.73	456/1489	4.32	4.61	4.29	4.07	4.73
4. Were special techniques successful	5	20	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	****/1006	3.86	3.98	4.00	3.81	****
Laboratory														
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	30	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 233	****	****	4.19	4.09	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	29	1	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 112	****	4.80	4.38	4.04	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	29	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 97	****	4.60	4.36	4.19	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	29	1	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 92	****	4.60	4.22	3.79	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	29	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 105	****	4.20	4.20	3.94	***
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	29	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 98	****	3.80	3.95	3.90	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	29	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 58	****	****	4.22	4.00	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	30	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.06	3.81	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	29	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.39	4.30	***
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	29	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 40	****	****	3.97	4.00	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	29	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.33	4.30	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	29	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 55	****	****	4.34	4.17	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	29	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 42	****	****	4.31	4.08	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	29	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 46	****	****	4.45	4.26	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	29	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 33	****	****	4.25	4.25	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	29	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 29	****	****	4.34	4.22	****
1 1 1 2 1 2 1 2 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1	-		-	-	-	-			,			· - -	· -	

Title AMER GOVT & POLITICS

Instructor: MELCAVAGE, EUGE

Enrollment: 43
Questionnaires: 31

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2006 Page 1350 JAN 18, 2007 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expecte	d Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors	
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	 А	12	Required for Majors	6	Graduate	0	Major	4
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	В	15						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	6	С	1	General	3	Under-grad	31	Non-major	27
84-150	7	3.00-3.49	6	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5	F	0	Electives	6	#### - Means	there	are not enough	ı
				P	1			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	15				
				?	1						

Title AMER GOVT & POLITICS

Instructor: KING-MEADOWS, T

Enrollment: 38
Questionnaires: 38

Fall 2006

Page 1351 JAN 18, 2007 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

University of Maryland

Baltimore County

			Fre	eque	ncie	s		Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	_			Mean
General				_					00-10-0					
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	14	0	0	0	3	10	11	4.33	,	4.34		4.23	4.02	4.33
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	14	0	2	1	6	10	5		1417/1666	3.82	4.26	4.19	4.11	3.63
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	14	0	0	5	5	7	7		1166/1421	3.88	4.41	4.24	4.11	3.67
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	14	0	2	0	8	5	9		1229/1617		4.27	4.15	3.99	3.79
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	3	5	16	4.54		4.15	4.38	4.00	3.92	4.54
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	13	0	1	1	7	10	6		1130/1543	3.87	4.27	4.06	3.86	3.76
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	14	0	0	1	3	12	8	4.13		4.25	4.25	4.12	4.06	4.13
8. How many times was class cancelled	14	0	0	0	0	19	5		1412/1668	4.59	4.42	4.67	4.62	4.21
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	16	0	1	1	5	10	5	3.77	1195/1605	3.94	4.25	4.07	3.96	3.77
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	14	0	0	0	0	3	21	4.88	240/1514	4.62	4.62	4.39	4.32	4.88
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	14	0	0	0	0	1	23	4.96	256/1551	4.91	4.87	4.66	4.55	4.96
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	14	0	0	1	7	9	7		1157/1503	4.16	4.46	4.24	4.17	3.92
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	2	7	15		604/1506	4.35	4.49	4.26	4.17	4.54
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	14	14	3	0	5	2	0		1213/1311				3.68	2.60
_, ,														
Discussion						_	_		0.40./4.400					
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	20	0	0	1	4	7	6	4.00	849/1490	4.03	4.33	4.05	3.85	4.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	21	0	0	2	5	4	6		1166/1502	4.20	4.60	4.26	4.06	3.82
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	20	0	0	1	1	6	10	4.39	818/1489	4.32	4.61	4.29	4.07	4.39
4. Were special techniques successful	20	2	0	0	3	5	8	4.31	354/1006	3.86	3.98	4.00	3.81	4.31
Laboratory														
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	37	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 233	****	****	4.19	4.09	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	36	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 112	****	4.80	4.38	4.04	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	37	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 97	****	4.60	4.36	4.19	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	37	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 92	****	4.60	4.22	3.79	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	37	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 105	****	4.20	4.20	3.94	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	37	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 98	****	3.80	3.95	3.90	****
7' 11 7 1														
Field Work			_											
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	37	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 58	****	****	4.22	4.00	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	37	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.06	3.81	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	37	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.39	4.30	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	37	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 40	****	****	3.97	4.00	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	37	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.33	4.30	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	37	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 55	****	****	4.34	4.17	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	37	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 42	****	****	4.31	4.08	***
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	37	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 46	****	****	4.45	4.26	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	37	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 33	***	****	4.25	4.25	****

Title AMER GOVT & POLITICS

Instructor: KING-MEADOWS, T

Enrollment: 38
Questionnaires: 38

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2006 Page 1351 JAN 18, 2007 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expecte	d Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	6	0.00-0.99	2	 А	2	Required for Majors	8	Graduate	0	Major	11
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	11						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	1	C	7	General	1	Under-grad	38	Non-major	27
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D	1						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	0	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	n
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	13	_			
				?	1						

Title AMER GOVT & POLITICS

Instructor: KING-MEADOWS, T

Enrollment: 44 Questionnaires: 44

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2006

Page 1352 JAN 18, 2007 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionna:	re
---------------------------------------	----

			Fre	equei	ncie	s		Ins	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank		_		Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	14	0	0	2	4	5	19	4.37	781/1669	4.34		4.23	4.02	4.37
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	14	0	2	4	6	12	6		1455/1666	3.82	4.26	4.19	4.11	3.53
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	14	0	2	3	8	12			1222/1421	3.88				3.50
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	14	1	0	2	4	13	10	4.07				4.15	3.99	4.07
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	14	0	1	0	3	9	17	4.37	469/1555		4.38	4.00	3.92	4.37
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	14	1	0	1	7	13	8	3.97	944/1543		4.27	4.06	3.86	3.97
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	14	0	1	0	3	12			851/1647	4.25	4.25	4.12		4.27
8. How many times was class cancelled	14	0	0	0	0	12	18		1125/1668		4.42	4.67		4.60
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	20	2	1	1	5	9	6	3.82	1164/1605	3.94	4.25	4.07	3.96	3.82
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	14	0	0	1	2	6	21	4.57	727/1514	4.62	4.62	4.39	4.32	4.57
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	14	0	0	0	0	2	28	4.93	358/1551	4.91	4.87	4.66	4.55	4.93
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	14	0	2	2	7	8	11	3.80	1210/1503	4.16	4.46	4.24	4.17	3.80
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	14	0	2	0	4	10	14	4.13	1002/1506	4.35	4.49	4.26	4.17	4.13
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	14	17	3	2	3	3	2	2.92	1151/1311	2.99	3.77	3.85	3.68	2.92
1, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,														
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	18	0	1	1	3	13	8	4.00	849/1490		4.33	4.05	3.85	4.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	18	0	0	1	3	8	14	4.35	809/1502	4.20	4.60	4.26	4.06	4.35
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	17	0	1	3	1	8		4.15	986/1489		4.61	4.29	4.07	
4. Were special techniques successful	17	5	1	2	4	7	8	3.86	621/1006	3.86	3.98	4.00	3.81	3.86
Laboratory														
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	43	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 233	****	****	4.19	4.09	****
1 1									,					
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	43	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 112	****	4.80	4.38	4.04	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	43	0	0	0	1	0	0		****/ 97	****	4.60	4.36	4.19	***
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	43	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 92	****	4.60	4.22	3.79	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	43	0	0	0	1	0	0		****/ 105	****	4.20	4.20	3.94	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	43	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 98	****	3.80	3.95	3.90	***
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	42	0	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/ 58	****	****	4.22	4.00	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	42	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.06	3.81	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	42	0	0	0	0	2	0		****/ 40	****	****	3.97	4.00	****
1. 11 115100 court for alboubb four confidence		·	J	ŭ	Ü	-	J	1.00	, 10			2.27	1.00	
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	42	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 55	****	****	4.34	4.17	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	42	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 42	****	****	4.31	4.08	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	42	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 46	****	****	4.45	4.26	****
Frequ	encv	Dist	rib	ution	า									

Credits E	Earned	Cum. GPA		Expecte	d Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors	
00-27	11	0.00-0.99	1	А	2	Required for Majors	5	Graduate	0	Major	13
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	В	10						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	1	С	7	General	3	Under-grad	44	Non-major	31
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	2	D	3						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F P	0 0	Electives	3	#### - Means responses to		are not enougl gnificant	n

I 0 ? 4 15 Other

Course Section: POLI 100H 0101 University of Maryland Baltimore County AMER GOVT/POLITICS-HON

Title Instructor: KING-MEADOWS, T Fall 2006

Enrollment: 5

84-150

Grad.

0

0

3.00-3.49

3.50-4.00

0

1

D

F

Ρ

I

0

0

0

0

1

Questionnaires: 5

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Page 1353

JAN 18, 2007

Job IRBR3029

- Means there are not enough

responses to be significant

							Fr	eque	ncies	3		Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
		Question	s		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		Genera	 1															
1. Did yo	ou gain n	ew insights,ski	lls fro	om this course	1	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	590/1669	4.50	4.46	4.23	4.02	4.50
2. Did th	ne instru	ctor make clear	the ex	spected goals	2	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	777/1666	4.33	4.26	4.19	4.11	4.33
3. Did th	ne exam q	uestions reflec	t the e	expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	280/1421	4.75	4.41	4.24	4.11	4.75
4. Did ot	ther eval	uations reflect	the ex	spected goals	1	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	496/1617	4.50	4.27	4.15	3.99	4.50
5. Did as	ssigned r	eadings contrib	ute to	what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	225/1555	4.67	4.38	4.00	3.92	4.67
6. Did wr	ritten as	signments contr	ibute t	to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	390/1543	4.50	4.27	4.06	3.86	4.50
7. Was th	ne gradin	g system clearly	y expla	ained	1	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	862/1647	4.25	4.25	4.12	4.06	4.25
8. How ma	any times	was class cance	elled		1	0	0	0	0	4	0	4.00	1530/1668	4.00	4.42	4.67	4.62	4.00
9. How wo	ould you	grade the overa	ll tead	ching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	1	2	0	3.67	1274/1605	3.67	4.25	4.07	3.96	3.67
		Lectur	e															
1. Were t	he instr	prepared	2	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1514	5.00	4.62	4.39	4.32	5.00		
		ctor seem inter			2	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1551	5.00	4.87	4.66	4.55	5.00
3. Was le	ecture ma	terial presente	d and e	explained clearly	3	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1503	5.00	4.46	4.24	4.17	5.00
4. Did th	ne lectur	es contribute to	o what	you learned	2	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	471/1506	4.67	4.49	4.26	4.17	4.67
		Discus	sion															
1. Did cl	lass disc	ussions contrib	ute to	what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	445/1490	4.50	4.33	4.05	3.85	4.50
2. Were a	all stude	nts actively en	courage	ed to participate	1	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	632/1502	4.50	4.60	4.26	4.06	4.50
		_	_	nd open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1489	5.00	4.61	4.29	4.07	5.00
4. Were s	special t	echniques succe	ssful	-	1	2	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	923/1006	3.00	3.98	4.00	3.81	3.00
				Frequ	iency	Dis	trib	utio	n									
Credits E	redits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grad							Rea	asons	5			Ту	pe			Majors	;
00-27				 Δ 1		 Re/		ed f	 or Ms	iore		1	Graduat		0	Majo		 1
28-55						1/6/	4urr	cu I	J_ 11C	. 101 2	,	_	Graduat	-	U	Ma J) <u>+</u>	Τ.
26-33 56-83	, T					Cor	nera	1				0	Under-g	rad	5	Non	-major	4
56-83							nera	т				U	onder-g	Lau	5	MOI1-	-ııa Jor	4

Electives

Other

1

2

Course Section: POLI 210 0101 University of Maryland Title POLITICAL PHILOSOPHY Baltimore County

Baltimore County Fall 2006

Instructor: STACEY, SIMON

Enrollment: 45
Ouestionnaires: 36

Student Course Evaluation Ouestionnaire

Page 1354

JAN 18, 2007

Job IRBR3029

Frequencies Instructor Course Dept UMBC Level Sect NR NA 1 2 3 4 5 Mean Ouestions Rank Mean Mean Mean Mean 1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course 3 0 1 2 2 11 17 4.24 926/1669 4.39 4.46 4.23 4.34 4.24 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals 3 0 1 0 6 10 16 4.21 935/1666 4.27 4.26 4.19 4.29 4.21 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals 3 1 0 0 2 8 22 4.63 441/1421 4.49 4.41 4.24 4.35 4.63 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals 3 6 1 2 4 8 12 4.04 1011/1617 4.30 4.27 4.15 4.24 4.04 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 4 0 0 2 2 8 20 4.44 408/1555 4.50 4.38 4.00 3.96 4.44 8 5 6 3.67 1195/1543 4.02 4.27 4.06 4.10 3.67 7. Was the grading system clearly explained 5 0 0 2 6 6 17 4.23 896/1647 4.34 4.25 4.12 4.19 4.23 8. How many times was class cancelled 5 0 0 0 0 22 9 4.29 1358/1668 4.28 4.42 4.67 4.59 4.29 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 7 1 0 0 2 13 13 4.39 512/1605 4.35 4.25 4.07 4.15 4.39 Lecture 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 4 0 0 Ω 0 3 29 4.91 189/1514 4.65 4.62 4.39 4.39 4.91 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 3 0 0 0 0 4 29 4.88 594/1551 4.85 4.87 4.66 4.72 4.88 4 0 0 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0 4 14 14 4.31 823/1503 4.37 4.46 4.24 4.29 4.31 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 3 0 0 0 2 7 24 4.67 471/1506 4.58 4.49 4.26 4.33 4.67 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 4 26 2 0 2 1 1 2.83 ****/1311 4.00 3.77 3.85 3.96 **** Discussion 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 11 0 1 3 7 12 4.08 816/1490 4.10 4.33 4.05 4.11 4.08 3 8 13 4.32 827/1502 4.41 4.60 4.26 4.31 4.32 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 11 0 0 1 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 11 0 0 0 3 7 15 4.48 707/1489 4.59 4.61 4.29 4.36 4.48 4. Were special techniques successful 11 19 0 1 2 1 2 3.67 ****/1006 3.55 3.98 4.00 3.99 **** Seminar 1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 35 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 112 **** 4.80 4.38 4.59 **** 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 97 **** 4.60 4.36 4.60 **** 2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 35 0 0 3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 35 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 92 **** 4.60 4.22 4.50 **** 5. Were criteria for grading made clear 35 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 98 **** 3.80 3.95 4.20 **** Frequency Distribution

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expecte	ed Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors	
00-27	4	0.00-0.99	2	А	10	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	16
28-55	5	1.00-1.99	0	В	16						
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	3	С	4	General	4	Under-grad	36	Non-major	20
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	7	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there a	are not enough	h
				P	0			responses to	be sign	nificant	
				I	0	Other	24	-	_		
				2	0						

Title POLITICAL PHILOSOPHY

Instructor: STACEY, SIMON

Enrollment: 49
Questionnaires: 19

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2006

Page 1355 JAN 18, 2007 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

			Fre	eaner	ncies	3		Inst	tructor	Course	Dept.	UMBC	Level	Sect
Ouestions	NR	NA	1	_	3	4	5	Mean	Rank		Mean			Mean

General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	1	3	5	10	4.26	901/1669	4.39	4.46	4.23	4.34	4.26
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	0	3	4	11	4.26	868/1666	4.27	4.26	4.19	4.29	4.26
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	5	12	4.47	594/1421	4.49	4.41	4.24	4.35	4.47
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	5	0	1	1	2	10	4.50	496/1617	4.30	4.27	4.15	4.24	4.50
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	1	3	14	4.53	324/1555	4.50	4.38	4.00	3.96	4.53
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	11	0	0	2	1	5	4.38	543/1543	4.02	4.27	4.06	4.10	4.38
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	4	1	13	4.37	713/1647	4.34	4.25	4.12	4.19	4.37
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	1	10	8	4.37	1305/1668	4.28	4.42	4.67	4.59	4.37
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	2	9	6	4.24	713/1605	4.35	4.25	4.07	4.15	4.24
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	2	1	15	4.72	489/1514	4.65	4.62	4.39	4.39	4.72
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	1	2	15	4.78	843/1551	4.85	4.87	4.66	4.72	4.78
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	1	2	2	13	4.50	556/1503	4.37	4.46	4.24	4.29	4.50
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	1	0	3	13	4.44	718/1506	4.58	4.49	4.26	4.33	4.44
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	13	1	0	0	1	3	4.00	587/1311	4.00	3.77	3.85	3.96	4.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	1	0	5	9	4.47	490/1490	4.10	4.33	4.05	4.11	4.47
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	0	3	3	9	4.40	754/1502	4.41	4.60	4.26	4.31	4.40
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	0	1	2	12	4.73	456/1489	4.59	4.61	4.29	4.36	4.73
4. Were special techniques successful	4	12	1	0	0	1	1	3.33	****/1006	3.55	3.98	4.00	3.99	****
- 1 · ·														
Laboratory	1 77	1	0	0	0	-	_	4 00	**** / OOC	****	****	4 00	4 40	****
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	17	1 0	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 226 ****/ 233	****	****	4.20	4.42	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	17		1	0	0 1	1	0	2.50		****	****	4.19	4.36	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	17	0		0		0	1	4.00	****/ 225	****	****	4.50	4.74	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance 5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	17 17	0 1	0	0	0 1	1	1		****/ 223 ****/ 206	****	****	4.35 4.15	4.71 4.59	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports crearry specified	1/		U	U	Т	U	U	3.00	/ 206			4.15	4.59	
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	17	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 112	****	4.80	4.38	4.59	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	17	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 97	****	4.60	4.36	4.60	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	0	0	2		****/ 92	****	4.60	4.22	4.50	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	0	1	1		****/ 105	****	4.20	4.20	4.63	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	17	0	0	0	1	0	1		****/ 98	****	3.80	3.95	4.20	****
The second of th									,					
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 58	****	****	4.22	4.20	***
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	17	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 52	****	****	4.06	5.00	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	17	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 39	****	****	4.39	5.00	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	17	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 40	****	****	3.97	5.00	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	17	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.33	5.00	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	0	1	1		****/ 55	****	****	4.34	4.67	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	17	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 42	****	****	4.31	5.00	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	16	1	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 46	****	****	4.45	5.00	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	17	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 33	****	****	4.25	5.00	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	17	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 29	****	****	4.34	5.00	****

Title POLITICAL PHILOSOPHY

Instructor: STACEY, SIMON

Enrollment: 49
Questionnaires: 19

ILOSOPHY Baltimore County
N Fall 2006

Page 1355 JAN 18, 2007 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

University of Maryland

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expecte	d Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	1	 А	5	Required for Majors	3	Graduate	0	Major	10
28-55	6	1.00-1.99	0	В	10						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	4	C	1	General	2	Under-grad	19	Non-major	9
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means	there	are not enough	a
				P	0			responses to	be sig	nificant	
				I	0	Other	10				
				?	1						

University of Maryland Baltimore County POLITICAL PHILOSOPHY

Title Instructor: SAULS, SHANAYSH

Enrollment: 42 Questionnaires: 40

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Fall 2006

Page 1356 JAN 18, 2007 Job IRBR3029

Questions	NR	NA	Fre	equer 2	ncie 3	s 4	5	Inst Mean	ructor Rank	Course Mean	_		Level Mean	Sect Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	10	0	0	0	1	8	21	4.67	389/1669	4.39	4.46	4.23	4.34	4.67
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	11	0	0	1	4	8	16	4.34	764/1666	4.27	4.26	4.19	4.29	4.34
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	10	1	1	0	3	8	17	4.38	710/1421	4.49	4.41	4.24	4.35	4.38
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	11	13	0	1	1	5	9	4.38	673/1617	4.30	4.27	4.15	4.24	4.38
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	1	2	6	19	4.54	316/1555	4.50	4.38	4.00	3.96	4.54
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	12	19	2	0	0	2	5	3.89	****/1543	4.02	4.27	4.06	4.10	****
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	12	0	0	2	3	4	19	4.43	617/1647	4.34	4.25	4.12	4.19	4.43
8. How many times was class cancelled	12	0	0	0	1	21	6	4.18	1431/1668	4.28	4.42	4.67	4.59	4.18
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	18	0	0	0	1	11	10	4.41	499/1605	4.35	4.25	4.07	4.15	4.41
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	11	0	0	2	4	6	17		1042/1514		4.62	4.39	4.39	4.31
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	11	0	0	0	1	1	27	4.90	539/1551	4.85	4.87	4.66	4.72	4.90
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	11	0	0	1	3	11	14	4.31	823/1503	4.37	4.46	4.24	4.29	4.31
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	1	1	6	21	4.62	521/1506	4.58	4.49	4.26	4.33	4.62
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	15	19	0	2	1	1	2	3.50	****/1311	4.00	3.77	3.85	3.96	****
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	15	0	4	2	1	7	11	3.76	1029/1490	4.10	4.33	4.05	4.11	3.76
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	15	0	0	1	1	7	16	4.52	613/1502	4.41	4.60	4.26	4.31	4.52
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	15	0	0	1	0	8	16	4.56	631/1489		4.61	4.29	4.36	4.56
4. Were special techniques successful	15	5	1	3	6	4	6	3.55	744/1006	3.55	3.98	4.00	3.99	3.55
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	35	3	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 226	****	****	4.20	4.42	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	38	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 233	****	****	4.19	4.36	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	38	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 225	****	****	4.50	4.74	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	38	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 223	****	****	4.35	4.71	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	39	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 206	****	****	4.15	4.59	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	37	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/ 112	****	4.80	4.38	4.59	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	38	0	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/ 97	****	4.60	4.36	4.60	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	38	0	0	0	0	1	1		****/ 92	****	4.60	4.22	4.50	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	38	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 105	****	4.20	4.20	4.63	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	39	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 98	****	3.80	3.95	4.20	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	37	0	1	0	0	1	1	3.33	****/ 58	****	****	4.22	4.20	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	38	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 52	****	****	4.06	5.00	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	38	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.39	5.00	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	38	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 40	****	****	3.97	5.00	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	39	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.33	5.00	***
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	38	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 55	****	****	4.34	4.67	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	39	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 42	****	****	4.31	5.00	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	38	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 46	****	****	4.45	5.00	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	38	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 33	****	****	4.25	5.00	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	39	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 29	****	****	4.34	5.00	****

Title POLITICAL PHILOSOPHY

Instructor: SAULS, SHANAYSH

Enrollment: 42
Questionnaires: 40

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2006 Page 1356 JAN 18, 2007 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expecte	d Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors		
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	2	 А	6	Required for Majors	4	Graduate	0	Major	1	
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	В	19							
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	1	C	0	General	6	Under-grad	40	Non-major	39	
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	2	D	0							
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	0	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	n	
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant		
				I	0	Other	14					
				?	0							

Course Section: POLI 233 0101 University of Maryland
Title COMMON LAW&LEGAL ANALY Baltimore County

Title COMMON LAW&LEGAL ANALY Baltimore County
Instructor: BARNER-BARRY, C Fall 2006

Enrollment: 29
Questionnaires: 29

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequencies

Instructor

Page 1357

JAN 18, 2007

Job IRBR3029

Course Dept UMBC Level Sect

	Trequencies						1110	LIUCCOI	COULDC	DCPC	OFIDC	TC A C T	DCCC					
Questions					NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		1																
you gain i	new insights,ski	lls from	n this cour	se	6	0	0	2	2	6	13	4.30	852/1669	4.30	4.46	4.23	4.34	4.30
the instru	uctor make clear	the exp	pected goal	s	7	0	0	1	3	8	10	4.23	922/1666	4.23	4.26	4.19	4.29	4.23
								3	4	5	10	4.00	969/1421	4.00	4.41	4.24	4.35	4.00
other eval	luations reflect	the exp	pected goal	s	6	3	0	1	4	6	9	4.15	911/1617	4.15	4.27	4.15	4.24	4.15
assigned 1	readings contrib	ute to	what you le	arned	6	0	0											
written as	ssignments contr	ibute to	o what you	learned	6	2	0	1	3	9	8	4.14	783/1543	4.14	4.27	4.06	4.10	4.14
the gradin	ng system clearl	y expla:	ined		6	0	1	4	6	4	8	3.61	1353/1647	3.61	4.25	4.12	4.19	3.61
many times	s was class canc	elled			6	0	0	0	5	11	7	4.09	1487/1668	4.09	4.42	4.67	4.59	4.09
would you	grade the overa	ll teac	ning effect	iveness	11	0	0	0	4	11	3	3.94	1022/1605	3.94	4.25	4.07	4.15	3.94
	Lectur	е																
e the inst	ructor's lecture	s well	orepared		8	0	0	0	2	7	12	4.48	845/1514	4.48	4.62	4.39	4.39	4.48
the instru	uctor seem inter	ested in	n the subje	ct	7	0	0	0	1	4	17	4.73	936/1551	4.73	4.87	4.66	4.72	4.73
lecture ma	aterial presente	d and e	xplained cl	early	7	0	0	0	3	8	11	4.36	765/1503	4.36	4.46	4.24	4.29	4.36
the lectur	res contribute t	o what	you learned	7	0	0	0	5	5	12	4.32	858/1506	4.32	4.49	4.26	4.33	4.32	
audiovisua	_				9	17	1	0										
	Discus	sion																
class disc	cussions contrib	ute to	what you le	arned	9	0	0	0	2	5	13	4.55	417/1490	4.55	4.33	4.05	4.11	4.55
e all stude	ents actively en	courage	d to partic	ipate	9	0	0	2	1	2	15	4.50	632/1502	4.50	4.60	4.26	4.31	4.50
					9	0	0	0	2	2	16	4.70	500/1489	4.70	4.61	4.29	4.36	4.70
e special t	techniques succe	ssful	_		10	2	0	0	2	6	9	4.41	299/1006	4.41	3.98	4.00	3.99	4.41
				Freq	ıency	Dis	trib	ation	n									
	G GD3		T	G.,	_			D -									24	
s Earned 	Cum. GPA		Expected 	. Grades				Rea	ason	.s 			 J.ÀĬ.	oe 			Majors 	
1	0.00-0.99	0	A	4		Re	quir	ed fo	or M	ajor	s	2	Graduate	2	0	Majc	or	12
2	1.00-1.99	0	В	11														
6	2.00-2.99	3	C	4		Ge	nera	l				2	Under-gi	rad 2	19	Non-	·major	17
n 1	3.00-3.49	8	D	1														
			F 0 Electives 0 #### - Means there are not er					-h										
	3.50-4.00	5				EL	ecti	ves				U						111
	3.50-4.00	5	P	0				ves					response					111
	3.50-4.00	5					ecti her	ves			1							311
	you gain in the instrict the exame other evaluation assigned as written as the gradin many times would you the instrict the instrict audiovisuation and instrict audiovisuation as special as the instrict audiovisuation as special as the instrict audiovisuation as special as the instrict as the instrict as special as the instrict as the	General you gain new insights, ski the instructor make clear the exam questions reflect other evaluations reflect assigned readings contributed written assignments contributed the grading system clearl many times was class cand would you grade the overal the instructor's lectured the instructor seem interfecture material presented the lectures contributed the audiovisual techniques end the instructor encouraged as special techniques successively encouraged as special techniques successively encouraged as special techniques and the instructor encouraged as the instructor e	General you gain new insights, skills from the instructor make clear the ext the exam questions reflect the ext other evaluations reflect the ext assigned readings contribute to written assignments contribute to the grading system clearly explain many times was class cancelled would you grade the overall teach Lecture the instructor's lectures well to the instructor seem interested in lecture material presented and ext audiovisual techniques enhance you Discussion class discussions contribute to what audiovisual techniques enhance you the instructor encourage fair and expecial techniques successful Earned Cum. GPA	General you gain new insights, skills from this cour the instructor make clear the expected goal the exam questions reflect the expected goal other evaluations reflect the expected goal assigned readings contribute to what you le written assignments contribute to what you the grading system clearly explained many times was class cancelled would you grade the overall teaching effect Lecture the instructor's lectures well prepared the instructor seem interested in the subje lecture material presented and explained cl the lectures contribute to what you learned audiovisual techniques enhance your underst Discussion class discussions contribute to what you le all students actively encouraged to partic the instructor encourage fair and open disc e special techniques successful Earned Cum. GPA Expected	General you gain new insights, skills from this course the instructor make clear the expected goals the exam questions reflect the expected goals other evaluations reflect the expected goals assigned readings contribute to what you learned written assignments contribute to what you learned the grading system clearly explained many times was class cancelled would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness Lecture the instructor's lectures well prepared the instructor seem interested in the subject lecture material presented and explained clearly the lectures contribute to what you learned audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding Discussion class discussions contribute to what you learned all students actively encouraged to participate the instructor encourage fair and open discussion expecial techniques successful Frequence S. Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades 1 0.00-0.99 0 A 4 2 1.00-1.99 0 B 11 6 2.00-2.99 3 C 4	General you gain new insights, skills from this course the instructor make clear the expected goals the exam questions reflect the expected goals other evaluations reflect the expected goals assigned readings contribute to what you learned written assignments contribute to what you learned for grading system clearly explained for many times was class cancelled for would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness Lecture for the instructor's lectures well prepared for the instructor seem interested in the subject for lecture material presented and explained clearly the lectures contribute to what you learned for audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding Discussion class discussions contribute to what you learned for all students actively encouraged to participate for all stude	General you gain new insights, skills from this course 6 0 the instructor make clear the expected goals 7 0 the exam questions reflect the expected goals 6 1 other evaluations reflect the expected goals 6 3 assigned readings contribute to what you learned 6 0 written assignments contribute to what you learned 6 2 the grading system clearly explained 6 0 many times was class cancelled 6 0 would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 11 0 Lecture the instructor's lectures well prepared 8 0 the instructor seem interested in the subject 7 0 lecture material presented and explained clearly 7 0 the lectures contribute to what you learned 7 0 audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 9 17 Discussion class discussions contribute to what you learned 9 0 the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 9 0 e special techniques successful 10 2 Frequency Dis Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades	General you gain new insights, skills from this course the instructor make clear the expected goals the exam questions reflect the expected goals other evaluations reflect the expected goals other evaluations reflect the expected goals assigned readings contribute to what you learned of o	General you gain new insights, skills from this course 6 0 0 2 the instructor make clear the expected goals 7 0 0 1 the exam questions reflect the expected goals 6 1 0 3 other evaluations reflect the expected goals 6 3 0 1 assigned readings contribute to what you learned 6 0 0 0 written assignments contribute to what you learned 6 2 0 1 the grading system clearly explained 6 0 1 4 many times was class cancelled 6 0 0 0 would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 11 0 0 0 Lecture the instructor's lectures well prepared 8 0 0 0 the instructor seem interested in the subject 7 0 0 0 lecture material presented and explained clearly 7 0 0 0 the lectures contribute to what you learned 7 0 0 0 audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 9 17 1 0 Discussion class discussions contribute to what you learned 9 0 0 0 all students actively encouraged to participate 9 0 0 2 the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 9 0 0 0 a special techniques successful 10 2 0 0 Frequency Distribution S Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades Recuired for	General you gain new insights, skills from this course 6 0 0 2 2 the instructor make clear the expected goals 7 0 0 1 3 the exam questions reflect the expected goals 6 1 0 3 4 other evaluations reflect the expected goals 6 3 0 1 4 assigned readings contribute to what you learned 6 0 0 0 3 written assignments contribute to what you learned 6 2 0 1 3 the grading system clearly explained 6 0 1 4 6 many times was class cancelled 6 0 0 0 5 would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 11 0 0 0 4 Lecture the instructor's lectures well prepared 8 0 0 0 2 the instructor seem interested in the subject 7 0 0 0 1 lecture material presented and explained clearly 7 0 0 0 3 the lectures contribute to what you learned 7 0 0 0 5 audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 9 17 1 0 0 Discussion class discussions contribute to what you learned 9 0 0 0 2 all students actively encouraged to participate 9 0 0 2 1 the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 9 0 0 0 2 se special techniques successful 10 2 0 0 2 Frequency Distribution S Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades Reason	General you gain new insights, skills from this course 6 0 0 2 2 6 the instructor make clear the expected goals 7 0 0 1 3 8 the exam questions reflect the expected goals 6 1 0 3 4 5 other evaluations reflect the expected goals 6 1 0 3 4 5 other evaluations reflect the expected goals 6 3 0 1 4 6 assigned readings contribute to what you learned 6 0 0 0 3 3 written assignments contribute to what you learned 6 2 0 1 3 9 the grading system clearly explained 6 0 1 4 6 4 many times was class cancelled 6 0 0 0 5 11 would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 11 0 0 0 0 4 11 Lecture the instructor's lectures well prepared 8 0 0 0 2 7 the instructor seem interested in the subject 7 0 0 0 1 4 lecture material presented and explained clearly 7 0 0 0 3 8 the lectures contribute to what you learned 7 0 0 0 5 5 audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 9 17 1 0 0 0 Discussion class discussions contribute to what you learned 9 0 0 0 2 5 all students actively encouraged to participate 9 0 0 2 1 2 the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 9 0 0 0 2 2 6 special techniques successful 10 2 0 0 2 6 Frequency Distribution	General you gain new insights, skills from this course 6 0 0 2 2 6 13 the instructor make clear the expected goals 7 0 0 1 3 8 10 the exam questions reflect the expected goals 6 1 0 3 4 5 10 other evaluations reflect the expected goals 6 3 0 1 4 6 9 assigned readings contribute to what you learned 6 0 0 0 3 3 17 written assignments contribute to what you learned 6 2 0 1 3 9 8 the grading system clearly explained 6 0 0 1 4 6 4 8 many times was class cancelled 6 0 0 0 5 11 7 would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 11 0 0 0 0 4 11 3 Lecture the instructor's lectures well prepared 8 0 0 0 2 7 12 the instructor seem interested in the subject 7 0 0 0 1 4 17 lecture material presented and explained clearly 7 0 0 0 3 8 11 the lectures contribute to what you learned 7 0 0 0 3 8 11 the lectures contribute to what you learned 7 0 0 0 5 5 12 audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 9 17 1 0 0 0 2 2 13 class discussions contribute to what you learned 9 0 0 2 2 5 13 sall students actively encouraged to participate 9 0 0 2 1 2 15 the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 9 0 0 0 2 2 16 sepecial techniques successful 10 2 0 0 2 6 9 Frequency Distribution Frequency Distribution	General you gain new insights, skills from this course 6 0 0 2 2 6 13 4.30 the instructor make clear the expected goals 7 0 0 1 3 8 10 4.23 the exam questions reflect the expected goals 6 1 0 3 4 5 10 4.00 other evaluations reflect the expected goals 6 3 0 1 4 6 9 4.15 assigned readings contribute to what you learned 6 0 0 0 3 3 17 4.61 written assignments contribute to what you learned 6 2 0 1 3 9 8 4.14 the grading system clearly explained 6 0 1 4 6 4 8 3.61 many times was class cancelled 6 0 0 0 5 11 7 4.09 would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 11 0 0 0 4 11 3 3.94 Lecture the instructor's lectures well prepared 8 0 0 0 2 7 12 4.48 the instructor seem interested in the subject 7 0 0 0 1 4 17 4.73 lecture material presented and explained clearly 7 0 0 0 3 8 11 4.36 the lectures contribute to what you learned 7 0 0 0 5 5 12 4.32 audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 9 17 1 0 0 0 2 3.67 Discussion class discussions contribute to what you learned 9 0 0 2 5 13 4.55 the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 9 0 0 2 2 1 2 15 4.50 the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 9 0 0 2 2 1 2 15 4.50 the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 9 0 0 2 2 1 6 4.70 expected Grades Reasons Frequency Distribution	General you gain new insights, skills from this course 6 0 0 2 2 6 13 4.30 852/1669 the instructor make clear the expected goals 7 0 0 1 3 8 10 4.23 922/1666 the exam questions reflect the expected goals 6 1 0 3 4 5 10 4.00 969/1421 other evaluations reflect the expected goals 6 1 0 3 4 5 10 4.00 969/1421 other evaluations reflect the expected goals 6 3 0 1 4 6 9 4.15 911/1617 assigned readings contribute to what you learned 6 0 0 0 3 3 17 4.61 262/1555 written assignments contribute to what you learned 6 2 0 1 3 9 8 4.14 783/1543 the grading system clearly explained 6 0 1 4 6 4 8 3.61 1353/1647 many times was class cancelled 6 0 0 0 5 11 7 4.09 1487/1668 would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 11 0 0 0 4 11 3 3.94 1022/1605 Lecture the instructor's lectures well prepared 8 0 0 0 2 7 12 4.48 845/1514 the instructor seem interested in the subject 7 0 0 0 1 4 17 4.73 936/1551 lecture material presented and explained clearly 7 0 0 0 1 4 17 4.73 936/1551 lecture material presented and explained clearly 7 0 0 0 0 3 8 11 4.36 765/1503 the lectures contribute to what you learned 7 0 0 0 5 5 12 4.32 858/1506 audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 9 17 1 0 0 0 2 3.67 ****/1311 Discussion class discussions contribute to what you learned 9 0 0 0 2 5 13 4.55 417/1490 e all students actively encouraged to participate 9 0 0 2 2 1 2 15 4.50 632/1502 the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 9 0 0 0 2 2 1 2 15 4.70 500/1489 e special techniques successful Frequency Distribution Frequency Distribution Frequency Distribution	General you gain new insights, skills from this course 6 0 0 2 2 6 13 4.30 852/1669 4.30 the instructor make clear the expected goals 7 0 0 1 3 8 10 4.23 922/1666 4.23 the exam questions reflect the expected goals 6 1 0 3 4 5 10 4.00 969/1421 4.00 other evaluations reflect the expected goals 6 3 0 1 4 6 9 4.15 911/1617 4.15 assigned readings contribute to what you learned 6 0 0 0 0 3 3 17 4.61 262/1555 4.61 written assignments contribute to what you learned 6 2 0 1 3 9 8 4.14 783/1543 4.14 the grading system clearly explained 6 0 1 4 6 4 8 3.61 1353/1647 3.61 many times was class cancelled 6 0 0 0 5 11 7 4.09 1487/1668 4.09 would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 11 0 0 0 4 11 3 3.94 1022/1605 3.94 Lecture the instructor's lectures well prepared 8 0 0 0 2 7 12 4.48 845/1514 4.48 the instructor seem interested in the subject 7 0 0 0 1 4 17 4.73 936/1551 4.73 lecture material presented and explained clearly 7 0 0 0 1 4 17 4.73 936/1551 4.73 lecture material presented and explained clearly 7 0 0 0 1 2 5 12 4.32 858/1506 4.32 audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 9 17 1 0 0 0 2 3.67 ****/1311 **** Discussion class discussions contribute to what you learned 9 0 0 0 2 5 13 4.55 417/1490 4.55 expected Grades Frequency Distribution Frequency Distribution Frequency Distribution	General you gain new insights, skills from this course 6 0 0 0 2 2 6 13 4.30 852/1669 4.30 4.46 the instructor make clear the expected goals 7 0 0 0 1 3 8 10 4.23 922/1666 4.23 4.26 the exam questions reflect the expected goals 6 1 0 3 4 5 10 4.00 969/1421 4.00 4.41 other evaluations reflect the expected goals 6 3 0 1 4 6 9 4.15 911/1617 4.15 4.27 assigned readings contribute to what you learned 6 0 0 0 0 3 3 17 4.61 262/1555 4.61 4.38 written assignments contribute to what you learned 6 0 0 0 0 3 3 17 4.61 262/1555 4.61 4.38 written assignments contribute to what you learned 6 0 0 1 3 9 8 4.14 783/1543 4.14 4.27 the grading system clearly explained 6 0 1 4 6 4 8 3.61 1353/1647 3.61 4.25 many times was class cancelled 6 0 0 0 5 11 7 4.09 1487/1668 4.09 4.42 would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 11 0 0 0 0 5 11 7 4.09 1487/1668 4.09 4.42 would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 11 0 0 0 0 2 7 12 4.48 845/1514 4.48 4.62 the instructor's lectures well prepared 8 0 0 0 2 7 12 4.48 845/1514 4.48 4.62 the instructor seem interested in the subject 7 0 0 0 0 1 1 4 17 4.73 936/1551 4.73 4.87 lecture material presented and explained clearly 7 0 0 0 0 3 8 11 4.36 765/1503 4.36 4.46 the lectures contribute to what you learned 7 0 0 0 5 5 12 4.32 858/1506 4.32 4.49 audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 9 17 1 0 0 0 0 2 3.67 ****/1311 **** 3.77 Discussion class discussions contribute to what you learned 9 0 0 0 2 5 13 4.55 417/1490 4.55 4.33 eall students actively encouraged to participate 9 0 0 0 2 5 13 4.55 417/1490 4.55 4.33 eall students actively encouraged to participate 9 0 0 0 2 6 9 4.41 299/1006 4.41 3.98 Frequency Distribution Frequency Distribution Frequency Distribution	General you gain new insights, skills from this course 6 0 0 0 2 2 6 13 4.30 852/1669 4.30 4.46 4.23 the instructor make clear the expected goals 7 0 0 0 1 3 8 10 4.23 922/1666 4.23 4.26 4.19 the exam questions reflect the expected goals 6 1 0 3 4 5 10 4.00 969/1421 4.00 4.41 4.24 other evaluations reflect the expected goals 6 3 0 1 4 6 9 4.15 911/1617 4.15 4.27 4.15 assigned readings contribute to what you learned 6 0 0 0 3 3 17 4.61 262/1555 4.61 4.38 4.00 written assignments contribute to what you learned 6 2 0 1 3 9 8 4.14 788/1543 4.14 4.27 4.06 the grading system clearly explained 6 0 1 4 6 4 8 3.61 1353/1647 3.61 4.25 4.12 many times was class cancelled 6 0 0 0 0 5 11 7 4.09 1487/1668 4.09 4.42 4.67 would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 11 0 0 0 0 4 11 3 3.94 1022/1605 3.94 4.25 4.07 Lecture The instructor's lectures well prepared 8 0 0 0 0 2 7 12 4.48 845/1514 4.48 4.62 4.39 the instructor seem interested in the subject 7 0 0 0 0 1 4 17 4.73 936/1551 4.73 4.87 4.66 lecture material presented and explained clearly 7 0 0 0 0 3 8 11 4.32 858/1503 4.36 4.46 4.24 the lectures contribute to what you learned 7 0 0 0 5 5 12 4.32 858/1503 4.36 4.46 4.24 the lectures contribute to what you learned 9 0 0 0 2 5 13 4.55 417/1490 4.55 4.33 4.05 and instructor encourage fair and open discussion 9 0 0 0 2 2 5 13 4.55 417/1490 4.55 4.33 4.05 and instructor encourage fair and open discussion 9 0 0 0 2 2 1 2 15 4.50 632/1502 4.50 4.60 4.26 the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 9 0 0 0 2 2 1 2 15 4.50 632/1502 4.50 4.61 4.29 as special techniques successful 10 2 0 0 2 6 9 4.41 299/1006 4.41 3.98 4.00 Frequency Distribution	General you gain new insights, skills from this course 6 0 0 0 2 2 6 13 4.30 852/1669 4.30 4.46 4.23 4.34 the instructor make clear the expected goals 7 0 0 1 3 8 10 4.23 922/1666 4.23 4.26 4.19 4.29 the exam questions reflect the expected goals 6 1 0 3 4 5 10 4.03 969/1421 4.00 4.41 4.24 4.25 other evaluations reflect the expected goals 6 1 0 3 3 8 10 4.23 922/1666 4.23 4.26 4.19 4.29 the exam questions reflect the expected goals 6 3 0 1 4 6 9 4.15 911/1617 4.15 4.27 4.15 4.24 assigned readings contribute to what you learned 6 0 0 0 3 3 17 4.61 262/1555 4.61 4.38 4.00 3.96 written assignments contribute to what you learned 6 2 0 1 3 9 8 4.14 783/1543 4.14 4.27 4.06 4.10 the grading system clearly explained 6 0 0 0 5 11 7 4.09 1487/1668 4.09 4.42 4.67 4.19 would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 11 0 0 0 0 4 11 3 3.94 1022/1605 3.94 4.25 4.07 4.15 Lecture the instructor's lectures well prepared 8 0 0 0 2 7 12 4.48 845/1514 4.48 4.62 4.39 4.39 the instructor seem interested in the subject 7 0 0 0 0 1 4 11 3 3.94 1022/1605 3.94 4.25 4.07 4.15 the instructor seem interested and explained clearly 7 0 0 0 0 3 8 11 4.36 765/1503 4.36 4.46 4.24 4.29 the lectures contribute to what you learned 7 0 0 0 0 3 8 11 4.36 765/1503 4.36 4.46 4.24 4.29 the lectures contribute to what you learned 7 0 0 0 0 3 8 11 4.35 765/1503 4.36 4.46 4.24 4.29 the lectures contribute to what you learned 7 0 0 0 0 5 12 4.32 858/1506 4.32 4.49 4.66 4.33 audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 9 17 1 0 0 0 2 3.67 ****/1311 **** 3.77 3.85 3.96 Discussion Class discussions contribute to what you learned 9 0 0 0 2 1 2 15 4.50 632/1502 4.50 4.60 4.26 4.31 the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 9 0 0 0 2 1 2 15 4.50 632/1502 4.50 4.60 4.26 4.31 the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 9 0 0 0 2 2 6 9 4.41 299/1006 4.41 3.98 4.00 3.99 Frequency Distribution Frequency Distribution

Course Section: POLI 233H 0101 University of Maryland Title Barrer County
Instructor: BARNER-BARRY, C Fall 2006

Enrollment:

Questionnaires: 12

12

University of Maryland Page 1358
Baltimore County JAN 18, 2007
Fall 2006 Job IRBR3029

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

	Frequencies				Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect			
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	2	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	128/1669	4.90	4.46	4.23	4.34	4.90
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	0	0	0	3	7	4.70	319/1666	4.70	4.26	4.19	4.29	4.70
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	217/1421	4.80	4.41	4.24	4.35	4.80
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	1	0	0	1	2	6	4.56	445/1617	4.56	4.27	4.15	4.24	4.56
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	141/1555	4.80	4.38	4.00	3.96	4.80
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	5	5	4.50	390/1543	4.50	4.27	4.06	4.10	4.50
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	0	1	3	6	4.50	481/1647	4.50	4.25	4.12	4.19	4.50
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	9	1	4.10	1477/1668	4.10	4.42	4.67	4.59	4.10
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	1	4	5	4.40	499/1605	4.40	4.25	4.07	4.15	4.40
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	0	0	1	3	4	4.38	984/1514	4.38	4.62	4.39	4.39	4.38
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	594/1551	4.88	4.87	4.66	4.72	4.88
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	5	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	173/1503	4.86	4.46	4.24	4.29	4.86
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	1	3	2	2	3.63	1292/1506	3.63	4.49	4.26	4.33	3.63
Discussion														
	2	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.89	155/1490	4.89	4.33	4.05	4.11	4.89
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1502	5.00		4.05	4.11	5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	_	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1502	5.00	4.60 4.61	4.26	4.31	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3 3	1	0	0	2	2	2	3.88	617/1006	3.88	3.98	4.29	3.99	3.88
4. Were special techniques successful	3	Т	U	U	3	3	4	3.08	01//1006	3.08	3.98	4.00	3.99	3.00
Frequency Distrib														

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	d Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	7	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	6
28-55	5	1.00-1.99	0	В	2						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	1	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	12	Non-major	6
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	7	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	10				
				?	1						

Title STATE & LOCAL POLITICS

Instructor: CROATTI, MARK

Enrollment: 37
Questionnaires: 36

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

University of Maryland

Baltimore County

Fall 2006

Page 1359 JAN 18, 2007 Job IRBR3029

	- 1				Ins	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect			
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	8	0	2	2	6	7	11	3.82	1339/1669	3.82	4.46	4.23	4.34	3.82
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	9	0	5	0	10	6	6	3.30	1535/1666	3.30	4.26	4.19	4.29	3.30
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	8	0	3	3	8	4	10	3.54	1212/1421	3.54	4.41	4.24	4.35	3.54
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	8	1	2	3	6	8	8	3.63	1323/1617	3.63	4.27	4.15	4.24	3.63
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	8	0	2	5	6	8	7	3.46	1257/1555	3.46	4.38	4.00	3.96	3.46
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	8	2	4	3	9	6	4	3.12	1389/1543	3.12	4.27	4.06	4.10	3.12
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	8	0	3	1	6	9	9	3.71	1295/1647	3.71	4.25	4.12	4.19	3.71
8. How many times was class cancelled	8	0	0	0	0	4	24	4.86	807/1668	4.86	4.42	4.67	4.59	4.86
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	11	1	3	1	4	10	6	3.63	1299/1605	3.63	4.25	4.07	4.15	3.63
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	9	0	2	0	7	6	12	3.96	1227/1514	3.96	4.62	4.39	4.39	3.96
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	9	0	1	0	3	2	21		1152/1551	4.56	4.87	4.66	4.72	4.56
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	10	0	2	2	5	4			1147/1503		4.46	4.24	4.29	3.92
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	9	0	3	2	6	3	13		1236/1506		4.49	4.26	4.33	3.78
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	9	3	2	4	4	5	9	3.63			3.77	3.85		3.63
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	18	0	2	2	7	1	2	2 22	1278/1490	3.22	4.33	4.05	4.11	3.22
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	18	0	3	1	,	7	7		1301/1502		4.53	4.05	4.11	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	18	0	3	2	2	4	6		1301/1302	3.44	4.60	4.29		3.44
4. Were special techniques successful	17	7	1	2	<i>3</i>	1	3	3.17	,		3.98	4.29	3.99	
4. Were special techniques successful	Ι/	/	1	3	4	Т	3	3.1/	902/1006	3.17	3.90	4.00	3.99	3.17
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	35	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 58	****	****	4.22	4.20	***

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expecte	d Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	 А	12	Required for Majors	2	Graduate	0	Major	17
28-55	8	1.00-1.99	0	В	10						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	5	C	2	General	1	Under-grad	36	Non-major	19
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	4	D	1						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	n
				P	1			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	22	_			
				2	1						

Course Section: POLI 250 0101 University of Maryland Title INTRO TO PUBLIC ADMIN

Baltimore County Fall 2006

Page 1360

JAN 18, 2007

Job IRBR3029

Instructor: CROATTI, MARK Enrollment: 40

Questionnaires: 40

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

				Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect				
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	5	0	2	5	10	10	8	3.49	1489/1669	3.49	4.46	4.23	4.34	3.49
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	5	0	3	7	12	7	6		1554/1666	3.17	4.26	4.19	4.29	3.17
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	5	0	3	9		6	11		1284/1421	3.37	4.41	4.24	4.35	3.37
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	6	2	3	3	12	5	9	3.44	1409/1617	3.44	4.27	4.15	4.24	3.44
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	5	0	4	6	10	7	8	3.26	1359/1555	3.26	4.38	4.00	3.96	3.26
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	6	11	4	3	6	4	6	3.22	1355/1543	3.22	4.27	4.06	4.10	3.22
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	5	0	1	2	4	11	17	4.17	940/1647	4.17	4.25	4.12	4.19	4.17
8. How many times was class cancelled	6	0	0	0	0	6	28	4.82	863/1668	4.82	4.42	4.67	4.59	4.82
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	9	0	2	2	12	10	5	3.45	1378/1605	3.45	4.25	4.07	4.15	3.45
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	5	0	0	7	10	10	8	3.54	1381/1514	3.54	4.62	4.39	4.39	3.54
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	6	0	2	2	1	5	24	4.38	1279/1551	4.38	4.87	4.66	4.72	4.38
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	6	0	2	6	4	16	6		1324/1503	3.53	4.46	4.24	4.29	3.53
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	6	0	5	4	9	7	9	3.32	1363/1506	3.32	4.49	4.26	4.33	3.32
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	6	4	7	5	9	4	5	2.83	1178/1311	2.83	3.77	3.85	3.96	2.83
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	13	Ω	5	5	4	7	6	3 15	1305/1490	3.15	4.33	4.05	4.11	3.15
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	13	0	2	2	6	5	12		1148/1502	3.85	4.60	4.26	4.31	3.85
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	13	0	4	5	2	6	10		1286/1489	3.48	4.61	4.29	4.36	3.48
4. Were special techniques successful	13	17	3	2	2	1	2	2.70	960/1006		3.98	4.00	3.99	2.70
			-	_	_	_	_		,					
Frequ	iency	Dist	crib	utio	n									

Credits E	Carned	Cum. GPA		Expecte	d Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	2	А	15	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	23
28-55	8	1.00-1.99	0	В	14						
56-83	5	2.00-2.99	4	C	4	General	2	Under-grad	40	Non-major	17
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	8	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	h
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	28				
				?	0						

COMPARATIVE POLITICS

Title

Instructor: FORESTIERE, CAR

Enrollment: 51 Questionnaires: 50

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2006

Page 1361 JAN 18, 2007 Job IRBR3029

Student (Course	${\tt Evaluation}$	Questionnaire
-----------	--------	--------------------	---------------

2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject				Fr	eque:	ncie	s		Inst	tructor	Course	e Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals 3. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 7. Was the grading system clearly explained	Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals 3. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 7. Was the grading system clearly explained	~ 1														
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals 15 0 0 2 3 8 22 4.43 662/1666 4.62 4.76 4.19 4.29 4.43 3.01 the the expected goals 15 0 0 2 5 10 4.03 961/1421 4.27 4.11 4.24 4.15 4.03 4.01 4.01 4.00 4		1 5	0	0	2	2	0	20	1 21	040/1660	A E1	1 16	1 22	1 21	1 21
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals 15 0 2 2 5 10 16 4.03 951/1421 4.27 4.41 4.24 4.35 4.03 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals 15 11 1 8 3 13.92 1154/1617 3.79 4.27 4.15 1.24 3.92 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 15 0 0 1 6 12 16 4.23 584/1555 4.31 4.38 4.00 3.96 4.22 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 15 0 0 0 5 7 23 4.15 469/1647 4.66 4.25 4.12 4.19 4.51 8. How many times was class cancelled 15 0 0 0 5 7 23 4.15 469/1647 4.66 4.25 4.12 4.19 4.51 8. How many times was class cancelled 16 0 0 0 0 5 7 23 4.5 809/1647 4.66 4.25 4.12 4.19 4.51 8. How many times was class cancelled 16 0 0 0 0 1 9 15 4.56 328/1605 4.61 4.25 4.07 4.15 4.56 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 23 2 0 0 1 9 15 4.56 328/1605 4.61 4.25 4.07 4.15 4.56 9. How mould you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 23 2 0 0 1 9 15 4.56 328/1605 4.61 4.25 4.07 4.15 4.56 9. How instructor's lectures well prepared 16 0 0 0 0 1 4 29 4.82 325/1514 4.91 4.62 4.39 4.39 4.82 1. Were the instructor seem interested in the subject 16 0 0 0 0 1 3 3 4.97 154/1551 4.99 4.87 4.66 4.72 4.97 4.40 1. Were the instructor seem interested in the subject 16 0 0 0 0 1 3 3 4.97 154/1551 4.99 4.87 4.66 4.72 4.97 4.40 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 16 0 0 0 2 7 25 4.68 458/1506 4.79 4.49 4.26 4.33 4.68 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 20 0 0 0 8 9 13 4.17 764/1490 4.26 4.33 4.05 4.11 4.17 4.17 4.17 4.17 4.17 4.17 4.17															
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals 15 11 1 8 3 11 3.92 1154/1617 3.79 4.27 4.15 4.24 3.92 5. Did assignmed readings contribute to what you learned 15 0 0 1 6 12 6 4.23 584/1555 4.31 4.38 4.00 3.96 4.22 4.21 4.25 4.21 4.25															
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	-					-									
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 19 1.4 0 0 6 5 6 4.00 895/1543 4.07 4.27 4.06 4.10 4.00 7. Was the grading system clearly explained 15 0 0 0 5 29 4.85 807/1668 4.81 4.42 4.67 4.59 4.85 8.00 Mow many times was class cancelled 16 0 0 0 0 5 29 4.85 807/1668 4.81 4.22 4.07 4.15 4.56 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 23 2 0 0 1 9 15 4.56 328/1605 4.61 4.25 4.07 4.15 4.56 1.00 Mow would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 23 2 0 0 1 9 15 4.56 328/1605 4.61 4.25 4.07 4.15 4.56 1.00 Mow would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 23 2 0 0 1 9 15 4.56 328/1605 4.61 4.25 4.07 4.15 4.56 1.00 Mow would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 23 2 0 0 1 9 15 4.56 328/1605 4.61 4.25 4.07 4.15 4.56 1.00 Mow would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 23 2 0 0 1 9 15 4.56 328/1605 4.61 4.25 4.07 4.15 4.56 1.00 Mow would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 23 2 0 0 1 9 15 4.56 328/1605 4.61 4.25 4.07 4.15 4.56 1.00 Mow would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 23 2 0 0 1 1 2 30 4.76 5 328/1605 4.61 4.25 4.07 4.15 4.56 1.00 Mow would you grade the instructor seem interested in the subject 16 0 0 0 1 1 3 3 4.77 154/1551 4.99 4.87 4.66 4.23 4.07 4.85 4.20 4.27 4.27 4.27 4.27 4.27 4.27 4.27 4.27	<u>.</u> 5			_	_	-				- ,					
7. Was the grading system clearly explained 15 0 0 0 5 7 23 4.51 469/1647 4.66 4.25 4.12 4.19 4.51 8.16 wam yt times was class cancelled 16 0 0 0 0 5 29 4.85 807/1668 4.81 4.42 4.67 4.59 4.85 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 23 2 0 0 1 9 15 4.56 328/1605 4.61 4.25 4.07 4.15 4.56 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 23 2 0 0 1 9 15 4.56 328/1605 4.61 4.25 4.07 4.15 4.56 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 23 2 0 0 1 9 15 4.56 328/1605 4.61 4.25 4.07 4.15 4.56 1.00 1 9 15 4.56 328/1605 4.61 4.25 4.07 4.15 4.56 1.00 1 9 15 4.56 328/1605 4.61 4.25 4.07 4.15 4.56 1.00 1 9 15 4.56 328/1605 4.61 4.25 4.07 4.15 4.56 1.00 1 9 15 4.56 328/1605 4.61 4.25 4.07 4.15 4.56 1.00 1 9 15 4.56 328/1605 4.61 4.25 4.07 4.15 4.56 1.00 1 9 15 4.56 328/1605 4.61 4.25 4.07 4.15 4.56 1.00 1 9 15 4.56 328/1605 4.61 4.25 4.07 4.15 4.56 1.00 1 9 15 4.56 328/1605 4.61 4.25 4.07 4.15 4.56 1.00 1 9 15 4.56 328/1605 4.61 4.25 4.07 4.15 4.56 1.00 1 9 15 4.56 328/1605 4.61 4.25 4.07 4.15 4.56 1.00 1 9 15 4.56 328/1605 4.61 4.25 4.07 4.15 4.56 1.00 1 9 1 3 4.57 1.00 1 9 1 4.29 4.86 4.39 4.89 4.89 4.80 4.26 4.33 4.66 4.26 4.24 4.20 4.76 4.20 4.76 4.20 4.76 4.20 4.76 4.20 4.76 4.20 4.76 4.20 4.76 4.20 4.76 4.20 4.76 4.20 4.76 4.20 4.76 4.20 4.76 4.20 4.76 4.20 4.76 4.20 4.76 4.20 4.76 4.20 4.20 4.76 4.20 4.20 4.76 4.20 4.20 4.20 4.20 4.20 4.20 4.20 4.20	3 3		-	-	_	•				,					
8. How many times was class cancelled 16 0 0 0 0 5 29 4.85 807/1668 4.81 4.42 4.67 4.59 4.85 807/1668 4.81 4.42 4.67 4.59 4.85 807/1668 4.81 4.42 4.67 4.59 4.85 807/1668 4.81 4.42 4.67 4.59 4.85 807/1668 4.81 4.42 4.67 4.59 4.85 8.86 807/1668 4.81 4.42 4.67 4.59 4.85 8.86 807/1668 4.81 4.42 4.67 4.59 4.85 8.86 807/1668 4.81 4.42 4.67 4.59 4.85 8.86 807/1668 4.81 4.82 4.84 4.85 807/1668 4.81 4.82 4.84 4.85 807/1668 4.81 4.82 4.84 4.85 807/1668 4.81 4.82 4.84 4.85 4.85 807/1668 4.81 4.82 4.84 4.85 4.85 807/1668 4.81 4.82 4.84 4.85 4.85 4.85 807/1668 4.81 4.82 4.84 4.85 4.85 4.85 4.85 4.85 4.85 4.85	<u> </u>			•	-	-	-	-							
Lecture Lect			-	-		-									
Lecture 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 1. Were the instructor seem interested in the subject 1. Were the instructor seem interested in the subject 1. Were the instructor seem interested in the subject 1. Were the instructor seem interested in the subject 1. Were the instructor seem interested in the subject 1. Were the instructor seem interested in the subject 1. Were the instructor seem interested in the subject 1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 1. Were only be successful 1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 1. Were criteria for grading made clear 1. Were criteria for grading made clear 1. Were only provided with adequate background information 1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 1. Were criteria for grading made clear 2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 3. Was the instructor available for consultation 4. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 4. Did the instructor available for consultation 4. Did the instructor available for consultation 4. Did the instructor available for consultation 4. Did				-											
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 16 0 0 0 1 4 4 29 4.82 325/1514 4.91 4.62 4.39 4.39 4.82 2.0 did the instructor seem interested in the subject 16 0 0 0 1 33 4.97 154/1551 4.99 4.87 4.66 4.72 4.97 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 16 0 1 0 1 2 30 4.76 266/1503 4.83 4.46 4.24 4.29 4.76 4.0 did the lectures contribute to what you learned 16 0 0 0 2 7 25 4.68 458/1506 4.79 4.49 4.26 4.33 4.05 5.0 did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 17 1 2 0 2 6 22 4.44 312/1311 4.39 3.77 3.85 3.96 4.44 3.20 4.20 4.20 4.20 4.20 4.20 4.20 4.20 4	9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	23	۷	U	U	1	9	15	4.50	320/1005	4.01	4.25	4.07	4.15	4.50
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	Lecture														
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 16 0 1 0 1 2 30 4.76 266/1503 4.83 4.46 4.24 4.29 4.76 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 16 0 0 0 2 7 25 4.68 458/1506 4.79 4.49 4.26 4.33 4.66 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 17 1 2 0 2 6 22 4.44 312/1311 4.39 3.77 3.85 3.96 4.44 Did presentations contribute to what you learned 20 0 0 0 8 9 13 4.17 764/1490 4.26 4.33 4.05 4.11 4.17 4.17 4.17 4.17 4.17 4.17 4.17	1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	16	0	0	0	1	4	29	4.82	325/1514	4.91	4.62	4.39	4.39	4.82
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 17 1 2 0 2 6 22 4.44 312/1311 4.39 3.77 3.85 3.96 4.46 Discussion 2. Discussion 2. Discussion 2. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 20 0 0 0 8 9 13 4.17 764/1490 4.26 4.33 4.05 4.11 4.17 2.10 4.10 4.26 4.33 4.05 4.11 4.17 4.17 4.18 4.19 4.26 4.33 4.05 4.11 4.17 4.18 4.19 4.26 4.31 4.47 4.19 4.26 4.21 4.21 4.21 4.21 4.21 4.21 4.21 4.21	2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	16	0	0	0			33	4.97	154/1551	4.99	4.87	4.66	4.72	4.97
Discussion Did class discussions contribute to what you learned Discussion Did class discussions contribute to what you learned Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned Did self-p	3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	16							4.76	266/1503	4.83	4.46		4.29	4.76
Discussion 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 20 0 0 0 8 9 13 4.17 764/1490 4.26 4.33 4.05 4.11 4.17 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 20 0 0 0 5 6 19 4.47 680/1502 4.54 4.60 4.26 4.31 4.47 4.60 4.26 4.33 4.61 4.29 4.36 4.64 4.64 4.65 4.65 4.65 4.65 4.65 4.6	-	16	0				7	25	4.68	458/1506	4.79	4.49	4.26	4.33	4.68
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 20 0 0 0 8 9 13 4.17 764/1490 4.26 4.33 4.05 4.11 4.17 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 20 0 0 0 5 6 19 4.47 680/1502 4.54 4.60 4.26 4.31 4.47 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 20 0 0 2 8 20 4.60 596/1489 4.73 4.61 4.29 4.36 4.64 4.89 4.73 4.61 4.29 4.36 4.64 4.89 4.79 4.61 4.29 4.36 4.61 4.29 4.20 4.20 4.20 4.20 4.20 4.20 4.20 4.20	5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	17	1	2	0	2	6	22	4.44	312/1311	4.39	3.77	3.85	3.96	4.44
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 20 0 0 0 8 9 13 4.17 764/1490 4.26 4.33 4.05 4.11 4.17 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 20 0 0 0 5 6 19 4.47 680/1502 4.54 4.60 4.26 4.31 4.47 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 20 0 0 2 8 20 4.60 596/1489 4.73 4.61 4.29 4.36 4.66 4. Were special techniques successful 20 17 2 0 5 2 4 3.46 779/1006 3.46 3.98 4.00 3.99 3.46 3. Were you provided with adequate background information 47 0 0 0 0 0 3 5.00 ****/ 225 **** ***** 4.19 4.36 **** 4.10 dthe lab instructor provide assistance 48 1 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 225 **** **** 4.50 4.74 **** 4.10 dthe lab instructor provide assistance 48 1 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 223 **** **** 4.35 4.71 **** 5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 48 1 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 206 **** 4.15 4.59 **** 4.15 4.59 **** 4.15 4.59 **** 4.15 4.59 **** 4.15 4.59 **** 4.15 4.59 **** 4.15 4.59 **** 4.15 4.59 **** 5. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 48 1 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 97 **** 4.60 4.36 4.60 **** 4.10 did presentations contribute to what you learned 48 1 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 98 **** 4.20 4.20 4.63 **** 5. Were criteria for grading made clear 48 1 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 98 **** 3.80 3.95 4.20 **** 5. Were criteria for grading made clear 48 0 1 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 58 **** 4.20 4.20 4.63 **** 5. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 48 0 1 0 0 0 0 1 3.00 ****/ 58 **** 4.22 4.20 **** 5. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 47 0 2 1 0 0 0 1.33 ***/ 52 **** **** 4.34 4.67 **** 5. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 49 0 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0	Discussion														
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 20 0 0 0 5 6 19 4.47 680/1502 4.54 4.60 4.26 4.31 4.47 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 20 0 0 0 2 8 20 4.60 596/1489 4.73 4.61 4.29 4.36 4.66 4.86 4.86 4.86 4.86 4.86 4.86 4.8		20	0	0	0	8	9	13	4.17	764/1490	4.26	4.33	4.05	4.11	4.17
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 20 0 0 0 2 8 20 4.60 596/1489 4.73 4.61 4.29 4.36 4.64 4. Were special techniques successful 20 17 2 0 5 2 4 3.46 779/1006 3.46 3.98 4.00 3.99 3.44 Laboratory 2. Were you provided with adequate background information 47 0 0 0 0 0 3 5.00 ****/ 233 **** **** 4.19 4.36 **** 3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 48 1 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 225 **** **** 4.50 4.74 **** 4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance 48 1 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 223 **** **** 4.35 4.71 **** 5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 48 1 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 206 **** **** 4.15 4.59 **** Seminar 1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 48 1 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 206 **** 4.80 4.38 4.59 **** 2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 48 1 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 97 **** 4.60 4.36 4.60 **** 4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned 48 1 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 98 **** 3.80 3.95 4.20 **** Field Work 1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 48 0 1 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 98 **** 3.80 3.95 4.20 **** 2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 47 0 2 1 0 0 0 1.33 ****/ 52 **** **** 4.22 4.20 **** Self Paced 1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 49 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 55 **** **** 4.34 4.67 ****	-					5									
Laboratory 2. Were you provided with adequate background information 47 0 0 0 0 0 3 5.00 ****/ 233 **** **** 4.19 4.36 **** 3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 48 1 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 225 **** **** 4.59 4.74 **** 4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance 48 1 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 226 **** **** 4.15 4.59 **** 5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 48 1 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 206 **** **** 4.15 4.59 **** Seminar 1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 48 1 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 206 **** **** 4.80 4.38 4.59 **** 2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 48 1 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 97 **** 4.60 4.36 4.60 **** 4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned 48 1 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 98 **** 3.80 3.95 4.20 **** Field Work 1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 48 0 1 0 0 0 1 3.00 ****/ 58 **** 4.22 4.20 **** 2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 47 0 2 1 0 0 0 1.33 ****/ 52 **** **** 4.06 5.00 **** 3. Was the instructor available for consultation 49 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 55 **** **** 4.39 5.00 **** Self Paced 1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 49 0 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0				-											
2. Were you provided with adequate background information 47 0 0 0 0 0 3 5.00 ****/ 233 **** **** 4.19 4.36 **** 3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 48 1 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 225 **** **** 4.50 4.74 **** 4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance 48 1 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 223 **** **** 4.35 4.71 **** 5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 48 1 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 206 **** **** 4.15 4.59 **** Seminar 1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 48 1 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 112 **** 4.80 4.38 4.59 **** 2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 48 1 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 97 **** 4.60 4.36 4.60 **** 4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned 48 1 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 105 **** 4.20 4.20 4.63 **** 5. Were criteria for grading made clear 48 1 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 98 **** 3.80 3.95 4.20 **** 1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 48 0 1 0 0 0 1 3.00 ****/ 98 **** 4.22 4.20 **** 2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 47 0 2 1 0 0 0 1 3.30 ****/ 52 **** **** 4.22 4.20 **** 3. Was the instructor available for consultation 49 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 55 **** **** 4.34 4.67 **** Self Paced 1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 49 0 0 0 0 1 0 0 3.00 ****/ 55 **** **** 4.34 4.67 ****	4. Were special techniques successful				-	_									
2. Were you provided with adequate background information 47 0 0 0 0 0 3 5.00 ****/ 233 **** **** 4.19 4.36 **** 3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 48 1 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 225 **** **** 4.50 4.74 **** 4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance 48 1 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 223 *** **** 4.35 4.71 **** 5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 48 1 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 206 **** **** 4.15 4.59 **** Seminar 1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 48 1 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 12 **** 4.80 4.38 4.59 **** 2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 48 1 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 97 **** 4.60 4.36 4.60 **** 4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned 48 1 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 105 **** 4.20 4.20 4.63 **** 5. Were criteria for grading made clear 48 1 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 98 **** 3.80 3.95 4.20 **** 1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 48 0 1 0 0 0 1 3.00 ****/ 58 **** 4.22 4.20 **** 2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 47 0 2 1 0 0 0 1.33 ****/ 52 **** 4.39 5.00 **** 3. Was the instructor available for consultation 49 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 55 **** 4.34 4.67 **** Self Paced 1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 49 0 0 0 0 1 0 0 3.00 ****/ 55 **** 4.34 4.67 ****	T albanahanna														
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 48 1 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 225 **** **** 4.50 4.74 **** 4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance 48 1 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 223 **** **** 4.35 4.71 **** 5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 48 1 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 206 **** **** 4.15 4.59 **** Seminar 1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 48 1 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 112 **** 4.80 4.38 4.59 **** 2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 48 1 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 97 **** 4.60 4.36 4.60 **** 5. Were criteria for grading made clear 48 1 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 105 **** 4.20 4.20 4.63 **** Field Work 1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 48 0 1 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 98 **** 3.80 3.95 4.20 **** 2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 47 0 2 1 0 0 0 1.33 ****/ 52 **** **** 4.34 4.67 **** Self Paced 1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 49 0 0 0 1 0 0 3.00 ****/ 55 **** **** 4.34 4.67 ****		17	0	Λ	Λ	Λ	Λ	2	E 00	****/ 222	****	****	1 10	1 26	***
48 1 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 223 **** **** 4.35 4.71 **** 5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 48 1 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 206 **** **** 4.15 4.59 **** Seminar 1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 48 1 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 112 **** 4.80 4.38 4.59 **** 2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 48 1 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 97 **** 4.60 4.36 4.60 **** 4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned 48 1 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 105 **** 4.20 4.20 4.63 **** 5. Were criteria for grading made clear 48 1 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 98 **** 3.80 3.95 4.20 **** Field Work 1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 48 0 1 0 0 0 1 3.00 ****/ 58 **** **** 4.22 4.20 **** 2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 47 0 2 1 0 0 0 1.33 ****/ 52 **** **** 4.34 4.67 **** Self Paced 1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 49 0 0 0 1 0 0 3.00 ****/ 55 **** **** 4.34 4.67 **** *******************************							_	_		,	****				
Seminar 1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme							_	_		,	****				
Seminar 1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	-						_	_		,					
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	48	1	U	U	U	U	1	5.00	****/ 206			4.15	4.59	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 48 1 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 97 **** 4.60 4.36 4.60 *** 4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned 48 1 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 105 **** 4.20 4.20 4.63 *** 5. Were criteria for grading made clear 48 1 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 98 **** 3.80 3.95 4.20 *** Field Work 1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 48 0 1 0 0 0 1 3.00 ****/ 58 **** **** 4.22 4.20 *** 2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 47 0 2 1 0 0 0 1.33 ****/ 52 **** **** 4.06 5.00 *** 3. Was the instructor available for consultation 49 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 39 **** **** 4.39 5.00 *** Self Paced 1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 49 0 0 0 1 0 0 3.00 ****/ 55 **** **** 4.34 4.67 ***															
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned 48 1 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 105 **** 4.20 4.20 4.63 *** 5. Were criteria for grading made clear 48 1 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 98 **** 3.80 3.95 4.20 *** Field Work 1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 48 0 1 0 0 0 1 3.00 ****/ 58 **** **** 4.22 4.20 *** 2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 47 0 2 1 0 0 0 1.33 ****/ 52 **** **** 4.06 5.00 *** 3. Was the instructor available for consultation 49 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 39 **** **** 4.39 5.00 *** Self Paced 1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 49 0 0 0 1 0 0 3.00 ****/ 55 **** **** 4.34 4.67 ***							_	1		•					
Field Work 1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 48 0 1 0 0 0 0 1 3.00 ****/ 58 **** **** 4.22 4.20 **** 2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 47 0 2 1 0 0 0 1 3.00 ****/ 52 **** **** 4.06 5.00 **** 3. Was the instructor available for consultation 49 0 0 0 1 0 0 3.00 ****/ 55 **** **** 4.34 4.67 **** Self Paced 1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 49 0 0 0 1 0 0 3.00 ****/ 55 **** **** 4.34 4.67 ****				-			-	_		,					
Field Work 1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 48 0 1 0 0 0 1 3.00 ****/ 58 **** **** 4.22 4.20 **** 2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 47 0 2 1 0 0 0 1.33 ****/ 52 **** **** 4.06 5.00 **** 3. Was the instructor available for consultation 49 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 39 **** **** 4.39 5.00 **** Self Paced 1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 49 0 0 0 1 0 0 3.00 ****/ 55 **** **** 4.34 4.67 ****					-	-	_	_		,					
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	5. Were criteria for grading made clear	48	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 98	****	3.80	3.95	4.20	***
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 47 0 2 1 0 0 0 1.33 ****/ 52 **** **** 4.06 5.00 **** 3. Was the instructor available for consultation 49 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 39 **** **** 4.39 5.00 **** Self Paced 1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 49 0 0 0 1 0 0 3.00 ****/ 55 **** **** 4.34 4.67 ****	Field Work														
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 47 0 2 1 0 0 0 1.33 ****/ 52 **** **** 4.06 5.00 **** 3. Was the instructor available for consultation 49 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 39 **** **** 4.39 5.00 **** Self Paced 1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 49 0 0 0 1 0 0 3.00 ****/ 55 **** **** 4.34 4.67 ****	1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	48	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 58	****	****	4.22	4.20	***
3. Was the instructor available for consultation 49 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 39 **** **** 4.39 5.00 **** Self Paced 1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 49 0 0 0 1 0 0 3.00 ****/ 55 **** **** 4.34 4.67 ****	2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	47	0	2	1	0	0	0	1.33	****/ 52	****	****	4.06	5.00	***
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 49 0 0 0 1 0 0 3.00 ****/ 55 **** **** 4.34 4.67 ****	3. Was the instructor available for consultation						0	1	5.00	****/ 39	****	****			* * * *
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 49 0 0 0 1 0 0 3.00 ****/ 55 **** **** 4.34 4.67 ****	Self Paced														
Frequency Distribution	1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	49	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 55	****	****	4.34	4.67	****
Trequency Profitation	Frem	encs	z Diet	trib	ut i o	n									
	11040	y	-10												

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	d Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	10	Required for Majors	2	Graduate	0	Major	23
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	1	В	14						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	1	C	4	General	1	Under-grad	50	Non-major	27
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5	F P	0 0	Electives	1	#### - Means responses to		are not enougl gnificant	h

I 0 Other 22

Course Section: POLI 260 0201 University of Maryland Title Baltimore County

COMPARATIVE POLITICS

Instructor: FORESTIERE, CAR Enrollment: 45 Questionnaires: 45

? 0

Page 1362 JAN 18, 2007 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Fall 2006

	Questions						eque:	ncie:	s 4	5	Ins Mean	tructor Rank		e Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
		General															
1. Did you	u gain ne	w insights, skills from	n this course	14	0	0	0	3	3	25	4.71	331/1669	9 4.51	4.46	4.23	4.34	4.71
		tor make clear the exp		14	0	0	0	1	4	26	4.81	181/1666	4.62	4.26	4.19	4.29	4.81
3. Did the	e exam qu	estions reflect the ex	spected goals	14	0	0	1	1	10	19	4.52	547/1421	L 4.27	4.41	4.24	4.35	4.52
4. Did oth	her evalu	ations reflect the exp	ected goals	14	16	3	0	2	4	6	3.67	1301/1617	7 3.79	4.27	4.15	4.24	3.67
	_	adings contribute to w	-	14	1	1	2	0	8	19	4.40	438/1555		4.38	4.00	3.96	4.40
		signments contribute to	-	14	17	1	0	3	2	8	4.14	783/1543		4.27	4.06	4.10	4.14
		system clearly explain	ined	14	0	0	0	0	6	25		167/1647			4.12	4.19	4.81
	-	was class cancelled		16	0	0	0	0	7	22	4.76	965/1668			4.67	4.59	4.76
9. How wor	uld you g	rade the overall teach	ling effectiveness	16	0	0	0	0	10	19	4.66	249/1605	4.61	4.25	4.07	4.15	4.66
		Lecture															
1. Were th	he instru	ctor's lectures well p	prepared	14	0	0	0	0	0	31	5.00	1/1514	4.91	4.62	4.39	4.39	5.00
2. Did the	e instruc	tor seem interested in	n the subject	14	0	0	0	0	0	31	5.00	1/1551	1 4.99	4.87	4.66	4.72	5.00
3. Was led	cture mat	erial presented and ex	xplained clearly	14	0	0	0	0	3	28	4.90	126/1503	3 4.83	4.46	4.24	4.29	4.90
		es contribute to what y		14	0	0	0	0	3	28	4.90	164/1506		4.49	4.26	4.33	4.90
5. Did aud	diovisual	techniques enhance yo	our understanding	14	5	2	0	1	7	16	4.35	381/1311	L 4.39	3.77	3.85	3.96	4.35
		Discussion															
1. Did cla	ass discu	what you learned	22	0	0	1	3	6	13	4.35	613/1490	4.26	4.33	4.05	4.11	4.35	
		_	22	0	0	0	3	3	17	4.61	540/1502	2 4.54	4.60	4.26	4.31	4.61	
3. Did the	ere all students actively encouraged to participa id the instructor encourage fair and open discuss					0	0	0	3	20	4.87	319/1489	4.73	4.61	4.29	4.36	4.87
4. Were sp	Were special techniques successful					1	1	0	1	5	4.00	****/1006	3.46	3.98	4.00	3.99	****
		Laboratory															
2. Were yo	ou provid	led with adequate backs	ground information	44	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 233	3 ****	****	4.19	4.36	****
		Seminar															
1. Were as	ssigned t	copics relevant to the	announced theme	44	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 112	2 ****	4.80	4.38	4.59	****
		-															
		Field Work				_				_							
	_	cience contribute to wh	-	44	0	1	0	0	0	0		****/ 58		****	4.22	4.20	****
_	_	understand your evalu		44	0	0	0	1 0	0 1	0		****/ 52 ****/ 39		****	4.06	5.00 5.00	****
		tor available for cons could you discuss your		44 44	0	0	1	0	0	0		****/ 4(****	4.39	5.00	****
4. 10 WIIA	t degree	could you discuss your	. evaluations	44	U	U	1	U	U	U	2.00	/ 4(,		3.97	5.00	
		Self Paced															
3. Were yo	our conta	cts with the instructo	or helpful	44	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 46	5 ****	****	4.45	5.00	****
	F					trib	utio	n									
Credits Ea	arned 	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades				Rea	ason	s 			Ту	/pe 			Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99 0	A 15		Red	quir	ed f	or Ma	ajor	s	2	Graduat	ce	0	Majo	or	21
28-55	5	1.00-1.99 0	в 8														
56-83	2	2.00-2.99 3	C 6		Gei	nera	1				1	Under-9	grad 4	45	Non-	major	24
84-150	9	3.00-3.49 5	D 0														
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 10	F 0		Ele	ecti	ves				0		Means			_	ıh
			P 0		0.1	1				_		respons	ses to l	be sign	nıticar	ıt	
			I O		Otl	her				2	!7						

Course Section: POLI 280 0101 University of Maryland Title Baltimore County INTERNATIONAL RELATION

Instructor: HAGERTY, DEVIN

Enrollment: 49

Questionnaires: 35

Fall 2006 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire Page 1363

JAN 18, 2007

Job IRBR3029

			Fre	equer	ncie	s		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	0	0	0	7	2.7	4.79	219/1669	4.74	4.46	4.23	4.34	4.79
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	1	1	6	26	4.68	345/1666	4.60	4.26	4.19	4.29	4.68
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	3	4	5	22	4.35	728/1421	4.47	4.41	4.24	4.35	4.35
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	18	0	2	3	2	9	4.13	946/1617	4.13	4.27	4.15	4.24	4.13
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	4	0	3	1	5	7	15	3.97	839/1555	4.07	4.38	4.00	3.96	3.97
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	22	0	1	2	2	6	4.18	735/1543	4.18	4.27	4.06	4.10	4.18
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	2	4	4	4	19	4.03	1027/1647	4.09	4.25	4.12	4.19	4.03
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	0	1	3	9	16	3	3.53	1637/1668	3.42	4.42	4.67	4.59	3.53
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	8	0	0	0	1	8	18	4.63	278/1605	4.39	4.25	4.07	4.15	4.63
Tarkuus														
Lecture	1	0	0	0	2	-	27	1 71	472/1514	4 71	1 (2	4 20	4 20	1 71
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	2	5 3	27	4.74	473/1514 460/1551	4.71	4.62 4.87	4.39	4.39	4.74
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	3	31	4.91	,	4.93		4.66	4.72	4.91
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	0	6	27	4.82	210/1503	4.80	4.46	4.24	4.29	4.82
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	Ι.	0	0	Ţ	5	27	4.79	313/1506	4.84	4.49	4.26	4.33	4.79
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	18	1	Τ	3	Τ	8	4.00	587/1311	4.00	3.77	3.85	3.96	4.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	12	0	1	0	3	3	16	4.43	524/1490	4.40	4.33	4.05	4.11	4.43
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	12	0	0	0	2	2	19	4.74	415/1502	4.56	4.60	4.26	4.31	4.74
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	12	0	0	0	3	0	20	4.74	456/1489	4.65	4.61	4.29	4.36	4.74
4. Were special techniques successful	12	14	0	1	1	1	6	4.33	344/1006	4.33	3.98	4.00	3.99	4.33
Frequ	encv	Dist	rib	ıt i or	า									

Credits E	Earned	Cum. GPA		Expecte	ed Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	1	A	8	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	22
28-55	10	1.00-1.99	0	В	20						
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	5	C	4	General	2	Under-grad	35	Non-major	13
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	6	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	8	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means	there	are not enough	n
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	26				
				?	0						

Course Section: POLI 280 0201 University of Maryland
Title INTERNATIONAL RELATION Baltimore County

Instructor: HAGERTY, DEVIN

Enrollment: 31

Questionnaires: 29

Fall 2006
Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Page 1364

JAN 18, 2007

Job IRBR3029

	Frequencies							Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	10	0	0	0	1	4	14	4.68	360/1669	4.74	4.46	4.23	4.34	4.68
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	10	0	0	0	1	7	11	4.53	527/1666	4.60	4.26	4.19	4.29	4.53
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	10	0	0	0	2	4	13	4.58	493/1421	4.47	4.41	4.24	4.35	4.58
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	10	13	0	1	0	2	3	4.17	****/1617	4.13	4.27	4.15	4.24	***
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	10	1	0	1	4	4	9	4.17	644/1555	4.07	4.38	4.00	3.96	4.17
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	10	16	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/1543	4.18	4.27	4.06	4.10	****
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	10	0	0	0	6	4	9	4.16	955/1647	4.09	4.25	4.12	4.19	4.16
8. How many times was class cancelled	10	0	0	0	14	4	1	3.32	1644/1668	3.42	4.42	4.67	4.59	3.32
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	10	0	0	0	4	8	7	4.16	800/1605	4.39	4.25	4.07	4.15	4.16
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	10	0	0	0	1	4	14	4.68	553/1514	4.71	4.62	4.39	4.39	4.68
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	10	0	0	0	0	1	18	4.95	307/1551	4.93	4.87	4.66	4.72	4.95
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	10	0	0	0	0	4	15	4.79	243/1503	4.80	4.46	4.24	4.29	4.79
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	1	0	18	4.89	176/1506	4.84	4.49	4.26	4.33	4.89
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	10	17	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/1311	4.00	3.77	3.85	3.96	****
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	1	2	3	10	4.38	585/1490	4.40	4.33	4.05	4.11	4.38
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	13	0	0	0	4	2	10	4.38	781/1502	4.56	4.60	4.26	4.31	4.38
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	13	0	0	0	3	1	12	4.56	631/1489	4.65	4.61	4.29	4.36	4.56
4. Were special techniques successful	13	13	2	0	0	0	1		****/1006	4.33	3.98	4.00	3.99	****
									,					

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expecte	ed Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	А	3	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	10
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	0	В	10						
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	1	C	0	General	7	Under-grad	29	Non-major	19
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	7	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	n
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	9	_			
				?	2						

Course Section: POLI 280H 0201 University of Maryl Title Baltimore County Instructor: HAGERTY, DEVIN Fall 2006

Enrollment:

Grad.

0

3.50-4.00

11

University of Maryland Page 1365
Baltimore County JAN 18, 2007
Fall 2006 Job IRBR3029

Questionnaires:	12	Student	Course	Evaluation	Questionnaire
Queberonnarreb.	- L	Deadcire	COULDC	II V CAI CCI CII	Queberonnarie

F

P I

?

2

								-	ncies		_		ructor	Course	_		Level	Sect
		Question	.S		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		Genera	1															
1. Did vou	gain ne	w insights,ski	-	m this course	5	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1669	5.00	4.46	4.23	4.34	5.00
		tor make clear			5	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	293/1666	4.71	4.26	4.19	4.29	4.71
		estions reflec			5	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	184/1421	4.86	4.41	4.24	4.35	4.86
	_	ations reflect		_	5	3	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	219/1617	4.75	4.27	4.15	4.24	4.75
5. Did assi	igned re	adings contrib	ute to	what you learned	5	0	0	0	2	3	2	4.00	773/1555	4.00	4.38	4.00	3.96	4.00
6. Did writ	ten ass	ignments contr	ibute t	o what you learned	5	2	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	723/1543	4.20	4.27	4.06	4.10	4.20
7. Was the	grading	system clearl	y expla	ined	5	0	0	0	1	1	5	4.57	401/1647	4.57	4.25	4.12	4.19	4.57
8. How many	/ times	was class canc	elled		5	0	0	0	4	3	0	3.43	1641/1668	3.43	4.42	4.67	4.59	3.43
9. How woul	ld you g	rade the overa	.ll teac	hing effectiveness	6	0	0	0	0	3	3	4.50	373/1605	4.50	4.25	4.07	4.15	4.50
		Lectur			_					_	_		054/4544					
		ctor's lecture			5	0	0	0	0	Ţ	6	4.86	274/1514	4.86	4.62	4.39	4.39	4.86
	Did the instructor seem interested in the subject Was lecture material presented and explained clea						0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1551	5.00	4.87	4.66	4.72	5.00
							0	0	0	1	6	4.86	173/1503	4.86	4.46	4.24	4.29	4.86
4. Did the	Did the lectures contribute to what you learned					0	U	0	0	1	6	4.86	225/1506	4.86	4.49	4.26	4.33	4.86
		Discus	sion															
1. Did clas	ss discu	ssions contrib	ute to	what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	5	2	4.29	667/1490	4.29	4.33	4.05	4.11	4.29
2. Were all	l studen	ts actively en	courage	d to participate	5	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1502	5.00	4.60	4.26	4.31	5.00
3. Did the	instruc	tor encourage	fair an	d open discussion	5	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	478/1489	4.71	4.61	4.29	4.36	4.71
		Semina																
	_	-		announced theme	10	0	0	0	0	0	2		****/ 112	****	4.80	4.38	4.59	****
				ividual attention	11	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 97	****	4.60	4.36	4.60	****
				what you learned	11	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 92	****	4.60	4.22	4.50	****
_		ns contribute		-	11	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 105	****	4.20	4.20	4.63	****
5. Were cri	iteria f	or grading mad	e clear		11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 98	****	3.80	3.95	4.20	****
	F						tribu	ution	n									
	Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Gra							_					_					
Credits Ear	redits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Gra							Rea	asons	; - 			Ту]	pe 			Majors	
00-27	00-27 1 0.00-0.99 1 A 1					Red	quire	ed fo	or Ma	jors	5	1	Graduate	2	0	Majo	r	3
28-55	28-55 2 1.00-1.99 0 B 4																	
56-83	56-83 1 2.00-2.99 0 C 0					Ger	neral	L				0	Under-g	rad 1	2	Non-	major	9
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	0	D 0														
						_									_			_

Electives

Other

0

6

- Means there are not enough
responses to be significant

Course Section: POLI 300 0101 University of Maryland Title QUANT POLI SCI Baltimore County Instructor:

MILLER, NICHOLA Fall 2006

Enrollment: 49 Questionnaires: 49

Page 1366 JAN 18, 2007 Job IRBR3029

Ctudent	COURCE	Evaluation	$\Omega_{11} \triangle c + i \triangle r$	naira

Questions	NR	NA	Fre	equer 2	cies 3	4	5	Inst Mean	tructor Rank	Course Mean	_	UMBC Mean		Sect Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	30	0	2	4	6	3	4	3 16	1582/1669	3.16	4.46	4.23	4.28	3.16
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	30	0	1	3	3	6	6		1372/1666		4.26	4.19	4.20	3.68
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	30	0	2	2	1	4	10		1024/1421	3.95	4.41	4.24	4.25	3.95
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	31	9	1	0	0	2	6		****/1617		4.27	4.15	4.22	****
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	30	1	7	2	2	2	5		1487/1555	2.78	4.38	4.00	4.03	2.78
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	30	4	2	0	2	1	10	4.13	795/1543	4.13	4.27	4.06	4.14	4.13
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	30	0	1	0	6	4			1113/1647		4.25	4.12	4.14	3.95
8. How many times was class cancelled	30	0	0	0	0	5	14	4.74	991/1668		4.42	4.67	4.68	4.74
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	33	0	1	2	5	7			1436/1605		4.25	4.07		3.31
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	31	0	1	0	2	2	13	4.44	892/1514	4.44	4.62	4.39	4.46	4.44
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	31	0	1	2	2	2	11	4.11	1387/1551	4.11	4.87	4.66	4.70	4.11
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	32	0	1	2	3	6	5		1261/1503	3.71	4.46	4.24	4.28	3.71
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	31	0	1	2	7	4	4		1335/1506		4.49	4.26	4.30	3.44
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	32	0	0	1	4	6	6	4.00	587/1311	4.00	3.77	3.85	3.97	4.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	36	0	5	1	3	2	2		1422/1490	2.62	4.33	4.05	4.11	2.62
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	36	0	3	1	0	2	7		1241/1502		4.60	4.26	4.28	3.69
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	36	0	2	1	1	3	6	3.77	1186/1489	3.77	4.61	4.29	4.35	3.77
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	48	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 226	***	***	4.20	4.17	***
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	48	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 233	****	****	4.19	4.13	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	48	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 225	****	****	4.50	4.45	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	48	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 223	****	****	4.35	4.27	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	48	U	U	U	U	U	1	5.00	****/ 206	^^^		4.15	4.08	* * * *
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	48	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 112	****	4.80	4.38	4.53	***
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	48	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 97	****	4.60	4.36	4.12	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	48	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 92	****	4.60	4.22	4.47	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	48	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 105	****	4.20	4.20	4.45	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	48	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 98	****	3.80	3.95	4.15	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	48	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 58	****	****	4.22	4.29	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	48	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 52	****	****	4.06	3.59	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	48	0	0	0	0	0	1		,	****	****	4.39	3.82	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	48	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 40	****	****	3.97	3.34	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	48	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.33	3.49	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	48	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 55	****	****	4.34	4.03	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	48	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 42	****	****	4.31	4.13	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	48	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 46	****	****	4.45	4.13	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	48	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 33	****	****	4.25	3.00	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	48	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 29	****	****	4.34	4.13	****

Course Section: POLI 300 0101
Title QUANT POLI SCI
Instructor: MILLER, NICHOLA

49

Enrollment:

Questionnaires: 49

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2006 Page 1366 JAN 18, 2007 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	l Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	7	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	16
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	2	В	4						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	1	C	4	General	0	Under-grad 4	19	Non-major	33
84-150	8	3.00-3.49	3	D	1						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means t	there are	e not enough	n
				P	0			responses to b	oe signi:	ficant	
				I	0	Other	15				
				?	0						

Course Section: POLI 309 0101 Title

SELECTED TOPICS IN POL

Instructor: MILLER, NICHOLA

Enrollment: 25 Questionnaires: 24

Fall 2006 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

University of Maryland

Baltimore County

Page 1367 JAN 18, 2007 Job IRBR3029

	Ouestions						Fre	eque	ncies	5		Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
		Question	S		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		 Genera	1															
1 Did vo	u gain n	ew insights,ski	-	om this course	9	0	0	2	2	3	8	4 13	1064/1669	4.13	4.46	4.23	4.28	4.13
		ctor make clear			10	0	0	2	2	5	5		1206/1666		4.26	4.19	4.20	3.93
		uestions reflec			10	0	0	2	1	0	11	4.43	657/1421		4.41	4.24	4.25	4.43
		uations reflect			9	0	0	0	1	4	10	4.60			4.27	4.15	4.22	4.60
				what you learned	9	0	1	1	2	2	9	4.13			4.38	4.00	4.03	4.13
	_	-		to what you learned	9	2	0	0	2	2	9	4.54			4.27	4.06	4.14	4.54
		g system clearl		_	9	0	1	1	0	3			759/1647		4.25	4.12	4.14	4.33
		was class canc			9	0	0	0	0	4			991/1668		4.42	4.67	4.68	4.73
				ching effectiveness	12	1	0	1	1	8			1164/1605		4.25		4.09	3.82
, 110 m mo	ara you	grade one evera		Jillig Gliggerveness		_	ŭ	_	_	Ū	_	3.02	1101, 1000	3.02	1.25	1.07	1.05	3.02
		Lectur	e															
		uctor's lecture			9	0	0	1	1	5	8	4.33	1022/1514	4.33	4.62	4.39	4.46	4.33
		ctor seem inter			9	0	0	0	1	1	13	4.80	788/1551	4.80	4.87	4.66	4.70	4.80
3. Was le	cture mat	terial presente	d and e	explained clearly	9	0	0	1	2	8	4	4.00	1066/1503	4.00	4.46	4.24	4.28	4.00
4. Did th	e lecture	es contribute t	o what	you learned	9	0	1	0	2	3	9	4.27	901/1506	4.27	4.49	4.26	4.30	4.27
5. Did au	diovisua	l techniques en	hance y	your understanding	9	0	0	1	1	2	11	4.53	250/1311	4.53	3.77	3.85	3.97	4.53
1 - 1 1		Discus				0	0	0	0	_		2 20	1000/1400	2 20	4 22	4 05	4 11	2 20
				what you learned	11	0	2	2	2	3	4		1220/1490		4.33	4.05	4.11	3.38
				ed to participate	11	0	0	2	1	1	9	4.31	,		4.60	4.26	4.28	4.31
				nd open discussion	11	0	0	0	2	2	9	4.54			4.61	4.29	4.35	4.54
4. were s	special te	echniques succe	ssiui		12	11	U	U	U	U	1	5.00	****/1006		3.98	4.00	4.10	
		Labora	tory															
2. Were y	ou provi	ded with adequa	te back	ground information	23	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 233	****	****	4.19	4.13	****
		Semina	r															
1. Were a	ssigned	topics relevant	to the	e announced theme	23	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 112	***	4.80	4.38	4.53	****
2. Was th	e instru	ctor available	for ind	dividual attention	22	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 97	****	4.60	4.36	4.12	****
3. Did re	search p	rojects contrib	ute to	what you learned	22	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 92	****	4.60	4.22	4.47	****
4. Did pr	esentatio	ons contribute	to what	you learned	22	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 105	****	4.20	4.20	4.45	****
5. Were c	riteria :	for grading mad	le clear	£	22	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 98	****	3.80	3.95	4.15	****
				Frequ	ency	Dist	trib	utio	n									
				_	_													
Credits E	edits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Gra							Rea	asons	5			Ту	pe			Majors	1
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	1	 А б		Red	guir	ed f	or Ma	jor	`s	1	Graduat	 е	0	Majo	r or	7
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	1	В 5						. ,				-	-) -		•
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	1	C 2		Ger	nera	1				1	Under-g	rad 2	24	Non-	-major	17
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	3	D 0		001		_				_	011001 9	2	-	2.011		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F 0		E] 6	ecti	ves				1	#### - :	Means t	here a	re not	enous	rh
~~.	Ü	3.33 1.00	-	P 0								_	respons				_	,
				T 0		O+1	0.070				1	0	T CDPOILD		5191			

Other

10

I

0

Course Section: POLI 309A 0101

Title CNTMP.AM. FOREIGN POLI

Instructor: MIKHAIL, NABIL

Enrollment:

30 Questionnaires: 28 Baltimore County Fall 2006

University of Maryland

Page 1368 JAN 18, 2007 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

			Fre	equer	cies	3		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	6	0	0	1	0	7	14	4.55	545/1669	4.55	4.46	4.23	4.28	4.55
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	6	0	0	1	2	8	11	4.32	801/1666	4.32	4.26	4.19	4.20	4.32
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	6	0	0	0	3	4	15	4.55	520/1421	4.55	4.41	4.24	4.25	4.55
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	6	0	0	1	5	3	13	4.27	780/1617	4.27	4.27	4.15	4.22	4.27
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	3	4	14	4.52	324/1555	4.52	4.38	4.00	4.03	4.52
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	7	3	0	0	3	5	10	4.39	534/1543	4.39	4.27	4.06	4.14	4.39
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	7	0	0	1	2	6	12	4.38	682/1647	4.38	4.25	4.12	4.14	4.38
8. How many times was class cancelled	8	0	0	0	1	12	7	4.30	1353/1668	4.30	4.42	4.67	4.68	4.30
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	10	0	0	0	3	5	10	4.39	525/1605	4.39	4.25	4.07	4.09	4.39
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	7	0	1	0	1	4	15	4.52	775/1514	4.52	4.62	4.39	4.46	4.52
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	7	0	0	0	1	1	19	4.86	650/1551	4.86	4.87	4.66	4.70	4.86
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	7	0	0	1	5	2	13	4.29	852/1503	4.29	4.46	4.24	4.28	4.29
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	1	2	3	15	4.52	623/1506	4.52	4.49	4.26	4.30	4.52
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	8	6	2	2	1	4	5	3.57	904/1311	3.57	3.77	3.85	3.97	3.57
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	2	6	9	4.41	546/1490	4.41	4.33	4.05	4.11	4.41
 Were all students actively encouraged to participate 	11	0	0	0	1	4	12	4.65	504/1502	4.65	4.60	4.26	4.28	4.65
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	11	0	0	0	1	1	15	4.82	358/1489	4.82	4.61	4.29	4.35	4.82
4. Were special techniques successful	11	11	1	1	1	0	3	3.50	****/1006	****	3.98	4.00	4.10	****
- 1														
Laboratory			_		_	_								
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	27	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 233	****	****	4.19	4.13	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	26	1	0	0	0	1	0	4 00	****/ 112	****	4.80	4.38	4.53	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	27	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 97	****	4.60	4.36	4.12	****
		0		0	0	1	0		,	****				****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	27		0				-		,	****	4.60	4.22	4.47	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	27	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 105 ****/ 98	****	4.20	4.20	4.45	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	27	U	U	U	U	1	U	4.00	***/ 98		3.80	3.95	4.15	
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	27	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 58	****	****	4.22	4.29	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	27	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 52	****	****	4.06	3.59	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	27	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 39	****	****	4.39	3.82	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	27	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 40	****	****	3.97	3.34	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	27	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.33	3.49	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	21	U	U	U	U	1	U	4.00	/ 30			4.33	3.49	
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	27	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 55	****	****	4.34	4.03	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	27	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 46	****	****	4.45	4.13	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	27	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 33	****	****	4.25	3.00	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	27	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 29	****	****	4.34	4.13	****
1 Suddies Francisco Suddies		ŭ	•	J	•	_	J	1.00	, 25					

Course Section: POLI 309A 0101

Title CNTMP.AM. FOREIGN POLI

Instructor: MI

MIKHAIL, NABIL

Enrollment: 30
Questionnaires: 28

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2006 Page 1368 JAN 18, 2007 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expecte	ed Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	 А	7	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	12
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	В	10						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	2	С	2	General	4	Under-grad	28	Non-major	16
84-150	10	3.00-3.49	5	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means	there	are not enough	h
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	14				
				?	1						

Course Section: POLI 320 0101 University of Maryland Title AMER POLITICAL THOUGHT Baltimore County JAN 18, 2007 Fall 2006

STACEY, SIMON Instructor:

Enrollment: 28 Questionnaires: 28

Student	Course	Evaluation	Ouestionnaire

Page 1369

Job IRBR3029

			Fre	equer	ncie	s		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	13	0	Ο	Λ	1	4	10	4.60	478/1669	4.60	4.46	4.23	4.28	4.60
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	13	0	0	0	3	2	10	4.47	605/1666	4.47	4.26	4.19	4.20	4.47
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	15	9	0	0	0	1	3		****/1421	****	4.41	4.24	4.25	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	14	3	0	0	2	4	5	4.27	780/1617	4.27	4.27	4.15	4.22	4.27
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	0	1	14	4.93	70/1555	4.93	4.38	4.00	4.03	4.93
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	13	3	0	0	0	5	7	4.58	316/1543	4.58	4.27	4.06	4.14	4.58
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	13	1	0	1	1	4	8	4.36	728/1647	4.36	4.25	4.12	4.14	4.36
8. How many times was class cancelled	13	0	0	0	0	12	3	4.20	1418/1668	4.20	4.42	4.67	4.68	4.20
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	17	0	0	0	0	3	8	4.73	188/1605	4.73	4.25	4.07	4.09	4.73
. 3														
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	14	0	0	0	0	2	12	4.86	274/1514	4.86	4.62	4.39	4.46	4.86
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	14	0	0	0	0	0	14	5.00	1/1551	5.00	4.87	4.66	4.70	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	14	0	0	0	0	1	13	4.93	101/1503	4.93	4.46	4.24	4.28	4.93
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	1	0	1	12	4.71	407/1506	4.71	4.49	4.26	4.30	4.71
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	16	11	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1311	****	3.77	3.85	3.97	****
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	127/1490	4.92	4.33	4.05	4.11	4.92
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	16	0	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	213/1502	4.92	4.60	4.26	4.28	4.92
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	16	0	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	252/1489	4.92	4.61	4.29	4.35	4.92
4. Were special techniques successful	17	9	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1006	****	3.98	4.00	4.10	****
Frequ	encv	Dist	rib	ution	า									
1														

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	d Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	А	4	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	11
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	9						
56-83	5	2.00-2.99	4	C	0	General	3	Under-grad	28	Non-major	17
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	4	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	n
				P	0			responses to	be sig	nificant	
				I	0	Other	9	_			
				?	0						

University of Maryland Baltimore County

Fall 2006

Page 1370

JAN 18, 2007

Job IRBR3029

Enrollment: 24 Questionnaires: 23 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Course Section: POLI 323 0101

THE PRESIDENCY

SCHALLER, THOMA

Title

Instructor:

Comparison NR NR 1 2 3 4 5 8 8 8 8 8 8 8 8 8	~							~											
General 1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals 3. 0 0 0 0 0 3 17 4.85 167/1669 4.85 4.46 4.23 4.28 4. 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals 3. 0 0 0 0 2 4 14 4.60 439/1666 4.60 4.26 4.19 4.20 4. 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals 3. 1 0 0 1 2 12 4.63 441/1421 4.63 4.41 4.24 4.25 4. 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 3. 0 0 0 0 1 1 19 4.95 60/1555 4.95 4.38 4.00 4.03 4. 6. Did with assignments contribute to what you learned 3. 0 0 0 0 1 1 19 4.95 60/1555 4.95 4.38 4.00 4.03 4. 6. Was the grading system clearly explained 3. 0 0 0 0 1 1 19 4.95 60/1555 4.95 4.38 4.00 4.03 4. 6. Was the grading system clearly explained 3. 0 0 0 2 2 1 15 4.45 583/1647 4.45 4.27 4.06 4.14 4. 6. Was the grading system clearly explained 3. 0 0 0 2 2 1 15 4.45 583/1647 4.45 4.25 4.12 4.14 4. 6. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 4. 1 0 1 0 4 13 4.61 288/1605 4.61 4.25 4.07 4.09 4. 6. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 4. Did the instructor's lectures well prepared 4. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 4. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 5. Did dustowal teaching effectivenes on the subject 6. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 7. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 7. Discussion 7. Discussion 8. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 8. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 5 0 0 0 0 1 1 7 4.94 142/1502 4.94 4.60 4.26 4.30 4. 8. Were all students activally encouraged to participate 5 0 0 0 0 0 1 1 7 4.94 142/1502 4.94 4.60 4.26 4.28 4. 8. Did due instructor encourage fair and open discussion 5 0 0 0 0 0 1 5 00 ***/ 58 **** *** 4.22 4.29 *** 8. Did goue clearly understand your evaluation criteria 22 0 0 0 0 0 1 5 00 ***/ 58 **** *** 4.24 4.29 *** 9. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 22 0 0 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0							Fr	eque	ncies	5		Ins	tructor	(Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sec
Did you gain new insights, skills from this course 3 0 0 0 0 3 17 4.85 167/1669 4.85 4.46 4.23 4.28 4.			Questions		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank		Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mea
Did you gain new insights, skills from this course 3 0 0 0 0 3 17 4.85 167/1669 4.85 4.46 4.23 4.28 4.			General																
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals 3	1. Did voi	u gain ne		rom this course	3	0	0	0	0	3	17	4.85	167/16	69	4.85	4.46	4.23	4.28	4.8
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals 3 4 0 0 2 2 12 4.63 441/1421 4.63 4.1 4.24 4.25 4.							0												4.6
1. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals 3 1 0 0 1 4 14 4.68 300/1617 4.68 4.27 4.15 4.22 4. Did sasigned readings contribute to what you learned 3 0 0 0 0 1 1 9 4.95 60/1555 4.95 4.38 4.00 4.03 4. 5. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 3 0 0 0 0 1 1 9 4.95 60/1555 4.95 4.38 4.00 4.03 4. 5. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 3 0 0 0 0 2 4 14 4.60 298/1543 4.60 4.27 4.06 4.14 4. 8. How many times was class cancelled 3 0 0 0 0 0 6 14 4.70 1039/1668 4.70 4.45 4.25 4.12 4.14 4. 8. How many times was class cancelled 3 0 0 0 0 0 6 14 4.70 1039/1668 4.70 4.42 4.67 4.68 4. 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 4 1 0 1 0 4 13 4.61 288/1605 4.61 4.25 4.07 4.09 4. 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 4 1 0 0 1 0 4 13 4.61 288/1605 4.61 4.25 4.07 4.09 4. 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 4 1 0 0 1 0 4 13 4.61 288/1605 4.61 4.25 4.07 4.09 4. 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 4 1 0 0 1 0 4 13 4.61 288/1605 4.61 4.25 4.07 4.09 4. 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 4 1 0 0 1 0 4 13 4.61 288/1605 4.61 4.25 4.07 4.09 4. 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 4 1 0 0 1 0 4 13 4.61 288/1605 4.61 4.25 4.07 4.09 4. 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 4 1 0 0 1 0 0 1 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 15 10 4.00 4.07 4.62 4.28 4. 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 4 1 0 0 1 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 15 5.00 4.07 4.62 4.29 4.4.60 4.26 4.28 4. 9. Did the instructor escontribute to what you learned 5 0 0 0 0 1 1 7 4.94 142/1502 4.94 4.60 4.26 4.28 4. 9. How would you grade the overall each you grade y					3	4	0	0	2	2	12	4.63					4.24		4.6
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 3 0 0 0 1 19 4.95 60/1555 4.95 4.38 4.00 4.03 4.4		_			3	1	0	0	1	4	14	4.68	300/16	17	4.68	4.27	4.15	4.22	4.6
1. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 3						0	0	0	0	1	19								4.9
Was the grading system clearly explained 3 0 0 2 2 1 1 15 4.45 583/1647 4.45 4.25 4.12 4.14 4.					3	0	0	0	2	4	14	4.60	298/15	43		4.27	4.06	4.14	4.
How many times was class cancelled 3 0 0 0 0 6 14 4.70 1039/1668 4.70 4.42 4.67 4.68 4.					3	0	0	2	2	1	15			47	4.45	4.25	4.12	4.14	4.
Lecture . Were the instructor's lectures well prepared . Were the instructor seem interested in the subject 3 0 0 0 0 2 2 16 4.70 537/1514 4.70 4.62 4.39 4.46 4. . Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 3 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 1/1551 5.00 4.87 4.66 4.70 5. . Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 3 0 0 0 0 2 2 16 4.70 37/1503 4.70 4.46 4.24 4.28 4. . Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 3 0 0 0 0 2 3 15 4.65 484/1506 4.65 4.49 4.26 4.30 4. . Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 5 0 0 0 3 5 10 4.39 576/1490 4.39 4.33 4.05 4.11 4. . Were all students actively encouraged to participate 5 0 0 0 0 1 17 4.94 142/1502 4.94 4.66 4.26 4.28 4. . Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 5 0 0 1 0 1 16 4.78 411/1489 4.78 4.61 4.29 4.35 4. . Were special techniques successful Field Work . Did field experience contribute to what you learned 2 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 58 **** **** 4.22 4.29 *** 2 Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 2 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 58 **** **** 4.22 4.29 *** 2 Did you clearly understand your evaluations 3 Did class discussions Trequency Distribution Prequency Distribution Prequency Distribution 1 Graduate 0 Majors Tredits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades Reasons Type Majors Type Major					3	0	0	0	0	6	14	4.70	1039/16	68	4.70	4.42	4.67	4.68	4.
Nere the instructor's lectures well prepared 3 0 0 0 0 2 2 16 4.70 537/1514 4.70 4.62 4.39 4.46 4.	How wo	uld you g	grade the overall te	aching effectiveness	4	1	0	1	0	4	13	4.61	288/16	05	4.61	4.25	4.07	4.09	4.6
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 3 0 0 0 0 0 2 0 5.00 1/1551 5.00 4.87 4.66 4.70 5.8 Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 3 0 0 0 2 2 16 4.70 347/1503 4.70 4.64 6.24 4.28 4.8 4.10 the lectures contribute to what you learned 3 0 0 0 0 2 3 15 4.65 484/1506 4.65 4.49 4.26 4.30 4.5 Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 4 2 2 0 1 5 9 4.12 531/1311 4.12 3.77 3.85 3.97 4. Discussion 1. Discussion 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 5 0 0 0 0 3 5 10 4.39 576/1490 4.39 4.33 4.05 4.11 4.2 8.00 the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 5 0 0 1 1 17 4.94 142/1502 4.94 4.60 4.26 4.28 4.8 4.8 the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 5 0 0 1 1 11 4.77 139/1006 4.77 3.98 4.00 4.10 4.10 4.10 4.10 4.10 4.10 4.10			Lecture																
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 3 0 0 0 0 0 2 0 5.00 1/1551 5.00 4.87 4.66 4.70 5.	. Were th	he instru	uctor's lectures wel	l prepared	3	0	0	0	2	2	16	4.70	537/15	14	4.70	4.62	4.39	4.46	4.
. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 3 0 0 0 2 2 16 4.70 347/1503 4.70 4.46 4.24 4.28 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 3 0 0 0 0 2 3 15 4.65 484/1506 4.65 4.49 4.26 4.30 4. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 4 2 2 0 1 5 9 4.12 531/1311 4.12 3.77 3.85 3.97 4. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 5 0 0 0 0 3 5 10 4.39 576/1490 4.39 4.33 4.05 4.11 4. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 5 0 0 1 0 1 17 4.94 142/1502 4.94 4.60 4.26 4.28 4. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 5 0 0 1 0 1 16 4.78 411/1489 4.78 4.61 4.29 4.35 4.60 4.26 4.28 4. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 22 0 0 0 0 1 1 11 4.77 139/1006 4.77 3.98 4.00 4.10 4. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 22 0 0 0 0 1 5 5.00 ****/ 58 **** **** 4.22 4.29 *** Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 22 0 0 0 0 1 5 5.00 ****/ 58 **** **** 4.06 3.59 *** *** Was the instructor available for consultation 22 0 0 0 0 0 1 5 5.00 ****/ 39 **** **** 4.33 3.82 *** *** Did conferences help you carry out field activities 22 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 5 5.00 ****/ 30 **** **** 4.33 3.49 *** *** Frequency Distribution **redits Earned*** Cum. GPA*** Expected Grades*** Reasons*** Type*** Majors** **Frequency Distribution** **Frequency Distribut					3	0	0	0	0	0	20	5.00	1/15	51	5.00	4.87	4.66	4.70	5.
Discussion Discussion Discussion Discussion Discussion Did class discussions contribute to what you learned by the couraged to participate by the discussion statically encouraged to participate by the discussion statically encouraged to participate by the discussion by the dis					3	0	0	0	2	2	16		347/15	03			4.24	4.28	4.
Discussion Discussion Discussion Discussion Discussion Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 5 0 0 0 0 3 5 10 4.39 576/1490 4.39 4.33 4.05 4.11 4. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 5 0 0 1 1 1 1 4.77 139/1006 4.77 3.98 4.00 4.10 4. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 22 0 0 0 0 1 1 1 14 4.77 139/1006 4.77 3.98 4.00 4.10 4. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 22 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 58 **** **** 4.22 4.29 ** Was the instructor available for consultation 22 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 58 **** **** 4.03 3.82 ** To what degree could you discuss your evaluations 22 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 39 **** **** 4.39 3.82 ** Did conferences help you carry out field activities 22 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 30 **** **** 4.33 3.49 ** Frequency Distribution Tredits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades Reasons Type Majors Frequency Distribution Tredits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades Reasons Type Majors Frequency Distribution Distribu	. Did the	e lecture	es contribute to wha	t you learned	3	0	0	0	2	3	15	4.65	484/15	06	4.65	4.49	4.26	4.30	4.
Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 5 0 0 0 3 5 10 4.39 576/1490 4.39 4.33 4.05 4.11 4. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 5 0 0 0 0 1 17 4.94 142/1502 4.94 4.60 4.26 4.28 4. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 5 0 0 1 1 1 16 4.78 41.1/1489 4.78 4.61 4.29 4.35 4. Were special techniques successful 5 5 0 0 1 1 1 11 4.77 139/1006 4.77 3.98 4.00 4.10 4. Field Work Did field experience contribute to what you learned 22 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 58 **** **** 4.22 4.29 ** Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 22 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 58 **** **** 4.06 3.59 ** To what degree could you discuss your evaluations 22 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 39 **** **** 4.39 3.82 ** Did conferences help you carry out field activities 22 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 30 **** **** 4.33 3.49 ** Frequency Distribution redits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades Reasons Type Majors OO-27 0 0.00-0.99 0 A 6 Required for Majors 1 Graduate 0 Major 1 28-55 2 1.00-1.99 0 B 7 Secondary 1 C 2 General 1 Under-grad 23 Non-major 84-150 6 3.00-3.49 5 D 0 Grad. 0 3.50-4.00 4 F 0 Electives 1 #### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant I 0 Other 13				-	4	2	2	0	1	5	9	4.12					3.85	3.97	4.
R. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 5 0 0 0 0 1 17 4.94 142/1502 4.94 4.60 4.26 4.28 4. 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 5 0 0 1 0 1 16 4.78 411/1489 4.78 4.61 4.29 4.35 4. 4. Were special techniques successful 5 5 0 0 1 1 11 4.77 139/1006 4.77 3.98 4.00 4.10 4. Field Work Did field experience contribute to what you learned 22 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 58 **** **** 4.22 4.29 *** Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 22 0 0 0 0 1 0 0 3.00 ****/ 52 **** **** 4.06 3.59 ** Was the instructor available for consultation 22 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 39 **** **** 4.39 3.82 ** Did to the instructor available for consultation 22 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 39 **** **** 4.39 3.82 ** Did you clearly understand your evaluations 22 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 39 **** **** 4.39 3.82 ** Did to onferences help you carry out field activities 22 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 30 **** **** 4.33 3.49 ** Frequency Distribution Tredits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades Reasons Type Majors O0-27 0 0.00-0.99 0 A 6 Required for Majors 1 Graduate 0 Major 1 28-55 2 1.00-1.99 0 B 7 66-83 3 2.00-2.99 1 C 2 General 1 Under-grad 23 Non-major 84-150 6 3.00-3.49 5 D 0 Grad. 0 3.50-4.00 4 F 0 Electives 1 #### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			Discussion																
1. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 5 0 0 1 0 1 16 4.78 411/1489 4.78 4.61 4.29 4.35 4. 18 Were special techniques successful 5 5 0 0 1 1 1 11 4.77 139/1006 4.77 3.98 4.00 4.10 4. 19 4.10 4. 19 4.10 4. 19 4.10 4. 10 4.	. Did cla	ass discu	ussions contribute t	o what you learned	5	0	0	0	3	5	10	4.39	576/14	90	4.39	4.33	4.05	4.11	4.
Field Work Did field experience contribute to what you learned 22 0 0 0 0 1 1 10 5.00 ****/ 58 **** **** 4.22 4.29 ** Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 22 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 52 **** **** 4.06 3.59 ** Was the instructor available for consultation 22 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 39 **** **** 4.39 3.82 ** To what degree could you discuss your evaluations 22 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 40 **** **** 3.97 3.34 ** Did conferences help you carry out field activities 22 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 30 **** **** 4.33 3.49 ** Frequency Distribution Tredits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades Reasons Type Majors Frequency Distribution Type Majors Type Majors Required for Majors 1 Graduate 0 Major 1 Required for Majors 1 Under-grad 23 Non-major 1 By 0 Electives 1 #### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant 1 Other 13	. Were a	ll studer	nts actively encoura	ged to participate	5	0	0	0	0	1	17	4.94	142/15	02	4.94	4.60	4.26	4.28	4.
Field Work Did field experience contribute to what you learned 22 0 0 0 0 1 1 10 5.00 ****/ 58 **** **** 4.22 4.29 ** Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 22 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 52 **** **** 4.06 3.59 ** Was the instructor available for consultation 22 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 39 **** **** 4.39 3.82 ** To what degree could you discuss your evaluations 22 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 40 **** **** 3.97 3.34 ** Did conferences help you carry out field activities 22 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 30 **** **** 4.33 3.49 ** Frequency Distribution Tredits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades Reasons Type Majors Frequency Distribution Type Majors Type Majors Required for Majors 1 Graduate 0 Major 1 Required for Majors 1 Under-grad 23 Non-major 1 By 0 Electives 1 #### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant 1 Other 13	. Did the	e instruc	ctor encourage fair	and open discussion	5	0	0	1	0	1	16	4.78	411/14	89	4.78	4.61	4.29	4.35	4.
. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 22 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 58 **** **** 4.22 4.29 ** Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 22 0 0 0 1 0 0 3.00 ****/ 52 **** **** 4.06 3.59 ** Was the instructor available for consultation 22 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 39 **** **** 4.39 3.82 ** To what degree could you discuss your evaluations 22 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 40 **** **** 3.97 3.34 ** Did conferences help you carry out field activities 22 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 30 **** **** 4.33 3.49 ** Frequency Distribution Tredits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades Reasons Type Majors Type Majors Type Majors Type Majors Reasons Type Majors General 1 Under-grad 23 Non-major 1 6-83 3 2.00-2.99 1 C 2 General 1 Under-grad 23 Non-major 1 6-83 3 3.00-3.49 5 D 0 1 6-10					5	5	0	0	1	1	11	4.77	139/10	06	4.77	3.98	4.00	4.10	4.
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 22 0 0 0 1 0 0 3.00 ****/ 52 **** **** 4.06 3.59 ** 8. Was the instructor available for consultation 22 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 39 **** **** 4.39 3.82 ** 8. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations 22 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 40 **** **** 3.97 3.34 ** 8. Did conferences help you carry out field activities 22 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 30 **** **** 4.33 3.49 ** Frequency Distribution Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades Reasons Type Majors O0-27 0 0.00-0.99 0 A 6 Required for Majors 1 Graduate 0 Major 1 28-55 2 1.00-1.99 0 B 7 56-83 3 2.00-2.99 1 C 2 General 1 Under-grad 23 Non-major 84-150 6 3.00-3.49 5 D 0 Grad. 0 3.50-4.00 4 F 0 Electives 1 #### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant I 0 Other 13																			
8. Was the instructor available for consultation 22 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 39 **** **** 4.39 3.82 ** 8. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations 22 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 40 **** **** 3.97 3.34 ** 8. Did conferences help you carry out field activities 22 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 30 **** **** 4.33 3.49 ** Frequency Distribution Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades Reasons Type Majors	. Did fi	eld exper	rience contribute to	what you learned	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/	58	****	****	4.22	4.29	* *
#### - Means there are not enough formal of the first state of the fir	. Did you	u clearly	y understand your ev	aluation criteria	22	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/	52	****	****	4.06	3.59	**:
Frequency Distribution Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades Reasons Type Majors O0-27	. Was the	e instruc	ctor available for c	onsultation	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/	39	****	****	4.39	3.82	* * :
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 1 28-55 2 1.00-1.99 0 B 7 56-83 3 2.00-2.99 1 C 2 General 1 Under-grad 23 Non-major 84-150 6 3.00-3.49 5 D 0 Grad. 0 3.50-4.00 4 F 0 Electives 1 #### - Means there are not enough P 0 responses to be significant	. To what	t degree	could you discuss y	our evaluations	22	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/	40	****	****	3.97	3.34	**
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 1 28-55 2 1.00-1.99 0 B 7 56-83 3 2.00-2.99 1 C 2 General 1 Under-grad 23 Non-major 84-150 6 3.00-3.49 5 D 0 Grad. 0 3.50-4.00 4 F 0 Electives 1 #### - Means there are not enough P 0 responses to be significant	. Did con	nferences	s help you carry out	field activities	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/	30	****	****	4.33	3.49	**:
00-27				Frequ	ıency	Dist	trib	utio	n										
28-55	Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades				Re	asons	5				Туре	e			Majors	3
28-55	 00-27		0 00-0 99	 Д б		 Re	anir	 ed f	 or Ma				Gradu	ate		0	Maic		1.2
56-83 3 2.00-2.99 1 C 2 General 1 Under-grad 23 Non-major 84-150 6 3.00-3.49 5 D 0 Grad. 0 3.50-4.00 4 F 0 Electives 1 #### - Means there are not enough P 0 responses to be significant I 0 Other 13						1/6/	quil	cu I	OT 1410	בטנ ג	۵.	_	Gradu	ule		J	Ma JC) <u>+</u>	1.
84-150 6 3.00-3.49 5 D 0 Grad. 0 3.50-4.00 4 F 0 Electives 1 #### - Means there are not enough P 0 responses to be significant I 0 Other 13				-		Cor	nara	1				1	IIndox	-ar	ad 2	2	Non	-maio~	
Grad. 0 3.50-4.00 4 F 0 Electives 1 #### - Means there are not enough P 0 responses to be significant I 0 Other 13						Gei	iiei d					_	onder	-gr	au Z	J	NOII-	ilia JUL	
P 0 responses to be significant I 0 Other 13					₽1.	oat i	7700				1	####	_ M	eand +	here a	re not	enous	rh	
I 0 Other 13	Grau.	U	3.30-4.00 4	- *		Elt	CCLI	veb				_						_	111
- · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·			- · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·		O+1	h 0 20				1	2	respo	mse:	s to D	e sign	ıııcar	16		
				? 0		Oti	ner.				1	. 3							

Title INTEREST GROUPS & LOBB

SCOTT, JAMES L Instructor:

Enrollment: 27 Questionnaires: 24

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2006

Page 1371 JAN 18, 2007 Job IRBR3029

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

			Fre	equer	ncies	;		Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	10	0	0	0	1	0	13	4.86	167/1669	4.86	4.46	4.23	4.28	4.86
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	10	0	0	0	1	4	9	4.57	472/1666	4.57	4.26	4.19	4.20	4.57
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	10	0	0	0	0	3	11	4.79	242/1421	4.79	4.41	4.24	4.25	4.79
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	10	0	0	0	1	3	10	4.64	347/1617	4.64	4.27	4.15	4.22	4.64
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	2	3	8	4.46	379/1555	4.46	4.38	4.00	4.03	4.46
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	1	3	9	4.62	290/1543	4.62	4.27	4.06	4.14	4.62
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	12	0	0	0	1	3	8	4.58	389/1647	4.58	4.25	4.12	4.14	4.58
8. How many times was class cancelled	10	0	0	0	0	0	14	5.00	1/1668	5.00	4.42	4.67	4.68	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	11	0	0	0	0	2	11	4.85	123/1605	4.85	4.25	4.07	4.09	4.85
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	11	0	0	0	0	1	12	4.92	151/1514	4.92	4.62	4.39	4.46	4.92
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	11	0	0	0	0	0	13	5.00	1/1551	5.00	4.87	4.66	4.70	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	11	0	0	0	1	3	9	4.62	451/1503	4.62	4.46	4.24	4.28	4.62
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	0	1		4.92	131/1506	4.92	4.49	4.26	4.30	4.92
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	11	6	1	2	1	1	2		1091/1311		3.77	3.85		3.14
5. Did addiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	11	0		4		Τ	4	3.14	1091/1311	3.14	3.77	3.05	3.97	3.14
Discussion					_	_			000/4400			4 0=		
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	1	3	9	4.62	380/1490	4.62	4.33	4.05	4.11	4.62
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	11	0	0	0	0	2	11	4.85	296/1502	4.85	4.60	4.26	4.28	4.85
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	11	0	0	0	1	0	12	4.85	338/1489	4.85	4.61	4.29	4.35	4.85
4. Were special techniques successful	11	1	0	1	0	4	7	4.42	299/1006	4.42	3.98	4.00	4.10	4.42
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	23	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 226	****	****	4.20	4.17	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	23	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 233	****	****	4.19	4.13	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	23	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 225	****	****	4.50	4.45	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	23	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 223	****	****	4.35	4.27	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	23	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 206	****	****	4.15	4.08	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	23	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 112	****	4.80	4.38	4.53	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	23	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 97	****	4.60	4.36	4.12	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	23	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 92	****	4.60	4.22	4.47	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	23	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 105	****	4.20	4.20	4.45	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	23	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 98	***	3.80	3.95	4.15	***
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	23	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 58	****	****	4.22	4.29	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	23	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.06	3.59	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	23	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.06	3.59	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations		0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 40	****	****	3.97		****
	23 23	0	0	0	0	1	U T		****/ 30	****	****	4.33	3.34	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	∠3	U	U	U	U	Т	U	4.00	/ 30			4.33	3.49	
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	23	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 55	****	****	4.34	4.03	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	23	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 42	****	****	4.31	4.13	****

Title INTEREST GROUPS & LOBB

Instructor: SCOTT, JAMES L

Enrollment: 27
Questionnaires: 24

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2006 Page 1371 JAN 18, 2007 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	d Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	 А	 7	Required for Majors	5	Graduate	0	Major	4
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	В	6						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	3	C	0	General	3	Under-grad	24	Non-major	20
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	n
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	5				
				?	0						

Course Section: POLI 328 0101 University of Maryland Title WOMEN AND POLITICS Baltimore County

Questionnaires: 31

JAN 18, 2007 Instructor: JONESDEWEEVER, Fall 2006 Job IRBR3029 Enrollment: 31

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

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Page 1372

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	l Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	 А	0	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	0						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	31	Non-major	31
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	a
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	0						

University of Maryland Baltimore County

Course Section: POLI 328 0101

28

WOMEN & POLITICS

JONESDEWEEVER

Title

Instructor:

Enrollment:

Questionnaires: 27

Fall 2006

Page 1373

JAN 18, 2007

Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

						Fre	eque	ncie	s		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect	
		Questions	3		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		Genera	 1															
1. Did vo	ou gain ne	ew insights,skil	_	this course	10	0	0	1	0	6	10	4.47	633/1669	4.47	4.46	4.23	4.28	4.47
		ctor make clear			9	0	0	1	2	8	7	4.17	984/1666	4.17	4.26	4.19	4.20	4.17
		estions reflect	_	_	10	0	0	1	0	6	10	4.47	594/1421	4.47	4.41	4.24	4.25	4.47
	_	uations reflect		_	10	0	0	1	1	10	5	4.12	958/1617	4.12	4.27	4.15	4.22	4.12
5. Did as	signed re	eadings contribu	ıte to v	hat you learned	10	0	0	1	1	5	10	4.41	428/1555	4.41	4.38	4.00	4.03	4.41
6. Did wr	ritten ass	signments contr	ibute to	what you learned	10	0	0	1	1	6	9	4.35	562/1543	4.35	4.27	4.06	4.14	4.35
7. Was th	ne gradino	g system clearly	v explai	ned	10	0	0	0	1	8	8	4.41	634/1647	4.41	4.25	4.12	4.14	4.41
8. How ma	ny times	was class cance	elled		10	0	0	0	6	10	1	3.71	1622/1668	3.71	4.42	4.67	4.68	3.71
9. How wo	ould you g	grade the overa	ll teach	ing effectiveness	13	1	0	1	0	6	6	4.31	631/1605	4.31	4.25	4.07	4.09	4.31
1 77	the designation	Lecture			1.0	0	0	0	1	_	1.0	4 52	775/1514	4 52	4 60	4 20	1 16	4 52
	the instructor's lectures well prepared the instructor seem interested in the subject				10 10	0	0	0	1	6	10	4.53	775/1514		4.62	4.39	4.46	4.53
	lecture material presented and explained clear					0	0	0	0	4	13	4.76	862/1551	4.76	4.87	4.66	4.70	4.76
	s lecture material presented and explained clearl I the lectures contribute to what you learned					0	0	0 1	1	5	11	4.59	482/1503	4.59	4.46	4.24	4.28	4.59
	the lectures contribute to what you learned audiovisual techniques enhance your understandi				10	0	0	U T	-	5 1	11		623/1506	4.53	4.49	4.26	4.30	4.53
5. Did au	laiovisual	i techniques en	nance yo	our understanding	13	11	U	U	1	1	1	4.00	****/1311	^^^	3.77	3.85	3.97	^ ^ ^ ^
		Discus	sion															
1. Did cl	ass discu	ussions contribu	ite to v	hat you learned	10	0	0	1	0	3	13	4.65	356/1490	4.65	4.33	4.05	4.11	4.65
				l to participate	10	0	0	0	1	1	15	4.82	316/1502	4.82	4.60	4.26	4.28	4.82
				l open discussion	10	0	0	0	1	3	13	4.71	490/1489	4.71	4.61	4.29	4.35	4.71
4. Were s	special te	echniques succes	ssful	_	11	14	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/1006	****	3.98	4.00	4.10	****
				Frequ	lency	7 Dist	cribu	utio	n									
Credits E	Carned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	ason	S			Ty	pe			Majors	;
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 13		Rec	 quire		 or M	 aior		2	Graduat		0	Majo	 r	10
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B 3		1000	1411	- u I	O_L 1.1	۱۰۲ د	~	_	Gradati	_	~	1100	-	
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	2	C 0		Ger	neral	L				7	Under-g	rad 2	7	Non-	major	17
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	3	D 0													5	
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	6	F 0		Ele	ectiv	<i>r</i> es				1	#### - 1	Means t	here a	re not	enou	ıh
				P 0	Bicceives						respons				_			
				I 0		Oth	ner					6	-					
	I 0																	

Course Section: POLI 353 0101

Title GOVERNMENTAL BUDGETING

Instructor: MEYERS, ROY T.

Enrollment: 32 Questionnaires: 30

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2006

Page 1374 JAN 18, 2007 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

			Frequencies			Instructor		Course Dept		UMBC Level		Sect		
Ouestions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank		_	Mean		
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	6	0	0	0	7	8	9	4.08	1117/1669	4.08	4.46	4.23	4.28	4.08
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	6	0	1	2	4	7	10	3.96	1164/1666	3.96	4.26	4.19	4.20	3.96
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	6	3	0	3	3	6	9	4.00	969/1421	4.00	4.41	4.24	4.25	4.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	6	0	1	1	4	8	10	4.04	1005/1617	4.04	4.27	4.15	4.22	4.04
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	6	0	2	2	4	6	10	3.83	996/1555	3.83	4.38	4.00	4.03	3.83
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	6	0	2	1	3	8	10	3.96	957/1543	3.96	4.27	4.06	4.14	3.96
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	6	0	3	2	1	9	9	3.79	1255/1647	3.79	4.25	4.12	4.14	3.79
8. How many times was class cancelled	6	0	0	0	0	18	6	4.25	1382/1668	4.25	4.42	4.67	4.68	4.25
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	9	0	2	0	6	8	5	3.67	1274/1605	3.67	4.25	4.07	4.09	3.67
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	6	0	1	0	1	8	14	4.42	939/1514	4.42	4.62	4.39	4.46	4.42
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	6	0	0	0	1	4	19	4.75	880/1551	4.75	4.87	4.66	4.70	4.75
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	6	0	2	0	5	7	10		1117/1503		4.46	4.24	4.28	3.96
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	3	5	6	9		1163/1506		4.49	4.26	4.30	3.91
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	8	3	1	0	5	2	11	4.16	507/1311		3.77	3.85	3.97	4.16
5. Did didiovibual ecominates emance four understanding	J	3	-	Ü	3	_		1.10	30771311	1.10	3.77	3.03	3.57	1.10
Discussion				_			_							
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	1	4	5	9	4.16	771/1490		4.33	4.05	4.11	4.16
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	11	0	1	0	1	3	14	4.53	613/1502	4.53	4.60	4.26	4.28	4.53
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	11	0	1	0	2	5	11	4.32	883/1489	4.32	4.61	4.29	4.35	4.32
4. Were special techniques successful	11	3	0	1	3	5	7	4.13	447/1006	4.13	3.98	4.00	4.10	4.13
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	29	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 226	****	****	4.20	4.17	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	29	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 233	****	****	4.19	4.13	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	28	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 225	****	****	4.50	4.45	***
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	29	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 223	****	****	4.35	4.27	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	29	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 206	****	****	4.15	4.08	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	29	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 112	****	4.80	4.38	4.53	***
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	29	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 97	****	4.60	4.36	4.12	***
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	29	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 92	****	4.60	4.22	4.47	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	29	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 105	****	4.20	4.20	4.45	***
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	29	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 98	****	3.80	3.95	4.15	****
Field Work														
	20	0	0	0	0	1	0	4 00	****/ 58	****	****	1 22	4 20	****
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	29	0	-	-	-	1	-		,	****	****	4.22	4.29	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	29	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 52	****		4.06	3.59	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	29	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 39		****	4.39	3.82	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	29	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 40	****	****	3.97	3.34	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	29	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.33	3.49	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	29	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 55	****	****	4.34	4.03	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	29	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 42	****	****	4.31	4.13	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	29	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 46	****	****	4.45	4.13	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	29	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 33	****	****	4.25	3.00	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	29	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 29	****	****	4.34	4.13	***

Course Section: POLI 353 0101

Title GOVERNMENTAL BUDGETING

Instructor: MEYERS, ROY T.

Enrollment: 32
Questionnaires: 30

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2006 Page 1374 JAN 18, 2007 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits E	Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Grades	Reasons		Туре	Majors			
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	 А	8	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	5	
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	1	В	6							
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	1	C	2	General	2	Under-grad	30	Non-major	25	
84-150	10	3.00-3.49	7	D	0							
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough				
				P	0		respon		be si	gnificant		
				I	0	Other	15					
				?	1							

Course Section: POLI 354 0101 University of Maryland Title

PUBL MGMNT/PERSONNEL S Baltimore County Fall 2006 ADLER, JOSEPH Instructor:

Enrollment: 25

Questionnaires: 24

Page 1375 JAN 18, 2007 Job IRBR3029

O+	~	The second second second	O
Student	course	Evaluation	Ouestionnaire

			Fre	equer	ncies	3		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	10	0	0	0	1	5	8	4.50	590/1669	4.50	4.46	4.23	4.28	4.50
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	10	0	0	0	0	3	11	4.79	206/1666	4.79	4.26	4.19	4.20	4.79
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	10	0	0	0	0	3	11	4.79	242/1421	4.79	4.41	4.24	4.25	4.79
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	10	0	0	0	0	3	11	4.79	184/1617	4.79	4.27	4.15	4.22	4.79
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	1	3	10	4.64	237/1555	4.64	4.38	4.00	4.03	4.64
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	2	2	10	4.57	325/1543	4.57	4.27	4.06	4.14	4.57
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	10	0	0	0	0	3	11	4.79	185/1647	4.79	4.25	4.12	4.14	4.79
8. How many times was class cancelled	10	0	0	0	0	2	12	4.86	807/1668	4.86	4.42	4.67	4.68	4.86
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	12	0	0	0	2	6	4	4.17	789/1605	4.17	4.25	4.07	4.09	4.17
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	10	0	0	0	1	2	11	4.71	505/1514	4.71	4.62	4.39	4.46	4.71
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	10	0	0	0	1	1	12	4.79	825/1551	4.79	4.87	4.66	4.70	4.79
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	10	0	0	0	1	3	10	4.64	412/1503	4.64	4.46	4.24	4.28	4.64
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	2	3	9	4.50	642/1506	4.50	4.49	4.26	4.30	4.50
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	10	4	0	2	2	2	4	3.80	764/1311	3.80	3.77	3.85	3.97	3.80
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	1	2	9	4.67	340/1490	4.67	4.33	4.05	4.11	4.67
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	12	0	0	0	1	1	10	4.75	393/1502	4.75	4.60	4.26	4.28	4.75
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	12	0	0	0	1	2	9	4.67	532/1489	4.67	4.61	4.29	4.35	4.67
4. Were special techniques successful	12	1	0	0	3	1	7	4.36	328/1006	4.36	3.98	4.00	4.10	4.36

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	d Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	5	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	5
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	1	В	6						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	5	C	0	General	1	Under-grad	24	Non-major	19
84-150	7	3.00-3.49	0	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	n
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	11	-			
				?	0						

Course Section: POLI 371 0101 University of Maryland Title

COMP ASIAN POLITICS Baltimore County GRODSKY, BRIAN Fall 2006

Enrollment: 29 Questionnaires: 27

Instructor:

JAN 18, 2007 Job IRBR3029

Page 1376

Student	Course	Fireliation	Ouestionnaire
Student	Course	Evaluation	Ouestronnarie

			Fre	equer	ncies	3		Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	9	0	0	4	5	4	5	3.56	1458/1669	3.56	4.46	4.23	4.28	3.56
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	9	0	2	4	7	3	2		1585/1666	2.94	4.26	4.19	4.20	2.94
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	9	0	0	3	6	3	6		1166/1421	3.67	4.41	4.24	4.25	3.67
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	9	2	4	1	5	4	2		1541/1617	2.94	4.27	4.15	4.22	2.94
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	11	0	2	2	6	5	1		1418/1555	3.06	4.38	4.00	4.03	3.06
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	10	3	1	3	3	5	2		1336/1543	3.29	4.27	4.06	4.14	3.29
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	10	0	2	2	4	6	3		1464/1647	3.35	4.25	4.12	4.14	3.35
8. How many times was class cancelled	10	1	0	0	0	3	13	4.81	882/1668	4.81	4.42	4.67	4.68	4.81
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	10	0	1	2	7	5	2	3.29	1443/1605	3.29	4.25	4.07	4.09	3.29
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	10	0	2	0	5	0	2	2 47	1394/1514	3.47	4.62	4.39	4.46	3.47
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	10	0	0	0	1	8	2 14	4.76	862/1551	4.76	4.62	4.39	4.46	3.47 4.76
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	11	0	2	2	7	4	1 1		1423/1503	3.00	4.67	4.24	4.70	3.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	10	0	2	1	3	4			1262/1506	3.71	4.49	4.24	4.20	3.71
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	11	3	0	1	<i>3</i>	6	2		825/1311				3.97	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	ΤT	3	U	Τ	4	О	2	3.69	825/1311	3.69	3.77	3.85	3.97	3.09
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	1	7	4	3	3.60	1117/1490	3.60	4.33	4.05	4.11	3.60
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	12	0	0	0	4	1	10	4.40	754/1502	4.40	4.60	4.26	4.28	4.40
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	12	0	0	2	2	2	9	4.20	953/1489	4.20	4.61	4.29	4.35	4.20
4. Were special techniques successful	12	12	2	0	1	0	0	1.67	****/1006	****	3.98	4.00	4.10	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	26	0	0	0	0	1	0	4 00	****/ 112	****	4.80	4.38	4.53	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	26	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 97	****	4.60	4.36	4.12	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	26	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 92	****	4.60	4.22	4.47	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	26	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 105	****	4.20	4.20	4.45	***
Frequ	encv	Dist	ribu	ution	ı									

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	 А	4	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	8
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	В	5						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	3	C	2	General	6	Under-grad	27	Non-major	19
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	3	D	3						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	h
				P	1			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	10	_			
				?	2						

Course Section: POLI 373 0101 University of Maryland COMP MID-EAST/N AFR PO

> ? 0

Title Baltimore County Instructor: MIKHAIL, NABIL Fall 2006

Enrollment: 52

Ouestionnaires: 47 Student Cou	ourse Evaluation (Duestionnaire
--------------------------------	--------------------	---------------

							Fr	eque	ncie	s		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
		Question		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
		 Genera	1															
1. Did vo	u gain ne	ew insights,ski	_	m this course	27	0	0	0	5	5	10	4.25	914/1669	4.25	4.46	4.23	4.28	4.25
_	_	ctor make clear			27	0	0	0	5	4	11	4.30	814/1666		4.26	4.19	4.20	4.30
		uestions reflec			27	0	0	1	4	2	13	4.35	728/1421	4.35	4.41	4.24	4.25	4.35
4. Did ot	her eval	uations reflect	the ex	pected goals	27	2	0	1	1	4	12	4.50	496/1617	4.50	4.27	4.15	4.22	4.50
5. Did as	signed re	eadings contrib	ute to	what you learned	27	1	0	0	2	4	13	4.58	285/1555	4.58	4.38	4.00	4.03	4.58
6. Did wr	itten as	signments contr	ibute t	o what you learned	27	1	0	0	3	2	14	4.58	325/1543	4.58	4.27	4.06	4.14	4.58
7. Was th	e gradin	g system clearl	y expla	ined	27	0	1	1	6	3	9	3.90	1161/1647	3.90	4.25	4.12	4.14	3.90
8. How max	ny times	was class canc	elled		27	0	0	1	0	12	7	4.25	1382/1668	4.25	4.42	4.67	4.68	4.25
9. How wo	uld you	grade the overa	ll teac	hing effectiveness	33	0	0	0	2	3	9	4.50	373/1605	4.50	4.25	4.07	4.09	4.50
		Lectur	۵															
1 Were t	he instr	uctor's lecture	-	prepared	28	0	0	1	2	3	13	4.47	845/1514	4.47	4.62	4.39	4.46	4.47
	. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject						0	0	1	1	17	4.84			4.87	4.66	4.70	4.84
	3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly					0 0	0	0	2		15	4.68	360/1503	4.68	4.46	4.24	4.28	4.68
	 was lecture material presented and explained clearly Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 					0	0	0	3		14		575/1506		4.49	4.26	4.30	4.58
				our understanding	28 31	6	0	0	1	1	8		****/1311		3.77	3.85	3.97	****
		Discus	aion															
1 Did al	ace diec			what you learned	34	0	1	0	1	3	8	4.31	650/1490	4.31	4.33	4.05	4.11	4.31
				d to participate	33	0	1	0	2	2	9	4.29	859/1502		4.60	4.26	4.28	4.29
				d open discussion	34	0	0	0	1	1		4.77	422/1489	4.77	4.61	4.29	4.35	4.77
		echniques succe		a open arseassion	35	6	0	0	1	0	5		****/1006			4.00	4.10	****
				_		<u> </u>												
				Frequ	iency	DIST	trib	utio	n									
Credits E	Expected Grades				Rea	ason	s			Ту	pe			Majors	3			
00-27 0 0.00-0.99 0 A 9						Red	quir	ed f	 or M	 ajor		1	Graduat	 e	0	Majo	 or	9
28-55	28-55 0 1.00-1.99 0 B 6									J						5		
56-83	56-83 2 2.00-2.99 2 C 1					Ger	nera	1				3	Under-g	rad 4	.7	Non-	-major	38
84-150 5 3.00-3.49 4 D 0																-		
Grad. 0 3.50-4.00 4 F 0				F 0		Ele	ecti	ves				2	#### - 1	Means t	here a	re not	enoug	jh
Р 0													respons	es to b	e sign	ifican	ıt	
I 0						Otl	ner				1	.1	_					

Page 1377

JAN 18, 2007

Job IRBR3029

Course Section: POLI 409 0101 University of Maryland SELECTED TOPICS POLI S Baltimore County

Title Instructor: GRODSKY, BRIAN Fall 2006

Enrollment: 10 Questionnaires: 9

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Page 1378

JAN 18, 2007

Job IRBR3029

			Fre	equer	ncies	3		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	0	0	0	3	5	4.63	448/1669	4.63	4.46	4.23	4.39	4.63
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	0	0	3	2	2	3.86	1273/1666	3.86	4.26	4.19	4.22	3.86
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	7	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/1421	****	4.41	4.24	4.38	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	1	0	1	1	3	2	3.86	1196/1617	3.86	4.27	4.15	4.22	3.86
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	112/1555	4.88	4.38	4.00	4.08	4.88
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	0	1	6	4.50	390/1543	4.50	4.27	4.06	4.18	4.50
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	1	6	1	0	0	0	1.14	1643/1647	1.14	4.25	4.12	4.14	1.14
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	769/1668	4.88	4.42	4.67	4.70	4.88
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	3	4	1	3.75	1210/1605	3.75	4.25	4.07	4.16	3.75
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	1	2	5	4.50	799/1514	4.50	4.62	4.39	4.45	4.50
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	594/1551	4.88	4.87	4.66	4.73	4.88
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	1	1	2	4	4.13	996/1503		4.46	4.24	4.27	4.13
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	2	0	2	4		1069/1506		4.49	4.26	4.29	4.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	7	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/1311	****	3.77	3.85	3.88	****
Diam. and an														
Discussion	_	0	0	^	0	1	_	1 00	100/1400	1 00	4 22	4 05	1 00	4 06
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	Ţ	6	4.86	177/1490		4.33	4.05	4.26	4.86
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2 2	0	0	0	0	0	/ 6	5.00 4.86	1/1502 329/1489	5.00 4.86	4.60 4.61	4.26 4.29	4.46 4.52	5.00 4.86
4. Were special techniques successful	2	2	0	0	2	3	0	3.60	729/1489	3.60	3.98	4.29	4.52	3.60
1. Mete apectar eccurrence adecessing		_	J	J		5	U	3.00	125/1000	5.00	5.90	1.00	1.21	5.00

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	l Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	 А	1	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	8
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	1						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	0	С	0	General	1	Under-grad	9	Non-major	1
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	1
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	5	-	_		
				2	6						

Course Section: POLI 409A 0101 University of Maryland Page 1379
Title MOCK TRIAL Baltimore County JAN 18, 2007
Instructor: VAN HOVEN, JONA Fall 2006 Job IRBR3029
Enrollment: 19

Ouestionnaires:	19	St.udent.	Course	Evaluation	Questionnaire
Quescronnarres.	12	beauciic	COULSE	Evaluation	Quescronnarie

I

?

0

0

						Fre	eque	ncies	3		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect	
		Question		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
		 Genera																
1 Did voi	u dain na	Genera ew insights,ski	_	om this course	3	0	0	Λ	1	1	14	4.81	199/1669	4.81	4.46	4.23	4.39	4.81
_	-	ctor make clear			3	0	0	0	1	2	13	4.75	243/1666	4.75	4.26	4.19	4.22	4.75
		uestions reflec			3	0	0	0	1	2	13	4.75	280/1421	4.75	4.41	4.24	4.38	4.75
	_	uations reflect		_	3	0	0	0	0	2	14	4.88	128/1617	4.88	4.27	4.15	4.22	4.88
				what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	2	14	4.88	112/1555	4.88	4.38	4.00	4.08	4.88
	-	-		to what you learned	3	1	0	0	2	1	12	4.67	250/1543		4.27	4.06	4.18	4.67
		g system clearl		-	3	0	0	0	1	3	12	4.69	281/1647	4.69	4.25	4.12	4.14	4.69
		was class canc		illica	3	0	0	0	0	9	7		1248/1668	4.44	4.42	4.67	4.70	4.44
				hing effectiveness	6	0	0	0	0	2	11	4.85	123/1605		4.25	4.07		4.85
J. 110W WO	ara you	grade the overa	II ccac	iiiiig ciiccciveness	O	O	O	O	U	_		1.05	123/1003	1.05	1.25	1.07	1.10	1.05
		Lectur	е															
1. Were th	he instr	uctor's lecture	s well	prepared	3	0	0	0	0	3	13	4.81	342/1514	4.81	4.62	4.39	4.45	4.81
	oid the instructor seem interested in the subject						0	0	0	1	15	4.94	358/1551	4.94	4.87	4.66	4.73	4.94
	Was lecture material presented and explained clearly					0	0	0	1	4	11	4.63	438/1503	4.63	4.46	4.24	4.27	4.63
		es contribute t			3	0	0	0	0	2	14	4.88	200/1506	4.88	4.49	4.26	4.29	4.88
				our understanding	4	10	1	0	1	0	3	3.80	764/1311	3.80	3.77	3.85	3.88	3.80
		-	-	3														
		Discus	sion															
1. Did cla	ass disc	ussions contrib	ute to	what you learned	6	0	0	0	1	0	12	4.85	184/1490	4.85	4.33	4.05	4.26	4.85
2. Were a	ll studer	nts actively en	courage	ed to participate	6	0	0	1	0	0	12	4.77	381/1502	4.77	4.60	4.26	4.46	4.77
3. Did the	e instru	ctor encourage	fair ar	nd open discussion	6	0	0	1	0	0	12	4.77	422/1489	4.77	4.61	4.29	4.52	4.77
4. Were sp	pecial te	echniques succe	ssful		6	0	1	0	0	0	12	4.69	167/1006	4.69	3.98	4.00	4.21	4.69
				Frequ	lency	Dis	trib	utio	n									
Crodita E	arnod	Cum CDA		Expected Grades				Po:	asons	,			Туј	00			Majors	
	Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grad								ason:	> 								,
00-27	00-27 0 0.00-0.99 1 A 11					Re	quir	ed f	or Ma	ajor	s	1	Graduat	e	0	Majo	r	10
28-55	28-55 0 1.00-1.99 0 B 2						-			,								
56-83					Ger	nera	l				4	Under-g	rad 1	.9	Non-	major	9	
84-150												_				-		
Grad. 0 3.50-4.00 2 F 0						Ele	ecti	ves				0	#### - 1	Means t	here a	ere are not enough		jh
				P 0									respons	es to b	e sign	ifican	t	
	_								_	_								

Other

8

Course Section: POLI 419 0101 University of Maryland Title TOPICS IN POLITICAL TH Baltimore County

STACEY, SIMON Instructor:

Enrollment: 18 Questionnaires: 13

JAN 18, 2007 Fall 2006 Job IRBR3029

Page 1380

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

			Fre	equer	ncies	3		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	4	9	4.69	345/1669	4.69	4.46	4.23	4.39	4.69
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	3	9	4.62	425/1666	4.62	4.26	4.19	4.22	4.62
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	7	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	197/1421	4.83	4.41	4.24	4.38	4.83
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	5	1	0	0	1	6	4.38	673/1617	4.38	4.27	4.15	4.22	4.38
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	12	4.92	80/1555	4.92	4.38	4.00	4.08	4.92
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	3	0	0	1	2	7	4.60	298/1543	4.60	4.27	4.06	4.18	4.60
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	0	2	10	4.62	356/1647	4.62	4.25	4.12	4.14	4.62
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	7	5	4.42	1265/1668	4.42	4.42	4.67	4.70	4.42
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	2	10	4.83	127/1605	4.83	4.25	4.07	4.16	4.83
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	170/1514	4.92	4.62	4.39	4.45	4.92
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/1551	5.00	4.87	4.66	4.73	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	113/1503	4.92	4.46	4.24	4.27	4.92
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	147/1506	4.92	4.49	4.26	4.29	4.92
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	8	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1311	5.00	3.77	3.85	3.88	5.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	141/1490	4.90	4.33	4.05	4.26	4.90
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1502	5.00	4.60	4.26	4.46	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1489	5.00	4.61	4.29	4.52	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	2	9	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1006	****	3.98	4.00	4.21	****

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	d Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	6	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	9
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	В	5						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	4	C	1	General	2	Under-grad	13	Non-major	4
84-150	7	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	ı
				P	0			responses to	be sig	nificant	
				I	0	Other	9	_			
				?	0						

Course Section: POLI 427 0101 University of Maryland Title AFRICAN AMERICAN POLIT Baltimore County JAN 18, 2007 Fall 2006 Job IRBR3029

Instructor: KING-MEADOWS, T

Enrollment: 14 Questionnaires: 14

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Page 1381

							Fre	equei	ncies	3		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
		Question	s		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		 Genera	 1															
1. Did vo	ou gain ne	ew insights,ski	_	m this course	10	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	269/1669	4.75	4.46	4.23	4.39	4.75
		ctor make clear			10	0	0	0	3	1	0	3.25	1541/1666	3.25	4.26	4.19	4.22	3.25
		uestions reflec			10	0	0	0	2	1	1	3.75	1135/1421	3.75	4.41	4.24	4.38	3.75
		uations reflect			10	0	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	1029/1617	4.00	4.27	4.15	4.22	4.00
5. Did as	signed re	eadings contrib	ute to	what you learned	10	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	171/1555	4.75	4.38	4.00	4.08	4.75
6. Did wr	itten ass	signments contr	ibute t	o what you learned	10	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	659/1543	4.25	4.27	4.06	4.18	4.25
7. Was th	ne grading	g system clearl	y expla	ined	10	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	481/1647	4.50	4.25	4.12	4.14	4.50
8. How ma	ny times	was class canc	elled		10	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	1190/1668	4.50	4.42	4.67	4.70	4.50
				hing effectiveness	10	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	690/1605	4.25	4.25	4.07	4.16	4.25
		Lectur	e															
1. Were t	he instr	uctor's lecture	s well	prepared	10	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	441/1514	4.75	4.62	4.39	4.45	4.75
2. Did th	e instru	ctor seem inter	ested i	n the subject	10	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1551	5.00	4.87	4.66	4.73	5.00
3. Was le	cture mat	terial presente	d and e	xplained clearly	10	0	0	1	1	1	1	3.50	1330/1503	3.50	4.46	4.24	4.27	3.50
4. Did th	e lecture	es contribute t	o what	you learned	10	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	642/1506	4.50	4.49	4.26	4.29	4.50
				our understanding	10	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	445/1311	4.25	3.77	3.85	3.88	4.25
		Discus	sion															
1. Did cl	ass discu	ussions contrib	ute to	what you learned	10	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	261/1490	4.75	4.33	4.05	4.26	4.75
2. Were a	ıll studer	nts actively en	courage	d to participate	10	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1502	5.00	4.60	4.26	4.46	5.00
				d open discussion	10	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	684/1489	4.50	4.61	4.29	4.52	4.50
4. Were s	special te	echniques succe	ssful	-	10	3	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1006	***	3.98	4.00	4.21	****
				Frequ	ıency	7 Dist	trib	ution	n									
				_	-								_					
Credits E	larned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	asons	3 			Ту:	pe 			Majors	;
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 3		Red	quir	ed fo	or Ma	ajors		0	Graduat	e	0	Majo	r	4
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	в 0														
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	1	C 1		Gei	nera	L				2	Under-g	rad 1	.4	Non-	major	10
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	1	D 0														
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F 0		Ele	ecti	<i>r</i> es				0	#### - 1					βh
				P 0									respons	es to b	e sign	ifican	ıt	
				I 0		Ot1	her					2						

?

0

Course Section: POLI 433 0101 University of Maryland Title FIRST AMENDMENT FREEDO Baltimore County

Instructor: LANOUE, GEORGE

Enrollment: 33 Questionnaires: 25

Fall 2006 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire Page 1382

JAN 18, 2007

Job IRBR3029

					Fre	eque	ncie	s		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	Questions		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
	 General															
1. Did you gain new		rom this source	Λ	0	Λ	0	1	6	18	4.68	375/1669	4.68	4.46	4.23	4.39	4.68
2. Did the instructor			0	0	0	0	2	5	18	4.64	385/1666	4.64	4.26	4.19	4.22	4.64
3. Did the exam que			0	0	0	0	0	5	20	4.80	217/1421	4.80	4.41	4.24	4.38	4.80
4. Did other evaluat			0	0	0	0	2	7	16	4.56	434/1617	4.56	4.27	4.15	4.22	4.56
5. Did assigned read		1 3	0	0	0	0	0	4	21	4.84	124/1555		4.38	4.10	4.08	4.84
6. Did written assi	_	_	0	1	0	0	2	7	15	4.54	353/1543		4.27	4.06	4.18	4.54
7. Was the grading a	-	-	0	0	0	0	4	2	19	4.60	367/1647	4.60	4.25	4.12	4.14	4.60
8. How many times wa		Lained	0	0	0	0	0	2	23	4.92	570/1668		4.42	4.67	4.70	4.92
9. How would you gra		aching effectiveness	5	1	0	0	1	9	9	4.42	473/1605		4.25	4.07	4.16	4.42
J. How would you give	ade the Overail tea	actifing effectiveness	J		U	U	_	,	,	7.72	4/3/1003	7.72	1.23	1.07	1.10	1.12
	Lecture															
1. Were the instruct	tor's lectures well	l prepared	0	0	0	0	0	3	22	4.88	223/1514	4.88	4.62	4.39	4.45	4.88
2. Did the instructo			0	0	0	0	0	3	22	4.88	567/1551	4.88	4.87	4.66	4.73	4.88
3. Was lecture mate		3	0	0	0	0	2	5	18	4.64	412/1503	4.64	4.46	4.24	4.27	4.64
4. Did the lectures	contribute to what	vou learned	0	0	0	0	0	4	21	4.84	237/1506	4.84	4.49	4.26	4.29	4.84
5. Did audiovisual	techniques enhance	your understanding	3	10	1	1	4	4	2	3.42	989/1311	3.42	3.77	3.85	3.88	3.42
	Discussion															
1. Did class discuss		_	2	0	0	0	2	11	10	4.35	613/1490		4.33	4.05	4.26	4.35
2. Were all students	-		2	0	0	0	1	1	21	4.87	276/1502		4.60	4.26	4.46	4.87
3. Did the instructor	-	and open discussion	2	0	0	0	1	1	21	4.87	319/1489		4.61	4.29	4.52	4.87
4. Were special tech	nniques successful		2	2	1	0	1	6	13	4.43	292/1006	4.43	3.98	4.00	4.21	4.43
		Frequ	ıency	, Dis	trib	utio	n									
a 1'. = 1	g gp.					_					_					
Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades				Rea	ason	S			Ty	pe			Majors	

Credits E	Earned	Cum. GPA	A	Expecte	d Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	 А	8	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	1	Major	14
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	10						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	2	C	3	General	5	Under-grad	24	Non-major	11
84-150	12	3.00-3.49	7	D	0						
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00	10	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enoug	h
				P	0			responses to	be sig	nificant	
				I	0	Other	18	_			
				2	0						

Baltimore County

University of Maryland Fall 2006

Page 1383

JAN 18, 2007

Job IRBR3029

Enrollment:	10				
Questionnaires:	10	Student	Course	Evaluation	Questionnaire

Course Section: POLI 435 0101

LEGAL REASONING

BARNER-BARRY, C

Title

Instructor:

		Questions	5		NR	NA	Fro	equei 2	ncies 3	5 4	5	Inst Mean	ructor Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean		Level Mean	Sect Mean
		General																
		ew insights,ski			1	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1669	5.00	4.46	4.23	4.39	5.00
		ctor make clear	_	_	1	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1666	5.00	4.26	4.19	4.22	5.00
	_	uestions reflect		_	1	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1421	5.00	4.41	4.24	4.38	5.00
		uations reflect			1	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	123/1617	4.89	4.27	4.15	4.22	4.89
				what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1555		4.38	4.00	4.08	5.00
				what you learned		0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1543		4.27	4.06	4.18	5.00
		g system clearly		ınea	2	0	0	0	0 1	0	8		1/1647		4.25	4.12	4.14	5.00
		was class cance			4	0	0	0	U T	4 2			1329/1668		4.42	4.67	4.70	4.33
9. How wo	ula you g	grade the overa.	LI teaci	ning effectiveness	4	U	U	U	U	2	4	4.67	239/1605	4.67	4.25	4.07	4.16	4.67
		T a a b																
1 17 41	h	Lecture			1	0	0	0	0	1	0	4 00	000/1514	4 00	1 ()	4 20	4 4 5	4 00
		uctor's lectures	_	-	1	0	0	0	0	0	8	4.89	223/1514 1/1551	4.89 5.00	4.62 4.87	4.39	4.45 4.73	4.89 5.00
		ctor seem intere		r the subject oplained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1501		4.87	4.00	4.73	5.00
		eriai presented es contribute to			1	0	1	0	0	0	8	4.56	594/1506		4.46	4.24	4.27	4.56
				our understanding	2	-	0	0	0	0	2		****/1311		3.77		3.88	****
5. Did au	diovisua.	r recuiriques em	lance yo	our understanding	2	О	U	U	U	U	4	5.00	~~~/1311		3.77	3.85	3.88	
		Discuss	ni on															
1 Did al	acc dica			what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1490	5.00	4.33	4.05	4.26	5.00
				d to participate	4	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1502		4.60	4.26	4.46	5.00
				d open discussion	4	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1489	5.00	4.61	4.29	4.52	
		echniques succes		d Open discussion	4	0	0	0	2	0	-	4.33	344/1006		3.98	4.00		4.33
T. WELE S	peciai ce	ecinitques succes	ssiui		-	U	U	U	2	U	-	1.33	344/1000	1.33	3.90	1.00	7.21	1.33
				Freq	uency	y Dis	trib	ution	n									
Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	asons	5			Ту	pe			Majors	\$
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 6		Re	quir	ed fo	or Ma	jors	. – – – }	0	Graduat	 e	1	Majo	 or	4
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В 3														
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	1	C 0		Ge	nera	l				3	Under-g	rad	9	Non-	-major	6
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	2	D 0														
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00	4	F 0		El	ecti	ves				0	#### - 1	Means t	here a	re not	enoug	jh
				P 0									respons	es to b	e sign	nificar	ıt	
				I 0		Ot]	her					4						
				? 0														

Course Section: POLI 445 0101 University of Maryland Baltimore County LAW/POLITICS/AMER EDUC

Title LANOUE, GEORGE Fall 2006

Instructor: Enrollment: 15

Questionnaires: 15

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Page 1384 JAN 18, 2007 Job IRBR3029

		Ouestion	3		ИR	NA	Fre	_	ncies 3	; 4	5	Inst Mean	ructor Rank	Course	Dept Mean		Level Mean	Sect Mean
		Genera	l															
1. Did you	ı gain ne	ew insights,ski	lls from	this course	2	0	0	0	0	2	11	4.85	175/1669	4.85	4.46	4.23	4.39	4.85
2. Did the	e instruc	ctor make clear	the exp	ected goals	2	0	0	1	0	5	7	4.38	715/1666	4.38	4.26	4.19	4.22	4.38
3. Did the	e exam qu	estions reflec	the ex	spected goals	2	6	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	331/1421	4.71	4.41	4.24	4.38	4.71
4. Did oth	ner evalu	ations reflect	the exp	ected goals	2	0	0	0	1	3	9	4.62	382/1617	4.62	4.27	4.15	4.22	4.62
				hat you learned	2	0	0	0	0	1	12	4.92	80/1555	4.92	4.38	4.00	4.08	4.92
		_		what you learned	2	1	0	0	1	1	10	4.75	180/1543	4.75	4.27	4.06	4.18	4.75
		g system clearly		ned	2	0	0	2	1	7	3		1214/1647	3.85	4.25	4.12	4.14	3.85
	-	was class cance			2	0	0	0	0	1	12	4.92	570/1668	4.92	4.42	4.67	4.70	4.92
9. How wou	ıld you 🤉	grade the overa	ll teach	ning effectiveness	5	0	0	0	2	4	4	4.20	759/1605	4.20	4.25	4.07	4.16	4.20
		Lectur				_		_		_								
		uctor's lecture	_	-	2	0	0	0	0	1	12	4.92	- , -			4.39	4.45	4.92
		ctor seem inter			2	0	0	0	0	0	13	5.00	1/1551	5.00	4.87	4.66	4.73	5.00
				plained clearly	2	0	0	0	0	2	11	4.85	182/1503	4.85	4.46	4.24	4.27	4.85
		es contribute t			2	0	0	0	1	0	12	4.85	237/1506	4.85	4.49	4.26	4.29	4.85
5. Did aud	diovisual	l techniques en	nance yo	our understanding	2	10	2	0	1	0	0	1.67	****/1311	****	3.77	3.85	3.88	****
		Discus																
1 544				1	_	0	0	0	0	_	11	4 05	104/1400	4 05	4 22	4 05	1 00	4 05
				hat you learned	2	0	0	0	0		11	4.85	184/1490 189/1502		4.33	4.05 4.26	4.26	4.85
				l to participate	2	0	0	1	0		11		500/1489	4.92	4.60	4.26	4.46 4.52	4.92 4.69
		echniques succe		l open discussion	2	5	1	1	0	2	4		617/1006		3.98	4.29	4.52	3.88
4. were sp	peciai te	echniques succe	SSLUI		4	5	Т	Т	U	2	4	3.88	61//1006	3.88	3.98	4.00	4.21	3.88
				Frequ	ency	7 Dist	trib	ıt i oı	า									
				11040	circy	DID	C	uc10.										
Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	asons	5			Ty	рe			Majors	;
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	 А б		Red	 ຫນ່າ		or Ma	ior		0	Graduat	 -	2	Majo	r	7
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В 3		1000	1411	- Cu -	J1 110	.) 🗆	_	· ·	Gradac	_	-	114)0	-	,
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C 1		Ger	nera:	1				1	Under-g	rad 1	.3	Non-	major	8
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	4	D 0			a.	_				_	011001 9		-	1.011		Ŭ
Grad.	2	3.50-4.00	5	F 0		Ele	ectiv	ves				0	#### - 1	Means t	here a	re not	enous	rh
	-	2.22 2.30	-	P 1								-	respons					•
				I 0		Ot.1	ner				1	.1					-	
				? 1							-							
				•														

Course Section: POLI 446 0101 University of Maryland Title

THE POLITICS OF POVERT

Instructor: BOUCHET, STACEY

Enrollment: 13 Questionnaires: 13

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Page 1385 Baltimore County JAN 18, 2007 Fall 2006 Job IRBR3029

			Fre	equer	ncies	5		Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	3	0	0	0	1	4	5	4.40	734/1669	4.40	4.46	4.23	4.39	4.40
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	3	0	0	0	2	2	6	4.40	691/1666	4.40	4.26	4.19	4.22	4.40
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	3	0	0	0	1	1	8	4.70	356/1421	4.70	4.41	4.24	4.38	4.70
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	4	1	0	1	1	3	3	4.00	1029/1617	4.00	4.27	4.15	4.22	4.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	1	0	1	7	4.56	301/1555	4.56	4.38	4.00	4.08	4.56
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	5	1	0	1	2	1	3	3.86	1060/1543	3.86	4.27	4.06	4.18	3.86
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	3	0	0	1	1	2	6	4.30	806/1647	4.30	4.25	4.12	4.14	4.30
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	0	0	0	0	6	4	4.40	1274/1668	4.40	4.42	4.67	4.70	4.40
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	1	0	0	2	3	3	4.13	830/1605	4.13	4.25	4.07	4.16	4.13
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	1	0	3	6	4.40	955/1514	4.40	4.62	4.39	4.45	4.40
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.40	512/1551	4.40	4.87	4.59	4.43	4.40
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	126/1503	4.90	4.46	4.24	4.73	4.90
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.70	433/1506	4.70	4.49	4.26	4.29	4.70
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	0	1	1	0	3	5	4.00	587/1311	4.00	3.77	3.85	3.88	4.00
5. Fin and of the first of the		ŭ	_	_	ŭ	J		1.00	30,,1311	1.00	J.,,	3.03	3.00	1.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	141/1490	4.90	4.33	4.05	4.26	4.90
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	0	1	0	8	4.78	370/1502	4.78	4.60	4.26	4.46	4.78
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	378/1489	4.80	4.61	4.29	4.52	4.80
4. Were special techniques successful	3	3	1	2	0	2	2	3.29	862/1006	3.29	3.98	4.00	4.21	3.29
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	11	0	0	0	0	1	1	4 E0	****/ 112	****	4.80	4.38	4.74	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	12	0	0	0	0	1	υ_		****/ 97	****	4.60	4.36	4.74	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 92	****	4.60	4.22	4.48	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	0	1	U		****/ 105	****	4.20	4.20	4.27	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	12	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 98	****	3.80	3.95	3.86	****
J. Here effected for grading made effort	12	U	U	U	Ü	_	J	1.00	, 50		3.00	3.73	3.00	
Frequ	ency	Dist	ribu	ution	1									

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

University of Maryland Baltimore County

Fall 2006

Page 1386 JAN 18, 2007 Job IRBR3029

Questionnaires: 11	Student	Course	Evaluation	Questionnaire
--------------------	---------	--------	------------	---------------

Course Section: POLI 452 0101

11

POLITICS OF HEALTH

BANKS, DAVID B

Title

Instructor: Enrollment:

	Frequencies							Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mea
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	3	0	0	0	0	4	4	4.50	590/1669	4.50	4.46	4.23	4.39	4.5
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	4	0	0	0	1	3	3	4.29	841/1666	4.29	4.26	4.19	4.22	4.2
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	3	2	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	392/1421	4.67	4.41	4.24	4.38	4.6
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	3	1	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	424/1617	4.57	4.27	4.15	4.22	4.5
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	1	1	3	3	4.00	773/1555	4.00	4.38	4.00	4.08	4.0
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	1	4	3	4.25	659/1543	4.25	4.27	4.06	4.18	4.2
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	3	0	0	0	3	3	2	3.88	1187/1647	3.88	4.25	4.12	4.14	3.8
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	769/1668	4.88	4.42	4.67	4.70	4.8
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	2	2	3	4.14	810/1605	4.14	4.25	4.07	4.16	4.1
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	Λ	3	5	4.63	647/1514	4.63	4.62	4.39	4.45	4.6
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	594/1551	4.88	4.87	4.66	4.73	4.8
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	0	4	4	4.50	556/1503		4.46	4.24	4.27	4.5
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	1	2	5		642/1506		4.49	4.26	4.29	
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	1	3	4	4.38	585/1490	4.38	4.33	4.05	4.26	4.3
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1502		4.60	4.26	4.46	5.0
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1489	5.00	4.61	4.29	4.52	
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	10	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 112	****	4.80	4.38	4.74	***
To a control of the c		D			_									
Frequ	uency	DIS	trib	utio	n									
Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades				Rea	ason	S			Ту	pe			Majors	ļ
00-27 0 0.00-0.99 0 A 6		Per	anir.	 ed f	 or M:	aiors		1	Graduat		0	Maio		4

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	 А	6	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	4
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	1						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General		Under-grad	11	Non-major	7
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	4	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	1
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	4	-	-		
				?	0						

Course Section: POLI 469 0101 Title

TOPICS IN COMP POLITIC

Instructor: FORESTIERE, CAR

Enrollment: 19 Questionnaires: 19

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

University of Maryland Page 1387 Baltimore County JAN 18, 2007 Fall 2006 Job IRBR3029

							Fre	equer	ncies	;		Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
		Question	s		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank		Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		Genera	_		_	_	_											
_	_	v insights,ski			2	0	0	0	1		13		331/1669		4.46	4.23	4.39	4.71
		or make clear			2	0	0	0	0	3	14		165/1666		4.26	4.19	4.22	4.82
	_	estions reflec		_	2	4	0	0	0				121/1421		4.41			4.92
		ations reflect			2	0	0	0	0				151/1617		4.27	4.15	4.22	
				what you learned	2	0	0	0	0				108/1555		4.38	4.00		4.88
				o what you learned	2	0	0	0	0				172/1543		4.27			4.76
		system clearl		ined	2	0	0	0	0				156/1647		4.25	4.12	4.14	4.82
		was class canc			2	0	0	0	0	4	13	4.76	952/1668	4.76	4.42	4.67	4.70	4.76
9. How wo	ould you gr	rade the overa	ll teac	hing effectiveness	6	0	0	0	0	4	9	4.69	210/1605	4.69	4.25	4.07	4.16	4.69
		Lectur	۵															
1 Were t	he instruc	ctor's lecture	_	nrenared	2	0	0	0	0	2	15	4.88	223/1514	4.88	4.62	4.39	4.45	4.88
		or seem inter			2	0	0	0	0			5.00	1/1551		4.87	4.66	4.73	5.00
				_	2	0	0	0	0	-		4.82			4.46	4.24	4.73	
				xplained clearly		0	0	0	0	-								
		contribute t			2										4.49	4.26		4.76
5. Did au	idiovisual	techniques en	hance y	our understanding	2	0	0	0	4	6	7	4.18	495/1311	4.18	3.77	3.85	3.88	4.18
		Discus	sion															
1. Did cl	ass discus	ssions contrib	ute to	what you learned	5	0	0	0	1	2	11	4.71	298/1490	4.71	4.33	4.05	4.26	4.71
2. Were a	all student	s actively en	courage	d to participate	5	0	0	0	0	1	13	4.93	189/1502	4.93	4.60	4.26	4.46	4.93
			encourage fair and open discussion					0	0	2	12	4.86	329/1489	4.86	4.61	4.29	4.52	4.86
4. Were s	Were special techniques successful						0	0	2	3	8	4.46	263/1006	4.46	3.98	4.00	4.21	4.46
		Semina	r															
1 Woro 2	agianod ta			announced theme	16	0	0	0	0	1	2	1 67	****/ 112	****	4.80	4.38	4.74	****
	-	_		ividual attention	16	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 97	****	4.60	4.36	4.69	****
					16	2	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 92	****	4.60	4.22	4.48	****
				what you learned						0	-		,	****				****
_		ns contribute		-	16	0	0	0	1	-	2		****/ 105		4.20	4.20	4.27	****
5. Were d	riteria io	or grading mad	e clear		16	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	****/ 98	****	3.80	3.95	3.86	****
		Field	Work															
1. Did fi	eld experi	lence contribu	te to w	hat you learned	18	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 58	****	****	4.22	3.94	****
		Self	Paced															
2. Did st	udy questi	lons make clea		xpected goal	18	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 42	****	****	4.31	5.00	****
				Frequ	encv	Dist	ribu	ıt.i.or	ı									
		_	2				=											
Credits E	Carned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	sons	;			Ту	pe			Majors	}
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 8		Rec	quire	ed fo	or Ma	jor	s	0	Graduat	e	0	Majo	or	15
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	в 7			_			-								
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	2	C 1		Ger	neral	l				4	Under-g	rad 1	9	Non-	-major	4
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	6	D 0									J				-	
Grad.						El€	ectiv	ves				0	#### - 1	Means t	here a	re not	enou	ıh
	P 0												respons				_	•
	I 0					Oth	ıer				1	.2						
	5 0					001						_						
				. 0														

Course Section: POLI 473 0101

Title GANDHI POL EXPMT TRUTH

Instructor: LEVY, HAROLD L

Enrollment: 11

Questionnaires: 11

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2006 Page 1388 JAN 18, 2007 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

	Frequencie		5		Inst	cructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect			
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	4	0	0	1	1	2	3	4.00	1173/1669	4.00	4.46	4.23	4.39	4.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	4	0	0	0	1	4	2		1001/1666	4.14	4.26	4.19	4.22	4.14
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	4	6	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1421	****	4.41	4.24	4.38	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	4	0	0	0	3	3	1	3.71	1273/1617	3.71	4.27	4.15	4.22	3.71
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	120/1555	4.86	4.38	4.00	4.08	4.86
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	1	1	5	4.57	325/1543	4.57	4.27	4.06	4.18	4.57
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	4	0	0	1	1	1	4	4.14	962/1647	4.14	4.25	4.12	4.14	4.14
8. How many times was class cancelled	4	0	0	0	0	5	2	4.29	1364/1668	4.29	4.42	4.67	4.70	4.29
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	8	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	591/1605	4.33	4.25	4.07	4.16	4.33
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	505/1514	4.71	4.62	4.39	4.45	4.71
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1551	5.00	4.87	4.66	4.73	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	0	0	1	2	4	4.43	686/1503	4.43	4.46	4.24	4.27	4.43
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	2	0	5	4.43	744/1506	4.43	4.49	4.26	4.29	4.43
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	6	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/1311	***	3.77	3.85	3.88	****
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	2	1	2	4.00	849/1490	4.00	4.33	4.05	4.26	4.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	0	1	0	4	4.60		4.60	4.60	4.26		4.60
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	596/1489	4.60	4.61	4.29	4.52	4.60
4. Were special techniques successful	6	4	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/1006	***	3.98	4.00	4.21	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	6	0	Ο	0	0	1	4	4.80	46/ 112	4.80	4.80	4.38	4.74	4.80
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	6	0	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	47/ 97	4.60	4.60	4.36	4.69	4.60
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	40/ 92	4.60	4.60	4.22	4.48	4.60
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	61/ 105	4.20	4.20	4.20	4.27	4.20
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	6	0	0	1	0	3	1	3.80	68/ 98	3.80	3.80	3.95	3.86	3.80
T T	ŭ	ŭ	ŭ	-	ŭ	_	_	3.00	00, 00	5.00	3.00	3.23	3.00	2.00

Credits E	Carned	Cum. GPA		Expected	l Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	 А	1	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	5
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	4						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General		Under-grad	11	Non-major	6
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	4	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	L
				P	0			responses to	be sig	nificant	
				I	0	Other	3	-			
				?	2						

University of Maryland Baltimore County

Fall 2006

Page 1389 JAN 18, 2007 Job IRBR3029

Enrollment:	17			
Questionnaires:	17	Student Cours	e Evaluation	Questionnaire

? 1

Course Section: POLI 482 0101

INTERNATIONAL LAW

MELCAVAGE, EUGE

Title

Instructor:

						Frequencies			Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect			
		Question	s		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		 Genera	1															
1. Did vo	u gain ne	ew insights,ski	_	m this course	3	0	0	0	0	2	12	4.86	167/1669	4.86	4.46	4.23	4.39	4.86
		ctor make clear			3	0	0	1	1	1	11	4.57	472/1666	4.57	4.26	4.19	4.22	4.57
		estions reflec			3	0	0	0	0	2	12	4.86	184/1421	4.86	4.41	4.24	4.38	4.86
		uations reflect			3	0	0	1	1	2	10	4.50	496/1617	4.50	4.27	4.15	4.22	4.50
				what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	2	12	4.86	120/1555	4.86	4.38	4.00	4.08	4.86
	_	-		o what you learned	3	0	1	0	0	3	10	4.50	390/1543	4.50	4.27	4.06	4.18	4.50
		g system clearl		_	3	0	0	0	1	2	11	4.71	250/1647	4.71	4.25	4.12	4.14	4.71
		was class canc			3	0	0	0	0	8	6	4.43	1257/1668	4.43	4.42	4.67	4.70	4.43
				hing effectiveness	6	0	0	0	1	3	7	4.55	343/1605	4.55	4.25	4.07	4.16	4.55
		Lectur			2	•	•	•	0	-	1.0	4 00	151/1514	4 00	4 60	4 20	4 45	4 00
		uctor's lecture			3	0	0	0	0	Ţ	13	4.93	151/1514		4.62	4.39	4.45	4.93
		ctor seem inter			3	0 0	0	0	0	0	14	5.00	1/1551	5.00	4.87	4.66	4.73	5.00
	3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearl						0	0	0	2	12	4.86	173/1503	4.86	4.46	4.24	4.27	4.86
	 Did the lectures contribute to what you learned Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understandi 					0	0	0	0	0	14	5.00	1/1506	5.00	4.49	4.26	4.29	5.00
5. Did au	diovisua.	l techniques en	hance y	our understanding	3	7	2	1	2	0	2	2.86	1173/1311	2.86	3.77	3.85	3.88	2.86
		Discus	sion															
1. Did cl	ass discu	ussions contrib	ute to	what you learned	7	0	0	0	1	2	7	4.60	389/1490	4.60	4.33	4.05	4.26	4.60
				d to participate	7	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	237/1502	4.90	4.60	4.26	4.46	4.90
				d open discussion	7	0	0	0	1	1	8	4.70	500/1489	4.70	4.61	4.29	4.52	4.70
		echniques succe			7	2	1	1	1	2	3	3.63	717/1006		3.98	4.00	4.21	3.63
				Frequ	iency	7 Dis	trib	utio	n									
Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Re	asons	3			Туј	pe			Majors	;
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 3		Re	 anir	 ed f	or Ma			1	Graduat		0	Majo		11
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В 6		1/6/	durr,	ca I	OT 1,10	⊥∪ر ہ	5	_	Gradati	_	J	1.10.10	, <u>.</u>	
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	4	C 3		Ger	nera	1				3	Under-g	rad 1	.7	Non-	major	6
84-150	7	3.00-3.49	2	D 0		GC.	c. a.	_				5	onaci -g.	Luu 1	- *	14011		U
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F 0		EJ.	ecti	ves				0	#### - 1	Means t	here a	re not	enous	rh
JI uu.	Ü	0 3.30-4.00 3 F 0					2001					•	respons				_	
				I O		O+1	her					9	I CDPOIID	L	o bigi	ai		
				± 0		00.						-						

Course Section: POLI 488 0101 University of Maryland Title

3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 17 0

4. Were special techniques successful

POLITICS/IR SOUTH ASIA Baltimore County Instructor: HAGERTY, DEVIN Fall 2006

Enrollment: 26

Ouestionnaires: 25

Student Course Evaluation Ouestionnaire

Page 1390

JAN 18, 2007

Job IRBR3029

Frequencies Instructor Course Dept UMBC Level Sect Ouestions NR NA 1 2 3 4 5 Mean Rank Mean Mean Mean Mean Mean 1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course 14 0 0 0 10 4.82 199/1669 4.82 4.46 4.23 4.39 4.82 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals 14 0 0 2 1 8 4.55 505/1666 4.55 4.26 4.19 4.22 4.55 0 1 1 9 4.73 318/1421 4.73 4.41 4.24 4.38 4.73 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals 14 0 04. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals 14 5 0 0 0 6 5.00 ****/1617 **** 4.27 4.15 4.22 **** 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 14 0 0 1 1 3 6 4.27 541/1555 4.27 4.38 4.00 4.08 4.27 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 14 6 0 0 0 5 5.00 ****/1543 **** 4.27 4.06 4.18 **** 7. Was the grading system clearly explained 14 0 0 0 1 1 9 4.73 241/1647 4.73 4.25 4.12 4.14 4.73 8. How many times was class cancelled 14 0 0 0 5 5 1 3.64 1631/1668 3.64 4.42 4.67 4.70 3.64 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 16 0 0 0 0 1 8 4.89 107/1605 4.89 4.25 4.07 4.16 4.89 Lecture 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 14 0 0 0 0 1 10 4.91 189/1514 4.91 4.62 4.39 4.45 4.91 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 14 0 0 0 0 1 10 4.91 512/1551 4.91 4.87 4.66 4.73 4.91 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 14 0 0 0 0 2 9 4.82 210/1503 4.82 4.46 4.24 4.27 4.82 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 14 0 0 0 0 1 10 4.91 164/1506 4.91 4.49 4.26 4.29 4.91 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 16 3 1 1 1 1 2 3.33 ****/1311 **** 3.77 3.85 3.88 **** Discussion 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 17 0 0 0 3 5 4.25 692/1490 4.25 4.33 4.05 4.26 4.25 0 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 17 0 0 0 2 0 6 4.50 632/1502 4.50 4.60 4.26 4.46 4.50

17 7 Frequency Distribution

0

0 2 0 6 4.50 684/1489 4.50 4.61 4.29 4.52 4.50

0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/1006 **** 3.98 4.00 4.21 ****

Credits Ea					Reasons		Туре		Majors		
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	А	3	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	11
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	5						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	0	C	1	General		Under-grad	25	Non-major	14
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	h
				P	0			responses to	be sig	nificant	
				I	0	Other	8	_			
				?	0						

Course Section: POLI 489 0101

Title SEL TOPICS: INTERNATL R

Instructor: MIKHAIL, NABIL

Enrollment:

35

Questionnaires: 35

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2006

Page 1391 JAN 18, 2007 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

			Fre	quer	ncie	s		Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank		Mean		Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	9	0	1	0	2	3	20	4.58	511/1669	4.58	4.46	4.23	4.39	4.58
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	10	0	1	0	3	4	17	4.44	634/1666	4.44	4.26	4.19	4.22	4.44
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	9	0	1	0	3	3	19	4.50	557/1421	4.50	4.41	4.24	4.38	4.50
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	9	3	0	1	1	3	18	4.65	335/1617	4.65	4.27	4.15	4.22	4.65
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	10	0	1	0	4	3	17	4.40	438/1555	4.40	4.38	4.00	4.08	4.40
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	11	1	1	0	3	2	17	4.48	427/1543	4.48	4.27	4.06	4.18	4.48
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	11	0	0	0	4	1	19	4.63	345/1647	4.63	4.25	4.12	4.14	4.63
8. How many times was class cancelled	11	0	1	2	2	15	4	3.79	1608/1668	3.79	4.42	4.67	4.70	3.79
-	15	1	1	1	1	4			617/1605	4.32		4.07		4.32
		_	_	_	_	_			,					
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	10	0	0	0	5	4	16	4.44	892/1514	4.44	4.62	4.39	4.45	4.44
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	11	0	0	0	0	2	22	4.92	460/1551	4.92	4.87	4.66	4.73	4.92
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	10	0	1	0	3	5	16	4.40	719/1503	4.40		4.24	4.27	4.40
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	2	5	18	4.64	496/1506	4.64	4.49	4.26	4.29	4.64
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	11	12	3	0	2	0	7		846/1311				3.88	3.67
J. Did additivibual eccinityaes ciniance your understanding		12	3	U	2	O	,	3.07	010/1311	3.07	3.77	3.03	3.00	3.07
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	0	2	18	4.90	141/1490	4.90	4.33	4.05	4.26	4.90
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	15	0	0	0	2	1	17	4.75	393/1502	4.75	4.60	4.26	4.46	4.75
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	14	0	0	0	1	1	19	4.86	329/1489	4.86	4.61	4.29	4.52	4.86
4. Were special techniques successful	14	10	0	0	1	1	9		155/1006			4.00	4.21	
1. Note Special committees successful			Ü	Ü	-	_		1.75	100, 1000	1.75	3.70	1.00		1.75
Laboratory														
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	34	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 233	****	****	4.19	4.40	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	33	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 225	****	****	4.50	4.39	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	33	0	0	0	0	0	2		****/ 223	****	****	4.35	4.56	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	33	0	0	0	0	1	1		****/ 206	****	****	4.15	4.20	****
or word requirements for run reports ordari, specifica	55	ŭ	Ü	Ü	Ŭ	_	_	1.50	, 200			1.15	1.20	
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	33	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 112	****	4.80	4.38	4.74	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	34	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 97	****	4.60	4.36	4.69	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	33	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 92	****	4.60	4.22	4.48	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	33	0	0	0	0	0	2		****/ 105	****	4.20	4.20	4.27	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	33	0	0	0	0	1	1		****/ 98	****	3.80	3.95	3.86	****
o. Note official for grading made official	55	ŭ	Ü	Ü	ŭ	_	_	1.50	, , ,		3.00	3.75	3.00	
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	33	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 58	****	****	4.22	3.94	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	33	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.06	3.80	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	33	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 39	****	****	4.39	3.78	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	33	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 40	****	****	3.97	3.81	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	33	0	0	1	0	0	1		****/ 30	****	****	4.33	4.50	****
J. Did conferences help you carry out freta activities	55	O	U	_	O	O	_	3.30	, 30			1.55	1.50	
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	33	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 55	****	****	4.34	5.00	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	33	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 42	****	****	4.31	5.00	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	33	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 46	****	****	4.45	4.92	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	33	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 33	****	****	4.25	3.00	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	33	0	0	0	0	0	2		****/ 29	****	****	4.34	2.00	****
5. Held didle chough products for all the bendefield	55	J	J	•	J	J		3.00	, 25			1.51	2.00	

Course Section: POLI 489 0101

Title SEL TOPICS: INTERNATL R

Instructor:

MIKHAIL, NABIL

Enrollment:

35 Questionnaires: 35 University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2006

Page 1391 JAN 18, 2007 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expecte	d Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	 А	14	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	17
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	В	7						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	2	C	0	General	6	Under-grad	35	Non-major	18
84-150	9	3.00-3.49	7	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enoug	h
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	13				
				?	0						

Course Section: POLI 623 0101

Title GOVERNMENTAL BUDGETING

Instructor: MEYERS, ROY T.

Enrollment: 18

Questionnaires: 18

University of Maryland

Baltimore County Fall 2006

Page 1392 JAN 18, 2007 Job IRBR3029

Student	Course	Evaluatio:	n Questionnaire
---------	--------	------------	-----------------

			Fre	equei	ncie	5		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	2	0	0	0	0	7	9	4.56	522/1669	4.56	4.46	4.23	4.35	4.56
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	0	0	0	6	10	4.63	412/1666	4.63	4.26	4.19	4.19	4.63
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	3	9	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	392/1421		4.41	4.24	4.33	4.67
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	0	0	0	1	4	11	4.63	370/1617	4.63	4.27	4.15	4.24	4.63
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	1	1	2	12	4.56	293/1555	4.56	4.38	4.00	4.07	4.56
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	1	0	15	4.88	115/1543	4.88	4.27	4.06	4.27	4.88
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	0	1	4	11	4.63	345/1647	4.63	4.25	4.12	4.15	4.63
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	0	16	5.00	1/1668	5.00	4.42	4.67	4.83	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	0	0	0	0	4	8	4.67	239/1605	4.67	4.25	4.07	4.13	4.67
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	0	1	15	4.94	132/1514	4.94	4.62	4.39	4.37	4.94
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	0	16	5.00	1/1551	5.00	4.87	4.66	4.72	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	0	6	10	4.63	438/1503	4.63	4.46	4.24	4.22	4.63
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	4	12	4.75	353/1506	4.75	4.49	4.26	4.24	4.75
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	0	0	0	2	7	7	4.31	405/1311			3.85	3.89	
									,					
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	5	10	4.67	340/1490	4.67	4.33	4.05	4.18	4.67
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	0	1	14	4.93	166/1502	4.93	4.60	4.26	4.46	4.93
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	0	1	14	4.93	196/1489	4.93	4.61	4.29	4.44	
4. Were special techniques successful	4	0	0	0	0	4	10	4.71	159/1006	4.71	3.98	4.00	4.11	4.71
Laboratory														
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 233	***	****	4.19	4.41	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	17	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 112	****	4.80	4.38	4.39	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	17	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 97	****	4.60	4.36	4.38	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 92	****	4.60	4.22	4.36	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 105	****	4.20	4.20	4.23	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 98	****	3.80	3.95	3.93	****
Fram	enas	. Diat	-rih	1+101	2									

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	 5	0.00-0.99	1	 А	14	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	9	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	1						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	1	Under-grad	9	Non-major	18
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	9	3.50-4.00	6	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	14				
				2	0						