

Course-Section: POLI 100 0101
 Title AMER GOVT & POLITICS
 Instructor: MILLER, NICHOLA
 Enrollment: 35
 Questionnaires: 33

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2008

Page 1321
 AUG 6, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	8	0	3	3	3	6	10	3.68	1478/1670	4.12	4.47	4.31	4.23	3.68
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	8	0	1	1	7	5	11	3.96	1246/1666	4.15	4.43	4.27	4.30	3.96
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	8	0	0	3	5	7	10	3.96	1086/1406	4.21	4.50	4.32	4.31	3.96
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	8	0	0	1	7	6	11	4.08	1039/1615	3.95	4.36	4.24	4.17	4.08
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	2	4	6	13	4.20	706/1566	3.99	4.29	4.07	4.03	4.20
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	8	0	1	1	5	8	10	4.00	899/1528	3.83	4.36	4.12	4.00	4.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	8	0	1	1	3	3	17	4.36	769/1650	4.33	4.42	4.22	4.28	4.36
8. How many times was class cancelled	8	2	0	0	0	10	13	4.57	1112/1667	4.72	4.67	4.67	4.61	4.57
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	15	1	0	2	4	10	1	3.59	1354/1626	3.83	4.21	4.11	4.07	3.59
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	9	0	0	2	0	5	17	4.54	846/1559	4.71	4.74	4.46	4.47	4.54
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	10	0	1	0	2	6	14	4.39	1333/1560	4.65	4.83	4.72	4.68	4.39
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	11	0	0	3	1	7	11	4.18	1036/1549	4.40	4.59	4.31	4.32	4.18
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	10	1	1	3	2	5	11	4.00	1139/1546	4.34	4.58	4.32	4.32	4.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	12	4	1	1	3	4	8	4.00	692/1323	3.77	3.90	4.00	3.91	4.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	14	0	6	2	3	4	4	2.89	1299/1384	3.64	4.37	4.10	3.92	2.89
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	14	0	2	2	5	3	7	3.58	1167/1378	3.87	4.57	4.29	4.09	3.58
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	14	0	1	1	3	5	9	4.05	962/1378	4.29	4.69	4.31	4.08	4.05
4. Were special techniques successful	14	14	0	1	2	1	1	3.40	****/ 904	****	3.95	4.03	3.94	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	29	2	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 232	****	****	4.19	4.25	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	31	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 239	****	****	4.21	4.35	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	31	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 230	****	****	4.44	4.58	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	29	2	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 87	****	3.83	4.65	4.67	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	31	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 79	****	4.00	4.64	4.72	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	31	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 75	****	4.17	4.57	4.46	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	31	1	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 79	****	3.67	4.45	4.59	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	31	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 80	****	3.83	3.97	3.99	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	31	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 41	****	****	4.50	3.91	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	31	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/ 38	****	****	4.19	4.07	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	31	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/ 38	****	****	4.62	4.63	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	31	1	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.27	4.42	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	31	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.47	4.28	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	31	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/ 28	****	****	4.64	4.59	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	31	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 16	****	****	4.67	4.83	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	31	1	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 27	****	****	4.54	4.46	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	31	1	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 10	****	****	4.84	4.75	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	31	1	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 6	****	****	4.92	4.83	****

Course-Section: POLI 100 0101
 Title AMER GOVT & POLITICS
 Instructor: MILLER, NICHOLA
 Enrollment: 35
 Questionnaires: 33

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2008

Page 1321
 AUG 6, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	1	A	4	Required for Majors	6	Graduate	0	Major	8
28-55	5	1.00-1.99	2	B	10						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	2	C	5	General	0	Under-grad	33	Non-major	25
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	1	D	1						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	1	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	15				
				?	0						

Course-Section: POLI 100 0201
 Title AMER GOVT & POLITICS
 Instructor: MILLER, NICHOLA
 Enrollment: 49
 Questionnaires: 40

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2008

Page 1322
 AUG 6, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	5	0	0	1	6	12	16	4.23	1027/1670	4.12	4.47	4.31	4.23	4.23
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	6	0	0	4	5	8	17	4.12	1125/1666	4.15	4.43	4.27	4.30	4.12
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	5	0	0	2	7	11	15	4.11	988/1406	4.21	4.50	4.32	4.31	4.11
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	5	0	1	5	9	9	11	3.69	1368/1615	3.95	4.36	4.24	4.17	3.69
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	7	0	1	1	11	10	10	3.82	1098/1566	3.99	4.29	4.07	4.03	3.82
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	8	0	2	0	10	11	9	3.78	1134/1528	3.83	4.36	4.12	4.00	3.78
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	8	0	1	3	3	5	20	4.25	903/1650	4.33	4.42	4.22	4.28	4.25
8. How many times was class cancelled	7	0	0	0	1	10	22	4.64	1052/1667	4.72	4.67	4.67	4.61	4.64
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	12	3	0	1	7	13	4	3.80	1220/1626	3.83	4.21	4.11	4.07	3.80
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	9	0	0	0	0	7	24	4.77	486/1559	4.71	4.74	4.46	4.47	4.77
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	9	0	0	0	1	7	23	4.71	1042/1560	4.65	4.83	4.72	4.68	4.71
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	9	0	0	0	4	9	18	4.45	749/1549	4.40	4.59	4.31	4.32	4.45
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	9	1	1	1	2	9	17	4.33	919/1546	4.34	4.58	4.32	4.32	4.33
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	9	2	0	1	7	11	10	4.03	681/1323	3.77	3.90	4.00	3.91	4.03
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	16	0	1	2	6	5	10	3.88	944/1384	3.64	4.37	4.10	3.92	3.88
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	16	0	1	1	6	8	8	3.88	1067/1378	3.87	4.57	4.29	4.09	3.88
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	16	0	1	1	4	5	13	4.17	915/1378	4.29	4.69	4.31	4.08	4.17
4. Were special techniques successful	18	15	0	1	2	2	2	3.71	****/ 904	****	3.95	4.03	3.94	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	38	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 232	****	****	4.19	4.25	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	38	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 239	****	****	4.21	4.35	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	38	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 230	****	****	4.44	4.58	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	38	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 231	****	****	4.31	4.45	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	38	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 218	****	****	4.18	4.47	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	38	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 87	****	3.83	4.65	4.67	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	38	0	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	****/ 79	****	4.00	4.64	4.72	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	38	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 75	****	4.17	4.57	4.46	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	38	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 79	****	3.67	4.45	4.59	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	38	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 80	****	3.83	3.97	3.99	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	38	0	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/ 41	****	****	4.50	3.91	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	38	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 38	****	****	4.19	4.07	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	39	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 38	****	****	4.62	4.63	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	38	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.27	4.42	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	38	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.47	4.28	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	38	0	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/ 28	****	****	4.64	4.59	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	38	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 16	****	****	4.67	4.83	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	38	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 27	****	****	4.54	4.46	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	38	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 10	****	****	4.84	4.75	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	38	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 6	****	****	4.92	4.83	****

Course-Section: POLI 100 0201
 Title AMER GOVT & POLITICS
 Instructor: MILLER, NICHOLA
 Enrollment: 49
 Questionnaires: 40

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2008

Page 1322
 AUG 6, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	9	0.00-0.99	1	A	10	Required for Majors	12	Graduate	0	Major	12
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	1	B	11						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	4	C	6	General	3	Under-grad	40	Non-major	28
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	4	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	16				
				?	2						

Course-Section: POLI 100 0301
 Title AMER GOVT & POLITICS
 Instructor: MELCAVAGE, EUGE
 Enrollment: 50
 Questionnaires: 38

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2008

Page 1323
 AUG 6, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	1	0	1	14	21	4.46	737/1670	4.12	4.47	4.31	4.23	4.46
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	1	4	12	20	4.38	821/1666	4.15	4.43	4.27	4.30	4.38
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	3	10	24	4.57	535/1406	4.21	4.50	4.32	4.31	4.57
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	12	2	1	2	8	12	4.08	1039/1615	3.95	4.36	4.24	4.17	4.08
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	0	3	2	6	8	17	3.94	946/1566	3.99	4.29	4.07	4.03	3.94
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	3	17	2	1	5	2	8	3.72	1170/1528	3.83	4.36	4.12	4.00	3.72
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	2	1	3	5	25	4.39	744/1650	4.33	4.42	4.22	4.28	4.39
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	1	35	4.97	203/1667	4.72	4.67	4.67	4.61	4.97
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	8	2	0	1	2	18	7	4.11	900/1626	3.83	4.21	4.11	4.07	4.11
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	2	3	30	4.80	435/1559	4.71	4.74	4.46	4.47	4.80
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	0	0	5	29	4.85	725/1560	4.65	4.83	4.72	4.68	4.85
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	1	13	21	4.57	598/1549	4.40	4.59	4.31	4.32	4.57
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	2	7	26	4.69	495/1546	4.34	4.58	4.32	4.32	4.69
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	5	14	4	2	4	3	6	3.26	1121/1323	3.77	3.90	4.00	3.91	3.26
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	2	3	12	11	4.14	758/1384	3.64	4.37	4.10	3.92	4.14
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	11	0	0	2	6	5	14	4.15	915/1378	3.87	4.57	4.29	4.09	4.15
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	12	0	0	0	2	5	19	4.65	541/1378	4.29	4.69	4.31	4.08	4.65
4. Were special techniques successful	12	17	1	1	4	1	2	3.22	****/ 904	****	3.95	4.03	3.94	****
Laboratory														
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	37	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 239	****	****	4.21	4.35	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	37	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 230	****	****	4.44	4.58	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	5	0.00-0.99 1	A 16	Required for Majors 9	Graduate 0 Major 4
28-55	7	1.00-1.99 1	B 14		
56-83	6	2.00-2.99 3	C 3	General 6	Under-grad 38 Non-major 34
84-150	5	3.00-3.49 7	D 0		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 15	F 0	Electives 3	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 19	
			? 2		

Course-Section: POLI 210 0101
 Title POLITICAL PHILOSOPHY
 Instructor: CARTER, JOHN W.
 Enrollment: 45
 Questionnaires: 39

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2008

Page 1324
 AUG 6, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	3	2	8	12	14	3.82	1400/1670	3.82	4.47	4.31	4.32	3.82
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	2	3	10	9	15	3.82	1370/1666	3.82	4.43	4.27	4.27	3.82
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	3	3	3	10	20	4.05	1027/1406	4.05	4.50	4.32	4.39	4.05
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	3	4	5	8	8	10	3.43	1486/1615	3.43	4.36	4.24	4.29	3.43
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	1	1	2	6	13	15	4.05	820/1566	4.05	4.29	4.07	4.00	4.05
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	5	4	11	9	9	3.34	1362/1528	3.34	4.36	4.12	4.11	3.34
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	3	0	1	6	8	11	10	3.64	1417/1650	3.64	4.42	4.22	4.20	3.64
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	1	0	1	35	4.89	693/1667	4.89	4.67	4.67	4.64	4.89
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	13	1	3	1	10	9	2	3.24	1494/1626	3.24	4.21	4.11	4.06	3.24
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	7	0	1	1	9	5	16	4.06	1265/1559	4.06	4.74	4.46	4.40	4.06
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	8	0	0	1	4	4	22	4.52	1239/1560	4.52	4.83	4.72	4.73	4.52
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	8	0	0	2	7	9	13	4.06	1120/1549	4.06	4.59	4.31	4.25	4.06
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	8	0	1	2	5	7	16	4.13	1087/1546	4.13	4.58	4.32	4.30	4.13
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	9	25	3	1	0	0	1	2.00	****/1323	****	3.90	4.00	4.08	****
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	16	0	1	1	6	9	6	3.78	983/1384	3.78	4.37	4.10	4.07	3.78
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	16	0	0	0	5	3	15	4.43	683/1378	4.43	4.57	4.29	4.25	4.43
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	16	0	1	0	7	7	8	3.91	1047/1378	3.91	4.69	4.31	4.26	3.91
4. Were special techniques successful	16	5	1	2	4	8	3	3.56	708/ 904	3.56	3.95	4.03	4.01	3.56
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	37	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 232	****	****	4.19	4.35	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	37	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 239	****	****	4.21	4.33	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	37	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 230	****	****	4.44	4.61	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	37	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 231	****	****	4.31	4.52	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	37	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 218	****	****	4.18	4.25	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	37	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 87	****	3.83	4.65	5.00	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	37	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 79	****	4.00	4.64	4.75	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	37	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 75	****	4.17	4.57	4.25	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	37	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 79	****	3.67	4.45	3.95	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	37	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 80	****	3.83	3.97	4.30	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	37	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 41	****	****	4.50	2.00	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	37	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 38	****	****	4.19	2.50	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	37	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 38	****	****	4.62	4.50	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	37	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.27	4.00	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	37	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.47	4.00	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	37	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 28	****	****	4.64	****	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	37	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 16	****	****	4.67	****	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	37	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 27	****	****	4.54	****	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	37	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 10	****	****	4.84	****	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	37	0	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/ 6	****	****	4.92	****	****

Course-Section: POLI 210 0101
 Title POLITICAL PHILOSOPHY
 Instructor: CARTER, JOHN W.
 Enrollment: 45
 Questionnaires: 39

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2008

Page 1324
 AUG 6, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	7	0.00-0.99	0	A	12	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	22
28-55	9	1.00-1.99	0	B	12						
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	7	C	6	General	3	Under-grad	39	Non-major	17
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	7	D	1						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	10	F	0	Electives	2	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	28				
				?	2						

Course-Section: POLI 230 0101
 Title INTRO CONSTITUTIONAL L
 Instructor: DAVIS, JEFFREY
 Enrollment: 51
 Questionnaires: 34

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2008

Page 1325
 AUG 6, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	7	26	4.74	388/1670	4.80	4.47	4.31	4.32	4.74
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	7	24	4.62	477/1666	4.61	4.43	4.27	4.27	4.62
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	1	11	21	4.61	495/1406	4.59	4.50	4.32	4.39	4.61
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	6	0	1	3	5	19	4.50	552/1615	4.39	4.36	4.24	4.29	4.50
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	1	1	0	0	5	26	4.72	258/1566	4.58	4.29	4.07	4.00	4.72
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	3	1	0	5	6	18	4.33	631/1528	4.35	4.36	4.12	4.11	4.33
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	1	0	0	2	10	20	4.56	485/1650	4.64	4.42	4.22	4.20	4.56
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	1	0	0	1	14	17	4.50	1157/1667	4.48	4.67	4.67	4.64	4.50
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	1	0	3	14	12	4.20	797/1626	4.16	4.21	4.11	4.06	4.20
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	1	1	29	4.90	276/1559	4.86	4.74	4.46	4.40	4.90
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	0	0	31	5.00	1/1560	4.95	4.83	4.72	4.73	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	2	6	23	4.68	475/1549	4.60	4.59	4.31	4.25	4.68
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	1	0	0	2	4	24	4.73	432/1546	4.63	4.58	4.32	4.30	4.73
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	5	4	2	1	4	7	11	3.96	743/1323	3.89	3.90	4.00	4.08	3.96
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	12	0	2	0	3	8	9	4.00	820/1384	4.31	4.37	4.10	4.07	4.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	13	0	1	0	3	4	13	4.33	797/1378	4.54	4.57	4.29	4.25	4.33
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	12	0	1	0	1	5	15	4.50	653/1378	4.59	4.69	4.31	4.26	4.50
4. Were special techniques successful	12	19	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 904	****	3.95	4.03	4.01	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	33	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 232	****	****	4.19	4.35	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	33	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 239	****	****	4.21	4.33	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	33	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 230	****	****	4.44	4.61	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	33	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 231	****	****	4.31	4.52	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	33	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 218	****	****	4.18	4.25	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	33	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 87	****	3.83	4.65	5.00	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	33	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 79	****	4.00	4.64	4.75	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	33	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 75	****	4.17	4.57	4.25	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	33	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 79	****	3.67	4.45	3.95	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	33	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 80	****	3.83	3.97	4.30	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	33	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 41	****	****	4.50	2.00	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	33	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 38	****	****	4.19	2.50	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	33	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 38	****	****	4.62	4.50	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	33	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.27	4.00	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	33	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.47	4.00	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	33	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 28	****	****	4.64	****	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	33	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 16	****	****	4.67	****	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	33	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 27	****	****	4.54	****	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	33	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 10	****	****	4.84	****	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	33	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 6	****	****	4.92	****	****

Course-Section: POLI 230 0101
 Title INTRO CONSTITUTIONAL L
 Instructor: DAVIS, JEFFREY
 Enrollment: 51
 Questionnaires: 34

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2008

Page 1325
 AUG 6, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	0	A	8	Required for Majors	4	Graduate	0	Major	11
28-55	10	1.00-1.99	1	B	15						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	2	C	3	General	2	Under-grad	34	Non-major	23
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	3	D	1						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	12	F	1	Electives	2	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	20				
				?	1						

Course-Section: POLI 230 0201
 Title INTRO CONSTITUTIONAL L
 Instructor: DAVIS, JEFFREY
 Enrollment: 49
 Questionnaires: 48

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2008

Page 1326
 AUG 6, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	25	0	0	0	1	1	21	4.87	243/1670	4.80	4.47	4.31	4.32	4.87
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	25	0	0	0	1	7	15	4.61	490/1666	4.61	4.43	4.27	4.27	4.61
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	25	0	0	0	2	6	15	4.57	535/1406	4.59	4.50	4.32	4.39	4.57
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	26	1	1	0	3	5	12	4.29	837/1615	4.39	4.36	4.24	4.29	4.29
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	25	0	0	1	3	4	15	4.43	460/1566	4.58	4.29	4.07	4.00	4.43
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	26	0	0	0	3	8	11	4.36	600/1528	4.35	4.36	4.12	4.11	4.36
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	26	0	0	0	2	2	18	4.73	298/1650	4.64	4.42	4.22	4.20	4.73
8. How many times was class cancelled	25	1	0	0	0	12	10	4.45	1206/1667	4.48	4.67	4.67	4.64	4.45
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	30	1	1	0	1	9	6	4.12	888/1626	4.16	4.21	4.11	4.06	4.12
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	26	0	0	0	1	2	19	4.82	419/1559	4.86	4.74	4.46	4.40	4.82
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	27	0	0	0	1	0	20	4.90	596/1560	4.95	4.83	4.72	4.73	4.90
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	27	0	0	0	3	4	14	4.52	658/1549	4.60	4.59	4.31	4.25	4.52
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	27	0	1	0	1	4	15	4.52	691/1546	4.63	4.58	4.32	4.30	4.52
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	30	2	1	2	2	5	6	3.81	886/1323	3.89	3.90	4.00	4.08	3.81
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	32	0	0	0	1	4	11	4.63	356/1384	4.31	4.37	4.10	4.07	4.63
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	32	0	0	0	1	2	13	4.75	400/1378	4.54	4.57	4.29	4.25	4.75
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	32	0	0	0	1	3	12	4.69	511/1378	4.59	4.69	4.31	4.26	4.69
4. Were special techniques successful	33	9	2	0	0	1	3	3.50	****/ 904	****	3.95	4.03	4.01	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors		
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	A 3	Required for Majors 0	Graduate 0	Major 12
28-55	6	1.00-1.99	0	B 10			
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	4	C 3	General 0	Under-grad 48	Non-major 36
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	4	D 0			
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5	F 0	Electives 0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	
				P 0			
				I 0	Other 19		
				? 1			

Course-Section: POLI 250 0101
 Title INTRO TO PUBLIC ADMIN
 Instructor: WILLIAMS-RANDAL
 Enrollment: 44
 Questionnaires: 42

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2008

Page 1327
 AUG 6, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	12	0	0	3	7	6	14	4.03	1199/1670	4.03	4.47	4.31	4.32	4.03
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	12	0	0	1	7	7	15	4.20	1037/1666	4.20	4.43	4.27	4.27	4.20
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	12	0	0	3	6	4	17	4.17	948/1406	4.17	4.50	4.32	4.39	4.17
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	12	0	1	2	3	10	14	4.13	1000/1615	4.13	4.36	4.24	4.29	4.13
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	13	0	3	2	2	7	15	4.00	851/1566	4.00	4.29	4.07	4.00	4.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	14	0	2	0	8	8	10	3.86	1080/1528	3.86	4.36	4.12	4.11	3.86
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	13	0	0	0	1	10	18	4.59	457/1650	4.59	4.42	4.22	4.20	4.59
8. How many times was class cancelled	15	0	0	0	0	18	9	4.33	1310/1667	4.33	4.67	4.67	4.64	4.33
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	19	2	0	1	6	11	3	3.76	1247/1626	3.76	4.21	4.11	4.06	3.76
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	13	0	0	0	2	5	22	4.69	640/1559	4.69	4.74	4.46	4.40	4.69
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	14	0	0	0	3	7	18	4.54	1222/1560	4.54	4.83	4.72	4.73	4.54
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	13	0	0	0	6	2	21	4.52	670/1549	4.52	4.59	4.31	4.25	4.52
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	13	0	1	2	2	6	18	4.31	939/1546	4.31	4.58	4.32	4.30	4.31
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	14	0	0	1	4	5	18	4.43	403/1323	4.43	3.90	4.00	4.08	4.43
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	22	0	0	1	7	1	11	4.10	796/1384	4.10	4.37	4.10	4.07	4.10
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	22	0	0	1	1	6	12	4.45	672/1378	4.45	4.57	4.29	4.25	4.45
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	22	0	0	0	1	4	15	4.70	501/1378	4.70	4.69	4.31	4.26	4.70
4. Were special techniques successful	22	6	1	3	2	2	6	3.64	680/ 904	3.64	3.95	4.03	4.01	3.64
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	41	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 232	****	****	4.19	4.35	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	41	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 239	****	****	4.21	4.33	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	41	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 230	****	****	4.44	4.61	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	41	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 231	****	****	4.31	4.52	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	41	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 218	****	****	4.18	4.25	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	41	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 87	****	3.83	4.65	5.00	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	41	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 79	****	4.00	4.64	4.75	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	41	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 75	****	4.17	4.57	4.25	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	41	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 79	****	3.67	4.45	3.95	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	41	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 80	****	3.83	3.97	4.30	****
Field Work														
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	41	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.47	4.00	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	41	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 28	****	****	4.64	****	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	41	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 16	****	****	4.67	****	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	41	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 27	****	****	4.54	****	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	41	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 10	****	****	4.84	****	****

Course-Section: POLI 250 0101
 Title INTRO TO PUBLIC ADMIN
 Instructor: WILLIAMS-RANDAL
 Enrollment: 44
 Questionnaires: 42

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2008

Page 1327
 AUG 6, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	8	0.00-0.99	0	A	10	Required for Majors	2	Graduate	0	Major	16
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	B	13						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	3	C	4	General	2	Under-grad	42	Non-major	26
84-150	6	3.00-3.49	7	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	6	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	24				
				?	0						

Course-Section: POLI 280 0101
 Title INTERNATIONAL RELATION
 Instructor: HAGERTY, DEVIN
 Enrollment: 48
 Questionnaires: 46

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2008

Page 1328
 AUG 6, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	15	0	0	0	1	5	25	4.77	338/1670	4.77	4.47	4.31	4.32	4.77
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	15	0	0	1	1	5	24	4.68	403/1666	4.68	4.43	4.27	4.27	4.68
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	15	0	0	0	0	6	25	4.81	261/1406	4.81	4.50	4.32	4.39	4.81
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	15	12	0	0	1	3	15	4.74	308/1615	4.74	4.36	4.24	4.29	4.74
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	2	5	6	17	4.27	632/1566	4.27	4.29	4.07	4.00	4.27
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	16	20	0	0	2	0	8	4.60	****/1528	****	4.36	4.12	4.11	****
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	16	0	1	1	4	5	19	4.33	806/1650	4.33	4.42	4.22	4.20	4.33
8. How many times was class cancelled	16	0	0	0	1	25	4	4.10	1472/1667	4.10	4.67	4.67	4.64	4.10
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	21	1	0	0	1	5	18	4.71	248/1626	4.71	4.21	4.11	4.06	4.71
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	16	0	0	0	0	3	27	4.90	276/1559	4.90	4.74	4.46	4.40	4.90
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	16	0	0	0	0	1	29	4.97	239/1560	4.97	4.83	4.72	4.73	4.97
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	16	0	0	1	0	5	24	4.73	395/1549	4.73	4.59	4.31	4.25	4.73
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	0	3	27	4.90	231/1546	4.90	4.58	4.32	4.30	4.90
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	16	20	2	0	0	2	6	4.00	****/1323	****	3.90	4.00	4.08	****
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	23	0	1	1	0	4	17	4.52	421/1384	4.52	4.37	4.10	4.07	4.52
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	23	0	1	0	3	4	15	4.39	729/1378	4.39	4.57	4.29	4.25	4.39
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	23	0	1	0	0	3	19	4.70	501/1378	4.70	4.69	4.31	4.26	4.70
4. Were special techniques successful	23	18	1	0	0	0	4	4.20	****/ 904	****	3.95	4.03	4.01	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	43	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 232	****	****	4.19	4.35	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	44	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 239	****	****	4.21	4.33	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	44	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 230	****	****	4.44	4.61	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	44	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 231	****	****	4.31	4.52	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	44	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 218	****	****	4.18	4.25	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	43	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 87	****	3.83	4.65	5.00	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	44	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 79	****	4.00	4.64	4.75	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	44	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 75	****	4.17	4.57	4.25	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	44	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 79	****	3.67	4.45	3.95	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	44	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 80	****	3.83	3.97	4.30	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	45	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 41	****	****	4.50	2.00	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	45	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 38	****	****	4.19	2.50	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	44	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 38	****	****	4.62	4.50	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	44	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.27	4.00	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	44	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.47	4.00	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	44	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 28	****	****	4.64	****	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	44	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 16	****	****	4.67	****	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	44	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 27	****	****	4.54	****	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	44	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 10	****	****	4.84	****	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	44	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 6	****	****	4.92	****	****

Course-Section: POLI 280 0101
 Title INTERNATIONAL RELATION
 Instructor: HAGERTY, DEVIN
 Enrollment: 48
 Questionnaires: 46

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2008

Page 1328
 AUG 6, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	5	0.00-0.99	0	A	8	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	18
28-55	9	1.00-1.99	0	B	11						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	2	C	2	General	2	Under-grad	46	Non-major	28
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	8	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	10	F	0	Electives	2	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	19				
				?	2						

Course-Section: POLI 301 0101
 Title POLI RESEARCH METHODS
 Instructor: FORESTIERE, CAR
 Enrollment: 35
 Questionnaires: 35

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2008

Page 1329
 AUG 6, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	5	0	0	2	1	8	19	4.47	722/1670	4.24	4.47	4.31	4.24	4.47
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	5	0	0	0	4	7	19	4.50	622/1666	4.34	4.43	4.27	4.18	4.50
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	5	6	0	0	2	9	13	4.46	656/1406	4.36	4.50	4.32	4.22	4.46
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	5	2	0	0	2	5	21	4.68	368/1615	4.48	4.36	4.24	4.18	4.68
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	6	1	1	1	4	5	17	4.29	610/1566	3.97	4.29	4.07	4.04	4.29
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	1	1	3	24	4.72	250/1528	4.51	4.36	4.12	4.07	4.72
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	6	0	1	2	1	6	19	4.38	757/1650	4.35	4.42	4.22	4.12	4.38
8. How many times was class cancelled	6	0	0	0	0	11	18	4.62	1062/1667	4.72	4.67	4.67	4.67	4.62
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	12	0	1	1	1	7	13	4.30	670/1626	3.77	4.21	4.11	4.06	4.30
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	5	0	0	0	0	5	25	4.83	387/1559	4.80	4.74	4.46	4.40	4.83
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	5	0	0	0	0	3	27	4.90	596/1560	4.73	4.83	4.72	4.67	4.90
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	5	0	0	0	0	7	23	4.77	352/1549	4.55	4.59	4.31	4.25	4.77
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	6	23	4.79	357/1546	4.49	4.58	4.32	4.24	4.79
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	6	4	0	2	3	3	17	4.40	423/1323	4.22	3.90	4.00	3.99	4.40
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	2	5	12	4.53	421/1384	4.27	4.37	4.10	4.12	4.53
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	16	0	0	1	0	3	15	4.68	466/1378	4.70	4.57	4.29	4.30	4.68
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	16	0	0	0	0	5	14	4.74	460/1378	4.79	4.69	4.31	4.33	4.74
4. Were special techniques successful	16	6	0	1	0	6	6	4.31	345/ 904	4.03	3.95	4.03	4.03	4.31
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	34	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 87	****	3.83	4.65	4.30	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	34	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 79	****	4.00	4.64	4.53	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	34	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 75	****	4.17	4.57	4.50	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	34	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 79	****	3.67	4.45	3.68	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	34	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 80	****	3.83	3.97	3.76	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors		

00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	15	Required for Majors		0	Graduate	0	Major	25
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	10							
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	5	C	2	General		0	Under-grad	35	Non-major	10
84-150	17	3.00-3.49	8	D	0							
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	11	F	1	Electives		0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0							
				I	0	Other		27				
				?	0							

Course-Section: POLI 301 0201
 Title POLI RESEARCH METHODS
 Instructor: FORESTIERE, CAR
 Enrollment: 32
 Questionnaires: 31

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2008

Page 1330
 AUG 6, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	11	0	0	0	3	4	13	4.50	665/1670	4.24	4.47	4.31	4.24	4.50
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	11	0	0	0	0	3	17	4.85	216/1666	4.34	4.43	4.27	4.18	4.85
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	12	3	1	0	0	2	13	4.63	471/1406	4.36	4.50	4.32	4.22	4.63
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	11	0	0	0	1	3	16	4.75	290/1615	4.48	4.36	4.24	4.18	4.75
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	12	0	3	1	2	4	9	3.79	1122/1566	3.97	4.29	4.07	4.04	3.79
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	1	5	13	4.63	323/1528	4.51	4.36	4.12	4.07	4.63
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	12	0	0	0	1	4	14	4.68	338/1650	4.35	4.42	4.22	4.12	4.68
8. How many times was class cancelled	12	0	0	0	2	5	12	4.53	1142/1667	4.72	4.67	4.67	4.67	4.53
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	15	0	1	0	1	8	6	4.13	877/1626	3.77	4.21	4.11	4.06	4.13
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	12	0	0	0	0	2	17	4.89	291/1559	4.80	4.74	4.46	4.40	4.89
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	12	0	0	0	0	3	16	4.84	751/1560	4.73	4.83	4.72	4.67	4.84
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	12	0	0	0	0	4	15	4.79	323/1549	4.55	4.59	4.31	4.25	4.79
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	0	3	16	4.84	299/1546	4.49	4.58	4.32	4.24	4.84
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	16	4	0	1	1	4	5	4.18	597/1323	4.22	3.90	4.00	3.99	4.18
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	20	0	0	2	0	3	6	4.18	721/1384	4.27	4.37	4.10	4.12	4.18
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	20	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	243/1378	4.70	4.57	4.29	4.30	4.91
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	20	0	0	0	0	2	9	4.82	375/1378	4.79	4.69	4.31	4.33	4.82
4. Were special techniques successful	20	2	1	0	1	3	4	4.00	461/ 904	4.03	3.95	4.03	4.03	4.00

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	13	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	15
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	4						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	2	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	31	Non-major	16
84-150	14	3.00-3.49	9	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0						
				Other	18						
				?	1						

Course-Section: POLI 301 8620
 Title POLI RESEARCH METHODS
 Instructor: STAFF
 Enrollment: 15
 Questionnaires: 14

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2008

Page 1331
 AUG 6, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	2	0	0	2	4	1	5	3.75	1442/1670	4.24	4.47	4.31	4.24	3.75
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	0	3	3	1	5	3.67	1452/1666	4.34	4.43	4.27	4.18	3.67
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	4	0	1	2	1	4	4.00	1057/1406	4.36	4.50	4.32	4.22	4.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	0	1	0	2	4	5	4.00	1083/1615	4.48	4.36	4.24	4.18	4.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	1	2	3	5	3.83	1078/1566	3.97	4.29	4.07	4.04	3.83
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	1	0	0	3	3	5	4.18	769/1528	4.51	4.36	4.12	4.07	4.18
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	1	2	0	2	7	4.00	1135/1650	4.35	4.42	4.22	4.12	4.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/1667	4.72	4.67	4.67	4.67	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	1	1	2	3	1	1	2.88	1564/1626	3.77	4.21	4.11	4.06	2.88
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	1	2	9	4.67	673/1559	4.80	4.74	4.46	4.40	4.67
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	3	0	8	4.45	1287/1560	4.73	4.83	4.72	4.67	4.45
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	1	0	2	3	6	4.08	1112/1549	4.55	4.59	4.31	4.25	4.08
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	3	2	1	6	3.83	1260/1546	4.49	4.58	4.32	4.24	3.83
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	0	1	0	2	3	6	4.08	663/1323	4.22	3.90	4.00	3.99	4.08
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	1	0	1	3	5	4.10	796/1384	4.27	4.37	4.10	4.12	4.10
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	1	1	0	8	4.50	603/1378	4.70	4.57	4.29	4.30	4.50
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	0	1	0	9	4.80	386/1378	4.79	4.69	4.31	4.33	4.80
4. Were special techniques successful	4	1	1	0	2	3	3	3.78	619/ 904	4.03	3.95	4.03	4.03	3.78

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: POLI 310 0101
 Title POLITICAL PHIL. TO 160
 Instructor: VAUGHAN, GEOFFR
 Enrollment: 39
 Questionnaires: 39

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2008

Page 1332
 AUG 6, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	14	0	0	0	2	5	18	4.64	505/1670	4.64	4.47	4.31	4.24	4.64
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	14	0	1	1	1	9	13	4.28	931/1666	4.28	4.43	4.27	4.18	4.28
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	14	17	0	0	0	3	5	4.63	****/1406	****	4.50	4.32	4.22	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	14	2	1	1	2	8	11	4.17	962/1615	4.17	4.36	4.24	4.18	4.17
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	1	2	3	19	4.60	339/1566	4.60	4.29	4.07	4.04	4.60
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	14	0	1	2	0	6	16	4.36	600/1528	4.36	4.36	4.12	4.07	4.36
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	16	0	0	1	2	1	19	4.65	372/1650	4.65	4.42	4.22	4.12	4.65
8. How many times was class cancelled	14	1	0	0	0	18	6	4.25	1368/1667	4.25	4.67	4.67	4.67	4.25
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	18	1	0	1	1	6	12	4.45	499/1626	4.45	4.21	4.11	4.06	4.45
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	14	0	0	0	0	1	24	4.96	111/1559	4.96	4.74	4.46	4.40	4.96
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	14	0	0	0	0	0	25	5.00	1/1560	5.00	4.83	4.72	4.67	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	14	0	0	0	0	2	23	4.92	161/1549	4.92	4.59	4.31	4.25	4.92
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	0	0	25	5.00	1/1546	5.00	4.58	4.32	4.24	5.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	15	9	2	0	1	3	9	4.13	634/1323	4.13	3.90	4.00	3.99	4.13
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	22	0	0	0	1	3	13	4.71	293/1384	4.71	4.37	4.10	4.12	4.71
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	22	0	0	0	2	2	13	4.65	495/1378	4.65	4.57	4.29	4.30	4.65
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	22	0	0	0	1	2	14	4.76	428/1378	4.76	4.69	4.31	4.33	4.76
4. Were special techniques successful	22	10	1	0	0	0	6	4.43	****/ 904	****	3.95	4.03	4.03	****
Laboratory														
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	38	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 239	****	****	4.21	3.99	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	37	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 87	****	3.83	4.65	4.30	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	37	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 79	****	4.00	4.64	4.53	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	38	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 41	****	****	4.50	4.44	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	38	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 38	****	****	4.19	3.96	****
Self Paced														
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	38	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 27	****	****	4.54	2.63	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors		
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 8	Required for Majors 1	Graduate 0	Major 14
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B 12			
56-83	6	2.00-2.99	5	C 1	General 9	Under-grad 39	Non-major 25
84-150	6	3.00-3.49	5	D 0			
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	7	F 0	Electives 2	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	
				P 0			
				I 0	Other 8		
				? 1			

Course-Section: POLI 323 0101
 Title THE PRESIDENCY
 Instructor: JIMENEZ, LUIS
 Enrollment: 34
 Questionnaires: 21

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2008

Page 1333
 AUG 6, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	0	1	2	3	14	4.50	665/1670	4.50	4.47	4.31	4.24	4.50
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	5	14	4.65	428/1666	4.65	4.43	4.27	4.18	4.65
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	2	3	15	4.65	435/1406	4.65	4.50	4.32	4.22	4.65
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	3	0	1	0	4	12	4.59	467/1615	4.59	4.36	4.24	4.18	4.59
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	0	4	5	10	4.15	743/1566	4.15	4.29	4.07	4.04	4.15
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	3	1	3	13	4.30	662/1528	4.30	4.36	4.12	4.07	4.30
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	1	0	3	16	4.70	327/1650	4.70	4.42	4.22	4.12	4.70
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	1	0	0	11	8	4.25	1368/1667	4.25	4.67	4.67	4.67	4.25
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	7	0	0	0	0	9	5	4.36	616/1626	4.36	4.21	4.11	4.06	4.36
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	1	2	17	4.80	435/1559	4.80	4.74	4.46	4.40	4.80
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	1	2	17	4.80	855/1560	4.80	4.83	4.72	4.67	4.80
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	2	3	15	4.65	500/1549	4.65	4.59	4.31	4.25	4.65
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	0	4	15	4.65	532/1546	4.65	4.58	4.32	4.24	4.65
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	6	4	2	0	2	6	3.29	1114/1323	3.29	3.90	4.00	3.99	3.29
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	1	2	2	9	4.36	589/1384	4.36	4.37	4.10	4.12	4.36
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	0	1	0	1	12	4.71	441/1378	4.71	4.57	4.29	4.30	4.71
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	0	0	1	0	13	4.86	333/1378	4.86	4.69	4.31	4.33	4.86
4. Were special techniques successful	6	10	0	1	0	0	4	4.40	****/ 904	****	3.95	4.03	4.03	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors		
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 15	Required for Majors 2	Graduate 0	Major 13
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B 5			
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	6	C 0	General 5	Under-grad 21	Non-major 8
84-150	10	3.00-3.49	4	D 0			
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F 0	Electives 1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	
				P 0			
				I 0	Other 10		
				? 0			

Course-Section: POLI 324 0101
 Title THE CONGRESS
 Instructor: SCOTT, JAMES L
 Enrollment: 27
 Questionnaires: 27

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2008

Page 1334
 AUG 6, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	5	0	2	1	1	3	15	4.27	974/1670	4.27	4.47	4.31	4.24	4.27
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	5	0	0	0	1	8	13	4.55	569/1666	4.55	4.43	4.27	4.18	4.55
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	5	0	0	1	3	4	14	4.41	715/1406	4.41	4.50	4.32	4.22	4.41
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	5	0	0	0	5	6	11	4.27	849/1615	4.27	4.36	4.24	4.18	4.27
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	6	0	1	1	0	7	12	4.33	559/1566	4.33	4.29	4.07	4.04	4.33
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	2	1	7	11	4.29	679/1528	4.29	4.36	4.12	4.07	4.29
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	5	0	0	1	1	8	12	4.41	720/1650	4.41	4.42	4.22	4.12	4.41
8. How many times was class cancelled	5	3	0	0	0	1	18	4.95	405/1667	4.95	4.67	4.67	4.67	4.95
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	9	0	0	0	4	5	9	4.28	704/1626	4.28	4.21	4.11	4.06	4.28
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	6	0	0	0	2	2	17	4.71	589/1559	4.71	4.74	4.46	4.40	4.71
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	6	0	0	0	1	2	18	4.81	855/1560	4.81	4.83	4.72	4.67	4.81
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	6	0	0	2	1	1	17	4.57	598/1549	4.57	4.59	4.31	4.25	4.57
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	6	1	1	1	0	3	15	4.50	715/1546	4.50	4.58	4.32	4.24	4.50
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	7	11	1	2	1	1	4	3.56	1015/1323	3.56	3.90	4.00	3.99	3.56
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	1	3	11	4.67	324/1384	4.67	4.37	4.10	4.12	4.67
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	12	0	0	0	1	1	13	4.80	348/1378	4.80	4.57	4.29	4.30	4.80
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	12	0	0	0	1	2	12	4.73	460/1378	4.73	4.69	4.31	4.33	4.73
4. Were special techniques successful	13	2	0	0	3	2	7	4.33	328/ 904	4.33	3.95	4.03	4.03	4.33

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99 0	A 16	Required for Majors 0	Graduate 0 Major 14
28-55	2	1.00-1.99 0	B 4		
56-83	4	2.00-2.99 8	C 1	General 5	Under-grad 27 Non-major 13
84-150	8	3.00-3.49 3	D 0		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 5	F 0	Electives 0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 16	
			? 1		

Course-Section: POLI 352 0101
 Title ADMINISTRATIVE LAW
 Instructor: MILLER, KERWIN
 Enrollment: 32
 Questionnaires: 32

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2008

Page 1335
 AUG 6, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	8	0	0	0	3	10	11	4.33	902/1670	4.33	4.47	4.31	4.24	4.33
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	8	0	0	0	2	7	15	4.54	569/1666	4.54	4.43	4.27	4.18	4.54
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	8	0	0	0	3	3	18	4.63	471/1406	4.63	4.50	4.32	4.22	4.63
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	8	5	0	0	2	7	10	4.42	660/1615	4.42	4.36	4.24	4.18	4.42
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	1	1	7	15	4.50	389/1566	4.50	4.29	4.07	4.04	4.50
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	8	2	1	1	4	7	9	4.00	899/1528	4.00	4.36	4.12	4.07	4.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	8	0	0	0	3	4	17	4.58	457/1650	4.58	4.42	4.22	4.12	4.58
8. How many times was class cancelled	9	0	0	0	0	1	22	4.96	338/1667	4.96	4.67	4.67	4.67	4.96
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	10	0	0	0	5	10	7	4.09	905/1626	4.09	4.21	4.11	4.06	4.09
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	9	0	0	0	2	5	16	4.61	772/1559	4.61	4.74	4.46	4.40	4.61
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	9	0	0	0	3	2	18	4.65	1102/1560	4.65	4.83	4.72	4.67	4.65
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	9	0	0	0	1	2	20	4.83	275/1549	4.83	4.59	4.31	4.25	4.83
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	2	2	19	4.74	432/1546	4.74	4.58	4.32	4.24	4.74
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	10	17	2	0	1	0	2	3.00	****/1323	****	3.90	4.00	3.99	****
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	9	0	1	0	5	7	10	4.09	800/1384	4.09	4.37	4.10	4.12	4.09
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	9	0	0	0	1	4	18	4.74	420/1378	4.74	4.57	4.29	4.30	4.74
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	0	0	1	5	17	4.70	501/1378	4.70	4.69	4.31	4.33	4.70
4. Were special techniques successful	9	5	1	0	2	5	10	4.28	361/ 904	4.28	3.95	4.03	4.03	4.28

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 13
28-55	1	1.00-1.99 0	B 7		
56-83	1	2.00-2.99 4	C 1	General 5	Under-grad 32 Non-major 19
84-150	13	3.00-3.49 3	D 0		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 9	F 0	Electives 0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 16	
			? 0		

Course-Section: POLI 360 0101
 Title COMPRTIVE POLI ANALYSI
 Instructor: GRODSKY, BRIAN
 Enrollment: 25
 Questionnaires: 24

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2008

Page 1336
 AUG 6, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	13	0	0	0	1	2	8	4.64	518/1670	4.43	4.47	4.31	4.24	4.64
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	13	0	0	0	1	4	6	4.45	703/1666	4.30	4.43	4.27	4.18	4.45
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	13	7	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	****/1406	****	4.50	4.32	4.22	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	13	0	0	0	1	6	4	4.27	849/1615	4.10	4.36	4.24	4.18	4.27
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	1	2	8	4.64	317/1566	4.47	4.29	4.07	4.04	4.64
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	2	2	7	4.45	490/1528	4.42	4.36	4.12	4.07	4.45
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	13	0	2	0	0	5	4	3.82	1324/1650	3.37	4.42	4.22	4.12	3.82
8. How many times was class cancelled	14	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	675/1667	4.95	4.67	4.67	4.67	4.90
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	15	0	0	1	0	3	5	4.33	637/1626	3.98	4.21	4.11	4.06	4.33
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	13	0	0	0	1	1	9	4.73	572/1559	4.75	4.74	4.46	4.40	4.73
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	13	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1560	4.88	4.83	4.72	4.67	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	13	0	0	0	0	3	8	4.73	410/1549	4.59	4.59	4.31	4.25	4.73
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	0	2	9	4.82	333/1546	4.68	4.58	4.32	4.24	4.82
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	13	0	0	0	4	4	3	3.91	820/1323	3.58	3.90	4.00	3.99	3.91
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	2	0	9	4.64	348/1384	4.65	4.37	4.10	4.12	4.64
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	13	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	243/1378	4.62	4.57	4.29	4.30	4.91
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	13	0	0	0	1	2	8	4.64	560/1378	4.57	4.69	4.31	4.33	4.64
4. Were special techniques successful	13	3	1	0	4	2	1	3.25	794/ 904	3.38	3.95	4.03	4.03	3.25
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	23	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 87	****	3.83	4.65	4.30	****
Field Work														
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	23	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 38	****	****	4.62	4.68	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	23	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.27	4.38	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	23	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.47	4.51	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	23	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 28	****	****	4.64	3.33	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	23	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 27	****	****	4.54	2.63	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	2	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	3
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	6						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	2	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	24	Non-major	21
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	8				
				?	0						

Course-Section: POLI 360 0201
 Title COMPRTIVE POLI ANALYSI
 Instructor: GRODSKY, BRIAN
 Enrollment: 14
 Questionnaires: 14

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2008

Page 1337
 AUG 6, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	0	1	2	3	7	4.23	1017/1670	4.43	4.47	4.31	4.24	4.23
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	1	0	0	7	5	4.15	1081/1666	4.30	4.43	4.27	4.18	4.15
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	10	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/1406	****	4.50	4.32	4.22	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	1	0	4	2	6	3.92	1203/1615	4.10	4.36	4.24	4.18	3.92
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	2	0	0	1	10	4.31	589/1566	4.47	4.29	4.07	4.04	4.31
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	2	4	7	4.38	580/1528	4.42	4.36	4.12	4.07	4.38
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	5	0	3	1	4	2.92	1598/1650	3.37	4.42	4.22	4.12	2.92
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	13	5.00	1/1667	4.95	4.67	4.67	4.67	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	1	0	2	7	1	3.64	1329/1626	3.98	4.21	4.11	4.06	3.64
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	3	10	4.77	503/1559	4.75	4.74	4.46	4.40	4.77
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	1	1	11	4.77	929/1560	4.88	4.83	4.72	4.67	4.77
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	2	3	8	4.46	736/1549	4.59	4.59	4.31	4.25	4.46
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	2	2	9	4.54	679/1546	4.68	4.58	4.32	4.24	4.54
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	1	1	0	7	3	1	3.25	1125/1323	3.58	3.90	4.00	3.99	3.25
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	1	0	1	10	4.67	324/1384	4.65	4.37	4.10	4.12	4.67
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	2	0	2	8	4.33	797/1378	4.62	4.57	4.29	4.30	4.33
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	1	1	1	9	4.50	653/1378	4.57	4.69	4.31	4.33	4.50
4. Were special techniques successful	2	2	1	1	2	4	2	3.50	718/ 904	3.38	3.95	4.03	4.03	3.50
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 232	****	****	4.19	4.04	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 239	****	****	4.21	3.99	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 230	****	****	4.44	4.25	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 231	****	****	4.31	4.11	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 218	****	****	4.18	3.93	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 87	****	3.83	4.65	4.30	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 79	****	4.00	4.64	4.53	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 75	****	4.17	4.57	4.50	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 79	****	3.67	4.45	3.68	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 80	****	3.83	3.97	3.76	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 41	****	****	4.50	4.44	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 38	****	****	4.19	3.96	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 38	****	****	4.62	4.68	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.27	4.38	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.47	4.51	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 28	****	****	4.64	3.33	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 16	****	****	4.67	4.00	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 27	****	****	4.54	2.63	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 10	****	****	4.84	****	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 6	****	****	4.92	****	****

Course-Section: POLI 360 0201
 Title COMPRTIVE POLI ANALYSI
 Instructor: GRODSKY, BRIAN
 Enrollment: 14
 Questionnaires: 14

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2008

Page 1337
 AUG 6, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	5	Required for Majors	3	Graduate	0	Major	11
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B	4						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	3	C	1	General	2	Under-grad	14	Non-major	3
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	7				
				?	1						

Course-Section: POLI 385 0101
 Title INTERNATIONAL SECURITY
 Instructor: LEBSON, MICAH
 Enrollment: 22
 Questionnaires: 21

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2008

Page 1338
 AUG 6, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	3	0	0	2	5	4	7	3.89	1358/1670	3.89	4.47	4.31	4.24	3.89
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	3	0	1	1	6	5	5	3.67	1452/1666	3.67	4.43	4.27	4.18	3.67
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	3	1	0	1	3	6	7	4.12	988/1406	4.12	4.50	4.32	4.22	4.12
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	4	0	0	1	3	4	9	4.24	898/1615	4.24	4.36	4.24	4.18	4.24
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	2	2	8	6	4.00	851/1566	4.00	4.29	4.07	4.04	4.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	3	1	1	1	1	5	9	4.18	778/1528	4.18	4.36	4.12	4.07	4.18
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	4	0	0	3	2	4	8	4.00	1135/1650	4.00	4.42	4.22	4.12	4.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	0	0	0	0	3	15	4.83	805/1667	4.83	4.67	4.67	4.67	4.83
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	0	2	2	4	5	2	3.20	1509/1626	3.20	4.21	4.11	4.06	3.20
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	2	2	4	10	4.22	1178/1559	4.22	4.74	4.46	4.40	4.22
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	1	0	1	4	12	4.44	1294/1560	4.44	4.83	4.72	4.67	4.44
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	4	2	5	7	3.83	1270/1549	3.83	4.59	4.31	4.25	3.83
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	1	2	2	4	9	4.00	1139/1546	4.00	4.58	4.32	4.24	4.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	2	1	1	5	5	3	3.53	1025/1323	3.53	3.90	4.00	3.99	3.53
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	2	3	0	7	4.00	820/1384	4.00	4.37	4.10	4.12	4.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	9	0	0	1	1	1	9	4.50	603/1378	4.50	4.57	4.29	4.30	4.50
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	0	0	2	3	7	4.42	741/1378	4.42	4.69	4.31	4.33	4.42
4. Were special techniques successful	9	1	0	0	3	4	4	4.09	443/ 904	4.09	3.95	4.03	4.03	4.09
Laboratory														
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	20	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 239	****	****	4.21	3.99	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 87	****	3.83	4.65	4.30	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	3	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	15
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	6						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	4	C	4	General	3	Under-grad	21	Non-major	6
84-150	8	3.00-3.49	5	D	1						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	11				
				?	2						

Course-Section: POLI 390 0101
 Title AMERICAN FOREIGN POLIC
 Instructor: STARKEY, BRIGID
 Enrollment: 35
 Questionnaires: 35

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2008

Page 1339
 AUG 6, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	5	0	0	0	0	11	19	4.63	518/1670	4.72	4.47	4.31	4.24	4.63
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	5	0	0	1	1	8	20	4.57	542/1666	4.60	4.43	4.27	4.18	4.57
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	5	0	0	0	2	8	20	4.60	495/1406	4.64	4.50	4.32	4.22	4.60
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	5	0	1	0	2	9	18	4.43	646/1615	4.40	4.36	4.24	4.18	4.43
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	1	0	8	21	4.63	317/1566	4.47	4.29	4.07	4.04	4.63
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	6	0	1	1	3	8	16	4.28	688/1528	4.34	4.36	4.12	4.07	4.28
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	5	0	0	2	3	12	13	4.20	973/1650	4.38	4.42	4.22	4.12	4.20
8. How many times was class cancelled	5	0	0	0	0	3	27	4.90	675/1667	4.89	4.67	4.67	4.67	4.90
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	12	0	0	0	3	6	14	4.48	451/1626	4.52	4.21	4.11	4.06	4.48
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	5	0	0	0	0	6	24	4.80	435/1559	4.81	4.74	4.46	4.40	4.80
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	5	0	0	0	0	2	28	4.93	417/1560	4.94	4.83	4.72	4.67	4.93
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	6	0	0	0	0	5	24	4.83	275/1549	4.78	4.59	4.31	4.25	4.83
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	1	0	7	22	4.67	520/1546	4.73	4.58	4.32	4.24	4.67
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	7	1	1	0	8	5	13	4.07	666/1323	4.08	3.90	4.00	3.99	4.07
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	2	6	14	4.55	409/1384	4.55	4.37	4.10	4.12	4.55
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	13	0	0	1	2	7	12	4.36	763/1378	4.62	4.57	4.29	4.30	4.36
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	13	0	0	1	1	3	17	4.64	560/1378	4.72	4.69	4.31	4.33	4.64
4. Were special techniques successful	13	4	2	0	5	8	3	3.56	708/ 904	3.78	3.95	4.03	4.03	3.56

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors		
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 9	Required for Majors 1	Graduate 0	Major 23
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	1	B 13			
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	6	C 4	General 4	Under-grad 35	Non-major 12
84-150	10	3.00-3.49	9	D 0			
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F 0	Electives 1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	
				P 1			
				I 0	Other 22		
				? 1			

Course-Section: POLI 390 8620
 Title AMERICAN FOREIGN POLIC
 Instructor: MELCAVAGE, EUGE
 Enrollment: 20
 Questionnaires: 19

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2008

Page 1340
 AUG 6, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	3	0	0	0	1	1	14	4.81	290/1670	4.72	4.47	4.31	4.24	4.81
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	3	0	0	0	1	4	11	4.63	465/1666	4.60	4.43	4.27	4.18	4.63
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	3	0	0	0	1	3	12	4.69	399/1406	4.64	4.50	4.32	4.22	4.69
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	3	0	1	0	1	4	10	4.38	724/1615	4.40	4.36	4.24	4.18	4.38
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	3	0	1	0	1	5	9	4.31	579/1566	4.47	4.29	4.07	4.04	4.31
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	3	1	1	0	0	5	9	4.40	560/1528	4.34	4.36	4.12	4.07	4.40
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	3	0	0	0	1	5	10	4.56	485/1650	4.38	4.42	4.22	4.12	4.56
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	0	0	0	0	2	14	4.88	730/1667	4.89	4.67	4.67	4.67	4.88
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	0	1	4	9	4.57	347/1626	4.52	4.21	4.11	4.06	4.57
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	1	1	14	4.81	419/1559	4.81	4.74	4.46	4.40	4.81
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	0	1	15	4.94	417/1560	4.94	4.83	4.72	4.67	4.94
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	0	0	1	2	12	4.73	395/1549	4.78	4.59	4.31	4.25	4.73
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	3	12	4.80	345/1546	4.73	4.58	4.32	4.24	4.80
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	5	3	1	0	1	4	5	4.09	659/1323	4.08	3.90	4.00	3.99	4.09
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	1	1	2	12	4.56	396/1384	4.55	4.37	4.10	4.12	4.56
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	0	2	14	4.88	274/1378	4.62	4.57	4.29	4.30	4.88
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	1	1	14	4.81	375/1378	4.72	4.69	4.31	4.33	4.81
4. Were special techniques successful	3	8	1	0	1	2	4	4.00	461/ 904	3.78	3.95	4.03	4.03	4.00

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99 0	A 5	Required for Majors 1	Graduate 0 Major 15
28-55	0	1.00-1.99 0	B 10		
56-83	6	2.00-2.99 2	C 0	General 1	Under-grad 19 Non-major 4
84-150	4	3.00-3.49 2	D 0		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 4	F 0	Electives 0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 14	
			? 0		

Course-Section: POLI 395 8620
 Title U.S. NAT'L SECURITY PO
 Instructor: TURNER, MICHAEL
 Enrollment: 18
 Questionnaires: 18

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2008

Page 1341
 AUG 6, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	0	0	0	1	16	4.94	124/1670	4.94	4.47	4.31	4.24	4.94
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	1	16	4.94	104/1666	4.94	4.43	4.27	4.18	4.94
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	1	0	0	0	2	14	4.88	212/1406	4.88	4.50	4.32	4.22	4.88
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	3	14	4.82	231/1615	4.82	4.36	4.24	4.18	4.82
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	1	15	4.82	176/1566	4.82	4.29	4.07	4.04	4.82
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	1	16	4.94	73/1528	4.94	4.36	4.12	4.07	4.94
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	0	1	16	4.94	95/1650	4.94	4.42	4.22	4.12	4.94
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	1	4	11	4.63	1062/1667	4.63	4.67	4.67	4.67	4.63
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	7	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	116/1626	4.91	4.21	4.11	4.06	4.91
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	0	1	15	4.94	193/1559	4.94	4.74	4.46	4.40	4.94
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	0	16	5.00	1/1560	5.00	4.83	4.72	4.67	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	0	1	14	4.93	141/1549	4.93	4.59	4.31	4.25	4.93
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	2	13	4.87	276/1546	4.87	4.58	4.32	4.24	4.87
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	1	0	0	1	0	13	4.86	137/1323	4.86	3.90	4.00	3.99	4.86
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	2	12	4.86	195/1384	4.86	4.37	4.10	4.12	4.86
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	0	0	1	13	4.93	194/1378	4.93	4.57	4.29	4.30	4.93
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	0	0	1	13	4.93	225/1378	4.93	4.69	4.31	4.33	4.93
4. Were special techniques successful	4	1	0	0	0	2	11	4.85	121/ 904	4.85	3.95	4.03	4.03	4.85

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors		
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	A 8	Required for Majors 0	Graduate 1	Major 10
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B 5			
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	4	C 0	General 3	Under-grad 17	Non-major 8
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	2	D 0			
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00	4	F 0	Electives 0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	
				P 0			
				I 0	Other 11		
				? 0			

Course-Section: POLI 401 1301
 Title INDIVIDUAL STUDY IN PO
 Instructor: FORESTIERE, CAR
 Enrollment: 1
 Questionnaires: 1

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2008

Page 1342
 AUG 6, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: POLI 402 1301
 Title HONORS RESEARCH
 Instructor: FORESTIERE, CAR
 Enrollment: 1
 Questionnaires: 1

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2008

Page 1343
 AUG 6, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: POLI 409A 0101
 Title HONRS THESIS PREP COUR
 Instructor: FORESTIERE, CAR
 Enrollment: 3
 Questionnaires: 3

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2008

Page 1344
 AUG 6, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1670	5.00	4.47	4.31	4.45	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1666	5.00	4.43	4.27	4.35	5.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1406	5.00	4.50	4.32	4.48	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1615	5.00	4.36	4.24	4.37	5.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1566	5.00	4.29	4.07	4.17	5.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1528	5.00	4.36	4.12	4.26	5.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1650	5.00	4.42	4.22	4.28	5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1524/1667	4.00	4.67	4.67	4.73	4.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1626	5.00	4.21	4.11	4.28	5.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1559	5.00	4.74	4.46	4.58	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1560	5.00	4.83	4.72	4.80	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1549	5.00	4.59	4.31	4.43	5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1546	5.00	4.58	4.32	4.43	5.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1323	5.00	3.90	4.00	4.10	5.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1384	5.00	4.37	4.10	4.32	5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1378	5.00	4.57	4.29	4.55	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1378	5.00	4.69	4.31	4.60	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 904	5.00	3.95	4.03	4.22	5.00

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	

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

Course-Section: POLI 409B 0101
 Title TRANSITIONAL JUSTICE
 Instructor: GRODSKY, BRIAN
 Enrollment: 17
 Questionnaires: 17

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2008

Page 1345
 AUG 6, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	7	0	0	0	0	4	6	4.60	557/1670	4.60	4.47	4.31	4.45	4.60
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	7	0	0	0	0	7	3	4.30	908/1666	4.30	4.43	4.27	4.35	4.30
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	7	8	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/1406	****	4.50	4.32	4.48	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	7	1	0	0	2	2	5	4.33	775/1615	4.33	4.36	4.24	4.37	4.33
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	0	3	7	4.70	273/1566	4.70	4.29	4.07	4.17	4.70
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	0	3	7	4.70	277/1528	4.70	4.36	4.12	4.26	4.70
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	7	0	0	0	4	2	4	4.00	1135/1650	4.00	4.42	4.22	4.28	4.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	7	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1667	5.00	4.67	4.67	4.73	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	8	0	0	0	0	6	3	4.33	637/1626	4.33	4.21	4.11	4.28	4.33
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	7	0	0	0	0	3	7	4.70	623/1559	4.70	4.74	4.46	4.58	4.70
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	7	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	596/1560	4.90	4.83	4.72	4.80	4.90
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	7	0	0	0	1	3	6	4.50	683/1549	4.50	4.59	4.31	4.43	4.50
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	345/1546	4.80	4.58	4.32	4.43	4.80
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	8	0	0	0	6	2	1	3.44	1065/1323	3.44	3.90	4.00	4.10	3.44
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	242/1384	4.78	4.37	4.10	4.32	4.78
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	0	0	1	0	8	4.78	379/1378	4.78	4.57	4.29	4.55	4.78
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1378	5.00	4.69	4.31	4.60	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	8	7	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/ 904	****	3.95	4.03	4.22	****

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: POLI 428 0101
 Title POLITICS INTERNSHIP
 Instructor: SCHALLER, THOMA
 Enrollment: 10
 Questionnaires: 9

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2008

Page 1346
 AUG 6, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	224/1670	4.89	4.47	4.31	4.45	4.89	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	190/1666	4.89	4.43	4.27	4.35	4.89	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	1	1	5	4.57	525/1406	4.57	4.50	4.32	4.48	4.57	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	2	0	6	4.50	552/1615	4.50	4.36	4.24	4.37	4.50	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	143/1566	4.89	4.29	4.07	4.17	4.89	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	1	6	4.44	504/1528	4.44	4.36	4.12	4.26	4.44	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	4	5	4.56	499/1650	4.56	4.42	4.22	4.28	4.56	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1667	5.00	4.67	4.67	4.73	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	141/1626	4.86	4.21	4.11	4.28	4.86	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	307/1559	4.89	4.74	4.46	4.58	4.89	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1560	5.00	4.83	4.72	4.80	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	1	7	4.67	488/1549	4.67	4.59	4.31	4.43	4.67	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	2	6	4.56	655/1546	4.56	4.58	4.32	4.43	4.56	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	1	0	1	0	1	6	4.50	326/1323	4.50	3.90	4.00	4.10	4.50	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	179/1384	4.89	4.37	4.10	4.32	4.89	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	264/1378	4.89	4.57	4.29	4.55	4.89	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	312/1378	4.88	4.69	4.31	4.60	4.88	
4. Were special techniques successful	0	4	1	0	1	0	3	3.80	605/ 904	3.80	3.95	4.03	4.22	3.80	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: POLI 432 0101
 Title CIVIL RIGHTS
 Instructor: LANOUE, GEORGE
 Enrollment: 38
 Questionnaires: 27

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2008

Page 1347
 AUG 6, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	1	1	4	21	4.67	479/1670	4.67	4.47	4.31	4.45	4.67
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	1	3	4	18	4.50	622/1666	4.50	4.43	4.27	4.35	4.50
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	3	4	19	4.52	586/1406	4.52	4.50	4.32	4.48	4.52
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	2	2	5	18	4.44	633/1615	4.44	4.36	4.24	4.37	4.44
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	2	3	21	4.73	242/1566	4.73	4.29	4.07	4.17	4.73
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	2	1	1	2	8	12	4.21	751/1528	4.21	4.36	4.12	4.26	4.21
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	2	4	20	4.69	327/1650	4.69	4.42	4.22	4.28	4.69
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	4	22	4.85	786/1667	4.85	4.67	4.67	4.73	4.85
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	1	1	0	2	7	12	4.32	659/1626	4.32	4.21	4.11	4.28	4.32
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	5	22	4.81	419/1559	4.81	4.74	4.46	4.58	4.81
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	4	22	4.78	911/1560	4.78	4.83	4.72	4.80	4.78
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	3	4	20	4.63	537/1549	4.63	4.59	4.31	4.43	4.63
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	1	5	20	4.63	570/1546	4.63	4.58	4.32	4.43	4.63
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	5	2	1	6	6	7	3.68	950/1323	3.68	3.90	4.00	4.10	3.68
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	1	1	2	2	16	4.41	541/1384	4.41	4.37	4.10	4.32	4.41
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	1	1	1	3	16	4.45	660/1378	4.45	4.57	4.29	4.55	4.45
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	1	0	0	2	19	4.73	470/1378	4.73	4.69	4.31	4.60	4.73
4. Were special techniques successful	6	0	0	0	1	3	17	4.76	142/ 904	4.76	3.95	4.03	4.22	4.76

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
28-55	0	1.00-1.99 0	B 11		Graduate 0
56-83	7	2.00-2.99 5	C 4	General	6
84-150	11	3.00-3.49 5	D 1		Under-grad 27
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 10	F 0	Electives	1
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	18
			? 3		

Course-Section: POLI 438 0101
 Title LEGAL INTERNSHIP
 Instructor: DAVIS, JEFFREY
 Enrollment: 17
 Questionnaires: 17

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2008

Page 1348
 AUG 6, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	4	0	0	0	2	3	8	4.46	722/1670	4.46	4.47	4.31	4.45	4.46
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	3	0	0	1	2	2	9	4.36	846/1666	4.36	4.43	4.27	4.35	4.36
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	3	7	0	0	1	0	6	4.71	363/1406	4.71	4.50	4.32	4.48	4.71
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	3	0	0	1	2	3	8	4.29	837/1615	4.29	4.36	4.24	4.37	4.29
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	1	3	5	5	4.00	851/1566	4.00	4.29	4.07	4.17	4.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	3	1	0	0	3	3	7	4.31	662/1528	4.31	4.36	4.12	4.26	4.31
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	3	0	0	0	2	4	8	4.43	690/1650	4.43	4.42	4.22	4.28	4.43
8. How many times was class cancelled	4	0	0	0	0	1	12	4.92	540/1667	4.92	4.67	4.67	4.73	4.92
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	0	0	0	0	6	5	4.45	483/1626	4.45	4.21	4.11	4.28	4.45
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	1	3	10	4.64	706/1559	4.64	4.74	4.46	4.58	4.64
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	0	1	13	4.93	477/1560	4.93	4.83	4.72	4.80	4.93
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	1	2	3	8	4.29	952/1549	4.29	4.59	4.31	4.43	4.29
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	3	2	9	4.43	822/1546	4.43	4.58	4.32	4.43	4.43
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	0	0	0	4	5	4	4.00	692/1323	4.00	3.90	4.00	4.10	4.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	2	3	7	4.42	530/1384	4.42	4.37	4.10	4.32	4.42
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	0	1	2	9	4.67	481/1378	4.67	4.57	4.29	4.55	4.67
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	253/1378	4.92	4.69	4.31	4.60	4.92
4. Were special techniques successful	5	6	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	243/ 904	4.50	3.95	4.03	4.22	4.50
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 87	****	3.83	4.65	4.80	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 41	****	****	4.50	4.98	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	15	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 38	****	****	4.19	4.36	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	15	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 38	****	****	4.62	4.58	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	15	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.27	4.02	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors					
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 12	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	4
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B 0						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	0	C 0	General	4	Under-grad	17	Non-major	13
84-150	6	3.00-3.49	5	D 0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	6	F 0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P 0						
				I 0	Other	6				
				? 0						

Course-Section: POLI 438H 0101
 Title LEGAL INTERNSHIP
 Instructor: DAVIS, JEFFREY
 Enrollment: 1
 Questionnaires: 1

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2008

Page 1349
 AUG 6, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1216/1670	4.00	4.47	4.31	4.45	4.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1199/1666	4.00	4.43	4.27	4.35	4.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1615	5.00	4.36	4.24	4.37	5.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	1551/1566	2.00	4.29	4.07	4.17	2.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1528	5.00	4.36	4.12	4.26	5.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1650	5.00	4.42	4.22	4.28	5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1667	5.00	4.67	4.67	4.73	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1626	5.00	4.21	4.11	4.28	5.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1559	5.00	4.74	4.46	4.58	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1560	5.00	4.83	4.72	4.80	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1549	5.00	4.59	4.31	4.43	5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1546	5.00	4.58	4.32	4.43	5.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1323	5.00	3.90	4.00	4.10	5.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	1260/1384	3.00	4.37	4.10	4.32	3.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1378	5.00	4.57	4.29	4.55	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1378	5.00	4.69	4.31	4.60	5.00

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: POLI 440 0101
 Title URBAN POLITICS
 Instructor: HANLON, BERNADE
 Enrollment: 20
 Questionnaires: 20

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2008

Page 1350
 AUG 6, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	11	0	1	0	2	3	3	3.78	1430/1670	3.78	4.47	4.31	4.45	3.78
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	11	0	0	1	1	0	7	4.44	719/1666	4.44	4.43	4.27	4.35	4.44
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	11	0	0	0	1	2	6	4.56	546/1406	4.56	4.50	4.32	4.48	4.56
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	11	0	0	0	1	2	6	4.56	499/1615	4.56	4.36	4.24	4.37	4.56
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	12	0	1	0	1	1	5	4.13	771/1566	4.13	4.29	4.07	4.17	4.13
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	12	0	1	1	0	1	5	4.00	899/1528	4.00	4.36	4.12	4.26	4.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	11	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1650	5.00	4.42	4.22	4.28	5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	11	0	0	0	0	5	4	4.44	1216/1667	4.44	4.67	4.67	4.73	4.44
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	15	0	0	1	1	3	0	3.40	1438/1626	3.40	4.21	4.11	4.28	3.40
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	12	0	0	0	1	1	6	4.63	739/1559	4.63	4.74	4.46	4.58	4.63
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	12	0	0	0	1	1	6	4.63	1138/1560	4.63	4.83	4.72	4.80	4.63
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	12	0	0	0	0	4	4	4.50	683/1549	4.50	4.59	4.31	4.43	4.50
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	12	0	1	0	1	2	4	4.00	1139/1546	4.00	4.58	4.32	4.43	4.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	14	0	2	1	0	0	3	3.17	1155/1323	3.17	3.90	4.00	4.10	3.17
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	1	1	1	2	3.80	975/1384	3.80	4.37	4.10	4.32	3.80
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	15	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	525/1378	4.60	4.57	4.29	4.55	4.60
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	15	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	386/1378	4.80	4.69	4.31	4.60	4.80
4. Were special techniques successful	15	1	0	2	0	0	2	3.50	****/ 904	****	3.95	4.03	4.22	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 232	****	****	4.19	4.35	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 239	****	****	4.21	4.26	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 218	****	****	4.18	4.09	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 87	****	3.83	4.65	4.80	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 79	****	3.67	4.45	4.53	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 80	****	3.83	3.97	3.67	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 41	****	****	4.50	4.98	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	19	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 38	****	****	4.19	4.36	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 28	****	****	4.64	5.00	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 16	****	****	4.67	4.80	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 10	****	****	4.84	****	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	8
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	0
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	4	C	0
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	2	D	0
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F	0
				P	0
				I	0
			Required for Majors	0	Graduate
			General	0	Under-grad
			Electives	0	20
			Other	7	Non-major
					12
				#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	

Course-Section: POLI 446 0101
 Title THE POLITICS OF POVERT
 Instructor: MILLER, CHERYL
 Enrollment: 9
 Questionnaires: 9

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2008

Page 1351
 AUG 6, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	234/1670	4.88	4.47	4.31	4.45	4.88
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	3	5	4.63	465/1666	4.63	4.43	4.27	4.35	4.63
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	2	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	240/1406	4.83	4.50	4.32	4.48	4.83
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	1	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	326/1615	4.71	4.36	4.24	4.37	4.71
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	148/1566	4.88	4.29	4.07	4.17	4.88
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1528	5.00	4.36	4.12	4.26	5.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	180/1650	4.88	4.42	4.22	4.28	4.88
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	5	3	4.38	1279/1667	4.38	4.67	4.67	4.73	4.38
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	1	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	347/1626	4.57	4.21	4.11	4.28	4.57
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	521/1559	4.75	4.74	4.46	4.58	4.75
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1560	5.00	4.83	4.72	4.80	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	424/1549	4.71	4.59	4.31	4.43	4.71
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	407/1546	4.75	4.58	4.32	4.43	4.75
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	1	0	0	4	3	4.00	692/1323	4.00	3.90	4.00	4.10	4.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1384	5.00	4.37	4.10	4.32	5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1378	5.00	4.57	4.29	4.55	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1378	5.00	4.69	4.31	4.60	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	4	2	1	0	1	0	1	3.00	820/ 904	3.00	3.95	4.03	4.22	3.00

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: POLI 473 0101
 Title GANDHI POL EXPMT TRUTH
 Instructor: LEVY, HAROLD L
 Enrollment: 12
 Questionnaires: 12

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2008

Page 1352
 AUG 6, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	4	0	1	1	2	3	1	3.25	1596/1670	3.25	4.47	4.31	4.45	3.25
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	4	0	1	0	4	0	3	3.50	1508/1666	3.50	4.43	4.27	4.35	3.50
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	4	5	0	0	2	1	0	3.33	1314/1406	3.33	4.50	4.32	4.48	3.33
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	4	0	1	2	2	1	2	3.13	1557/1615	3.13	4.36	4.24	4.37	3.13
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	5	0	1	0	4	1	1	3.14	1447/1566	3.14	4.29	4.07	4.17	3.14
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	4	0	1	1	3	3	0	3.00	1447/1528	3.00	4.36	4.12	4.26	3.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	4	0	3	0	1	1	3	3.13	1565/1650	3.13	4.42	4.22	4.28	3.13
8. How many times was class cancelled	4	0	0	0	0	5	3	4.38	1279/1667	4.38	4.67	4.67	4.73	4.38
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	7	0	1	1	1	2	0	2.80	1574/1626	2.80	4.21	4.11	4.28	2.80
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	0	0	1	1	6	4.63	739/1559	4.63	4.74	4.46	4.58	4.63
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	1	0	2	5	4.38	1347/1560	4.38	4.83	4.72	4.80	4.38
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	1	0	1	4	2	3.75	1308/1549	3.75	4.59	4.31	4.43	3.75
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	1	0	2	4	1	3.50	1379/1546	3.50	4.58	4.32	4.43	3.50
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	5	2	1	0	0	0	1.33	1316/1323	1.33	3.90	4.00	4.10	1.33
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	1	0	1	2	2	3.67	1033/1384	3.67	4.37	4.10	4.32	3.67
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	1	1	0	1	3	3.67	1139/1378	3.67	4.57	4.29	4.55	3.67
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	1	1	1	0	3	3.50	1189/1378	3.50	4.69	4.31	4.60	3.50
4. Were special techniques successful	6	3	1	1	0	0	1	2.67	860/ 904	2.67	3.95	4.03	4.22	2.67
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	6	0	0	1	2	0	3	3.83	81/ 87	3.83	3.83	4.65	4.80	3.83
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	6	0	0	0	3	0	3	4.00	69/ 79	4.00	4.00	4.64	4.60	4.00
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	2	1	3	4.17	56/ 75	4.17	4.17	4.57	4.56	4.17
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	1	2	1	2	3.67	71/ 79	3.67	3.67	4.45	4.53	3.67
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	6	0	0	1	2	0	3	3.83	48/ 80	3.83	3.83	3.97	3.67	3.83
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 41	****	****	4.50	4.98	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	11	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 38	****	****	4.19	4.36	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	11	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 38	****	****	4.62	4.58	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	11	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.27	4.02	****

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: POLI 480 0101
 Title INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZA
 Instructor: HODY, CYNTHIA
 Enrollment: 18
 Questionnaires: 14

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2008

Page 1353
 AUG 6, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General																
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	3	11	4.79	325/1670	4.79	4.47	4.31	4.45	4.79		
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	3	10	4.64	440/1666	4.64	4.43	4.27	4.35	4.64		
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	10	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	318/1406	4.75	4.50	4.32	4.48	4.75		
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	3	10	4.77	281/1615	4.77	4.36	4.24	4.37	4.77		
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	3	6	4	4.08	808/1566	4.08	4.29	4.07	4.17	4.08		
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	6	7	4.54	398/1528	4.54	4.36	4.12	4.26	4.54		
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	1	4	8	4.54	527/1650	4.54	4.42	4.22	4.28	4.54		
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	1	7	5	4.31	1334/1667	4.31	4.67	4.67	4.73	4.31		
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	1	0	0	0	3	8	4.73	231/1626	4.73	4.21	4.11	4.28	4.73		
Lecture																
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	1	2	10	4.69	623/1559	4.69	4.74	4.46	4.58	4.69		
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	13	5.00	1/1560	5.00	4.83	4.72	4.80	5.00		
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	1	2	9	4.67	488/1549	4.67	4.59	4.31	4.43	4.67		
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	2	11	4.85	299/1546	4.85	4.58	4.32	4.43	4.85		
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	10	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	****/1323	****	3.90	4.00	4.10	****		
Discussion																
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	169/1384	4.91	4.37	4.10	4.32	4.91		
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1378	5.00	4.57	4.29	4.55	5.00		
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	281/1378	4.91	4.69	4.31	4.60	4.91		
4. Were special techniques successful	3	3	0	0	0	3	5	4.63	194/ 904	4.63	3.95	4.03	4.22	4.63		

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors				
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 5	Required for Majors	2	Graduate	0	Major	10
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	B 6						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	C 1	General	1	Under-grad	14	Non-major	4
84-150	7	3.00-3.49	D 0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
			P 0						
			I 0	Other	8				
			? 0						

Course-Section: POLI 486 0101
 Title MIDDLE EAST INTL RELAT
 Instructor: STARKEY, BRIGID
 Enrollment: 25
 Questionnaires: 24

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2008

Page 1354
 AUG 6, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	2	0	0	0	0	4	18	4.82	290/1670	4.82	4.47	4.31	4.45	4.82
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	0	1	0	5	16	4.64	452/1666	4.64	4.43	4.27	4.35	4.64
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	0	1	0	2	2	17	4.55	556/1406	4.55	4.50	4.32	4.48	4.55
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	0	0	0	2	7	13	4.50	552/1615	4.50	4.36	4.24	4.37	4.50
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	1	5	16	4.68	280/1566	4.68	4.29	4.07	4.17	4.68
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	2	7	13	4.50	421/1528	4.50	4.36	4.12	4.26	4.50
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	1	1	4	16	4.59	443/1650	4.59	4.42	4.22	4.28	4.59
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	0	22	5.00	1/1667	5.00	4.67	4.67	4.73	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	1	2	6	12	4.38	584/1626	4.38	4.21	4.11	4.28	4.38
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	0	2	19	4.90	276/1559	4.90	4.74	4.46	4.58	4.90
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	0	1	20	4.95	298/1560	4.95	4.83	4.72	4.80	4.95
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	0	3	18	4.86	248/1549	4.86	4.59	4.31	4.43	4.86
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	2	19	4.90	231/1546	4.90	4.58	4.32	4.43	4.90
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	5	0	0	0	3	7	9	4.32	498/1323	4.32	3.90	4.00	4.10	4.32
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	0	5	8	4.62	364/1384	4.62	4.37	4.10	4.32	4.62
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	11	0	0	0	0	3	10	4.77	389/1378	4.77	4.57	4.29	4.55	4.77
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	11	0	0	0	0	2	11	4.85	344/1378	4.85	4.69	4.31	4.60	4.85
4. Were special techniques successful	11	0	2	0	1	4	6	3.92	548/ 904	3.92	3.95	4.03	4.22	3.92

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors		
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 6	Required for Majors 1	Graduate 0	Major 16
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B 10			
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	6	C 3	General 8	Under-grad 24	Non-major 8
84-150	10	3.00-3.49	6	D 0			
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F 1	Electives 0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	
				P 0			
				I 0	Other 13		
				? 0			

Course-Section: POLI 487 0101
 Title INTERNATIONAL POLI ECO
 Instructor: HODY, CYNTHIA
 Enrollment: 25
 Questionnaires: 20

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2008

Page 1355
 AUG 6, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	4	16	4.80	300/1670	4.80	4.47	4.31	4.45	4.80
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	4	16	4.80	259/1666	4.80	4.43	4.27	4.35	4.80
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	12	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	318/1406	4.75	4.50	4.32	4.48	4.75
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	4	15	4.79	263/1615	4.79	4.36	4.24	4.37	4.79
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	18	4.90	132/1566	4.90	4.29	4.07	4.17	4.90
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	5	15	4.75	221/1528	4.75	4.36	4.12	4.26	4.75
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	4	15	4.70	327/1650	4.70	4.42	4.22	4.28	4.70
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	9	11	4.55	1119/1667	4.55	4.67	4.67	4.73	4.55
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	0	3	14	4.82	156/1626	4.82	4.21	4.11	4.28	4.82
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	1	0	4	14	4.63	722/1559	4.63	4.74	4.46	4.58	4.63
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	19	5.00	1/1560	5.00	4.83	4.72	4.80	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	1	1	4	13	4.53	658/1549	4.53	4.59	4.31	4.43	4.53
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	0	1	3	14	4.53	691/1546	4.53	4.58	4.32	4.43	4.53
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	8	1	0	2	1	6	4.10	656/1323	4.10	3.90	4.00	4.10	4.10
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	4	14	4.78	242/1384	4.78	4.37	4.10	4.32	4.78
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	0	2	16	4.89	264/1378	4.89	4.57	4.29	4.55	4.89
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	1	1	16	4.83	354/1378	4.83	4.69	4.31	4.60	4.83
4. Were special techniques successful	2	15	0	0	2	0	1	3.67	****/ 904	****	3.95	4.03	4.22	****
Laboratory														
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 230	****	****	4.44	4.30	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors		
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	10	Required for Majors		0	Graduate	0	Major	10
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	6							
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	2	C	1	General		2	Under-grad	20	Non-major	10
84-150	8	3.00-3.49	6	D	0							
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	6	F	0	Electives		0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0							
				I	0	Other		15				
				?	1							

Course-Section: POLI 489 0101
 Title SEL TOPICS:INTERNATL R
 Instructor: HAGERTY, DEVIN
 Enrollment: 7
 Questionnaires: 5

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2008

Page 1356
 AUG 6, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	300/1670	4.80	4.47	4.31	4.45	4.80
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	490/1666	4.57	4.43	4.27	4.35	4.60
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1406	4.80	4.50	4.32	4.48	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	944/1615	4.30	4.36	4.24	4.37	4.20
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	491/1566	4.32	4.29	4.07	4.17	4.40
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	173/1528	4.65	4.36	4.12	4.26	4.80
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	720/1650	4.50	4.42	4.22	4.28	4.40
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	3	1	4.25	1368/1667	4.57	4.67	4.67	4.73	4.25
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1626	4.60	4.21	4.11	4.28	****
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	896/1559	4.68	4.74	4.46	4.58	4.50
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1560	4.93	4.83	4.72	4.80	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1549	4.74	4.59	4.31	4.43	5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	715/1546	4.57	4.58	4.32	4.43	4.50
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	3	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1323	3.50	3.90	4.00	4.10	****
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1384	4.78	4.37	4.10	4.32	5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	970/1378	4.31	4.57	4.29	4.55	4.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1378	4.84	4.69	4.31	4.60	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	3	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	243/ 904	4.30	3.95	4.03	4.22	4.50
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 87	****	3.83	4.65	4.80	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 79	****	4.00	4.64	4.60	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 75	****	4.17	4.57	4.56	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 79	****	3.67	4.45	4.53	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 80	****	3.83	3.97	3.67	****

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: POLI 489 8620
 Title SEL TOPICS:INTERNATL R
 Instructor: MELCAVAGE, EUGE
 Enrollment: 22
 Questionnaires: 22

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2008

Page 1357
 AUG 6, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	2	0	0	0	1	2	17	4.80	300/1670	4.80	4.47	4.31	4.45	4.80
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	0	0	2	5	13	4.55	556/1666	4.57	4.43	4.27	4.35	4.55
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	0	0	0	2	4	14	4.60	495/1406	4.80	4.50	4.32	4.48	4.60
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	0	0	0	3	6	11	4.40	687/1615	4.30	4.36	4.24	4.37	4.40
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	1	4	4	11	4.25	643/1566	4.32	4.29	4.07	4.17	4.25
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	2	6	12	4.50	421/1528	4.65	4.36	4.12	4.26	4.50
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	1	0	5	14	4.60	429/1650	4.50	4.42	4.22	4.28	4.60
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	2	18	4.90	675/1667	4.57	4.67	4.67	4.73	4.90
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	7	0	0	0	1	4	10	4.60	324/1626	4.60	4.21	4.11	4.28	4.60
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	1	0	0	19	4.85	355/1559	4.68	4.74	4.46	4.58	4.85
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	1	1	18	4.85	725/1560	4.93	4.83	4.72	4.80	4.85
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	1	0	1	4	13	4.47	722/1549	4.74	4.59	4.31	4.43	4.47
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	1	0	4	14	4.63	557/1546	4.57	4.58	4.32	4.43	4.63
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	7	2	1	3	1	5	3.50	1040/1323	3.50	3.90	4.00	4.10	3.50
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	2	3	11	4.56	396/1384	4.78	4.37	4.10	4.32	4.56
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	1	1	1	13	4.63	510/1378	4.31	4.57	4.29	4.55	4.63
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	0	0	2	1	13	4.69	511/1378	4.84	4.69	4.31	4.60	4.69
4. Were special techniques successful	6	6	1	0	1	3	5	4.10	442/ 904	4.30	3.95	4.03	4.22	4.10

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99 0	A 5	Required for Majors 3	Graduate 0 Major 17
28-55	0	1.00-1.99 0	B 12		
56-83	7	2.00-2.99 3	C 2	General 0	Under-grad 22 Non-major 5
84-150	6	3.00-3.49 2	D 0		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 6	F 0	Electives 0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 18	
			? 1		

Course-Section: POLI 646 0101
 Title THE POLITICS OF POVERT
 Instructor: MILLER, CHERYL
 Enrollment: 5
 Questionnaires: 5

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2008

Page 1358
 AUG 6, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1670	5.00	4.47	4.31	4.46	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	490/1666	4.60	4.43	4.27	4.34	4.60
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	799/1406	4.33	4.50	4.32	4.36	4.33
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	1	2	4.00	1083/1615	4.00	4.36	4.24	4.33	4.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	187/1566	4.80	4.29	4.07	4.20	4.80
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	173/1528	4.80	4.36	4.12	4.33	4.80
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	429/1650	4.60	4.42	4.22	4.30	4.60
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	1082/1667	4.60	4.67	4.67	4.74	4.60
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	278/1626	4.67	4.21	4.11	4.20	4.67
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	435/1559	4.80	4.74	4.46	4.49	4.80
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1560	5.00	4.83	4.72	4.81	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	294/1549	4.80	4.59	4.31	4.37	4.80
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1546	5.00	4.58	4.32	4.40	5.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	1	0	0	0	3	4.00	692/1323	4.00	3.90	4.00	4.03	4.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	257/1384	4.75	4.37	4.10	4.21	4.75
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1378	5.00	4.57	4.29	4.42	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1378	5.00	4.69	4.31	4.51	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	2	0	0	0	2	0	1	3.67	671/ 904	3.67	3.95	4.03	4.04	3.67

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: POLI 652 0101
 Title POLITICS OF HEALTH
 Instructor: MILLER, NANCY A
 Enrollment: 17
 Questionnaires: 15

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2008

Page 1359
 AUG 6, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	5	10	4.67	479/1670	4.67	4.47	4.31	4.46	4.67	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	6	8	4.47	686/1666	4.47	4.43	4.27	4.34	4.47	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	12	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/1406	****	4.50	4.32	4.36	****	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	5	9	4.64	401/1615	4.64	4.36	4.24	4.33	4.64	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	6	9	4.60	339/1566	4.60	4.29	4.07	4.20	4.60	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	4	11	4.73	240/1528	4.73	4.36	4.12	4.33	4.73	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	4	11	4.73	289/1650	4.73	4.42	4.22	4.30	4.73	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	15	5.00	1/1667	5.00	4.67	4.67	4.74	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	6	8	4.57	347/1626	4.57	4.21	4.11	4.20	4.57	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	2	12	4.73	555/1559	4.73	4.74	4.46	4.49	4.73	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	14	4.93	417/1560	4.93	4.83	4.72	4.81	4.93	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	5	10	4.67	488/1549	4.67	4.59	4.31	4.37	4.67	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	5	10	4.67	520/1546	4.67	4.58	4.32	4.40	4.67	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	8	1	1	0	1	4	3.86	857/1323	3.86	3.90	4.00	4.03	3.86	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	1	0	3	7	4.45	487/1384	4.45	4.37	4.10	4.21	4.45	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	1	0	2	2	5	4.00	970/1378	4.00	4.57	4.29	4.42	4.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	0	1	0	10	4.82	375/1378	4.82	4.69	4.31	4.51	4.82	
4. Were special techniques successful	4	6	2	0	1	0	2	3.00	820/ 904	3.00	3.95	4.03	4.04	3.00	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors		
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	0	A 8	Required for Majors 1	Graduate 3	Major 0
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	B 1			
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C 0	General 3	Under-grad 12	Non-major 15
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	2	D 0			
Grad.	3	3.50-4.00	9	F 0	Electives 0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	
				P 0			
				I 0	Other 11		
				? 4			