

Course-Section: SOCY 101 0101  
 Title BASIC CONCEPTS IN SOCY  
 Instructor: COUSINGOSSETT,  
 Enrollment: 144  
 Questionnaires: 91

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2008

Page 1482  
 FEB 11, 2009  
 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	2	5	13	37	32	4.03	1162/1649	4.12	4.27	4.28	4.11	4.03	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	0	2	11	43	33	4.20	955/1648	4.32	4.19	4.23	4.16	4.20	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	4	1	1	2	8	25	50	4.41	665/1375	4.38	4.30	4.27	4.10	4.41	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	3	13	0	5	15	25	30	4.07	1032/1595	4.07	4.15	4.20	4.03	4.07	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	6	4	4	7	33	36	4.11	748/1533	4.22	4.23	4.04	3.87	4.11	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	25	4	2	14	18	26	3.94	980/1512	3.83	4.09	4.10	3.86	3.94	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	1	0	4	6	18	61	4.53	480/1623	4.52	4.14	4.16	4.08	4.53	
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	1	0	0	0	3	84	4.97	266/1646	4.91	4.65	4.69	4.67	4.97	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	28	3	1	1	15	30	13	3.88	1078/1621	4.10	3.95	4.06	3.96	3.88	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	5	0	0	1	4	21	60	4.63	699/1568	4.67	4.41	4.43	4.39	4.63	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	6	0	0	1	3	16	65	4.71	1022/1572	4.76	4.74	4.70	4.64	4.71	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	6	0	0	2	10	16	57	4.51	651/1564	4.58	4.33	4.28	4.20	4.51	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	5	0	2	4	5	18	57	4.44	777/1559	4.44	4.34	4.29	4.20	4.44	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	7	0	1	4	8	19	52	4.39	407/1352	4.38	4.01	3.98	3.86	4.39	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	27	0	1	5	7	22	29	4.14	737/1384	4.09	4.17	4.08	3.86	4.14	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	27	0	1	6	8	28	21	3.97	980/1382	4.13	4.37	4.29	4.03	3.97	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	29	0	0	1	6	16	39	4.50	654/1368	4.57	4.45	4.30	4.01	4.50	
4. Were special techniques successful	29	23	7	1	10	10	11	3.44	731/ 948	3.34	3.74	3.95	3.75	3.44	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	76	7	1	0	1	3	3	3.88	****/ 221	****	****	4.16	4.05	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	84	0	0	0	3	2	2	3.86	****/ 243	****	****	4.12	4.08	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	82	4	0	0	2	0	3	4.20	****/ 212	****	****	4.40	4.43	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	83	3	1	0	0	2	2	3.80	****/ 209	****	****	4.35	4.38	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	81	5	0	0	2	0	3	4.20	****/ 555	****	4.91	4.29	4.14	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	81	4	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	****/ 88	****	4.87	4.54	4.31	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	81	4	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	****/ 85	****	4.60	4.47	4.30	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	82	5	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	****/ 81	****	5.00	4.43	4.39	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	81	4	0	0	1	0	5	4.67	****/ 92	****	4.31	4.35	4.01	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	81	5	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	****/ 288	****	3.88	3.68	3.54	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	84	0	1	0	2	2	2	3.57	****/ 52	****	****	4.06	3.72	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	84	0	0	0	2	2	3	4.14	****/ 48	****	****	4.09	3.65	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	83	2	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	****/ 39	****	****	4.47	4.36	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	83	3	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	****/ 39	****	****	4.38	4.37	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	83	3	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	****/ 312	****	****	3.68	3.51	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	85	0	0	0	1	2	3	4.33	****/ 53	****	****	4.30	4.17	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	84	3	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	****/ 30	****	****	4.16	4.06	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	84	3	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	****/ 41	****	****	4.43	4.27	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	84	2	0	1	1	0	3	4.00	****/ 24	****	****	4.42	4.24	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	84	3	0	1	0	0	3	4.25	****/ 110	****	****	3.99	3.83	****	

Course-Section: SOCY 101 0101  
 Title BASIC CONCEPTS IN SOCY  
 Instructor: COUSINGOSSETT,  
 Enrollment: 144  
 Questionnaires: 91

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2008

Page 1482  
 FEB 11, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors		
00-27	9	0.00-0.99 0	A 28	Required for Majors	51	Graduate 0	Major 0
28-55	12	1.00-1.99 1	B 34				
56-83	2	2.00-2.99 4	C 14	General	8	Under-grad 91	Non-major 91
84-150	1	3.00-3.49 6	D 1				
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 7	F 0	Electives	3	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	
			P 0				
			I 0	Other	14		
			? 2				

Course-Section: SOCY 101 0201  
 Title BASIC CONCEPTS IN SOCY  
 Instructor: TUFEKCIOGLU, ZE  
 Enrollment: 97  
 Questionnaires: 72

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2008

Page 1483  
 FEB 11, 2009  
 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	4	12	26	28	4.11	1106/1649	4.12	4.27	4.28	4.11	4.11	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	0	2	13	26	29	4.17	988/1648	4.32	4.19	4.23	4.16	4.17	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	0	3	5	19	16	27	3.84	1065/1375	4.38	4.30	4.27	4.10	3.84	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	12	4	4	14	21	15	3.67	1329/1595	4.07	4.15	4.20	4.03	3.67	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	4	3	2	2	8	20	33	4.23	643/1533	4.22	4.23	4.04	3.87	4.23	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	4	8	6	6	12	22	14	3.53	1246/1512	3.83	4.09	4.10	3.86	3.53	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	1	6	22	41	4.47	541/1623	4.52	4.14	4.16	4.08	4.47	
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	1	0	2	0	5	61	4.84	782/1646	4.91	4.65	4.69	4.67	4.84	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	17	0	0	2	8	32	13	4.02	908/1621	4.10	3.95	4.06	3.96	4.02	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	7	0	0	1	4	17	43	4.57	779/1568	4.67	4.41	4.43	4.39	4.57	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	6	0	0	3	1	9	53	4.70	1034/1572	4.76	4.74	4.70	4.64	4.70	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	9	0	0	3	7	16	37	4.38	801/1564	4.58	4.33	4.28	4.20	4.38	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	6	1	5	2	8	18	32	4.08	1088/1559	4.44	4.34	4.29	4.20	4.08	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	7	2	2	2	9	17	33	4.22	534/1352	4.38	4.01	3.98	3.86	4.22	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	40	0	4	4	4	6	14	3.69	1002/1384	4.09	4.17	4.08	3.86	3.69	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	41	0	2	3	3	10	13	3.94	1005/1382	4.13	4.37	4.29	4.03	3.94	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	41	0	0	1	5	8	17	4.32	803/1368	4.57	4.45	4.30	4.01	4.32	
4. Were special techniques successful	41	18	4	2	2	3	2	2.77	****/ 948	3.34	3.74	3.95	3.75	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	67	2	0	1	0	2	0	3.33	****/ 221	****	****	4.16	4.05	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	68	0	1	1	1	0	1	2.75	****/ 243	****	****	4.12	4.08	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	67	3	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 212	****	****	4.40	4.43	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	67	3	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	****/ 209	****	****	4.35	4.38	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	66	3	0	0	2	1	0	3.33	****/ 555	****	4.91	4.29	4.14	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	67	1	0	1	1	1	1	3.50	****/ 88	****	4.87	4.54	4.31	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	67	2	1	0	0	2	0	3.00	****/ 85	****	4.60	4.47	4.30	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	67	3	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	****/ 81	****	5.00	4.43	4.39	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	67	1	0	0	0	3	1	4.25	****/ 92	****	4.31	4.35	4.01	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	67	2	0	1	0	2	0	3.33	****/ 288	****	3.88	3.68	3.54	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	69	0	0	0	1	2	0	3.67	****/ 52	****	****	4.06	3.72	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	69	0	0	1	0	2	0	3.33	****/ 48	****	****	4.09	3.65	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	68	1	0	0	2	0	1	3.67	****/ 39	****	****	4.47	4.36	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	68	1	0	0	1	2	0	3.67	****/ 39	****	****	4.38	4.37	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	68	2	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 312	****	****	3.68	3.51	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	69	0	0	1	1	1	0	3.00	****/ 53	****	****	4.30	4.17	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	68	0	0	1	1	1	1	3.50	****/ 30	****	****	4.16	4.06	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	68	2	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/ 41	****	****	4.43	4.27	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	68	1	0	0	1	2	0	3.67	****/ 24	****	****	4.42	4.24	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	67	1	0	1	1	1	1	3.50	****/ 110	****	****	3.99	3.83	****	

Course-Section: SOCY 101 0201  
 Title BASIC CONCEPTS IN SOCY  
 Instructor: TUFEKCIOGLU, ZE  
 Enrollment: 97  
 Questionnaires: 72

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2008

Page 1483  
 FEB 11, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	11	0.00-0.99	1	A	24	Required for Majors	36	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	0	B	29						
56-83	7	2.00-2.99	4	C	7	General	12	Under-grad	72	Non-major	72
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	8	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	7	F	0	Electives	4	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	12				
				?	2						

Course-Section: SOCY 101 0301  
 Title BASIC CONCEPTS IN SOCY  
 Instructor: COUSINGOSSETT,  
 Enrollment: 152  
 Questionnaires: 92

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2008

Page 1484  
 FEB 11, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR NA		Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sept
	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	17	28	45	4.27	943/1649	4.12	4.27	4.28	4.11	4.27
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	3	0	0	2	5	27	55	4.52	544/1648	4.32	4.19	4.23	4.16	4.52
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	1	0	0	3	23	64	4.68	391/1375	4.38	4.30	4.27	4.10	4.68
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	20	2	0	6	30	33	4.30	770/1595	4.07	4.15	4.20	4.03	4.30
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	5	2	1	16	22	44	4.24	643/1533	4.22	4.23	4.04	3.87	4.24
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	17	2	4	15	25	27	3.97	924/1512	3.83	4.09	4.10	3.86	3.97
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	4	6	20	60	4.51	491/1623	4.52	4.14	4.16	4.08	4.51
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	2	0	0	1	1	86	4.97	266/1646	4.91	4.65	4.69	4.67	4.97
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	17	1	0	0	6	37	31	4.34	595/1621	4.10	3.95	4.06	3.96	4.34
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	1	0	16	72	4.79	424/1568	4.67	4.41	4.43	4.39	4.79
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	1	0	2	8	77	4.82	815/1572	4.76	4.74	4.70	4.64	4.82
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	0	0	1	18	69	4.77	310/1564	4.58	4.33	4.28	4.20	4.77
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	1	0	0	3	20	64	4.70	463/1559	4.44	4.34	4.29	4.20	4.70
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	0	0	3	7	21	57	4.50	303/1352	4.38	4.01	3.98	3.86	4.50
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	22	0	4	2	6	19	39	4.24	679/1384	4.09	4.17	4.08	3.86	4.24
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	22	0	0	3	12	15	40	4.31	790/1382	4.13	4.37	4.29	4.03	4.31
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	22	0	0	0	1	15	54	4.76	426/1368	4.57	4.45	4.30	4.01	4.76
4. Were special techniques successful	23	19	7	9	9	10	15	3.34	771/ 948	3.34	3.74	3.95	3.75	3.34
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	87	3	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 221	****	****	4.16	4.05	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	88	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	****/ 243	****	****	4.12	4.08	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	87	2	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 212	****	****	4.40	4.43	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	88	2	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 209	****	****	4.35	4.38	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	84	2	0	1	2	1	2	3.67	****/ 555	****	4.91	4.29	4.14	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	88	1	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 88	****	4.87	4.54	4.31	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	88	2	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 85	****	4.60	4.47	4.30	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	88	3	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 81	****	5.00	4.43	4.39	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	88	2	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 92	****	4.31	4.35	4.01	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	86	3	0	1	0	1	1	3.67	****/ 288	****	3.88	3.68	3.54	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	89	0	1	0	0	0	2	3.67	****/ 52	****	****	4.06	3.72	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	90	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.09	3.65	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	89	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/ 39	****	****	4.47	4.36	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	88	3	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.38	4.37	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	88	2	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 312	****	****	3.68	3.51	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	88	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	****/ 53	****	****	4.30	4.17	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	88	2	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/ 30	****	****	4.16	4.06	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	88	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	****/ 41	****	****	4.43	4.27	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	88	2	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 24	****	****	4.42	4.24	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	88	2	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 110	****	****	3.99	3.83	****

Course-Section: SOCY 101 0301  
 Title BASIC CONCEPTS IN SOCY  
 Instructor: COUSINGOSSETT,  
 Enrollment: 152  
 Questionnaires: 92

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2008

Page 1484  
 FEB 11, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	17	0.00-0.99	1	A	41	Required for Majors	36	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	8	1.00-1.99	0	B	27						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	4	C	4	General	16	Under-grad	92	Non-major	92
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	12	F	0	Electives	3	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	20				
				?	1						

Course-Section: SOCY 101 0401  
 Title BASIC CONCEPTS IN SOCY  
 Instructor: COUSINGOSSETT,  
 Enrollment: 151  
 Questionnaires: 90

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2008

Page 1485  
 FEB 11, 2009  
 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	4	19	35	32	4.06	1149/1649	4.12	4.27	4.28	4.11	4.06	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	1	4	7	26	51	4.37	743/1648	4.32	4.19	4.23	4.16	4.37	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	2	3	26	58	4.57	488/1375	4.38	4.30	4.27	4.10	4.57	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	11	1	5	9	22	41	4.24	829/1595	4.07	4.15	4.20	4.03	4.24	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	3	2	4	10	20	49	4.29	584/1533	4.22	4.23	4.04	3.87	4.29	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	9	4	8	17	18	34	3.86	1048/1512	3.83	4.09	4.10	3.86	3.86	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	2	2	23	61	4.58	416/1623	4.52	4.14	4.16	4.08	4.58	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	1	0	9	79	4.87	731/1646	4.91	4.65	4.69	4.67	4.87	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	18	3	0	0	9	40	20	4.16	801/1621	4.10	3.95	4.06	3.96	4.16	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	0	1	4	15	66	4.70	588/1568	4.67	4.41	4.43	4.39	4.70	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	6	0	0	0	2	11	71	4.82	790/1572	4.76	4.74	4.70	4.64	4.82	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	4	20	63	4.68	460/1564	4.58	4.33	4.28	4.20	4.68	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	2	0	7	20	59	4.52	673/1559	4.44	4.34	4.29	4.20	4.52	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	2	2	2	10	17	53	4.39	407/1352	4.38	4.01	3.98	3.86	4.39	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	18	0	3	2	7	18	42	4.31	644/1384	4.09	4.17	4.08	3.86	4.31	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	18	0	0	4	12	14	42	4.31	799/1382	4.13	4.37	4.29	4.03	4.31	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	18	0	1	0	4	10	57	4.69	493/1368	4.57	4.45	4.30	4.01	4.69	
4. Were special techniques successful	19	19	12	2	11	16	11	3.23	804/ 948	3.34	3.74	3.95	3.75	3.23	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	81	5	0	3	0	0	1	2.75	****/ 221	****	****	4.16	4.05	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	84	0	0	0	4	0	2	3.67	****/ 243	****	****	4.12	4.08	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	84	2	0	2	1	0	1	3.00	****/ 212	****	****	4.40	4.43	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	84	1	0	1	0	2	2	4.00	****/ 209	****	****	4.35	4.38	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	80	2	0	1	2	2	3	3.88	****/ 555	****	4.91	4.29	4.14	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	81	5	0	1	2	0	1	3.25	****/ 88	****	4.87	4.54	4.31	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	84	2	0	1	2	0	1	3.25	****/ 85	****	4.60	4.47	4.30	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	84	2	0	2	1	0	1	3.00	****/ 81	****	5.00	4.43	4.39	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	84	2	0	1	0	2	1	3.75	****/ 92	****	4.31	4.35	4.01	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	84	1	1	0	0	1	3	4.00	****/ 288	****	3.88	3.68	3.54	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	84	0	0	0	3	0	3	4.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.06	3.72	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	84	0	0	0	1	2	3	4.33	****/ 48	****	****	4.09	3.65	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	84	1	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	****/ 39	****	****	4.47	4.36	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	84	1	0	3	0	0	2	3.20	****/ 39	****	****	4.38	4.37	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	83	4	0	1	0	0	2	4.00	****/ 312	****	****	3.68	3.51	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	83	0	0	0	2	0	5	4.43	****/ 53	****	****	4.30	4.17	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	83	2	0	1	0	2	2	4.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.16	4.06	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	83	2	0	1	2	0	2	3.60	****/ 41	****	****	4.43	4.27	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	83	2	0	1	2	0	2	3.60	****/ 24	****	****	4.42	4.24	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	83	2	0	1	0	2	2	4.00	****/ 110	****	****	3.99	3.83	****	

Course-Section: SOCY 101 0401  
 Title BASIC CONCEPTS IN SOCY  
 Instructor: COUSINGOSSETT,  
 Enrollment: 151  
 Questionnaires: 90

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2008

Page 1485  
 FEB 11, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	30	0.00-0.99	1	A	31	Required for Majors	46	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	0	B	40						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	5	C	8	General	13	Under-grad	90	Non-major	89
84-150	6	3.00-3.49	7	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	8	F	0	Electives	2	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	21				
				?	1						



Course-Section: SOCY 101Y 0101  
 Title BASIC CONCEPTS IN SOCY  
 Instructor: TUFEKCIOGLU, ZE (Instr. A)  
 Enrollment: 20  
 Questionnaires: 10

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2008

Page 1486  
 FEB 11, 2009  
 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	0	2	5	3.70	1402/1649	3.70	4.27	4.28	4.11	3.70	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	4	3	4.00	1124/1648	4.00	4.19	4.23	4.16	4.00	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	1	1	3	2	3.86	1060/1375	3.86	4.30	4.27	4.10	3.86	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	1	1	2	3	4.00	1067/1595	4.00	4.15	4.20	4.03	4.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	0	1	2	5	4.50	366/1533	4.50	4.23	4.04	3.87	4.50	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	0	2	2	4	4.25	687/1512	4.25	4.09	4.10	3.86	4.25	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	1	1	7	4.40	635/1623	4.40	4.14	4.16	4.08	4.40	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	1	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1646	5.00	4.65	4.69	4.67	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	1	0	1	0	3	1	3.80	1151/1621	4.00	3.95	4.06	3.96	4.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	1	0	0	8	4.67	636/1568	4.76	4.41	4.43	4.39	4.76	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	1	1	0	0	7	4.22	1409/1572	4.61	4.74	4.70	4.64	4.61	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	1	0	1	7	4.56	600/1564	4.78	4.33	4.28	4.20	4.78	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	0	1	0	7	4.33	901/1559	4.67	4.34	4.29	4.20	4.67	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	1	1	1	0	6	4.00	690/1352	3.88	4.01	3.98	3.86	3.88	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	1	0	1	0	5	4.14	737/1384	4.14	4.17	4.08	3.86	4.14	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	1	1	1	4	4.14	899/1382	4.14	4.37	4.29	4.03	4.14	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	1	1	0	5	4.29	827/1368	4.29	4.45	4.30	4.01	4.29	
4. Were special techniques successful	3	3	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	122/ 948	4.75	3.74	3.95	3.75	4.75	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 221	****	****	4.16	4.05	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 243	****	****	4.12	4.08	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 212	****	****	4.40	4.43	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 209	****	****	4.35	4.38	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 555	****	4.91	4.29	4.14	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	7	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/ 88	5.00	4.87	4.54	4.31	5.00	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	7	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/ 85	5.00	4.60	4.47	4.30	5.00	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/ 81	5.00	5.00	4.43	4.39	5.00	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	32/ 92	4.67	4.31	4.35	4.01	4.67	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	7	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	31/ 288	4.67	3.88	3.68	3.54	4.67	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.06	3.72	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.09	3.65	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.47	4.36	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.38	4.37	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 312	****	****	3.68	3.51	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 53	****	****	4.30	4.17	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.16	4.06	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 41	****	****	4.43	4.27	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 24	****	****	4.42	4.24	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 110	****	****	3.99	3.83	****	

Course-Section: SOCY 101Y 0101  
 Title BASIC CONCEPTS IN SOCY  
 Instructor: TUFEKCIOGLU, ZE (Instr. A)  
 Enrollment: 20  
 Questionnaires: 10

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2008

Page 1486  
 FEB 11, 2009  
 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	3	Required for Majors	3	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	2						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	1	General	1	Under-grad	10	Non-major	10
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	0	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	1				
				?	0						

Course-Section: SOCY 101Y 0101  
 Title BASIC CONCEPTS IN SOCY  
 Instructor: TUFEKCIOGLU, ZE (Instr. B)  
 Enrollment: 20  
 Questionnaires: 10

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2008

Page 1487  
 FEB 11, 2009  
 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	0	2	5	3.70	1402/1649	3.70	4.27	4.28	4.11	3.70	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	4	3	4.00	1124/1648	4.00	4.19	4.23	4.16	4.00	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	1	1	3	2	3.86	1060/1375	3.86	4.30	4.27	4.10	3.86	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	1	1	2	3	4.00	1067/1595	4.00	4.15	4.20	4.03	4.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	0	1	2	5	4.50	366/1533	4.50	4.23	4.04	3.87	4.50	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	0	2	2	4	4.25	687/1512	4.25	4.09	4.10	3.86	4.25	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	1	1	7	4.40	635/1623	4.40	4.14	4.16	4.08	4.40	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	1	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1646	5.00	4.65	4.69	4.67	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	1	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	754/1621	4.00	3.95	4.06	3.96	4.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	316/1568	4.76	4.41	4.43	4.39	4.76	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1572	4.61	4.74	4.70	4.64	4.61	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1564	4.78	4.33	4.28	4.20	4.78	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1559	4.67	4.34	4.29	4.20	4.67	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	3	0	1	1	0	2	3.75	914/1352	3.88	4.01	3.98	3.86	3.88	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	1	0	1	0	5	4.14	737/1384	4.14	4.17	4.08	3.86	4.14	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	1	1	1	4	4.14	899/1382	4.14	4.37	4.29	4.03	4.14	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	1	1	0	5	4.29	827/1368	4.29	4.45	4.30	4.01	4.29	
4. Were special techniques successful	3	3	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	122/ 948	4.75	3.74	3.95	3.75	4.75	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 221	****	****	4.16	4.05	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 243	****	****	4.12	4.08	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 212	****	****	4.40	4.43	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 209	****	****	4.35	4.38	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 555	****	4.91	4.29	4.14	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	7	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/ 88	5.00	4.87	4.54	4.31	5.00	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	7	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/ 85	5.00	4.60	4.47	4.30	5.00	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/ 81	5.00	5.00	4.43	4.39	5.00	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	32/ 92	4.67	4.31	4.35	4.01	4.67	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	7	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	31/ 288	4.67	3.88	3.68	3.54	4.67	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.06	3.72	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.09	3.65	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.47	4.36	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.38	4.37	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 312	****	****	3.68	3.51	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 53	****	****	4.30	4.17	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.16	4.06	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 41	****	****	4.43	4.27	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 24	****	****	4.42	4.24	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 110	****	****	3.99	3.83	****	

Course-Section: SOCY 101Y 0101  
 Title BASIC CONCEPTS IN SOCY  
 Instructor: TUFEEKCIOGLU, ZE (Instr. B)  
 Enrollment: 20  
 Questionnaires: 10

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2008

Page 1487  
 FEB 11, 2009  
 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	3	Required for Majors	3	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	2						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	1	General	1	Under-grad	10	Non-major	10
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	0	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	1				
				?	0						

Course-Section: SOCY 210 0101  
 Title CLASS/INEQUALITY IN U.  
 Instructor: COUSINGOSSETT,  
 Enrollment: 39  
 Questionnaires: 22

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2008

Page 1488  
 FEB 11, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor Mean	Instructor Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5								
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	0	0	3	6	12	4.43	749/1649	4.43	4.27	4.28	4.29	4.43	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	2	8	11	4.43	672/1648	4.43	4.19	4.23	4.25	4.43	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	2	5	14	4.57	488/1375	4.57	4.30	4.27	4.37	4.57	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	3	0	0	1	7	10	4.50	497/1595	4.50	4.15	4.20	4.22	4.50	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	2	7	12	4.48	399/1533	4.48	4.23	4.04	4.04	4.48	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	4	0	0	3	7	7	4.24	711/1512	4.24	4.09	4.10	4.14	4.24	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	3	7	11	4.38	659/1623	4.38	4.14	4.16	4.21	4.38	
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	14	6	4.30	1364/1646	4.30	4.65	4.69	4.63	4.30	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	0	0	0	1	12	3	4.13	835/1621	4.13	3.95	4.06	4.01	4.13	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	2	7	12	4.48	891/1568	4.48	4.41	4.43	4.39	4.48	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	1	3	17	4.76	912/1572	4.76	4.74	4.70	4.73	4.76	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	2	6	13	4.52	630/1564	4.52	4.33	4.28	4.27	4.52	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	4	17	4.81	318/1559	4.81	4.34	4.29	4.33	4.81	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	0	5	7	9	4.19	556/1352	4.19	4.01	3.98	4.07	4.19	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	1	1	2	3	8	4.07	774/1384	4.07	4.17	4.08	3.99	4.07	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	1	0	1	4	9	4.33	774/1382	4.33	4.37	4.29	4.19	4.33	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	1	0	0	1	13	4.67	522/1368	4.67	4.45	4.30	4.21	4.67	
4. Were special techniques successful	7	0	1	0	3	6	5	3.93	502/ 948	3.93	3.74	3.95	3.89	3.93	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 88	****	4.87	4.54	3.75	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 85	****	4.60	4.47	3.33	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	21	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 92	****	4.31	4.35	5.00	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	19	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	****/ 288	****	3.88	3.68	3.65	****	
Field Work															
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	21	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 312	****	****	3.68	3.59	****	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: SOCY 300 0101  
 Title METHODOLOGY:SOCIAL RSR  
 Instructor: TUFEKCIOGLU, ZE  
 Enrollment: 37  
 Questionnaires: 28

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2008

Page 1489  
 FEB 11, 2009  
 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	2	4	14	7	3.86	1311/1649	3.83	4.27	4.28	4.27	3.86	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	3	4	15	6	3.86	1271/1648	4.03	4.19	4.23	4.18	3.86	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	3	2	8	14	4.11	915/1375	4.17	4.30	4.27	4.22	4.11	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	4	5	10	8	3.71	1305/1595	4.01	4.15	4.20	4.21	3.71	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	2	6	10	9	3.86	966/1533	4.07	4.23	4.04	4.05	3.86	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	3	1	7	8	8	3.63	1191/1512	4.01	4.09	4.10	4.11	3.63	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	3	5	11	8	3.79	1252/1623	4.00	4.14	4.16	4.08	3.79	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	1	0	7	20	4.64	1059/1646	4.46	4.65	4.69	4.67	4.64	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	2	9	9	5	3.68	1247/1621	3.69	3.95	4.06	4.02	3.68	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	2	1	3	8	13	4.07	1248/1568	4.30	4.41	4.43	4.39	4.07	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	1	1	3	22	4.70	1022/1572	4.63	4.74	4.70	4.64	4.70	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	2	8	8	9	3.89	1229/1564	4.01	4.33	4.28	4.25	3.89	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	2	3	4	7	11	3.81	1241/1559	4.01	4.34	4.29	4.23	3.81	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	3	0	3	11	10	3.93	792/1352	4.02	4.01	3.98	3.97	3.93	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	13	0	3	0	5	4	3	3.27	1188/1384	3.54	4.17	4.08	4.11	3.27	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	13	0	1	2	1	6	5	3.80	1069/1382	4.04	4.37	4.29	4.37	3.80	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	13	0	1	1	2	6	5	3.87	1047/1368	4.22	4.45	4.30	4.39	3.87	
4. Were special techniques successful	13	3	3	2	2	2	3	3.00	844/ 948	3.69	3.74	3.95	4.00	3.00	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	25	0	2	0	1	0	0	1.67	****/ 221	****	****	4.16	4.07	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	25	0	1	0	1	0	1	3.00	****/ 243	****	****	4.12	3.89	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	25	0	1	0	1	0	1	3.00	****/ 212	****	****	4.40	4.21	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	25	0	2	0	1	0	0	1.67	****/ 209	****	****	4.35	4.12	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	25	2	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 555	****	4.91	4.29	4.22	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	25	1	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 88	****	4.87	4.54	4.63	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	25	0	0	1	0	2	0	3.33	****/ 85	****	4.60	4.47	4.55	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	25	0	0	0	1	2	0	3.67	****/ 81	****	5.00	4.43	4.30	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	25	0	1	1	0	0	1	2.67	****/ 92	****	4.31	4.35	4.46	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	25	0	1	1	0	1	0	2.33	****/ 288	****	3.88	3.68	3.58	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	26	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 52	****	****	4.06	3.59	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	26	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 48	****	****	4.09	4.21	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	26	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 39	****	****	4.47	4.43	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	26	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 39	****	****	4.38	4.32	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	26	0	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/ 312	****	****	3.68	3.60	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	27	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 53	****	****	4.30	4.32	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	27	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.16	4.44	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	27	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 41	****	****	4.43	5.00	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	27	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 24	****	****	4.42	5.00	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	27	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 110	****	****	3.99	4.05	****	

Course-Section: SOCY 300 0101  
 Title METHODOLOGY:SOCIAL RSR  
 Instructor: TUFEKCIOGLU, ZE  
 Enrollment: 37  
 Questionnaires: 28

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2008

Page 1489  
 FEB 11, 2009  
 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	0	Graduate	0	Major	5
28-55	5	1.00-1.99	1	B	12						
56-83	8	2.00-2.99	3	C	3	General	0	Under-grad	28	Non-major	23
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	6	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	10	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	24				
				?	1						

Course-Section: SOCY 300 0201  
 Title METHODOLOGY:SOCIAL RSR  
 Instructor: ANDERSON, DANIE  
 Enrollment: 37  
 Questionnaires: 29

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2008

Page 1490  
 FEB 11, 2009  
 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	2	6	17	4	3.79	1356/1649	3.83	4.27	4.28	4.27	3.79	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	0	5	9	14	4.21	955/1648	4.03	4.19	4.23	4.18	4.21	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	3	13	12	4.24	814/1375	4.17	4.30	4.27	4.22	4.24	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	1	1	1	1	10	14	4.30	770/1595	4.01	4.15	4.20	4.21	4.30	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	1	2	10	15	4.28	604/1533	4.07	4.23	4.04	4.05	4.28	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	5	7	16	4.39	532/1512	4.01	4.09	4.10	4.11	4.39	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	2	5	7	15	4.21	873/1623	4.00	4.14	4.16	4.08	4.21	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	21	8	4.28	1384/1646	4.46	4.65	4.69	4.67	4.28	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	1	7	14	2	3.71	1234/1621	3.69	3.95	4.06	4.02	3.71	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	1	1	9	18	4.52	839/1568	4.30	4.41	4.43	4.39	4.52	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	1	0	10	18	4.55	1193/1572	4.63	4.74	4.70	4.64	4.55	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	1	4	14	10	4.14	1055/1564	4.01	4.33	4.28	4.25	4.14	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	3	2	10	14	4.21	1002/1559	4.01	4.34	4.29	4.23	4.21	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	1	2	0	4	9	13	4.11	633/1352	4.02	4.01	3.98	3.97	4.11	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	1	2	4	7	7	3.81	937/1384	3.54	4.17	4.08	4.11	3.81	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	0	1	2	8	10	4.29	812/1382	4.04	4.37	4.29	4.37	4.29	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	0	0	3	3	15	4.57	601/1368	4.22	4.45	4.30	4.39	4.57	
4. Were special techniques successful	8	5	0	0	1	8	7	4.38	293/ 948	3.69	3.74	3.95	4.00	4.38	
Laboratory															
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	28	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 243	****	****	4.12	3.89	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	28	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 88	****	4.87	4.54	4.63	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	28	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 85	****	4.60	4.47	4.55	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	28	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 81	****	5.00	4.43	4.30	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	28	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 92	****	4.31	4.35	4.46	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	28	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 288	****	3.88	3.68	3.58	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	28	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.06	3.59	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	28	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.09	4.21	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	28	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.47	4.43	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	28	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.38	4.32	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	28	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 312	****	****	3.68	3.60	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	28	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 53	****	****	4.30	4.32	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	28	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.16	4.44	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	28	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 24	****	****	4.42	5.00	****	



Course-Section: SOCY 300 0201  
 Title METHODOLOGY:SOCIAL RSR  
 Instructor: ANDERSON, DANIE  
 Enrollment: 37  
 Questionnaires: 29

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2008

Page 1490  
 FEB 11, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	10	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	11
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	9						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	2	C	4	General	1	Under-grad	29	Non-major	18
84-150	7	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	24				
				?	0						

Course-Section: SOCY 301 0101  
 Title ANALY:SOCIOLOGICAL DAT  
 Instructor: LOTTES, ILSA L.  
 Enrollment: 30  
 Questionnaires: 21

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2008

Page 1491  
 FEB 11, 2009  
 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	2	3	4	12	4.24	986/1649	4.24	4.27	4.28	4.27	4.24	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	0	3	2	15	4.43	672/1648	4.43	4.19	4.23	4.18	4.43	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	4	16	4.71	347/1375	4.71	4.30	4.27	4.22	4.71	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	1	3	5	11	4.30	759/1595	4.30	4.15	4.20	4.21	4.30	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	2	5	5	8	3.95	865/1533	3.95	4.23	4.04	4.05	3.95	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	5	1	1	3	3	7	3.93	980/1512	3.93	4.09	4.10	4.11	3.93	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	0	2	4	14	4.43	608/1623	4.43	4.14	4.16	4.08	4.43	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	21	5.00	1/1646	5.00	4.65	4.69	4.67	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	1	1	1	9	4	3.88	1087/1621	3.88	3.95	4.06	4.02	3.88	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	1	0	2	7	8	4.17	1191/1568	4.17	4.41	4.43	4.39	4.17	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	1	0	0	17	4.83	765/1572	4.83	4.74	4.70	4.64	4.83	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	2	0	3	6	7	3.89	1229/1564	3.89	4.33	4.28	4.25	3.89	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	2	1	0	2	13	4.28	952/1559	4.28	4.34	4.29	4.23	4.28	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	9	2	1	2	1	2	3.00	1219/1352	3.00	4.01	3.98	3.97	3.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	1	0	2	5	5	4.00	795/1384	4.00	4.17	4.08	4.11	4.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	0	0	1	2	10	4.69	455/1382	4.69	4.37	4.29	4.37	4.69	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	1	0	0	4	7	4.33	796/1368	4.33	4.45	4.30	4.39	4.33	
4. Were special techniques successful	9	6	0	0	2	1	3	4.17	380/ 948	4.17	3.74	3.95	4.00	4.17	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 221	****	****	4.16	4.07	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 243	****	****	4.12	3.89	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 212	****	****	4.40	4.21	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 209	****	****	4.35	4.12	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	9	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	16
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	4						
56-83	6	2.00-2.99	4	C	5	General	0	Under-grad	21	Non-major	5
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	7	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	19				
				?	1						

Course-Section: SOCY 321 0101  
 Title RACE & ETHNIC RELATION  
 Instructor: PINCUS, FRED L  
 Enrollment: 39  
 Questionnaires: 25

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2008

Page 1492  
 FEB 11, 2009  
 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	1	11	11	4.43	736/1649	4.43	4.27	4.28	4.27	4.43	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	0	3	4	3	13	4.13	1032/1648	4.13	4.19	4.23	4.18	4.13	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	4	4	7	9	3.88	1049/1375	3.88	4.30	4.27	4.22	3.88	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	0	0	2	4	8	9	4.04	1044/1595	4.04	4.15	4.20	4.21	4.04	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	3	5	16	4.54	334/1533	4.54	4.23	4.04	4.05	4.54	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	3	9	11	4.25	687/1512	4.25	4.09	4.10	4.11	4.25	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	2	4	6	12	4.17	915/1623	4.17	4.14	4.16	4.08	4.17	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	1	0	0	0	2	21	4.91	597/1646	4.91	4.65	4.69	4.67	4.91	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	3	5	13	2	3.61	1302/1621	3.61	3.95	4.06	4.02	3.61	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	2	2	20	4.75	480/1568	4.75	4.41	4.43	4.39	4.75	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	2	1	21	4.79	858/1572	4.79	4.74	4.70	4.64	4.79	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	1	2	4	15	4.50	651/1564	4.50	4.33	4.28	4.25	4.50	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	1	6	16	4.54	651/1559	4.54	4.34	4.29	4.23	4.54	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	2	4	2	3	5	6	3.35	1122/1352	3.35	4.01	3.98	3.97	3.35	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	1	2	10	7	4.15	732/1384	4.15	4.17	4.08	4.11	4.15	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	1	1	7	11	4.40	716/1382	4.40	4.37	4.29	4.37	4.40	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	2	0	5	13	4.45	712/1368	4.45	4.45	4.30	4.39	4.45	
4. Were special techniques successful	5	4	2	2	4	5	3	3.31	784/ 948	3.31	3.74	3.95	4.00	3.31	
Laboratory															
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	24	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 243	****	****	4.12	3.89	****	
Seminar															
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	24	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 81	****	5.00	4.43	4.30	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	24	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.06	3.59	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	24	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.09	4.21	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	24	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.47	4.43	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	24	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 53	****	****	4.30	4.32	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	24	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.16	4.44	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 7	Required for Majors	3
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	B 10		Graduate 0
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	C 6	General	5
84-150	6	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad 25
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	3
			P 0		### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	13
			? 1		

Course-Section: SOCY 332 0101  
 Title HUM SEXUALITY/SOCIO PE  
 Instructor: LOTTES, ILSA L.  
 Enrollment: 77  
 Questionnaires: 52

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2008

Page 1493  
 FEB 11, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR		Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	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	4	8	14	22	4.00	1183/1649	4.00	4.27	4.28	4.27	4.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	0	2	6	22	20	4.20	966/1648	4.20	4.19	4.23	4.18	4.20
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	0	3	6	14	11	16	3.62	1162/1375	3.62	4.30	4.27	4.22	3.62
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	3	3	4	4	8	16	14	3.70	1317/1595	3.70	4.15	4.20	4.21	3.70
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	0	2	1	2	25	20	4.20	680/1533	4.20	4.23	4.04	4.05	4.20
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	3	1	2	4	12	14	16	3.79	1095/1512	3.79	4.09	4.10	4.11	3.79
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	3	6	12	29	4.34	708/1623	4.34	4.14	4.16	4.08	4.34
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	1	0	6	43	4.82	799/1646	4.82	4.65	4.69	4.67	4.82
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	18	0	1	2	6	12	13	4.00	914/1621	4.00	3.95	4.06	4.02	4.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	1	8	8	16	15	3.75	1401/1568	3.75	4.41	4.43	4.39	3.75
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	1	1	5	41	4.79	858/1572	4.79	4.74	4.70	4.64	4.79
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	5	0	3	2	15	12	15	3.72	1311/1564	3.72	4.33	4.28	4.25	3.72
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	5	1	4	1	7	11	23	4.04	1102/1559	4.04	4.34	4.29	4.23	4.04
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	5	5	5	1	7	13	16	3.81	879/1352	3.81	4.01	3.98	3.97	3.81
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	12	0	3	2	13	9	13	3.67	1006/1384	3.68	4.17	4.08	4.11	3.67
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	12	0	2	6	6	6	20	3.90	1031/1382	3.90	4.37	4.29	4.37	3.90
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	12	0	1	1	5	7	26	4.40	752/1368	4.40	4.45	4.30	4.39	4.40
4. Were special techniques successful	12	25	7	2	4	1	1	2.13	934/ 948	2.13	3.74	3.95	4.00	2.13
Laboratory														
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	51	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 243	****	****	4.12	3.89	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	51	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 209	****	****	4.35	4.12	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	49	0	1	0	1	0	1	3.00	****/ 555	****	4.91	4.29	4.22	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	51	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 88	****	4.87	4.54	4.63	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	51	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 85	****	4.60	4.47	4.55	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	51	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 81	****	5.00	4.43	4.30	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	51	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 92	****	4.31	4.35	4.46	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	51	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 288	****	3.88	3.68	3.58	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	51	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.06	3.59	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	51	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.09	4.21	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	51	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.47	4.43	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	51	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.38	4.32	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	50	0	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	****/ 312	****	****	3.68	3.60	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	51	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 53	****	****	4.30	4.32	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	51	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.16	4.44	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	51	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 41	****	****	4.43	5.00	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	51	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 24	****	****	4.42	5.00	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	51	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 110	****	****	3.99	4.05	****

Course-Section: SOCY 332 0101  
 Title HUM SEXUALITY/SOCIO PE  
 Instructor: LOTTES, ILSA L.  
 Enrollment: 77  
 Questionnaires: 52

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2008

Page 1493  
 FEB 11, 2009  
 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	9	Required for Majors	8	Graduate	0	Major	11
28-55	6	1.00-1.99	1	B	23						
56-83	5	2.00-2.99	8	C	9	General	15	Under-grad	52	Non-major	41
84-150	6	3.00-3.49	5	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	2	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	15				
				?	1						

Course-Section: SOCY 333 8620  
 Title HUM SEXUALITY/CROSS-CU  
 Instructor: HYLTON, KEVIN  
 Enrollment: 36  
 Questionnaires: 33

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2008

Page 1494  
 FEB 11, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	21	0	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/1649	5.00	4.27	4.28	4.27	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	21	0	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	133/1648	4.92	4.19	4.23	4.18	4.92
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	21	0	0	0	1	2	9	4.67	401/1375	4.67	4.30	4.27	4.22	4.67
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	20	0	0	1	1	3	8	4.38	660/1595	4.38	4.15	4.20	4.21	4.38
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	21	0	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/1533	5.00	4.23	4.04	4.05	5.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	21	0	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	99/1512	4.92	4.09	4.10	4.11	4.92
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	21	0	0	0	2	0	10	4.67	321/1623	4.67	4.14	4.16	4.08	4.67
8. How many times was class cancelled	21	0	0	0	0	8	4	4.33	1340/1646	4.33	4.65	4.69	4.67	4.33
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	24	0	0	0	1	4	4	4.33	595/1621	4.33	3.95	4.06	4.02	4.33
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	21	0	0	0	0	2	10	4.83	344/1568	4.83	4.41	4.43	4.39	4.83
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	21	0	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/1572	5.00	4.74	4.70	4.64	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	20	0	0	0	0	2	11	4.85	225/1564	4.85	4.33	4.28	4.25	4.85
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	20	0	0	0	0	0	13	5.00	1/1559	5.00	4.34	4.29	4.23	5.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	21	1	0	0	3	0	8	4.45	351/1352	4.45	4.01	3.98	3.97	4.45
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	21	0	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	135/1384	4.92	4.17	4.08	4.11	4.92
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	20	0	0	0	0	1	12	4.92	194/1382	4.92	4.37	4.29	4.37	4.92
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	21	0	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/1368	5.00	4.45	4.30	4.39	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	20	6	0	1	0	2	4	4.29	****/ 948	****	3.74	3.95	4.00	****
Laboratory														
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	4	0	0	0	0	0	29	5.00	1/ 555	5.00	4.91	4.29	4.22	5.00
Seminar														
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	30	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	****/ 288	****	3.88	3.68	3.58	****
Self Paced														
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	31	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 110	****	****	3.99	4.05	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	1	A	5	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	1	Major	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	5						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	1	General	8	Under-grad	32	Non-major	33
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	6	D	0						
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	3				
				?	0						

Course-Section: SOCY 349 0101  
 Title SOCIOLOGY OF RELIGION  
 Instructor: COHEN, JERE M  
 Enrollment: 58  
 Questionnaires: 36

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2008

Page 1495  
 FEB 11, 2009  
 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	3	13	20	4.47	683/1649	4.47	4.27	4.28	4.27	4.47	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	4	16	16	4.33	797/1648	4.33	4.19	4.23	4.18	4.33	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	0	0	0	0	8	26	4.76	283/1375	4.76	4.30	4.27	4.22	4.76	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	19	1	0	2	7	7	4.12	996/1595	4.12	4.15	4.20	4.21	4.12	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	2	2	7	12	12	3.86	966/1533	3.86	4.23	4.04	4.05	3.86	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	25	0	0	2	4	5	4.27	663/1512	4.27	4.09	4.10	4.11	4.27	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	4	12	20	4.44	581/1623	4.44	4.14	4.16	4.08	4.44	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	21	15	4.42	1277/1646	4.42	4.65	4.69	4.67	4.42	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	1	0	0	4	15	11	4.23	709/1621	4.23	3.95	4.06	4.02	4.23	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	1	0	7	28	4.72	535/1568	4.72	4.41	4.43	4.39	4.72	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	2	34	4.94	355/1572	4.94	4.74	4.70	4.64	4.94	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	1	2	7	25	4.60	550/1564	4.60	4.33	4.28	4.25	4.60	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	6	28	4.72	434/1559	4.72	4.34	4.29	4.23	4.72	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	30	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	****/1352	****	4.01	3.98	3.97	****	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	14	0	1	4	4	6	7	3.64	1025/1384	3.64	4.17	4.08	4.11	3.64	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	14	0	1	0	3	4	14	4.36	749/1382	4.36	4.37	4.29	4.37	4.36	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	14	0	1	1	1	3	16	4.45	703/1368	4.45	4.45	4.30	4.39	4.45	
4. Were special techniques successful	14	20	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 948	****	3.74	3.95	4.00	****	
Laboratory															
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	35	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 243	****	****	4.12	3.89	****	
Seminar															
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	35	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 288	****	3.88	3.68	3.58	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	35	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.06	3.59	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	35	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.09	4.21	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	11	Required for Majors	4	Graduate	0	Major	9
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	17						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	3	C	3	General	9	Under-grad	36	Non-major	27
84-150	10	3.00-3.49	5	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	2	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	11				
				?	0						

Course-Section: SOCY 351 0101  
 Title MEDICAL SOCIOLOGY  
 Instructor: NOLIN, MICHAEL  
 Enrollment: 49  
 Questionnaires: 35

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2008

Page 1496  
 FEB 11, 2009  
 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	2	2	3	6	21	4.24	986/1649	4.24	4.27	4.28	4.27	4.24	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	2	2	8	8	14	3.88	1245/1648	3.88	4.19	4.23	4.18	3.88	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	1	0	4	6	11	12	3.94	1008/1375	3.94	4.30	4.27	4.22	3.94	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	1	0	4	5	8	16	4.09	1015/1595	4.09	4.15	4.20	4.21	4.09	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	2	8	3	21	4.26	614/1533	4.26	4.23	4.04	4.05	4.26	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	11	2	2	5	5	8	3.68	1159/1512	3.68	4.09	4.10	4.11	3.68	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	2	4	3	12	13	3.88	1192/1623	3.88	4.14	4.16	4.08	3.88	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	2	32	4.94	398/1646	4.94	4.65	4.69	4.67	4.94	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	0	0	4	6	8	11	3.90	1069/1621	3.90	3.95	4.06	4.02	3.90	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	1	1	6	9	17	4.18	1183/1568	4.18	4.41	4.43	4.39	4.18	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	1	1	4	28	4.74	967/1572	4.74	4.74	4.70	4.64	4.74	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	4	3	9	17	4.18	1010/1564	4.18	4.33	4.28	4.25	4.18	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	2	2	4	6	20	4.18	1023/1559	4.18	4.34	4.29	4.23	4.18	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	4	0	4	5	7	13	4.00	690/1352	4.00	4.01	3.98	3.97	4.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	1	3	5	10	4.26	667/1384	4.26	4.17	4.08	4.11	4.26	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	16	0	0	1	3	1	14	4.47	646/1382	4.47	4.37	4.29	4.37	4.47	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	16	0	0	0	2	4	13	4.58	601/1368	4.58	4.45	4.30	4.39	4.58	
4. Were special techniques successful	16	13	0	1	1	2	2	3.83	****/ 948	****	3.74	3.95	4.00	****	
Laboratory															
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	33	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/ 555	****	4.91	4.29	4.22	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	33	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/ 88	****	4.87	4.54	4.63	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	33	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/ 85	****	4.60	4.47	4.55	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	33	0	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	****/ 81	****	5.00	4.43	4.30	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	33	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 92	****	4.31	4.35	4.46	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	32	0	1	1	0	0	1	2.67	****/ 288	****	3.88	3.68	3.58	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	34	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.06	3.59	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	34	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.09	4.21	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	34	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.47	4.43	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	34	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.38	4.32	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	33	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 312	****	****	3.68	3.60	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	34	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 53	****	****	4.30	4.32	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	17	Required for Majors	3	Graduate	0	Major	5
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B	7						
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	7	C	3	General	12	Under-grad	35	Non-major	30
84-150	13	3.00-3.49	7	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						



I	0	Other	15
?	1		

Course-Section: SOCY 352 0101  
 Title ISSUES IN HEALTH CARE  
 Instructor: ANDERSON, DANIE  
 Enrollment: 50  
 Questionnaires: 36

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2008

Page 1497  
 FEB 11, 2009  
 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	6	27	4.66	446/1649	3.86	4.27	4.28	4.27	4.66	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	1	0	5	12	17	4.26	897/1648	3.46	4.19	4.23	4.18	4.26	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	3	0	0	2	2	9	20	4.42	641/1375	3.61	4.30	4.27	4.22	4.42	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	3	6	0	0	1	9	17	4.59	394/1595	3.60	4.15	4.20	4.21	4.59	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	2	6	8	18	4.14	718/1533	3.68	4.23	4.04	4.05	4.14	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	4	0	1	5	8	16	4.30	627/1512	3.72	4.09	4.10	4.11	4.30	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	1	5	9	19	4.26	815/1623	2.95	4.14	4.16	4.08	4.26	
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	0	0	0	0	18	15	4.45	1240/1646	4.44	4.65	4.69	4.67	4.45	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	13	0	1	0	2	14	6	4.04	892/1621	3.23	3.95	4.06	4.02	4.04	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	3	8	22	4.58	767/1568	3.32	4.41	4.43	4.39	4.58	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	3	5	25	4.67	1071/1572	4.30	4.74	4.70	4.64	4.67	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	5	0	0	1	1	9	20	4.55	610/1564	3.57	4.33	4.28	4.25	4.55	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	1	0	4	8	20	4.39	841/1559	3.27	4.34	4.29	4.23	4.39	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	6	2	0	0	1	10	17	4.57	263/1352	3.51	4.01	3.98	3.97	4.57	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	10	0	1	0	1	3	21	4.65	335/1384	4.37	4.17	4.08	4.11	4.65	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	11	0	1	0	1	0	23	4.76	383/1382	4.33	4.37	4.29	4.37	4.76	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	11	0	1	0	1	1	22	4.72	472/1368	4.27	4.45	4.30	4.39	4.72	
4. Were special techniques successful	10	9	1	1	5	2	8	3.88	542/ 948	3.37	3.74	3.95	4.00	3.88	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	34	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 221	****	****	4.16	4.07	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	34	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 243	****	****	4.12	3.89	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	34	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 209	****	****	4.35	4.12	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	32	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	****/ 555	4.73	4.91	4.29	4.22	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	34	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 88	****	4.87	4.54	4.63	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	34	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 85	****	4.60	4.47	4.55	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	34	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 81	****	5.00	4.43	4.30	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	34	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 92	****	4.31	4.35	4.46	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	34	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 288	****	3.88	3.68	3.58	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	35	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.06	3.59	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	35	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.09	4.21	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	35	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.47	4.43	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	35	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.38	4.32	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	34	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 312	****	****	3.68	3.60	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	35	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 53	****	****	4.30	4.32	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	35	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.16	4.44	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	35	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 41	****	****	4.43	5.00	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	35	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 24	****	****	4.42	5.00	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	35	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 110	****	****	3.99	4.05	****	

Course-Section: SOCY 352 0101  
 Title ISSUES IN HEALTH CARE  
 Instructor: ANDERSON, DANIE  
 Enrollment: 50  
 Questionnaires: 36

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2008

Page 1497  
 FEB 11, 2009  
 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	17	Required for Majors	4	Graduate	0	Major	4
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	14						
56-83	6	2.00-2.99	6	C	0	General	7	Under-grad	36	Non-major	32
84-150	12	3.00-3.49	8	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	6	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	16				
				?	0						

Course-Section: SOCY 352 8620  
 Title ISSUES IN HEALTH CARE  
 Instructor: SUFIAN, MERYL  
 Enrollment: 22  
 Questionnaires: 17

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2008

Page 1498  
 FEB 11, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR NA		Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sept
	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	2	5	5	1	3.07	1597/1649	3.86	4.27	4.28	4.27	3.07
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	3	3	6	2	1	2.67	1625/1648	3.46	4.19	4.23	4.18	2.67
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	0	2	5	2	6	0	2.80	1351/1375	3.61	4.30	4.27	4.22	2.80
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	2	2	5	2	4	0	2.62	1580/1595	3.60	4.15	4.20	4.21	2.62
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	3	0	1	2	6	3	2	3.21	1381/1533	3.68	4.23	4.04	4.05	3.21
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	3	0	1	1	8	3	1	3.14	1408/1512	3.72	4.09	4.10	4.11	3.14
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	3	0	9	2	2	1	0	1.64	1619/1623	2.95	4.14	4.16	4.08	1.64
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	0	0	0	0	8	6	4.43	1268/1646	4.44	4.65	4.69	4.67	4.43
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	3	3	4	2	0	2.42	1596/1621	3.23	3.95	4.06	4.02	2.42
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	8	1	3	3	0	2.07	1563/1568	3.32	4.41	4.43	4.39	2.07
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	1	0	3	5	5	3.93	1486/1572	4.30	4.74	4.70	4.64	3.93
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	5	1	4	5	0	2.60	1541/1564	3.57	4.33	4.28	4.25	2.60
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	1	6	1	4	2	0	2.15	1544/1559	3.27	4.34	4.29	4.23	2.15
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	3	2	5	1	3	0	2.45	1308/1352	3.51	4.01	3.98	3.97	2.45
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	1	1	6	4	4.08	767/1384	4.37	4.17	4.08	4.11	4.08
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	1	1	1	3	5	3.91	1031/1382	4.33	4.37	4.29	4.37	3.91
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	1	0	2	5	3	3.82	1067/1368	4.27	4.45	4.30	4.39	3.82
4. Were special techniques successful	6	4	1	1	3	2	0	2.86	885/ 948	3.37	3.74	3.95	4.00	2.86
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	15	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 221	****	****	4.16	4.07	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	15	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 243	****	****	4.12	3.89	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	15	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/ 212	****	****	4.40	4.21	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	15	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 209	****	****	4.35	4.12	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	5	1	0	1	0	0	10	4.73	260/ 555	4.73	4.91	4.29	4.22	4.73
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	15	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 88	****	4.87	4.54	4.63	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	15	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 85	****	4.60	4.47	4.55	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 81	****	5.00	4.43	4.30	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 92	****	4.31	4.35	4.46	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	15	0	2	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 288	****	3.88	3.68	3.58	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.06	3.59	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	15	0	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/ 48	****	****	4.09	4.21	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	15	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 39	****	****	4.47	4.43	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	15	0	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.38	4.32	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	15	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/ 312	****	****	3.68	3.60	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 53	****	****	4.30	4.32	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	15	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 30	****	****	4.16	4.44	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	15	0	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/ 41	****	****	4.43	5.00	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	15	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 24	****	****	4.42	5.00	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	15	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 110	****	****	3.99	4.05	****

Course-Section: SOCY 352 8620  
 Title ISSUES IN HEALTH CARE  
 Instructor: SUFIAN, MERYL  
 Enrollment: 22  
 Questionnaires: 17

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2008

Page 1498  
 FEB 11, 2009  
 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	4	Required for Majors	2	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B	6						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	1	C	1	General	7	Under-grad	17	Non-major	17
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	4				
				?	2						

Course-Section: SOCY 353 0101  
 Title MARRIAGE AND THE FAMIL  
 Instructor: COZART, MERYL S  
 Enrollment: 88  
 Questionnaires: 50

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2008

Page 1499  
 FEB 11, 2009  
 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	2	2	10	15	19	3.98	1209/1649	3.98	4.27	4.28	4.27	3.98	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	3	5	13	14	13	3.60	1448/1648	3.60	4.19	4.23	4.18	3.60	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	0	3	5	15	16	9	3.48	1218/1375	3.48	4.30	4.27	4.22	3.48	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	4	2	1	11	12	18	3.98	1107/1595	3.98	4.15	4.20	4.21	3.98	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	0	3	6	12	16	11	3.54	1221/1533	3.54	4.23	4.04	4.05	3.54	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	1	4	4	10	20	10	3.58	1214/1512	3.58	4.09	4.10	4.11	3.58	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	5	6	17	6	15	3.41	1434/1623	3.41	4.14	4.16	4.08	3.41	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	34	15	4.31	1364/1646	4.31	4.65	4.69	4.67	4.31	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	13	1	2	0	11	18	5	3.67	1261/1621	3.67	3.95	4.06	4.02	3.67	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	2	2	12	15	17	3.90	1350/1568	3.90	4.41	4.43	4.39	3.90	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	1	0	2	8	38	4.67	1059/1572	4.67	4.74	4.70	4.64	4.67	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	2	3	14	16	14	3.76	1297/1564	3.76	4.33	4.28	4.25	3.76	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	4	3	15	10	17	3.67	1318/1559	3.67	4.34	4.29	4.23	3.67	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	28	6	3	4	1	5	2.79	1272/1352	2.79	4.01	3.98	3.97	2.79	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	11	0	2	3	5	4	25	4.21	703/1384	4.21	4.17	4.08	4.11	4.21	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	11	0	1	0	3	6	29	4.59	555/1382	4.59	4.37	4.29	4.37	4.59	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	11	0	2	0	1	2	34	4.69	493/1368	4.69	4.45	4.30	4.39	4.69	
4. Were special techniques successful	11	11	6	4	9	4	5	2.93	873/ 948	2.93	3.74	3.95	4.00	2.93	
Laboratory															
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	47	0	1	0	1	0	1	3.00	****/ 243	****	****	4.12	3.89	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	47	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 212	****	****	4.40	4.21	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	47	1	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 209	****	****	4.35	4.12	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	47	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 555	****	4.91	4.29	4.22	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	47	1	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 88	****	4.87	4.54	4.63	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	47	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 85	****	4.60	4.47	4.55	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	47	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 81	****	5.00	4.43	4.30	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	47	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 92	****	4.31	4.35	4.46	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	47	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 288	****	3.88	3.68	3.58	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	47	0	1	0	1	0	1	3.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.06	3.59	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	47	0	1	0	1	0	1	3.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.09	4.21	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	47	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.47	4.43	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	47	1	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.38	4.32	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	46	2	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 312	****	****	3.68	3.60	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	47	0	1	0	1	0	1	3.00	****/ 53	****	****	4.30	4.32	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	47	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.16	4.44	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	47	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 41	****	****	4.43	5.00	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	47	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 24	****	****	4.42	5.00	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	47	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 110	****	****	3.99	4.05	****	

Course-Section: SOCY 353 0101  
 Title MARRIAGE AND THE FAMIL  
 Instructor: COZART, MERYL S  
 Enrollment: 88  
 Questionnaires: 50

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2008

Page 1499  
 FEB 11, 2009  
 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	3	Required for Majors	6	Graduate	0	Major	3
28-55	5	1.00-1.99	0	B	18						
56-83	5	2.00-2.99	3	C	10	General	20	Under-grad	50	Non-major	47
84-150	8	3.00-3.49	7	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	9				
				?	4						

Course-Section: SOCY 354 0101  
 Title SOC BASES:PUBL/COMM HL  
 Instructor: KALFOGLOU, ANDR  
 Enrollment: 36  
 Questionnaires: 11

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2008

Page 1500  
 FEB 11, 2009  
 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	10	4.91	186/1649	4.91	4.27	4.28	4.27	4.91	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	9	4.82	209/1648	4.82	4.19	4.23	4.18	4.82	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	1	0	1	8	4.60	464/1375	4.60	4.30	4.27	4.22	4.60	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	192/1595	4.80	4.15	4.20	4.21	4.80	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	1	0	8	4.50	366/1533	4.50	4.23	4.04	4.05	4.50	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	3	7	4.70	240/1512	4.70	4.09	4.10	4.11	4.70	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	121/1623	4.90	4.14	4.16	4.08	4.90	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	1	0	0	2	7	4.40	1287/1646	4.40	4.65	4.69	4.67	4.40	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	8	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	595/1621	4.33	3.95	4.06	4.02	4.33	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	387/1568	4.80	4.41	4.43	4.39	4.80	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1572	5.00	4.74	4.70	4.64	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	310/1564	4.78	4.33	4.28	4.25	4.78	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	205/1559	4.90	4.34	4.29	4.23	4.90	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	0	1	0	9	4.80	133/1352	4.80	4.01	3.98	3.97	4.80	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1384	5.00	4.17	4.08	4.11	5.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1382	5.00	4.37	4.29	4.37	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1368	5.00	4.45	4.30	4.39	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	5	3	1	0	0	1	1	3.33	776/ 948	3.33	3.74	3.95	4.00	3.33	
Laboratory															
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	10	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 555	****	4.91	4.29	4.22	****	
Seminar															
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	10	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 288	****	3.88	3.68	3.58	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	10	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	2
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	0						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	3	C	0	General	2	Under-grad	11	Non-major	9
84-150	5	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	7				
				?	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	1	0	1	0	6	17	11	4.06	1149/1649	4.06	4.27	4.28	4.27	4.06	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	2	1	4	20	8	3.89	1245/1648	3.89	4.19	4.23	4.18	3.89	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	1	4	3	15	12	3.94	1000/1375	3.94	4.30	4.27	4.22	3.94	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	6	0	5	6	9	9	3.76	1285/1595	3.76	4.15	4.20	4.21	3.76	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	2	4	1	6	13	8	3.63	1166/1533	3.63	4.23	4.04	4.05	3.63	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	9	2	4	5	9	6	3.50	1266/1512	3.50	4.09	4.10	4.11	3.50	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	5	2	10	17	4.06	1004/1623	4.06	4.14	4.16	4.08	4.06	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	12	23	4.66	1048/1646	4.66	4.65	4.69	4.67	4.66	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	1	1	0	16	11	1	3.38	1415/1621	3.38	3.95	4.06	4.02	3.38	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	1	3	12	17	4.36	1021/1568	4.36	4.41	4.43	4.39	4.36	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	1	1	5	25	4.69	1046/1572	4.69	4.74	4.70	4.64	4.69	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	3	4	14	12	4.06	1100/1564	4.06	4.33	4.28	4.25	4.06	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	1	3	13	16	4.33	901/1559	4.33	4.34	4.29	4.23	4.33	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	1	0	1	7	9	15	4.19	565/1352	4.19	4.01	3.98	3.97	4.19	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	22	0	1	3	2	5	3	3.43	1113/1384	3.43	4.17	4.08	4.11	3.43	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	22	0	1	2	1	5	5	3.79	1080/1382	3.79	4.37	4.29	4.37	3.79	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	22	0	2	0	2	6	4	3.71	1115/1368	3.71	4.45	4.30	4.39	3.71	
4. Were special techniques successful	22	6	1	4	0	1	2	2.88	****/ 948	****	3.74	3.95	4.00	****	
Laboratory															
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	32	0	0	0	2	0	2	4.00	****/ 555	****	4.91	4.29	4.22	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	35	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 88	****	4.87	4.54	4.63	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	35	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 85	****	4.60	4.47	4.55	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	35	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 81	****	5.00	4.43	4.30	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	35	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 92	****	4.31	4.35	4.46	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	34	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 288	****	3.88	3.68	3.58	****	
Field Work															
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	34	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 312	****	****	3.68	3.60	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors		
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A 8	Required for Majors 5	Graduate 0	Major 6
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	0	B 13			
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	4	C 3	General 13	Under-grad 36	Non-major 30
84-150	4	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 10		
				? 3			

Course-Section: SOCY 374 0101  
 Title DRUGS AND ALCOHOL  
 Instructor: VOSS, CINDY C  
 Enrollment: 39  
 Questionnaires: 22

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2008

Page 1502  
 FEB 11, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	3	1	5	5	8	3.64	1450/1649	3.64	4.27	4.28	4.27	3.64
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	3	6	6	6	3.59	1451/1648	3.59	4.19	4.23	4.18	3.59
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	1	6	7	7	3.82	1081/1375	3.82	4.30	4.27	4.22	3.82
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	2	1	7	6	6	3.59	1374/1595	3.59	4.15	4.20	4.21	3.59
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	4	5	4	7	3.45	1283/1533	3.45	4.23	4.04	4.05	3.45
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	2	3	8	7	3.73	1137/1512	3.73	4.09	4.10	4.11	3.73
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	2	3	6	10	4.00	1029/1623	4.00	4.14	4.16	4.08	4.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	1	0	1	20	4.82	816/1646	4.82	4.65	4.69	4.67	4.82
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	1	3	2	4	6	1	3.00	1504/1621	3.00	3.95	4.06	4.02	3.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	1	2	4	5	9	3.90	1347/1568	3.90	4.41	4.43	4.39	3.90
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	1	0	3	3	14	4.38	1333/1572	4.38	4.74	4.70	4.64	4.38
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	1	2	4	5	9	3.90	1219/1564	3.90	4.33	4.28	4.25	3.90
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	3	2	3	3	10	3.71	1301/1559	3.71	4.34	4.29	4.23	3.71
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	0	3	2	5	1	9	3.55	1025/1352	3.55	4.01	3.98	3.97	3.55
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	9	0	1	0	2	3	7	4.15	732/1384	4.15	4.17	4.08	4.11	4.15
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	9	0	1	0	1	2	9	4.38	732/1382	4.38	4.37	4.29	4.37	4.38
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	0	1	0	3	9	4.54	631/1368	4.54	4.45	4.30	4.39	4.54
4. Were special techniques successful	9	2	2	0	4	2	3	3.36	763/ 948	3.36	3.74	3.95	4.00	3.36

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	1	0.00-0.99 0	A 7	Required for Majors 2	Graduate 0 Major 3
28-55	1	1.00-1.99 0	B 8		
56-83	2	2.00-2.99 2	C 3	General 5	Under-grad 22 Non-major 19
84-150	7	3.00-3.49 6	D 0		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 4	F 0	Electives 0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 10	
			? 0		

Course-Section: SOCY 396 0101  
 Title COMM SERV & LEARN INTE  
 Instructor: WOLFF, MICHELE  
 Enrollment: 19  
 Questionnaires: 11

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2008

Page 1503  
 FEB 11, 2009  
 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	1	0	2	3	3	3.78	1366/1649	3.78	4.27	4.28	4.27	3.78	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	0	1	2	2	4	4.00	1124/1648	4.00	4.19	4.23	4.18	4.00	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	1	0	2	0	2	4	4.00	950/1375	4.00	4.30	4.27	4.22	4.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	1	0	2	0	2	4	4.00	1067/1595	4.00	4.15	4.20	4.21	4.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	1	2	3	3	3.89	935/1533	3.89	4.23	4.04	4.05	3.89	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	1	0	1	2	1	4	4.00	883/1512	4.00	4.09	4.10	4.11	4.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	3	1	0	2	1	1	3	3.71	1293/1623	3.71	4.14	4.16	4.08	3.71	
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	1	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	913/1646	4.75	4.65	4.69	4.67	4.75	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	0	2	3	1	3.83	1123/1621	3.83	3.95	4.06	4.02	3.83	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	7	0	0	0	2	1	1	3.75	1401/1568	3.75	4.41	4.43	4.39	3.75	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	7	0	0	0	2	0	2	4.00	1463/1572	4.00	4.74	4.70	4.64	4.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	7	0	0	0	2	0	2	4.00	1127/1564	4.00	4.33	4.28	4.25	4.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	1	1	0	2	3.75	1277/1559	3.75	4.34	4.29	4.23	3.75	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	8	1	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/1352	****	4.01	3.98	3.97	****	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	376/1384	4.60	4.17	4.08	4.11	4.60	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	540/1382	4.60	4.37	4.29	4.37	4.60	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	369/1368	4.80	4.45	4.30	4.39	4.80	
4. Were special techniques successful	6	0	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	170/ 948	4.60	3.74	3.95	4.00	4.60	
Laboratory															
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	10	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 555	****	4.91	4.29	4.22	****	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: SOCY 409 0101  
 Title SOCIOLOGICAL THEORY  
 Instructor: COHEN, JERE M  
 Enrollment: 46  
 Questionnaires: 30

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2008

Page 1504  
 FEB 11, 2009  
 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	1	6	23	4.73	350/1649	4.73	4.27	4.28	4.50	4.73	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	0	8	21	4.63	401/1648	4.63	4.19	4.23	4.36	4.63	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	4	25	4.80	233/1375	4.80	4.30	4.27	4.48	4.80	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	9	0	0	1	7	13	4.57	417/1595	4.57	4.15	4.20	4.36	4.57	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	2	0	1	10	16	4.31	565/1533	4.31	4.23	4.04	4.14	4.31	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	9	0	0	1	4	16	4.71	225/1512	4.71	4.09	4.10	4.26	4.71	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	2	2	3	7	16	4.10	979/1623	4.10	4.14	4.16	4.27	4.10	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	1	0	0	0	15	14	4.48	1211/1646	4.48	4.65	4.69	4.71	4.48	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	0	0	1	2	10	11	4.29	643/1621	4.29	3.95	4.06	4.24	4.29	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	0	2	26	4.93	196/1568	4.93	4.41	4.43	4.54	4.93	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	1	5	22	4.75	931/1572	4.75	4.74	4.70	4.79	4.75	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	2	4	22	4.71	406/1564	4.71	4.33	4.28	4.40	4.71	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	2	3	23	4.75	390/1559	4.75	4.34	4.29	4.41	4.75	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	5	20	1	0	1	0	3	3.80	****/1352	****	4.01	3.98	4.07	****	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	15	0	3	1	2	1	8	3.67	1011/1384	3.67	4.17	4.08	4.35	3.67	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	15	0	0	1	1	4	9	4.40	716/1382	4.40	4.37	4.29	4.56	4.40	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	15	0	0	0	1	1	13	4.80	369/1368	4.80	4.45	4.30	4.58	4.80	
4. Were special techniques successful	15	12	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 948	****	3.74	3.95	4.31	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	29	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 88	****	4.87	4.54	4.66	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	29	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 85	****	4.60	4.47	4.54	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	29	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 92	****	4.31	4.35	4.44	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	29	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 288	****	3.88	3.68	3.71	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	7	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	2	Major	18
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	13						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	1	C	1	General	3	Under-grad	28	Non-major	12
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	6	D	0						
Grad.	2	3.50-4.00	8	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	21				
				?	1						

Course-Section: SOCY 419 0101  
 Title QUAL METH SOCIAL RESRC  
 Instructor: RUBINSTEIN, ROB  
 Enrollment: 27  
 Questionnaires: 20

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2008

Page 1505  
 FEB 11, 2009  
 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	1	6	12	4.40	776/1649	4.40	4.27	4.28	4.50	4.40	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	1	3	8	7	3.95	1176/1648	3.95	4.19	4.23	4.36	3.95	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	13	0	0	1	5	4.83	212/1375	4.83	4.30	4.27	4.48	4.83		
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	1	1	4	3	9	4.00	1067/1595	4.00	4.15	4.20	4.36	4.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	1	4	2	11	4.28	604/1533	4.28	4.23	4.04	4.14	4.28	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	0	1	6	11	4.37	564/1512	4.37	4.09	4.10	4.26	4.37	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	1	3	3	6	1	5	3.11	1520/1623	3.11	4.14	4.16	4.27	3.11	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	5	14	4.74	945/1646	4.74	4.65	4.69	4.71	4.74	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	1	2	0	2	6	6	3.88	1087/1621	3.88	3.95	4.06	4.24	3.88	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	1	0	3	4	10	4.22	1145/1568	4.22	4.41	4.43	4.54	4.22	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	2	17	4.89	615/1572	4.89	4.74	4.70	4.79	4.89	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	1	1	3	4	10	4.11	1083/1564	4.11	4.33	4.28	4.40	4.11	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	1	3	4	10	4.11	1075/1559	4.11	4.34	4.29	4.41	4.11	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	13	1	0	0	1	2	3.75	****/1352	****	4.01	3.98	4.07	****	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	2	0	2	1	12	4.24	685/1384	4.24	4.17	4.08	4.35	4.24	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	1	0	0	2	14	4.65	502/1382	4.65	4.37	4.29	4.56	4.65	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	1	0	0	1	15	4.71	484/1368	4.71	4.45	4.30	4.58	4.71	
4. Were special techniques successful	3	3	0	0	3	2	9	4.43	265/ 948	4.43	3.74	3.95	4.31	4.43	
Laboratory															
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 555	****	4.91	4.29	4.41	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.06	4.86	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	19	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.09	4.42	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	18	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.47	4.52	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	18	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.38	4.59	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	18	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 312	****	****	3.68	3.95	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	A 18	Required for Majors 5
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B 2	
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	0	C 0	General 8
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	3	D 0	
Grad.	15	3.50-4.00	14	F 0	Electives 0
				P 0	
				I 0	
				? 0	Other 7

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

Course-Section: SOCY 420 0101  
 Title SOCIAL EPIDEMIOLOGY  
 Instructor: TOLEA, MAGDALEN  
 Enrollment: 21  
 Questionnaires: 12

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2008

Page 1506  
 FEB 11, 2009  
 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	1	5	5	4.36	830/1649	4.36	4.27	4.28	4.50	4.36	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	6	5	4.45	629/1648	4.45	4.19	4.23	4.36	4.45	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	2	0	9	4.64	432/1375	4.64	4.30	4.27	4.48	4.64	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	0	0	0	0	4	6	4.60	383/1595	4.60	4.15	4.20	4.36	4.60	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	0	0	1	9	4.55	334/1533	4.55	4.23	4.04	4.14	4.55	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	3	5	3	4.00	883/1512	4.00	4.09	4.10	4.26	4.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	121/1623	4.90	4.14	4.16	4.27	4.90	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	4	7	4.64	1070/1646	4.64	4.65	4.69	4.71	4.64	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	1	3	4	1	3.56	1323/1621	3.56	3.95	4.06	4.24	3.56	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	3	9	4.75	480/1568	4.75	4.41	4.43	4.54	4.75	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	2	10	4.83	765/1572	4.83	4.74	4.70	4.79	4.83	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	7	4	4.25	939/1564	4.25	4.33	4.28	4.40	4.25	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	6	5	4.33	901/1559	4.33	4.34	4.29	4.41	4.33	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	0	2	1	8	4.55	280/1352	4.55	4.01	3.98	4.07	4.55	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	1	2	4	4.43	520/1384	4.43	4.17	4.08	4.35	4.43	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	0	2	1	4	4.29	812/1382	4.29	4.37	4.29	4.56	4.29	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	1	0	1	5	4.43	732/1368	4.43	4.45	4.30	4.58	4.43	
4. Were special techniques successful	5	2	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	281/ 948	4.40	3.74	3.95	4.31	4.40	
Seminar															
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	11	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 288	****	3.88	3.68	3.71	****	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: SOCY 430 0101  
 Title SOCIOLOGY OF AGING  
 Instructor: CLARK, LEANNE J  
 Enrollment: 25  
 Questionnaires: 20

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2008

Page 1507  
 FEB 11, 2009  
 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	2	18	4.90	186/1649	4.90	4.27	4.28	4.50	4.90	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	18	4.90	148/1648	4.90	4.19	4.23	4.36	4.90	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	20	5.00	1/1375	5.00	4.30	4.27	4.48	5.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	4	16	4.80	192/1595	4.80	4.15	4.20	4.36	4.80	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	5	15	4.75	180/1533	4.75	4.23	4.04	4.14	4.75	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	3	16	4.75	194/1512	4.75	4.09	4.10	4.26	4.75	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	1	19	4.95	73/1623	4.95	4.14	4.16	4.27	4.95	
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	7	11	4.61	1092/1646	4.61	4.65	4.69	4.71	4.61	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	8	0	0	0	0	7	5	4.42	497/1621	4.42	3.95	4.06	4.24	4.42	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	2	18	4.90	245/1568	4.90	4.41	4.43	4.54	4.90	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	1	18	4.95	355/1572	4.95	4.74	4.70	4.79	4.95	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	0	1	16	4.94	101/1564	4.94	4.33	4.28	4.40	4.94	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	1	18	4.95	123/1559	4.95	4.34	4.29	4.41	4.95	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	3	3	0	2	2	8	3.80	879/1352	3.80	4.01	3.98	4.07	3.80	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	1	0	12	4.85	180/1384	4.85	4.17	4.08	4.35	4.85	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	0	0	0	0	13	5.00	1/1382	5.00	4.37	4.29	4.56	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	0	0	0	0	13	5.00	1/1368	5.00	4.45	4.30	4.58	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	7	1	0	0	1	3	8	4.58	176/ 948	4.58	3.74	3.95	4.31	4.58	
Laboratory															
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	19	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 555	****	4.91	4.29	4.41	****	
Seminar															
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	19	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 288	****	3.88	3.68	3.71	****	
Field Work															
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	18	0	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	****/ 312	****	****	3.68	3.95	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	12	Required for Majors	6	Graduate	0	Major	5
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	4						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	2	C	0	General	4	Under-grad	20	Non-major	15
84-150	6	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	5				
				?	0						

Course-Section: SOCY 432 0101  
 Title WORK AND RETIREMENT  
 Instructor: MORGAN, LESLIE  
 Enrollment: 12  
 Questionnaires: 9

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2008

Page 1508  
 FEB 11, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	203/1649	4.89	4.27	4.28	4.50	4.89	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	1	7	4.67	362/1648	4.67	4.19	4.23	4.36	4.67	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	271/1375	4.78	4.30	4.27	4.48	4.78	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	2	6	4.56	440/1595	4.56	4.15	4.20	4.36	4.56	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	3	6	4.67	241/1533	4.67	4.23	4.04	4.14	4.67	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	2	6	4.56	345/1512	4.56	4.09	4.10	4.26	4.56	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	2	1	6	4.44	581/1623	4.44	4.14	4.16	4.27	4.44	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1646	5.00	4.65	4.69	4.71	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	1	1	6	4.63	270/1621	4.63	3.95	4.06	4.24	4.63	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	273/1568	4.89	4.41	4.43	4.54	4.89	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	640/1572	4.89	4.74	4.70	4.79	4.89	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	310/1564	4.78	4.33	4.28	4.40	4.78	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	227/1559	4.89	4.34	4.29	4.41	4.89	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	1	0	1	0	1	6	4.50	303/1352	4.50	4.01	3.98	4.07	4.50	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	247/1384	4.75	4.17	4.08	4.35	4.75	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	272/1382	4.88	4.37	4.29	4.56	4.88	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	295/1368	4.88	4.45	4.30	4.58	4.88	
4. Were special techniques successful	2	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	97/ 948	4.86	3.74	3.95	4.31	4.86	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 6	Required for Majors	1
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	B 2		Graduate
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	C 0	General	3
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad
Grad.	5	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	4
			P 0		
			I 0		
			? 0		
					5

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



Course-Section: SOCY 452 0101  
 Title HEALTH CARE ORG/DEL  
 Instructor: STUART, MARY  
 Enrollment: 37  
 Questionnaires: 28

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2008

Page 1509  
 FEB 11, 2009  
 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	6	3	18	4.32	884/1649	4.32	4.27	4.28	4.50	4.32	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	5	3	20	4.54	521/1648	4.54	4.19	4.23	4.36	4.54	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	5	6	17	4.43	641/1375	4.43	4.30	4.27	4.48	4.43	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	10	0	2	1	4	10	4.29	770/1595	4.29	4.15	4.20	4.36	4.29	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	5	5	18	4.46	410/1533	4.46	4.23	4.04	4.14	4.46	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	11	0	0	2	4	10	4.50	380/1512	4.50	4.09	4.10	4.26	4.50	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	1	3	23	4.71	261/1623	4.71	4.14	4.16	4.27	4.71	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	1	0	0	27	4.89	680/1646	4.89	4.65	4.69	4.71	4.89	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	8	1	1	1	1	6	10	4.21	731/1621	4.21	3.95	4.06	4.24	4.21	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	1	1	1	25	4.79	424/1568	4.79	4.41	4.43	4.54	4.79	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	1	26	4.89	615/1572	4.89	4.74	4.70	4.79	4.89	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	1	2	4	21	4.61	550/1564	4.61	4.33	4.28	4.40	4.61	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	3	2	21	4.59	596/1559	4.59	4.34	4.29	4.41	4.59	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	1	2	5	19	4.56	275/1352	4.56	4.01	3.98	4.07	4.56	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	1	1	13	4.80	201/1384	4.80	4.17	4.08	4.35	4.80	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	13	0	0	0	0	2	13	4.87	282/1382	4.87	4.37	4.29	4.56	4.87	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	13	0	0	0	0	1	14	4.93	185/1368	4.93	4.45	4.30	4.58	4.93	
4. Were special techniques successful	13	3	1	0	1	2	8	4.33	310/ 948	4.33	3.74	3.95	4.31	4.33	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	26	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 221	****	****	4.16	4.73	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	26	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 243	****	****	4.12	4.61	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	26	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 212	****	****	4.40	4.57	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	26	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 209	****	****	4.35	4.63	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	26	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 555	****	4.91	4.29	4.41	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	26	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 88	****	4.87	4.54	4.66	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	26	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 85	****	4.60	4.47	4.54	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	26	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 81	****	5.00	4.43	4.57	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	26	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 92	****	4.31	4.35	4.44	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	26	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 288	****	3.88	3.68	3.71	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	27	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.06	4.86	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	26	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.09	4.42	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	26	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.47	4.52	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	26	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.38	4.59	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	26	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 312	****	****	3.68	3.95	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	26	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 53	****	****	4.30	4.64	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	26	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.16	4.24	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	26	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 41	****	****	4.43	4.84	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	26	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 24	****	****	4.42	4.85	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	26	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 110	****	****	3.99	4.22	****	

Course-Section: SOCY 452 0101  
 Title HEALTH CARE ORG/DEL  
 Instructor: STUART, MARY  
 Enrollment: 37  
 Questionnaires: 28

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2008

Page 1509  
 FEB 11, 2009  
 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	8	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	2
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	8						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	3	C	1	General	3	Under-grad	28	Non-major	26
84-150	6	3.00-3.49	2	D	1						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5	F	0	Electives	3	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	14				
				?	0						

Course-Section: SOCY 457 0101  
 Title SOCIAL HIST OF MEDICIN  
 Instructor: ROTHSTEIN, WILL  
 Enrollment: 9  
 Questionnaires: 7

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2008

Page 1510  
 FEB 11, 2009  
 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	7	5.00	1/1649	5.00	4.27	4.28	4.50	5.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	3	3	4.50	556/1648	4.50	4.19	4.23	4.36	4.50	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	546/1375	4.50	4.30	4.27	4.48	4.50	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	2	0	0	1	3	0	3.75	1285/1595	3.75	4.15	4.20	4.36	3.75	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	128/1533	4.86	4.23	4.04	4.14	4.86	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	2	1	0	2	2	0	3.00	1428/1512	3.00	4.09	4.10	4.26	3.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	3	1	1	2	3.29	1478/1623	3.29	4.14	4.16	4.27	3.29	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	5	2	4.29	1377/1646	4.29	4.65	4.69	4.71	4.29	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	1	3	2	4.17	789/1621	4.17	3.95	4.06	4.24	4.17	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1568	5.00	4.41	4.43	4.54	5.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1572	5.00	4.74	4.70	4.79	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	406/1564	4.71	4.33	4.28	4.40	4.71	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	261/1559	4.86	4.34	4.29	4.41	4.86	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	1	0	2	1	2	0	3.00	1219/1352	3.00	4.01	3.98	4.07	3.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	0	1	5	4.43	520/1384	4.43	4.17	4.08	4.35	4.43	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	1	1	2	3	4.00	946/1382	4.00	4.37	4.29	4.56	4.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	1	0	1	2	3	3.86	1051/1368	3.86	4.45	4.30	4.58	3.86	
4. Were special techniques successful	0	6	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 948	****	3.74	3.95	4.31	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 4	Required for Majors	1 Graduate 2 Major 2
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	B 1		
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	C 1	General	5 Under-grad 5 Non-major 5
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	D 0		
Grad.	2	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		
			I 0	Other	1
			? 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: 16  
 Questionnaires: 14

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2008

Page 1511  
 FEB 11, 2009  
 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	1	3	10	4.64	459/1649	4.64	4.27	4.28	4.50	4.64	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	2	9	4.36	770/1648	4.36	4.19	4.23	4.36	4.36	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	0	2	10	4.83	212/1375	4.83	4.30	4.27	4.48	4.83	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	3	10	4.64	342/1595	4.64	4.15	4.20	4.36	4.64	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	2	11	4.71	204/1533	4.71	4.23	4.04	4.14	4.71	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	4	9	4.57	331/1512	4.57	4.09	4.10	4.26	4.57	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	3	11	4.79	189/1623	4.79	4.14	4.16	4.27	4.79	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	8	6	4.43	1268/1646	4.43	4.65	4.69	4.71	4.43	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	1	0	5	5	4.27	665/1621	4.27	3.95	4.06	4.24	4.27	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	1	1	2	9	4.46	904/1568	4.46	4.41	4.43	4.54	4.46	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	2	11	4.85	740/1572	4.85	4.74	4.70	4.79	4.85	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	1	0	1	2	9	4.38	801/1564	4.38	4.33	4.28	4.40	4.38	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	2	10	4.69	475/1559	4.69	4.34	4.29	4.41	4.69	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	0	0	1	12	4.92	81/1352	4.92	4.01	3.98	4.07	4.92	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	175/1384	4.86	4.17	4.08	4.35	4.86	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1382	5.00	4.37	4.29	4.56	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	0	0	1	0	6	4.71	472/1368	4.71	4.45	4.30	4.58	4.71	
4. Were special techniques successful	7	2	1	0	0	0	4	4.20	365/ 948	4.20	3.74	3.95	4.31	4.20	
Laboratory															
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 555	****	4.91	4.29	4.41	****	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: SOCY 600 0101  
 Title RESEARCH METHODOLOGY  
 Instructor: ADLER, MARINA  
 Enrollment: 18  
 Questionnaires: 17

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2008

Page 1512  
 FEB 11, 2009  
 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	3	3	11	4.47	683/1649	4.40	4.27	4.28	4.46	4.47	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	3	12	4.59	464/1648	4.46	4.19	4.23	4.34	4.59	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	8	0	0	2	2	5	4.33	733/1375	4.27	4.30	4.27	4.44	4.33	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	1	3	5	7	4.13	983/1595	4.26	4.15	4.20	4.35	4.13	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	2	3	10	4.38	505/1533	4.25	4.23	4.04	4.28	4.38	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	1	1	4	10	4.24	711/1512	4.45	4.09	4.10	4.35	4.24	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	1	2	13	4.59	416/1623	4.49	4.14	4.16	4.29	4.59	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	17	5.00	1/1646	4.97	4.65	4.69	4.81	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	9	0	0	0	0	6	2	4.25	687/1621	4.04	3.95	4.06	4.20	4.25	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	3	14	4.82	358/1568	4.51	4.41	4.43	4.52	4.82	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	1	15	4.82	790/1572	4.88	4.74	4.70	4.83	4.82	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	2	4	10	4.50	651/1564	4.38	4.33	4.28	4.41	4.50	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	1	14	4.71	463/1559	4.42	4.34	4.29	4.41	4.71	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	1	1	3	4	7	3.94	779/1352	3.90	4.01	3.98	4.10	3.94	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	2	2	5	6	3.81	931/1384	3.98	4.17	4.08	4.30	3.81	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	1	1	5	3	6	3.75	1098/1382	4.18	4.37	4.29	4.52	3.75	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	1	5	3	7	4.00	948/1368	4.31	4.45	4.30	4.56	4.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	1	1	0	1	4	6	4	3.87	551/ 948	3.98	3.74	3.95	4.03	3.87	
Laboratory															
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 243	****	****	4.12	4.61	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 88	****	4.87	4.54	4.63	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 85	****	4.60	4.47	4.50	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 81	****	5.00	4.43	4.43	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 92	****	4.31	4.35	4.42	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 288	****	3.88	3.68	3.87	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.06	4.51	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.09	4.47	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.47	4.58	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	16	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.38	4.44	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 312	****	****	3.68	3.83	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 53	****	****	4.30	4.37	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.16	4.49	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 41	****	****	4.43	4.43	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	16	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 24	****	****	4.42	4.67	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	16	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 110	****	****	3.99	3.92	****	

Course-Section: SOCY 600 0101  
 Title RESEARCH METHODOLOGY  
 Instructor: ADLER, MARINA  
 Enrollment: 18  
 Questionnaires: 17

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2008

Page 1512  
 FEB 11, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	8	0.00-0.99	4	A	8	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	6	Major	12
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	7						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	11	Non-major	5
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	6	3.50-4.00	7	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	15				
				?	0						

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

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2008

Page 1513  
 FEB 11, 2009  
 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	2	2	10	4.33	871/1649	4.40	4.27	4.28	4.46	4.33	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	2	0	4	9	4.33	797/1648	4.46	4.19	4.23	4.34	4.33	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	5	0	0	3	2	5	4.20	855/1375	4.27	4.30	4.27	4.44	4.20	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	3	9	4.40	636/1595	4.26	4.15	4.20	4.35	4.40	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	2	1	5	7	4.13	725/1533	4.25	4.23	4.04	4.28	4.13	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	3	11	4.67	263/1512	4.45	4.09	4.10	4.35	4.67	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	2	1	1	11	4.40	635/1623	4.49	4.14	4.16	4.29	4.40	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	14	4.93	465/1646	4.97	4.65	4.69	4.81	4.93	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	4	6	2	3.83	1123/1621	4.04	3.95	4.06	4.20	3.83	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	2	2	2	9	4.20	1169/1568	4.51	4.41	4.43	4.52	4.20	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	14	4.93	414/1572	4.88	4.74	4.70	4.83	4.93	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	2	0	5	8	4.27	929/1564	4.38	4.33	4.28	4.41	4.27	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	2	2	3	8	4.13	1053/1559	4.42	4.34	4.29	4.41	4.13	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	1	6	1	6	3.86	848/1352	3.90	4.01	3.98	4.10	3.86	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	4	3	6	4.15	732/1384	3.98	4.17	4.08	4.30	4.15	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	1	0	2	10	4.62	530/1382	4.18	4.37	4.29	4.52	4.62	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	1	0	2	10	4.62	569/1368	4.31	4.45	4.30	4.56	4.62	
4. Were special techniques successful	2	2	0	1	3	1	6	4.09	411/ 948	3.98	3.74	3.95	4.03	4.09	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: SOCY 605 0101  
 Title ADV RES & EVAL TECH  
 Instructor: ADLER, MARINA  
 Enrollment: 18  
 Questionnaires: 18

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2008

Page 1514  
 FEB 11, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor Mean	Instructor Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5								
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	0	0	0	5	12	4.71	383/1649	4.71	4.27	4.28	4.46	4.71	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	4	12	4.65	388/1648	4.65	4.19	4.23	4.34	4.65	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	3	2	0	0	2	3	8	4.46	593/1375	4.46	4.30	4.27	4.44	4.46	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	4	12	4.65	342/1595	4.65	4.15	4.20	4.35	4.65	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	4	13	4.76	174/1533	4.76	4.23	4.04	4.28	4.76	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	7	10	4.59	324/1512	4.59	4.09	4.10	4.35	4.59	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	2	1	3	11	4.35	696/1623	4.35	4.14	4.16	4.29	4.35	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	13	4	4.24	1412/1646	4.24	4.65	4.69	4.81	4.24	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	2	15	4.88	101/1621	4.88	3.95	4.06	4.20	4.88	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	3	14	4.82	358/1568	4.82	4.41	4.43	4.52	4.82	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	2	15	4.88	640/1572	4.88	4.74	4.70	4.83	4.88	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	4	13	4.76	326/1564	4.76	4.33	4.28	4.41	4.76	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	3	14	4.82	295/1559	4.82	4.34	4.29	4.41	4.82	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	0	2	5	10	4.47	331/1352	4.47	4.01	3.98	4.10	4.47	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	3	13	4.81	195/1384	4.81	4.17	4.08	4.30	4.81	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	0	2	14	4.88	272/1382	4.88	4.37	4.29	4.52	4.88	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	0	1	15	4.94	185/1368	4.94	4.45	4.30	4.56	4.94	
4. Were special techniques successful	2	3	0	0	2	1	10	4.62	167/ 948	4.62	3.74	3.95	4.03	4.62	
Laboratory															
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	17	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 555	****	4.91	4.29	4.66	****	
Seminar															
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	17	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 288	****	3.88	3.68	3.87	****	
Field Work															
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	16	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 312	****	****	3.68	3.83	****	

Frequency Distribution

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



Course-Section: SOCY 611 0101  
 Title CONSTR RACE CLASS & GE  
 Instructor: PINCUS, FRED L  
 Enrollment: 18  
 Questionnaires: 17

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2008

Page 1515  
 FEB 11, 2009  
 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	2	4	8	3.88	1287/1649	3.88	4.27	4.28	4.46	3.88	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	1	4	4	2	5	3.38	1535/1648	3.38	4.19	4.23	4.34	3.38	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	13	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/1375	****	4.30	4.27	4.44	****	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	2	2	6	3	3	3.19	1504/1595	3.19	4.15	4.20	4.35	3.19	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	0	3	4	8	4.13	733/1533	4.13	4.23	4.04	4.28	4.13	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	3	5	3	4	3.38	1330/1512	3.38	4.09	4.10	4.35	3.38	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	1	3	1	1	3	6	3.57	1359/1623	3.57	4.14	4.16	4.29	3.57	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	16	5.00	1/1646	5.00	4.65	4.69	4.81	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	2	5	5	3	3.60	1302/1621	3.60	3.95	4.06	4.20	3.60	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	3	1	4	3	3	3.14	1506/1568	3.14	4.41	4.43	4.52	3.14	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	1	1	4	9	4.40	1321/1572	4.40	4.74	4.70	4.83	4.40	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	2	1	3	5	3	3.43	1419/1564	3.43	4.33	4.28	4.41	3.43	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	4	2	2	4	3	3.00	1479/1559	3.00	4.34	4.29	4.41	3.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	11	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/1352	****	4.01	3.98	4.10	****	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	4	2	3	7	3.65	1020/1384	3.65	4.17	4.08	4.30	3.65	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	5	2	10	4.29	805/1382	4.29	4.37	4.29	4.52	4.29	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	1	4	3	9	4.18	886/1368	4.18	4.45	4.30	4.56	4.18	
4. Were special techniques successful	1	11	0	0	2	3	0	3.60	678/ 948	3.60	3.74	3.95	4.03	3.60	
Laboratory															
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	16	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 555	****	4.91	4.29	4.66	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	12	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	50/ 88	4.60	4.87	4.54	4.63	4.60	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	12	0	0	1	1	1	2	3.80	75/ 85	3.80	4.60	4.47	4.50	3.80	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	12	1	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	****/ 81	****	5.00	4.43	4.43	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	12	0	1	0	0	3	1	3.60	80/ 92	3.60	4.31	4.35	4.42	3.60	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	11	1	1	1	0	2	1	3.20	219/ 288	3.20	3.88	3.68	3.87	3.20	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	16	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.06	4.51	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	16	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 312	****	****	3.68	3.83	****	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: SOCY 620 0101  
 Title SOCIAL EPIDEMIOLOGY  
 Instructor: SERPI, TRACEY L  
 Enrollment: 18  
 Questionnaires: 14

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2008

Page 1516  
 FEB 11, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	1	1	2	5	5	3.86	1311/1649	3.86	4.27	4.28	4.46	3.86
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	2	0	5	4	3	3.43	1517/1648	3.43	4.19	4.23	4.34	3.43
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	1	1	2	9	4.21	840/1375	4.21	4.30	4.27	4.44	4.21
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	1	4	4	4	3.64	1347/1595	3.64	4.15	4.20	4.35	3.64
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	1	3	5	4	3.71	1103/1533	3.71	4.23	4.04	4.28	3.71
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	0	2	5	5	3.79	1101/1512	3.79	4.09	4.10	4.35	3.79
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	3	2	9	4.43	608/1623	4.43	4.14	4.16	4.29	4.43
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	12	2	4.14	1476/1646	4.14	4.65	4.69	4.81	4.14
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	1	1	3	4	3	3.58	1310/1621	3.58	3.95	4.06	4.20	3.58
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	1	0	5	4	4	3.71	1414/1568	3.71	4.41	4.43	4.52	3.71
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	1	2	2	9	4.36	1352/1572	4.36	4.74	4.70	4.83	4.36
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	1	1	5	3	4	3.57	1368/1564	3.57	4.33	4.28	4.41	3.57
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	2	0	4	4	3	3.46	1385/1559	3.46	4.34	4.29	4.41	3.46
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	2	0	2	5	4	3.69	955/1352	3.69	4.01	3.98	4.10	3.69
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	3	5	2	3.90	886/1384	3.90	4.17	4.08	4.30	3.90
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	0	2	0	8	4.60	540/1382	4.60	4.37	4.29	4.52	4.60
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	1	0	1	8	4.60	579/1368	4.60	4.45	4.30	4.56	4.60
4. Were special techniques successful	4	3	1	0	3	1	2	3.43	736/ 948	3.43	3.74	3.95	4.03	3.43
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	12	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 88	****	4.87	4.54	4.63	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	13	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 85	****	4.60	4.47	4.50	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 81	****	5.00	4.43	4.43	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 92	****	4.31	4.35	4.42	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 288	****	3.88	3.68	3.87	****

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: SOCY 630 0101  
 Title SOCIOLOGY OF AGING  
 Instructor: TRELA, JAMES E  
 Enrollment: 13  
 Questionnaires: 10

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2008

Page 1517  
 FEB 11, 2009  
 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	2	2	5	4.10	1116/1649	4.10	4.27	4.28	4.46	4.10	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	5	2	3.90	1229/1648	3.90	4.19	4.23	4.34	3.90	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	0	2	3	4	3.90	1034/1375	3.90	4.30	4.27	4.44	3.90	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	4	4	2	3.80	1260/1595	3.80	4.15	4.20	4.35	3.80	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	3	5	1	3.60	1180/1533	3.60	4.23	4.04	4.28	3.60	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	4	2	3	3.89	1035/1512	3.89	4.09	4.10	4.35	3.89	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	1	5	1	2	3.20	1496/1623	3.20	4.14	4.16	4.29	3.20	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	664/1646	4.90	4.65	4.69	4.81	4.90	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	1	0	4	3	0	3.13	1483/1621	3.13	3.95	4.06	4.20	3.13	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	2	5	3	4.10	1235/1568	4.10	4.41	4.43	4.52	4.10	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1572	5.00	4.74	4.70	4.83	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	3	2	5	4.20	1001/1564	4.20	4.33	4.28	4.41	4.20	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	2	2	5	4.10	1075/1559	4.10	4.34	4.29	4.41	4.10	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	2	1	7	4.50	303/1352	4.50	4.01	3.98	4.10	4.50	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	1	5	3	3.90	886/1384	3.90	4.17	4.08	4.30	3.90	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	1	2	1	6	4.20	869/1382	4.20	4.37	4.29	4.52	4.20	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	2	0	2	6	4.20	876/1368	4.20	4.45	4.30	4.56	4.20	
4. Were special techniques successful	0	7	0	2	0	0	1	3.00	844/ 948	3.00	3.74	3.95	4.03	3.00	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	9	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 88	****	4.87	4.54	4.63	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	9	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 85	****	4.60	4.47	4.50	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 81	****	5.00	4.43	4.43	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 92	****	4.31	4.35	4.42	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	9	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 288	****	3.88	3.68	3.87	****	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: SOCY 657 0101  
 Title SOC HIST OF AMER MEDCN  
 Instructor: ROTHSTEIN, WILL  
 Enrollment: 11  
 Questionnaires: 9

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2008

Page 1518  
 FEB 11, 2009  
 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	2	3	4	4.22	996/1649	4.22	4.27	4.28	4.46	4.22	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	3	2	3	3.78	1333/1648	3.78	4.19	4.23	4.34	3.78	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	4	1	4	4.00	950/1375	4.00	4.30	4.27	4.44	4.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	1	3	4	4.38	672/1595	4.38	4.15	4.20	4.35	4.38	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	4	4	4.33	545/1533	4.33	4.23	4.04	4.28	4.33	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	2	4	2	4.00	883/1512	4.00	4.09	4.10	4.35	4.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	4	2	3	3.89	1192/1623	3.89	4.14	4.16	4.29	3.89	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	6	3	4.33	1340/1646	4.33	4.65	4.69	4.81	4.33	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	2	4	3	4.11	847/1621	4.11	3.95	4.06	4.20	4.11	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	3	5	4.44	930/1568	4.44	4.41	4.43	4.52	4.44	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	3	6	4.67	1071/1572	4.67	4.74	4.70	4.83	4.67	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	3	2	4	4.11	1073/1564	4.11	4.33	4.28	4.41	4.11	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	4	5	4.56	640/1559	4.56	4.34	4.29	4.41	4.56	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	3	3	3	4.00	690/1352	4.00	4.01	3.98	4.10	4.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	1	1	3	0	3.40	1122/1384	3.40	4.17	4.08	4.30	3.40	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	2	1	1	1	3.20	1291/1382	3.20	4.37	4.29	4.52	3.20	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	2	2	1	0	2.80	1326/1368	2.80	4.45	4.30	4.56	2.80	
4. Were special techniques successful	4	4	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 948	****	3.74	3.95	4.03	****	
Laboratory															
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	7	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 555	****	4.91	4.29	4.66	****	
Seminar															
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	8	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 288	****	3.88	3.68	3.87	****	
Field Work															
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	8	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 312	****	****	3.68	3.83	****	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: SOCY 658 0101  
 Title SOC MENTAL HEALTH  
 Instructor: SECKIN, GUL  
 Enrollment: 9  
 Questionnaires: 8

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2008

Page 1519  
 FEB 11, 2009  
 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	1	1	5	4.57	550/1649	4.57	4.27	4.28	4.46	4.57	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	1	0	0	6	4.57	475/1648	4.57	4.19	4.23	4.34	4.57	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	199/1375	4.86	4.30	4.27	4.44	4.86	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	1	5	4.57	417/1595	4.57	4.15	4.20	4.35	4.57	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	2	0	5	4.43	454/1533	4.43	4.23	4.04	4.28	4.43	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	2	1	4	4.29	651/1512	4.29	4.09	4.10	4.35	4.29	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	1	1	5	4.57	427/1623	4.57	4.14	4.16	4.29	4.57	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	4	3	4.43	1268/1646	4.43	4.65	4.69	4.81	4.43	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	374/1621	4.50	3.95	4.06	4.20	4.50	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1568	5.00	4.41	4.43	4.52	5.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1572	5.00	4.74	4.70	4.83	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	5	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1564	5.00	4.33	4.28	4.41	5.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	390/1559	4.75	4.34	4.29	4.41	4.75	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	5	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1352	5.00	4.01	3.98	4.10	5.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	376/1384	4.60	4.17	4.08	4.30	4.60	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1382	5.00	4.37	4.29	4.52	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1368	5.00	4.45	4.30	4.56	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	3	0	0	0	2	1	2	4.00	431/ 948	4.00	3.74	3.95	4.03	4.00	
Laboratory															
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	7	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 555	****	4.91	4.29	4.66	****	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: SOCY 681 8020  
 Title NONPROFIT ORGANIZATION  
 Instructor: ROTHSTEIN, WILL  
 Enrollment: 8  
 Questionnaires: 6

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2008

Page 1520  
 FEB 11, 2009  
 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	5	4.83	247/1649	4.83	4.27	4.28	4.46	4.83	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	556/1648	4.50	4.19	4.23	4.34	4.50	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	212/1375	4.83	4.30	4.27	4.44	4.83	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1595	5.00	4.15	4.20	4.35	5.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	0	2	3	4.17	703/1533	4.17	4.23	4.04	4.28	4.17	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	1	3	4.17	782/1512	4.17	4.09	4.10	4.35	4.17	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	3	1	1	1	3.00	1533/1623	3.00	4.14	4.16	4.29	3.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	5	1	4.17	1462/1646	4.17	4.65	4.69	4.81	4.17	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	754/1621	4.20	3.95	4.06	4.20	4.20	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	344/1568	4.83	4.41	4.43	4.52	4.83	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	765/1572	4.83	4.74	4.70	4.83	4.83	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	473/1564	4.67	4.33	4.28	4.41	4.67	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	284/1559	4.83	4.34	4.29	4.41	4.83	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	1	3	1	0	3.00	1219/1352	3.00	4.01	3.98	4.10	3.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	2	1	2	4.00	795/1384	4.00	4.17	4.08	4.30	4.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	1	1	1	2	3.80	1069/1382	3.80	4.37	4.29	4.52	3.80	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	2	0	1	2	3.60	1143/1368	3.60	4.45	4.30	4.56	3.60	
4. Were special techniques successful	1	3	2	0	0	0	0	1.00	945/ 948	1.00	3.74	3.95	4.03	1.00	
Laboratory															
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	4	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 555	5.00	4.91	4.29	4.66	5.00	
Seminar															
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	4	0	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	229/ 288	3.00	3.88	3.68	3.87	3.00	

Frequency Distribution

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