

Course-Section: SOCY 101 0101  
 Title BASIC CONCEPTS IN SOCY  
 Instructor: TUFEKCIOGLU, ZE  
 Enrollment: 150  
 Questionnaires: 90

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2007

Page 1479  
 FEB 13, 2008  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sept
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	2	4	16	32	35	4.06	1103/1639	4.03	4.22	4.27	4.08	4.06	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	3	0	1	2	18	33	33	4.09	1021/1639	3.95	4.22	4.22	4.17	4.09	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	1	1	21	30	36	4.11	925/1397	3.93	4.24	4.28	4.18	4.11	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	12	5	6	19	26	20	3.66	1331/1583	3.68	4.11	4.19	4.01	3.66	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	2	4	5	19	21	37	3.95	842/1532	3.97	4.18	4.01	3.88	3.95	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	4	6	8	3	23	23	23	3.63	1141/1504	3.59	4.03	4.05	3.78	3.63	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	1	3	13	21	50	4.32	743/1612	4.20	4.20	4.16	4.10	4.32	
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	2	1	0	4	29	52	4.52	1121/1635	4.63	4.77	4.65	4.56	4.52	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	29	2	0	0	11	32	16	4.08	841/1579	4.02	4.03	4.08	3.95	4.08	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	8	0	1	0	6	21	54	4.55	757/1518	4.43	4.46	4.43	4.38	4.55	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	10	0	1	0	3	13	63	4.71	961/1520	4.73	4.75	4.70	4.61	4.71	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	11	0	2	1	8	25	43	4.34	790/1517	4.29	4.33	4.27	4.20	4.34	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	12	1	1	1	7	27	41	4.38	796/1550	4.35	4.36	4.22	4.17	4.38	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	15	1	3	3	11	21	36	4.14	553/1295	3.90	3.97	3.94	3.84	4.14	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	40	0	4	1	6	15	24	4.08	742/1398	3.72	4.05	4.07	3.85	4.08	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	42	0	2	0	7	13	26	4.27	801/1391	3.83	4.33	4.30	4.07	4.27	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	42	0	2	0	6	8	32	4.42	730/1388	4.18	4.41	4.28	4.01	4.42	
4. Were special techniques successful	42	15	4	1	6	10	12	3.76	610/ 958	3.48	3.97	3.93	3.71	3.76	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	88	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 224	****	****	4.10	3.90	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	88	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 240	****	****	4.11	4.01	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	89	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 219	****	****	4.44	4.44	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	89	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 215	****	****	4.35	4.43	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	89	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 198	****	****	4.18	4.25	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	88	0	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/ 85	****	4.60	4.58	4.50	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	89	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 82	****	4.68	4.52	4.12	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	89	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 78	****	4.56	4.47	4.25	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	89	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 80	****	4.52	4.47	4.39	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	89	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 82	****	4.25	4.16	3.90	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	89	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 52	****	5.00	4.04	3.61	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	89	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 53	****	5.00	4.05	3.51	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	89	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 42	****	5.00	4.75	4.79	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	89	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 37	****	5.00	4.58	5.00	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	89	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 32	****	5.00	4.56	4.60	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	89	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 50	****	5.00	4.45	4.54	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	89	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 32	****	****	4.51	4.67	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	89	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 43	****	5.00	4.69	4.69	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	89	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 32	****	****	4.37	4.67	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	89	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 21	****	****	4.52	5.00	****	

Course-Section: SOCY 101 0101  
 Title BASIC CONCEPTS IN SOCY  
 Instructor: TUFEKCIOGLU, ZE  
 Enrollment: 150  
 Questionnaires: 90

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2007

Page 1479  
 FEB 13, 2008  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	9	0.00-0.99 4	A 30	Required for Majors 31	Graduate 0 Major 0
28-55	11	1.00-1.99 0	B 25		
56-83	2	2.00-2.99 3	C 6	General 11	Under-grad 90 Non-major 90
84-150	6	3.00-3.49 7	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 12		
			? 0		



Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	3	0	1	3	12	32	32	4.14	1029/1639	4.03	4.22	4.27	4.08	4.14	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	4	0	3	3	15	26	32	4.03	1074/1639	3.95	4.22	4.22	4.17	4.03	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	3	0	3	10	9	27	31	3.91	1074/1397	3.93	4.24	4.28	4.18	3.91	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	6	46	0	6	7	7	11	3.74	1268/1583	3.68	4.11	4.19	4.01	3.74	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	5	1	1	6	14	18	38	4.12	692/1532	3.97	4.18	4.01	3.88	4.12	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	8	60	1	1	3	5	5	3.80	****/1504	3.59	4.03	4.05	3.78	****	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	5	1	2	2	5	13	55	4.52	479/1612	4.20	4.20	4.16	4.10	4.52	
8. How many times was class cancelled	7	0	0	0	0	2	74	4.97	199/1635	4.63	4.77	4.65	4.56	4.97	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	23	2	1	2	10	24	21	4.07	853/1579	4.02	4.03	4.08	3.95	4.07	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	7	0	1	1	6	22	46	4.46	863/1518	4.43	4.46	4.43	4.38	4.46	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	7	0	0	0	1	6	69	4.89	571/1520	4.73	4.75	4.70	4.61	4.89	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	10	0	0	3	13	19	38	4.26	875/1517	4.29	4.33	4.27	4.20	4.26	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	7	0	3	3	9	11	50	4.34	823/1550	4.35	4.36	4.22	4.17	4.34	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	8	0	2	2	3	14	54	4.55	247/1295	3.90	3.97	3.94	3.84	4.55	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	31	0	6	0	11	16	19	3.81	929/1398	3.72	4.05	4.07	3.85	3.81	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	31	0	1	4	9	11	27	4.13	911/1391	3.83	4.33	4.30	4.07	4.13	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	31	0	0	0	9	7	36	4.52	639/1388	4.18	4.41	4.28	4.01	4.52	
4. Were special techniques successful	31	38	2	2	6	2	2	3.00	****/ 958	3.48	3.97	3.93	3.71	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	77	5	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 224	****	****	4.10	3.90	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	81	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/ 240	****	****	4.11	4.01	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	80	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 219	****	****	4.44	4.44	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	80	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 215	****	****	4.35	4.43	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	80	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 198	****	****	4.18	4.25	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	79	3	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 85	****	4.60	4.58	4.50	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	80	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 82	****	4.68	4.52	4.12	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	80	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 80	****	4.52	4.47	4.39	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	80	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 82	****	4.25	4.16	3.90	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	81	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/ 52	****	5.00	4.04	3.61	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	81	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/ 53	****	5.00	4.05	3.51	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	81	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 42	****	5.00	4.75	4.79	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	81	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 37	****	5.00	4.58	5.00	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	81	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 32	****	5.00	4.56	4.60	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	81	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/ 50	****	5.00	4.45	4.54	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	81	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 32	****	****	4.51	4.67	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	81	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 43	****	5.00	4.69	4.69	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	81	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 32	****	****	4.37	4.67	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	81	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 21	****	****	4.52	5.00	****	

Course-Section: SOCY 101 0301  
 Title BASIC CONCEPTS IN SOCY  
 Instructor: MACLENNAN, JAMI  
 Enrollment: 149  
 Questionnaires: 83

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2007

Page 1481  
 FEB 13, 2008  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	15	0.00-0.99	3	A	22	Required for Majors	39	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	B	25						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	1	C	5	General	8	Under-grad	83	Non-major	83
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	1	D	1						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	14				
				?	1						

Course-Section: SOCY 101 0401  
 Title BASIC CONCEPTS IN SOCY  
 Instructor: TUFEKCIOGLU, ZE  
 Enrollment: 148  
 Questionnaires: 90

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2007

Page 1482  
 FEB 13, 2008  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sept
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	2	0	2	3	15	35	33	4.07	1096/1639	4.03	4.22	4.27	4.08	4.07	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	0	2	28	30	28	3.95	1176/1639	3.95	4.22	4.22	4.17	3.95	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	3	0	1	7	26	21	32	3.87	1105/1397	3.93	4.24	4.28	4.18	3.87	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	4	9	2	4	29	24	18	3.68	1317/1583	3.68	4.11	4.19	4.01	3.68	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	3	2	3	3	22	23	34	3.96	828/1532	3.97	4.18	4.01	3.88	3.96	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	3	10	5	10	18	26	18	3.55	1188/1504	3.59	4.03	4.05	3.78	3.55	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	3	0	1	4	16	20	46	4.22	860/1612	4.20	4.20	4.16	4.10	4.22	
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	2	0	2	33	49	4.50	1135/1635	4.63	4.77	4.65	4.56	4.50		
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	21	3	2	1	9	36	18	4.02	883/1579	4.02	4.03	4.08	3.95	4.02	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	1	11	30	45	4.37	989/1518	4.43	4.46	4.43	4.38	4.37	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	1	1	7	14	64	4.60	1122/1520	4.73	4.75	4.70	4.61	4.60	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	1	1	10	30	44	4.34	800/1517	4.29	4.33	4.27	4.20	4.34	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	1	3	3	10	24	46	4.24	905/1550	4.35	4.36	4.22	4.17	4.24	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	6	0	3	3	9	27	42	4.21	489/1295	3.90	3.97	3.94	3.84	4.21	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	26	0	3	2	18	20	21	3.84	912/1398	3.72	4.05	4.07	3.85	3.84	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	26	0	3	4	16	19	22	3.83	1112/1391	3.83	4.33	4.30	4.07	3.83	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	26	0	2	2	10	17	33	4.20	867/1388	4.18	4.41	4.28	4.01	4.20	
4. Were special techniques successful	26	19	5	9	13	8	10	3.20	818/ 958	3.48	3.97	3.93	3.71	3.20	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	76	8	0	2	1	1	2	3.50	****/ 224	****	****	4.10	3.90	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	80	0	0	2	2	3	3	3.70	****/ 240	****	****	4.11	4.01	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	80	4	1	1	1	1	2	3.33	****/ 219	****	****	4.44	4.44	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	80	4	1	1	1	0	3	3.50	****/ 215	****	****	4.35	4.43	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	80	4	1	1	1	1	2	3.33	****/ 198	****	****	4.18	4.25	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	78	4	0	2	1	1	4	3.88	****/ 85	****	4.60	4.58	4.50	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	79	3	0	3	0	1	4	3.75	****/ 82	****	4.68	4.52	4.12	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	79	4	0	2	1	2	2	3.57	****/ 78	****	4.56	4.47	4.25	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	79	2	0	3	0	3	3	3.67	****/ 80	****	4.52	4.47	4.39	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	79	3	0	1	1	4	2	3.88	****/ 82	****	4.25	4.16	3.90	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	82	0	1	1	3	0	3	3.38	****/ 52	****	5.00	4.04	3.61	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	81	0	0	1	4	2	2	3.56	****/ 53	****	5.00	4.05	3.51	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	80	2	1	1	1	2	3	3.63	****/ 42	****	5.00	4.75	4.79	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	80	3	1	0	3	1	2	3.43	****/ 37	****	5.00	4.58	5.00	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	80	4	1	2	0	1	2	3.17	****/ 32	****	5.00	4.56	4.60	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	78	0	0	3	3	2	4	3.58	****/ 50	****	5.00	4.45	4.54	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	78	1	1	1	2	2	5	3.82	****/ 32	****	****	4.51	4.67	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	78	2	1	4	1	2	2	3.00	****/ 43	****	5.00	4.69	4.69	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	79	3	1	3	1	1	2	3.00	****/ 32	****	****	4.37	4.67	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	79	3	1	2	2	1	2	3.13	****/ 21	****	****	4.52	5.00	****	

Course-Section: SOCY 101 0401  
 Title BASIC CONCEPTS IN SOCY  
 Instructor: TUFEKCIOGLU, ZE  
 Enrollment: 148  
 Questionnaires: 90

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2007

Page 1482  
 FEB 13, 2008  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	10	0.00-0.99	0	A	22	Required for Majors	33	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	7	1.00-1.99	0	B	23						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	3	C	9	General	11	Under-grad	90	Non-major	90
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	4	D	1						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5	F	0	Electives	2	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	8				
				?	0						

Course-Section: SOCY 202 0101  
 Title DRUGS & ALCOHOL IN SOC  
 Instructor: VOSS, CINDY C  
 Enrollment: 39  
 Questionnaires: 23

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2007

Page 1483  
 FEB 13, 2008  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	2	1	1	6	13	4.17	977/1639	4.17	4.22	4.27	4.35	4.17	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	3	6	4	9	3.74	1369/1639	3.74	4.22	4.22	4.27	3.74	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	4	7	5	6	3.48	1277/1397	3.48	4.24	4.28	4.39	3.48	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	3	2	4	4	10	3.70	1303/1583	3.70	4.11	4.19	4.28	3.70	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	3	3	6	9	3.86	942/1532	3.86	4.18	4.01	4.09	3.86	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	4	2	1	8	7	3.55	1188/1504	3.55	4.03	4.05	4.09	3.55	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	2	3	5	12	4.23	848/1612	4.23	4.20	4.16	4.21	4.23	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	7	15	4.68	979/1635	4.68	4.77	4.65	4.63	4.68	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	1	0	3	5	6	4	3.61	1263/1579	3.61	4.03	4.08	4.14	3.61	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	1	2	8	12	4.35	1010/1518	4.35	4.46	4.43	4.48	4.35	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	2	3	18	4.70	992/1520	4.70	4.75	4.70	4.78	4.70	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	4	5	14	4.43	687/1517	4.43	4.33	4.27	4.34	4.43	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	6	15	4.57	568/1550	4.57	4.36	4.22	4.33	4.57	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	1	0	1	5	4	12	4.23	481/1295	4.23	3.97	3.94	4.07	4.23	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	1	0	1	6	12	4.40	511/1398	4.40	4.05	4.07	4.14	4.40	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	1	0	3	2	14	4.40	694/1391	4.40	4.33	4.30	4.35	4.40	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	1	0	2	5	12	4.35	771/1388	4.35	4.41	4.28	4.37	4.35	
4. Were special techniques successful	3	5	5	0	3	4	3	3.00	841/ 958	3.00	3.97	3.93	4.00	3.00	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 224	****	****	4.10	4.33	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 240	****	****	4.11	4.47	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 52	****	5.00	4.04	4.78	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 50	****	5.00	4.45	3.24	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 32	****	****	4.51	4.33	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 43	****	5.00	4.69	****	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 32	****	****	4.37	1.00	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 21	****	****	4.52	3.00	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	1	A	1
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B	12
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	1	C	4
84-150	6	3.00-3.49	9	D	1
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F	0
				P	1
				I	0
				?	1
			Required for Majors	3	Graduate
			General	12	Under-grad
			Electives	1	Major
			Other	6	Non-major
					15
					#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant



Course-Section: SOCY 210 0101  
 Title CLASS/INEQUALITY IN U.  
 Instructor: HEWITT, CHRIS J  
 Enrollment: 40  
 Questionnaires: 22

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2007

Page 1484  
 FEB 13, 2008  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	0	0	4	5	12	4.38	771/1639	4.38	4.22	4.27	4.35	4.38	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	3	2	8	8	4.00	1090/1639	4.00	4.22	4.22	4.27	4.00	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	2	4	7	8	4.00	973/1397	4.00	4.24	4.28	4.39	4.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	2	0	2	1	9	7	4.11	939/1583	4.11	4.11	4.19	4.28	4.11	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	3	2	0	1	1	5	10	4.41	430/1532	4.41	4.18	4.01	4.09	4.41	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	3	1	0	2	5	3	8	3.94	896/1504	3.94	4.03	4.05	4.09	3.94	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	1	1	7	7	4	3.60	1360/1612	3.60	4.20	4.16	4.21	3.60	
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	15	5	4.25	1350/1635	4.25	4.77	4.65	4.63	4.25	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	3	8	9	4.30	601/1579	4.30	4.03	4.08	4.14	4.30	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	0	4	16	4.80	360/1518	4.80	4.46	4.43	4.48	4.80	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	2	18	4.90	546/1520	4.90	4.75	4.70	4.78	4.90	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	1	8	11	4.50	597/1517	4.50	4.33	4.27	4.34	4.50	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	1	5	14	4.65	468/1550	4.65	4.36	4.22	4.33	4.65	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	19	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1295	****	3.97	3.94	4.07	****	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	12	0	1	0	1	3	5	4.10	735/1398	4.10	4.05	4.07	4.14	4.10	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	12	0	1	0	1	3	5	4.10	936/1391	4.10	4.33	4.30	4.35	4.10	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	12	0	0	1	1	1	7	4.40	740/1388	4.40	4.41	4.28	4.37	4.40	
4. Were special techniques successful	12	8	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 958	****	3.97	3.93	4.00	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	A 12	Required for Majors	8
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	B 3		Graduate 0
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	C 2	General	5
84-150	6	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad 22
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	2
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	2
			? 0		

Course-Section: SOCY 240 0101  
 Title ELEMENTARY SOCIAL BEHA  
 Instructor: TUFEKCIOGLU, ZE  
 Enrollment: 46  
 Questionnaires: 31

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2007

Page 1485  
 FEB 13, 2008  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	0	0	2	11	17	4.50	615/1639	4.50	4.22	4.27	4.35	4.50	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	9	20	4.63	382/1639	4.63	4.22	4.22	4.27	4.63	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	1	0	0	10	19	4.53	487/1397	4.53	4.24	4.28	4.39	4.53	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	4	8	0	0	3	5	11	4.42	572/1583	4.42	4.11	4.19	4.28	4.42	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	2	1	8	18	4.45	398/1532	4.45	4.18	4.01	4.09	4.45	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	12	0	1	3	4	9	4.24	629/1504	4.24	4.03	4.05	4.09	4.24	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	1	0	2	4	22	4.59	408/1612	4.59	4.20	4.16	4.21	4.59	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	11	19	4.63	1034/1635	4.63	4.77	4.65	4.63	4.63	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	13	0	0	0	0	8	10	4.56	332/1579	4.56	4.03	4.08	4.14	4.56	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	0	5	23	4.82	330/1518	4.82	4.46	4.43	4.48	4.82	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	1	28	4.97	219/1520	4.97	4.75	4.70	4.78	4.97	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	0	5	24	4.83	222/1517	4.83	4.33	4.27	4.34	4.83	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	1	7	21	4.69	435/1550	4.69	4.36	4.22	4.33	4.69	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	0	1	0	2	7	18	4.46	297/1295	4.46	3.97	3.94	4.07	4.46	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	10	0	1	0	2	5	13	4.38	525/1398	4.38	4.05	4.07	4.14	4.38	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	10	0	1	0	3	3	14	4.38	710/1391	4.38	4.33	4.30	4.35	4.38	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	10	0	0	0	1	2	18	4.81	328/1388	4.81	4.41	4.28	4.37	4.81	
4. Were special techniques successful	11	3	0	1	5	2	9	4.12	430/ 958	4.12	3.97	3.93	4.00	4.12	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	29	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 224	****	****	4.10	4.33	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	29	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 240	****	****	4.11	4.47	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	29	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 219	****	****	4.44	4.61	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	29	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 215	****	****	4.35	4.43	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	29	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 198	****	****	4.18	4.08	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	28	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 85	****	4.60	4.58	4.00	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	28	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 82	****	4.68	4.52	3.00	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	28	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 78	****	4.56	4.47	****	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	28	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 80	****	4.52	4.47	2.00	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	28	1	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 82	****	4.25	4.16	4.00	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	30	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 52	****	5.00	4.04	4.78	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	29	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 53	****	5.00	4.05	4.28	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	29	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 42	****	5.00	4.75	****	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	29	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 37	****	5.00	4.58	****	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	29	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 32	****	5.00	4.56	****	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	29	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 50	****	5.00	4.45	3.24	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	28	1	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 32	****	****	4.51	4.33	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	28	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/ 43	****	5.00	4.69	****	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	28	1	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 32	****	****	4.37	1.00	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	28	1	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 21	****	****	4.52	3.00	****	

Course-Section: SOCY 240 0101  
 Title ELEMENTARY SOCIAL BEHA  
 Instructor: TUFEKCIOGLU, ZE  
 Enrollment: 46  
 Questionnaires: 31

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2007

Page 1485  
 FEB 13, 2008  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	A	6	Required for Majors	7	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B	14						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	6	C	2	General	3	Under-grad	31	Non-major	30
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F	0	Electives	3	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	9				
				?	1						

Course-Section: SOCY 300 0101  
 Title METHODOLOGY:SOCIAL RSR  
 Instructor: MACLENNAN, JAMI  
 Enrollment: 43  
 Questionnaires: 22

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2007

Page 1486  
 FEB 13, 2008  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	3	0	0	0	3	5	11	4.42	726/1639	4.19	4.22	4.27	4.28	4.42	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	3	0	0	0	3	1	15	4.63	382/1639	4.60	4.22	4.22	4.20	4.63	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	3	0	0	0	0	4	15	4.79	250/1397	4.59	4.24	4.28	4.26	4.79	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	3	0	0	0	1	6	12	4.58	402/1583	4.49	4.11	4.19	4.24	4.58	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	3	0	2	0	5	2	10	3.95	856/1532	3.95	4.18	4.01	4.05	3.95	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	1	5	2	11	4.21	647/1504	3.95	4.03	4.05	4.12	4.21	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	3	0	0	1	1	1	16	4.68	293/1612	4.65	4.20	4.16	4.12	4.68	
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	0	0	0	0	0	19	5.00	1/1635	4.92	4.77	4.65	4.66	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	0	0	0	2	6	8	4.38	527/1579	4.26	4.03	4.08	4.07	4.38	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	1	0	3	16	4.70	561/1518	4.73	4.46	4.43	4.39	4.70	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	3	17	4.85	674/1520	4.70	4.75	4.70	4.68	4.85	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	1	0	5	14	4.60	474/1517	4.55	4.33	4.27	4.23	4.60	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	1	3	16	4.75	351/1550	4.60	4.36	4.22	4.20	4.75	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	1	0	2	1	5	11	4.32	413/1295	4.46	3.97	3.94	3.95	4.32	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	1	3	3	8	4.20	675/1398	4.13	4.05	4.07	4.13	4.20	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	0	0	1	2	12	4.73	417/1391	4.57	4.33	4.30	4.35	4.73	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	0	0	1	3	11	4.67	496/1388	4.57	4.41	4.28	4.34	4.67	
4. Were special techniques successful	7	9	0	0	3	0	3	4.00	456/ 958	4.13	3.97	3.93	3.97	4.00	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	20	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 224	****	****	4.10	4.06	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 240	****	****	4.11	4.08	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	21	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 219	****	****	4.44	4.44	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	21	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 215	****	****	4.35	4.21	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	21	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 85	****	4.60	4.58	4.50	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	20	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 82	****	4.68	4.52	4.59	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 78	****	4.56	4.47	4.60	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	20	0	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	****/ 80	****	4.52	4.47	4.65	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	20	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 82	****	4.25	4.16	4.08	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	21	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 52	****	5.00	4.04	4.78	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	21	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 53	****	5.00	4.05	4.31	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	21	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 42	****	5.00	4.75	4.63	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	21	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 37	****	5.00	4.58	4.52	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 32	****	5.00	4.56	4.30	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	21	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 50	****	5.00	4.45	5.00	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	20	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 32	****	****	4.51	5.00	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	20	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/ 43	****	5.00	4.69	5.00	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	20	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 21	****	****	4.52	5.00	****	

Course-Section: SOCY 300 0101  
 Title METHODOLOGY:SOCIAL RSR  
 Instructor: MACLENNAN, JAMI  
 Enrollment: 43  
 Questionnaires: 22

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2007

Page 1486  
 FEB 13, 2008  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	15	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	3
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	B	3						
56-83	5	2.00-2.99	1	C	1	General	0	Under-grad	22	Non-major	19
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	5	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	16				
				?	0						

Course-Section: SOCY 300 0201  
 Title METHODOLOGY:SOCIAL RSR  
 Instructor: MACLENNAN, JAMI  
 Enrollment: 42  
 Questionnaires: 27

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2007

Page 1487  
 FEB 13, 2008  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	0	3	3	12	8	3.96	1183/1639	4.19	4.22	4.27	4.28	3.96	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	4	3	19	4.58	445/1639	4.60	4.22	4.22	4.20	4.58	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	1	0	3	6	16	4.38	678/1397	4.59	4.24	4.28	4.26	4.38	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	1	0	1	2	8	14	4.40	597/1583	4.49	4.11	4.19	4.24	4.40	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	2	1	6	4	13	3.96	828/1532	3.95	4.18	4.01	4.05	3.96	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	3	1	7	5	10	3.69	1098/1504	3.95	4.03	4.05	4.12	3.69	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	3	4	19	4.62	376/1612	4.65	4.20	4.16	4.12	4.62	
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	1	2	22	4.84	751/1635	4.92	4.77	4.65	4.66	4.84	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	7	0	0	0	2	13	5	4.15	772/1579	4.26	4.03	4.08	4.07	4.15	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	1	4	20	4.76	435/1518	4.73	4.46	4.43	4.39	4.76	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	1	1	6	16	4.54	1158/1520	4.70	4.75	4.70	4.68	4.54	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	1	1	7	15	4.50	597/1517	4.55	4.33	4.27	4.23	4.50	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	2	9	13	4.46	703/1550	4.60	4.36	4.22	4.20	4.46	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	2	0	0	0	9	14	4.61	221/1295	4.46	3.97	3.94	3.95	4.61	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	2	2	6	7	4.06	752/1398	4.13	4.05	4.07	4.13	4.06	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	10	0	0	0	3	4	10	4.41	686/1391	4.57	4.33	4.30	4.35	4.41	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	10	0	0	0	3	3	11	4.47	674/1388	4.57	4.41	4.28	4.34	4.47	
4. Were special techniques successful	10	9	0	0	2	2	4	4.25	349/ 958	4.13	3.97	3.93	3.97	4.25	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	26	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 85	****	4.60	4.58	4.50	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	26	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 82	****	4.68	4.52	4.59	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	26	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 78	****	4.56	4.47	4.60	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	26	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 80	****	4.52	4.47	4.65	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	26	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 82	****	4.25	4.16	4.08	****	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: SOCY 301 0101  
 Title ANALY:SOCIOLOGICAL DAT  
 Instructor: LOTTES, ILSA L.  
 Enrollment: 38  
 Questionnaires: 24

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2007

Page 1488  
 FEB 13, 2008  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	3	0	0	0	2	5	14	4.57	540/1639	4.57	4.22	4.27	4.28	4.57	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	3	0	0	0	1	3	17	4.76	241/1639	4.76	4.22	4.22	4.20	4.76	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	3	0	0	0	0	4	17	4.81	230/1397	4.81	4.24	4.28	4.26	4.81	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	2	1	1	1	6	11	4.25	792/1583	4.25	4.11	4.19	4.24	4.25	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	3	0	2	4	2	8	5	3.48	1258/1532	3.48	4.18	4.01	4.05	3.48	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	3	5	1	1	1	6	7	4.06	791/1504	4.06	4.03	4.05	4.12	4.06	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	3	0	2	2	1	4	12	4.05	1016/1612	4.05	4.20	4.16	4.12	4.05	
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	0	0	0	0	4	17	4.81	811/1635	4.81	4.77	4.65	4.66	4.81	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	7	0	0	0	3	7	7	4.24	680/1579	4.24	4.03	4.08	4.07	4.24	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	2	3	4	12	4.24	1110/1518	4.24	4.46	4.43	4.39	4.24	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	2	1	4	14	4.43	1256/1520	4.43	4.75	4.70	4.68	4.43	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	1	2	2	6	10	4.05	1059/1517	4.05	4.33	4.27	4.23	4.05	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	3	3	15	4.57	556/1550	4.57	4.36	4.22	4.20	4.57	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	8	3	0	4	3	4	3.36	1058/1295	3.36	3.97	3.94	3.95	3.36	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	13	0	1	1	2	3	4	3.73	987/1398	3.73	4.05	4.07	4.13	3.73	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	13	0	0	1	0	3	7	4.45	655/1391	4.45	4.33	4.30	4.35	4.45	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	12	0	0	1	1	4	6	4.25	834/1388	4.25	4.41	4.28	4.34	4.25	
4. Were special techniques successful	14	4	1	0	1	2	2	3.67	658/ 958	3.67	3.97	3.93	3.97	3.67	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	19	0	2	0	1	0	2	3.00	****/ 224	****	****	4.10	4.06	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	19	0	0	1	2	0	2	3.60	****/ 240	****	****	4.11	4.08	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	19	0	1	0	1	1	2	3.60	****/ 219	****	****	4.44	4.44	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	20	0	1	0	1	0	2	3.50	****/ 215	****	****	4.35	4.21	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	20	0	0	1	1	0	2	3.75	****/ 198	****	****	4.18	4.04	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	23	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 85	****	4.60	4.58	4.50	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	23	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 82	****	4.68	4.52	4.59	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	23	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 78	****	4.56	4.47	4.60	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	23	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 80	****	4.52	4.47	4.65	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	23	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 82	****	4.25	4.16	4.08	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	23	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 50	****	5.00	4.45	5.00	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	23	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 32	****	****	4.51	5.00	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	23	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 43	****	5.00	4.69	5.00	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	23	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 32	****	****	4.37	5.00	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	23	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 21	****	****	4.52	5.00	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	1	A	10	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	14
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	9						
56-83	5	2.00-2.99	3	C	1	General	0	Under-grad	24	Non-major	10
84-150	12	3.00-3.49	4	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	8	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough			

P	0			responses to be significant
I	0	Other	20	
?	0			



Course-Section: SOCY 321 0101  
 Title RACE & ETHNIC RELATION  
 Instructor: PINCUS, FRED L  
 Enrollment: 45  
 Questionnaires: 25

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2007

Page 1489  
 FEB 13, 2008  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	2	0	0	0	3	7	13	4.43	712/1639	4.43	4.22	4.27	4.28	4.43	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	3	0	0	1	3	10	8	4.14	981/1639	4.14	4.22	4.22	4.20	4.14	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	4	0	0	1	5	5	10	4.14	897/1397	4.14	4.24	4.28	4.26	4.14	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	0	1	2	6	7	7	3.74	1275/1583	3.74	4.11	4.19	4.24	3.74	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	1	2	8	12	4.35	497/1532	4.35	4.18	4.01	4.05	4.35	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	1	7	7	7	3.78	1026/1504	3.78	4.03	4.05	4.12	3.78	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	1	1	3	7	11	4.13	944/1612	4.13	4.20	4.16	4.12	4.13	
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	0	0	0	0	11	11	4.50	1135/1635	4.50	4.77	4.65	4.66	4.50	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	8	1	0	0	4	8	4	4.00	889/1579	4.00	4.03	4.08	4.07	4.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	1	5	17	4.70	561/1518	4.70	4.46	4.43	4.39	4.70	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	1	5	17	4.70	992/1520	4.70	4.75	4.70	4.68	4.70	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	2	9	11	4.41	726/1517	4.41	4.33	4.27	4.23	4.41	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	3	8	12	4.39	778/1550	4.39	4.36	4.22	4.20	4.39	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	1	1	1	8	5	6	3.67	894/1295	3.67	3.97	3.94	3.95	3.67	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	11	0	1	0	0	6	7	4.29	599/1398	4.29	4.05	4.07	4.13	4.29	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	11	0	0	0	0	7	7	4.50	616/1391	4.50	4.33	4.30	4.35	4.50	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	11	0	0	0	2	7	5	4.21	860/1388	4.21	4.41	4.28	4.34	4.21	
4. Were special techniques successful	11	3	0	0	3	4	4	4.09	438/ 958	4.09	3.97	3.93	3.97	4.09	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 7	Required for Majors	4
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	B 10		Graduate 0
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	C 3	General	6
84-150	11	3.00-3.49	D 0		25
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	1
			P 0		
			I 0		
			? 0	Other	9

#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant

Course-Section: SOCY 332 0101  
 Title HUM SEXUALITY/SOCIO PE  
 Instructor: LOTTES, ILSA L.  
 Enrollment: 76  
 Questionnaires: 54

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2007

Page 1490  
 FEB 13, 2008  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	3	2	5	10	34	4.30	850/1639	4.30	4.22	4.27	4.28	4.30	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	2	2	8	15	27	4.17	948/1639	4.17	4.22	4.22	4.20	4.17	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	2	3	14	20	15	3.80	1155/1397	3.80	4.24	4.28	4.26	3.80	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	3	1	4	3	23	20	4.12	929/1583	4.12	4.11	4.19	4.24	4.12	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	6	18	29	4.39	459/1532	4.39	4.18	4.01	4.05	4.39	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	3	9	16	25	4.13	747/1504	4.13	4.03	4.05	4.12	4.13	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	4	7	7	36	4.39	656/1612	4.39	4.20	4.16	4.12	4.39	
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	2	50	4.96	265/1635	4.96	4.77	4.65	4.66	4.96	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	11	2	0	3	6	18	14	4.05	865/1579	4.05	4.03	4.08	4.07	4.05	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	3	1	8	20	21	4.04	1226/1518	4.04	4.46	4.43	4.39	4.04	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	1	2	50	4.92	437/1520	4.92	4.75	4.70	4.68	4.92	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	2	5	6	19	19	3.94	1142/1517	3.94	4.33	4.27	4.23	3.94	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	1	2	2	3	14	29	4.32	841/1550	4.32	4.36	4.22	4.20	4.32	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	5	4	6	10	12	14	3.57	948/1295	3.57	3.97	3.94	3.95	3.57	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	13	0	1	0	9	11	20	4.20	675/1398	4.20	4.05	4.07	4.13	4.20	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	13	0	0	2	6	7	26	4.39	702/1391	4.39	4.33	4.30	4.35	4.39	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	13	0	0	0	6	7	28	4.54	624/1388	4.54	4.41	4.28	4.34	4.54	
4. Were special techniques successful	13	28	1	2	4	1	5	3.54	****/ 958	****	3.97	3.93	3.97	****	
Laboratory															
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	53	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 240	****	****	4.11	4.08	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	53	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 219	****	****	4.44	4.44	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	53	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 215	****	****	4.35	4.21	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	51	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 85	****	4.60	4.58	4.50	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	52	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 82	****	4.68	4.52	4.59	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	52	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 80	****	4.52	4.47	4.65	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	52	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 82	****	4.25	4.16	4.08	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	51	0	0	0	3	0	0	3.00	****/ 52	****	5.00	4.04	4.78	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	52	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/ 53	****	5.00	4.05	4.31	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	52	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 42	****	5.00	4.75	4.63	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	52	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/ 37	****	5.00	4.58	4.52	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	52	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 32	****	5.00	4.56	4.30	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	52	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/ 50	****	5.00	4.45	5.00	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	52	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/ 32	****	****	4.51	5.00	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	52	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 43	****	5.00	4.69	5.00	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	52	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 32	****	****	4.37	5.00	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	52	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 21	****	****	4.52	5.00	****	

Course-Section: SOCY 332 0101  
 Title HUM SEXUALITY/SOCIO PE  
 Instructor: LOTTES, ILSA L.  
 Enrollment: 76  
 Questionnaires: 54

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2007

Page 1490  
 FEB 13, 2008  
 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	10	Required for Majors	2	Graduate	0	Major	9
28-55	5	1.00-1.99	0	B	19						
56-83	9	2.00-2.99	3	C	8	General	23	Under-grad	54	Non-major	45
84-150	6	3.00-3.49	7	D	2						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	11	F	0	Electives	2	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	9				
				?	2						

Course-Section: SOCY 349 0101  
 Title SOCIOLOGY OF RELIGION  
 Instructor: COHEN, JERE M  
 Enrollment: 60  
 Questionnaires: 38

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2007

Page 1491  
 FEB 13, 2008  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	0	4	6	10	17	4.08	1082/1639	4.08	4.22	4.27	4.28	4.08	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	7	13	17	4.27	840/1639	4.27	4.22	4.22	4.20	4.27	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	1	1	9	26	4.62	400/1397	4.62	4.24	4.28	4.26	4.62	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	21	1	1	3	2	8	4.00	1010/1583	4.00	4.11	4.19	4.24	4.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	4	4	6	8	15	3.70	1104/1532	3.70	4.18	4.01	4.05	3.70	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	23	0	1	3	2	7	4.15	713/1504	4.15	4.03	4.05	4.12	4.15	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	1	0	1	5	11	19	4.33	718/1612	4.33	4.20	4.16	4.12	4.33	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	17	20	4.54	1107/1635	4.54	4.77	4.65	4.66	4.54	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	9	0	0	2	6	16	5	3.83	1117/1579	3.83	4.03	4.08	4.07	3.83	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	1	0	1	3	32	4.76	454/1518	4.76	4.46	4.43	4.39	4.76	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	1	4	3	29	4.62	1087/1520	4.62	4.75	4.70	4.68	4.62	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	1	0	6	6	23	4.39	747/1517	4.39	4.33	4.27	4.23	4.39	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	4	5	27	4.64	489/1550	4.64	4.36	4.22	4.20	4.64	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	25	3	2	1	1	3	2.90	1200/1295	2.90	3.97	3.94	3.95	2.90	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	19	0	1	0	4	5	9	4.11	735/1398	4.11	4.05	4.07	4.13	4.11	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	19	0	0	0	3	3	13	4.53	601/1391	4.53	4.33	4.30	4.35	4.53	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	19	0	0	0	1	2	16	4.79	351/1388	4.79	4.41	4.28	4.34	4.79	
4. Were special techniques successful	19	13	2	0	1	1	2	3.17	****/ 958	****	3.97	3.93	3.97	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	36	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 85	****	4.60	4.58	4.50	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	36	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 82	****	4.68	4.52	4.59	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	36	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 80	****	4.52	4.47	4.65	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	36	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 82	****	4.25	4.16	4.08	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	1	A	14
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	13
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	7	C	4
84-150	19	3.00-3.49	14	D	0
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F	0
				P	0
				I	0
				?	2
			Required for Majors	7	Graduate
			General	10	Under-grad
			Electives	3	Non-major
			Other	13	

#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant

Course-Section: SOCY 351 0101  
 Title MEDICAL SOCIOLOGY  
 Instructor: SCHUMACHER, JOH  
 Enrollment: 50  
 Questionnaires: 30

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2007

Page 1492  
 FEB 13, 2008  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	1	0	1	7	20	4.55	561/1639	4.55	4.22	4.27	4.28	4.55	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	1	1	2	4	20	4.46	583/1639	4.46	4.22	4.22	4.20	4.46	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	0	0	3	0	5	20	4.50	517/1397	4.50	4.24	4.28	4.26	4.50	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	1	2	4	5	17	4.21	843/1583	4.21	4.11	4.19	4.24	4.21	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	3	7	19	4.55	305/1532	4.55	4.18	4.01	4.05	4.55	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	1	1	2	3	9	13	4.11	770/1504	4.11	4.03	4.05	4.12	4.11	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	2	5	22	4.69	293/1612	4.69	4.20	4.16	4.12	4.69	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	1	0	0	1	3	24	4.82	781/1635	4.82	4.77	4.65	4.66	4.82	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	7	0	0	0	4	6	13	4.39	506/1579	4.39	4.03	4.08	4.07	4.39	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	5	0	1	0	3	2	19	4.52	782/1518	4.52	4.46	4.43	4.39	4.52	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	5	0	0	0	2	2	21	4.76	872/1520	4.76	4.75	4.70	4.68	4.76	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	5	0	0	1	3	3	18	4.52	572/1517	4.52	4.33	4.27	4.23	4.52	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	4	3	18	4.56	568/1550	4.56	4.36	4.22	4.20	4.56	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	5	2	0	0	4	4	15	4.48	289/1295	4.48	3.97	3.94	3.95	4.48	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	11	0	1	0	2	6	10	4.26	616/1398	4.26	4.05	4.07	4.13	4.26	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	11	0	0	0	1	4	14	4.68	471/1391	4.68	4.33	4.30	4.35	4.68	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	11	0	0	0	1	5	13	4.63	533/1388	4.63	4.41	4.28	4.34	4.63	
4. Were special techniques successful	11	2	3	3	2	4	5	3.29	796/ 958	3.29	3.97	3.93	3.97	3.29	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 17	Required for Majors	4
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	B 7		Graduate 0
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	C 1	General	5
84-150	14	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad 30
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	1
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	14
			? 0		

Course-Section: SOCY 352 0101  
 Title ISSUES IN HEALTH CARE  
 Instructor: NOLIN, MICHAEL  
 Enrollment: 50  
 Questionnaires: 21

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2007

Page 1493  
 FEB 13, 2008  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	0	1	1	4	14	4.55	561/1639	4.55	4.22	4.27	4.28	4.55	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	0	1	2	5	11	4.37	735/1639	4.37	4.22	4.22	4.20	4.37	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	1	1	1	5	12	4.30	749/1397	4.30	4.24	4.28	4.26	4.30	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	1	2	2	15	4.55	423/1583	4.55	4.11	4.19	4.24	4.55	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	3	0	1	0	2	5	10	4.28	562/1532	4.28	4.18	4.01	4.05	4.28	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	3	1	0	0	1	2	14	4.76	176/1504	4.76	4.03	4.05	4.12	4.76	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	3	0	0	2	3	1	12	4.28	790/1612	4.28	4.20	4.16	4.12	4.28	
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	1	18	4.95	397/1635	4.95	4.77	4.65	4.66	4.95	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	2	0	0	1	7	8	4.44	461/1579	4.44	4.03	4.08	4.07	4.44	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	1	0	2	3	14	4.45	891/1518	4.45	4.46	4.43	4.39	4.45	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	1	0	19	4.90	546/1520	4.90	4.75	4.70	4.68	4.90	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	1	1	0	3	15	4.50	597/1517	4.50	4.33	4.27	4.23	4.50	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	1	0	1	0	1	17	4.79	313/1550	4.79	4.36	4.22	4.20	4.79	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	1	0	1	1	2	15	4.63	203/1295	4.63	3.97	3.94	3.95	4.63	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	0	1	2	16	4.60	369/1398	4.60	4.05	4.07	4.13	4.60	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	1	0	0	1	18	4.75	393/1391	4.75	4.33	4.30	4.35	4.75	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	1	0	0	19	4.85	276/1388	4.85	4.41	4.28	4.34	4.85	
4. Were special techniques successful	1	10	0	1	1	1	7	4.40	267/ 958	4.40	3.97	3.93	3.97	4.40	
Laboratory															
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	19	0	2	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 240	****	****	4.11	4.08	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	19	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 85	****	4.60	4.58	4.50	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	19	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 82	****	4.68	4.52	4.59	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 78	****	4.56	4.47	4.60	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 80	****	4.52	4.47	4.65	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	19	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 82	****	4.25	4.16	4.08	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 52	****	5.00	4.04	4.78	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 53	****	5.00	4.05	4.31	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 37	****	5.00	4.58	4.52	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 50	****	5.00	4.45	5.00	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 32	****	****	4.51	5.00	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 43	****	5.00	4.69	5.00	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 32	****	****	4.37	5.00	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 21	****	****	4.52	5.00	****	

Course-Section: SOCY 352 0101  
 Title ISSUES IN HEALTH CARE  
 Instructor: NOLIN, MICHAEL  
 Enrollment: 50  
 Questionnaires: 21

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2007

Page 1493  
 FEB 13, 2008  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	13	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B	5						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	5	C	0	General	9	Under-grad	21	Non-major	20
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5	F	0	Electives	2	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	6				
				?	0						

Course-Section: SOCY 353 0101  
 Title MARRIAGE AND THE FAMIL  
 Instructor: SERVATIUS, NANC  
 Enrollment: 92  
 Questionnaires: 36

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2007

Page 1494  
 FEB 13, 2008  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sept
	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	7	5	8	9	7	3.11	1589/1639	3.88	4.22	4.27	4.28	3.11	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	6	10	4	10	6	3.00	1579/1639	3.75	4.22	4.22	4.20	3.00	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	10	4	8	8	6	2.89	1380/1397	3.67	4.24	4.28	4.26	2.89	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	6	5	3	5	6	11	3.50	1406/1583	4.00	4.11	4.19	4.24	3.50	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	4	3	7	11	9	3.53	1229/1532	4.06	4.18	4.01	4.05	3.53	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	5	13	3	5	4	6	2.58	1474/1504	3.62	4.03	4.05	4.12	2.58	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	2	6	6	6	7	9	3.21	1488/1612	3.95	4.20	4.16	4.12	3.21	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	1	1	0	28	6	4.03	1488/1635	4.51	4.77	4.65	4.66	4.03	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	7	0	6	7	9	6	1	2.62	1545/1579	3.54	4.03	4.08	4.07	2.62	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	8	5	6	6	9	3.09	1477/1518	3.94	4.46	4.43	4.39	3.09	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	2	3	4	5	20	4.12	1394/1520	4.48	4.75	4.70	4.68	4.12	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	10	4	9	4	7	2.82	1480/1517	3.79	4.33	4.27	4.23	2.82	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	1	11	5	5	4	6	2.65	1484/1550	3.57	4.36	4.22	4.20	2.65	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	14	6	3	5	1	5	2.80	1213/1295	3.53	3.97	3.94	3.95	2.80	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	15	0	6	1	5	4	5	3.05	1266/1398	3.77	4.05	4.07	4.13	3.05	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	15	0	6	3	3	4	5	2.95	1334/1391	3.78	4.33	4.30	4.35	2.95	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	16	0	4	3	2	5	6	3.30	1258/1388	4.03	4.41	4.28	4.34	3.30	
4. Were special techniques successful	15	10	3	0	1	3	4	3.45	747/ 958	3.69	3.97	3.93	3.97	3.45	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	31	4	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 224	****	****	4.10	4.06	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	31	0	4	0	0	0	1	1.80	****/ 240	****	****	4.11	4.08	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	31	3	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 219	****	****	4.44	4.44	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	31	2	2	0	0	0	1	2.33	****/ 215	****	****	4.35	4.21	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	31	3	2	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 198	****	****	4.18	4.04	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	31	1	2	0	0	0	2	3.00	****/ 85	****	4.60	4.58	4.50	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	31	1	2	0	0	0	2	3.00	****/ 82	****	4.68	4.52	4.59	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	31	1	2	0	0	0	2	3.00	****/ 78	****	4.56	4.47	4.60	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	31	1	2	0	0	0	2	3.00	****/ 80	****	4.52	4.47	4.65	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	31	1	2	0	0	0	2	3.00	****/ 82	****	4.25	4.16	4.08	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	32	0	2	1	0	0	1	2.25	****/ 52	****	5.00	4.04	4.78	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	33	0	3	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 53	****	5.00	4.05	4.31	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	33	2	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 42	****	5.00	4.75	4.63	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	33	1	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/ 37	****	5.00	4.58	4.52	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	33	2	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 32	****	5.00	4.56	4.30	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	31	0	1	2	0	1	1	2.80	****/ 50	****	5.00	4.45	5.00	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	31	2	2	0	0	0	1	2.33	****/ 32	****	****	4.51	5.00	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	31	2	1	1	0	0	1	2.67	****/ 43	****	5.00	4.69	5.00	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	31	3	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 32	****	****	4.37	5.00	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	31	3	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 21	****	****	4.52	5.00	****	



Course-Section: SOCY 353 0101  
 Title MARRIAGE AND THE FAMIL  
 Instructor: SERVATIUS, NANC  
 Enrollment: 92  
 Questionnaires: 36

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2007

Page 1494  
 FEB 13, 2008  
 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	11	Required for Majors	8	Graduate	0	Major	2
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B	11						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	6	C	5	General	11	Under-grad	36	Non-major	34
84-150	6	3.00-3.49	6	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	4				
				?	0						

Course-Section: SOCY 353 8020  
 Title MARRIAGE AND THE FAMIL  
 Instructor: STAFF  
 Enrollment: 29  
 Questionnaires: 20

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2007

Page 1495  
 FEB 13, 2008  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	1	1	2	16	4.65	443/1639	3.88	4.22	4.27	4.28	4.65	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	4	13	4.50	517/1639	3.75	4.22	4.22	4.20	4.50	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	4	13	4.45	603/1397	3.67	4.24	4.28	4.26	4.45	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	3	3	12	4.50	476/1583	4.00	4.11	4.19	4.24	4.50	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	4	14	4.60	276/1532	4.06	4.18	4.01	4.05	4.60	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	5	14	4.65	253/1504	3.62	4.03	4.05	4.12	4.65	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	1	4	14	4.68	293/1612	3.95	4.20	4.16	4.12	4.68	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	20	5.00	1/1635	4.51	4.77	4.65	4.66	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	9	0	0	0	1	4	6	4.45	439/1579	3.54	4.03	4.08	4.07	4.45	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	2	0	17	4.79	397/1518	3.94	4.46	4.43	4.39	4.79	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	1	1	17	4.84	699/1520	4.48	4.75	4.70	4.68	4.84	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	3	16	4.75	299/1517	3.79	4.33	4.27	4.23	4.75	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	3	1	15	4.50	638/1550	3.57	4.36	4.22	4.20	4.50	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	1	1	1	2	3	12	4.26	451/1295	3.53	3.97	3.94	3.95	4.26	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	6	12	4.50	426/1398	3.77	4.05	4.07	4.13	4.50	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	2	4	14	4.60	543/1391	3.78	4.33	4.30	4.35	4.60	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	2	1	17	4.75	387/1388	4.03	4.41	4.28	4.34	4.75	
4. Were special techniques successful	0	7	2	0	3	0	8	3.92	516/ 958	3.69	3.97	3.93	3.97	3.92	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	18	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 224	****	****	4.10	4.06	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	18	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 240	****	****	4.11	4.08	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	18	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 219	****	****	4.44	4.44	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	18	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 215	****	****	4.35	4.21	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	18	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 198	****	****	4.18	4.04	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	18	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 85	****	4.60	4.58	4.50	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	18	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 82	****	4.68	4.52	4.59	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 78	****	4.56	4.47	4.60	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 80	****	4.52	4.47	4.65	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	18	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 82	****	4.25	4.16	4.08	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 52	****	5.00	4.04	4.78	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	18	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 53	****	5.00	4.05	4.31	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	18	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 42	****	5.00	4.75	4.63	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	18	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 37	****	5.00	4.58	4.52	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	18	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 32	****	5.00	4.56	4.30	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 50	****	5.00	4.45	5.00	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	18	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 32	****	****	4.51	5.00	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	18	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 43	****	5.00	4.69	5.00	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	18	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 32	****	****	4.37	5.00	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	18	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 21	****	****	4.52	5.00	****	

Course-Section: SOCY 353 8020  
 Title MARRIAGE AND THE FAMIL  
 Instructor: STAFF  
 Enrollment: 29  
 Questionnaires: 20

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2007

Page 1495  
 FEB 13, 2008  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	8	Required for Majors	3	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	6						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	0	C	1	General	6	Under-grad	20	Non-major	20
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	2	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	7				
				?	0						

Course-Section: SOCY 354 0101  
 Title SOC BASES:PUBL/COMM HL  
 Instructor: KALFOGLOU, ANDR  
 Enrollment: 31  
 Questionnaires: 23

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2007

Page 1496  
 FEB 13, 2008  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	4	19	4.83	239/1639	4.83	4.22	4.27	4.28	4.83	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	6	16	4.65	360/1639	4.65	4.22	4.22	4.20	4.65	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	5	16	4.61	417/1397	4.61	4.24	4.28	4.26	4.61	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	5	18	4.78	207/1583	4.78	4.11	4.19	4.24	4.78	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	4	17	4.81	146/1532	4.81	4.18	4.01	4.05	4.81	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	3	0	0	1	6	12	4.58	313/1504	4.58	4.03	4.05	4.12	4.58	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	2	6	14	4.55	449/1612	4.55	4.20	4.16	4.12	4.55	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	9	13	4.59	1073/1635	4.59	4.77	4.65	4.66	4.59	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	8	1	0	0	2	6	6	4.29	623/1579	4.29	4.03	4.08	4.07	4.29	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	1	0	2	5	12	4.35	1000/1518	4.35	4.46	4.43	4.39	4.35	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	0	2	18	4.90	546/1520	4.90	4.75	4.70	4.68	4.90	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	0	5	16	4.76	287/1517	4.76	4.33	4.27	4.23	4.76	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	4	17	4.81	288/1550	4.81	4.36	4.22	4.20	4.81	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	1	1	0	0	5	12	4.50	265/1295	4.50	3.97	3.94	3.95	4.50	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	3	14	4.82	205/1398	4.82	4.05	4.07	4.13	4.82	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	0	1	1	15	4.82	311/1391	4.82	4.33	4.30	4.35	4.82	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	0	0	0	1	16	4.94	134/1388	4.94	4.41	4.28	4.34	4.94	
4. Were special techniques successful	6	6	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	75/ 958	4.91	3.97	3.93	3.97	4.91	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 224	****	****	4.10	4.06	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 240	****	****	4.11	4.08	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 219	****	****	4.44	4.44	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 215	****	****	4.35	4.21	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 198	****	****	4.18	4.04	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 85	****	4.60	4.58	4.50	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 82	****	4.68	4.52	4.59	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 78	****	4.56	4.47	4.60	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 80	****	4.52	4.47	4.65	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 82	****	4.25	4.16	4.08	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors		
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 10	Required for Majors 2	Graduate 0	Major 8
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B 9			
56-83	5	2.00-2.99	3	C 0	General 5	Under-grad 23	Non-major 15
84-150	8	3.00-3.49	5	D 0			
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F 0	Electives 0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	
				P 0			
				I 0	Other 13		
				? 0			

Course-Section: SOCY 359 0101  
 Title DEATH AND DYING  
 Instructor: CUMBERLAND, TRA  
 Enrollment: 20  
 Questionnaires: 13

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2007

Page 1497  
 FEB 13, 2008  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	1	0	3	2	7	4.08	1089/1639	4.08	4.22	4.27	4.28	4.08	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	0	5	0	7	3.92	1227/1639	3.92	4.22	4.22	4.20	3.92	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	2	1	2	7	3.92	1063/1397	3.92	4.24	4.28	4.26	3.92	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	3	1	4	4	3.75	1261/1583	3.75	4.11	4.19	4.24	3.75	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	3	3	5	4.00	774/1532	4.00	4.18	4.01	4.05	4.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	2	2	4	4	3.83	990/1504	3.83	4.03	4.05	4.12	3.83	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	0	5	7	4.58	408/1612	4.58	4.20	4.16	4.12	4.58	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/1635	5.00	4.77	4.65	4.66	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	1	1	5	1	3.75	1170/1579	3.75	4.03	4.08	4.07	3.75	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	1	11	4.77	435/1518	4.77	4.46	4.43	4.39	4.77	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	12	4.92	437/1520	4.92	4.75	4.70	4.68	4.92	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	1	0	4	7	4.42	713/1517	4.42	4.33	4.27	4.23	4.42	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	2	3	7	4.23	912/1550	4.23	4.36	4.22	4.20	4.23	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	1	2	2	8	4.31	421/1295	4.31	3.97	3.94	3.95	4.31	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	5	3	4.38	532/1398	4.38	4.05	4.07	4.13	4.38	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	393/1391	4.75	4.33	4.30	4.35	4.75	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	255/1388	4.88	4.41	4.28	4.34	4.88	
4. Were special techniques successful	4	1	1	0	2	2	3	3.75	610/ 958	3.75	3.97	3.93	3.97	3.75	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: SOCY 371 0101  
 Title CRIMINOLOGY AND PENOLO  
 Instructor: KNAPP, ROLAND  
 Enrollment: 70  
 Questionnaires: 22

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2007

Page 1498  
 FEB 13, 2008  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	1	1	4	4	12	4.14	1029/1639	4.14	4.22	4.27	4.28	4.14	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	3	2	4	3	10	3.68	1399/1639	3.68	4.22	4.22	4.20	3.68	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	3	3	2	2	12	3.77	1165/1397	3.77	4.24	4.28	4.26	3.77	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	11	0	4	1	1	5	3.64	1345/1583	3.64	4.11	4.19	4.24	3.64	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	2	1	5	5	7	3.70	1104/1532	3.70	4.18	4.01	4.05	3.70	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	11	1	3	3	1	3	3.18	1364/1504	3.18	4.03	4.05	4.12	3.18	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	2	5	3	11	3.95	1109/1612	3.95	4.20	4.16	4.12	3.95	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	8	14	4.64	1034/1635	4.64	4.77	4.65	4.66	4.64	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	2	0	5	3	6	6	3.65	1239/1579	3.65	4.03	4.08	4.07	3.65	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	1	1	4	4	10	4.05	1220/1518	4.05	4.46	4.43	4.39	4.05	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	3	4	13	4.50	1188/1520	4.50	4.75	4.70	4.68	4.50	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	2	2	4	4	8	3.70	1280/1517	3.70	4.33	4.27	4.23	3.70	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	1	3	4	11	4.15	982/1550	4.15	4.36	4.22	4.20	4.15	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	4	4	0	3	2	7	3.50	978/1295	3.50	3.97	3.94	3.95	3.50	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	12	0	2	2	2	1	3	3.10	1260/1398	3.10	4.05	4.07	4.13	3.10	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	12	0	1	0	5	0	4	3.60	1192/1391	3.60	4.33	4.30	4.35	3.60	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	12	0	1	0	2	2	5	4.00	944/1388	4.00	4.41	4.28	4.34	4.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	12	6	1	2	0	0	1	2.50	****/ 958	****	3.97	3.93	3.97	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99 0	A 7	Required for Majors 1	Graduate 0 Major 4
28-55	1	1.00-1.99 0	B 8		
56-83	3	2.00-2.99 1	C 1	General 8	Under-grad 22 Non-major 18
84-150	6	3.00-3.49 2	D 0		
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 6	
			? 1		

Course-Section: SOCY 396 0101  
 Title COMM SERV & LEARN INTE  
 Instructor: WOLFF, MICHELE  
 Enrollment: 15  
 Questionnaires: 10

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2007

Page 1499  
 FEB 13, 2008  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	171/1639	4.06	4.22	4.27	4.28	4.90	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	128/1639	4.34	4.22	4.22	4.20	4.90	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	5	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1397	5.00	4.24	4.28	4.26	5.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1583	4.42	4.11	4.19	4.24	5.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1532	5.00	4.18	4.01	4.05	5.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1504	4.22	4.03	4.05	4.12	5.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1612	4.42	4.20	4.16	4.12	5.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	5	5	4.50	1135/1635	4.67	4.77	4.65	4.66	4.50	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	2	0	0	0	3	1	4.25	657/1579	4.01	4.03	4.08	4.07	4.25	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	213/1518	4.42	4.46	4.43	4.39	4.90	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1520	4.70	4.75	4.70	4.68	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	157/1517	4.42	4.33	4.27	4.23	4.90	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1550	4.31	4.36	4.22	4.20	5.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	7	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1295	****	3.97	3.94	3.95	****	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1398	4.35	4.05	4.07	4.13	5.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1391	4.62	4.33	4.30	4.35	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1388	4.56	4.41	4.28	4.34	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	0	1	0	1	0	1	7	4.56	190/ 958	4.05	3.97	3.93	3.97	4.56	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 52	****	5.00	4.04	4.78	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 53	****	5.00	4.05	4.31	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 42	****	5.00	4.75	4.63	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	9	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 37	****	5.00	4.58	4.52	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	9	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 32	****	5.00	4.56	4.30	****	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: SOCY 396 0103  
 Title COMM SERV & LEARN INTE  
 Instructor: WOLFF, MICHELE  
 Enrollment: 23  
 Questionnaires: 20

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2007

Page 1500  
 FEB 13, 2008  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	1	5	6	3	4	3.21	1575/1639	4.06	4.22	4.27	4.28	3.21	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	1	2	5	2	8	3.78	1344/1639	4.34	4.22	4.22	4.20	3.78	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	15	0	0	2	1	1	3.75	****/1397	5.00	4.24	4.28	4.26	****	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	7	1	0	3	4	4	3.83	1205/1583	4.42	4.11	4.19	4.24	3.83	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	16	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/1532	5.00	4.18	4.01	4.05	****	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	1	3	1	4	5	5	3.44	1240/1504	4.22	4.03	4.05	4.12	3.44	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	6	0	1	4	3	4	3.83	1229/1612	4.42	4.20	4.16	4.12	3.83	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	1	0	0	18	4.84	751/1635	4.67	4.77	4.65	4.66	4.84	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	9	2	0	0	3	5	1	3.78	1155/1579	4.01	4.03	4.08	4.07	3.78	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	5	0	1	1	3	3	7	3.93	1293/1518	4.42	4.46	4.43	4.39	3.93	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	5	0	1	0	2	1	11	4.40	1273/1520	4.70	4.75	4.70	4.68	4.40	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	5	0	1	2	2	2	8	3.93	1152/1517	4.42	4.33	4.27	4.23	3.93	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	6	1	1	1	4	3	4	3.62	1293/1550	4.31	4.36	4.22	4.20	3.62	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	6	10	1	0	1	0	2	3.50	****/1295	****	3.97	3.94	3.95	****	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	2	0	4	6	5	3.71	1002/1398	4.35	4.05	4.07	4.13	3.71	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	1	1	1	4	10	4.24	831/1391	4.62	4.33	4.30	4.35	4.24	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	1	1	3	2	10	4.12	912/1388	4.56	4.41	4.28	4.34	4.12	
4. Were special techniques successful	3	6	2	0	2	4	3	3.55	707/ 958	4.05	3.97	3.93	3.97	3.55	
Laboratory															
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	19	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 240	****	****	4.11	4.08	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	12	0	1	0	2	0	5	4.00	69/ 85	4.00	4.60	4.58	4.50	4.00	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	12	0	1	0	0	2	5	4.25	65/ 82	4.25	4.68	4.52	4.59	4.25	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	12	0	1	1	1	0	5	3.88	66/ 78	3.88	4.56	4.47	4.60	3.88	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	12	0	1	1	1	1	4	3.75	69/ 80	3.75	4.52	4.47	4.65	3.75	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	12	0	1	1	1	1	4	3.75	58/ 82	3.75	4.25	4.16	4.08	3.75	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 52	****	5.00	4.04	4.78	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	19	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 53	****	5.00	4.05	4.31	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	19	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 42	****	5.00	4.75	4.63	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	19	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 37	****	5.00	4.58	4.52	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	19	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 32	****	5.00	4.56	4.30	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 50	****	5.00	4.45	5.00	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	19	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 32	****	****	4.51	5.00	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	19	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 43	****	5.00	4.69	5.00	****	



Course-Section: SOCY 396 0103  
 Title COMM SERV & LEARN INTE  
 Instructor: WOLFF, MICHELE  
 Enrollment: 23  
 Questionnaires: 20

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2007

Page 1500  
 FEB 13, 2008  
 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	1	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	B	0						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	1	C	0	General	3	Under-grad	20	Non-major	20
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	7	F	0	Electives	2	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	17						
				I	0	Other	13				
				?	0						

Course-Section: SOCY 409 0101  
 Title SOCIOLOGICAL THEORY  
 Instructor: COHEN, JERE M  
 Enrollment: 43  
 Questionnaires: 21

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2007

Page 1501  
 FEB 13, 2008  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	0	0	0	9	11	4.55	561/1639	4.55	4.22	4.27	4.42	4.55	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	7	13	4.65	360/1639	4.65	4.22	4.22	4.29	4.65	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	2	17	4.80	230/1397	4.80	4.24	4.28	4.38	4.80	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	9	0	0	0	3	8	4.73	270/1583	4.73	4.11	4.19	4.31	4.73	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	3	0	5	4	8	3.70	1104/1532	3.70	4.18	4.01	4.07	3.70	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	11	1	0	0	3	5	4.22	638/1504	4.22	4.03	4.05	4.20	4.22	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	1	3	3	12	4.37	681/1612	4.37	4.20	4.16	4.18	4.37	
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	1	0	0	0	7	11	4.61	1056/1635	4.61	4.77	4.65	4.72	4.61	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	1	1	0	10	6	4.06	859/1579	4.06	4.03	4.08	4.21	4.06	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	1	19	4.95	128/1518	4.95	4.46	4.43	4.51	4.95	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	1	19	4.95	328/1520	4.95	4.75	4.70	4.75	4.95	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	4	16	4.80	239/1517	4.80	4.33	4.27	4.34	4.80	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	2	18	4.90	174/1550	4.90	4.36	4.22	4.24	4.90	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	15	0	1	2	0	2	3.60	****/1295	****	3.97	3.94	4.01	****	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	10	0	1	2	0	2	6	3.91	887/1398	3.91	4.05	4.07	4.23	3.91	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	10	0	0	2	0	1	8	4.36	727/1391	4.36	4.33	4.30	4.48	4.36	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	10	0	1	0	0	1	9	4.55	616/1388	4.55	4.41	4.28	4.50	4.55	
4. Were special techniques successful	10	10	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 958	****	3.97	3.93	4.24	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99 0	A 5	Required for Majors	1
28-55	0	1.00-1.99 0	B 11		Graduate 1
56-83	1	2.00-2.99 3	C 1	General	1
84-150	9	3.00-3.49 4	D 0		Under-grad 20
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00 3	F 0	Electives	1
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	15
			? 1		

Course-Section: SOCY 419 0101  
 Title QUAL METH SOCIAL RESRC  
 Instructor: RUBINSTEIN, ROB  
 Enrollment: 28  
 Questionnaires: 21

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2007

Page 1502  
 FEB 13, 2008  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	1	1	2	8	8	4.05	1103/1639	4.05	4.22	4.27	4.42	4.05	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	2	7	4	7	3.80	1326/1639	3.80	4.22	4.22	4.29	3.80	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	17	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/1397	****	4.24	4.28	4.38	****	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	4	2	0	4	2	8	3.88	1178/1583	3.88	4.11	4.19	4.31	3.88	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	3	0	1	2	2	5	8	3.94	856/1532	3.94	4.18	4.01	4.07	3.94	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	3	0	1	1	4	6	6	3.83	990/1504	3.83	4.03	4.05	4.20	3.83	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	3	0	4	0	5	3	6	3.39	1445/1612	3.39	4.20	4.16	4.18	3.39	
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	0	0	0	0	5	13	4.72	928/1635	4.72	4.77	4.65	4.72	4.72	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	2	1	3	8	4	3.61	1263/1579	3.61	4.03	4.08	4.21	3.61	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	2	3	3	7	5	3.50	1419/1518	3.50	4.46	4.43	4.51	3.50	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	3	1	16	4.65	1047/1520	4.65	4.75	4.70	4.75	4.65	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	2	2	4	6	6	3.60	1310/1517	3.60	4.33	4.27	4.34	3.60	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	3	2	5	9	3.90	1161/1550	3.90	4.36	4.22	4.24	3.90	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	18	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/1295	****	3.97	3.94	4.01	****	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	4	2	3	2	6	3.24	1213/1398	3.24	4.05	4.07	4.23	3.24	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	1	1	1	2	12	4.35	736/1391	4.35	4.33	4.30	4.48	4.35	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	1	0	3	1	12	4.35	771/1388	4.35	4.41	4.28	4.50	4.35	
4. Were special techniques successful	4	11	0	1	0	4	1	3.83	563/ 958	3.83	3.97	3.93	4.24	3.83	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	17	0	0	1	0	0	3	4.25	****/ 85	****	4.60	4.58	4.83	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	17	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	****/ 82	****	4.68	4.52	4.49	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	****/ 78	****	4.56	4.47	4.56	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	17	0	1	0	0	0	3	4.00	****/ 80	****	4.52	4.47	4.59	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	17	0	1	0	1	0	2	3.50	****/ 82	****	4.25	4.16	4.02	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 52	****	5.00	4.04	4.84	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	18	0	1	0	1	1	0	2.67	****/ 53	****	5.00	4.05	4.58	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	18	0	0	1	1	0	1	3.33	****/ 42	****	5.00	4.75	4.71	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	18	1	0	2	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 37	****	5.00	4.58	4.73	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	18	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/ 32	****	5.00	4.56	4.64	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	4	0.00-0.99 0	A 17	Required for Majors 1	Graduate 8 Major 8
28-55	0	1.00-1.99 0	B 0		
56-83	2	2.00-2.99 0	C 0	General 5	Under-grad 13 Non-major 13
84-150	0	3.00-3.49 2	D 0		
Grad.	8	3.50-4.00 11	F 0	Electives 0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 12	
			? 1		

Course-Section: SOCY 420 0101  
 Title SOCIAL EPIDEMIOLOGY  
 Instructor: SERPI, TRACEY L  
 Enrollment: 36  
 Questionnaires: 27

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2007

Page 1503  
 FEB 13, 2008  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	1	7	11	8	3.96	1183/1639	3.96	4.22	4.27	4.42	3.96	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	10	9	8	3.93	1227/1639	3.93	4.22	4.22	4.29	3.93	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	5	1	2	3	9	7	3.86	1112/1397	3.86	4.24	4.28	4.38	3.86	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	1	0	1	5	8	11	4.16	881/1583	4.16	4.11	4.19	4.31	4.16	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	2	2	8	12	4.25	580/1532	4.25	4.18	4.01	4.07	4.25	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	3	1	0	0	6	8	9	4.13	735/1504	4.13	4.03	4.05	4.20	4.13	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	3	0	0	3	2	7	12	4.17	913/1612	4.17	4.20	4.16	4.18	4.17	
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	0	25	5.00	1/1635	5.00	4.77	4.65	4.72	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	12	13	0	3.52	1308/1579	3.52	4.03	4.08	4.21	3.52	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	1	2	3	18	4.58	708/1518	4.58	4.46	4.43	4.51	4.58	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	1	5	18	4.71	979/1520	4.71	4.75	4.70	4.75	4.71	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	2	11	12	4.40	726/1517	4.40	4.33	4.27	4.34	4.40	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	1	5	11	8	4.04	1057/1550	4.04	4.36	4.22	4.24	4.04	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	2	1	2	2	5	12	4.14	553/1295	4.14	3.97	3.94	4.01	4.14	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	1	3	7	6	5	3.50	1106/1398	3.50	4.05	4.07	4.23	3.50	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	1	0	2	7	13	4.35	744/1391	4.35	4.33	4.30	4.48	4.35	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	1	1	0	7	14	4.39	746/1388	4.39	4.41	4.28	4.50	4.39	
4. Were special techniques successful	4	4	1	2	3	5	8	3.89	535/ 958	3.89	3.97	3.93	4.24	3.89	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	26	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 224	****	****	4.10	4.49	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	26	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 215	****	****	4.35	4.28	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	26	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 85	****	4.60	4.58	4.83	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	26	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 52	****	5.00	4.04	4.84	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	26	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 53	****	5.00	4.05	4.58	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	26	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 42	****	5.00	4.75	4.71	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	26	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 50	****	5.00	4.45	4.85	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	26	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 32	****	****	4.51	4.00	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors		
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	1	A 18	Required for Majors 3	Graduate 9	Major 9
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B 2			
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	0	C 4	General 8	Under-grad 18	Non-major 18
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	4	D 0			
Grad.	9	3.50-4.00	10	F 0	Electives 0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	
				P 0			
				I 0	Other 15		
				? 2			

Course-Section: SOCY 430 0101  
 Title SOCIOLOGY OF AGING  
 Instructor: CLARK, LEANNE J  
 Enrollment: 15  
 Questionnaires: 13

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2007

Page 1504  
 FEB 13, 2008  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	13	5.00	1/1639	5.00	4.22	4.27	4.42	5.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	13	5.00	1/1639	5.00	4.22	4.22	4.29	5.00	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	12	4.92	129/1397	4.92	4.24	4.28	4.38	4.92	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	12	4.92	114/1583	4.92	4.11	4.19	4.31	4.92	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	94/1532	4.92	4.18	4.01	4.07	4.92	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	3	9	4.75	182/1504	4.75	4.03	4.05	4.20	4.75	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/1612	5.00	4.20	4.16	4.18	5.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	4	8	4.67	1001/1635	4.67	4.77	4.65	4.72	4.67	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	137/1579	4.80	4.03	4.08	4.21	4.80	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	1	12	4.92	170/1518	4.92	4.46	4.43	4.51	4.92	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	12	4.92	437/1520	4.92	4.75	4.70	4.75	4.92	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	1	0	0	1	11	4.62	462/1517	4.62	4.33	4.27	4.34	4.62	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	0	0	12	4.77	338/1550	4.77	4.36	4.22	4.24	4.77	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	2	3	0	1	1	6	3.64	911/1295	3.64	3.97	3.94	4.01	3.64	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	1	0	9	4.80	217/1398	4.80	4.05	4.07	4.23	4.80	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1391	5.00	4.33	4.30	4.48	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1388	5.00	4.41	4.28	4.50	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	3	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/ 958	5.00	3.97	3.93	4.24	5.00	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 85	****	4.60	4.58	4.83	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 82	****	4.68	4.52	4.49	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 78	****	4.56	4.47	4.56	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 80	****	4.52	4.47	4.59	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 82	****	4.25	4.16	4.02	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 50	****	5.00	4.45	4.85	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 32	****	****	4.51	4.00	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 43	****	5.00	4.69	4.85	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 32	****	****	4.37	4.67	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 21	****	****	4.52	4.50	****	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: SOCY 452 0101  
 Title HEALTH CARE ORG/DEL  
 Instructor: STUART, MARY  
 Enrollment: 37  
 Questionnaires: 27

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2007

Page 1505  
 FEB 13, 2008  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	3	0	1	0	3	7	13	4.29	850/1639	4.29	4.22	4.27	4.42	4.29	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	0	1	3	6	15	4.40	684/1639	4.40	4.22	4.22	4.29	4.40	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	0	0	0	4	4	17	4.52	497/1397	4.52	4.24	4.28	4.38	4.52	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	9	0	0	3	4	9	4.38	640/1583	4.38	4.11	4.19	4.31	4.38	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	0	3	1	3	5	13	3.96	828/1532	3.96	4.18	4.01	4.07	3.96	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	12	0	1	4	2	6	4.00	824/1504	4.00	4.03	4.05	4.20	4.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	3	0	2	0	2	3	17	4.38	669/1612	4.38	4.20	4.16	4.18	4.38	
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	1	0	0	0	1	23	4.96	331/1635	4.96	4.77	4.65	4.72	4.96	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	12	0	0	0	3	6	6	4.20	725/1579	4.20	4.03	4.08	4.21	4.20	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	2	2	20	4.75	454/1518	4.75	4.46	4.43	4.51	4.75	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	1	1	22	4.88	622/1520	4.88	4.75	4.70	4.75	4.88	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	2	4	18	4.67	405/1517	4.67	4.33	4.27	4.34	4.67	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	3	5	16	4.54	591/1550	4.54	4.36	4.22	4.24	4.54	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	1	1	2	4	3	12	4.05	604/1295	4.05	3.97	3.94	4.01	4.05	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	2	2	8	4.50	426/1398	4.50	4.05	4.07	4.23	4.50	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	15	0	0	0	1	2	9	4.67	489/1391	4.67	4.33	4.30	4.48	4.67	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	15	0	0	0	0	4	8	4.67	496/1388	4.67	4.41	4.28	4.50	4.67	
4. Were special techniques successful	15	3	0	2	3	1	3	3.56	703/ 958	3.56	3.97	3.93	4.24	3.56	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99 0	A 16	Required for Majors 0	Graduate 1 Major 2
28-55	2	1.00-1.99 0	B 3		
56-83	1	2.00-2.99 4	C 0	General 5	Under-grad 26 Non-major 25
84-150	8	3.00-3.49 5	D 0		
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00 4	F 0	Electives 0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 13	
			? 0		

Course-Section: SOCY 457 0101  
 Title SOCIAL HIST OF MEDICIN  
 Instructor: ROTHSTEIN, WILL  
 Enrollment: 21  
 Questionnaires: 4

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2007

Page 1506  
 FEB 13, 2008  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	1	0	2	1	3.75	1358/1639	3.75	4.22	4.27	4.42	3.75	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	517/1639	4.50	4.22	4.22	4.29	4.50	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	795/1397	4.25	4.24	4.28	4.38	4.25	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	2	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	1532/1583	3.00	4.11	4.19	4.31	3.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	1	1	1	3.50	1241/1532	3.50	4.18	4.01	4.07	3.50	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	2	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	1415/1504	3.00	4.03	4.05	4.20	3.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	1	0	1	1	3.00	1519/1612	3.00	4.20	4.16	4.18	3.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1635	5.00	4.77	4.65	4.72	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	382/1579	4.50	4.03	4.08	4.21	4.50	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	807/1518	4.50	4.46	4.43	4.51	4.50	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	890/1520	4.75	4.75	4.70	4.75	4.75	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	886/1517	4.25	4.33	4.27	4.34	4.25	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	638/1550	4.50	4.36	4.22	4.24	4.50	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	2	1	0	1	3.00	1158/1295	3.00	3.97	3.94	4.01	3.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	1	0	0	1	2.67	1342/1398	2.67	4.05	4.07	4.23	2.67	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	1	1	0	1	3.33	1265/1391	3.33	4.33	4.30	4.48	3.33	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	783/1388	4.33	4.41	4.28	4.50	4.33	
4. Were special techniques successful	1	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 958	5.00	3.97	3.93	4.24	5.00	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 85	5.00	4.60	4.58	4.83	5.00	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 82	5.00	4.68	4.52	4.49	5.00	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 78	5.00	4.56	4.47	4.56	5.00	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 80	5.00	4.52	4.47	4.59	5.00	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 82	5.00	4.25	4.16	4.02	5.00	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 52	5.00	5.00	4.04	4.84	5.00	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 53	5.00	5.00	4.05	4.58	5.00	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 42	5.00	5.00	4.75	4.71	5.00	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 37	5.00	5.00	4.58	4.73	5.00	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 32	5.00	5.00	4.56	4.64	5.00	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 50	5.00	5.00	4.45	4.85	5.00	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 43	5.00	5.00	4.69	4.85	5.00	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 3	Required for Majors 0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B 0	
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C 0	General 4
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	1	D 0	Under-grad 2
Grad.	2	3.50-4.00	1	F 0	Non-major 3
				P 0	
				I 0	
				? 1	Other 0

#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant

Course-Section: SOCY 458 0101  
 Title SOC OF MENTAL HLTH & I  
 Instructor: SECKIN, GUL  
 Enrollment: 30  
 Questionnaires: 19

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2007

Page 1507  
 FEB 13, 2008  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	1	1	2	6	8	4.06	1103/1639	4.06	4.22	4.27	4.42	4.06	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	2	2	5	9	4.17	948/1639	4.17	4.22	4.22	4.29	4.17	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	4	0	2	3	1	8	4.07	946/1397	4.07	4.24	4.28	4.38	4.07	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	3	1	0	4	2	8	4.07	967/1583	4.07	4.11	4.19	4.31	4.07	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	1	5	11	4.44	398/1532	4.44	4.18	4.01	4.07	4.44	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	5	0	2	0	3	9	4.36	529/1504	4.36	4.03	4.05	4.20	4.36	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	3	1	2	0	11	3.88	1190/1612	3.88	4.20	4.16	4.18	3.88	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	18	5.00	1/1635	5.00	4.77	4.65	4.72	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	2	3	2	8	1	3.19	1443/1579	3.19	4.03	4.08	4.21	3.19	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	1	4	6	7	4.06	1220/1518	4.06	4.46	4.43	4.51	4.06	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	2	2	15	4.68	1006/1520	4.68	4.75	4.70	4.75	4.68	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	2	2	4	3	7	3.61	1307/1517	3.61	4.33	4.27	4.34	3.61	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	2	2	3	1	10	3.83	1198/1550	3.83	4.36	4.22	4.24	3.83	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	0	1	5	12	4.61	215/1295	4.61	3.97	3.94	4.01	4.61	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	1	3	4	8	4.00	770/1398	4.00	4.05	4.07	4.23	4.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	2	3	12	4.59	557/1391	4.59	4.33	4.30	4.48	4.59	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	2	1	2	2	10	4.00	944/1388	4.00	4.41	4.28	4.50	4.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	2	12	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	267/ 958	4.40	3.97	3.93	4.24	4.40	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	3	0.00-0.99 3	A 14	Required for Majors	1
28-55	0	1.00-1.99 0	B 2		Graduate 8
56-83	0	2.00-2.99 0	C 1	General	10
84-150	0	3.00-3.49 1	D 0		11
Grad.	8	3.50-4.00 5	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		
			I 0	Other	5
			? 0		

#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant



Course-Section: SOCY 600 0101  
 Title RESEARCH METHODOLOGY  
 Instructor: ADLER, MARINA  
 Enrollment: 19  
 Questionnaires: 14

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2007

Page 1508  
 FEB 13, 2008  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	3	11	4.79	281/1639	3.86	4.22	4.27	4.42	4.79	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	4	9	4.57	445/1639	3.89	4.22	4.22	4.26	4.57	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	8	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	850/1397	3.74	4.24	4.28	4.37	4.20	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	4	8	4.43	572/1583	3.68	4.11	4.19	4.31	4.43	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	2	3	8	4.46	377/1532	4.00	4.18	4.01	4.10	4.46	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	1	0	1	1	2	8	4.42	478/1504	3.64	4.03	4.05	4.29	4.42	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	1	0	12	4.85	144/1612	4.02	4.20	4.16	4.27	4.85	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	13	5.00	1/1635	4.97	4.77	4.65	4.81	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	0	6	5	4.45	439/1579	3.50	4.03	4.08	4.17	4.45	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	1	12	4.79	397/1518	4.26	4.46	4.43	4.49	4.79	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	2	11	4.71	961/1520	4.54	4.75	4.70	4.79	4.71	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	1	12	4.79	263/1517	3.96	4.33	4.27	4.32	4.79	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	2	11	4.71	401/1550	3.78	4.36	4.22	4.23	4.71	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	1	0	0	0	4	9	4.69	167/1295	3.77	3.97	3.94	3.95	4.69	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	1	5	6	4.42	502/1398	3.81	4.05	4.07	4.22	4.42	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	1	3	8	4.58	557/1391	3.99	4.33	4.30	4.47	4.58	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	0	5	7	4.58	586/1388	3.90	4.41	4.28	4.49	4.58	
4. Were special techniques successful	2	3	0	0	1	2	6	4.56	190/ 958	3.63	3.97	3.93	4.01	4.56	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	12	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/ 85	****	4.60	4.58	4.58	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	12	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 82	****	4.68	4.52	4.74	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/ 78	****	4.56	4.47	4.52	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 80	****	4.52	4.47	4.50	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	12	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/ 82	****	4.25	4.16	4.37	****	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: SOCY 600 0201  
 Title RESEARCH METHODOLOGY  
 Instructor: SECKIN, GUL  
 Enrollment: 18  
 Questionnaires: 15

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2007

Page 1509  
 FEB 13, 2008  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	3	4	3	1	4	2.93	1613/1639	3.86	4.22	4.27	4.42	2.93	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	6	4	1	4	3.20	1564/1639	3.89	4.22	4.22	4.26	3.20	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	4	6	0	4	3.29	1329/1397	3.74	4.24	4.28	4.37	3.29	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	2	4	3	1	3	2.92	1554/1583	3.68	4.11	4.19	4.31	2.92	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	2	2	4	5	3.53	1223/1532	4.00	4.18	4.01	4.10	3.53	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	4	3	2	1	4	2.86	1440/1504	3.64	4.03	4.05	4.29	2.86	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	4	0	4	3	4	3.20	1488/1612	4.02	4.20	4.16	4.27	3.20	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	14	4.93	463/1635	4.97	4.77	4.65	4.81	4.93	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	1	4	1	4	0	2	2.55	1552/1579	3.50	4.03	4.08	4.17	2.55	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	3	4	2	6	3.73	1374/1518	4.26	4.46	4.43	4.49	3.73	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	3	3	8	4.36	1305/1520	4.54	4.75	4.70	4.79	4.36	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	2	3	4	1	4	3.14	1442/1517	3.96	4.33	4.27	4.32	3.14	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	1	4	2	2	2	3	2.85	1469/1550	3.78	4.36	4.22	4.23	2.85	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	0	4	3	0	3	3	2.85	1207/1295	3.77	3.97	3.94	3.95	2.85	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	3	2	3	3	4	3.20	1222/1398	3.81	4.05	4.07	4.22	3.20	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	1	1	7	3	3	3.40	1247/1391	3.99	4.33	4.30	4.47	3.40	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	1	4	4	1	4	3.21	1279/1388	3.90	4.41	4.28	4.49	3.21	
4. Were special techniques successful	0	8	2	1	2	1	1	2.71	900/ 958	3.63	3.97	3.93	4.01	2.71	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	13	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 224	****	****	4.10	4.43	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	14	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 240	****	****	4.11	3.96	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	14	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 219	****	****	4.44	4.23	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	14	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 215	****	****	4.35	4.72	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 198	****	****	4.18	4.74	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	13	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 85	****	4.60	4.58	4.58	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 82	****	4.68	4.52	4.74	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 78	****	4.56	4.47	4.52	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	13	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 80	****	4.52	4.47	4.50	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	13	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/ 82	****	4.25	4.16	4.37	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 52	****	5.00	4.04	3.64	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 53	****	5.00	4.05	4.03	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	14	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 37	****	5.00	4.58	4.33	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	14	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 50	****	5.00	4.45	4.39	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	14	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 21	****	****	4.52	4.42	****	

Course-Section: SOCY 600 0201  
 Title RESEARCH METHODOLOGY  
 Instructor: SECKIN, GUL  
 Enrollment: 18  
 Questionnaires: 15

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2007

Page 1509  
 FEB 13, 2008  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	4	0.00-0.99	2	A	14	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	6	Major	11
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	0						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	9	Non-major	4
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D	0						
Grad.	6	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	13				
				?	0						



Course-Section: SOCY 611 0101  
 Title CONSTR RACE CLASS & GE  
 Instructor: PINCUS, FRED L  
 Enrollment: 13  
 Questionnaires: 10

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2007

Page 1511  
 FEB 13, 2008  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	4	6	4.60	508/1639	4.60	4.22	4.27	4.42	4.60	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	199/1639	4.80	4.22	4.22	4.26	4.80	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	8	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1397	****	4.24	4.28	4.37	****	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	3	6	4.50	476/1583	4.50	4.11	4.19	4.31	4.50	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1532	5.00	4.18	4.01	4.10	5.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	150/1504	4.80	4.03	4.05	4.29	4.80	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	2	0	8	4.60	388/1612	4.60	4.20	4.16	4.27	4.60	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	3	7	4.70	968/1635	4.70	4.77	4.65	4.81	4.70	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	312/1579	4.57	4.03	4.08	4.17	4.57	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	1	1	7	4.67	602/1518	4.67	4.46	4.43	4.49	4.67	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	597/1520	4.89	4.75	4.70	4.79	4.89	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	173/1517	4.89	4.33	4.27	4.32	4.89	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	4	5	4.56	580/1550	4.56	4.36	4.22	4.23	4.56	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1398	5.00	4.05	4.07	4.22	5.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1391	5.00	4.33	4.30	4.47	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1388	5.00	4.41	4.28	4.49	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	0	7	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	155/ 958	4.67	3.97	3.93	4.01	4.67	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	5	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	44/ 85	4.80	4.60	4.58	4.58	4.80	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	5	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	34/ 82	4.80	4.68	4.52	4.74	4.80	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	38/ 78	4.80	4.56	4.47	4.52	4.80	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	39/ 80	4.80	4.52	4.47	4.50	4.80	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	5	0	0	1	0	2	2	4.00	49/ 82	4.00	4.25	4.16	4.37	4.00	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: SOCY 630 0101  
 Title SOCIOLOGY OF AGING  
 Instructor: TRELA, JAMES E  
 Enrollment: 17  
 Questionnaires: 14

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2007

Page 1512  
 FEB 13, 2008  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	5	9	4.64	456/1639	4.64	4.22	4.27	4.42	4.64	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	3	9	4.50	517/1639	4.50	4.22	4.22	4.26	4.50	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	5	8	4.50	517/1397	4.50	4.24	4.28	4.37	4.50	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	2	3	8	4.46	524/1583	4.46	4.11	4.19	4.31	4.46	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	1	3	9	4.43	419/1532	4.43	4.18	4.01	4.10	4.43	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	4	8	4.54	344/1504	4.54	4.03	4.05	4.29	4.54	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	1	1	1	10	4.54	459/1612	4.54	4.20	4.16	4.27	4.54	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	13	5.00	1/1635	5.00	4.77	4.65	4.81	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	2	3	7	4.42	484/1579	4.42	4.03	4.08	4.17	4.42	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	4	9	4.57	720/1518	4.57	4.46	4.43	4.49	4.57	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	14	5.00	1/1520	5.00	4.75	4.70	4.79	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	1	2	0	11	4.50	597/1517	4.50	4.33	4.27	4.32	4.50	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	1	2	10	4.50	638/1550	4.50	4.36	4.22	4.23	4.50	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	2	1	0	1	2	8	4.33	398/1295	4.33	3.97	3.94	3.95	4.33	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	0	5	7	4.38	525/1398	4.38	4.05	4.07	4.22	4.38	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	1	1	11	4.77	380/1391	4.77	4.33	4.30	4.47	4.77	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	2	1	10	4.62	558/1388	4.62	4.41	4.28	4.49	4.62	
4. Were special techniques successful	1	10	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 958	****	3.97	3.93	4.01	****	
Laboratory															
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	13	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 240	****	****	4.11	3.96	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	11	1	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 85	****	4.60	4.58	4.58	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	12	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 82	****	4.68	4.52	4.74	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 78	****	4.56	4.47	4.52	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 80	****	4.52	4.47	4.50	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	12	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 82	****	4.25	4.16	4.37	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	13	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 52	****	5.00	4.04	3.64	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	13	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 53	****	5.00	4.05	4.03	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	12	1	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 42	****	5.00	4.75	4.78	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	13	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 50	****	5.00	4.45	4.39	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors		
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	3	A 12	Required for Majors 1	Graduate 7	Major 9
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B 1			
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C 0	General 7	Under-grad 7	Non-major 5
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	0	D 0			
Grad.	7	3.50-4.00	4	F 0	Electives 0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	
				P 0			
				I 0	Other 6		
				? 0			

Course-Section: SOCY 681 8020  
 Title NONPROFIT ORGANIZATION  
 Instructor: ROTHSTEIN, WILL  
 Enrollment: 13  
 Questionnaires: 10

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2007

Page 1513  
 FEB 13, 2008  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	2	2	1	0	5	3.40	1530/1639	3.40	4.22	4.27	4.42	3.40	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	3	0	1	3	3	3.30	1542/1639	3.30	4.22	4.22	4.26	3.30	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	8	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1397	****	4.24	4.28	4.37	****	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	2	0	2	1	3	3.38	1455/1583	3.38	4.11	4.19	4.31	3.38	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	5	0	1	0	0	4	4.40	441/1532	4.40	4.18	4.01	4.10	4.40	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	2	0	0	6	3.60	1154/1504	3.60	4.03	4.05	4.29	3.60	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	5	0	0	3	1	2.44	1579/1612	2.44	4.20	4.16	4.27	2.44	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1635	5.00	4.77	4.65	4.81	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	3	0	2	2	2	3.00	1477/1579	3.00	4.03	4.08	4.17	3.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	2	3	5	4.30	1053/1518	4.30	4.46	4.43	4.49	4.30	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	802/1520	4.80	4.75	4.70	4.79	4.80	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	2	2	6	4.40	726/1517	4.40	4.33	4.27	4.32	4.40	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	2	1	0	5	3.40	1368/1550	3.40	4.36	4.22	4.23	3.40	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	1	0	2	4	3	3.80	806/1295	3.80	3.97	3.94	3.95	3.80	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	3	2	1	3	3.44	1139/1398	3.44	4.05	4.07	4.22	3.44	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	3	0	4	3	3.70	1168/1391	3.70	4.33	4.30	4.47	3.70	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	3	0	2	1	4	3.30	1258/1388	3.30	4.41	4.28	4.49	3.30	
4. Were special techniques successful	0	1	1	1	2	3	2	3.44	751/ 958	3.44	3.97	3.93	4.01	3.44	
Laboratory															
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	9	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 240	****	****	4.11	3.96	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	9	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 85	****	4.60	4.58	4.58	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	9	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 82	****	4.68	4.52	4.74	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 78	****	4.56	4.47	4.52	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 80	****	4.52	4.47	4.50	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	9	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 82	****	4.25	4.16	4.37	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	9	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 52	****	5.00	4.04	3.64	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	9	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 53	****	5.00	4.05	4.03	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	9	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 42	****	5.00	4.75	4.78	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	9	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 37	****	5.00	4.58	4.33	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	9	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 32	****	5.00	4.56	4.59	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 50	****	5.00	4.45	4.39	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 32	****	****	4.51	4.50	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 43	****	5.00	4.69	4.61	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	9	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 32	****	****	4.37	4.31	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 21	****	****	4.52	4.42	****	

Course-Section: SOCY 681 8020  
 Title NONPROFIT ORGANIZATION  
 Instructor: ROTHSTEIN, WILL  
 Enrollment: 13  
 Questionnaires: 10

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2007

Page 1513  
 FEB 13, 2008  
 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	4	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	5	Major	7
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	4						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	1	Under-grad	5	Non-major	3
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D	0						
Grad.	5	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	5				
				?	0						



Course-Section: SOCY 698 0101  
 Title ADVANCED SELECTED TOPI  
 Instructor: MALLINSON, CHRI  
 Enrollment: 7  
 Questionnaires: 4

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2007

Page 1514  
 FEB 13, 2008  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	318/1639	4.75	4.22	4.27	4.42	4.75	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	517/1639	4.50	4.22	4.22	4.26	4.50	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1397	5.00	4.24	4.28	4.37	5.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	239/1583	4.75	4.11	4.19	4.31	4.75	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	178/1532	4.75	4.18	4.01	4.10	4.75	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1504	5.00	4.03	4.05	4.29	5.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	490/1612	4.50	4.20	4.16	4.27	4.50	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1635	5.00	4.77	4.65	4.81	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	241/1579	4.67	4.03	4.08	4.17	4.67	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	454/1518	4.75	4.46	4.43	4.49	4.75	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1520	5.00	4.75	4.70	4.79	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	299/1517	4.75	4.33	4.27	4.32	4.75	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1550	5.00	4.36	4.22	4.23	5.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	459/1295	4.25	3.97	3.94	3.95	4.25	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	426/1398	4.50	4.05	4.07	4.22	4.50	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	616/1391	4.50	4.33	4.30	4.47	4.50	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	647/1388	4.50	4.41	4.28	4.49	4.50	
4. Were special techniques successful	2	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	201/ 958	4.50	3.97	3.93	4.01	4.50	

Frequency Distribution

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