```
Course-Section: POLI 100  0101               University of Maryland                                    Page 1332
Title       AMER GOVT & POLITICS             Baltimore County                                         FEB 13, 2008
Instructor:   MILLER, NICHOLA                Fall   2007                                              Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:     51
Questionnaires: 50                           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  13   0   2   2  10  14   9  3.70 1391/1639  4.15  4.44  4.27  4.08  3.70
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals   13   0   1   4   9   7  16  3.89 1268/1639  4.09  4.32  4.22  4.17  3.89
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals  14   0   1   6   9   6  14  3.72 1190/1397  4.18  4.39  4.28  4.18  3.72
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals   12   3   4   3   7   7  14  3.69 1310/1583  3.82  4.29  4.19  4.01  3.69
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 14   2   2   6   4   8  14  3.76 1035/1532  4.06  4.40  4.01  3.88  3.76
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 14   0   4   2   7  11  12  3.69 1098/1504  3.82  4.20  4.05  3.78  3.69
7. Was the grading system clearly explained           15   0   0   2   7   9  17  4.17  903/1612  4.44  4.30  4.16  4.10  4.17
8. How many times was class cancelled                 12   2   0   1   0  24  11  4.25 1350/1635  4.38  4.55  4.65  4.56  4.25
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 18   0   1   1  12  15   3  3.56 1289/1579  4.01  4.17  4.08  3.95  3.56

                  Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared       14   0   0   0   4  13  19  4.42  933/1518  4.60  4.62  4.43  4.38  4.42
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject  14   0   0   1   2   9  24  4.56 1151/1520  4.83  4.83  4.70  4.61  4.56
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 17   0   1   1   7   9  15  4.09 1030/1517  4.37  4.45  4.27  4.20  4.09
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned    14   1   3   0   5   9  18  4.11 1019/1550  4.38  4.41  4.22  4.17  4.11
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 14   3   4   4   3   9  13  3.70  876/1295  4.08  3.95  3.94  3.84  3.70

                  Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 24   0   3   2   8   7   6  3.42 1150/1398  3.53  4.25  4.07  3.85  3.42
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 24   0   4   4  10   4   4  3.00 1321/1391  3.41  4.39  4.30  4.07  3.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 22   0   2   2   5   8  11  3.86 1056/1388  3.88  4.51  4.28  4.01  3.86
4. Were special techniques successful                 25  15   3   0   4   3   0  2.70 ****/ 958  ****  4.15  3.93  3.71  ****

                  Laboratory
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material 46   1   0   0   2   1   0  3.33 ****/ 224  ****  ****  4.10  3.90  ****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information 47   0   0   0   1   2   0  3.67 ****/ 240  ****  ****  4.11  4.01  ****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 47   0   0   0   2   1   0  3.33 ****/ 219  ****  ****  4.44  4.44  ****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance          47   0   0   1   1   1   0  3.00 ****/ 215  ****  ****  4.35  4.43  ****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 47   0   0   0   2   1   0  3.33 ****/ 198  ****  ****  4.18  4.25  ****

                  Seminar
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 46   0   0   1   2   1   0  3.00 ****/  85  ****  4.50  4.58  4.50  ****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 47   1   0   0   2   0   0  3.00 ****/  82  ****  5.00  4.52  4.12  ****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 47   1   0   0   2   0   0  3.00 ****/  78  ****  4.50  4.47  4.25  ****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned   47   0   0   0   1   1   1  4.00 ****/  80  ****  4.50  4.47  4.39  ****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear               47   0   0   0   0   2   1  4.33 ****/  82  ****  4.25  4.16  3.90  ****

                  Field Work
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 48   0   0   0   0   2   0  4.00 ****/  52  ****  ****  4.04  3.61  ****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 48   0   0   0   1   1   0  3.50 ****/  53  ****  ****  4.05  3.51  ****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation      48   0   0   0   0   0   2  5.00 ****/  42  ****  ****  4.75  4.79  ****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations  48   0   0   0   1   1   0  3.50 ****/  37  ****  ****  4.58  5.00  ****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities 49   0   0   0   0   1   0  4.00 ****/  32  ****  ****  4.56  4.60  ****

                  Self  Paced
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 48   0   0   0   0   2   0  4.00 ****/  50  ****  ****  4.45  4.54  ****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal   48   0   0   0   1   1   0  3.50 ****/  32  ****  ****  4.51  4.67  ****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful     48   0   0   0   1   1   0  3.50 ****/  43  ****  ****  4.69  4.69  ****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful      48   0   0   1   0   1   0  3.00 ****/  32  ****  ****  4.37  4.67  ****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students    48   0   0   1   0   1   0  3.00 ****/  21  ****  ****  4.52  5.00  ****
```

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	14	0.00-0.99	0	A	4	Required for Majors	14	Graduate	0	Major	5
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	0	B	16						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	0	C	8	General	6	Under-grad	50	Non-major	45
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	5	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough			
				P	0			responses to be significant			
				I	0	Other	12				
				?	2						

```
Course-Section: POLI 100  0201              University of Maryland                              Page 1333
Title      AMER GOVT & POLITICS             Baltimore County                                    FEB 13, 2008
Instructor:   MILLER, NICHOLA               Fall   2007                                         Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:    48
Questionnaires: 48               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   8  0  1  3  7 16 13  3.92 1229/1639  4.15  4.44  4.27  4.08  3.92
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    9  0  0  4  9  9 17  4.00 1090/1639  4.09  4.32  4.22  4.17  4.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   8  0  1  3  9  8 19  4.03  965/1397  4.18  4.39  4.28  4.18  4.03
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    8  0  1  2  9 14 14  3.95 1084/1583  3.82  4.29  4.19  4.01  3.95
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 9  0  2  5  7  6 19  3.90  918/1532  4.06  4.40  4.01  3.88  3.90
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 9 0 1 3 8 12 15  3.95  896/1504  3.82  4.20  4.05  3.78  3.95
7. Was the grading system clearly explained            9  0  0  3  4 11 21  4.28  779/1612  4.44  4.30  4.16  4.10  4.28
8. How many times was class cancelled                  9  0  0  0  0 26 13  4.33 1288/1635  4.38  4.55  4.65  4.56  4.33
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 13 0 0 1 7 20  7  3.94  989/1579  4.01  4.17  4.08  3.95  3.94

                    Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared       11  0  0  0  3  6 28  4.68  588/1518  4.60  4.62  4.43  4.38  4.68
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject  11  0  0  1  0  3 33  4.84  725/1520  4.83  4.83  4.70  4.61  4.84
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 12 0 0 1 5 7 23  4.44  674/1517  4.37  4.45  4.27  4.20  4.44
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     7  3  0  2  4  8 24  4.42  742/1550  4.38  4.41  4.22  4.17  4.42
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 12 4 3 1 2 8 18  4.16  537/1295  4.08  3.95  3.94  3.84  4.16

                    Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 22 0 3 5 4 7 7  3.38 1168/1398  3.53  4.25  4.07  3.85  3.38
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 23 0 4 3 7 4 7  3.28 1277/1391  3.41  4.39  4.30  4.07  3.28
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 20 0 3 4 3 8 10 3.64 1139/1388  3.88  4.51  4.28  4.01  3.64
4. Were special techniques successful                  25 19  0  1  0  1  2  4.00 ****/ 958  ****  4.15  3.93  3.71  ****

                    Laboratory
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material  45  2  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/ 224  ****  ****  4.10  3.90  ****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information 46 0 1 0 0 0 1  3.00 ****/ 240  ****  ****  4.11  4.01  ****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 45 2 0 0 0 0 1  5.00 ****/ 219  ****  ****  4.44  4.44  ****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance           45  2  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/ 215  ****  ****  4.35  4.43  ****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 45  2  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/ 198  ****  ****  4.18  4.25  ****

                    Seminar
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 45 1 0 0 0 0 2  5.00 ****/  85  ****  4.50  4.58  4.50  ****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 45 2 0 0 0 0 1  5.00 ****/  82  ****  5.00  4.52  4.12  ****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 45 2 0 0 0 0 1  5.00 ****/  78  ****  4.50  4.47  4.25  ****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned    45  2  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  80  ****  4.50  4.47  4.39  ****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear                45  2  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  82  ****  4.25  4.16  3.90  ****

                    Field Work
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 46 0 1 0 0 0 1  3.00 ****/  52  ****  ****  4.04  3.61  ****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 46 0 1 0 0 0 1  3.00 ****/  53  ****  ****  4.05  3.51  ****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation       45  2  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  42  ****  ****  4.75  4.79  ****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities 45  2  0  0  1  0  0  3.00 ****/  32  ****  ****  4.56  4.60  ****

                    Self  Paced
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 45 0 0 0 1 0 2  4.33 ****/  50  ****  ****  4.45  4.54  ****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal    45  0  0  0  0  1  2  4.67 ****/  32  ****  ****  4.51  4.67  ****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful      45  2  0  0  0  1  0  4.00 ****/  43  ****  ****  4.69  4.69  ****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful       45  2  1  0  0  0  0  1.00 ****/  32  ****  ****  4.37  4.67  ****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students     45  2  0  0  1  0  0  3.00 ****/  21  ****  ****  4.52  5.00  ****
```

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	18	0.00-0.99	3	A	6	Required for Majors	17	Graduate	0	Major	14
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	16						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	1	C	12	General	2	Under-grad	48	Non-major	34
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	5	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	3	#### - Means there are not enough			
				P	0			responses to be significant			
				I	0	Other	14				
				?	1						

```
Course-Section: POLI 100  0301           University of Maryland                            Page 1334
Title      AMER GOVT & POLITICS           Baltimore County                                 FEB 13, 2008
Instructor:   SCHALLER, THOMA             Fall   2007                                      Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:    43
Questionnaires: 42                 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	19	0	0	0	0	6	17	4.74	342/1639	4.15	4.44	4.27	4.08	4.74
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	19	0	0	0	0	12	11	4.48	567/1639	4.09	4.32	4.22	4.17	4.48
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	19	0	0	0	2	4	17	4.65	375/1397	4.18	4.39	4.28	4.18	4.65
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	19	14	1	0	1	4	3	3.89	****/1583	3.82	4.29	4.19	4.01	****
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	4	2	17	4.57	299/1532	4.06	4.40	4.01	3.88	4.57
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	21	17	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	****/1504	3.82	4.20	4.05	3.78	****
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	19	0	0	0	2	3	18	4.70	281/1612	4.44	4.30	4.16	4.10	4.70
8. How many times was class cancelled	20	0	0	0	0	11	11	4.50	1135/1635	4.38	4.55	4.65	4.56	4.50
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	20	1	0	0	1	8	12	4.52	362/1579	4.01	4.17	4.08	3.95	4.52
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	19	0	0	0	1	3	19	4.78	397/1518	4.60	4.62	4.43	4.38	4.78
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	20	0	0	0	0	0	22	5.00	1/1520	4.83	4.83	4.70	4.61	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	20	0	0	1	0	5	16	4.64	439/1517	4.37	4.45	4.27	4.20	4.64
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	17	2	0	1	0	4	18	4.70	424/1550	4.38	4.41	4.22	4.17	4.70
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	20	0	0	0	2	11	9	4.32	413/1295	4.08	3.95	3.94	3.84	4.32
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	24	0	0	4	1	6	7	3.89	895/1398	3.53	4.25	4.07	3.85	3.89
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	24	0	0	4	4	3	7	3.72	1159/1391	3.41	4.39	4.30	4.07	3.72
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	19	0	0	2	2	11	8	4.09	923/1388	3.88	4.51	4.28	4.01	4.09
4. Were special techniques successful	24	12	2	1	2	0	1	2.50	****/ 958	****	4.15	3.93	3.71	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	36	5	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 224	****	****	4.10	3.90	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	39	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/ 240	****	****	4.11	4.01	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	39	1	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 219	****	****	4.44	4.44	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	39	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 215	****	****	4.35	4.43	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	39	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 198	****	****	4.18	4.25	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	38	2	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 85	****	4.50	4.58	4.50	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	39	1	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 82	****	5.00	4.52	4.12	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	39	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 78	****	4.50	4.47	4.25	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	36	1	0	0	3	0	2	3.80	****/ 80	****	4.50	4.47	4.39	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	39	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 82	****	4.25	4.16	3.90	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	39	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 52	****	****	4.04	3.61	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	39	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 53	****	****	4.05	3.51	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	39	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	****/ 42	****	****	4.75	4.79	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	39	1	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 37	****	****	4.58	5.00	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	39	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 32	****	****	4.56	4.60	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	39	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	****/ 50	****	****	4.45	4.54	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	39	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 32	****	****	4.51	4.67	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	39	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 43	****	****	4.69	4.69	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	39	1	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 32	****	****	4.37	4.67	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	39	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 21	****	****	4.52	5.00	****

```
Course-Section: POLI 100  0301             University of Maryland                         Page 1334
Title          AMER GOVT & POLITICS         Baltimore County                             FEB 13, 2008
Instructor:    SCHALLER, THOMA              Fall   2007                                  Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:      43
Questionnaires:  42                  Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire


                                         Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned            Cum. GPA          Expected Grades           Reasons                    Type                     Majors
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
 00-27      6        0.00-0.99   4         A    9        Required for Majors   4        Graduate     0        Major         7
 28-55      4        1.00-1.99   0         B    6                                                             
 56-83      0        2.00-2.99   2         C    7        General               4        Under-grad  42        Non-major    35
 84-150     3        3.00-3.49   2         D    0
 Grad.      0        3.50-4.00   2         F    0        Electives             1        #### - Means there are not enough
                                           P    0                                       responses to be significant
                                           I    0        Other                13
                                           ?    0
```

```
Course-Section: POLI 100  0401                University of Maryland                                   Page 1335
Title        AMER GOVT & POLITICS             Baltimore County                                        FEB 13, 2008
Instructor:  SCHALLER, THOMA                  Fall  2007                                              Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:     49
Questionnaires: 48                       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   16   0  1  0  6  8 17  4.25  890/1639  4.15  4.44  4.27  4.08  4.25
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    16   0  1  1  8  9 13  4.00 1090/1639  4.09  4.32  4.22  4.17  4.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   15   0  1  0  5  9 18  4.30  749/1397  4.18  4.39  4.28  4.18  4.30
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    16  24  0  1  2  0  5  4.13 ****/1583  3.82  4.29  4.19  4.01  ****
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 16  0  3  0  4 11 14  4.03  751/1532  4.06  4.40  4.01  3.88  4.03
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 16 29  0  0  0  1  2  4.67 ****/1504  3.82  4.20  4.05  3.78  ****
7. Was the grading system clearly explained            16   0  1  2  0  3 26  4.59  398/1612  4.44  4.30  4.16  4.10  4.59
8. How many times was class cancelled                  17   0  0  0  0 18 13  4.42 1225/1635  4.38  4.55  4.65  4.56  4.42
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 21  0  2  1  5  6 13  4.00  889/1579  4.01  4.17  4.08  3.95  4.00


                 Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        18   0  0  2  0  8 20  4.53  770/1518  4.60  4.62  4.43  4.38  4.53
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   18   0  0  0  0  2 28  4.93  382/1520  4.83  4.83  4.70  4.61  4.93
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 17  0  1  0  4  9 17  4.32  811/1517  4.37  4.45  4.27  4.20  4.32
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     18   0  1  1  3  8 17  4.30  860/1550  4.38  4.41  4.22  4.17  4.30
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 18  0  1  1  5  9 14  4.13  553/1295  4.08  3.95  3.94  3.84  4.13


                 Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 29  0  2  4  3  4  6  3.42 1150/1398  3.53  4.25  4.07  3.85  3.42
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 29  0  1  4  4  2  8  3.63 1184/1391  3.41  4.39  4.30  4.07  3.63
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 25  0  1  3  2  8  9  3.91 1025/1388  3.88  4.51  4.28  4.01  3.91
4. Were special techniques successful                  29  16  1  0  1  0  1  3.00 ****/ 958  ****  4.15  3.93  3.71  ****

                 Laboratory
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance           46   1  0  0  1  0  0  3.00 ****/ 215  ****  ****  4.35  4.43  ****

                 Seminar
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned    47   0  0  0  1  0  0  3.00 ****/  80  ****  4.50  4.47  4.39  ****

                              Frequency Distribution


Credits Earned         Cum. GPA         Expected Grades         Reasons              Type              Majors
---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
 00-27    8      0.00-0.99    3      A   11      Required for Majors  7    Graduate      0      Major        9
 28-55    9      1.00-1.99    0      B   10
 56-83    3      2.00-2.99    2      C    6      General              2    Under-grad   48      Non-major   39
 84-150   2      3.00-3.49    5      D    0
 Grad.    0      3.50-4.00    4      F    0      Electives            2    #### - Means there are not enough
                                     P    0                               responses to be significant
                                     I    0      Other               19
                                     ?    1
```

```
Course-Section: POLI 210  0101              University of Maryland                          Page 1336
Title        POLITICAL PHILOSOPHY            Baltimore County                              FEB 13, 2008
Instructor:  VAUGHAN, GEOFFR                 Fall   2007                                   Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:       48
Questionnaires:   47             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   17   0   0   1   1   8  20  4.57  550/1639  4.42  4.44  4.27  4.35  4.57
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    17   0   0   0   2  10  18  4.53  486/1639  4.35  4.32  4.22  4.27  4.53
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   17   0   0   0   0   8  22  4.73  302/1397  4.52  4.39  4.28  4.39  4.73
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    18  19   1   0   1   2   6  4.20 ****/1583  4.34  4.29  4.19  4.28  ****
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 17   0   1   0   5   6  18  4.33  506/1532  4.38  4.40  4.01  4.09  4.33
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 17  23   1   0   0   3   3  4.00 ****/1504  4.21  4.20  4.05  4.09  ****
7. Was the grading system clearly explained            17   0   0   0   2   5  23  4.70  281/1612  4.50  4.30  4.16  4.21  4.70
8. How many times was class cancelled                  17   0   0   0   0  15  15  4.50 1135/1635  4.32  4.55  4.65  4.63  4.50
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 26   0   1   0   1   7  12  4.38  517/1579  4.39  4.17  4.08  4.14  4.38


              Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        18   0   0   0   0   2  27  4.93  149/1518  4.90  4.62  4.43  4.48  4.93
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   18   0   0   0   0   1  28  4.97  219/1520  4.91  4.83  4.70  4.78  4.97
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 18   0   0   0   0   3  26  4.90  165/1517  4.67  4.45  4.27  4.34  4.90
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     18   0   0   0   0   3  26  4.90  185/1550  4.74  4.41  4.22  4.33  4.90
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 19  21   0   0   1   3   3  4.29 ****/1295  3.65  3.95  3.94  4.07  ****


              Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 20   0   0   0   3   6  18  4.56  397/1398  4.24  4.25  4.07  4.14  4.56
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 20   0   0   0   2   9  16  4.52  608/1391  4.28  4.39  4.30  4.35  4.52
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 19   0   0   0   0   2  26  4.93  179/1388  4.78  4.51  4.28  4.37  4.93
4. Were special techniques successful                  20  22   0   0   2   0   3  4.20 ****/ 958  4.12  4.15  3.93  4.00  ****


              Laboratory
2. Were you provided with adequate background information 44   0   1   0   1   1   0  2.67 ****/ 240  ****  ****  4.11  4.47  ****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 43   3   0   0   0   0   1  5.00 ****/ 219  ****  ****  4.44  4.61  ****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance           42   3   0   0   1   0   1  4.00 ****/ 215  ****  ****  4.35  4.43  ****


              Seminar
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned    42   2   0   0   2   1   0  3.33 ****/  80  ****  4.50  4.47  2.00  ****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear                44   2   0   0   1   0   0  3.00 ****/  82  ****  4.25  4.16  4.00  ****


              Field Work
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 45   0   1   0   1   0   0  2.00 ****/  52  ****  ****  4.04  4.78  ****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 45   0   1   0   0   0   1  3.00 ****/  53  ****  ****  4.05  4.28  ****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation       44   2   0   0   0   0   1  5.00 ****/  42  ****  ****  4.75  ****  ****


              Self  Paced
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 44   0   0   0   0   0   3  5.00 ****/  50  ****  ****  4.45  3.24  ****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal    44   1   0   0   0   0   2  5.00 ****/  32  ****  ****  4.51  4.33  ****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful      44   1   0   0   0   0   2  5.00 ****/  43  ****  ****  4.69  ****  ****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful       43   2   0   0   1   0   1  4.00 ****/  32  ****  ****  4.37  1.00  ****

                                      Frequency Distribution


Credits Earned          Cum. GPA          Expected Grades          Reasons              Type              Majors
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
00-27       5       0.00-0.99     3      A    12     Required for Majors   2     Graduate       0      Major         13
28-55       1       1.00-1.99     0      B    15
56-83       5       2.00-2.99     2      C     2     General               7     Under-grad    47      Non-major     34
84-150      1       3.00-3.49     4      D     0
Grad.       0       3.50-4.00     3      F     0     Electives             2     #### - Means there are not enough
                                        P     0                                 responses to be significant
```

```
I    0              Other              18
?    0
```

```
Course-Section: POLI 210  0201              University of Maryland                              Page 1337
Title      POLITICAL PHILOSOPHY             Baltimore County                                   FEB 13, 2008
Instructor:    VAUGHAN, GEOFFR              Fall   2007                                        Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:      48
Questionnaires:  48                    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   17   0  0  1  3  7  20  4.48  642/1639  4.42  4.44  4.27  4.35  4.48
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    17   0  0  1  3 10  17  4.39  709/1639  4.35  4.32  4.22  4.27  4.39
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   16   0  0  0  2  9  21  4.59  427/1397  4.52  4.39  4.28  4.39  4.59
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    17  16  0  0  1  5   9  4.53  444/1583  4.34  4.29  4.19  4.28  4.53
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 17  0  2  0  2  8  19  4.35  488/1532  4.38  4.40  4.01  4.09  4.35
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 17 20  0  0  0  4  7  4.64 ****/1504  4.21  4.20  4.05  4.09  ****
7. Was the grading system clearly explained            17   0  0  0  1  6  24  4.74  228/1612  4.50  4.30  4.16  4.21  4.74
8. How many times was class cancelled                  16   0  0  2  0 18  12  4.25 1350/1635  4.32  4.55  4.65  4.63  4.25
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 25 0  1  0  0  6  16  4.57  322/1579  4.39  4.17  4.08  4.14  4.57


                Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        18   0  0  0  0  3  27  4.90  213/1518  4.90  4.62  4.43  4.48  4.90
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   18   0  0  0  0  2  28  4.93  382/1520  4.91  4.83  4.70  4.78  4.93
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 18  0  0  0  0  7  23  4.77  287/1517  4.67  4.45  4.27  4.34  4.77
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     16   2  0  0  1  4  25  4.80  288/1550  4.74  4.41  4.22  4.33  4.80
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 18 13  2  2  2  5   6  3.65  905/1295  3.65  3.95  3.94  4.07  3.65


                Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 25  0  1  1  4  6  11  4.09  742/1398  4.24  4.25  4.07  4.14  4.09
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 25  0  2  2  3  3  13  4.00  983/1391  4.28  4.39  4.30  4.35  4.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 22 0  1  0  0  4  21  4.69  459/1388  4.78  4.51  4.28  4.37  4.69
4. Were special techniques successful                  25  14  0  0  0  2   7  4.78 ****/ 958  4.12  4.15  3.93  4.00  ****


                Laboratory
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material  43   4  0  0  0  0   1  5.00 ****/ 224  ****  ****  4.10  4.33  ****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information 44 0  1  0  0  1   2  3.75 ****/ 240  ****  ****  4.11  4.47  ****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 45  2  0  0  0  0   1  5.00 ****/ 219  ****  ****  4.44  4.61  ****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance           45   2  0  0  0  0   1  5.00 ****/ 215  ****  ****  4.35  4.43  ****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 45   1  0  0  1  0   1  4.00 ****/ 198  ****  ****  4.18  4.08  ****


                Seminar
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 45  2  0  0  0  0   1  5.00 ****/  85  ****  4.50  4.58  4.00  ****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 45  1  0  0  0  1   1  4.50 ****/  82  ****  5.00  4.52  3.00  ****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 46  1  0  0  0  0   1  5.00 ****/  78  ****  4.50  4.47  ****  ****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned    46   1  0  0  0  0   1  5.00 ****/  80  ****  4.50  4.47  2.00  ****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear                46   1  0  0  0  0   1  5.00 ****/  82  ****  4.25  4.16  4.00  ****


                Field Work
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 45   0  2  0  0  0   1  2.33 ****/  52  ****  ****  4.04  4.78  ****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 46   0  1  0  0  0   1  3.00 ****/  53  ****  ****  4.05  4.28  ****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation       46   1  0  0  0  0   1  5.00 ****/  42  ****  ****  4.75  ****  ****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations   46   0  1  0  0  0   1  3.00 ****/  37  ****  ****  4.58  ****  ****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities 46   1  0  0  0  0   1  5.00 ****/  32  ****  ****  4.56  ****  ****


                Self  Paced
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 45  0  1  0  1  0   1  3.00 ****/  50  ****  ****  4.45  3.24  ****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal    46   1  0  0  0  0   1  5.00 ****/  32  ****  ****  4.51  4.33  ****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful      46   1  0  0  0  0   1  5.00 ****/  43  ****  ****  4.69  ****  ****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful       43   1  0  0  3  0   1  3.50 ****/  32  ****  ****  4.37  1.00  ****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students     46   1  0  0  0  0   1  5.00 ****/  21  ****  ****  4.52  3.00  ****
```

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	5	0.00-0.99	3	A	11	Required for Majors	8	Graduate	0	Major	14
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	1	B	13						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	1	C	3	General	4	Under-grad	48	Non-major	34
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	2	#### - Means there are not enough			
				P	0			responses to be significant			
				I	0	Other	15				
				?	2						

```
Course-Section: POLI 210  0301              University of Maryland                          Page 1338
Title      POLITICAL PHILOSOPHY             Baltimore County                               FEB 13, 2008
Instructor:   CARTER, JOHN W.                Fall   2007                                    Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:     47
Questionnaires:  41                    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   12  0  0  0  6 11 12  4.21  939/1639  4.42 4.44  4.27 4.35 4.21
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    12  0  0  1  4 14 10  4.14  981/1639  4.35 4.32  4.22 4.27 4.14
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   12  0  0  1  4 11 13  4.24  804/1397  4.52 4.39  4.28 4.39 4.24
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    11  3  0  0  6 11 10  4.15  900/1583  4.34 4.29  4.19 4.28 4.15
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 12  0  0  1  3  7 18  4.45  398/1532  4.38 4.40  4.01 4.09 4.45
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 12  0  0  0  5 13 11  4.21  656/1504  4.21 4.20  4.05 4.09 4.21
7. Was the grading system clearly explained            13  0  1  1  6  7 13  4.07  996/1612  4.50 4.30  4.16 4.21 4.07
8. How many times was class cancelled                  12  0  0  0  0 23  6  4.21 1390/1635  4.32 4.55  4.65 4.63 4.21
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 14  0  0  0  4 13 10  4.22  691/1579  4.39 4.17  4.08 4.14 4.22


              Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        12  0  0  0  0  4 25  4.86  271/1518  4.90 4.62  4.43 4.48 4.86
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   12  0  0  0  0  5 24  4.83  750/1520  4.91 4.83  4.70 4.78 4.83
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 12  0  0  0  6  7 16  4.34  790/1517  4.67 4.45  4.27 4.34 4.34
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     12  1  0  0  4  5 19  4.54  603/1550  4.74 4.41  4.22 4.33 4.54
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 14 17  3  0  2  2  3  3.20 ****/1295  3.65 3.95  3.94 4.07 ****


              Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 14  0  2  3  0  8 14  4.07  745/1398  4.24 4.25  4.07 4.14 4.07
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 14  0  0  1  5  5 16  4.33  752/1391  4.28 4.39  4.30 4.35 4.33
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 13  0  0  0  1  6 21  4.71  435/1388  4.78 4.51  4.28 4.37 4.71
4. Were special techniques successful                  14  1  2  0  3  9 12  4.12  430/ 958  4.12 4.15  3.93 4.00 4.12


              Laboratory
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance           38  0  0  0  3  0  0  3.00 ****/ 215  **** ****  4.35 4.43 ****


              Seminar
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned    40  0  0  0  1  0  0  3.00 ****/  80  **** 4.50  4.47 2.00 ****


              Self  Paced
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful       40  0  0  0  1  0  0  3.00 ****/  32  **** ****  4.37 1.00 ****

                                   Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned        Cum. GPA        Expected Grades        Reasons              Type              Majors
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
  00-27    4      0.00-0.99    1      A   11        Required for Majors  6    Graduate      0    Major       8
  28-55    3      1.00-1.99    0      B   12
  56-83    6      2.00-2.99    1      C    2        General              7    Under-grad   41    Non-major  33
  84-150   4      3.00-3.49    6      D    0
  Grad.    0      3.50-4.00    4      F    0        Electives            3    #### - Means there are not enough
                                      P    0                                 responses to be significant
                                      I    0        Other               11
                                      ?    1
```

```
Course-Section: POLI 210H 0101          University of Maryland                              Page 1339
Title       POLITICAL PHILOSOPHY        Baltimore County                                    FEB 13, 2008
Instructor: VAUGHAN, GEOFFR             Fall   2007                                          Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:      9
Questionnaires:  9                       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  0  7  5.00   1/1639   5.00  4.44  4.27 4.35  5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals     2   0   0  0  0  0  7  5.00   1/1639   5.00  4.32  4.22 4.27  5.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals    2   0   0  0  0  1  6  4.86 196/1397   4.86  4.39  4.28 4.39  4.86
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals     2   1   0  0  0  1  5  4.83 173/1583   4.83  4.29  4.19 4.28  4.83
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 2   0   0  0  1  1  5  4.57 293/1532   4.57  4.40  4.01 4.09  4.57
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 2  3  1  0  0  0  3  4.00 824/1504   4.00  4.20  4.05 4.09  4.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained             2   0   0  0  0  0  7  5.00   1/1612   5.00  4.30  4.16 4.21  5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled                   1   1   0  0  0  2  5  4.71 943/1635   4.71  4.55  4.65 4.63  4.71
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 3  1  0  0  0  1  4  4.80 137/1579   4.80  4.17  4.08 4.14  4.80

                Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared         2   0   0  0  0  0  7  5.00   1/1518   5.00  4.62  4.43 4.48  5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject    2   0   0  0  0  0  7  5.00   1/1520   5.00  4.83  4.70 4.78  5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 2   0   0  0  0  0  7  5.00   1/1517   5.00  4.45  4.27 4.34  5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned      0   2   0  0  0  0  7  5.00   1/1550   5.00  4.41  4.22 4.33  5.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 2  4  0  0  0  0  3  5.00   1/1295   5.00  3.95  3.94 4.07  5.00

                Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 2   0   0  0  1  1  5  4.57 386/1398   4.57  4.25  4.07 4.14  4.57
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 2   0   0  0  1  0  6  4.71 441/1391   4.71  4.39  4.30 4.35  4.71
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 2  0  0  0  0  1  6  4.86 276/1388   4.86  4.51  4.28 4.37  4.86
4. Were special techniques successful                   2   3   0  0  0  0  4  5.00   1/ 958   5.00  4.15  3.93 4.00  5.00

                                     Frequency Distribution

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

```
Course-Section: POLI 233  0101            University of Maryland                                     Page 1340
Title       COMMON LAW&LEGAL ANALY          Baltimore County                                        FEB 13, 2008
Instructor:   MCKEE, BRENT                      Fall   2007                                          Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:    35
Questionnaires: 35                    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  10   0   0   1   5   9  10  4.12 1042/1639  4.12  4.44  4.27  4.35  4.12
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals   10   0   1   0   8   8   8  3.88 1274/1639  3.88  4.32  4.22  4.27  3.88
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals  10  15   0   0   4   1   5  4.10  935/1397  4.10  4.39  4.28  4.39  4.10
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals   10   0   2   0   4  10   9  3.96 1069/1583  3.96  4.29  4.19  4.28  3.96
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 10  0   1   2   5   4  13  4.04  744/1532  4.04  4.40  4.01  4.09  4.04
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 10 0  0   0   5  11   9  4.16  701/1504  4.16  4.20  4.05  4.09  4.16
7. Was the grading system clearly explained           10   0   1   4   4   7   9  3.76 1273/1612  3.76  4.30  4.16  4.21  3.76
8. How many times was class cancelled                 10   0   0   0   3  15   7  4.16 1415/1635  4.16  4.55  4.65  4.63  4.16
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 15 0  1   2   6   9   2  3.45 1341/1579  3.45  4.17  4.08  4.14  3.45


              Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared       10   0   0   3   6   9   7  3.80 1351/1518  3.80  4.62  4.43  4.48  3.80
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject  10   0   0   1   2   6  16  4.48 1205/1520  4.48  4.83  4.70  4.78  4.48
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 10  0   0   1  10   6   8  3.84 1217/1517  3.84  4.45  4.27  4.34  3.84
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned    10   0   0   4   5  10   6  3.72 1250/1550  3.72  4.41  4.22  4.33  3.72
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 11 3  0   2   8   5   6  3.71  864/1295  3.71  3.95  3.94  4.07  3.71


              Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 12  0   2   1   2   7  11  4.04  756/1398  4.04  4.25  4.07  4.14  4.04
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 12  0   0   1   2   4  16  4.52  601/1391  4.52  4.39  4.30  4.35  4.52
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 12 0  0   0   1   3  19  4.78  351/1388  4.78  4.51  4.28  4.37  4.78
4. Were special techniques successful                 11   6   2   3   5   5   3  3.22  813/ 958  3.22  4.15  3.93  4.00  3.22

              Laboratory
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance          34   0   0   0   1   0   0  3.00 ****/ 215  ****  ****  4.35  4.43  ****

              Seminar
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned   34   0   0   0   1   0   0  3.00 ****/  80  ****  4.50  4.47  2.00  ****

                                        Frequency Distribution


Credits Earned        Cum. GPA       Expected Grades        Reasons              Type              Majors

 00-27     1       0.00-0.99    1     A   16      Required for Majors  3     Graduate      0     Major      17
 28-55     3       1.00-1.99    0     B    7                                                      
 56-83     3       2.00-2.99    4     C    1      General              4     Under-grad   35     Non-major  18
 84-150    7       3.00-3.49    4     D    0
 Grad.     0       3.50-4.00    7     F    0      Electives            1     #### - Means there are not enough
                                      P    0                                 responses to be significant
                                      I    0      Other               17
                                      ?    0
```

```
Course-Section: POLI 240  0101               University of Maryland                              Page 1341
Title        STATE & LOCAL POLITICS             Baltimore County                                 FEB 13, 2008
Instructor:  CROATTI, MARK                         Fall   2007                                   Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:     39
Questionnaires: 38                      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  10  0  5  5  2  9  7  3.29 1558/1639  3.29  4.44  4.27 4.35  3.29
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals   10  0  7  6  3  7  5  2.89 1606/1639  2.89  4.32  4.22 4.27  2.89
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals  11  1  7  3  6  6  4  2.88 1380/1397  2.88  4.39  4.28 4.39  2.88
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals   11  1  8  4  6  3  5  2.73 1569/1583  2.73  4.29  4.19 4.28  2.73
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 12  1  5  2  2  8  8  3.48 1252/1532  3.48  4.40  4.01 4.09  3.48
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 11  2  8  3  6  4  4  2.72 1465/1504  2.72  4.20  4.05 4.09  2.72
7. Was the grading system clearly explained           11  2  5  5  5  4  6  3.04 1515/1612  3.04  4.30  4.16 4.21  3.04
8. How many times was class cancelled                 11  1  0  0  1 19  6  4.19 1396/1635  4.19  4.55  4.65 4.63  4.19
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 17  0  4  1  6  7  3  3.19 1440/1579  3.19  4.17  4.08 4.14  3.19


            Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared       13  0  4  4  4  6  7  3.32 1450/1518  3.32  4.62  4.43 4.48  3.32
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject  13  0  0  1  5  4 15  4.32 1325/1520  4.32  4.83  4.70 4.78  4.32
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 14  0  6  0  5  7  6  3.29 1416/1517  3.29  4.45  4.27 4.34  3.29
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned    14  0  3  3  3  5 10  3.67 1274/1550  3.67  4.41  4.22 4.33  3.67
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 15  5  3  2  2  5  6  3.50  978/1295  3.50  3.95  3.94 4.07  3.50


            Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 20  0  3  5  3  0  7  3.17 1237/1398  3.17  4.25  4.07 4.14  3.17
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 21  0  4  1  6  2  4  3.06 1314/1391  3.06  4.39  4.30 4.35  3.06
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 18  0  4  3  5  5  3  3.00 1320/1388  3.00  4.51  4.28 4.37  3.00
4. Were special techniques successful                 20  7  4  0  4  2  1  2.64  905/ 958  2.64  4.15  3.93 4.00  2.64


            Laboratory
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 37  0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/ 219  ****  ****  4.44 4.61  ****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance          37  0  0  0  1  0  0  3.00 ****/ 215  ****  ****  4.35 4.43  ****


            Seminar
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned   35  0  0  0  3  0  0  3.00 ****/  80  ****  4.50  4.47 2.00  ****


                                    Frequency Distribution


Credits Earned         Cum. GPA        Expected Grades         Reasons                 Type                    Majors
------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
 00-27      1      0.00-0.99   1      A   15     Required for Majors   4     Graduate       0     Major       16
 28-55      7      1.00-1.99   0      B    4
 56-83      3      2.00-2.99   7      C    3     General               0     Under-grad    38     Non-major   22
 84-150     3      3.00-3.49   5      D    0
 Grad.      0      3.50-4.00   3      F    0     Electives             1     #### - Means there are not enough
                                      P    0                                responses to be significant
                                      I    0     Other                17
                                      ?    2
```

```
Course-Section: POLI 250  0101             University of Maryland                              Page 1342
Title       INTRO TO PUBLIC ADMIN            Baltimore County                                  FEB 13, 2008
Instructor:  WILLIAMS-RANDAL                 Fall   2007                                        Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:     31
Questionnaires:  29                      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   6   0  1  1  4  5  12  4.13 1029/1639  4.13  4.44  4.27  4.35  4.13
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    6   0  0  1  4  5  13  4.30  813/1639  4.30  4.32  4.22  4.27  4.30
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   6   0  0  2  2  7  12  4.26  785/1397  4.26  4.39  4.28  4.39  4.26
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    6   0  2  0  1  7  13  4.26  781/1583  4.26  4.29  4.19  4.28  4.26
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 6  0  1  4  3  6   9  3.78 1012/1532  3.78  4.40  4.01  4.09  3.78
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 7 0 2  2  5  4   9  3.73 1075/1504  3.73  4.20  4.05  4.09  3.73
7. Was the grading system clearly explained            7   0  0  1  3  4  14  4.41  632/1612  4.41  4.30  4.16  4.21  4.41
8. How many times was class cancelled                  7   1  0  0  0  4  17  4.81  811/1635  4.81  4.55  4.65  4.63  4.81
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 13 2 1  0  5  5   3  3.64 1245/1579  3.64  4.17  4.08  4.14  3.64


              Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        7   0  0  2  0  2  18  4.64  643/1518  4.64  4.62  4.43  4.48  4.64
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   7   0  1  1  1  6  13  4.32 1331/1520  4.32  4.83  4.70  4.78  4.32
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 7  0  1  1  0  7  13  4.36  768/1517  4.36  4.45  4.27  4.34  4.36
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     7   1  0  1  2  6  12  4.38  787/1550  4.38  4.41  4.22  4.33  4.38
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 8 0 1  0  4  4  12  4.24  474/1295  4.24  3.95  3.94  4.07  4.24


              Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 10 0 1  0  2  3  13  4.42  494/1398  4.42  4.25  4.07  4.14  4.42
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 10 0 0  0  1  6  12  4.58  564/1391  4.58  4.39  4.30  4.35  4.58
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 8 0 0  0  1  9  11  4.48  674/1388  4.48  4.51  4.28  4.37  4.48
4. Were special techniques successful                 10   6  0  1  1  3   8  4.38  278/ 958  4.38  4.15  3.93  4.00  4.38


              Laboratory
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material  28   0  0  0  0  0   1  5.00 ****/ 224  ****  ****  4.10  4.33  ****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information 28 0 0 0  0  0   1  5.00 ****/ 240  ****  ****  4.11  4.47  ****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 28 0 0 0  0  0   1  5.00 ****/ 219  ****  ****  4.44  4.61  ****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance           27   0  0  0  1  0   1  4.00 ****/ 215  ****  ****  4.35  4.43  ****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 28   0  0  0  0  0   1  5.00 ****/ 198  ****  ****  4.18  4.08  ****


              Seminar
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 28  0  0  0  0  0   1  5.00 ****/  85  ****  4.50  4.58  4.00  ****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 28 0 0 0  0  0   1  5.00 ****/  82  ****  5.00  4.52  3.00  ****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 28  0  0  0  0  0   1  5.00 ****/  78  ****  4.50  4.47  ****  ****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned    26   0  0  0  2  0   1  3.67 ****/  80  ****  4.50  4.47  2.00  ****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear                28   0  0  0  0  0   1  5.00 ****/  82  ****  4.25  4.16  4.00  ****


              Field Work
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 28   0  0  0  0  0   1  5.00 ****/  52  ****  ****  4.04  4.78  ****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria  28   0  0  0  0  0   1  5.00 ****/  53  ****  ****  4.05  4.28  ****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation        28   0  0  0  0  0   1  5.00 ****/  42  ****  ****  4.75  ****  ****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations    28   0  0  0  0  0   1  5.00 ****/  37  ****  ****  4.58  ****  ****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities  28   0  0  0  0  0   1  5.00 ****/  32  ****  ****  4.56  ****  ****


              Self  Paced
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 28   0  0  0  0  0   1  5.00 ****/  50  ****  ****  4.45  3.24  ****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal     28   0  0  0  0  0   1  5.00 ****/  32  ****  ****  4.51  4.33  ****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful       28   0  0  0  0  0   1  5.00 ****/  43  ****  ****  4.69  ****  ****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful        27   0  0  0  1  0   1  4.00 ****/  32  ****  ****  4.37  1.00  ****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students      28   0  0  0  0  0   1  5.00 ****/  21  ****  ****  4.52  3.00  ****
```

```
Course-Section: POLI 250  0101                    University of Maryland                         Page 1342
Title          INTRO TO PUBLIC ADMIN                Baltimore County                           FEB 13, 2008
Instructor:    WILLIAMS-RANDAL                        Fall   2007                               Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:     31
Questionnaires: 29                        Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire


                                            Frequency Distribution


Credits Earned            Cum. GPA           Expected Grades              Reasons                    Type                   Majors
--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
  00-27    1          0.00-0.99    4         A    12         Required for Majors   1       Graduate     0       Major        11
  28-55    1          1.00-1.99    0         B     5                                                            
  56-83    2          2.00-2.99    3         C     2         General               2       Under-grad  29       Non-major    18
  84-150   6          3.00-3.49    6         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                19
                                             ?     2
```

```
Course-Section: POLI 260  0101                University of Maryland                              Page 1343
Title        COMPARATIVE POLITICS             Baltimore County                                   FEB 13, 2008
Instructor:  FORESTIERE, CAR                  Fall  2007                                         Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:      51
Questionnaires:  50                     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  18   0  0  1  1  7 23  4.63  482/1639  4.62  4.44  4.27 4.35  4.63
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals   18   0  0  0  2 10 20  4.56  455/1639  4.60  4.32  4.22 4.27  4.56
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals  18   0  0  0  2 10 20  4.56  457/1397  4.62  4.39  4.28 4.39  4.56
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals   18  14  0  0  1  3 14  4.72  270/1583  4.70  4.29  4.19 4.28  4.72
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 18  0  0  1  2 11 18  4.44  409/1532  4.51  4.40  4.01 4.09  4.44
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 19 16 0 1 0 3 11 4.60 291/1504 4.60 4.20 4.05 4.09 4.60
7. Was the grading system clearly explained           18   0  0  0  2 10 20  4.56  428/1612  4.68  4.30  4.16 4.21  4.56
8. How many times was class cancelled                 19   0  0  0  0  2 29  4.94  463/1635  4.81  4.55  4.65 4.63  4.94
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 28 2 0 0 2 10 8 4.30 601/1579 4.30 4.17 4.08 4.14 4.30

              Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared       18   0  0  0  0  5 27  4.84  301/1518  4.83  4.62  4.43 4.48  4.84
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject  19   0  0  0  0  1 30  4.97  219/1520  4.95  4.83  4.70 4.78  4.97
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 19  0  0  0  1  4 26  4.81  239/1517  4.72  4.45  4.27 4.34  4.81
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned    14   5  0  1  1  2 27  4.77  325/1550  4.70  4.41  4.22 4.33  4.77
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 20 1 0 0 6 2 21 4.52 260/1295 4.53 3.95 3.94 4.07 4.52

              Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 26  0  0  1  3  5 15  4.42  502/1398  4.24  4.25  4.07 4.14  4.42
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 27  0  0  1  4  0 18  4.52  601/1391  4.51  4.39  4.30 4.35  4.52
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 24 0 0 0 2 1 23 4.81 328/1388 4.52 4.51 4.28 4.37 4.81
4. Were special techniques successful                 25  11  1  0  1  3  9  4.36  296/ 958  4.36  4.15  3.93 4.00  4.36

              Laboratory
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 49  0  0  0  0  1  0  4.00 ****/ 198  ****  ****  4.18 4.08  ****

              Seminar
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 49  0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  85  ****  4.50  4.58 4.00  ****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 49 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 82 **** 5.00 4.52 3.00 ****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned   49   0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  80  ****  4.50  4.47 2.00  ****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear               49   0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  82  ****  4.25  4.16 4.00  ****

              Self  Paced
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful      49   0  0  0  1  0  0  3.00 ****/  32  ****  ****  4.37 1.00  ****
```

```
                                        Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned        Cum. GPA        Expected Grades        Reasons              Type                Majors
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
00-27      3       0.00-0.99    4        A    8        Required for Majors  3    Graduate      0      Major      17
28-55      3       1.00-1.99    0        B   15
56-83      2       2.00-2.99    4        C    4        General              2    Under-grad   50      Non-major  33
84-150     5       3.00-3.49    4        D    1
Grad.      0       3.50-4.00    5        F    0        Electives            0    #### - Means there are not enough
                                         P    0                                 responses to be significant
                                         I    0        Other               19
                                         ?    1
```

Title   COMPARATIVE POLITICS   Baltimore County   FEB 13, 2008
Instructor: FORESTIERE, CAR   Fall   2007   Job IRBR3029
Enrollment: 51
Questionnaires: 51   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  17   0  0  0  2  9 23  4.62  495/1639  4.62  4.44  4.27  4.35  4.62
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals   17   0  0  1  2  5 26  4.65  371/1639  4.60  4.32  4.22  4.27  4.65
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals  17   0  0  1  1  6 26  4.68  358/1397  4.62  4.39  4.28  4.39  4.68
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals   16  19  0  0  0  5 11  4.69  307/1583  4.70  4.29  4.19  4.28  4.69
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 17  1  0  1  2  7 23  4.58  293/1532  4.51  4.40  4.01  4.09  4.58
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 17 26 0 0 0  3  5  4.63  ****/1504  4.60  4.20  4.05  4.09  ****
7. Was the grading system clearly explained           18   0  0  0  2  3 28  4.79  186/1612  4.68  4.30  4.16  4.21  4.79
8. How many times was class cancelled                 16   1  0  0  0 11 23  4.68  990/1635  4.81  4.55  4.65  4.63  4.68
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 23 1 0 1 3 10 13  4.30  612/1579  4.30  4.17  4.08  4.14  4.30

            Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared       19   0  0  0  0  6 26  4.81  345/1518  4.83  4.62  4.43  4.48  4.81
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject  18   0  0  0  0  2 31  4.94  382/1520  4.95  4.83  4.70  4.78  4.94
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 18  0  0  0  1 10 22  4.64  439/1517  4.72  4.45  4.27  4.34  4.64
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned    16   1  0  1  2  6 25  4.62  511/1550  4.70  4.41  4.22  4.33  4.62
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 19  2 0 1  1  9 19  4.53  251/1295  4.53  3.95  3.94  4.07  4.53

            Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 33  0  2  0  2  5  9  4.06  752/1398  4.24  4.25  4.07  4.14  4.06
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 33  0  1  1  0  2 14  4.50  616/1391  4.51  4.39  4.30  4.35  4.50
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 25 0 0 3 1  9 13  4.23  847/1388  4.52  4.51  4.28  4.37  4.23
4. Were special techniques successful                 34  12  0  2  1  0  2  3.40  ****/ 958  4.36  4.15  3.93  4.00  ****
```

                                            Frequency Distribution

```
Credits Earned          Cum. GPA          Expected Grades        Reasons                Type                 Majors
------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
  00-27      3         0.00-0.99   1        A   13        Required for Majors   1    Graduate      0        Major      23
  28-55      8         1.00-1.99   0        B   14
  56-83      1         2.00-2.99   5        C    2        General               2    Under-grad   51        Non-major  28
  84-150     7         3.00-3.49   6        D    0
  Grad.      0         3.50-4.00   8        F    0        Electives             3    #### - Means there are not enough
                                            P    0                                   responses to be significant
                                            I    0        Other                23
                                            ?    1
```

```
Course-Section: POLI 280  0101          University of Maryland                        Page 1345
Title        INTERNATIONAL RELATION      Baltimore County                             FEB 13, 2008
Instructor:  HODY, CYNTHIA               Fall  2007                                   Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:     35
Questionnaires:  12                   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    0   0   0   1   0   6   5  4.25  890/1639  4.31  4.44  4.27  4.35  4.25
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals     0   0   0   2   1   5   4  3.92 1244/1639  4.12  4.32  4.22  4.27  3.92
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals    0   0   0   1   1   5   5  4.17  878/1397  4.17  4.39  4.28  4.39  4.17
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals     0   1   0   1   3   6   1  3.64 1345/1583  3.67  4.29  4.19  4.28  3.64
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0   0   0   0   2   5   5  4.25  580/1532  4.38  4.40  4.01  4.09  4.25
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 3   0   0   1   6   2  4.11  758/1504  4.13  4.20  4.05  4.09  4.11
7. Was the grading system clearly explained             0   0   0   1   1   7   3  4.00 1044/1612  3.98  4.30  4.16  4.21  4.00
8. How many times was class cancelled                   1   2   0   0   1   3   5  4.44 1195/1635  4.49  4.55  4.65  4.63  4.44
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 4 0   0   1   0   6   1  3.88 1079/1579  3.85  4.17  4.08  4.14  3.88


            Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared         0   0   0   0   1   5   6  4.42  933/1518  4.30  4.62  4.43  4.48  4.42
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject    0   0   0   0   0   0  12  5.00    1/1520  4.82  4.83  4.70  4.78  5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0   0   0   0   4   7   1  3.75 1260/1517  3.80  4.45  4.27  4.34  3.75
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned      0   0   1   0   5   3   3  3.58 1303/1550  3.67  4.41  4.22  4.33  3.58
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 0  9   1   0   0   2   0  3.00 1158/1295  2.80  3.95  3.94  4.07  3.00


            Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 3   0   2   1   2   4   0  2.89 1315/1398  3.22  4.25  4.07  4.14  2.89
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 3   0   0   1   1   3   4  4.11  927/1391  4.06  4.39  4.30  4.35  4.11
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 2  0   1   0   1   3   5  4.10  918/1388  4.30  4.51  4.28  4.37  4.10
4. Were special techniques successful                   3   6   0   0   2   1   0  3.33  786/ 958  3.33  4.15  3.93  4.00  3.33


                              Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned        Cum. GPA        Expected Grades        Reasons                Type                  Majors
---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
 00-27      0      0.00-0.99   0      A   3      Required for Majors  2     Graduate     0      Major      6
 28-55      4      1.00-1.99   0      B   4
 56-83      1      2.00-2.99   0      C   4      General              1     Under-grad  12      Non-major  6
 84-150     0      3.00-3.49   3      D   0
 Grad.      0      3.50-4.00   2      F   0      Electives            1     #### - Means there are not enough
                                      P   0                                responses to be significant
                                      I   0      Other                7
                                      ?   1
```

```
Course-Section: POLI 280  0201            University of Maryland                          Page 1346
Title        INTERNATIONAL RELATION        Baltimore County                               FEB 13, 2008
Instructor:  HODY, CYNTHIA                 Fall   2007                                     Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:     40
Questionnaires: 24              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  1  0  2  6  13  4.36   788/1639  4.31  4.44  4.27  4.35  4.36
 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    2  0  0  2  1  7  12  4.32   800/1639  4.12  4.32  4.22  4.27  4.32
 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   2  0  0  2  2  8  10  4.18   859/1397  4.17  4.39  4.28  4.39  4.18
 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    2  2  3  0  4  6   7  3.70  1296/1583  3.67  4.29  4.19  4.28  3.70
 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 2  0  0  1  1  6  14  4.50   335/1532  4.38  4.40  4.01  4.09  4.50
 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 2  3  0  2  3  4  10  4.16   713/1504  4.13  4.20  4.05  4.09  4.16
 7. Was the grading system clearly explained            2  0  2  0  4  7   9  3.95  1109/1612  3.98  4.30  4.16  4.21  3.95
 8. How many times was class cancelled                  1  1  0  0  2  6  14  4.55  1107/1635  4.49  4.55  4.65  4.63  4.55
 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 6  0  1  0  5  7   5  3.83  1109/1579  3.85  4.17  4.08  4.14  3.83


             Lecture
 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        3  0  0  1  4  6  10  4.19  1141/1518  4.30  4.62  4.43  4.48  4.19
 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   2  0  1  0  1  2  18  4.64  1074/1520  4.82  4.83  4.70  4.78  4.64
 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 3  0  1  2  4  6   8  3.86  1211/1517  3.80  4.45  4.27  4.34  3.86
 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     3  0  2  1  5  5   8  3.76  1232/1550  3.67  4.41  4.22  4.33  3.76
 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 5  9  2  2  4  2   0  2.60  1237/1295  2.80  3.95  3.94  4.07  2.60


             Discussion
 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 13  0  1  0  5  2   3  3.55  1093/1398  3.22  4.25  4.07  4.14  3.55
 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 13  0  0  0  2  7   2  4.00   983/1391  4.06  4.39  4.30  4.35  4.00
 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 12  0  0  0  1  4   7  4.50   647/1388  4.30  4.51  4.28  4.37  4.50
 4. Were special techniques successful                  13  9  0  0  1  0   1  4.00  ****/ 958  3.33  4.15  3.93  4.00  ****


                              Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned        Cum. GPA        Expected Grades         Reasons                Type                Majors
-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
 00-27      0      0.00-0.99    1      A    8      Required for Majors   2      Graduate      0      Major      15
 28-55      1      1.00-1.99    0      B   10
 56-83      5      2.00-2.99    1      C    2      General               1      Under-grad   24      Non-major   9
 84-150     5      3.00-3.49    4      D    0
 Grad.      0      3.50-4.00    5      F    0      Electives             0      #### - Means there are not enough
                                        P    0                                 responses to be significant
                                        I    0      Other                16
                                        ?    0
```

```
Course-Section: POLI 300  0101              University of Maryland                              Page 1347
Title     QUANT POLI SCI                     Baltimore County                                  FEB 13, 2008
Instructor:   MILLER, NICHOLA                Fall   2007                                       Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:    52
Questionnaires: 51                    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   18   0   2   2  10  11   8  3.64 1435/1639  3.64  4.44  4.27  4.28  3.64
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    18   0   2   0   8  10  13  3.97 1158/1639  3.97  4.32  4.22  4.20  3.97
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   18   0   1   1   6  11  14  4.09  938/1397  4.09  4.39  4.28  4.26  4.09
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    16  11   1   0   5   9   9  4.04  981/1583  4.04  4.29  4.19  4.24  4.04
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 18   2   8   3   8   6   6  2.97 1437/1532  2.97  4.40  4.01  4.05  2.97
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 20 10   0   1   6   7   7  3.95  884/1504  3.95  4.20  4.05  4.12  3.95
7. Was the grading system clearly explained            18   0   1   3   6   9  14  3.97 1096/1612  3.97  4.30  4.16  4.12  3.97
8. How many times was class cancelled                  17   1   0   0   0  19  14  4.42 1215/1635  4.42  4.55  4.65  4.66  4.42
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 27  0   2   3   6  11   2  3.33 1390/1579  3.33  4.17  4.08  4.07  3.33


                Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        19   0   2   1   2   4  23  4.41  947/1518  4.41  4.62  4.43  4.39  4.41
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   19   0   0   0   2   8  22  4.63 1087/1520  4.63  4.83  4.70  4.68  4.63
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 19  0   2   2   3  11  14  4.03 1065/1517  4.03  4.45  4.27  4.23  4.03
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     12   2   5   4   6   9  13  3.57 1309/1550  3.57  4.41  4.22  4.20  3.57
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 19  3   0   1   7   6  15  4.21  497/1295  4.21  3.95  3.94  3.95  4.21


                Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 27   0  11   1   4   1   7  2.67 1342/1398  2.67  4.25  4.07  4.13  2.67
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 27   0   3   3   5   5   8  3.50 1220/1391  3.50  4.39  4.30  4.35  3.50
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 24  0   2   3   2   9  11  3.89 1043/1388  3.89  4.51  4.28  4.34  3.89
4. Were special techniques successful                  26  18   2   0   2   0   3  3.29 ****/ 958  ****  4.15  3.93  3.97  ****


                Laboratory
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material  49   1   1   0   0   0   0  1.00 ****/ 224  ****  ****  4.10  4.06  ****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information 48  0   0   0   0   2   1  4.33 ****/ 240  ****  ****  4.11  4.08  ****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 49  1   0   0   0   1   0  4.00 ****/ 219  ****  ****  4.44  4.44  ****


                Field Work
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 50   0   0   0   1   0   0  3.00 ****/  52  ****  ****  4.04  4.78  ****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 50   0   0   0   1   0   0  3.00 ****/  53  ****  ****  4.05  4.31  ****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation       50   0   0   0   0   0   1  5.00 ****/  42  ****  ****  4.75  4.63  ****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations   50   0   0   0   0   0   1  5.00 ****/  37  ****  ****  4.58  4.52  ****


                Self  Paced
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 50   0   0   0   1   0   0  3.00 ****/  50  ****  ****  4.45  5.00  ****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful      50   0   0   0   1   0   0  3.00 ****/  43  ****  ****  4.69  5.00  ****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful       49   0   0   0   1   1   0  3.50 ****/  32  ****  ****  4.37  5.00  ****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students     50   0   0   0   0   0   1  5.00 ****/  21  ****  ****  4.52  5.00  ****


                        Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned          Cum. GPA          Expected Grades          Reasons                  Type                    Majors
-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
  00-27      0         0.00-0.99    2       A    7         Required for Majors   0      Graduate      0        Major        30
  28-55      2         1.00-1.99    0       B   11
  56-83      5         2.00-2.99    8       C   13         General               0      Under-grad   51        Non-major    21
  84-150    14         3.00-3.49    3       D    2
  Grad.      0         3.50-4.00   12       F    0         Electives             0      #### - Means there are not enough
                                            P    0                                      responses to be significant
                                            I    0         Other                31
                                            ?    0
```

```
Course-Section: POLI 327  0101            University of Maryland                                Page 1348
Title      INTEREST GROUPS & LOBB         Baltimore County                                     FEB 13, 2008
Instructor:   SCHALLER, THOMA             Fall  2007                                            Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:    30
Questionnaires: 30                    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	12	0	0	0	2	0	16	4.78	293/1639	4.78	4.44	4.27	4.28	4.78
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	12	0	0	1	1	3	13	4.56	466/1639	4.56	4.32	4.22	4.20	4.56
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	12	0	0	0	0	2	16	4.89	175/1397	4.89	4.39	4.28	4.26	4.89
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	12	0	0	0	2	3	13	4.61	363/1583	4.61	4.29	4.19	4.24	4.61
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	0	2	16	4.89	113/1532	4.89	4.40	4.01	4.05	4.89
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	12	0	1	1	2	3	11	4.22	638/1504	4.22	4.20	4.05	4.12	4.22
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	12	0	0	0	3	3	12	4.50	490/1612	4.50	4.30	4.16	4.12	4.50
8. How many times was class cancelled	12	0	0	0	0	2	16	4.89	691/1635	4.89	4.55	4.65	4.66	4.89
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	16	0	1	0	1	4	8	4.29	623/1579	4.29	4.17	4.08	4.07	4.29
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	12	0	0	0	1	1	16	4.83	315/1518	4.83	4.62	4.43	4.39	4.83
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	12	0	0	0	2	0	16	4.78	855/1520	4.78	4.83	4.70	4.68	4.78
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	12	0	0	0	2	1	15	4.72	335/1517	4.72	4.45	4.27	4.23	4.72
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	10	2	0	0	2	2	14	4.67	457/1550	4.67	4.41	4.22	4.20	4.67
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	12	0	1	0	2	1	14	4.50	265/1295	4.50	3.95	3.94	3.95	4.50
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	0	1	14	4.93	113/1398	4.93	4.25	4.07	4.13	4.93
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	15	0	0	1	0	1	13	4.73	417/1391	4.73	4.39	4.30	4.35	4.73
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	14	0	0	1	0	0	15	4.81	317/1388	4.81	4.51	4.28	4.34	4.81
4. Were special techniques successful	15	1	1	0	1	2	10	4.43	253/ 958	4.43	4.15	3.93	3.97	4.43
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	29	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 224	****	****	4.10	4.06	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	29	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 240	****	****	4.11	4.08	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	28	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/ 219	****	****	4.44	4.44	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	29	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 215	****	****	4.35	4.21	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	29	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 198	****	****	4.18	4.04	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	29	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 85	****	4.50	4.58	4.50	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	29	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 82	****	5.00	4.52	4.59	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	29	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 78	****	4.50	4.47	4.60	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	25	0	0	0	4	0	1	3.40	****/ 80	****	4.50	4.47	4.65	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	29	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 82	****	4.25	4.16	4.08	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	29	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.04	4.78	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	29	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 53	****	****	4.05	4.31	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	29	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 42	****	****	4.75	4.63	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	29	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 37	****	****	4.58	4.52	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	29	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 32	****	****	4.56	4.30	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	29	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 50	****	****	4.45	5.00	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	29	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 32	****	****	4.51	5.00	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	29	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 43	****	****	4.69	5.00	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	29	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 32	****	****	4.37	5.00	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	29	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 21	****	****	4.52	5.00	****

```
Course-Section: POLI 327  0101              University of Maryland                        Page 1348
Title       INTEREST GROUPS & LOBB           Baltimore County                            FEB 13, 2008
Instructor:     SCHALLER, THOMA              Fall   2007                                 Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:     30
Questionnaires: 30                  Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire


                                         Frequency Distribution


Credits Earned          Cum. GPA        Expected Grades           Reasons              Type              Majors
--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
 00-27     2      0.00-0.99    0      A    4     Required for Majors  1    Graduate    0    Major      14
 28-55     2      1.00-1.99    1      B    9
 56-83     4      2.00-2.99    4      C    2     General              3    Under-grad  30   Non-major  16
 84-150    2      3.00-3.49    4      D    0
 Grad.     0      3.50-4.00    2      F    0     Electives            0    #### - Means there are not enough
                                      P    0                              responses to be significant
                                      I    0     Other               12
                                      ?    0
```

```
Course-Section: POLI 328  0101            University of Maryland                                Page 1349
Title      WOMEN AND POLITICS              Baltimore County                                     FEB 13, 2008
Instructor:  GUISEGERRITY, N              Fall  2007                                            Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:    33
Questionnaires: 31                  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   7  0  1  1  4  8 10  4.04 1110/1639  4.04  4.44  4.27 4.28  4.04
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    7  0  0  4  3  8  9  3.92 1244/1639  3.92  4.32  4.22 4.20  3.92
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   7  0  0  0  3 10 11  4.33  722/1397  4.33  4.39  4.28 4.26  4.33
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    7  0  0  4  3  6 11  4.00 1010/1583  4.00  4.29  4.19 4.24  4.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 8  0  0  2  2  4 15  4.39  450/1532  4.39  4.40  4.01 4.05  4.39
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 8 0 1  2  4  7  9  3.91  932/1504  3.91  4.20  4.05 4.12  3.91
7. Was the grading system clearly explained            7  0  3  5  4  6  6  3.29 1463/1612  3.29  4.30  4.16 4.12  3.29
8. How many times was class cancelled                  8  0  0  0  0 20  3  4.13 1434/1635  4.13  4.55  4.65 4.66  4.13
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 16 1 1 1 4  4  4  3.64 1245/1579  3.64  4.17  4.08 4.07  3.64

          Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        9  0  0  0  1  9 12  4.50  807/1518  4.50  4.62  4.43 4.39  4.50
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject  11  0  0  0  0  5 15  4.75  890/1520  4.75  4.83  4.70 4.68  4.75
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 10 0 0  1  4  5 11  4.24  907/1517  4.24  4.45  4.27 4.23  4.24
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     8  1  0  2  3  6 11  4.18  953/1550  4.18  4.41  4.22 4.20  4.18
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 10 4 3  3  3  2  6  3.29 1085/1295  3.29  3.95  3.94 3.95  3.29

          Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 12 0 0  0  1  6 12  4.58  386/1398  4.58  4.25  4.07 4.13  4.58
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 12 0 0  0  1  6 12  4.58  564/1391  4.58  4.39  4.30 4.35  4.58
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 11 0 0  0  1  7 12  4.55  609/1388  4.55  4.51  4.28 4.34  4.55
4. Were special techniques successful                  14  2  0  2  3  5  5  3.87  549/ 958  3.87  4.15  3.93 3.97  3.87

          Laboratory
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material  30  0  0  0  0  1  0  4.00 ****/ 224  ****  ****  4.10 4.06  ****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information 30 0 0 0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/ 240  ****  ****  4.11 4.08  ****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 29 0 0 0  0  1  1  4.50 ****/ 219  ****  ****  4.44 4.44  ****

          Seminar
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned    30  0  0  0  1  0  0  3.00 ****/  80  ****  4.50  4.47 4.65  ****

                              Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned       Cum. GPA        Expected Grades        Reasons              Type              Majors
-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
 00-27      0       0.00-0.99   0     A   11       Required for Majors   1    Graduate     0     Major       8
 28-55      0       1.00-1.99   0     B    8
 56-83      4       2.00-2.99   3     C    1       General               8    Under-grad  31     Non-major  23
 84-150     7       3.00-3.49   6     D    0
 Grad.      0       3.50-4.00   3     F    0       Electives             0    #### - Means there are not enough
                                      P    0                                  responses to be significant
                                      I    0       Other                11
                                      ?    1
```

```
Course-Section: POLI 337  0101                University of Maryland                              Page 1350
Title       COMPARATIVE JUSTICE                   Baltimore County                             FEB 13, 2008
Instructor:  DAVIS, JEFFREY                        Fall   2007                                 Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:     19
Questionnaires:  19                      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  15  0  0  0  0  0  4  5.00 ****/1639  ****  4.44 4.27  4.28 ****
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals   15  0  0  0  0  0  4  5.00 ****/1639  ****  4.32 4.22  4.20 ****
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals  15  0  0  0  0  0  4  5.00 ****/1397  ****  4.39 4.28  4.26 ****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals   15  0  0  0  0  0  4  5.00 ****/1583  ****  4.29 4.19  4.24 ****
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 15  0  0  0  0  0  4  5.00 ****/1532  ****  4.40 4.01  4.05 ****
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 15 0 0 0 0 1 3  4.75 ****/1504  ****  4.20 4.05  4.12 ****
7. Was the grading system clearly explained           15  0  0  0  0  1  3  4.75 ****/1612  ****  4.30 4.16  4.12 ****
8. How many times was class cancelled                 15  0  0  0  0  3  1  4.25 ****/1635  ****  4.55 4.65  4.66 ****
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 17 0 0 0 0 1 1  4.50 ****/1579  ****  4.17 4.08  4.07 ****


               Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared       15  0  0  0  0  1  3  4.75 ****/1518  ****  4.62 4.43  4.39 ****
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject  15  0  0  0  0  0  4  5.00 ****/1520  ****  4.83 4.70  4.68 ****
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 15 0 0 0 0 0 4  5.00 ****/1517  ****  4.45 4.27  4.23 ****
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned    12  3  0  0  0  0  4  5.00 ****/1550  ****  4.41 4.22  4.20 ****
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 16 0 0 0 1 1 1  4.00 ****/1295  ****  3.95 3.94  3.95 ****


               Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 17 0 0 0 0 0 2  5.00 ****/1398  ****  4.25 4.07  4.13 ****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 17 0 0 0 0 0 2  5.00 ****/1391  ****  4.39 4.30  4.35 ****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 16 0 0 0 0 1 2  4.67 ****/1388  ****  4.51 4.28  4.34 ****
4. Were special techniques successful                 17  1  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/ 958  ****  4.15 3.93  3.97 ****

               Field Work
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations  18  0  0  0  1  0  0  3.00 ****/  37  ****  **** 4.58  4.52 ****


               Self  Paced
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful      18  0  0  0  1  0  0  3.00 ****/  32  ****  **** 4.37  5.00 ****


                                         Frequency Distribution


Credits Earned          Cum. GPA          Expected Grades         Reasons                 Type                    Majors
------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
 00-27      0        0.00-0.99   0        A    3        Required for Majors  0     Graduate     0        Major        3
 28-55      1        1.00-1.99   0        B    0
 56-83      1        2.00-2.99   0        C    0        General              0     Under-grad  19        Non-major   16
 84-150     1        3.00-3.49   2        D    0
 Grad.      0        3.50-4.00   1        F    0        Electives            0     #### - Means there are not enough
                                          P    0                                  responses to be significant
                                          I    0        Other                3
                                          ?    0
```

```
Course-Section: POLI 339  0101                University of Maryland                            Page 1351
Title       LEGAL ADVOCACY                      Baltimore County                               FEB 13, 2008
Instructor:  DAVIS, JEFFREY                         Fall  2007                                  Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:    19
Questionnaires:  29                    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    8  0  0  0  1  3 17  4.76  305/1639  4.76  4.44  4.27 4.28  4.76
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals     8  0  0  1  0  3 17  4.71  295/1639  4.71  4.32  4.22 4.20  4.71
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals    8  0  0  0  2  3 16  4.67  367/1397  4.67  4.39  4.28 4.26  4.67
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals     8  0  0  0  0  3 18  4.86  164/1583  4.86  4.29  4.19 4.24  4.86
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 8  0  1  0  3  4 13  4.33  506/1532  4.33  4.40  4.01 4.05  4.33
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 8 1 0 0 1 6 13 4.60 291/1504  4.60  4.20  4.05 4.12  4.60
7. Was the grading system clearly explained             8  0  0  0  0  3 18  4.86  139/1612  4.86  4.30  4.16 4.12  4.86
8. How many times was class cancelled                   8  0  0  0  0 14  7  4.33 1288/1635  4.33  4.55  4.65 4.66  4.33
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 9 1 0 0 0 2 17 4.89 110/1579  4.89  4.17  4.08 4.07  4.89

              Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared         8  0  0  0  0  2 19  4.90  213/1518  4.90  4.62  4.43 4.39  4.90
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject    8  0  0  0  0  1 20  4.95  273/1520  4.95  4.83  4.70 4.68  4.95
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 10 0  0  0  0  0 19  5.00    1/1517  5.00  4.45  4.27 4.23  5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned      8  0  0  0  0  3 18  4.86  231/1550  4.86  4.41  4.22 4.20  4.86
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 8 7 0 0 0 4 10 4.71 155/1295  4.71  3.95  3.94 3.95  4.71

              Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 13 0  0  0  0  4 12  4.75  260/1398  4.75  4.25  4.07 4.13  4.75
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 13 0  0  0  0  1 15  4.94  159/1391  4.94  4.39  4.30 4.35  4.94
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 13 0 0 0 0 1 15 4.94 157/1388  4.94  4.51  4.28 4.34  4.94
4. Were special techniques successful                   13 4  0  0  0  0 12  5.00    1/ 958  5.00  4.15  3.93 3.97  5.00

              Laboratory
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance            27 0  0  0  2  0  0  3.00 ****/ 215  ****  ****  4.35 4.21  ****

              Seminar
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned     27 0  0  0  2  0  0  3.00 ****/  80  ****  4.50  4.47 4.65  ****

                                    Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned          Cum. GPA          Expected Grades         Reasons              Type              Majors
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
 00-27      1        0.00-0.99    0        A  15        Required for Majors  3      Graduate     0       Major      16
 28-55      0        1.00-1.99    0        B   5                                                         
 56-83      1        2.00-2.99    4        C   1        General              3      Under-grad  29       Non-major  13
 84-150     9        3.00-3.49    3        D   0                                                         
 Grad.      0        3.50-4.00    4        F   0        Electives            0      #### - Means there are not enough
                                           P   0                                    responses to be significant
                                           I   0        Other               15
                                           ?   0
```

```
Course-Section: POLI 353  0101                University of Maryland                                      Page 1352
Title       GOVERNMENTAL BUDGETING                 Baltimore County                                       FEB 13, 2008
Instructor: MEYERS, ROY T.                         Fall   2007                                            Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:      34
Questionnaires: 33                        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   8   0  0  0  2  4 19  4.68   417/1639  4.68  4.44  4.27 4.28  4.68
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    8   0  0  0  2  5 18  4.64   371/1639  4.64  4.32  4.22 4.20  4.64
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   8  16  0  0  1  0  8  4.78   261/1397  4.78  4.39  4.28 4.26  4.78
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    8   0  0  0  2  1 22  4.80   186/1583  4.80  4.29  4.19 4.24  4.80
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 8  0  0  0  2  5 18  4.64   249/1532  4.64  4.40  4.01 4.05  4.64
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 8 0 0  0  1  4 20  4.76   176/1504  4.76  4.20  4.05 4.12  4.76
7. Was the grading system clearly explained            8   0  0  3  1  4 17  4.40   632/1612  4.40  4.30  4.16 4.12  4.40
8. How many times was class cancelled                  7   1  0  0  0  9 16  4.64  1023/1635  4.64  4.55  4.65 4.66  4.64
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 8 1 0  0  1 11 12  4.46   439/1579  4.46  4.17  4.08 4.07  4.46

              Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        8   0  0  0  1  3 21  4.80   360/1518  4.80  4.62  4.43 4.39  4.80
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   8   0  0  0  0  0 25  5.00     1/1520  5.00  4.83  4.70 4.68  5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 8  0  0  1  4  4 16  4.40   726/1517  4.40  4.45  4.27 4.23  4.40
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     6   1  0  1  4  1 20  4.54   603/1550  4.54  4.41  4.22 4.20  4.54
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 9 5 0  2  2  7  8  4.11   577/1295  4.11  3.95  3.94 3.95  4.11

              Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 15 0 0  0  2  5 11  4.50   426/1398  4.50  4.25  4.07 4.13  4.50
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 15 0 0  0  0  3 15  4.83   300/1391  4.83  4.39  4.30 4.35  4.83
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 15 0 0 0  0  2 16  4.89   244/1388  4.89  4.51  4.28 4.34  4.89
4. Were special techniques successful                  15   4  1  0  2  4  7  4.14   411/ 958  4.14  4.15  3.93 3.97  4.14

              Laboratory
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance           32   0  0  0  1  0  0  3.00  ****/ 215  ****  ****  4.35 4.21  ****

                                    Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned        Cum. GPA        Expected Grades         Reasons                Type                 Majors
----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
  00-27     0        0.00-0.99   0      A  13        Required for Majors   1    Graduate      0    Major       8
  28-55     0        1.00-1.99   0      B   5
  56-83     5        2.00-2.99   5      C   4        General               1    Under-grad   33    Non-major  25
  84-150   11        3.00-3.49   4      D   0
  Grad.     0        3.50-4.00   8      F   0        Electives             0    #### - Means there are not enough
                                       P   0                                    responses to be significant
                                       I   0        Other                21
                                       ?   1
```

```
Course-Section: POLI 354  0101            University of Maryland                              Page 1353
Title       PUBL MGMNT/PERSONNEL S        Baltimore County                                   FEB 13, 2008
Instructor: ADLER, JOSEPH                 Fall   2007                                         Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:     23
Questionnaires: 23                   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  8  0  0  0  0  8  7  4.47  670/1639  4.47  4.44  4.27  4.28  4.47
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals   8  0  1  0  1  3 10  4.40  684/1639  4.40  4.32  4.22  4.20  4.40
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals  8  0  0  1  0  4 10  4.53  487/1397  4.53  4.39  4.28  4.26  4.53
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals   8  0  0  1  3  6  5  4.00 1010/1583  4.00  4.29  4.19  4.24  4.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 8 0 0  0  1  7  7  4.40  441/1532  4.40  4.40  4.01  4.05  4.40
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 8 0 0 1  3  6  5  4.00  824/1504  4.00  4.20  4.05  4.12  4.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained           8  0  0  0  2  3 10  4.53  459/1612  4.53  4.30  4.16  4.12  4.53
8. How many times was class cancelled                 8  0  0  0  0 13  2  4.13 1434/1635  4.13  4.55  4.65  4.66  4.13
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 11 0 0 0 2 7  3  4.08  841/1579  4.08  4.17  4.08  4.07  4.08


           Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared       8  0  0  0  0  4 11  4.73  491/1518  4.73  4.62  4.43  4.39  4.73
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject  8  0  0  0  0  1 14  4.93  382/1520  4.93  4.83  4.70  4.68  4.93
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 8 0 0  0  1  3 11  4.67  405/1517  4.67  4.45  4.27  4.23  4.67
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned    8  0  0  0  0  2 13  4.87  219/1550  4.87  4.41  4.22  4.20  4.87
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 9 1 1 0 2  4  6  4.08  590/1295  4.08  3.95  3.94  3.95  4.08


           Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 12 0 1 0 0  2  8  4.45  468/1398  4.45  4.25  4.07  4.13  4.45
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 12 0 0 0 1  0 10  4.82  321/1391  4.82  4.39  4.30  4.35  4.82
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 11 0 0 1 0 1 10  4.67  496/1388  4.67  4.51  4.28  4.34  4.67
4. Were special techniques successful                 11  2  0  1  0  6  3  4.10  437/ 958  4.10  4.15  3.93  3.97  4.10

           Field Work
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations  22  0  0  0  1  0  0  3.00 ****/  37  ****  ****  4.58  4.52  ****

                              Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned        Cum. GPA         Expected Grades          Reasons                  Type                 Majors
----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
 00-27     1       0.00-0.99    0        A   5        Required for Majors   1    Graduate      0      Major        9
 28-55     0       1.00-1.99    0        B   9
 56-83     6       2.00-2.99    3        C   0        General               1    Under-grad   23      Non-major   14
 84-150    4       3.00-3.49    4        D   0
 Grad.     0       3.50-4.00    3        F   0        Electives             2    #### - Means there are not enough
                                         P   0                                   responses to be significant
                                         I   0        Other                10
                                         ?   0
```

```
Course-Section: POLI 371  0101            University of Maryland                         Page 1354
Title         COMP ASIAN POLITICS          Baltimore County                          FEB 13, 2008
Instructor:   GRODSKY, BRIAN                   Fall   2007                            Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:      28
Questionnaires:  28              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   9   0   0  1  2  1 15  4.58  540/1639  4.58  4.44  4.27  4.28  4.58
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    9   0   0  1  0 10  8  4.32  800/1639  4.32  4.32  4.22  4.20  4.32
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   9   0   0  1  2  5 11  4.37  696/1397  4.37  4.39  4.28  4.26  4.37
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    8   5   0  0  2  5  8  4.40  597/1583  4.40  4.29  4.19  4.24  4.40
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 9  0   0  0  4  7  8  4.21  616/1532  4.21  4.40  4.01  4.05  4.21
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 9 11  0  0  2  1  5  4.38  514/1504  4.38  4.20  4.05  4.12  4.38
7. Was the grading system clearly explained            9   0   0  0  3  6 10  4.37  681/1612  4.37  4.30  4.16  4.12  4.37
8. How many times was class cancelled                  9   1   0  0  0  9  9  4.50 1135/1635  4.50  4.55  4.65  4.66  4.50
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 12 0  0  0  3 10  3  4.00  889/1579  4.00  4.17  4.08  4.07  4.00


               Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        10  0   0  0  0  2 16  4.89  242/1518  4.89  4.62  4.43  4.39  4.89
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   10  0   0  0  0  0 18  5.00    1/1520  5.00  4.83  4.70  4.68  5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 10 0   0  1  1  5 11  4.44  674/1517  4.44  4.45  4.27  4.23  4.44
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     10  0   1  0  1  4 12  4.44  716/1550  4.44  4.41  4.22  4.20  4.44
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 10 0  1  0  1  3 13  4.50  265/1295  4.50  3.95  3.94  3.95  4.50


               Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 16 0   0  1  1  3  7  4.33  560/1398  4.33  4.25  4.07  4.13  4.33
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 16 0   0  0  2  3  7  4.42  686/1391  4.42  4.39  4.30  4.35  4.42
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 16 0  0  0  1  3  8  4.58  586/1388  4.58  4.51  4.28  4.34  4.58
4. Were special techniques successful                  17  7   1  0  0  1  2  3.75 ****/ 958  ****  4.15  3.93  3.97  ****


                                    Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned        Cum. GPA         Expected Grades        Reasons              Type                Majors
-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
  00-27     1      0.00-0.99   0        A    3       Required for Majors  2     Graduate      0      Major       6
  28-55     1      1.00-1.99   0        B    9
  56-83     2      2.00-2.99   6        C    3       General              2     Under-grad   28      Non-major  22
  84-150    4      3.00-3.49   3        D    0
  Grad.     0      3.50-4.00   3        F    0       Electives            0     #### - Means there are not enough
                                        P    0                                 responses to be significant
                                        I    0       Other               11
                                        ?    0
```

```
Course-Section: POLI 380  0101            University of Maryland                                    Page 1355
Title      INTERNATIONAL RELATION          Baltimore County                                         FEB 13, 2008
Instructor:   HODY, CYNTHIA                 Fall   2007                                              Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:     32
Questionnaires: 32                    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   6   0   0   2   1  10  13  4.31  841/1639  4.31  4.44  4.27  4.28  4.31
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    6   0   0   1   3  10  12  4.27  849/1639  4.27  4.32  4.22  4.20  4.27
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   7   4   1   1   0  10   9  4.19  850/1397  4.19  4.39  4.28  4.26  4.19
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    6   3   0   0   3   8  12  4.39  611/1583  4.39  4.29  4.19  4.24  4.39
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 6   0   0   0   2   3  21  4.73  190/1532  4.73  4.40  4.01  4.05  4.73
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 6  0   1   2   0   9  14  4.27  603/1504  4.27  4.20  4.05  4.12  4.27
7. Was the grading system clearly explained            6   1   0   0   4   6  15  4.44  575/1612  4.44  4.30  4.16  4.12  4.44
8. How many times was class cancelled                  6   0   0   0   0   5  21  4.81  811/1635  4.81  4.55  4.65  4.66  4.81
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 6  0   0   0   3  10  13  4.38  517/1579  4.38  4.17  4.08  4.07  4.38


            Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        7   0   0   0   2   9  14  4.48  835/1518  4.48  4.62  4.43  4.39  4.48
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   7   0   0   0   0   1  24  4.96  219/1520  4.96  4.83  4.70  4.68  4.96
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 7  0   1   1   5   5  13  4.12 1007/1517  4.12  4.45  4.27  4.23  4.12
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     6   1   0   1   2   8  14  4.40  769/1550  4.40  4.41  4.22  4.20  4.40
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 7 21   1   0   2   0   1  3.00 ****/1295  ****  3.95  3.94  3.95  ****


            Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 12  0   1   0   1   3  15  4.55  397/1398  4.55  4.25  4.07  4.13  4.55
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 12  0   0   0   1   2  17  4.80  332/1391  4.80  4.39  4.30  4.35  4.80
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 12 0   0   0   0   2  18  4.90  224/1388  4.90  4.51  4.28  4.34  4.90
4. Were special techniques successful                  12  16   1   1   0   0   2  3.25 ****/ 958  ****  4.15  3.93  3.97  ****


            Laboratory
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material  31   0   0   0   0   0   1  5.00 ****/ 224  ****  ****  4.10  4.06  ****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information 31 0   0   0   0   0   1  5.00 ****/ 240  ****  ****  4.11  4.08  ****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 31 0   0   0   0   0   1  5.00 ****/ 219  ****  ****  4.44  4.44  ****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance           31   0   0   0   0   0   1  5.00 ****/ 215  ****  ****  4.35  4.21  ****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 31   0   0   0   0   0   1  5.00 ****/ 198  ****  ****  4.18  4.04  ****


            Seminar
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 31  0   0   0   0   0   1  5.00 ****/  85  ****  4.50  4.58  4.50  ****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 31 0   0   0   0   0   1  5.00 ****/  82  ****  5.00  4.52  4.59  ****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 31  0   0   0   0   0   1  5.00 ****/  78  ****  4.50  4.47  4.60  ****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned    31   0   0   0   0   0   1  5.00 ****/  80  ****  4.50  4.47  4.65  ****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear                31   0   0   0   0   0   1  5.00 ****/  82  ****  4.25  4.16  4.08  ****


            Field Work
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 31   0   0   0   0   0   1  5.00 ****/  52  ****  ****  4.04  4.78  ****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 31   0   0   0   0   0   1  5.00 ****/  53  ****  ****  4.05  4.31  ****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation       31   0   0   0   0   0   1  5.00 ****/  42  ****  ****  4.75  4.63  ****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations   31   0   0   0   0   0   1  5.00 ****/  37  ****  ****  4.58  4.52  ****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities 31   0   0   0   0   0   1  5.00 ****/  32  ****  ****  4.56  4.30  ****


            Self  Paced
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 31  0   0   0   0   0   1  5.00 ****/  50  ****  ****  4.45  5.00  ****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal    31   0   0   0   0   0   1  5.00 ****/  32  ****  ****  4.51  5.00  ****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful      31   0   0   0   0   0   1  5.00 ****/  43  ****  ****  4.69  5.00  ****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful       31   0   0   0   0   0   1  5.00 ****/  32  ****  ****  4.37  5.00  ****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students     31   0   0   0   0   0   1  5.00 ****/  21  ****  ****  4.52  5.00  ****
```

```
Course-Section: POLI 380  0101                University of Maryland                        Page 1355
Title        INTERNATIONAL RELATION             Baltimore County                          FEB 13, 2008
Instructor:  HODY, CYNTHIA                       Fall   2007                               Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:     32
Questionnaires: 32                    Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire


                                          Frequency Distribution


Credits Earned          Cum. GPA        Expected Grades            Reasons                  Type                    Majors
-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
 00-27      0        0.00-0.99   0       A    9       Required for Majors   5     Graduate     0       Major      21
 28-55      0        1.00-1.99   0       B   15
 56-83      1        2.00-2.99   5       C    0       General               4     Under-grad  32       Non-major  11
 84-150    11        3.00-3.49   3       D    0
 Grad.      0        3.50-4.00   8       F    0       Electives             2     #### - Means there are not enough
                                         P    0                                   responses to be significant
                                         I    0       Other                13
                                         ?    1
```

```
Course-Section: POLI 395  0101              University of Maryland                              Page 1356
Title        U.S. NAT'L SECURITY PO          Baltimore County                                FEB 13, 2008
Instructor:  STARKEY, BRIGID                    Fall  2007                                   Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:     34
Questionnaires: 33                    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     9  0  0  2  2  4 16  4.42  740/1639  4.42  4.44  4.27 4.28  4.42
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals      9  0  0  0  1  3 20  4.79  209/1639  4.79  4.32  4.22 4.20  4.79
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals     9  0  1  0  1  6 16  4.50  517/1397  4.50  4.39  4.28 4.26  4.50
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals      9  1  0  0  4  5 14  4.43  560/1583  4.43  4.29  4.19 4.24  4.43
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned  9  0  0  0  1  5 18  4.71  210/1532  4.71  4.40  4.01 4.05  4.71
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 9 0  0  2  2  8 12  4.25  612/1504  4.25  4.20  4.05 4.12  4.25
7. Was the grading system clearly explained              9  0  0  0  1  7 16  4.63  364/1612  4.63  4.30  4.16 4.12  4.63
8. How many times was class cancelled                    9  0  0  0  0  3 21  4.88  706/1635  4.88  4.55  4.65 4.66  4.88
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 10 0  0  1  2  6 14  4.43  461/1579  4.43  4.17  4.08 4.07  4.43

             Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared         10  0  0  0  0  3 20  4.87  271/1518  4.87  4.62  4.43 4.39  4.87
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject     9  0  0  1  0  1 22  4.83  725/1520  4.83  4.83  4.70 4.68  4.83
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly  9  0  0  0  2  2 20  4.75  299/1517  4.75  4.45  4.27 4.23  4.75
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned       8  1  0  0  2  1 21  4.79  300/1550  4.79  4.41  4.22 4.20  4.79
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 9 16  0  1  2  0  5  4.13 ****/1295  ****  3.95  3.94 3.95  ****

             Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 11  0  1  1  0  5 15  4.45  468/1398  4.45  4.25  4.07 4.13  4.45
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 11  0  0  0  2  2 18  4.73  429/1391  4.73  4.39  4.30 4.35  4.73
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 7  0  0  1  0  3 22  4.77  375/1388  4.77  4.51  4.28 4.34  4.77
4. Were special techniques successful                   12  8  1  0  0  4  8  4.38  278/ 958  4.38  4.15  3.93 3.97  4.38

             Laboratory
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance            32  0  0  0  1  0  0  3.00 ****/ 215  ****  ****  4.35 4.21  ****

             Seminar
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned     32  0  0  0  1  0  0  3.00 ****/  80  ****  4.50  4.47 4.65  ****

                                    Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned        Cum. GPA        Expected Grades        Reasons              Type                  Majors
---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
 00-27      0        0.00-0.99   0     A   10        Required for Majors  2    Graduate      0      Major      14
 28-55      0        1.00-1.99   0     B   12
 56-83      3        2.00-2.99   6     C    1        General              3    Under-grad   33      Non-major  19
 84-150     8        3.00-3.49   5     D    0
 Grad.      0        3.50-4.00   4     F    0        Electives            0    #### - Means there are not enough
                                       P    0                                 responses to be significant
                                       I    0        Other               17
                                       ?    0
```

```
Course-Section: POLI 409  0101            University of Maryland                              Page 1357
Title      SELECTED TOPICS POLI S          Baltimore County                                 FEB 13, 2008
Instructor:  GRODSKY, BRIAN                    Fall  2007                                    Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:     15
Questionnaires: 15                   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  10  0  0  0  0  1  4  4.80   257/1639  4.80  4.44  4.27  4.42  4.80
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals   10  0  0  0  1  1  3  4.40   684/1639  4.40  4.32  4.22  4.29  4.40
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals  10  4  0  0  0  0  1  5.00  ****/1397  ****  4.39  4.28  4.38  ****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals   10  0  0  0  1  1  3  4.40   597/1583  4.40  4.29  4.19  4.31  4.40
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 10  0  0  0  0  2  3  4.60   276/1532  4.60  4.40  4.01  4.07  4.60
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 10 0  0  0  0  2  3  4.60   291/1504  4.60  4.20  4.05  4.20  4.60
7. Was the grading system clearly explained           10  0  0  2  0  3  0  3.20  1488/1612  3.20  4.30  4.16  4.18  3.20
8. How many times was class cancelled                 10  0  0  0  0  5  0  4.00  1497/1635  4.00  4.55  4.65  4.72  4.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 11 0  0  0  0  2  2  4.50   382/1579  4.50  4.17  4.08  4.21  4.50

           Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared       10  0  0  0  2  0  3  4.20  1141/1518  4.20  4.62  4.43  4.51  4.20
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject  10  0  0  0  1  0  4  4.60  1115/1520  4.60  4.83  4.70  4.75  4.60
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 10  0  0  0  1  1  3  4.40   726/1517  4.40  4.45  4.27  4.34  4.40
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned    10  0  0  1  0  1  3  4.20   944/1550  4.20  4.41  4.22  4.24  4.20
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 10 0  0  0  2  2  1  3.80   806/1295  3.80  3.95  3.94  4.01  3.80

           Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 10  0  0  0  0  0  5  5.00     1/1398  5.00  4.25  4.07  4.23  5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 10  0  0  0  0  0  5  5.00     1/1391  5.00  4.39  4.30  4.48  5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion  9  0  0  1  0  0  5  4.50   647/1388  4.50  4.51  4.28  4.50  4.50
4. Were special techniques successful                 10  3  0  0  0  1  1  4.50  ****/ 958  ****  4.15  3.93  4.24  ****

           Laboratory
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance          12  0  0  0  3  0  0  3.00  ****/ 215  ****  ****  4.35  4.28  ****

           Seminar
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 14  0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00  ****/  78  ****  4.50  4.47  4.56  ****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned   13  0  0  0  2  0  0  3.00  ****/  80  ****  4.50  4.47  4.59  ****
```

```
                                   Frequency Distribution

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

```
Course-Section: POLI 419  0101              University of Maryland                                   Page 1358
Title       TOPICS IN POLITICAL TH           Baltimore County                                        FEB 13, 2008
Instructor: VAUGHAN, GEOFFR (Instr. A)            Fall   2007                                        Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:    16
Questionnaires: 16                      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    8   0   0   0   1   1   6  4.63   482/1639   4.63  4.44  4.27  4.42  4.63
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals     8   0   0   0   1   2   5  4.50   517/1639   4.50  4.32  4.22  4.29  4.50
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals    8   4   0   0   1   0   3  4.50   517/1397   4.50  4.39  4.28  4.38  4.50
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals     6   2   0   0   1   2   5  4.50   476/1583   4.50  4.29  4.19  4.31  4.50
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 8   0   0   0   0   0   8  5.00     1/1532   5.00  4.40  4.01  4.07  5.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 8 0   0   1   0   1   6  4.50   367/1504   4.50  4.20  4.05  4.20  4.50
7. Was the grading system clearly explained             8   0   0   0   0   2   6  4.75   218/1612   4.75  4.30  4.16  4.18  4.75
8. How many times was class cancelled                   7   1   0   0   0   4   4  4.50  1135/1635   4.50  4.55  4.65  4.72  4.50
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 10 0  0   0   1   0   5  4.67   241/1579   4.67  4.17  4.08  4.21  4.67

              Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared         9   0   0   0   0   1   6  4.86   286/1518   4.86  4.62  4.43  4.51  4.86
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject    9   0   0   0   0   1   6  4.86   674/1520   4.86  4.83  4.70  4.75  4.86
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 9   0   0   0   0   1   6  4.86   198/1517   4.86  4.45  4.27  4.34  4.86
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned      9   1   0   0   0   0   6  5.00     1/1550   3.50  4.41  4.22  4.24  3.50
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 9  5   0   0   1   1   0  3.50  ****/1295   ****  3.95  3.94  4.01  ****

              Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 11  0   0   0   0   1   4  4.80   217/1398   4.80  4.25  4.07  4.23  4.80
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 11  0   0   0   0   1   4  4.80   332/1391   4.80  4.39  4.30  4.48  4.80
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 11 0   0   0   0   1   4  4.80   328/1388   4.80  4.51  4.28  4.50  4.80
4. Were special techniques successful                   12  2   0   0   0   0   2  5.00  ****/ 958   ****  4.15  3.93  4.24  ****

                                        Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned        Cum. GPA         Expected Grades         Reasons              Type                 Majors
----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
  00-27      0      0.00-0.99    1       A    4       Required for Majors   2     Graduate      0      Major        4
  28-55      1      1.00-1.99    0       B    1
  56-83      3      2.00-2.99    1       C    2       General               0     Under-grad   16      Non-major   12
  84-150     1      3.00-3.49    4       D    0
  Grad.      0      3.50-4.00    1       F    0       Electives             0     #### - Means there are not enough
                                         P    0                                   responses to be significant
                                         I    0       Other                 5
                                         ?    1
```

```
Course-Section: POLI 419  0101              University of Maryland                          Page 1359
Title       TOPICS IN POLITICAL TH            Baltimore County                             FEB 13, 2008
Instructor:                  (Instr. C)           Fall  2007                               Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:      16
Questionnaires: 16                   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   8   0  0  0  1  1  6  4.63   482/1639   4.63  4.44  4.27  4.42  4.63
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    8   0  0  0  1  2  5  4.50   517/1639   4.50  4.32  4.22  4.29  4.50
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   8   4  0  0  1  0  3  4.50   517/1397   4.50  4.39  4.28  4.38  4.50
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    6   2  0  0  1  2  5  4.50   476/1583   4.50  4.29  4.19  4.31  4.50
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 8  0  0  0  0  0  8  5.00     1/1532   5.00  4.40  4.01  4.07  5.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 8 0 0 1 0 1 6  4.50   367/1504   4.50  4.20  4.05  4.20  4.50
7. Was the grading system clearly explained            8   0  0  0  0  2  6  4.75   218/1612   4.75  4.30  4.16  4.18  4.75
8. How many times was class cancelled                  7   1  0  0  0  4  4  4.50  1135/1635   4.50  4.55  4.65  4.72  4.50

               Lecture
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned    10   3  1  2  0  0  0  1.67  ****/1550   3.50  4.41  4.22  4.24  3.50


               Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 11 0 0 0 0 1 4  4.80   217/1398   4.80  4.25  4.07  4.23  4.80
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 11 0 0 0 0 1 4  4.80   332/1391   4.80  4.39  4.30  4.48  4.80
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 11 0 0 0 0 1 4 4.80   328/1388   4.80  4.51  4.28  4.50  4.80
4. Were special techniques successful                  12   2  0  0  0  0  2  5.00  ****/ 958   ****  4.15  3.93  4.24  ****


                                   Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned          Cum. GPA          Expected Grades          Reasons               Type                    Majors
----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
  00-27      0       0.00-0.99    1        A    4        Required for Majors  2     Graduate      0       Major        4
  28-55      1       1.00-1.99    0        B    1
  56-83      3       2.00-2.99    1        C    2        General              0     Under-grad   16       Non-major   12
  84-150     1       3.00-3.49    4        D    0
  Grad.      0       3.50-4.00    1        F    0        Electives            0     #### - Means there are not enough
                                           P    0                                  responses to be significant
                                           I    0        Other                5
                                           ?    1
```

```
Course-Section: POLI 427  0101              University of Maryland                              Page 1360
Title       AFRICAN AMERICAN POLIT              Baltimore County                               FEB 13, 2008
Instructor: JACKSON, NENAJI                     Fall   2007                                    Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:      18
Questionnaires: 17                       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   5   0  0  0  1  4  7  4.50   615/1639  4.50  4.44  4.27  4.42  4.50
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    5   0  0  2  2  2  6  4.00  1090/1639  4.00  4.32  4.22  4.29  4.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   5   0  1  2  4  1  4  3.42  1296/1397  3.42  4.39  4.28  4.38  3.42
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    5   1  0  1  3  4  3  3.82  1219/1583  3.82  4.29  4.19  4.31  3.82
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 5  0  0  0  0  5  7  4.58   287/1532  4.58  4.40  4.01  4.07  4.58
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 5 1  0  0  3  5  3  4.00   824/1504  4.00  4.20  4.05  4.20  4.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained            5   0  0  2  3  4  3  3.67  1327/1612  3.67  4.30  4.16  4.18  3.67
8. How many times was class cancelled                  5   0  0  0  0  0 12  5.00     1/1635  5.00  4.55  4.65  4.72  5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 9 0  0  0  3  4  1  3.75  1170/1579  3.75  4.17  4.08  4.21  3.75


              Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        5   0  0  3  1  2  6  3.92  1309/1518  3.92  4.62  4.43  4.51  3.92
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   5   0  0  0  0  1 11  4.92   491/1520  4.92  4.83  4.70  4.75  4.92
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 5  0  0  2  3  2  5  3.83  1223/1517  3.83  4.45  4.27  4.34  3.83
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     5   0  0  0  1  5  6  4.42   755/1550  4.42  4.41  4.22  4.24  4.42
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 6 0  0  1  4  1  5  3.91   731/1295  3.91  3.95  3.94  4.01  3.91


              Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 6  0  0  0  3  2  6  4.27   608/1398  4.27  4.25  4.07  4.23  4.27
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 6  0  0  1  2  1  7  4.27   801/1391  4.27  4.39  4.30  4.48  4.27
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 6 0  0  1  2  3  5  4.09   920/1388  4.09  4.51  4.28  4.50  4.09
4. Were special techniques successful                  6   6  0  0  0  0  5  5.00     1/ 958  5.00  4.15  3.93  4.24  5.00

              Field Work
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 16  0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00  ****/  52  ****  ****  4.04  4.84  ****


                                         Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned        Cum. GPA        Expected Grades           Reasons                Type                    Majors
----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
  00-27      1        0.00-0.99    0      A    4       Required for Majors   0      Graduate      2        Major        10
  28-55      0        1.00-1.99    0      B    5                                                           
  56-83      2        2.00-2.99    2      C    2       General               3      Under-grad   15        Non-major     7
  84-150     4        3.00-3.49    3      D    0                                                           
  Grad.      2        3.50-4.00    3      F    0       Electives             2      #### - Means there are not enough
                                          P    0                                    responses to be significant
                                          I    0       Other                 7
                                          ?    0
```

```
Course-Section: POLI 433  0101            University of Maryland                        Page 1361
Title       FIRST AMENDMENT FREEDO         Baltimore County                            FEB 13, 2008
Instructor:  LANOUE, GEORGE                   Fall   2007                               Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:      33
Questionnaires:  23                 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   1  0  0  0  1  3 18  4.77  293/1639  4.77  4.44  4.27  4.42  4.77
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    1  0  0  0  3  5 14  4.50  517/1639  4.50  4.32  4.22  4.29  4.50
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   1  0  0  0  2  2 18  4.73  313/1397  4.73  4.39  4.28  4.38  4.73
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    1  1  0  1  2  6 12  4.38  625/1583  4.38  4.29  4.19  4.31  4.38
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 1  0  0  1  2  1 18  4.64  256/1532  4.64  4.40  4.01  4.07  4.64
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 1  0  1  0  4  6 11  4.18  678/1504  4.18  4.20  4.05  4.20  4.18
7. Was the grading system clearly explained            1  0  0  0  1  4 17  4.73  249/1612  4.73  4.30  4.16  4.18  4.73
8. How many times was class cancelled                  1  0  0  0  0  0 22  5.00    1/1635  5.00  4.55  4.65  4.72  5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 6  0  1  0  3  5  8  4.12  818/1579  4.12  4.17  4.08  4.21  4.12


              Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        1  0  0  0  0  3 19  4.86  271/1518  4.86  4.62  4.43  4.51  4.86
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   1  0  0  0  1  2 19  4.82  776/1520  4.82  4.83  4.70  4.75  4.82
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 1  0  0  0  0  6 16  4.73  335/1517  4.73  4.45  4.27  4.34  4.73
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     1  0  0  0  1  3 18  4.77  325/1550  4.77  4.41  4.22  4.24  4.77
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 1  3  3  0  3  7  6  3.68  882/1295  3.68  3.95  3.94  4.01  3.68


              Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 7  0  0  0  1  2 13  4.75  260/1398  4.75  4.25  4.07  4.23  4.75
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 7  0  0  0  1  1 14  4.81  321/1391  4.81  4.39  4.30  4.48  4.81
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 4  0  0  1  0  4 14  4.63  533/1388  4.63  4.51  4.28  4.50  4.63
4. Were special techniques successful                  7  0  1  0  1  6  8  4.25  349/ 958  4.25  4.15  3.93  4.24  4.25

              Seminar
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned   21  0  0  0  2  0  0  3.00 ****/  80  ****  4.50  4.47  4.59  ****


              Self  Paced
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful      22  0  0  0  1  0  0  3.00 ****/  32  ****  ****  4.37  4.67  ****

                                   Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned          Cum. GPA          Expected Grades        Reasons              Type              Majors
-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
  00-27     0        0.00-0.99    2        A    6     Required for Majors  1    Graduate     2       Major       16
  28-55     1        1.00-1.99    0        B   11
  56-83     6        2.00-2.99    2        C    2     General              4    Under-grad  21       Non-major    7
  84-150    5        3.00-3.49    3        D    0
  Grad.     2        3.50-4.00    6        F    0     Electives            1    #### - Means there are not enough
                                          P    0                               responses to be significant
                                          I    0     Other               16
                                          ?    3
```

```
Course-Section: POLI 435  0101                   University of Maryland                                    Page 1362
Title       LEGAL REASONING                        Baltimore County                                       FEB 13, 2008
Instructor:  BARNER-BARRY, C                          Fall   2007                                         Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:      14
Questionnaires:  14                          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   4   0  0  0  0  1  9  4.90  171/1639   4.90  4.44  4.27  4.42  4.90
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    4   0  0  0  1  2  7  4.60  415/1639   4.60  4.32  4.22  4.29  4.60
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   4   1  0  0  0  2  7  4.78  261/1397   4.78  4.39  4.28  4.38  4.78
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    4   0  0  0  0  2  8  4.80  186/1583   4.80  4.29  4.19  4.31  4.80
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 4  0  0  0  0  2  8  4.80  146/1532   4.80  4.40  4.01  4.07  4.80
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 4 1 0  0  0  1  8  4.89  118/1504   4.89  4.20  4.05  4.20  4.89
7. Was the grading system clearly explained            4   0  0  0  1  1  8  4.70  281/1612   4.70  4.30  4.16  4.18  4.70
8. How many times was class cancelled                  5   0  0  0  0  3  6  4.67 1001/1635   4.67  4.55  4.65  4.72  4.67
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 6 1 0  0  0  2  5  4.71  205/1579   4.71  4.17  4.08  4.21  4.71


              Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        5   0  0  0  1  0  8  4.78  416/1518   4.78  4.62  4.43  4.51  4.78
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   5   0  0  0  0  0  9  5.00    1/1520   5.00  4.83  4.70  4.75  5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 5  0  0  0  1  0  8  4.78  275/1517   4.78  4.45  4.27  4.34  4.78
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     5   0  0  0  0  1  8  4.89  196/1550   4.89  4.41  4.22  4.24  4.89
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 6 5 0  0  0  0  3  5.00 ****/1295   ****  3.95  3.94  4.01  ****


              Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 6  0  0  0  0  1  7  4.88  177/1398   4.88  4.25  4.07  4.23  4.88
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 6  0  0  0  0  0  8  5.00    1/1391   5.00  4.39  4.30  4.48  5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 4  0  0  0  0  3  7  4.70  459/1388   4.70  4.51  4.28  4.50  4.70
4. Were special techniques successful                  5   1  0  1  0  1  6  4.50  201/ 958   4.50  4.15  3.93  4.24  4.50


                                 Frequency Distribution

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

```
Course-Section: POLI 445  0101              University of Maryland                           Page 1363
Title          LAW/POLITICS/AMER EDUC       Baltimore County                                FEB 13, 2008
Instructor:    LANOUE, GEORGE               Fall  2007                                      Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:      14
Questionnaires:  14                  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  2  0  1  9 4.42  740/1639  4.42  4.44  4.27 4.42  4.42
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    2   0  0  0  2  6  4 4.17  948/1639  4.17  4.32  4.22 4.29  4.17
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   2  10  0  0  0  1  1 4.50 ****/1397  ****  4.39  4.28 4.38  ****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    1   1  0  1  0  5  6 4.33  697/1583  4.33  4.29  4.19 4.31  4.33
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 2  0  1  0  0  1 10 4.58  287/1532  4.58  4.40  4.01 4.07  4.58
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 2 0 1 0 2 4  5 4.00  824/1504  4.00  4.20  4.05 4.20  4.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained            2   0  1  0  4  4  3 3.67 1327/1612  3.67  4.30  4.16 4.18  3.67
8. How many times was class cancelled                  2   0  0  0  0  2 10 4.83  766/1635  4.83  4.55  4.65 4.72  4.83
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 4 0 0 0 0 8  2 4.20  725/1579  4.20  4.17  4.08 4.21  4.20


                 Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        2   0  1  0  0  0 11 4.67  602/1518  4.67  4.62  4.43 4.51  4.67
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   2   0  0  1  0  0 11 4.75  890/1520  4.75  4.83  4.70 4.75  4.75
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 2  0  0  1  0  3  8 4.50  597/1517  4.50  4.45  4.27 4.34  4.50
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     2   0  1  0  0  1 10 4.58  545/1550  4.58  4.41  4.22 4.24  4.58
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 3 6 1 1 2  1  0 2.60 1237/1295  2.60  3.95  3.94 4.01  2.60


                 Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 2  0  1  0  0  3  8 4.42  502/1398  4.42  4.25  4.07 4.23  4.42
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 2  0  2  0  1  1  8 4.08  945/1391  4.08  4.39  4.30 4.48  4.08
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 2 0 1 0 0  0 11 4.67  496/1388  4.67  4.51  4.28 4.50  4.67
4. Were special techniques successful                  2   3  3  1  0  4  1 2.89  882/ 958  2.89  4.15  3.93 4.24  2.89


                 Laboratory
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 13 0 0 0 0  0  1 5.00 ****/ 219  ****  ****  4.44 4.42  ****


                 Seminar
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 10 0  0  0  0  2  2 4.50   52/ 85  4.50  4.50  4.58 4.83  4.50
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 10 0 0  0  0  0  4 5.00    1/ 82  5.00  5.00  4.52 4.49  5.00
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 10 0  0  0  0  2  2 4.50   45/ 78  4.50  4.50  4.47 4.56  4.50
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned    10  0  0  0  1  0  3 4.50   44/ 80  4.50  4.50  4.47 4.59  4.50
5. Were criteria for grading made clear                10  0  0  0  1  1  2 4.25   46/ 82  4.25  4.25  4.16 4.02  4.25


                              Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned       Cum. GPA        Expected Grades        Reasons              Type                  Majors
----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
 00-27      2       0.00-0.99   0      A    5      Required for Majors  1    Graduate     4      Major        3
 28-55      0       1.00-1.99   0      B    4
 56-83      0       2.00-2.99   0      C    0      General              0    Under-grad  10      Non-major   11
 84-150     4       3.00-3.49   3      D    0
 Grad.      4       3.50-4.00   6      F    0      Electives            0    #### - Means there are not enough
                                       P    0                               responses to be significant
                                       I    0      Other               10
                                       ?    1
```

```
Course-Section: POLI 460  0101              University of Maryland                         Page 1364
Title        COMP INST DEVELOPMENT             Baltimore County                           FEB 13, 2008
Instructor:  FORESTIERE, CAR                    Fall   2007                                Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:     19
Questionnaires: 19                     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   5   0  0  0  0  3 11  4.79  281/1639  4.79  4.44  4.27  4.42  4.79
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    5   0  0  0  1  3 10  4.64  371/1639  4.64  4.32  4.22  4.29  4.64
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   5   5  0  0  1  1  7  4.67  367/1397  4.67  4.39  4.28  4.38  4.67
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    5   0  0  0  2  3  9  4.50  476/1583  4.50  4.29  4.19  4.31  4.50
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 5  0  0  0  1  1 12  4.79  158/1532  4.79  4.40  4.01  4.07  4.79
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 5 0  0  0  1  2 11  4.71  208/1504  4.71  4.20  4.05  4.20  4.71
7. Was the grading system clearly explained            5   0  1  1  3  4  5  3.79 1263/1612  3.79  4.30  4.16  4.18  3.79
8. How many times was class cancelled                  5   0  0  0  0  4 10  4.71  943/1635  4.71  4.55  4.65  4.72  4.71
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 10 0  0  0  1  2  6  4.56  332/1579  4.56  4.17  4.08  4.21  4.56

            Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        7   0  0  0  0  2 10  4.83  315/1518  4.83  4.62  4.43  4.51  4.83
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   7   0  0  0  0  2 10  4.83  725/1520  4.83  4.83  4.70  4.75  4.83
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 7  0  0  0  0  3  9  4.75  299/1517  4.75  4.45  4.27  4.34  4.75
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     5   2  0  0  1  0 11  4.83  253/1550  4.83  4.41  4.22  4.24  4.83
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 7  8  1  0  1  0  2  3.50 ****/1295  ****  3.95  3.94  4.01  ****

            Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 7  0  0  0  1  2  9  4.67  329/1398  4.67  4.25  4.07  4.23  4.67
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 8  0  0  0  0  1 10  4.91  227/1391  4.91  4.39  4.30  4.48  4.91
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 7 0  0  0  0  1 11  4.92  201/1388  4.92  4.51  4.28  4.50  4.92
4. Were special techniques successful                  7   0  0  0  1  4  7  4.50  201/ 958  4.50  4.15  3.93  4.24  4.50

            Laboratory
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 18  0  0  0  1  0  0  3.00 ****/ 198  ****  ****  4.18  4.21  ****

                                   Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned        Cum. GPA        Expected Grades        Reasons              Type                    Majors
-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
  00-27     1       0.00-0.99   0      A   7      Required for Majors  0     Graduate      0      Major       11
  28-55     0       1.00-1.99   0      B   4
  56-83     2       2.00-2.99   1      C   0      General              2     Under-grad   19      Non-major    8
  84-150    6       3.00-3.49   3      D   0
  Grad.     0       3.50-4.00   3      F   0      Electives            1     #### - Means there are not enough
                                       P   0                                responses to be significant
                                       I   0      Other                9
                                       ?   1
```

```
Course-Section: POLI 489  0101            University of Maryland                        Page 1365
Title        SEL TOPICS:INTERNATL R         Baltimore County                           FEB 13, 2008
Instructor:  STARKEY, BRIGID                  Fall   2007                               Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:    21
Questionnaires: 18                     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   1  0  0  0  0  3  14  4.82  239/1639  4.82  4.44  4.27  4.42  4.82
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    1  0  0  0  0  4  13  4.76  241/1639  4.76  4.32  4.22  4.29  4.76
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   1  0  0  0  0  2  15  4.88  175/1397  4.88  4.39  4.28  4.38  4.88
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    1  1  0  0  1  2  13  4.75  239/1583  4.75  4.29  4.19  4.31  4.75
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 1  0  0  0  0  4  13  4.76  171/1532  4.76  4.40  4.01  4.07  4.76
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 1 0  0  1  4  4  8  4.12  758/1504  4.12  4.20  4.05  4.20  4.12
7. Was the grading system clearly explained            1  0  0  1  0  4  12  4.59  408/1612  4.59  4.30  4.16  4.18  4.59
8. How many times was class cancelled                  0  1  0  0  0  0  17  5.00    1/1635  5.00  4.55  4.65  4.72  5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 4 0 0 0  0  7  7  4.50  382/1579  4.50  4.17  4.08  4.21  4.50


              Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        1  0  0  0  0  2  15  4.88  242/1518  4.88  4.62  4.43  4.51  4.88
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   1  0  0  0  0  0  17  5.00    1/1520  5.00  4.83  4.70  4.75  5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 1 0  0  0  0  4  13  4.76  287/1517  4.76  4.45  4.27  4.34  4.76
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     1  0  0  0  0  2  15  4.88  196/1550  4.88  4.41  4.22  4.24  4.88
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 1 7 0 1  2  2  5  4.10  577/1295  4.10  3.95  3.94  4.01  4.10


              Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 5 0  0  0  0  2  11  4.85  194/1398  4.85  4.25  4.07  4.23  4.85
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 5 0  0  0  0  2  11  4.85  290/1391  4.85  4.39  4.30  4.48  4.85
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 5 0 0 0  0  1  12  4.92  179/1388  4.92  4.51  4.28  4.50  4.92
4. Were special techniques successful                  5  4  0  1  1  0  7  4.44  240/ 958  4.44  4.15  3.93  4.24  4.44


                                 Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned        Cum. GPA        Expected Grades        Reasons                 Type                  Majors
------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
  00-27      2      0.00-0.99   0      A   10      Required for Majors   1     Graduate      0      Major        16
  28-55      0      1.00-1.99   0      B    7
  56-83      2      2.00-2.99   5      C    0      General               0     Under-grad   18      Non-major     2
  84-150     5      3.00-3.49   4      D    0
  Grad.      0      3.50-4.00   0      F    0      Electives             0     #### - Means there are not enough
                                       P    0                                 responses to be significant
                                       I    0      Other                16
                                       ?    0
```

Title   GOVERNMENTAL BUDGETING   Baltimore County   FEB 13, 2008
Instructor: MEYERS, ROY T.   Fall   2007   Job IRBR3029
Enrollment: 19
Questionnaires: 19   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  6   0  0  0  0  3  10  4.77  305/1639  4.77  4.44  4.27  4.42  4.77
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals   6   0  0  1  1  3   8  4.38  709/1639  4.38  4.32  4.22  4.26  4.38
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals  6   8  0  0  0  1   4  4.80  230/1397  4.80  4.39  4.28  4.37  4.80
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals   6   0  0  0  1  4   8  4.54  444/1583  4.54  4.29  4.19  4.31  4.54
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 6  0  0  0  0  4   9  4.69  216/1532  4.69  4.40  4.01  4.10  4.69
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 6 0 0 0 1 1 11  4.77  176/1504  4.77  4.20  4.05  4.29  4.77
7. Was the grading system clearly explained           6   0  0  0  1  2  10  4.69  281/1612  4.69  4.30  4.16  4.27  4.69
8. How many times was class cancelled                 6   0  0  0  0  1  12  4.92  529/1635  4.92  4.55  4.65  4.81  4.92
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 7 0 0 0 0 5  7  4.58  302/1579  4.58  4.17  4.08  4.17  4.58

          Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared       6   0  0  0  0  1  12  4.92  170/1518  4.92  4.62  4.43  4.49  4.92
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject  6   0  0  0  0  0  13  5.00    1/1520  5.00  4.83  4.70  4.79  5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 6 0 0  0  1  2  10  4.69  371/1517  4.69  4.45  4.27  4.32  4.69
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned    6   0  0  0  1  3   9  4.62  511/1550  4.62  4.41  4.22  4.23  4.62
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 6 2 0 0 2 4  5  4.27  443/1295  4.27  3.95  3.94  3.95  4.27

          Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 8  0  0  0  0  0  11  5.00    1/1398  5.00  4.25  4.07  4.22  5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 8  0  0  0  0  1  10  4.91  227/1391  4.91  4.39  4.30  4.47  4.91
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 5 0 0 0 0 3 11  4.79  351/1388  4.79  4.51  4.28  4.49  4.79
4. Were special techniques successful                 8   1  0  0  2  2   6  4.40  267/ 958  4.40  4.15  3.93  4.01  4.40

          Laboratory
2. Were you provided with adequate background information 18 0 0 0 0 0  1  5.00 ****/ 240  ****  ****  4.11  3.96  ****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance          18   0  0  0  1  0   0  3.00 ****/ 215  ****  ****  4.35  4.72  ****

          Seminar
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 18 0 0 0 0 0  1  5.00 ****/  85  ****  4.50  4.58  4.58  ****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned   17   0  0  0  1  0   1  4.00 ****/  80  ****  4.50  4.47  4.50  ****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear               18   0  0  0  0  0   1  5.00 ****/  82  ****  4.25  4.16  4.37  ****
```

Frequency Distribution

```
Credits Earned        Cum. GPA          Expected Grades          Reasons                    Type                    Majors
--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
00-27      4       0.00-0.99    1        A   9          Required for Majors  1       Graduate     5       Major        1
28-55      3       1.00-1.99    0        B   2                                                            
56-83      0       2.00-2.99    0        C   0          General              2       Under-grad  14       Non-major   18
84-150     0       3.00-3.49    2        D   0                                                            
Grad.      5       3.50-4.00    7        F   0          Electives            0       #### - Means there are not enough
                                         P   0                                       responses to be significant
                                         I   0          Other               10
                                         ?   0
```