

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	2	2	6	10	11	3.84	1214/1447	4.23	4.56	4.31	4.18	3.84
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	2	2	6	9	12	3.87	1161/1447	4.27	4.43	4.27	4.30	3.87
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	1	4	7	5	14	3.87	1008/1241	4.31	4.63	4.33	4.25	3.87
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	1	1	3	10	9	7	3.60	1227/1402	4.07	4.40	4.24	4.15	3.60
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	0	3	2	7	8	10	3.67	1084/1358	4.19	4.42	4.11	4.03	3.67
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	0	2	2	6	10	10	3.80	968/1316	4.08	4.41	4.14	3.99	3.80
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	1	5	7	17	4.33	680/1427	4.42	4.41	4.19	4.24	4.33
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	1	11	19	4.58	1030/1447	4.61	4.75	4.69	4.68	4.58
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	3	8	13	3	3.59	1193/1434	4.26	4.24	4.10	4.10	3.59
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	2	5	24	4.71	506/1387	4.69	4.68	4.46	4.46	4.71
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	3	7	22	4.59	1063/1387	4.78	4.86	4.73	4.71	4.59
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	5	4	8	13	3.97	1079/1386	4.35	4.51	4.32	4.32	3.97
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	2	3	4	8	13	3.90	1104/1380	4.37	4.47	4.32	4.31	3.90
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	4	1	2	9	4	12	3.86	786/1193	4.12	3.92	4.02	3.99	3.86
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	12	0	4	0	6	4	6	3.40	1024/1172	3.63	4.37	4.15	3.95	3.40
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	12	0	2	5	2	6	5	3.35	1111/1182	3.72	4.60	4.35	4.18	3.35
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	12	0	1	1	4	5	9	4.00	864/1170	4.07	4.63	4.38	4.17	4.00
4. Were special techniques successful	11	12	0	2	3	1	3	3.56	642/ 800	3.33	4.14	4.06	3.95	3.56
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	31	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 189	****	****	4.34	4.18	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	31	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 192	****	****	4.34	4.31	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	31	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 186	****	****	4.48	4.46	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	31	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 187	****	****	4.33	4.37	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	31	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 168	****	****	4.20	4.29	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	31	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 66	****	5.00	4.58	3.95	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	31	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 62	****	4.64	4.56	4.08	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	31	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 58	****	4.57	4.41	3.88	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	31	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 65	****	4.94	4.42	3.78	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	31	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 64	****	3.96	4.09	3.75	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	31	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 38	****	4.50	4.49	3.83	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	31	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 36	****	3.00	4.25	4.26	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	31	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 28	****	4.50	4.52	3.84	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	31	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 30	****	4.50	4.30	3.64	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	31	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 27	****	4.50	4.43	3.73	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	31	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.72	4.50	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	31	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 21	****	****	4.57	4.38	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	31	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.64	4.65	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	31	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 20	****	****	4.60	4.49	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	31	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 15	****	****	4.61	4.31	****

Course-Section: POLI 100 1
 Title Amer Govt & Politics
 Instructor: Miller, Nicholas
 Enrollment: 47
 Questionnaires: 32

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 1148
 JUN 28, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	2	A	1	Required for Majors	12	Graduate	0	Major	6
28-55	7	1.00-1.99	0	B	11						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	5	C	10	General	5	Under-grad	32	Non-major	26
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	6	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	5	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	2				
				?	3						

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	1	6	13	19	4.28	839/1447	4.23	4.56	4.31	4.18	4.28
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	1	5	11	21	4.37	728/1447	4.27	4.43	4.27	4.30	4.37
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	0	1	2	3	9	22	4.32	726/1241	4.31	4.63	4.33	4.25	4.32
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	2	0	2	4	10	19	4.31	705/1402	4.07	4.40	4.24	4.15	4.31
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	5	3	9	19	4.08	756/1358	4.19	4.42	4.11	4.03	4.08
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	3	0	1	1	2	12	20	4.36	527/1316	4.08	4.41	4.14	3.99	4.36
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	3	0	0	2	3	7	24	4.47	500/1427	4.42	4.41	4.19	4.24	4.47
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	2	1	22	14	4.23	1263/1447	4.61	4.75	4.69	4.68	4.23
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	8	2	0	1	2	14	12	4.28	611/1434	4.26	4.24	4.10	4.10	4.28
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	1	7	28	4.75	429/1387	4.69	4.68	4.46	4.46	4.75
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	1	1	7	27	4.67	982/1387	4.78	4.86	4.73	4.71	4.67
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	1	0	5	5	24	4.46	677/1386	4.35	4.51	4.32	4.32	4.46
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	1	1	1	3	6	24	4.46	709/1380	4.37	4.47	4.32	4.31	4.46
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	2	2	1	7	8	16	4.03	644/1193	4.12	3.92	4.02	3.99	4.03
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	20	0	2	2	5	3	7	3.58	970/1172	3.63	4.37	4.15	3.95	3.58
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	20	0	1	3	5	5	5	3.53	1073/1182	3.72	4.60	4.35	4.18	3.53
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	20	0	0	1	6	6	6	3.89	944/1170	4.07	4.63	4.38	4.17	3.89
4. Were special techniques successful	20	9	2	2	1	3	2	3.10	739/ 800	3.33	4.14	4.06	3.95	3.10
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	38	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 189	****	****	4.34	4.18	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	38	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 192	****	****	4.34	4.31	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	38	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 186	****	****	4.48	4.46	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	38	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 187	****	****	4.33	4.37	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	38	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 168	****	****	4.20	4.29	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	38	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 66	****	5.00	4.58	3.95	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	38	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 65	****	4.94	4.42	3.78	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	38	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 64	****	3.96	4.09	3.75	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	38	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 38	****	4.50	4.49	3.83	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	38	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 36	****	3.00	4.25	4.26	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	38	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 28	****	4.50	4.52	3.84	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	38	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 30	****	4.50	4.30	3.64	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	38	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 27	****	4.50	4.43	3.73	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	38	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.72	4.50	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	38	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 21	****	****	4.57	4.38	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	38	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.64	4.65	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	38	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 20	****	****	4.60	4.49	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	38	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 15	****	****	4.61	4.31	****

Course-Section: POLI 100 2
 Title Amer Govt & Politics
 Instructor: Miller, Nicholas
 Enrollment: 46
 Questionnaires: 39

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 1149
 JUN 28, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	9	0.00-0.99	2	A	10	Required for Majors	11	Graduate	0	Major	3
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	1	B	18						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	6	C	3	General	13	Under-grad	39	Non-major	36
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	6	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	6	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	3				
				?	1						

Course-Section: POLI 100 3
 Title Amer Govt & Politics
 Instructor: Schaller, Thomas
 Enrollment: 49
 Questionnaires: 30

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 1150
 JUN 28, 2010
 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	3	12	15	4.40	723/1447	4.23	4.56	4.31	4.18	4.40
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	14	14	4.40	677/1447	4.27	4.43	4.27	4.30	4.40
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	7	21	4.63	415/1241	4.31	4.63	4.33	4.25	4.63
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	24	0	0	1	3	2	4.17	****/1402	4.07	4.40	4.24	4.15	****
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	1	9	17	4.59	286/1358	4.19	4.42	4.11	4.03	4.59
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	23	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	****/1316	4.08	4.41	4.14	3.99	****
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	1	2	8	17	4.46	513/1427	4.42	4.41	4.19	4.24	4.46
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	4	24	4.86	619/1447	4.61	4.75	4.69	4.68	4.86
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	2	0	0	3	10	11	4.33	540/1434	4.26	4.24	4.10	4.10	4.33
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	1	0	7	21	4.66	581/1387	4.69	4.68	4.46	4.46	4.66
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	3	26	4.90	553/1387	4.78	4.86	4.73	4.71	4.90
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	2	0	8	19	4.52	597/1386	4.35	4.51	4.32	4.32	4.52
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	2	8	19	4.59	571/1380	4.37	4.47	4.32	4.31	4.59
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	1	1	2	4	6	15	4.14	574/1193	4.12	3.92	4.02	3.99	4.14
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	10	0	3	0	4	8	5	3.60	958/1172	3.63	4.37	4.15	3.95	3.60
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	9	0	0	2	5	7	7	3.90	941/1182	3.72	4.60	4.35	4.18	3.90
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	10	0	0	1	2	6	11	4.35	695/1170	4.07	4.63	4.38	4.17	4.35
4. Were special techniques successful	9	15	0	1	1	1	3	4.00	****/ 800	3.33	4.14	4.06	3.95	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors		
00-27	4	0.00-0.99	0	A 13	Required for Majors 11	Graduate 0	Major 5
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B 4			
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	2	C 6	General 6	Under-grad 30	Non-major 25
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	4	D 0			
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F 0	Electives 4	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	
				P 0			
				I 0	Other 3		
				? 1			

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	7	6	25	4.41	709/1447	4.23	4.56	4.31	4.18	4.41
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	6	9	23	4.45	619/1447	4.27	4.43	4.27	4.30	4.45
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	4	12	22	4.41	646/1241	4.31	4.63	4.33	4.25	4.41
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	26	0	2	0	3	8	4.31	715/1402	4.07	4.40	4.24	4.15	4.31
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	2	16	20	4.41	441/1358	4.19	4.42	4.11	4.03	4.41
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	31	0	0	1	1	5	4.57	****/1316	4.08	4.41	4.14	3.99	****
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	2	1	11	24	4.41	582/1427	4.42	4.41	4.19	4.24	4.41
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	1	1	4	32	4.76	819/1447	4.61	4.75	4.69	4.68	4.76
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	18	1	0	0	0	3	17	4.85	102/1434	4.26	4.24	4.10	4.10	4.85
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	4	5	27	4.64	611/1387	4.69	4.68	4.46	4.46	4.64
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	2	37	4.95	317/1387	4.78	4.86	4.73	4.71	4.95
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	2	16	19	4.46	677/1386	4.35	4.51	4.32	4.32	4.46
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	2	2	8	26	4.53	637/1380	4.37	4.47	4.32	4.31	4.53
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	0	4	13	21	4.45	340/1193	4.12	3.92	4.02	3.99	4.45
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	9	7	8	3.96	755/1172	3.63	4.37	4.15	3.95	3.96
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	15	0	0	2	5	6	11	4.08	836/1182	3.72	4.60	4.35	4.18	4.08
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	15	0	1	1	5	6	11	4.04	858/1170	4.07	4.63	4.38	4.17	4.04
4. Were special techniques successful	16	16	1	0	2	2	2	3.57	****/ 800	3.33	4.14	4.06	3.95	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	35	2	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 189	****	****	4.34	4.18	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	36	0	1	0	0	0	2	3.67	****/ 192	****	****	4.34	4.31	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	36	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 186	****	****	4.48	4.46	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	36	0	0	1	0	0	2	4.00	****/ 187	****	****	4.33	4.37	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	36	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 168	****	****	4.20	4.29	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	35	2	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 66	****	5.00	4.58	3.95	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	36	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 62	****	4.64	4.56	4.08	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	36	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 58	****	4.57	4.41	3.88	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	36	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 65	****	4.94	4.42	3.78	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	36	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 64	****	3.96	4.09	3.75	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	35	0	1	0	1	0	2	3.50	****/ 38	****	4.50	4.49	3.83	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	36	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/ 36	****	3.00	4.25	4.26	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	36	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 28	****	4.50	4.52	3.84	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	36	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 30	****	4.50	4.30	3.64	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	36	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 27	****	4.50	4.43	3.73	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	35	0	1	0	1	0	2	3.50	****/ 31	****	****	4.72	4.50	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	36	0	0	1	0	0	2	4.00	****/ 21	****	****	4.57	4.38	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	36	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.64	4.65	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	36	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 20	****	****	4.60	4.49	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	36	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 15	****	****	4.61	4.31	****

Course-Section: POLI 100 4
 Title Amer Govt & Politics
 Instructor: Schaller, Thomas
 Enrollment: 50
 Questionnaires: 39

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 1151
 JUN 28, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	4	0.00-0.99	1	A	15	Required for Majors	18	Graduate	0	Major	2
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B	14						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	3	C	5	General	7	Under-grad	39	Non-major	37
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	3	D	1						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	10	F	0	Electives	6	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	1						
				I	0	Other	2				
				?	2						

Course-Section: POLI 210 1
 Title Political Philosophy
 Instructor: Carter, John
 Enrollment: 53
 Questionnaires: 37

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 1152
 JUN 28, 2010
 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	1	6	9	21	4.35	771/1447	4.35	4.56	4.31	4.31	4.35
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	2	4	7	24	4.43	633/1447	4.43	4.43	4.27	4.23	4.43
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	3	31	4.76	282/1241	4.76	4.63	4.33	4.35	4.76
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	15	1	2	1	4	14	4.27	745/1402	4.27	4.40	4.24	4.24	4.27
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	3	2	14	18	4.27	590/1358	4.27	4.42	4.11	4.12	4.27
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	16	1	2	1	4	13	4.24	635/1316	4.24	4.41	4.14	4.08	4.24
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	5	5	26	4.58	361/1427	4.58	4.41	4.19	4.14	4.58
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	31	6	4.16	1301/1447	4.16	4.75	4.69	4.70	4.16
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	1	2	0	7	16	7	3.81	1045/1434	3.81	4.24	4.10	3.97	3.81

Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	4	7	26	4.59	670/1387	4.59	4.68	4.46	4.42	4.59
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	4	32	4.84	707/1387	4.84	4.86	4.73	4.71	4.84
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	1	4	10	22	4.43	705/1386	4.43	4.51	4.32	4.24	4.43
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	3	2	7	25	4.46	709/1380	4.46	4.47	4.32	4.30	4.46
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	8	3	0	6	8	12	3.90	764/1193	3.90	3.92	4.02	4.04	3.90

Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	11	0	1	2	3	2	18	4.31	546/1172	4.31	4.37	4.15	4.12	4.31
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	11	0	0	1	3	3	19	4.54	534/1182	4.54	4.60	4.35	4.30	4.54
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	11	0	1	0	3	6	16	4.38	672/1170	4.38	4.63	4.38	4.32	4.38
4. Were special techniques successful	11	3	1	1	1	3	17	4.48	211/ 800	4.48	4.14	4.06	4.01	4.48

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	2	0.00-0.99 0	A 20	Required for Majors 27	Graduate 0 Major 24
28-55	9	1.00-1.99 0	B 10	General 2	Under-grad 37 Non-major 13
56-83	3	2.00-2.99 4	C 3		
84-150	2	3.00-3.49 7	D 0	Electives 1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 15	F 0		
			P 0		
			I 0		
			? 0	Other 1	

Course-Section: POLI 230 1
 Title Intro Constitutional L
 Instructor: Jones, Gary
 Enrollment: 52
 Questionnaires: 43

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 1153
 JUN 28, 2010
 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	1	2	8	15	15	4.00	1058/1447	4.05	4.56	4.31	4.31	4.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	1	3	9	15	13	3.88	1161/1447	4.14	4.43	4.27	4.23	3.88
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	0	0	3	9	10	19	4.10	882/1241	4.25	4.63	4.33	4.35	4.10
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	5	2	1	10	12	11	3.81	1139/1402	4.00	4.40	4.24	4.24	3.81
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	1	7	10	23	4.34	518/1358	4.40	4.42	4.11	4.12	4.34
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	4	2	2	0	11	13	11	3.84	950/1316	3.93	4.41	4.14	4.08	3.84
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	3	0	0	2	7	5	26	4.38	632/1427	4.40	4.41	4.19	4.14	4.38
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	3	0	0	0	0	38	5.00	1/1447	4.97	4.75	4.69	4.70	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	14	0	0	0	18	9	2	3.45	1261/1434	3.42	4.24	4.10	3.97	3.45

Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	0	2	7	11	19	4.21	1079/1387	4.36	4.68	4.46	4.42	4.21
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	1	2	10	14	12	3.87	1341/1387	4.00	4.86	4.73	4.71	3.87
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	6	0	0	3	9	15	10	3.86	1146/1386	4.04	4.51	4.32	4.24	3.86
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	1	3	2	12	11	10	3.61	1218/1380	3.76	4.47	4.32	4.30	3.61
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	7	28	4	2	1	1	0	1.88	****/1193	3.29	3.92	4.02	4.04	****

Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	22	0	6	3	7	4	1	2.57	1156/1172	2.74	4.37	4.15	4.12	2.57
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	22	0	5	3	8	3	2	2.71	1162/1182	3.10	4.60	4.35	4.30	2.71
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	22	0	2	2	7	5	5	3.43	1094/1170	3.48	4.63	4.38	4.32	3.43
4. Were special techniques successful	22	13	2	2	2	2	0	2.50	****/ 800	****	4.14	4.06	4.01	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	9	0.00-0.99 0	A 15	Required for Majors 31	Graduate 1 Major 29
28-55	5	1.00-1.99 1	B 18		
56-83	6	2.00-2.99 5	C 3	General 2	Under-grad 42 Non-major 14
84-150	6	3.00-3.49 11	D 0		
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00 12	F 0	Electives 5	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 2	
			? 1		

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	8	12	17	4.10	1007/1447	4.05	4.56	4.31	4.31	4.10
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	3	0	0	1	4	13	22	4.40	677/1447	4.14	4.43	4.27	4.23	4.40
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	4	0	0	3	2	10	24	4.41	646/1241	4.25	4.63	4.33	4.35	4.41
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	4	2	1	1	7	9	19	4.19	836/1402	4.00	4.40	4.24	4.24	4.19
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	4	0	1	0	4	9	25	4.46	387/1358	4.40	4.42	4.11	4.12	4.46
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	3	0	1	4	4	15	16	4.03	801/1316	3.93	4.41	4.14	4.08	4.03
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	3	0	0	3	4	6	27	4.43	568/1427	4.40	4.41	4.19	4.14	4.43
8. How many times was class cancelled	4	2	0	0	0	2	35	4.95	291/1447	4.97	4.75	4.69	4.70	4.95
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	12	0	0	2	17	10	2	3.39	1281/1434	3.42	4.24	4.10	3.97	3.39
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	6	0	1	1	1	9	25	4.51	783/1387	4.36	4.68	4.46	4.42	4.51
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	6	0	1	3	4	11	18	4.14	1296/1387	4.00	4.86	4.73	4.71	4.14
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	6	0	1	1	5	12	18	4.22	911/1386	4.04	4.51	4.32	4.24	4.22
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	7	1	3	0	7	12	13	3.91	1096/1380	3.76	4.47	4.32	4.30	3.91
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	7	22	3	1	4	1	5	3.29	1035/1193	3.29	3.92	4.02	4.04	3.29
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	20	0	7	2	5	4	5	2.91	1116/1172	2.74	4.37	4.15	4.12	2.91
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	20	0	4	1	7	2	9	3.48	1086/1182	3.10	4.60	4.35	4.30	3.48
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	20	0	4	1	5	5	8	3.52	1062/1170	3.48	4.63	4.38	4.32	3.52
4. Were special techniques successful	21	13	1	0	3	2	3	3.67	****/ 800	****	4.14	4.06	4.01	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	39	1	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/ 189	****	****	4.34	4.47	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	39	0	1	0	0	1	2	3.75	****/ 192	****	****	4.34	4.38	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	39	1	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/ 186	****	****	4.48	4.57	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	40	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 187	****	****	4.33	4.46	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	40	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 168	****	****	4.20	4.15	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	40	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 66	****	5.00	4.58	4.43	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	40	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 62	****	4.64	4.56	4.28	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	40	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 58	****	4.57	4.41	3.79	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	40	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/ 65	****	4.94	4.42	4.36	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	40	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/ 64	****	3.96	4.09	3.70	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	40	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 38	****	4.50	4.49	2.25	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	40	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/ 36	****	3.00	4.25	3.25	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	40	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/ 28	****	4.50	4.52	****	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	40	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 30	****	4.50	4.30	****	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	40	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 27	****	4.50	4.43	****	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	40	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 31	****	****	4.72	****	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	40	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/ 21	****	****	4.57	****	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	40	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 31	****	****	4.64	****	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	40	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 20	****	****	4.60	****	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	40	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 15	****	****	4.61	****	****

Course-Section: POLI 230 2
 Title Intro Constitutional L
 Instructor: Jones, Gary
 Enrollment: 50
 Questionnaires: 43

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 1154
 JUN 28, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	6	0.00-0.99	1	A	14	Required for Majors	28	Graduate	0	Major	29
28-55	8	1.00-1.99	1	B	12						
56-83	5	2.00-2.99	4	C	5	General	1	Under-grad	43	Non-major	14
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	10	D	1						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5	F	0	Electives	3	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	2						

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	3	5	9	4.35	771/1447	4.35	4.56	4.31	4.31	4.35
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	4	10	4.41	662/1447	4.41	4.43	4.27	4.23	4.41
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	4	2	11	4.41	646/1241	4.41	4.63	4.33	4.35	4.41
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	4	2	10	4.24	787/1402	4.24	4.40	4.24	4.24	4.24
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	3	2	12	4.53	332/1358	4.53	4.42	4.11	4.12	4.53
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	5	3	9	4.24	635/1316	4.24	4.41	4.14	4.08	4.24
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	4	3	10	4.35	656/1427	4.35	4.41	4.19	4.14	4.35
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	1	1	15	4.82	700/1447	4.82	4.75	4.69	4.70	4.82
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	0	2	8	2	4.00	849/1434	4.00	4.24	4.10	3.97	4.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	1	1	13	4.80	353/1387	4.80	4.68	4.46	4.42	4.80
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	1	1	13	4.80	784/1387	4.80	4.86	4.73	4.71	4.80
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	1	0	13	4.86	194/1386	4.86	4.51	4.32	4.24	4.86
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	1	0	4	8	4.46	699/1380	4.46	4.47	4.32	4.30	4.46
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	0	0	0	1	5	8	4.50	288/1193	4.50	3.92	4.02	4.04	4.50
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	2	2	7	4.45	420/1172	4.45	4.37	4.15	4.12	4.45
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	0	1	0	10	4.82	292/1182	4.82	4.60	4.35	4.30	4.82
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	0	0	1	0	10	4.82	316/1170	4.82	4.63	4.38	4.32	4.82
4. Were special techniques successful	6	0	0	0	2	3	6	4.36	273/ 800	4.36	4.14	4.06	4.01	4.36
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 189	****	****	4.34	4.47	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 192	****	****	4.34	4.38	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 186	****	****	4.48	4.57	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 187	****	****	4.33	4.46	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 168	****	****	4.20	4.15	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 66	****	5.00	4.58	4.43	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 62	****	4.64	4.56	4.28	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 58	****	4.57	4.41	3.79	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 65	****	4.94	4.42	4.36	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 64	****	3.96	4.09	3.70	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 38	****	4.50	4.49	2.25	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 36	****	3.00	4.25	3.25	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 28	****	4.50	4.52	****	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 30	****	4.50	4.30	****	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 27	****	4.50	4.43	****	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.72	****	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 21	****	****	4.57	****	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.64	****	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 20	****	****	4.60	****	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 15	****	****	4.61	****	****

Course-Section: POLI 250 1
 Title Intro To Public Admin
 Instructor: Hussey, Laura S.
 Enrollment: 49
 Questionnaires: 17

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 1155
 JUN 28, 2010
 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	4	Required for Majors	12	Graduate	0	Major	7
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B	9						
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	2	C	2	General	1	Under-grad	17	Non-major	10
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	2	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	0				
				?	0						

Course-Section: POLI 280 1
 Title International Relation
 Instructor: Hody,Cynthia A
 Enrollment: 53
 Questionnaires: 39

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 1156
 JUN 28, 2010
 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	2	5	7	25	4.41	709/1447	4.41	4.56	4.31	4.31	4.41
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	11	10	17	4.10	993/1447	4.10	4.43	4.27	4.23	4.10
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	4	10	24	4.46	587/1241	4.46	4.63	4.33	4.35	4.46
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	1	7	13	17	4.21	807/1402	4.21	4.40	4.24	4.24	4.21
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	6	7	25	4.44	419/1358	4.44	4.42	4.11	4.12	4.44
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	3	1	2	6	13	14	4.03	801/1316	4.03	4.41	4.14	4.08	4.03
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	6	8	24	4.41	582/1427	4.41	4.41	4.19	4.14	4.41
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	3	36	4.92	388/1447	4.92	4.75	4.69	4.70	4.92
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	9	1	1	0	6	12	10	4.03	833/1434	4.03	4.24	4.10	3.97	4.03
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	1	0	6	10	22	4.33	970/1387	4.33	4.68	4.46	4.42	4.33
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	4	34	4.85	681/1387	4.85	4.86	4.73	4.71	4.85
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	2	9	12	15	4.05	1026/1386	4.05	4.51	4.32	4.24	4.05
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	3	9	6	18	4.00	1030/1380	4.00	4.47	4.32	4.30	4.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	9	5	3	7	5	8	3.29	1035/1193	3.29	3.92	4.02	4.04	3.29
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	1	6	3	10	4.10	672/1172	4.10	4.37	4.15	4.12	4.10
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	19	0	0	0	4	2	14	4.50	553/1182	4.50	4.60	4.35	4.30	4.50
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	19	0	0	0	4	4	12	4.40	657/1170	4.40	4.63	4.38	4.32	4.40
4. Were special techniques successful	20	12	0	2	2	0	3	3.57	****/ 800	****	4.14	4.06	4.01	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	3	0.00-0.99 0	A 14	Required for Majors 24	Graduate 0 Major 20
28-55	10	1.00-1.99 0	B 15		
56-83	5	2.00-2.99 2	C 4	General 2	Under-grad 39 Non-major 19
84-150	3	3.00-3.49 10	D 0		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 11	F 0	Electives 6	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 1	
			? 1		

Course-Section: POLI 301 01
 Title Poli Research Methods
 Instructor: Forestiere,Caro
 Enrollment: 33
 Questionnaires: 26

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 1157
 JUN 28, 2010
 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	1	1	24	4.88	169/1447	4.68	4.56	4.31	4.32	4.88
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	0	5	20	4.69	315/1447	4.47	4.43	4.27	4.23	4.69
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	1	0	1	22	4.83	204/1241	4.87	4.63	4.33	4.33	4.83
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	1	0	1	1	21	4.71	270/1402	4.28	4.40	4.24	4.24	4.71
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	1	4	0	19	4.27	599/1358	3.96	4.42	4.11	4.10	4.27
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	0	1	24	4.85	107/1316	4.27	4.41	4.14	4.13	4.85
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	3	2	20	4.58	373/1427	4.24	4.41	4.19	4.15	4.58
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	1	6	19	4.69	928/1447	4.70	4.75	4.69	4.65	4.69
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	1	0	2	9	11	4.26	623/1434	4.48	4.24	4.10	4.09	4.26
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	0	0	1	0	21	4.91	200/1387	4.69	4.68	4.46	4.44	4.91
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	0	0	0	22	5.00	1/1387	5.00	4.86	4.73	4.71	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	0	0	0	4	18	4.82	241/1386	4.43	4.51	4.32	4.30	4.82
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	4	17	4.81	273/1380	4.01	4.47	4.32	4.32	4.81
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	7	0	0	0	0	4	15	4.79	112/1193	3.80	3.92	4.02	4.05	4.79
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	1	2	11	4.71	247/1172	4.45	4.37	4.15	4.24	4.71
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	12	0	0	0	0	0	14	5.00	1/1182	5.00	4.60	4.35	4.42	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	12	0	0	0	0	0	14	5.00	1/1170	4.80	4.63	4.38	4.49	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	12	4	1	0	0	1	8	4.50	195/ 800	4.07	4.14	4.06	4.12	4.50

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	9	Required for Majors	20	Graduate	0	Major	13
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	9						
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	2	C	2	General	0	Under-grad	26	Non-major	13
84-150	8	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	8	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	1						

Course-Section: POLI 301 02
 Title: Poli Research Methods
 Instructor: Forestiere,Caro
 Enrollment: 30
 Questionnaires: 22

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 1158
 JUN 28, 2010
 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	2	0	5	15	4.50	585/1447	4.68	4.56	4.31	4.32	4.50
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	3	17	4.68	327/1447	4.47	4.43	4.27	4.23	4.68
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	0	2	3	16	4.50	541/1241	4.87	4.63	4.33	4.33	4.50
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	1	4	16	4.71	259/1402	4.28	4.40	4.24	4.24	4.71
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	3	2	4	6	7	3.55	1152/1358	3.96	4.42	4.11	4.10	3.55
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	1	5	14	4.52	372/1316	4.27	4.41	4.14	4.13	4.52
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	1	3	17	4.64	310/1427	4.24	4.41	4.19	4.15	4.64
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	1	2	18	4.81	754/1447	4.70	4.75	4.69	4.65	4.81
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	1	0	0	11	6	4.17	733/1434	4.48	4.24	4.10	4.09	4.17
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	1	1	17	4.84	291/1387	4.69	4.68	4.46	4.44	4.84
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	0	0	19	5.00	1/1387	5.00	4.86	4.73	4.71	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	0	2	17	4.89	147/1386	4.43	4.51	4.32	4.30	4.89
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	1	3	15	4.74	366/1380	4.01	4.47	4.32	4.32	4.74
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	5	0	0	2	4	8	4.43	358/1193	3.80	3.92	4.02	4.05	4.43
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	0	5	6	4.55	355/1172	4.45	4.37	4.15	4.24	4.55
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	11	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1182	5.00	4.60	4.35	4.42	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	11	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1170	4.80	4.63	4.38	4.49	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	11	3	0	2	1	1	4	3.88	527/ 800	4.07	4.14	4.06	4.12	3.88

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	1	A	15	Required for Majors	20	Graduate	0	Major	13
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	3						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	3	C	1	General	0	Under-grad	22	Non-major	9
84-150	12	3.00-3.49	5	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	7	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	2						

Course-Section: POLI 301 03
 Title Poli Research Methods
 Instructor: Dasgupta, Sunil (Instr. A)
 Enrollment: 5
 Questionnaires: 3

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 1159
 JUN 28, 2010
 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	1	2	4.67	408/1447	4.68	4.56	4.31	4.32	4.67
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	766/1447	4.47	4.43	4.27	4.23	4.33
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1241	4.87	4.63	4.33	4.33	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	976/1402	4.28	4.40	4.24	4.24	4.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	799/1358	3.96	4.42	4.11	4.10	4.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	812/1316	4.27	4.41	4.14	4.13	4.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	971/1427	4.24	4.41	4.19	4.15	4.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	958/1447	4.70	4.75	4.69	4.65	4.67
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1434	4.48	4.24	4.10	4.09	5.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1387	4.69	4.68	4.46	4.44	4.50
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1387	5.00	4.86	4.73	4.71	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	1047/1386	4.43	4.51	4.32	4.30	4.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	659/1380	4.01	4.47	4.32	4.32	3.25
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1193	3.80	3.92	4.02	4.05	3.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	521/1172	4.45	4.37	4.15	4.24	4.33
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1182	5.00	4.60	4.35	4.42	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	480/1170	4.80	4.63	4.38	4.49	4.67
4. Were special techniques successful	0	1	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	423/ 800	4.07	4.14	4.06	4.12	4.00
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	23/ 38	4.50	4.50	4.49	4.73	4.50
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	1	0	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	33/ 36	3.00	3.00	4.25	3.81	3.00
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	18/ 28	4.50	4.50	4.52	4.46	4.50
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	10/ 30	4.50	4.50	4.30	4.42	4.50
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	14/ 27	4.50	4.50	4.43	4.50	4.50

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	

00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	0	Required for Majors	3	Graduate	0	Major	2
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	2						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	3	Non-major	1
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	1	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				
				?	1						

Course-Section: POLI 301 03
 Title Poli Research Methods
 Instructor: (Instr. B)
 Enrollment: 5
 Questionnaires: 3

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 1160
 JUN 28, 2010
 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	1	2	4.67	408/1447	4.68	4.56	4.31	4.32	4.67
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	766/1447	4.47	4.43	4.27	4.23	4.33
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1241	4.87	4.63	4.33	4.33	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	976/1402	4.28	4.40	4.24	4.24	4.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	799/1358	3.96	4.42	4.11	4.10	4.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	812/1316	4.27	4.41	4.14	4.13	4.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	971/1427	4.24	4.41	4.19	4.15	4.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	958/1447	4.70	4.75	4.69	4.65	4.67
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1176/1387	4.69	4.68	4.46	4.44	4.50
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1047/1386	4.43	4.51	4.32	4.30	4.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	1371/1380	4.01	4.47	4.32	4.32	3.25
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	521/1172	4.45	4.37	4.15	4.24	4.33
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1182	5.00	4.60	4.35	4.42	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	480/1170	4.80	4.63	4.38	4.49	4.67
4. Were special techniques successful	0	1	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	423/ 800	4.07	4.14	4.06	4.12	4.00
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	23/ 38	4.50	4.50	4.49	4.73	4.50
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	1	0	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	33/ 36	3.00	3.00	4.25	3.81	3.00
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	18/ 28	4.50	4.50	4.52	4.46	4.50
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	10/ 30	4.50	4.50	4.30	4.42	4.50
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	14/ 27	4.50	4.50	4.43	4.50	4.50

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	2
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	0	C	0
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	1	D	0
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	0	F	0
				P	0
				I	0
				?	1

			Required for Majors	3	Graduate
			General	0	Under-grad
			Electives	0	3
			Other	0	Non-major
					1
#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant					

Course-Section: POLI 301 03
 Title Poli Research Methods
 Instructor: (Instr. C)
 Enrollment: 5
 Questionnaires: 3

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 1161
 JUN 28, 2010
 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	1	2	4.67	408/1447	4.68	4.56	4.31	4.32	4.67
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	766/1447	4.47	4.43	4.27	4.23	4.33
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1241	4.87	4.63	4.33	4.33	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	976/1402	4.28	4.40	4.24	4.24	4.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	799/1358	3.96	4.42	4.11	4.10	4.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	812/1316	4.27	4.41	4.14	4.13	4.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	971/1427	4.24	4.41	4.19	4.15	4.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	958/1447	4.70	4.75	4.69	4.65	4.67
Lecture														
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	1188/1193	3.80	3.92	4.02	4.05	3.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	521/1172	4.45	4.37	4.15	4.24	4.33
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1182	5.00	4.60	4.35	4.42	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	480/1170	4.80	4.63	4.38	4.49	4.67
4. Were special techniques successful	0	1	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	423/ 800	4.07	4.14	4.06	4.12	4.00
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	23/ 38	4.50	4.50	4.49	4.73	4.50
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	1	0	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	33/ 36	3.00	3.00	4.25	3.81	3.00
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	18/ 28	4.50	4.50	4.52	4.46	4.50
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	10/ 30	4.50	4.50	4.30	4.42	4.50
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	14/ 27	4.50	4.50	4.43	4.50	4.50

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: POLI 309 01
 Title Selected Topics In Pol
 Instructor: Sawyer, John P
 Enrollment: 15
 Questionnaires: 8

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 1162
 JUN 28, 2010
 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	1	1	2	4	4.13	989/1447	4.13	4.56	4.31	4.32	4.13
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	2	3	3.88	1161/1447	3.88	4.43	4.27	4.23	3.88
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	1	1	2	2	3.83	1034/1241	3.83	4.63	4.33	4.33	3.83
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	0	1	2	4	4.00	976/1402	4.00	4.40	4.24	4.24	4.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	2	2	3	4.14	709/1358	4.14	4.42	4.11	4.10	4.14
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	3	4	4.38	519/1316	4.38	4.41	4.14	4.13	4.38
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	1	2	4	4.13	898/1427	4.13	4.41	4.19	4.15	4.13
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	565/1447	4.88	4.75	4.69	4.65	4.88
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	1	5	2	4.13	775/1434	4.13	4.24	4.10	4.09	4.13
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	429/1387	4.75	4.68	4.46	4.44	4.75
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	604/1387	4.88	4.86	4.73	4.71	4.88
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	2	1	5	4.38	775/1386	4.38	4.51	4.32	4.30	4.38
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	2	5	4.50	659/1380	4.50	4.47	4.32	4.32	4.50
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	1	3	4	4.38	395/1193	4.38	3.92	4.02	4.05	4.38
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	4	3	4.25	580/1172	4.25	4.37	4.15	4.24	4.25
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	229/1182	4.88	4.60	4.35	4.42	4.88
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	390/1170	4.75	4.63	4.38	4.49	4.75
4. Were special techniques successful	0	2	1	1	0	0	4	3.83	547/ 800	3.83	4.14	4.06	4.12	3.83

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: POLI 320 1
 Title Amer Political Thought
 Instructor: Carter,John
 Enrollment: 32
 Questionnaires: 18

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 1163
 JUN 28, 2010
 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	1	0	2	3	12	4.39	742/1447	4.39	4.56	4.31	4.32	4.39
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	0	2	4	11	4.33	766/1447	4.33	4.43	4.27	4.23	4.33
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	2	3	12	4.44	611/1241	4.44	4.63	4.33	4.33	4.44	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	2	0	3	12	4.47	530/1402	4.47	4.40	4.24	4.24	4.47
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	1	16	4.83	122/1358	4.83	4.42	4.11	4.10	4.83
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	1	2	2	12	4.28	599/1316	4.28	4.41	4.14	4.13	4.28
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	4	1	6	7	3.89	1090/1427	3.89	4.41	4.19	4.15	3.89
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	1	0	12	4	4.12	1326/1447	4.12	4.75	4.69	4.65	4.12
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	1	0	2	6	5	4.00	849/1434	4.00	4.24	4.10	4.09	4.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	1	1	2	14	4.61	641/1387	4.61	4.68	4.46	4.44	4.61
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	1	16	4.83	707/1387	4.83	4.86	4.73	4.71	4.83
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	1	0	3	14	4.67	431/1386	4.67	4.51	4.32	4.30	4.67
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	1	2	14	4.56	604/1380	4.56	4.47	4.32	4.32	4.56
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	0	4	0	1	4	7	3.63	916/1193	3.63	3.92	4.02	4.05	3.63
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	1	0	0	4	9	4.43	445/1172	4.43	4.37	4.15	4.24	4.43
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	0	0	5	9	4.64	450/1182	4.64	4.60	4.35	4.42	4.64
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	0	1	3	10	4.64	494/1170	4.64	4.63	4.38	4.49	4.64
4. Were special techniques successful	4	1	0	0	3	2	8	4.38	261/ 800	4.38	4.14	4.06	4.12	4.38
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 189	****	****	4.34	4.26	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 192	****	****	4.34	4.20	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 186	****	****	4.48	4.36	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 187	****	****	4.33	4.11	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 168	****	****	4.20	4.02	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 66	****	5.00	4.58	4.17	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 62	****	4.64	4.56	4.21	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 58	****	4.57	4.41	2.87	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 65	****	4.94	4.42	4.01	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 64	****	3.96	4.09	3.38	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 38	****	4.50	4.49	4.73	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 36	****	3.00	4.25	3.81	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 28	****	4.50	4.52	4.46	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 30	****	4.50	4.30	4.42	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 27	****	4.50	4.43	4.50	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.72	5.00	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 21	****	****	4.57	5.00	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.64	5.00	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 20	****	****	4.60	5.00	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 15	****	****	4.61	5.00	****

Course-Section: POLI 320 1
 Title Amer Political Thought
 Instructor: Carter, John
 Enrollment: 32
 Questionnaires: 18

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 1163
 JUN 28, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	11	Required for Majors	7	Graduate	0	Major	15
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	3						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	4	C	2	General	1	Under-grad	18	Non-major	3
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	4	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	1				
				?	0						

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	2	3	13	4.61	463/1447	4.61	4.56	4.31	4.32	4.61
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	5	11	4.50	532/1447	4.50	4.43	4.27	4.23	4.50
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	6	11	4.56	496/1241	4.56	4.63	4.33	4.33	4.56
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	4	12	4.56	437/1402	4.56	4.40	4.24	4.24	4.56
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	7	9	4.39	474/1358	4.39	4.42	4.11	4.10	4.39
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	1	15	4.72	188/1316	4.72	4.41	4.14	4.13	4.72
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	2	15	4.78	181/1427	4.78	4.41	4.19	4.15	4.78
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	4	14	4.78	803/1447	4.78	4.75	4.69	4.65	4.78
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	1	1	6	6	4.21	679/1434	4.21	4.24	4.10	4.09	4.21
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	1	17	4.94	120/1387	4.94	4.68	4.46	4.44	4.94
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	17	4.94	317/1387	4.94	4.86	4.73	4.71	4.94
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	5	13	4.72	353/1386	4.72	4.51	4.32	4.30	4.72
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	4	13	4.67	463/1380	4.67	4.47	4.32	4.32	4.67
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	2	0	0	5	6	5	4.00	652/1193	4.00	3.92	4.02	4.05	4.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	1	0	0	1	12	4.64	295/1172	4.64	4.37	4.15	4.24	4.64
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	1	0	1	12	4.71	382/1182	4.71	4.60	4.35	4.42	4.71
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	0	0	1	13	4.93	178/1170	4.93	4.63	4.38	4.49	4.93
4. Were special techniques successful	4	5	0	0	0	4	5	4.56	177/ 800	4.56	4.14	4.06	4.12	4.56
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 189	****	****	4.34	4.26	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 192	****	****	4.34	4.20	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 186	****	****	4.48	4.36	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 187	****	****	4.33	4.11	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 168	****	****	4.20	4.02	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 66	****	5.00	4.58	4.17	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 62	****	4.64	4.56	4.21	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 58	****	4.57	4.41	2.87	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 65	****	4.94	4.42	4.01	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 64	****	3.96	4.09	3.38	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 38	****	4.50	4.49	4.73	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 36	****	3.00	4.25	3.81	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 28	****	4.50	4.52	4.46	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 30	****	4.50	4.30	4.42	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 27	****	4.50	4.43	4.50	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.72	5.00	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 21	****	****	4.57	5.00	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.64	5.00	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 20	****	****	4.60	5.00	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 15	****	****	4.61	5.00	****

Course-Section: POLI 350 1
 Title Policy-Making Process
 Instructor: Hussey, Laura S.
 Enrollment: 28
 Questionnaires: 18

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 1164
 JUN 28, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	5	Required for Majors	14	Graduate	0	Major	14
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	10						
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	1	C	1	General	1	Under-grad	18	Non-major	4
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	5	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	0				
				?	0						

Course-Section: POLI 352 1
 Title Administrative Law
 Instructor: Miller, Kerwin
 Enrollment: 35
 Questionnaires: 21

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 1165
 JUN 28, 2010
 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	6	12	4.40	723/1447	4.40	4.56	4.31	4.32	4.40
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	7	13	4.65	364/1447	4.65	4.43	4.27	4.23	4.65
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	3	17	4.85	186/1241	4.85	4.63	4.33	4.33	4.85
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	7	0	0	0	4	9	4.69	281/1402	4.69	4.40	4.24	4.24	4.69
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	1	4	14	4.68	223/1358	4.68	4.42	4.11	4.10	4.68
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	6	0	0	0	3	10	4.77	158/1316	4.77	4.41	4.14	4.13	4.77
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	0	0	4	15	4.79	172/1427	4.79	4.41	4.19	4.15	4.79
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	1	18	4.95	291/1447	4.95	4.75	4.69	4.65	4.95
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	1	1	0	0	10	3	4.00	849/1434	4.00	4.24	4.10	4.09	4.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	0	0	18	5.00	1/1387	5.00	4.68	4.46	4.44	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	0	1	17	4.94	317/1387	4.94	4.86	4.73	4.71	4.94
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	0	2	16	4.89	159/1386	4.89	4.51	4.32	4.30	4.89
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	2	16	4.89	181/1380	4.89	4.47	4.32	4.32	4.89
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	2	0	0	2	3	10	4.53	268/1193	4.53	3.92	4.02	4.05	4.53
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	12	0	1	0	3	2	3	3.67	925/1172	3.67	4.37	4.15	4.24	3.67
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	13	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	229/1182	4.88	4.60	4.35	4.42	4.88
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	12	0	0	0	1	0	8	4.78	364/1170	4.78	4.63	4.38	4.49	4.78
4. Were special techniques successful	12	2	0	1	3	0	3	3.71	596/ 800	3.71	4.14	4.06	4.12	3.71
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 189	****	****	4.34	4.26	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 192	****	****	4.34	4.20	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 186	****	****	4.48	4.36	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 187	****	****	4.33	4.11	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 168	****	****	4.20	4.02	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 66	****	5.00	4.58	4.17	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 62	****	4.64	4.56	4.21	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 58	****	4.57	4.41	2.87	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 65	****	4.94	4.42	4.01	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 64	****	3.96	4.09	3.38	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 38	****	4.50	4.49	4.73	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 36	****	3.00	4.25	3.81	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 28	****	4.50	4.52	4.46	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 30	****	4.50	4.30	4.42	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 27	****	4.50	4.43	4.50	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.72	5.00	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 21	****	****	4.57	5.00	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.64	5.00	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 20	****	****	4.60	5.00	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 15	****	****	4.61	5.00	****

Course-Section: POLI 352 1
 Title Administrative Law
 Instructor: Miller, Kerwin
 Enrollment: 35
 Questionnaires: 21

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 1165
 JUN 28, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	2	0.00-0.99 1	A 12	Required for Majors 9	Graduate 0 Major 12
28-55	1	1.00-1.99 0	B 4		
56-83	1	2.00-2.99 2	C 2	General 2	Under-grad 21 Non-major 9
84-150	6	3.00-3.49 2	D 0		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 7	F 0	Electives 4	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 1	
			? 1		

Course-Section: POLI 360 1
 Title Comprtive Poli Analysi
 Instructor: Grodsky, Brian
 Enrollment: 29
 Questionnaires: 29

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 1166
 JUN 28, 2010
 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	0	0	5	19	4.79	265/1447	4.72	4.56	4.31	4.32	4.79
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	5	0	0	0	0	5	19	4.79	206/1447	4.60	4.43	4.27	4.23	4.79
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	5	14	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1241	4.80	4.63	4.33	4.33	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	5	0	0	0	1	5	18	4.71	270/1402	4.65	4.40	4.24	4.24	4.71
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	3	21	4.88	102/1358	4.82	4.42	4.11	4.10	4.88
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	2	22	4.92	68/1316	4.80	4.41	4.14	4.13	4.92
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	6	0	0	0	1	6	16	4.65	292/1427	4.41	4.41	4.19	4.15	4.65
8. How many times was class cancelled	5	0	0	0	0	1	23	4.96	243/1447	4.98	4.75	4.69	4.65	4.96
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	10	0	0	0	0	7	12	4.63	254/1434	4.39	4.24	4.10	4.09	4.63
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	5	0	0	0	0	4	20	4.83	307/1387	4.77	4.68	4.46	4.44	4.83
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	5	0	0	0	0	1	23	4.96	264/1387	4.89	4.86	4.73	4.71	4.96
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	5	0	0	0	0	5	19	4.79	265/1386	4.63	4.51	4.32	4.30	4.79
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	1	1	22	4.88	193/1380	4.75	4.47	4.32	4.32	4.88
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	7	0	1	1	4	7	9	4.00	652/1193	4.03	3.92	4.02	4.05	4.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	0	3	18	4.86	152/1172	4.86	4.37	4.15	4.24	4.86
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	0	0	0	3	18	4.86	250/1182	4.75	4.60	4.35	4.42	4.86
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	0	0	0	2	19	4.90	223/1170	4.85	4.63	4.38	4.49	4.90
4. Were special techniques successful	8	0	0	0	4	5	12	4.38	261/ 800	4.40	4.14	4.06	4.12	4.38
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	27	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 189	****	****	4.34	4.26	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	27	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 192	****	****	4.34	4.20	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	27	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 186	****	****	4.48	4.36	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	27	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 187	****	****	4.33	4.11	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	27	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 168	****	****	4.20	4.02	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	26	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 66	****	5.00	4.58	4.17	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	26	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 62	****	4.64	4.56	4.21	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	26	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 58	****	4.57	4.41	2.87	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	26	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 65	****	4.94	4.42	4.01	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	26	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 64	****	3.96	4.09	3.38	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	27	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 38	****	4.50	4.49	4.73	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	27	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 36	****	3.00	4.25	3.81	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	27	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 28	****	4.50	4.52	4.46	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	27	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 30	****	4.50	4.30	4.42	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	27	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 27	****	4.50	4.43	4.50	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	26	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 31	****	****	4.72	5.00	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	26	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 21	****	****	4.57	5.00	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	26	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 31	****	****	4.64	5.00	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	26	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 20	****	****	4.60	5.00	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	26	2	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 15	****	****	4.61	5.00	****

Course-Section: POLI 360 1
 Title: Comprtive Poli Analsi
 Instructor: Grodsky, Brian
 Enrollment: 29
 Questionnaires: 29

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 1166
 JUN 28, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	6	Required for Majors	13	Graduate	0	Major	17
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	1	B	11						
56-83	5	2.00-2.99	4	C	2	General	2	Under-grad	29	Non-major	12
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	3	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	0						

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	6	11	4.65	430/1447	4.72	4.56	4.31	4.32	4.65
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	6	9	4.41	662/1447	4.60	4.43	4.27	4.23	4.41
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	12	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	451/1241	4.80	4.63	4.33	4.33	4.60
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	5	11	4.59	402/1402	4.65	4.40	4.24	4.24	4.59
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	2	14	4.76	165/1358	4.82	4.42	4.11	4.10	4.76
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	0	5	11	4.69	221/1316	4.80	4.41	4.14	4.13	4.69
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	2	7	7	4.18	858/1427	4.41	4.41	4.19	4.15	4.18
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	17	5.00	1/1447	4.98	4.75	4.69	4.65	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	3	5	5	4.15	744/1434	4.39	4.24	4.10	4.09	4.15
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	3	13	4.71	506/1387	4.77	4.68	4.46	4.44	4.71
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	3	14	4.82	732/1387	4.89	4.86	4.73	4.71	4.82
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	2	5	10	4.47	649/1386	4.63	4.51	4.32	4.30	4.47
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	4	11	4.63	520/1380	4.75	4.47	4.32	4.32	4.63
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	1	3	7	6	4.06	632/1193	4.03	3.92	4.02	4.05	4.06
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	2	12	4.86	152/1172	4.86	4.37	4.15	4.24	4.86
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	2	1	11	4.64	450/1182	4.75	4.60	4.35	4.42	4.64
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	1	1	12	4.79	352/1170	4.85	4.63	4.38	4.49	4.79
4. Were special techniques successful	3	0	1	0	1	2	10	4.43	239/ 800	4.40	4.14	4.06	4.12	4.43
Laboratory														
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	16	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 192	****	****	4.34	4.20	****
Seminar														
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 65	****	4.94	4.42	4.01	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 38	****	4.50	4.49	4.73	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	16	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 36	****	3.00	4.25	3.81	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	16	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 28	****	4.50	4.52	4.46	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	16	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 30	****	4.50	4.30	4.42	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	16	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 27	****	4.50	4.43	4.50	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	16	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.72	5.00	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	16	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.64	5.00	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	7	Required for Majors	12	Graduate	0	Major	12
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	8						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	1	C	1	General	3	Under-grad	17	Non-major	5
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	1	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	0				
				?	0						

Course-Section: POLI 385 01
 Title International Security
 Instructor: Hagerty, Devin T
 Enrollment: 25
 Questionnaires: 20

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 1168
 JUN 28, 2010
 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	2	18	4.90	148/1447	4.90	4.56	4.31	4.32	4.90
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	7	12	4.55	479/1447	4.55	4.43	4.27	4.23	4.55
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	17	4.85	186/1241	4.85	4.63	4.33	4.33	4.85
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	9	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	93/1402	4.91	4.40	4.24	4.24	4.91
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	1	0	3	15	4.50	345/1358	4.50	4.42	4.11	4.10	4.50
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	13	1	0	0	0	6	4.43	476/1316	4.43	4.41	4.14	4.13	4.43
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	4	15	4.70	256/1427	4.70	4.41	4.19	4.15	4.70
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	1	11	8	4.35	1189/1447	4.35	4.75	4.69	4.65	4.35
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	1	4	15	4.70	206/1434	4.70	4.24	4.10	4.09	4.70
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	0	1	17	4.94	120/1387	4.94	4.68	4.46	4.44	4.94
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	1	17	4.94	317/1387	4.94	4.86	4.73	4.71	4.94
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	0	3	15	4.83	217/1386	4.83	4.51	4.32	4.30	4.83
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	2	16	4.89	181/1380	4.89	4.47	4.32	4.32	4.89
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	3	2	1	1	5	5	3.71	867/1193	3.71	3.92	4.02	4.05	3.71
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1172	5.00	4.37	4.15	4.24	5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	13	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	250/1182	4.86	4.60	4.35	4.42	4.86
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	13	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	275/1170	4.86	4.63	4.38	4.49	4.86
4. Were special techniques successful	13	3	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	****/ 800	****	4.14	4.06	4.12	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 189	****	****	4.34	4.26	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 192	****	****	4.34	4.20	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 186	****	****	4.48	4.36	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 187	****	****	4.33	4.11	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 168	****	****	4.20	4.02	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	18	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 66	****	5.00	4.58	4.17	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	18	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 62	****	4.64	4.56	4.21	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 58	****	4.57	4.41	2.87	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 65	****	4.94	4.42	4.01	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	18	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 64	****	3.96	4.09	3.38	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 38	****	4.50	4.49	4.73	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 36	****	3.00	4.25	3.81	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 28	****	4.50	4.52	4.46	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	18	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 30	****	4.50	4.30	4.42	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 27	****	4.50	4.43	4.50	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.72	5.00	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 21	****	****	4.57	5.00	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.64	5.00	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 20	****	****	4.60	5.00	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	18	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 15	****	****	4.61	5.00	****

Course-Section: POLI 385 01
 Title International Security
 Instructor: Hagerty, Devin T
 Enrollment: 25
 Questionnaires: 20

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 1168
 JUN 28, 2010
 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	7	Required for Majors	10	Graduate	0	Major	12
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	11						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	2	C	2	General	1	Under-grad	20	Non-major	8
84-150	10	3.00-3.49	6	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	7	F	0	Electives	4	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	1				
				?	0						

Course-Section: POLI 388 01
 Title Internatl Confl & Coop
 Instructor: Miller, Nicholas
 Enrollment: 36
 Questionnaires: 22

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 1169
 JUN 28, 2010
 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	9	12	4.57	507/1447	4.57	4.56	4.31	4.32	4.57
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	2	5	14	4.57	457/1447	4.57	4.43	4.27	4.23	4.57
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	1	1	4	15	4.57	478/1241	4.57	4.63	4.33	4.33	4.57
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	1	3	4	13	4.38	635/1402	4.38	4.40	4.24	4.24	4.38
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	2	0	1	7	11	4.19	663/1358	4.19	4.42	4.11	4.10	4.19
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	2	7	12	4.48	423/1316	4.48	4.41	4.14	4.13	4.48
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	1	3	4	13	4.38	620/1427	4.38	4.41	4.19	4.15	4.38
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	3	18	4.86	619/1447	4.86	4.75	4.69	4.65	4.86
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	1	1	0	2	6	7	4.13	775/1434	4.13	4.24	4.10	4.09	4.13
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	0	2	18	4.90	200/1387	4.90	4.68	4.46	4.44	4.90
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	2	18	4.90	528/1387	4.90	4.86	4.73	4.71	4.90
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	2	5	13	4.55	558/1386	4.55	4.51	4.32	4.30	4.55
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	3	3	13	4.53	637/1380	4.53	4.47	4.32	4.32	4.53
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	1	1	0	1	3	13	4.50	288/1193	4.50	3.92	4.02	4.05	4.50
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	1	1	2	6	4.30	546/1172	4.30	4.37	4.15	4.24	4.30
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	12	0	1	0	0	1	8	4.50	553/1182	4.50	4.60	4.35	4.42	4.50
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	12	0	0	1	0	0	9	4.70	459/1170	4.70	4.63	4.38	4.49	4.70
4. Were special techniques successful	12	3	2	0	0	0	5	3.86	537/ 800	3.86	4.14	4.06	4.12	3.86

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors		
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 3	Required for Majors 9	Graduate 0	Major 13
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B 8			
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	2	C 3	General 1	Under-grad 22	Non-major 9
84-150	9	3.00-3.49	6	D 0			
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F 0	Electives 5	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	
				P 1			
				I 0	Other 2		
				? 2			

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	20	4.95	74/1447	4.95	4.56	4.31	4.32	4.95
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	3	18	4.86	154/1447	4.86	4.43	4.27	4.23	4.86
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	2	19	4.90	141/1241	4.90	4.63	4.33	4.33	4.90
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	2	19	4.90	93/1402	4.90	4.40	4.24	4.24	4.90
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	2	19	4.90	87/1358	4.90	4.42	4.11	4.10	4.90
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	1	0	0	1	2	17	4.80	128/1316	4.80	4.41	4.14	4.13	4.80
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	1	2	1	17	4.62	328/1427	4.62	4.41	4.19	4.15	4.62
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	2	19	4.90	485/1447	4.90	4.75	4.69	4.65	4.90
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	0	4	15	4.79	133/1434	4.79	4.24	4.10	4.09	4.79
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	0	1	18	4.95	120/1387	4.95	4.68	4.46	4.44	4.95
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	0	0	0	18	5.00	1/1387	5.00	4.86	4.73	4.71	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	0	1	18	4.95	82/1386	4.95	4.51	4.32	4.30	4.95
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	1	18	4.95	95/1380	4.95	4.47	4.32	4.32	4.95
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	6	1	0	2	1	9	4.31	440/1193	4.31	3.92	4.02	4.05	4.31
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	124/1172	4.91	4.37	4.15	4.24	4.91
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	11	0	0	0	1	0	10	4.82	292/1182	4.82	4.60	4.35	4.42	4.82
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	11	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1170	5.00	4.63	4.38	4.49	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	11	2	0	0	0	3	6	4.67	133/ 800	4.67	4.14	4.06	4.12	4.67
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 189	****	****	4.34	4.26	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 192	****	****	4.34	4.20	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 186	****	****	4.48	4.36	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 187	****	****	4.33	4.11	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 168	****	****	4.20	4.02	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 66	****	5.00	4.58	4.17	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 62	****	4.64	4.56	4.21	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 58	****	4.57	4.41	2.87	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 65	****	4.94	4.42	4.01	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 64	****	3.96	4.09	3.38	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 38	****	4.50	4.49	4.73	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 36	****	3.00	4.25	3.81	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 28	****	4.50	4.52	4.46	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 30	****	4.50	4.30	4.42	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 27	****	4.50	4.43	4.50	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.72	5.00	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 21	****	****	4.57	5.00	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.64	5.00	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 20	****	****	4.60	5.00	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 15	****	****	4.61	5.00	****

Course-Section: POLI 390 01
 Title American Foreign Polic
 Instructor: Starkey, Brigid
 Enrollment: 30
 Questionnaires: 22

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 1170
 JUN 28, 2010
 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	10	Required for Majors	13	Graduate	0	Major	13
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	6						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	3	C	0	General	2	Under-grad	22	Non-major	9
84-150	9	3.00-3.49	5	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	0				
				?	0						

Course-Section: POLI 395 01
 Title U.S. Nat'l Security Po
 Instructor: Dasgupta,Sunil
 Enrollment: 10
 Questionnaires: 10

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 1171
 JUN 28, 2010
 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	5	4.50	585/1447	4.50	4.56	4.31	4.32	4.50
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	0	2	1	1	4	3.88	1161/1447	3.88	4.43	4.27	4.23	3.88
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	4	0	0	1	3	4.75	282/1241	4.75	4.63	4.33	4.33	4.75	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	1	0	1	2	1	3	3.86	1107/1402	3.86	4.40	4.24	4.24	3.86
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	201/1358	4.71	4.42	4.11	4.10	4.71
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	1	2	4	4.43	476/1316	4.43	4.41	4.14	4.13	4.43
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	3	0	1	0	3	3	0	3.14	1351/1427	3.14	4.41	4.19	4.15	3.14
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	619/1447	4.86	4.75	4.69	4.65	4.86
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	1	1	4	2	3.88	1003/1434	3.88	4.24	4.10	4.09	3.88
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	2	2	4	4.25	1039/1387	4.25	4.68	4.46	4.44	4.25
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1387	5.00	4.86	4.73	4.71	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	1	4	3	4.25	879/1386	4.25	4.51	4.32	4.30	4.25
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	2	1	5	4.38	783/1380	4.38	4.47	4.32	4.32	4.38
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	6	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/1193	****	3.92	4.02	4.05	****
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	1	2	5	4.50	377/1172	4.50	4.37	4.15	4.24	4.50
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	1	1	6	4.63	470/1182	4.63	4.60	4.35	4.42	4.63
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	1	1	1	4	4.14	827/1170	4.14	4.63	4.38	4.49	4.14
4. Were special techniques successful	3	4	0	1	1	0	1	3.33	701/ 800	3.33	4.14	4.06	4.12	3.33
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 66	****	5.00	4.58	4.17	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	9	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 62	****	4.64	4.56	4.21	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 58	****	4.57	4.41	2.87	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 65	****	4.94	4.42	4.01	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	9	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 64	****	3.96	4.09	3.38	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors				
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 3	Required for Majors	2	Graduate	0	Major	8
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	B 3						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	C 0	General	4	Under-grad	10	Non-major	2
84-150	0	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	0				
			? 1						

Course-Section: POLI 401 08
 Title Individual Study In Po
 Instructor: Lanoue,George R
 Enrollment: 1
 Questionnaires: 1

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 1172
 JUN 28, 2010
 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	1	5.00	1/1447	4.85	4.56	4.31	4.43	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1447	4.73	4.43	4.27	4.31	5.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1241	5.00	4.63	4.33	4.41	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1402	4.38	4.40	4.24	4.34	5.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1358	4.36	4.42	4.11	4.15	5.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1316	4.50	4.41	4.14	4.27	5.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1427	4.68	4.41	4.19	4.20	5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1447	4.96	4.75	4.69	4.72	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	849/1434	4.06	4.24	4.10	4.17	4.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1176/1387	4.19	4.68	4.46	4.48	4.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1387	4.94	4.86	4.73	4.76	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1047/1386	4.38	4.51	4.32	4.34	4.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1030/1380	4.38	4.47	4.32	4.34	4.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	652/1193	4.00	3.92	4.02	4.00	4.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1172	4.71	4.37	4.15	4.25	5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1182	4.93	4.60	4.35	4.49	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1170	5.00	4.63	4.38	4.51	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	423/ 800	3.90	4.14	4.06	4.19	4.00

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	0	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	1						
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	0	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	0						

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	2	0	11	4.69	375/1447	4.85	4.56	4.31	4.43	4.69
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	0	10	4.46	590/1447	4.73	4.43	4.27	4.31	4.46
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	11	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1241	5.00	4.63	4.33	4.41	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	5	0	1	2	3	2	3.75	1163/1402	4.38	4.40	4.24	4.34	3.75
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	6	1	1	1	0	4	3.71	1050/1358	4.36	4.42	4.11	4.15	3.71
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	4	0	0	4	1	4	4.00	812/1316	4.50	4.41	4.14	4.27	4.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	2	0	1	1	2	7	4.36	644/1427	4.68	4.41	4.19	4.20	4.36
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	12	4.92	388/1447	4.96	4.75	4.69	4.72	4.92
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	1	0	0	1	5	2	4.13	775/1434	4.06	4.24	4.10	4.17	4.13
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	5	0	0	1	0	2	5	4.38	931/1387	4.19	4.68	4.46	4.48	4.38
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	5	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	604/1387	4.94	4.86	4.73	4.76	4.88
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	5	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	316/1386	4.38	4.51	4.32	4.34	4.75
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	339/1380	4.38	4.47	4.32	4.34	4.75
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	6	4	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/1193	4.00	3.92	4.02	4.00	****
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	1	2	4	4.43	445/1172	4.71	4.37	4.15	4.25	4.43
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	250/1182	4.93	4.60	4.35	4.49	4.86
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1170	5.00	4.63	4.38	4.51	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	6	2	1	0	0	2	2	3.80	562/ 800	3.90	4.14	4.06	4.19	3.80
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 38	****	4.50	4.49	4.68	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	10	0	1	0	0	2	0	3.00	****/ 36	****	3.00	4.25	4.42	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	10	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 28	****	4.50	4.52	4.72	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	10	2	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 27	****	4.50	4.43	4.62	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	12	Required for Majors	5	Graduate	0	Major	8
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	0						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	1	Under-grad	13	Non-major	5
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	6	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	0						

Course-Section: POLI 409 01
 Title Selected Topics Poli S
 Instructor: Forestiere,Caro
 Enrollment: 11
 Questionnaires: 10

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 1174
 JUN 28, 2010
 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	2	2	6	4.40	723/1447	4.68	4.56	4.31	4.43	4.40
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	2	6	4.40	677/1447	4.52	4.43	4.27	4.31	4.40
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	6	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1241	4.87	4.63	4.33	4.41	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	259/1402	4.82	4.40	4.24	4.34	4.71
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	1	0	4	4	4.22	635/1358	4.32	4.42	4.11	4.15	4.22
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	2	7	4.60	292/1316	4.66	4.41	4.14	4.27	4.60
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	7	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	680/1427	4.41	4.41	4.19	4.20	4.33
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	1	0	0	9	4.70	928/1447	4.63	4.75	4.69	4.72	4.70
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	3	7	4.70	206/1434	4.34	4.24	4.10	4.17	4.70
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	3	6	4.67	566/1387	4.72	4.68	4.46	4.48	4.67
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1387	4.95	4.86	4.73	4.76	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1386	4.83	4.51	4.32	4.34	5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	312/1380	4.78	4.47	4.32	4.34	4.78
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	8	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1193	3.50	3.92	4.02	4.00	****
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	377/1172	4.80	4.37	4.15	4.25	4.50
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1182	4.93	4.60	4.35	4.49	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1170	4.93	4.63	4.38	4.51	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	6	1	1	0	0	0	2	3.67	612/ 800	4.33	4.14	4.06	4.19	3.67

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: POLI 409 02
 Title Selected Topics Poli S
 Instructor: Snyder,Quddus Z
 Enrollment: 17
 Questionnaires: 15

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 1175
 JUN 28, 2010
 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	2	13	4.87	190/1447	4.68	4.56	4.31	4.43	4.87
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	0	3	11	4.60	426/1447	4.52	4.43	4.27	4.31	4.60
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	1	12	4.60	451/1241	4.87	4.63	4.33	4.41	4.60
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	2	12	4.73	238/1402	4.82	4.40	4.24	4.34	4.73
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	4	11	4.73	187/1358	4.32	4.42	4.11	4.15	4.73
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	3	12	4.80	128/1316	4.66	4.41	4.14	4.27	4.80
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	1	4	9	4.40	596/1427	4.41	4.41	4.19	4.20	4.40
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	12	3	4.20	1286/1447	4.63	4.75	4.69	4.72	4.20
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	1	1	0	1	5	5	4.08	807/1434	4.34	4.24	4.10	4.17	4.08
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	2	3	9	4.50	798/1387	4.72	4.68	4.46	4.48	4.50
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	2	12	4.86	656/1387	4.95	4.86	4.73	4.76	4.86
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	1	0	4	9	4.50	607/1386	4.83	4.51	4.32	4.34	4.50
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	0	3	10	4.57	582/1380	4.78	4.47	4.32	4.34	4.57
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	1	1	1	2	7	1	3.50	960/1193	3.50	3.92	4.02	4.00	3.50
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	124/1172	4.80	4.37	4.15	4.25	4.90
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	303/1182	4.93	4.60	4.35	4.49	4.80
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	0	1	0	9	4.80	327/1170	4.93	4.63	4.38	4.51	4.80
4. Were special techniques successful	5	7	1	0	0	0	2	3.67	****/ 800	4.33	4.14	4.06	4.19	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 66	****	5.00	4.58	4.87	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	A	9	Required for Majors	6	Graduate	0	Major	7
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	5						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	1	C	0	General	1	Under-grad	15	Non-major	8
84-150	7	3.00-3.49	4	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5	F	0	Electives	4	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	2				
				?	0						

Course-Section: POLI 409 3
 Title Selected Topics Poli S
 Instructor: Hussey, Laura S.
 Enrollment: 9
 Questionnaires: 9

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 1176
 JUN 28, 2010
 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	2	7	4.78	287/1447	4.68	4.56	4.31	4.43	4.78
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	0	7	4.56	479/1447	4.52	4.43	4.27	4.31	4.56
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	5	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1241	4.87	4.63	4.33	4.41	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1402	4.82	4.40	4.24	4.34	5.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	4	0	1	1	0	3	4.00	799/1358	4.32	4.42	4.11	4.15	4.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	0	1	1	5	4.57	322/1316	4.66	4.41	4.14	4.27	4.57
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	0	0	2	0	6	4.50	459/1427	4.41	4.41	4.19	4.20	4.50
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1447	4.63	4.75	4.69	4.72	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	1	0	0	0	3	1	4.25	634/1434	4.34	4.24	4.10	4.17	4.25
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	6	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1387	4.72	4.68	4.46	4.48	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	5	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1387	4.95	4.86	4.73	4.76	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	6	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1386	4.83	4.51	4.32	4.34	5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1380	4.78	4.47	4.32	4.34	5.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	6	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1193	3.50	3.92	4.02	4.00	****
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1172	4.80	4.37	4.15	4.25	5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1182	4.93	4.60	4.35	4.49	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1170	4.93	4.63	4.38	4.51	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	3	3	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/ 800	4.33	4.14	4.06	4.19	5.00

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: POLI 412 01
 Title Ethics & Public Policy
 Instructor: Ball, Calvin
 Enrollment: 23
 Questionnaires: 23

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 1177
 JUN 28, 2010
 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	0	0	3	2	14	4.58	507/1447	4.58	4.56	4.31	4.43	4.58
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	4	0	0	0	3	1	15	4.63	389/1447	4.63	4.43	4.27	4.31	4.63
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	4	5	0	0	3	0	11	4.57	478/1241	4.57	4.63	4.33	4.41	4.57
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	4	0	0	0	2	3	14	4.63	347/1402	4.63	4.40	4.24	4.34	4.63
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	1	2	2	14	4.53	332/1358	4.53	4.42	4.11	4.15	4.53
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	1	1	2	14	4.61	283/1316	4.61	4.41	4.14	4.27	4.61
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	4	0	0	1	1	1	16	4.68	265/1427	4.68	4.41	4.19	4.20	4.68
8. How many times was class cancelled	4	0	0	0	0	1	18	4.95	291/1447	4.95	4.75	4.69	4.72	4.95
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	0	2	4	12	4.56	309/1434	4.56	4.24	4.10	4.17	4.56
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	1	0	1	1	16	4.63	611/1387	4.63	4.68	4.46	4.48	4.63
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	1	0	1	0	17	4.68	958/1387	4.68	4.86	4.73	4.76	4.68
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	1	0	1	1	16	4.63	470/1386	4.63	4.51	4.32	4.34	4.63
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	1	1	1	16	4.68	434/1380	4.68	4.47	4.32	4.34	4.68
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	0	2	1	0	2	14	4.32	433/1193	4.32	3.92	4.02	4.00	4.32
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	1	0	0	2	14	4.65	295/1172	4.65	4.37	4.15	4.25	4.65
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	1	0	0	1	15	4.71	391/1182	4.71	4.60	4.35	4.49	4.71
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	0	1	0	0	16	4.82	306/1170	4.82	4.63	4.38	4.51	4.82
4. Were special techniques successful	6	1	1	0	3	1	11	4.31	302/ 800	4.31	4.14	4.06	4.19	4.31

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	

00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	11	Required for Majors	10	Graduate	0	Major	5
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	4						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	1	C	0	General	2	Under-grad	23	Non-major	18
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	4	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	2	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	0						

Course-Section: POLI 419 1
 Title Topics In Political Th
 Instructor: Vetter,Lisa Pac
 Enrollment: 18
 Questionnaires: 13

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 1178
 JUN 28, 2010
 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	0	2	9	4.50	585/1447	4.50	4.56	4.31	4.43	4.50
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	1	0	0	2	9	4.50	532/1447	4.50	4.43	4.27	4.31	4.50
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	2	10	4.83	204/1241	4.83	4.63	4.33	4.41	4.83
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	1	0	1	2	8	4.33	685/1402	4.33	4.40	4.24	4.34	4.33
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	0	0	2	9	4.50	345/1358	4.50	4.42	4.11	4.15	4.50
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	0	0	2	9	4.50	392/1316	4.50	4.41	4.14	4.27	4.50
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	0	0	3	8	4.42	582/1427	4.42	4.41	4.19	4.20	4.42
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	436/1447	4.92	4.75	4.69	4.72	4.92
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	1	0	0	4	6	4.27	611/1434	4.27	4.24	4.10	4.17	4.27
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	200/1387	4.90	4.68	4.46	4.48	4.90
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1387	5.00	4.86	4.73	4.76	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	1	1	0	0	8	4.30	839/1386	4.30	4.51	4.32	4.34	4.30
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	1	1	0	1	7	4.20	940/1380	4.20	4.47	4.32	4.34	4.20
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	5	1	1	1	0	0	5	4.00	652/1193	4.00	3.92	4.02	4.00	4.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	1	0	0	0	6	4.43	445/1172	4.43	4.37	4.15	4.25	4.43
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1182	5.00	4.60	4.35	4.49	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1170	5.00	4.63	4.38	4.51	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	6	1	1	0	0	0	5	4.33	290/ 800	4.33	4.14	4.06	4.19	4.33

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: POLI 428 01
 Title Politics Internship
 Instructor: Schaller, Thomas
 Enrollment: 15
 Questionnaires: 12

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 1179
 JUN 28, 2010
 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	1	2	9	4.67	408/1447	4.67	4.56	4.31	4.43	4.67
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	5	2	5	4.00	1053/1447	4.00	4.43	4.27	4.31	4.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	0	1	5	3	4.22	806/1241	4.22	4.63	4.33	4.41	4.22
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	4	1	7	4.25	766/1402	4.25	4.40	4.24	4.34	4.25
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	3	9	4.75	173/1358	4.75	4.42	4.11	4.15	4.75
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	3	7	4.42	486/1316	4.42	4.41	4.14	4.27	4.42
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	0	3	8	4.50	459/1427	4.50	4.41	4.19	4.20	4.50
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	1	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1447	5.00	4.75	4.69	4.72	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	2	0	0	1	3	5	4.44	408/1434	4.44	4.24	4.10	4.17	4.44
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	5	7	4.58	684/1387	4.58	4.68	4.46	4.48	4.58
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	475/1387	4.92	4.86	4.73	4.76	4.92
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	6	6	4.50	607/1386	4.50	4.51	4.32	4.34	4.50
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	6	6	4.50	659/1380	4.50	4.47	4.32	4.34	4.50
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	1	1	1	2	4	3	3.64	911/1193	3.64	3.92	4.02	4.00	3.64
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	124/1172	4.90	4.37	4.15	4.25	4.90
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	303/1182	4.80	4.60	4.35	4.49	4.80
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	1	1	8	4.70	459/1170	4.70	4.63	4.38	4.51	4.70
4. Were special techniques successful	2	4	0	0	1	2	3	4.33	290/ 800	4.33	4.14	4.06	4.19	4.33

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: POLI 432 1
 Title Civil Rights
 Instructor: Lanoue, George R
 Enrollment: 38
 Questionnaires: 23

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 1180
 JUN 28, 2010
 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	1	7	15	4.61	474/1447	4.61	4.56	4.31	4.43	4.61
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	3	7	12	4.30	805/1447	4.30	4.43	4.27	4.31	4.30
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	2	5	15	4.59	460/1241	4.59	4.63	4.33	4.41	4.59
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	1	1	2	5	13	4.27	745/1402	4.27	4.40	4.24	4.34	4.27
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	2	2	18	4.57	306/1358	4.57	4.42	4.11	4.15	4.57
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	1	3	5	12	4.04	790/1316	4.04	4.41	4.14	4.27	4.04
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	1	1	7	13	4.30	716/1427	4.30	4.41	4.19	4.20	4.30
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	2	21	4.91	436/1447	4.91	4.75	4.69	4.72	4.91
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	3	9	7	4.21	679/1434	4.21	4.24	4.10	4.17	4.21
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	0	2	18	4.90	200/1387	4.90	4.68	4.46	4.48	4.90
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	0	2	18	4.90	528/1387	4.90	4.86	4.73	4.76	4.90
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	1	0	3	6	9	4.16	962/1386	4.16	4.51	4.32	4.34	4.16
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	2	5	13	4.55	604/1380	4.55	4.47	4.32	4.34	4.55
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	3	0	0	2	7	7	4.31	433/1193	4.31	3.92	4.02	4.00	4.31
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	2	2	4	4	3.83	841/1172	3.83	4.37	4.15	4.25	3.83
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	11	0	2	0	1	4	5	3.83	979/1182	3.83	4.60	4.35	4.49	3.83
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	11	0	1	0	0	4	7	4.33	710/1170	4.33	4.63	4.38	4.51	4.33
4. Were special techniques successful	11	2	0	0	0	4	6	4.60	159/ 800	4.60	4.14	4.06	4.19	4.60

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors		
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 9	Required for Majors 15	Graduate 1	Major 13
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B 5			
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	1	C 5	General 4	Under-grad 22	Non-major 10
84-150	7	3.00-3.49	4	D 0			
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00	9	F 0	Electives 2	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	
				P 0			
				I 0	Other 0		
				? 4			

Course-Section: POLI 438 01
 Title Legal Internship
 Instructor: VanHoven,Jonath
 Enrollment: 14
 Questionnaires: 14

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 1181
 JUN 28, 2010
 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	1	1	2	0	10	4.21	909/1447	4.21	4.56	4.31	4.43	4.21
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	1	1	4	7	4.07	1011/1447	4.07	4.43	4.27	4.31	4.07
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	10	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	282/1241	4.75	4.63	4.33	4.41	4.75
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	0	2	5	6	4.07	929/1402	4.07	4.40	4.24	4.34	4.07
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	2	0	7	4	3.79	1001/1358	3.79	4.42	4.11	4.15	3.79
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	1	0	0	1	5	6	4.42	486/1316	4.42	4.41	4.14	4.27	4.42
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	5	8	4.50	459/1427	4.50	4.41	4.19	4.20	4.50
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	3	11	4.79	786/1447	4.79	4.75	4.69	4.72	4.79
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	1	1	1	5	2	3.60	1188/1434	3.60	4.24	4.10	4.17	3.60
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	2	6	5	4.23	1055/1387	4.23	4.68	4.46	4.48	4.23
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	1	12	4.92	422/1387	4.92	4.86	4.73	4.76	4.92
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	2	1	3	7	4.15	962/1386	4.15	4.51	4.32	4.34	4.15
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	2	1	3	7	4.15	965/1380	4.15	4.47	4.32	4.34	4.15
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	7	2	1	0	0	3	3.17	1060/1193	3.17	3.92	4.02	4.00	3.17
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	1	0	4	5	4.30	546/1172	4.30	4.37	4.15	4.25	4.30
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	303/1182	4.80	4.60	4.35	4.49	4.80
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	327/1170	4.80	4.63	4.38	4.51	4.80
4. Were special techniques successful	4	4	0	0	1	4	1	4.00	423/ 800	4.00	4.14	4.06	4.19	4.00
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 38	****	4.50	4.49	4.68	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 36	****	3.00	4.25	4.42	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	13	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 28	****	4.50	4.52	4.72	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	13	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 30	****	4.50	4.30	4.38	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	13	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 27	****	4.50	4.43	4.62	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors				
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 12	Required for Majors	6	Graduate	0	Major	10
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	B 0						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	C 0	General	0	Under-grad	14	Non-major	4
84-150	7	3.00-3.49	D 0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	6	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
			P 0						
			I 0	Other	1				
			? 0						

Course-Section: POLI 440 02
 Title Urban Politics
 Instructor: Croatti, Mark
 Enrollment: 26
 Questionnaires: 21

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 1182
 JUN 28, 2010
 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	1	0	1	2	17	4.62	463/1447	4.62	4.56	4.31	4.43	4.62
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	3	4	13	4.38	702/1447	4.38	4.43	4.27	4.31	4.38
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	0	1	3	16	4.57	478/1241	4.57	4.63	4.33	4.41	4.57
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	1	0	0	4	15	4.60	380/1402	4.60	4.40	4.24	4.34	4.60
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	1	3	15	4.74	187/1358	4.74	4.42	4.11	4.15	4.74
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	1	4	1	12	4.16	710/1316	4.16	4.41	4.14	4.27	4.16
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	0	1	2	16	4.79	172/1427	4.79	4.41	4.19	4.20	4.79
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	2	17	4.89	511/1447	4.89	4.75	4.69	4.72	4.89
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	0	0	5	11	4.69	214/1434	4.69	4.24	4.10	4.17	4.69
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	3	17	4.85	276/1387	4.85	4.68	4.46	4.48	4.85
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	1	19	4.95	317/1387	4.95	4.86	4.73	4.76	4.95
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	2	3	15	4.65	444/1386	4.65	4.51	4.32	4.34	4.65
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	0	3	16	4.70	420/1380	4.70	4.47	4.32	4.34	4.70
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	2	3	5	10	4.15	564/1193	4.15	3.92	4.02	4.00	4.15
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	0	2	3	14	4.45	428/1172	4.45	4.37	4.15	4.25	4.45
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	1	0	1	2	16	4.60	490/1182	4.60	4.60	4.35	4.49	4.60
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	1	0	1	3	15	4.55	549/1170	4.55	4.63	4.38	4.51	4.55
4. Were special techniques successful	2	7	0	0	0	3	9	4.75	103/ 800	4.75	4.14	4.06	4.19	4.75
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	18	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 66	****	5.00	4.58	4.87	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	18	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 62	****	4.64	4.56	4.80	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 58	****	4.57	4.41	4.59	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 65	****	4.94	4.42	4.55	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	18	0	0	1	0	0	2	4.00	****/ 64	****	3.96	4.09	4.43	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 38	****	4.50	4.49	4.68	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	19	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 36	****	3.00	4.25	4.42	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	19	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 28	****	4.50	4.52	4.72	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	19	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 30	****	4.50	4.30	4.38	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	19	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 27	****	4.50	4.43	4.62	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	A	5	Required for Majors	8	Graduate	0	Major	17
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	8						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	1	C	2	General	5	Under-grad	21	Non-major	4
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	4	D	1						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	2	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	1				
				?	1						

Course-Section: POLI 450 01
 Title Sem Pub Admin And Poli
 Instructor: Johnson, Arthur
 Enrollment: 14
 Questionnaires: 9

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 1183
 JUN 28, 2010
 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	1	0	8	4.78	287/1447	4.82	4.56	4.31	4.43	4.78
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	5	4	4.44	619/1447	4.54	4.43	4.27	4.31	4.44
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	0	3	5	4.33	717/1241	4.56	4.63	4.33	4.41	4.33
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	0	0	1	7	4.44	567/1402	4.44	4.40	4.24	4.34	4.44
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	97/1358	4.94	4.42	4.11	4.15	4.89
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	0	4	4	4.22	644/1316	4.40	4.41	4.14	4.27	4.22
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	0	1	3	4	4.00	971/1427	4.25	4.41	4.19	4.20	4.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	6	3	4.33	1202/1447	4.54	4.75	4.69	4.72	4.33
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	1	2	4	4.43	431/1434	4.38	4.24	4.10	4.17	4.43
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	398/1387	4.85	4.68	4.46	4.48	4.78
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	579/1387	4.91	4.86	4.73	4.76	4.89
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	4	4	4.33	811/1386	4.47	4.51	4.32	4.34	4.33
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	5	4	4.44	719/1380	4.61	4.47	4.32	4.34	4.44
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	5	3	0	0	0	1	2.00	1177/1193	2.69	3.92	4.02	4.00	2.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1172	4.89	4.37	4.15	4.25	5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1182	4.93	4.60	4.35	4.49	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	1	0	7	4.75	390/1170	4.66	4.63	4.38	4.51	4.75
4. Were special techniques successful	1	3	1	0	1	0	3	3.80	562/ 800	3.60	4.14	4.06	4.19	3.80
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	4	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/ 66	5.00	5.00	4.58	4.87	5.00
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	4	0	0	0	0	3	2	4.40	48/ 62	4.64	4.64	4.56	4.80	4.40
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	37/ 58	4.57	4.57	4.41	4.59	4.40
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/ 65	4.94	4.94	4.42	4.55	5.00
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	4	0	1	0	1	0	3	3.80	43/ 64	3.96	3.96	4.09	4.43	3.80

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors				
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 2	Required for Majors	4	Graduate	0	Major	7
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	B 5						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	C 0	General	1	Under-grad	9	Non-major	2
84-150	1	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	0				
			? 0						

Course-Section: POLI 450 02
 Title Sem Pub Admin And Poli
 Instructor: Johnson,Arthur
 Enrollment: 20
 Questionnaires: 14

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 1184
 JUN 28, 2010
 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	2	12	4.86	201/1447	4.82	4.56	4.31	4.43	4.86
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	3	10	4.64	376/1447	4.54	4.43	4.27	4.31	4.64
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	1	12	4.79	251/1241	4.56	4.63	4.33	4.41	4.79
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	1	10	4.43	591/1402	4.44	4.40	4.24	4.34	4.43
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/1358	4.94	4.42	4.11	4.15	5.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	5	7	4.58	312/1316	4.40	4.41	4.14	4.27	4.58
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	1	1	1	9	4.50	459/1427	4.25	4.41	4.19	4.20	4.50
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	3	9	4.75	836/1447	4.54	4.75	4.69	4.72	4.75
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	0	0	6	3	4.33	540/1434	4.38	4.24	4.10	4.17	4.33
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	1	12	4.92	160/1387	4.85	4.68	4.46	4.48	4.92
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	13	4.93	422/1387	4.91	4.86	4.73	4.76	4.93
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	1	3	9	4.62	496/1386	4.47	4.51	4.32	4.34	4.62
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	3	10	4.77	326/1380	4.61	4.47	4.32	4.34	4.77
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	6	2	1	1	0	4	3.38	1008/1193	2.69	3.92	4.02	4.00	3.38
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	1	12	4.79	195/1172	4.89	4.37	4.15	4.25	4.79
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	1	0	13	4.86	250/1182	4.93	4.60	4.35	4.49	4.86
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	2	2	10	4.57	538/1170	4.66	4.63	4.38	4.51	4.57
4. Were special techniques successful	0	4	4	0	0	0	6	3.40	683/ 800	3.60	4.14	4.06	4.19	3.40
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	6	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/ 66	5.00	5.00	4.58	4.87	5.00
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	6	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	25/ 62	4.64	4.64	4.56	4.80	4.88
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	23/ 58	4.57	4.57	4.41	4.59	4.75
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	19/ 65	4.94	4.94	4.42	4.55	4.88
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	6	0	0	0	2	3	3	4.13	35/ 64	3.96	3.96	4.09	4.43	4.13

Frequency Distribution

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

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	18	4.95	89/1447	4.95	4.56	4.31	4.43	4.95
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	4	15	4.79	217/1447	4.79	4.43	4.27	4.31	4.79
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	16	4.84	195/1241	4.84	4.63	4.33	4.41	4.84
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	2	16	4.79	186/1402	4.79	4.40	4.24	4.34	4.79
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	17	4.89	92/1358	4.89	4.42	4.11	4.15	4.89
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	4	14	4.68	221/1316	4.68	4.41	4.14	4.27	4.68
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	4	15	4.79	172/1427	4.79	4.41	4.19	4.20	4.79
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	18	4.95	291/1447	4.95	4.75	4.69	4.72	4.95
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	0	4	13	4.76	149/1434	4.76	4.24	4.10	4.17	4.76
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	1	17	4.84	291/1387	4.84	4.68	4.46	4.48	4.84
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	19	5.00	1/1387	5.00	4.86	4.73	4.76	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	3	15	4.74	341/1386	4.74	4.51	4.32	4.34	4.74
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	3	16	4.84	227/1380	4.84	4.47	4.32	4.34	4.84
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	3	0	1	1	1	13	4.63	211/1193	4.63	3.92	4.02	4.00	4.63
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	2	12	4.86	152/1172	4.86	4.37	4.15	4.25	4.86
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	0	0	0	14	5.00	1/1182	5.00	4.60	4.35	4.49	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	0	0	0	14	5.00	1/1170	5.00	4.63	4.38	4.51	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	5	3	0	0	0	4	7	4.64	146/ 800	4.64	4.14	4.06	4.19	4.64
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 189	****	****	4.34	4.74	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 192	****	****	4.34	4.61	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 186	****	****	4.48	4.72	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 187	****	****	4.33	4.59	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 168	****	****	4.20	4.53	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 66	****	5.00	4.58	4.87	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 62	****	4.64	4.56	4.80	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 58	****	4.57	4.41	4.59	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 65	****	4.94	4.42	4.55	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 64	****	3.96	4.09	4.43	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 38	****	4.50	4.49	4.68	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 36	****	3.00	4.25	4.42	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 28	****	4.50	4.52	4.72	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 30	****	4.50	4.30	4.38	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 27	****	4.50	4.43	4.62	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.72	4.80	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 21	****	****	4.57	5.00	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.64	4.60	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 20	****	****	4.60	5.00	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 15	****	****	4.61	5.00	****

Course-Section: POLI 486 01
 Title Middle East Intl Relat
 Instructor: Starkey, Brigid
 Enrollment: 22
 Questionnaires: 19

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 1185
 JUN 28, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: POLI 487 01
 Title International Poli Eco
 Instructor: Hody,Cynthia A
 Enrollment: 22
 Questionnaires: 15

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 1186
 JUN 28, 2010
 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	1	1	13	4.80	254/1447	4.80	4.56	4.31	4.43	4.80
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	1	13	4.80	196/1447	4.80	4.43	4.27	4.31	4.80
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	8	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	186/1241	4.86	4.63	4.33	4.41	4.86
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	1	13	4.80	165/1402	4.80	4.40	4.24	4.34	4.80
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	0	2	11	4.64	251/1358	4.64	4.42	4.11	4.15	4.64
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	2	12	4.86	102/1316	4.86	4.41	4.14	4.27	4.86
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	1	0	0	1	1	11	4.77	191/1427	4.77	4.41	4.19	4.20	4.77
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	1	5	8	4.50	1079/1447	4.50	4.75	4.69	4.72	4.50
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	5	10	4.67	230/1434	4.67	4.24	4.10	4.17	4.67
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	1	14	4.93	140/1387	4.93	4.68	4.46	4.48	4.93
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	15	5.00	1/1387	5.00	4.86	4.73	4.76	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	2	12	4.86	194/1386	4.86	4.51	4.32	4.34	4.86
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	14	4.93	111/1380	4.93	4.47	4.32	4.34	4.93
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	0	1	4	9	4.57	243/1193	4.57	3.92	4.02	4.00	4.57
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	2	10	4.83	163/1172	4.83	4.37	4.15	4.25	4.83
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/1182	5.00	4.60	4.35	4.49	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	1	1	10	4.75	390/1170	4.75	4.63	4.38	4.51	4.75
4. Were special techniques successful	3	6	0	0	1	0	5	4.67	133/ 800	4.67	4.14	4.06	4.19	4.67
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 66	****	5.00	4.58	4.87	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 65	****	4.94	4.42	4.55	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 64	****	3.96	4.09	4.43	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	1	A	8	Required for Majors	11	Graduate	0	Major	9
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	6						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	1	C	0	General	1	Under-grad	15	Non-major	6
84-150	7	3.00-3.49	5	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	0				
				?	0						