RESEARCH METHODOLOGY Baltimore County

Course-Section: PUBL 600 0101 University of Maryland Page 1442 Title FEB 13, 2008 Instructor: MANDELL, MARVIN Fall 2007 Job IRBR3029

Enrollment:	27				
Questionnaires:	22	Student	Course	Evaluation	Questionnaire

I

0

0

					Frequencies NR NA 1 2 3 4 5 N					tructor	Course	_						
		Question	S		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		Genera	 1															
1. Did vo	ou gain n	ew insights,ski		m this course	0	0	0	0	1	8	13	4.55	572/1639	4.55	4.44	4.27	4.42	4.55
		ctor make clear			0	0	0	1	8	3	10	4.00	1090/1639	4.00	4.10	4.22	4.26	4.00
		uestions reflec			0	16	0	0	1	0	5	4.67			4.57	4.28	4.37	4.67
	_	uations reflect		_	0	0	0	0	4	9	9	4.23	822/1583	4.23	4.25	4.19	4.31	4.23
5. Did as	ssigned r	eadings contrib	ute to	what you learned	0	0	3	2	1	5	11	3.86	942/1532	3.86	4.28	4.01	4.10	3.86
6. Did w	ritten as	signments contr	ibute t	o what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	8	12	4.45	429/1504	4.45	4.33	4.05	4.29	4.45
7. Was th	he gradin	g system clearl	y expla	ined	0	0	0	4	3	2	13	4.09	982/1612	4.09	4.28	4.16	4.27	4.09
8. How ma	any times	was class canc	elled		0	0	0	0	0	7	15	4.68	979/1635	4.68	4.74	4.65	4.81	4.68
9. How wo	ould you	grade the overa	ll teac	hing effectiveness	0	1	0	0	0	12	9	4.43	473/1579	4.43	4.17	4.08	4.17	4.43
		Lectur	۵															
1. Were t	the instr	uctor's lecture		prepared	1	0	0	0	8	3	10	4.10	1206/1518	4.10	4.38	4.43	4.49	4.10
	Did the instructor seem interested in the subject				0	0	0	0	0		18	4.82			4.92	4.70	4.79	4.82
	3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly					0	0	1		6	9		1059/1517		4.15	4.27	4.32	4.05
		es contribute t		-	0	0	1	3	3				1161/1550			4.22	4.23	3.91
				our understanding	2	3	1	1	4	6			832/1295			3.94	3.95	3.76
		Discus	gion															
1 Did di	lass disc			what you learned	3	0	1	0	6	4	8	3.95	840/1398	3.95	4.35	4.07	4.22	3.95
				d to participate	3	0	1	2	3	_		4.11	,		4.54	4.30	4.47	4.11
				d open discussion	3	0	0	1	2	3					4.69	4.28	4.49	4.47
		echniques succe		a open albeablin	3		0	1	2	3		3.89	. ,		3.78			3.89
				Frequ	encs	, Dis	trib	ıtioı	า									
				11040	circy	DID	CIID	20101										
Credits I	Earned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	ason	S			Ту	pe			Majors	3
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	2	A 11		Re	quir	ed fo	or M	 ajor	`====	0	 Graduat	 e 1	.9	Majo	r or	21
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В 8	Required for Majors										3 -			
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C 0	General						0	Under-g	rad	3	Non-	major	1	
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D 0														
Grad.	19	3.50-4.00	9	F 0	Electives							0	#### -	Means t	here a	re not	enoug	_J h
				P 0									respons	es to b	e sign	ificar	ıt	
				_							_	_						

Other

20

Course-Section: PUBL 601 0101 University of Maryland Title

POLITICAL/SOCIAL CONTE Baltimore County Instructor: MILLER, CHERYL Fall 2007

Enrollment: 20

Questionnaires: 16 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

I

?

0

1

							-											
						Fr	equer	ncies	3		Inst	ructor	Cour	se De	ept	UMBC	Level	Sect
		Questions		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mea	n Me	ean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		General																
1. Did vo	ou gain ne	0 0	from this course	0	0	0	0	1	5	10	4.56	550/163	9 4.	6 4	.44	4.27	4.42	4.56
		tor make clear th		0	0	0	0	3	6	7	4.25	859/163			.10	4.22	4.26	4.25
			he expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	6	7	4.25	795/139			.57	4.28		4.25
	_	ations reflect th		0	0	0	1	1	6	8	4.31	726/158			. 25	4.19	4.31	4.31
			to what you learned	0	0	1	0	0	3	12	4.56	299/153			. 28	4.01	4.10	4.56
			te to what you learned	0	1	0	0	2	6	7	4.33	544/150			. 33	4.05	4.29	4.33
		system clearly e		1	0	0	0	1	0	14		134/161			. 28	4.16	4.27	4.87
		was class cancell		1	1	0	0	0	0	14	5.00	1/163			74	4.65	4.81	5.00
	-		teaching effectiveness	1	1	0	0	1	7		4.36	548/157			17		4.17	
		Lecture																
1 Wara t	ho inatru	ctor's lectures w	vall propaged	1	0	0	0	1	2	11	4.67	602/151	8 4.6	7 /	. 38	4.43	4.49	4.67
			ed in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	٥	15	5.00	1/152			. 92	4.70	4.79	5.00
			nd explained clearly	1	0	0	0	1	6	8	4.47				. 15	4.70	4.79	4.47
		hat you learned	1	0	0	1	0			4.47				. 25	4.27	4.32		
				2	9	1	1	1	2	0		- ,			. 23 . 73			2.80
5. Did at	Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understandin					Т	1	1	2	U	2.80	1213/129	5 2.8	30 3.	. / 3	3.94	3.95	2.80
		n																
			to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	4		4.67	329/139			. 35	4.07	4.22	4.67
			raged to participate	4	0	0	0	0	3		4.75	393/139			. 54	4.30	4.47	4.75
		_	r and open discussion	4	0	0	0	2	5		4.25	834/138			. 69	4.28		4.25
4. Were s	special te	chniques successf	ul	4	4	0	0	4	2	2	3.75	610/ 95	8 3.	5 3	. 78	3.93	4.01	3.75
		Seminar																
1. Were a	assigned t	opics relevant to	the announced theme	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 8	5 **	* 5	.00	4.58	4.58	***
2. Was th	ne instruc	tor available for	individual attention	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 8	2 **	* 4	.50	4.52	4.74	***
			to what you learned	15	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/	8 **	* 3	.50	4.47	4.52	***
4. Did pr	resentatio	ns contribute to	what you learned	15	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 8	0 **	* 4	.00	4.47	4.50	***
5. Were c	criteria f	or grading made c	lear	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/	2 **	* 3	.00	4.16	4.37	****
			Frequ	iency	, Dist	rib	ution	ı										
			_	_														
Credits E	Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades				Rea	sons	5 				'ype				Majors	;
00-27	2	0.00-0.99 2	A 5	Required for Ma						s	0	Gradua	.te	11		Majo	or	13
28-55	1	1.00-1.99 0																
56-83	0	2.00-2.99 0		General							0	Under-	grad	5		Non-	-major	3
84-150	0	3.00-3.49 2	D 0															
Grad.	11	3.50-4.00 4	F 0		Ele	ecti	ves				0						enoug	βh
	P 0											respor	ses to	be s	sign	ifican	ıt	

Other

15

Page 1443

FEB 13, 2008

Job IRBR3029

Course-Section: PUBL 603 0101 University of Maryland Title POLICY ANALYSIS Baltimore County Instructor: MILLER, NANCY A Fall 2007

Enrollment:

Questionnaires: 20

21

Page 1444 FEB 13, 2008 Job IRBR3029

C+1	~	The second second second	0	
Student	course	Evaluation	Ouestionn	aire

-								-											
							Fre	equer	ncies	3		Inst	tructo	r	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
		Questions	i		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rai	nk	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		General																	
1 Did vo	u gain ne	w insights,skil		this source	0	0	1	0	1	5	13	4.45	698/1	1630	4.45	4.44	4.27	4.42	4.45
		tor make clear			1	0	0	0	1	1	14	4.68	,		4.68	4.10	4.27	4.42	4.68
		estions reflect	_	_	1	14	0	0	0	0	5	5.00		1397		4.57	4.28	4.37	5.00
	_	ations reflect		_	1	0	0	1	0	5	13	4.58				4.25	4.19	4.31	4.58
				hat you learned	2	0	0	1	3	5	9	4.22	- ,			4.28	4.19	4.10	4.22
	_	-		what you learned	2	0	0	1	1	2	14	4.61				4.33	4.05	4.29	4.61
		system clearly		_	2	0	0	0	1	6	11	4.56				4.28	4.16	4.27	4.56
		was class cance	_	iica	3	0	0	0	0	0	17	5.00		1635			4.65	4.81	5.00
	-			ing effectiveness	9	0	0	1	0	5	5	4.27				4.17	4.08		
y. 110 o	ara you g	1440 0110 010141	_ 000011	ing cricociveness		Ü	Ü	_	Ü		J	1.27	001,	20,5	1.27		1.00		1.27
		Lecture		_				_	_										
		ctor's lectures	_	_	1	0	0	0	0	8		4.58				4.38	4.43	4.49	4.58
		tor seem intere		_	1	0	0	0	0	1	18	4.95				4.92	4.70	4.79	4.95
				plained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	9	10	4.53			4.53	4.15	4.27	4.32	4.53
		s contribute to			1	0	0	1	0	5	13	4.58				4.25	4.22		4.58
5. Did au	diovisual	techniques enh	ance yo	ur understanding	1	0	1	2	4	3	9	3.89	738/	1295	3.89	3.73	3.94	3.95	3.89
		Discuss	ion																
1. Did cl	ass discu	ssions contribu	te to w	hat you learned	2	0	1	1	1	8	7	4.06	752/3	1398	4.06	4.35	4.07	4.22	4.06
				to participate	2	0	0	0	2	4	12	4.56				4.54	4.30	4.47	4.56
		_	_	open discussion	2	0	0	0	0	4	14	4.78			4.78	4.69	4.28	4.49	4.78
		chniques succes		-	2	2	0	1	6	4	5	3.81	572/	958	3.81	3.78	3.93	4.01	3.81
0		Laborat	-	1	1.0	0	•	0	•	•	-	F 00	de de de de 7	0.40	als als als als	ale ale ale ale	4 11	2 06	ale ale ale ale
2. Were y	ou provid	ed with adequat	e backg	round information	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/	240	****	****	4.11	3.96	****
		Seminar																	
1. Were a	ssigned t	opics relevant	to the	announced theme	18	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/	85	****	5.00	4.58	4.58	****
2. Was th	e instruc	tor available f	or indi	vidual attention	18	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/	82	****	4.50	4.52	4.74	****
4. Did pr	esentatio	ns contribute t	o what	you learned	18	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/	80	****	4.00	4.47	4.50	****
5. Were c	riteria f	or grading made	clear		18	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/	82	****	3.00	4.16	4.37	****
1 Did fi	old owner	Field W ience contribut		at wou learned	18	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/	52	****	****	4.04	3.64	****
	_	understand you		_	18	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	,	53	****	****	4.05	4.03	****
_	_	tor available f			18	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00		42	****	****	4.75	4.78	****
		could you discu			18	0	0	0	0	1	1		****/	37	****	****	4.73	4.78	****
	-	help you carry	-		18	1	0	0	0	0	1		****/	32	****	****	4.56	4.59	****
3. Dia co.	III CI CIICCD	neip you carry	out II	cia accivicios		-	Ü	Ü	Ü	J	-	3.00	,	32			1.50	1.35	
				Frequ	ency	Dist	cribu	ution	ı										
Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	asons	3				Ty	pe			Majors	;
00 07		0.00.000														1			
00-27 28-55	4 1	0.00-0.99 1.00-1.99	3 0	A 13 B 5		кес	4u1re	eu I	or Ma	ıjor	ದ	2	Grad	duat	e 1	.1	Majo)Ţ.	6
56-83							neral	L				0	Unde	er-g	rad	9	Non-	-major	14
84-150														٠.				3	
Grad.						Ele	ectiv	<i>r</i> es				1	####	# - 1	Means t	here a	re not	enou	ιh
	P 0													es to b			_		
				I 0		Oth	ner				1	.8				3			
	? 0																		
	· · ·																		

Course-Section: PUBL 610B 0101

Title HEALTH POLICIES/PROGRA

Instructor: SALKEVER, DAVID

Enrollment: 10
Questionnaires: 9

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2007

Page 1445 FEB 13, 2008 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Eva	luation Qu	uesti	.onnai	ire
--------------------	------------	-------	--------	-----

	- 1					Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect		
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	Λ	Ω	Λ	0	Λ	5	4	1 11	698/1639	4.44	4.44	4.27	4.42	4.44
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	2	4	4.00	,	4.00	4.10	4.22	4.26	4.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	3	4	4.22	822/1397	4.22	4.57	4.28	4.37	4.22
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	3	3	4.00		4.00	4.25	4.19	4.31	4.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	3	6	4.67	236/1532	4.67	4.28	4.01	4.10	4.67
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	0	4	4	4.11	758/1504	4.11	4.33	4.05	4.29	4.11
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	1	2	5	4.22	848/1612	4.22	4.28	4.16	4.27	4.22
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	855/1635	4.78	4.74	4.65	4.81	4.78
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	1	4	3	4.25	657/1579	4.25	4.17	4.08	4.17	4.25
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	416/1518	4.78	4.38	4.43	4.49	4.78
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1520	5.00	4.92	4.70	4.79	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	1	0	2	6	4.44	674/1517	4.44	4.15	4.27	4.32	4.44
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	0	2	6	4.44	716/1550	4.44	4.25	4.22	4.23	4.44
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	5	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	398/1295	4.33	3.73	3.94	3.95	4.33
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	5	3	4.22	651/1398	4.22	4.35	4.07	4.22	4.22
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	1	1	2	5	4.22	839/1391	4.22	4.54	4.30	4.47	4.22
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1388	5.00	4.69	4.28	4.49	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	0	6	0	0	1	2	0	3.67	658/ 958	3.67	3.78	3.93	4.01	3.67
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	8	Ο	Ω	0	Ω	1	Ο	4.00	****/ 85	****	5.00	4.58	4.58	****
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	0	U	J	J	U		U	4.00	/ 65		5.00	1.50	T.30	

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

Course-Section: PUBL 610C 0101 Title

CAUSAL INFER PROGRM EV

Instructor: MARCOTTE, DAVID

Enrollment: 12 Questionnaires: 11 University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2007

Page 1446 FEB 13, 2008 Job IRBR3029

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

		Frequencies			Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect			
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	4	7	4.64	469/1639	4.64	4.44	4.27	4.42	4.64
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	2	8	4.64	382/1639	4.64	4.10	4.22		4.64
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	8	4.73	313/1397	4.73	4.57	4.28	4.37	4.73
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	8	4.73	270/1583	4.73	4.25	4.19	4.31	4.73
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	0	3	7	4.36	478/1532	4.36	4.28	4.01	4.10	4.36
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	1	1	8	4.45	429/1504	4.45	4.33	4.05	4.29	4.45
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	2	2	7	4.45	561/1612	4.45	4.28	4.16	4.27	4.45
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1635	5.00	4.74	4.65	4.81	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	6	5	4.45	439/1579	4.45	4.17	4.08	4.17	4.45
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	0	10	4.82	345/1518		4.38	4.43		4.82
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	546/1520	4.91	4.92	4.70	4.79	4.91
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	1	4	5	4.40	726/1517	4.40	4.15	4.27	4.32	4.40
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	2	8	4.64	489/1550	4.64	4.25	4.22		4.64
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	3	0	1	2	2	3	3.88	753/1295	3.88	3.73	3.94	3.95	3.88
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	1	5	3	4.22	651/1398	4.22	4.35	4.07	4.22	4.22
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	368/1391	4.78	4.54	4.30	4.47	4.78
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	0	3	6	4.67	496/1388	4.67	4.69	4.28	4.49	4.67
4. Were special techniques successful	2	7	0	1	0	0	1		****/ 958		3.78	3.93	4.01	****
•														
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	10	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 224	****	****	4.10	4.43	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	9	0	0	0	1	1	0		****/ 240	****	****	4.11	3.96	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	9	0	0	0	1	1	0		****/ 219	****	****	4.44	4.23	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	10	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 215	****	****	4.35	4.72	****

Credits E	Carned	Cum. GPA		Expected	d Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	Α	7	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	9	Major	9
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	В	3						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	4	Under-grad	2	Non-major	2
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D	0						
Grad.	9	3.50-4.00	8	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	ı
				P	0			responses to	be sig	nificant	
				I	1	Other					
				?	0						

Course-Section: PUBL 647 0101 UTitle URBAN PROB & POLICY

URBAN PROB & POLICI

Instructor: NORRIS, DONALD

Enrollment: 9
Questionnaires: 6

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2007 Page 1447 FEB 13, 2008 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

	Frequencies			Ins	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect				
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	2	2	2		1138/1639	4.00	4.44	4.27	4.42	4.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	4	1	0		1579/1639	3.00	4.10	4.22	4.26	3.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	5	0	0	0	0	1		****/1397	****	4.57	4.28	4.37	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	0	5	0		1324/1583	3.67	4.25	4.19	4.31	3.67
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	4	1	4.00	774/1532		4.28	4.01	4.10	4.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	2	2	4.00	824/1504		4.33	4.05	4.29	4.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	2	0	1	1	1	1		1399/1612	3.50	4.28	4.16	4.27	3.50
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	1	1	1	3		1497/1635		4.74	4.65	4.81	4.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	1	0	0	3	0	3.25	1420/1579	3.25	4.17	4.08	4.17	3.25
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	1	0	2	2	1		1449/1518		4.38	4.43	4.49	3.33
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	725/1520	4.83	4.92	4.70	4.79	4.83
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	1	0	2	2	0		1453/1517	3.00	4.15	4.27	4.32	3.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	2	2	1		1385/1550	3.33	4.25	4.22	4.23	3.33
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	5	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/1295	****	3.73	3.94	3.95	****
_,														
Discussion	_						_							
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	Τ	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1398		4.35	4.07	4.22	5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	332/1391	4.80	4.54	4.30	4.47	4.80
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1388	5.00	4.69	4.28	4.49	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	1	4	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 958	****	3.78	3.93	4.01	****
Laboratory														
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	5	0	1	0	0	0	0	1 00	****/ 240	****	****	4.11	3.96	****
z. Were you provided with adequate background intolliation	5	U		U	U	U	U	1.00	/ 240			4.11	3.90	
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	4	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 85	5.00	5.00	4.58	4.58	5.00
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	4	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	47/ 82	4.50	4.50	4.52	4.74	4.50
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	71/ 78	3.50	3.50	4.47	4.52	3.50
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	58/ 80		4.00	4.47	4.50	4.00
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	4	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	71/ 82	3.00	3.00	4.16	4.37	3.00
1 1	-	Ŭ	Ū	Ū	_	Ū	ŭ	2.00	. 1, 02	3.00	3.00		1.57	3.00

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA	<u>.</u>	Expecte	d Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors			
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	1	 А	1	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	3	Major	4		
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	4								
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	С	0	General	2	Under-grad	3	Non-major	2		
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	1	D	0								
Grad.	3	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	3 #### - Mea		ans there are not enough				
				P	0			responses to	responses to be significant				
				I	0	Other	1						
				2	1								

Course-Section: PUBL 698 0101 University of Maryland Page 19 Title FEB 13, 2008

Job IRBR3029

Policy Analysis Capstone Baltimore County Miller, N. Instructor: Fall 2007

Enrollment: 0

Questionnaires:	10	Student	Course	Evaluation	Questionnaire
Queberonnarres.	10	Deddelle	COULDC	DValuacion	Queberonnarie

						Frequencies					Inst	ructor Course		Dept	Dept UMBC Lev		Sect	
		Question	s		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		 Genera	1															
1. Did vo	u gain ne	ew insights,ski		om this course	0	0	0	0	0	4	6	4.60	508/1639	****	4.31	4.27	4.08	4.60
_	_	ctor make clear			0	0	0	0	1	3	6	4.50	517/1639	****	4.37	4.22	4.17	4.50
		uestions reflec		1 3	0	7	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1397	****	4.51	4.28	4.18	5.00
	_	uations reflect			0	0	0	0	0	3	7	4.70	299/1583	****	4.31	4.19	4.01	4.70
				what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	146/1532	****	4.07	4.01	3.88	4.80
	_	_		o what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	3	7	4.70	222/1504	****	4.14	4.05	3.78	4.70
		g system clearl			0	0	0	0	2	1	7	4.50	490/1612	****	4.13	4.16	4.10	4.50
		was class canc			0	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	662/1635	****	4.78	4.65	4.56	4.90
9. How wo	uld you	grade the overa	ll tead	hing effectiveness	3	0	0	0	0	4	3	4.43	473/1579	****	4.13	4.08	3.95	4.43
		Lectur	e															
1. Were t	1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared						0	0	0	1	8	4.89	242/1518	****	4.46	4.43	4.38	4.89
	2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject						0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1520	****	4.76	4.70	4.61	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly						0	0	0	1	2	6	4.56	535/1517	****	4.43	4.27	4.20	4.56
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned						0	0	0	2	2	5	4.33	832/1550	****	4.20	4.22	4.17	4.33
5. Did au	diovisua	l techniques en	hance y	our understanding	1	6	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	398/1295	****	4.31	3.94	3.84	4.33
		Discus	sion															
1. Did cl	ass disc	ussions contrib	ute to	what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	3	7	4.70	309/1398	****	4.37	4.07	3.85	4.70
				ed to participate	0	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	332/1391	****	4.60	4.30	4.07	4.80
3. Did th	e instru	ctor encourage	fair ar	d open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	328/1388	****	4.53	4.28	4.01	4.80
4. Were s	pecial te	echniques succe	ssful	-	0	1	0	1	0	2	6	4.44	240/ 958	****	4.39	3.93	3.71	4.44
				Frequ	ency	Dist	trib	utio	n									
Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	asons	5			Ту	pe			Majors	3
				- 														
00-27 28-55	3	0.00-0.99 1.00-1.99	0	A 7 B 1		ке	quir	ea I	or Ma	ijors	5	0	Graduat	е	2	Majo	Dr.	0
28-55 56-83	2 0		0	B 1 C 0		a	nera	1				0	IIndox	nad.	8	Mon	ma i a	0
56-83 84-150	0	2.00-2.99 3.00-3.49	0 1	D 0		Gei	nera	Т				U	Under-g	Lau	0	Non-	-major	U
64-150 Grad.	2	3.50-4.00	6	D 0 F 0		. רק	ecti [.]	700				0	#### - 1	Maana +	here a	re not	enous	rh
Grau.	4	3.30-4.00	U	P 0		EI	CCLI	ves				U					_	111
				I 0		∩ +1	har				1	.0	responses to be significant			10		
				2 1		Other				_	. 0							

Course-Section: PUBL 698 0102 University of Maryland

Title Baltimore County Policy Analysis Capstone (Instr. A) Fall 2007

I

0

Instructor: Short, J. Enrollment: 0

Questionnaires: 5 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Page 20

FEB 13, 2008

Job IRBR3029

							Frequencies				Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect	
	Questions			NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
		General	 L															
1. Did yo	Did you gain new insights, skills from this course						0	0	1	2	2	4.20	951/1639	****	4.31	4.27	4.08	4.20
2. Did th	ne instru	ctor make clear	the ex	pected goals	0	0	0	1	1	3	0	3.40	1522/1639	****	4.37	4.22	4.17	3.40
3. Did th	ne exam q	uestions reflect	the e	expected goals	0	4	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1397	****	4.51	4.28	4.18	***
4. Did ot	her eval	uations reflect	the ex	pected goals	0	2	0	0	2	1	0	3.33	1465/1583	****	4.31	4.19	4.01	3.33
5. Did as	signed r	eadings contribu	ate to	what you learned	0	1	0	0	1	3	0	3.75	1046/1532	****	4.07	4.01	3.88	3.75
5. Did wr	ritten as:	signments contr	ibute t	o what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	4	1	4.20	667/1504	****	4.14	4.05	3.78	4.20
7. Was th	ne gradin	g system clearly	y expla	ined	0	3	2	0	0	0	0	1.00	1606/1612	****	4.13	4.16	4.10	1.00
B. How ma	ny times	was class cance	elled		0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1635	****	4.78	4.65	4.56	5.00
9. How wo	ould you	grade the overa	ll teac	hing effectiveness	3	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	1318/1579	****	4.13	4.08	3.95	3.50
		Lecture	2															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared						0	2	1	0	0	0	1.33	1518/1518	****	4.46	4.43	4.38	1.33
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject						0	0	1	1	1	0	3.00	1512/1520	****	4.76	4.70	4.61	3.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly					3	0	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	1501/1517	****	4.43	4.27	4.20	2.50
4. Did th	ne lectur	es contribute to	what	you learned	3	0	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	1518/1550	****	4.20	4.22	4.17	2.00
		Discus	sion															
1. Did cl	ass disc	ussions contribu	ite to	what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	511/1398	****	4.37	4.07	3.85	4.40
2. Were a	all stude	nts actively end	courage	d to participate	0	0	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	543/1391	****	4.60	4.30	4.07	4.60
3. Did th	ne instru	ctor encourage i	fair ar	d open discussion	0	0	0	0	3	1	1	3.60	1157/1388	****	4.53	4.28	4.01	3.60
4. Were s	special to	echniques succes	ssful		0	4	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 958	****	4.39	3.93	3.71	****
				Frequ	ıency	Dis	trib	utio	n									
Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	asons	3			Ty	pe			Majors	;
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A 3		Red	quir	ed fo	or Ma	jors	S	0	Graduat	е	0	Majo	or	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	в 1														
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C 0		Gei	nera	1				0	Under-g	rad	5	Non-	-major	5
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	1	D 0														
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F 0		Ele	ecti	ves				0	#### -				_	ſh
				P 0									respons	es to b	e sign	ificar	nt	
												_						

Other

3

Course-Section: PUBL 698 0102 University of Maryland

Title Baltimore County Policy Analysis Capstone Instructor: Short, J. (Instr. B) Fall 2007

Enrollment:

0	
Questionnaires:	5

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Page 21

FEB 13, 2008

Job IRBR3029

			Frequencies					Inst	ructor	Course Dept		t UMBC Level		Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	951/1639	****	4.31	4.27	4.08	4.20
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	3	0	3.40	1522/1639	****	4.37	4.22	4.17	3.40
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	4	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1397	****	4.51	4.28	4.18	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	2	1	0	3.33	1465/1583	****	4.31	4.19	4.01	3.33
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	1	3	0	3.75	1046/1532	****	4.07	4.01	3.88	3.75
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	4	1	4.20	667/1504	****	4.14	4.05	3.78	4.20
 Was the grading system clearly explained 	0	3	2	0	0	0	0	1.00	1606/1612	****	4.13	4.16	4.10	1.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1635	****	4.78	4.65	4.56	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	1318/1579	***	4.13	4.08	3.95	3.50
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/1518	****	4.46	4.43	4.38	1.33
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/1520	****	4.76	4.70	4.61	3.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	511/1398	****	4.37	4.07	3.85	4.40
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	543/1391	****	4.60	4.30	4.07	4.60
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion			0	0	3	1	1		1157/1388	****	4.53	4.28	4.01	3.60
4. Were special techniques successful	0	4	0	1	0	0	0		****/ 958		4.39	3.93	3.71	***

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