**Course-Section: POLI 100 01** 

**Title: Amer Govt & Politics** 

**Instructor:** Hinkle, Rachael

**Term - Fall 2013** 

Enrollment: 54

		R         NA         1         2         3         4         5         Mean           9         0         0         1         3         9         20         4.45           9         0         0         0         2         9         22         4.61           9         0         0         0         2         8         23         4.64           9         1         0         0         2         8         22         4.63           0         0         0         1         5         5         21         4.44           0         0         2         2         2         14         12         4.00           0         0         0         0         1         3         28         4.84           9         0         0         0         12         21         4.64           8         0         0         0         3         11         10         4.29           0         0         0         1         1         30         4.91           0         0         0         0         9         23         4.72 <th>structor</th> <th>Course</th> <th>Org</th> <th><b>UMBC</b></th> <th>Level</th> <th>Sect</th>				structor	Course	Org	<b>UMBC</b>	Level	Sect			
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	19	0	0	1	3	9	20	4.45	751/1644	4.14	4.49	4.32	4.16	4.45
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	19	0	0	0	2	9	22	4.61	508/1644	4.26	4.36	4.28	4.23	4.61
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	19	0	0	0	2	8	23	4.64	502/1419	4.40	4.48	4.35	4.25	4.64
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	19	1	0	0	2	8	22	4.63	410/1596	4.13	4.33	4.24	4.09	4.63
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	20	0	0	1	5	5	21	4.44	537/1535	4.22	4.46	4.15	4.02	4.44
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	20	0	2	2	2	14	12	4.00	921/1510	3.98	4.33	4.13	3.91	4.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	20	0	0	0	1	3	28	4.84	131/1620	4.41	4.33	4.20	4.13	4.84
8. How many times was class cancelled	19	0	0	0	0	12	21	4.64	1075/1642	4.81	4.68	4.68	4.68	4.64
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	28	0	0	0	3	11	10	4.29	654/1596	3.97	4.22	4.12	4.07	4.29
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	20	0	0	1	0	3	28	4.81	419/1534	4.57	4.63	4.48	4.45	4.81
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	20	0	0	0	1	1	30	4.91	609/1539	4.81	4.83	4.76	4.72	4.91
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	20	0	0	1	1	7	23	4.63	536/1531	4.39	4.47	4.33	4.30	4.63
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	20	0	0	0	0	9	23	4.72	502/1530	4.42	4.53	4.35	4.30	4.72
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	22	3	0	1	5	5	16	4.33	551/1409	4.12	3.97	4.08	3.97	4.33
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	25	0	0	0	5	11	11	4.22	742/1366	4.31	4.39	4.18	3.96	4.22
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	25	0	1	3	2	5	16	4.19	920/1364	4.18	4.50	4.33	4.10	4.19
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	25	0	0	0	2	8	17	4.56	661/1361	4.54	4.58	4.39	4.17	4.56
4. Were special techniques successful	25	16	2	0	3	3	3	3.45	****/1019	3.26	4.05	4.09	3.97	****

**Course-Section: POLI 100 01** 

**Title: Amer Govt & Politics** 

**Instructor:** Hinkle, Rachael

**Term - Fall 2013** 

Enrollment: 54

	NR         NA         1         2         3         4         5         Mean         4           51         0         0         0         0         0         1         5.00         ***           51         0         0         0         0         0         1         5.00         ***           51         0         0         0         0         0         1         5.00         ***           51         0         0         0         0         0         1         5.00         ***           51         0         0         0         0         0         1         5.00         ***           51         0         0         0         0         0         1         5.00         ***           51         0         0         0         0         0         1         5.00         ***           51         0         0         0         0         0         1         5.00         ***           51         0         0         0         0         0         1         5.00         ***           51         0         0         0				structor	Course	Org	<b>UMBC</b>	Level	Sect				
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	51	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/72	****	5.00	4.53	4.35	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	51	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/71	****	4.67	4.38	4.21	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	51	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/68	****	4.67	4.41	4.22	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	51	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/71	****	3.67	4.40	4.19	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	51	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/73	****	5.00	4.09	3.85	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	51	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/48	****	****	4.16	3.97	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	51	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/45	****	****	4.19	3.97	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	51	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/30	****	****	4.57	4.58	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	51	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/27	****	****	4.25	4.37	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	51	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/25	****	****	4.35	4.63	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	51	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/51	****	****	4.03	4.19	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	51	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/31	****	****	4.18	4.46	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	51	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/36	****	****	4.33	4.38	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	51	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/19	****	***	4.17	4.29	****

# **Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires**

Course-Section: POLI 100 01

Title: Amer Govt & Politics

Instructor: Hinkle,Rachael

**Term - Fall 2013** 

Enrollment: 54

Questionnaires: 52

				Fre	quen	cies		Ins	structor	Course	Org	<b>UMBC</b>	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Self Paced														
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	51	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/14	****	****	4.17	4.35	****

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GP/	4	Expected	Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors	
00-27	5	0.00-0.99	1	Α	18	Required for Majors	16	Graduate	0	Major	9
28-55	6	1.00-1.99	0	В	10						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	3	С	2	General	6	Under-grad	52	Non-major	43
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	4	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	5	**** - Means the	re are not e	nough responses	
				Р	0			to be significant			
				1	0	Other	2				
				?	22						

**Course-Section: POLI 100 02** 

**Title: Amer Govt & Politics** 

**Instructor:** Kobren, Martin E

**Term - Fall 2013** 

Enrollment: 48

				Fre	quen	cies		In	structor	Course	Org	<b>UMBC</b>	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	2	0	1	3	6	6	14	3.97	1255/1644	4.14	4.49	4.32	4.16	3.97
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	1	2	5	11	11	3.97	1248/1644	4.26	4.36	4.28	4.23	3.97
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	2	0	0	5	6	17	4.43	746/1419	4.40	4.48	4.35	4.25	4.43
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	4	2	1	8	5	10	3.77	1298/1596	4.13	4.33	4.24	4.09	3.77
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	0	3	1	4	8	14	3.97	1009/1535	4.22	4.46	4.15	4.02	3.97
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	2	2	3	6	4	13	3.82	1096/1510	3.98	4.33	4.13	3.91	3.82
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	4	0	2	1	6	6	13	3.96	1176/1620	4.41	4.33	4.20	4.13	3.96
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	0	0	0	0	0	29	5.00	1/1642	4.81	4.68	4.68	4.68	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	11	0	1	1	3	12	4	3.81	1203/1596	3.97	4.22	4.12	4.07	3.81
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	0	0	4	8	16	4.43	1002/1534	4.57	4.63	4.48	4.45	4.43
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	0	0	2	26	4.93	487/1539	4.81	4.83	4.76	4.72	4.93
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	5	0	0	0	3	11	13	4.37	879/1531	4.39	4.47	4.33	4.30	4.37
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	5	0	1	1	1	5	19	4.48	780/1530	4.42	4.53	4.35	4.30	4.48
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	6	1	1	1	4	11	8	3.96	863/1409	4.12	3.97	4.08	3.97	3.96
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	10	0	1	0	1	7	13	4.41	604/1366	4.31	4.39	4.18	3.96	4.41
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	10	0	0	1	5	5	11	4.18	920/1364	4.18	4.50	4.33	4.10	4.18
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	10	0	0	1	1	6	14	4.50	703/1361	4.54	4.58	4.39	4.17	4.50
4. Were special techniques successful	11	9	5	0	3	2	2	2.67	999/1019	3.26	4.05	4.09	3.97	2.67

**Course-Section: POLI 100 02** 

**Title: Amer Govt & Politics** 

**Instructor:** Kobren, Martin E

**Term - Fall 2013** 

Enrollment: 48

				Fre	quen	cies		Ins	structor	Course	Org	<b>UMBC</b>	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	30	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/185	****	4.00	4.23	4.19	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	31	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/209	****	4.00	4.19	4.18	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	31	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/181	****	4.44	4.53	4.68	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	31	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/183	****	3.88	4.46	4.50	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	30	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/72	****	5.00	4.53	4.35	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	31	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/71	****	4.67	4.38	4.21	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	31	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/71	****	3.67	4.40	4.19	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	31	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/73	****	5.00	4.09	3.85	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	31	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/48	****	****	4.16	3.97	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	31	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/45	****	****	4.19	3.97	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	31	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/30	****	****	4.57	4.58	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	31	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/27	****	****	4.25	4.37	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	31	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/51	****	****	4.03	4.19	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	31	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/31	****	****	4.18	4.46	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	31	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/19	****	****	4.17	4.29	****

# **Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires**

Course-Section: POLI 100 02

Title: Amer Govt & Politics

Instructor: Kobren, Martin E

**Term - Fall 2013** 

Enrollment: 48

Questionnaires: 32

				Fre	quen	cies		Ins	structor	Course	Org	<b>UMBC</b>	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Self Paced														
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	31	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/14	****	****	4.17	4.35	****

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA	4	Expected	Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors	
00-27	6	0.00-0.99	1	Α	2	Required for Majors	11	Graduate	0	Major	3
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	В	14						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	С	3	General	2	Under-grad	32	Non-major	29
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	2	**** - Means the	re are not e	nough responses	
				Р	0			to be significant			
				1	0	Other	1				
				?	13						

**Course-Section: POLI 100 03** 

**Title: Amer Govt & Politics** 

**Instructor:** Prucka, Susannah

**Term - Fall 2013** 

Enrollment: 49

				Fre	quen	cies		In	structor	Course	Org	<b>UMBC</b>	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	10	0	0	6	3	7	15	4.00	1218/1644	4.14	4.49	4.32	4.16	4.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	10	0	1	3	3	6	18	4.19	1049/1644	4.26	4.36	4.28	4.23	4.19
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	12	0	2	2	2	7	16	4.14	1033/1419	4.40	4.48	4.35	4.25	4.14
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	10	3	0	4	3	10	11	4.00	1129/1596	4.13	4.33	4.24	4.09	4.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	3	2	10	16	4.26	737/1535	4.22	4.46	4.15	4.02	4.26
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	10	7	1	0	5	7	11	4.13	857/1510	3.98	4.33	4.13	3.91	4.13
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	10	0	0	2	2	8	19	4.42	669/1620	4.41	4.33	4.20	4.13	4.42
8. How many times was class cancelled	11	1	0	0	0	6	23	4.79	854/1642	4.81	4.68	4.68	4.68	4.79
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	16	0	0	3	4	13	5	3.80	1203/1596	3.97	4.22	4.12	4.07	3.80
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	10	0	1	1	2	5	22	4.48	918/1534	4.57	4.63	4.48	4.45	4.48
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	10	0	0	1	3	4	23	4.58	1230/1539	4.81	4.83	4.76	4.72	4.58
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	10	0	0	4	2	10	15	4.16	1069/1531	4.39	4.47	4.33	4.30	4.16
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	3	7	6	15	4.06	1133/1530	4.42	4.53	4.35	4.30	4.06
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	16	0	2	1	3	6	13	4.08	777/1409	4.12	3.97	4.08	3.97	4.08
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	17	0	2	1	0	6	15	4.29	692/1366	4.31	4.39	4.18	3.96	4.29
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	17	0	0	3	4	3	14	4.17	930/1364	4.18	4.50	4.33	4.10	4.17
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	18	0	0	1	0	7	15	4.57	652/1361	4.54	4.58	4.39	4.17	4.57
4. Were special techniques successful	18	2	2	0	5	6	8	3.86	693/1019	3.26	4.05	4.09	3.97	3.86

**Course-Section: POLI 100 03** 

**Title: Amer Govt & Politics** 

**Instructor:** Prucka, Susannah

**Term - Fall 2013** 

**Enrollment: 49** 

**Questionnaires: 41** 

				Fre	quen	cies		Ins	structor	Course	Org	<b>UMBC</b>	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	37	1	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/185	****	4.00	4.23	4.19	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	37	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	****/209	****	4.00	4.19	4.18	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	38	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/181	****	4.44	4.53	4.68	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	38	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/183	****	3.88	4.46	4.50	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	38	1	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/172	****	3.63	4.14	4.22	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	39	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/72	****	5.00	4.53	4.35	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	39	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/71	****	4.67	4.38	4.21	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	39	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/68	****	4.67	4.41	4.22	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	39	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/71	****	3.67	4.40	4.19	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	39	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/73	****	5.00	4.09	3.85	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	39	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/48	****	****	4.16	3.97	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	39	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/45	****	****	4.19	3.97	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	39	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/30	****	****	4.57	4.58	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	39	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/27	****	****	4.25	4.37	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	39	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/25	****	****	4.35	4.63	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	39	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/51	****	****	4.03	4.19	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	39	0	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/31	****	****	4.18	4.46	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	39	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/36	****	****	4.33	4.38	****

Run Date: 1/30/2014 2:25:48 PM

# **Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires**

**Course-Section: POLI 100 03** 

**Title: Amer Govt & Politics** 

**Instructor:** Prucka, Susannah

**Term - Fall 2013** 

Enrollment: 49

**Questionnaires: 41** 

				Fre	quen	cies		Ins	structor	Course	Org	<b>UMBC</b>	Level	Sect
Questions	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
Self Paced														
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	39	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/19	****	****	4.17	4.29	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	39	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/14	****	****	4.17	4.35	****

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GP	4	Expected	Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors	
00-27	5	0.00-0.99	3	Α	6	Required for Majors	9	Graduate	0	Major	6
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	В	14						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	3	С	6	General	10	Under-grad	41	Non-major	35
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	5	D	1						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F	0	Electives	2	**** - Means the	re are not e	nough responses	
				Р	0			to be significant			
				1	0	Other	5				
				?	14						

**Course-Section: POLI 230 01** 

**Title: Intro Constitutional Law** 

**Instructor:** Davis, Jeffrey

**Term - Fall 2013** 

Enrollment: 52

				Fre	quen	cies		Ins	structor	Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	20	0	0	0	2	5	24	4.71	428/1644	4.78	4.49	4.32	4.36	4.71
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	20	0	0	0	2	9	20	4.58	533/1644	4.72	4.36	4.28	4.35	4.58
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	20	0	0	0	2	7	22	4.65	489/1419	4.70	4.48	4.35	4.42	4.65
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	20	6	0	0	2	7	16	4.56	489/1596	4.63	4.33	4.24	4.31	4.56
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	21	0	0	0	1	5	24	4.77	218/1535	4.78	4.46	4.15	4.20	4.77
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	21	1	0	3	4	5	17	4.24	739/1510	4.48	4.33	4.13	4.17	4.24
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	21	0	0	0	4	5	21	4.57	449/1620	4.76	4.33	4.20	4.25	4.57
8. How many times was class cancelled	21	0	0	0	0	2	28	4.93	442/1642	4.97	4.68	4.68	4.67	4.93
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	22	0	1	0	2	13	13	4.28	679/1596	4.48	4.22	4.12	4.13	4.28
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	21	0	0	0	0	6	24	4.80	439/1534	4.81	4.63	4.48	4.51	4.80
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	21	0	0	0	0	2	28	4.93	426/1539	4.91	4.83	4.76	4.80	4.93
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	22	0	0	0	1	10	18	4.59	596/1531	4.65	4.47	4.33	4.38	4.59
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	21	0	0	0	3	5	22	4.63	606/1530	4.82	4.53	4.35	4.41	4.63
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	23	2	0	3	5	9	9	3.92	902/1409	4.15	3.97	4.08	4.23	3.92
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	34	0	1	0	1	5	10	4.35	644/1366	4.35	4.39	4.18	4.24	4.35
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	34	0	0	1	1	5	10	4.41	745/1364	4.41	4.50	4.33	4.39	4.41
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	35	0	0	0	0	3	13	4.81	366/1361	4.81	4.58	4.39	4.48	4.81

# **Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires**

Course-Section: POLI 230 01

**Title: Intro Constitutional Law** 

**Instructor:** Davis, Jeffrey

**Term - Fall 2013** 

Enrollment: 52

Questionnaires: 51

				Fre	quen	cies		In	structor	Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Discussion														
4. Were special techniques successful	34	11	1	0	1	2	2	3.67	****/1019	****	4.05	4.09	4.14	****

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA	4	Expected	l Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors	
00-27	5	0.00-0.99	1	Α	13	Required for Majors	18	Graduate	0	Major	17
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	В	8						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	1	С	3	General	5	Under-grad	51	Non-major	34
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	6	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5	F	0	Electives	2	**** - Means the	re are not e	nough responses	
				Р	0			to be significant			
				1	0	Other	2				
				?	26						

Course-Section: POLI 230 02

**Title: Intro Constitutional Law** 

**Instructor:** Davis, Jeffrey

**Term - Fall 2013** 

Enrollment: 53

				Fre	quend	cies		Ins	structor	Course	Org	<b>UMBC</b>	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	32	0	0	0	0	3	17	4.85	231/1644	4.78	4.49	4.32	4.36	4.85
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	32	0	0	0	0	3	17	4.85	186/1644	4.72	4.36	4.28	4.35	4.85
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	32	0	0	0	1	3	16	4.75	337/1419	4.70	4.48	4.35	4.42	4.75
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	32	3	0	0	1	3	13	4.71	302/1596	4.63	4.33	4.24	4.31	4.71
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	33	0	0	0	1	2	16	4.79	204/1535	4.78	4.46	4.15	4.20	4.79
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	33	1	0	0	0	5	13	4.72	225/1510	4.48	4.33	4.13	4.17	4.72
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	33	0	0	0	0	1	18	4.95	53/1620	4.76	4.33	4.20	4.25	4.95
8. How many times was class cancelled	34	0	0	0	0	0	18	5.00	1/1642	4.97	4.68	4.68	4.67	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	36	0	0	0	0	5	11	4.69	229/1596	4.48	4.22	4.12	4.13	4.69
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	35	0	0	0	1	1	15	4.82	400/1534	4.81	4.63	4.48	4.51	4.82
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	35	0	0	0	0	2	15	4.88	666/1539	4.91	4.83	4.76	4.80	4.88
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	35	0	0	0	1	3	13	4.71	421/1531	4.65	4.47	4.33	4.38	4.71
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	35	0	0	0	0	0	17	5.00	1/1530	4.82	4.53	4.35	4.41	5.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	35	1	0	0	5	0	11	4.38	513/1409	4.15	3.97	4.08	4.23	4.38
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	40	0	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	****/1366	4.35	4.39	4.18	4.24	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	40	0	0	0	1	2	9	4.67	****/1364	4.41	4.50	4.33	4.39	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	40	0	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	****/1361	4.81	4.58	4.39	4.48	****

# **Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires**

Course-Section: POLI 230 02

**Title: Intro Constitutional Law** 

**Instructor:** Davis, Jeffrey

**Term - Fall 2013** 

Enrollment: 53

**Questionnaires:** 52

				Fre	quen	cies		In	structor	Course	Org	<b>UMBC</b>	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Discussion														
4. Were special techniques successful	41	6	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	****/1019	****	4.05	4.09	4.14	****

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA	4	Expected	Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	Α	4	Required for Majors	12	Graduate	0	Major	13
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	В	7						
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	3	С	3	General	1	Under-grad	52	Non-major	39
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	2	**** - Means the	re are not e	nough responses	
				Р	0			to be significant			
				1	0	Other	0				
				?	38						

**Course-Section: POLI 233 01** 

Title: Common Law&Legal Analys

**Instructor:** Miller, Kerwin

**Term - Fall 2013** 

Enrollment: 50

				Fre	quen	cies		Ins	structor	Course	Org	<b>UMBC</b>	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	10	0	0	0	4	8	28	4.60	564/1644	4.60	4.49	4.32	4.36	4.60
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	11	0	0	0	4	12	23	4.49	666/1644	4.49	4.36	4.28	4.35	4.49
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	10	0	0	2	3	10	25	4.45	703/1419	4.45	4.48	4.35	4.42	4.45
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	12	2	0	1	5	4	26	4.53	541/1596	4.53	4.33	4.24	4.31	4.53
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	1	1	7	31	4.70	260/1535	4.70	4.46	4.15	4.20	4.70
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	10	1	1	0	4	8	26	4.49	450/1510	4.49	4.33	4.13	4.17	4.49
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	10	0	0	1	8	3	28	4.45	606/1620	4.45	4.33	4.20	4.25	4.45
8. How many times was class cancelled	10	0	0	0	0	32	8	4.20	1432/1642	4.20	4.68	4.68	4.67	4.20
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	16	0	1	0	1	16	16	4.35	578/1596	4.35	4.22	4.12	4.13	4.35
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	11	0	0	0	2	5	32	4.77	507/1534	4.77	4.63	4.48	4.51	4.77
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	11	0	0	0	1	2	36	4.90	637/1539	4.90	4.83	4.76	4.80	4.90
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	12	0	0	0	3	5	30	4.71	406/1531	4.71	4.47	4.33	4.38	4.71
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	2	5	32	4.77	421/1530	4.77	4.53	4.35	4.41	4.77
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	12	4	1	1	5	6	21	4.32	560/1409	4.32	3.97	4.08	4.23	4.32
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	24	0	0	0	0	4	22	4.85	200/1366	4.85	4.39	4.18	4.24	4.85
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	24	0	0	0	1	1	24	4.88	240/1364	4.88	4.50	4.33	4.39	4.88
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	24	0	0	0	1	1	24	4.88	273/1361	4.88	4.58	4.39	4.48	4.88
4. Were special techniques successful	25	4	1	1	5	3	11	4.05	551/1019	4.05	4.05	4.09	4.14	4.05

# **Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires**

**Course-Section: POLI 233 01** 

Title: Common Law&Legal Analys

**Instructor:** Miller, Kerwin

**Term - Fall 2013** 

Enrollment: 50
Questionnaires: 50

				Fre	quen	cies		Ins	structor	Course	Org	<b>UMBC</b>	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	49	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/48	****	****	4.16	4.81	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	49	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/45	****	****	4.19	4.58	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	49	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/30	****	****	4.57	4.57	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	49	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/51	****	****	4.03	5.00	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	49	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/36	****	****	4.33	****	****

Credits E	arned	Cum. GP.	A	Expected	Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors	
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	Α	21	Required for Majors	30	Graduate	1	Major	19
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	В	13						
56-83	7	2.00-2.99	4	С	0	General	2	Under-grad	49	Non-major	31
84-150	7	3.00-3.49	7	D	0						
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00	10	F	0	Electives	1	**** - Means the	re are not e	nough responses	
				Р	0			to be significant			
				1	0	Other	1				
				?	16						

**Course-Section: POLI 250 02** 

Title: Intro To Public Admin

**Instructor:** Johnson, Arthur

**Term - Fall 2013** 

Enrollment: 52

				Fre	quen	cies		In	structor	Course	Org	<b>UMBC</b>	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	10	0	1	2	2	5	32	4.55	638/1644	4.55	4.49	4.32	4.36	4.55
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	11	0	1	2	2	13	23	4.34	884/1644	4.34	4.36	4.28	4.35	4.34
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	10	0	1	2	2	9	28	4.45	703/1419	4.45	4.48	4.35	4.42	4.45
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	10	13	4	2	3	8	12	3.76	1305/1596	3.76	4.33	4.24	4.31	3.76
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	10	0	1	1	6	8	26	4.36	635/1535	4.36	4.46	4.15	4.20	4.36
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	10	26	3	2	1	2	8	3.63	1204/1510	3.63	4.33	4.13	4.17	3.63
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	10	0	2	6	6	7	21	3.93	1219/1620	3.93	4.33	4.20	4.25	3.93
8. How many times was class cancelled	10	0	0	0	0	3	39	4.93	505/1642	4.93	4.68	4.68	4.67	4.93
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	15	2	1	1	2	19	12	4.14	850/1596	4.14	4.22	4.12	4.13	4.14
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	10	0	1	1	2	2	36	4.69	627/1534	4.69	4.63	4.48	4.51	4.69
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	10	0	0	1	1	4	36	4.79	932/1539	4.79	4.83	4.76	4.80	4.79
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	10	0	1	3	3	11	24	4.29	962/1531	4.29	4.47	4.33	4.38	4.29
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	10	0	3	1	1	10	27	4.36	923/1530	4.36	4.53	4.35	4.41	4.36
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	11	17	3	1	4	9	7	3.67	1089/1409	3.67	3.97	4.08	4.23	3.67
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	23	0	1	0	2	10	16	4.38	628/1366	4.38	4.39	4.18	4.24	4.38
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	23	0	2	0	3	4	20	4.38	782/1364	4.38	4.50	4.33	4.39	4.38
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	23	0	1	1	3	4	20	4.41	806/1361	4.41	4.58	4.39	4.48	4.41

# **Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires**

Course-Section: POLI 250 02
Title: Intro To Public Admin

**Instructor: Johnson, Arthur** 

**Term - Fall 2013** 

Enrollment: 52

Questionnaires: 52

				Fre	quen	cies		In	structor	Course	Org	<b>UMBC</b>	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Discussion														
4. Were special techniques successful	23	19	1	0	1	3	5	4.10	****/1019	****	4.05	4.09	4.14	****

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA	4	Expected	l Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	Α	13	Required for Majors	33	Graduate	0	Major	11
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	В	17						
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	3	С	6	General	1	Under-grad	52	Non-major	41
84-150	8	3.00-3.49	5	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	9	F	0	Electives	2	**** - Means the	re are not e	nough responses	
				Р	0			to be significant			
				1	0	Other	2				
				?	14						

**Course-Section: POLI 260 01** 

**Title: Comparative Politics** 

**Instructor: Grodsky,Brian** 

**Term - Fall 2013** 

Enrollment: 44

				Fre	quen	cies		In	structor	Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	22	0	0	0	0	8	11	4.58	601/1644	4.67	4.49	4.32	4.36	4.58
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	22	0	0	0	2	4	13	4.58	545/1644	4.67	4.36	4.28	4.35	4.58
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	22	0	0	0	0	6	13	4.68	435/1419	4.65	4.48	4.35	4.42	4.68
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	22	10	0	0	2	1	6	4.44	****/1596	4.68	4.33	4.24	4.31	****
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	22	0	1	0	2	4	12	4.37	624/1535	4.60	4.46	4.15	4.20	4.37
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	22	18	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1510	4.10	4.33	4.13	4.17	****
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	22	0	0	0	0	2	17	4.89	95/1620	4.81	4.33	4.20	4.25	4.89
8. How many times was class cancelled	22	0	0	0	0	0	19	5.00	1/1642	5.00	4.68	4.68	4.67	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	23	1	0	0	1	9	7	4.35	578/1596	4.49	4.22	4.12	4.13	4.35
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	22	0	0	0	0	1	18	4.95	149/1534	4.97	4.63	4.48	4.51	4.95
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	22	0	0	0	0	0	19	5.00	1/1539	5.00	4.83	4.76	4.80	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	23	0	0	0	1	4	13	4.67	478/1531	4.79	4.47	4.33	4.38	4.67
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	22	0	0	0	0	1	18	4.95	121/1530	4.88	4.53	4.35	4.41	4.95
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	22	0	1	1	2	3	12	4.26	617/1409	4.47	3.97	4.08	4.23	4.26
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	24	0	0	0	1	2	14	4.76	275/1366	4.81	4.39	4.18	4.24	4.76
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	24	0	0	0	1	4	12	4.65	523/1364	4.77	4.50	4.33	4.39	4.65
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	24	0	0	0	1	4	12	4.65	572/1361	4.82	4.58	4.39	4.48	4.65

# **Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires**

Course-Section: POLI 260 01

Title: Comparative Politics

Instructor: Grodsky,Brian

**Term - Fall 2013** 

Enrollment: 44

Questionnaires: 41

				Fre	quen	cies		In	structor	Course	Org	<b>UMBC</b>	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Discussion														
4. Were special techniques successful	25	1	0	0	2	3	10	4.53	248/1019	4.52	4.05	4.09	4.14	4.53

Credits E	arned	Cum. GP/	4	Expected	Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	Α	11	Required for Majors	13	Graduate	0	Major	11
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	В	5						
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	2	С	2	General	1	Under-grad	41	Non-major	30
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	4	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	2	**** - Means the	re are not e	nough responses	
				Р	0			to be significant			
				1	0	Other	1				
				?	23						

**Course-Section: POLI 260 02** 

**Title: Comparative Politics** 

**Instructor: Grodsky,Brian** 

**Term - Fall 2013** 

Enrollment: 26

·				Fre	quen	cies		Ins	structor	Course	Org	<b>UMBC</b>	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	2	2	21	4.76	344/1644	4.67	4.49	4.32	4.36	4.76
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	0	22	4.76	288/1644	4.67	4.36	4.28	4.35	4.76
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	1	1	4	18	4.63	516/1419	4.65	4.48	4.35	4.42	4.63
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	5	0	0	1	4	14	4.68	329/1596	4.68	4.33	4.24	4.31	4.68
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	4	20	4.83	165/1535	4.60	4.46	4.15	4.20	4.83
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	14	1	1	1	0	7	4.10	875/1510	4.10	4.33	4.13	4.17	4.10
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	1	2	21	4.72	261/1620	4.81	4.33	4.20	4.25	4.72
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	24	5.00	1/1642	5.00	4.68	4.68	4.67	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	8	1	0	0	0	6	10	4.63	280/1596	4.49	4.22	4.12	4.13	4.63
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	0	0	23	5.00	1/1534	4.97	4.63	4.48	4.51	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	0	0	22	5.00	1/1539	5.00	4.83	4.76	4.80	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	0	2	21	4.91	145/1531	4.79	4.47	4.33	4.38	4.91
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	1	0	0	1	2	19	4.82	340/1530	4.88	4.53	4.35	4.41	4.82
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	0	0	0	2	3	17	4.68	228/1409	4.47	3.97	4.08	4.23	4.68
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	1	1	19	4.86	191/1366	4.81	4.39	4.18	4.24	4.86
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	0	0	2	18	4.90	215/1364	4.77	4.50	4.33	4.39	4.90
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	0	0	0	20	5.00	1/1361	4.82	4.58	4.39	4.48	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	5	2	1	0	2	1	14	4.50	262/1019	4.52	4.05	4.09	4.14	4.50

# **Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires**

**Course-Section: POLI 260 02** 

**Title: Comparative Politics** 

**Instructor: Grodsky,Brian** 

**Term - Fall 2013** 

Enrollment: 26

Questionnaires: 25

				Fre	quen	cies		Ins	structor	Course	Org	<b>UMBC</b>	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	24	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/209	****	4.00	4.19	4.45	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	24	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/181	****	4.44	4.53	4.67	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	24	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/72	****	5.00	4.53	4.71	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	24	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/71	****	4.67	4.38	4.63	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	24	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/68	****	4.67	4.41	4.25	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	24	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/71	****	3.67	4.40	4.47	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	24	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/73	****	5.00	4.09	3.99	****

Credits E	arned	Cum. GP/	4	Expected	Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors	
00-27	4	0.00-0.99	1	Α	10	Required for Majors	13	Graduate	0	Major	11
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	В	10						
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	1	С	3	General	5	Under-grad	25	Non-major	14
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	6	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	3	**** - Means the	re are not e	nough responses	
				Р	0			to be significant			
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	2						

**Course-Section: POLI 280 01** 

**Title: International Relations** 

**Instructor:** Hody, Cynthia A

**Term - Fall 2013** 

Enrollment: 50

				Fre	quen	cies		In	structor	Course	Org	<b>UMBC</b>	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	21	0	0	3	3	7	15	4.21	1017/1644	4.36	4.49	4.32	4.36	4.21
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	21	0	2	3	7	6	10	3.68	1426/1644	3.99	4.36	4.28	4.35	3.68
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	21	0	1	4	7	9	7	3.61	1269/1419	3.99	4.48	4.35	4.42	3.61
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	21	0	2	1	5	10	10	3.89	1220/1596	3.89	4.33	4.24	4.31	3.89
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	21	0	1	2	4	8	13	4.07	912/1535	4.33	4.46	4.15	4.20	4.07
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	21	0	0	2	7	9	10	3.96	965/1510	3.96	4.33	4.13	4.17	3.96
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	21	0	2	3	1	9	13	4.00	1134/1620	4.17	4.33	4.20	4.25	4.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	21	0	0	0	0	26	2	4.07	1504/1642	4.08	4.68	4.68	4.67	4.07
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	25	1	0	2	3	10	8	4.04	944/1596	4.16	4.22	4.12	4.13	4.04
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	22	0	1	4	10	5	7	3.48	1466/1534	4.11	4.63	4.48	4.51	3.48
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	22	0	0	2	0	1	24	4.74	1009/1539	4.82	4.83	4.76	4.80	4.74
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	22	0	1	5	7	9	5	3.44	1404/1531	4.04	4.47	4.33	4.38	3.44
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	24	0	2	4	6	4	9	3.56	1362/1530	4.08	4.53	4.35	4.41	3.56
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	24	14	2	1	5	1	2	3.00	****/1409	3.69	3.97	4.08	4.23	****
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	35	0	0	2	4	3	5	3.79	1027/1366	3.79	4.39	4.18	4.24	3.79
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	35	0	2	1	2	0	9	3.93	1073/1364	3.93	4.50	4.33	4.39	3.93
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	34	0	1	1	1	1	11	4.33	875/1361	4.33	4.58	4.39	4.48	4.33
4. Were special techniques successful	35	11	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/1019	****	4.05	4.09	4.14	****

**Course-Section: POLI 280 01** 

**Title: International Relations** 

**Instructor:** Hody, Cynthia A

**Term - Fall 2013** 

Enrollment: 50

				Fre	quen	cies		Ins	structor	Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	48	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/185	****	4.00	4.23	4.42	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	47	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/209	****	4.00	4.19	4.45	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	48	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/181	****	4.44	4.53	4.67	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	48	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/72	****	5.00	4.53	4.71	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	48	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/71	****	4.67	4.38	4.63	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	48	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/68	****	4.67	4.41	4.25	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	48	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/71	****	3.67	4.40	4.47	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	48	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/73	****	5.00	4.09	3.99	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	48	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/48	****	****	4.16	4.81	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	48	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/45	****	****	4.19	4.58	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	48	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/30	****	****	4.57	4.57	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	48	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/27	****	****	4.25	5.00	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	48	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/25	****	****	4.35	5.00	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	48	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/51	****	****	4.03	5.00	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	48	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/31	****	****	4.18	5.00	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	48	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/36	****	****	4.33	****	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	48	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/19	****	****	4.17	****	****

# **Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires**

Course-Section: POLI 280 01
Title: International Relations

**Instructor:** Hody, Cynthia A

**Term - Fall 2013** 

Enrollment: 50
Questionnaires: 49

				Fre	quend	cies		In	structor	Course	Org	<b>UMBC</b>	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Self Paced														
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	48	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/14	****	****	4.17	****	****

Credits E	arned	Cum. GP/	4	Expected	l Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors	
00-27	4	0.00-0.99	0	Α	8	Required for Majors	8	Graduate	0	Major	8
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	0	В	12						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	1	С	2	General	3	Under-grad	49	Non-major	41
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	7	D	1						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	7	F	0	Electives	7	**** - Means the	re are not e	nough responses	
				Р	0			to be significant			
				1	0	Other	1				
				?	25						

Course-Section: POLI 280 02

**Title: International Relations** 

**Instructor:** Hagerty, Devin T

**Term - Fall 2013** 

Enrollment: 49

				Fre	quen	cies		In	structor	Course	Org	<b>UMBC</b>	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	25	0	0	0	4	4	16	4.50	688/1644	4.36	4.49	4.32	4.36	4.50
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	25	0	0	1	3	8	12	4.29	948/1644	3.99	4.36	4.28	4.35	4.29
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	25	0	0	1	3	6	14	4.38	812/1419	3.99	4.48	4.35	4.42	4.38
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	26	13	1	0	0	4	5	4.20	****/1596	3.89	4.33	4.24	4.31	****
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	25	0	0	0	3	4	17	4.58	377/1535	4.33	4.46	4.15	4.20	4.58
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	27	15	0	1	1	1	4	4.14	****/1510	3.96	4.33	4.13	4.17	****
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	26	0	1	0	3	5	14	4.35	766/1620	4.17	4.33	4.20	4.25	4.35
8. How many times was class cancelled	28	0	0	0	0	19	2	4.10	1497/1642	4.08	4.68	4.68	4.67	4.10
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	34	0	0	0	1	9	5	4.27	692/1596	4.16	4.22	4.12	4.13	4.27
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	26	0	0	0	1	4	18	4.74	559/1534	4.11	4.63	4.48	4.51	4.74
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	27	0	0	0	0	2	20	4.91	609/1539	4.82	4.83	4.76	4.80	4.91
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	27	0	0	0	1	6	15	4.64	521/1531	4.04	4.47	4.33	4.38	4.64
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	27	0	0	0	2	5	15	4.59	655/1530	4.08	4.53	4.35	4.41	4.59
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	32	1	0	1	8	2	5	3.69	1077/1409	3.69	3.97	4.08	4.23	3.69
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	38	0	1	1	0	6	3	3.82	****/1366	3.79	4.39	4.18	4.24	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	38	0	0	0	2	4	5	4.27	****/1364	3.93	4.50	4.33	4.39	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	38	0	0	0	0	4	7	4.64	****/1361	4.33	4.58	4.39	4.48	****
4. Were special techniques successful	38	9	2	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/1019	****	4.05	4.09	4.14	****

# **Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires**

Course-Section: POLI 280 02

**Title: International Relations** 

**Instructor:** Hagerty, Devin T

**Term - Fall 2013** 

Enrollment: 49
Questionnaires: 49

				Fre	quen	cies		Ins	structor	Course	Org	<b>UMBC</b>	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	48	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/72	****	5.00	4.53	4.71	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	48	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/71	****	4.67	4.38	4.63	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	48	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/71	****	3.67	4.40	4.47	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	48	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/73	****	5.00	4.09	3.99	****

Credits E	arned	Cum. GP/	4	Expected	l Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors	
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	1	Α	6	Required for Majors	6	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	0	В	13						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	2	С	2	General	7	Under-grad	49	Non-major	49
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5	F	0	Electives	5	**** - Means the	re are not e	nough responses	
				Р	0			to be significant			
				I	0	Other	1				
				?	28						

**Course-Section: POLI 300 01** 

**Title: Quant Poli Sci** 

**Instructor:** Goldberg, Marni

**Term - Fall 2013** 

Enrollment: 28

'	_			Fre	quen	cies		Ins	structor	Course	Org	<b>UMBC</b>	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	9	0	0	3	4	3	9	3.95	1274/1644	3.95	4.49	4.32	4.31	3.95
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	9	0	0	2	3	7	7	4.00	1210/1644	4.00	4.36	4.28	4.25	4.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	9	0	0	1	1	7	10	4.37	825/1419	4.37	4.48	4.35	4.31	4.37
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	9	0	0	2	1	7	9	4.21	952/1596	4.21	4.33	4.24	4.25	4.21
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	1	2	6	10	4.32	681/1535	4.32	4.46	4.15	4.14	4.32
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	9	0	1	0	2	3	13	4.42	516/1510	4.42	4.33	4.13	4.16	4.42
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	9	0	0	2	5	4	8	3.95	1198/1620	3.95	4.33	4.20	4.18	3.95
8. How many times was class cancelled	9	0	0	0	0	5	14	4.74	943/1642	4.74	4.68	4.68	4.65	4.74
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	15	0	1	1	3	5	3	3.62	1332/1596	3.62	4.22	4.12	4.09	3.62
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	10	0	1	0	1	8	8	4.22	1178/1534	4.22	4.63	4.48	4.44	4.22
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	10	0	0	0	3	4	11	4.44	1339/1539	4.44	4.83	4.76	4.74	4.44
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	10	0	0	4	3	4	7	3.78	1305/1531	3.78	4.47	4.33	4.30	3.78
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	10	0	1	0	5	2	10	4.11	1106/1530	4.11	4.53	4.35	4.32	4.11
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	10	0	2	1	4	5	6	3.67	1089/1409	3.67	3.97	4.08	4.09	3.67
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	4	7	6	4.12	826/1366	4.12	4.39	4.18	4.22	4.12
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	11	0	0	0	1	5	11	4.59	585/1364	4.59	4.50	4.33	4.37	4.59
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	11	0	0	1	3	4	9	4.24	940/1361	4.24	4.58	4.39	4.39	4.24
4. Were special techniques successful	11	10	2	0	0	2	3	3.57	816/1019	3.57	4.05	4.09	4.04	3.57

**Course-Section: POLI 300 01** 

**Title: Quant Poli Sci** 

**Instructor:** Goldberg, Marni

**Term - Fall 2013** 

**Enrollment: 28** 

	_			Fre	quen	cies		Ins	structor	Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	19	0	2	0	0	1	6	4.00	123/185	4.00	4.00	4.23	4.16	4.00
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	19	0	1	0	1	3	4	4.00	143/209	4.00	4.00	4.19	4.18	4.00
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	19	0	0	0	2	1	6	4.44	131/181	4.44	4.44	4.53	4.49	4.44
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	20	0	1	0	1	3	3	3.88	167/183	3.88	3.88	4.46	4.38	3.88
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	19	1	1	1	1	2	3	3.63	140/172	3.63	3.63	4.14	4.07	3.63
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	23	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	****/72	****	5.00	4.53	4.68	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	23	0	0	1	1	0	3	4.00	****/71	****	4.67	4.38	4.61	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	23	0	0	1	2	0	2	3.60	****/68	****	4.67	4.41	4.59	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	23	0	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	****/71	****	3.67	4.40	4.51	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	23	0	0	1	0	0	4	4.40	****/73	****	5.00	4.09	4.57	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	23	0	0	1	1	0	3	4.00	****/48	****	****	4.16	4.95	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	23	0	0	2	0	0	3	3.80	****/45	****	****	4.19	4.95	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	23	1	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	****/30	****	****	4.57	4.93	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	24	0	0	1	1	0	2	3.75	****/27	****	****	4.25	4.90	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	23	0	1	0	1	1	2	3.60	****/25	****	****	4.35	4.90	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	23	0	1	0	0	1	3	4.00	****/51	****	****	4.03	4.75	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	23	0	0	1	0	2	2	4.00	****/31	****	****	4.18	4.80	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	23	0	0	1	0	2	2	4.00	****/36	****	****	4.33	4.83	****

# **Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires**

Course-Section: POLI 300 01

**Title: Quant Poli Sci** 

Instructor: Goldberg, Marni

**Term - Fall 2013** 

Enrollment: 28

Questionnaires: 28

				Fre	quen	cies		Ins	structor	Course	Org	<b>UMBC</b>	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Self Paced														
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	25	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/19	****	****	4.17	4.20	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	24	1	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/14	****	****	4.17	4.60	****

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GP	4	Expected	Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors	
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	1	Α	5	Required for Majors	13	Graduate	0	Major	15
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	8						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	1	С	1	General	1	Under-grad	28	Non-major	13
84-150	6	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	1	**** - Means the	re are not e	nough responses	
				Р	0			to be significant			
				1	0	Other	0				
				?	13						

**Course-Section: POLI 301 01** 

**Title: Poli Research Methods** 

**Instructor:** Forestiere, Caro

**Term - Fall 2013** 

**Enrollment: 29** 

				Fre	quen	cies		Ins	structor	Course	Org	<b>UMBC</b>	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	11	0	1	0	3	1	13	4.39	835/1644	4.62	4.49	4.32	4.31	4.39
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	11	0	1	0	2	2	13	4.44	734/1644	4.64	4.36	4.28	4.25	4.44
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	12	2	0	0	0	2	13	4.87	208/1419	4.77	4.48	4.35	4.31	4.87
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	11	0	1	0	1	4	12	4.44	657/1596	4.64	4.33	4.24	4.25	4.44
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	2	2	14	4.67	300/1535	4.61	4.46	4.15	4.14	4.67
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	11	0	1	0	0	1	16	4.72	225/1510	4.75	4.33	4.13	4.16	4.72
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	11	0	1	1	2	2	12	4.28	864/1620	4.40	4.33	4.20	4.18	4.28
8. How many times was class cancelled	11	0	0	0	0	3	15	4.83	777/1642	4.79	4.68	4.68	4.65	4.83
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	13	1	1	0	0	6	8	4.33	603/1596	4.42	4.22	4.12	4.09	4.33
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	12	0	1	0	0	2	14	4.65	707/1534	4.69	4.63	4.48	4.44	4.65
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	11	0	0	0	0	0	18	5.00	1/1539	5.00	4.83	4.76	4.74	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	12	0	1	0	2	2	12	4.41	839/1531	4.63	4.47	4.33	4.30	4.41
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	11	0	1	1	0	2	14	4.50	755/1530	4.59	4.53	4.35	4.32	4.50
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	11	4	1	0	5	2	6	3.86	957/1409	4.08	3.97	4.08	4.09	3.86
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	0	0	4	7	4.64	396/1366	4.32	4.39	4.18	4.22	4.64
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	18	0	0	0	1	2	8	4.64	535/1364	4.53	4.50	4.33	4.37	4.64
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	18	0	0	0	0	4	7	4.64	584/1361	4.50	4.58	4.39	4.39	4.64
4. Were special techniques successful	18	1	1	0	1	2	6	4.20	462/1019	4.20	4.05	4.09	4.04	4.20

# **Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires**

**Course-Section: POLI 301 01** 

**Title: Poli Research Methods** 

**Instructor:** Forestiere, Caro

**Term - Fall 2013** 

Enrollment: 29

Questionnaires: 29

				Fre	quen	cies		Ins	structor	Course	Org	<b>UMBC</b>	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	28	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/48	****	****	4.16	4.95	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	28	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/45	****	****	4.19	4.95	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	28	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/27	****	****	4.25	4.90	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	28	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/25	****	****	4.35	4.90	****

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA	4	Expected	Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	Α	8	Required for Majors	14	Graduate	0	Major	12
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	В	5						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	0	С	1	General	1	Under-grad	29	Non-major	17
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	0	**** - Means the	re are not e	nough responses	
				Р	0			to be significant			
				1	0	Other	0				
				?	14						

**Course-Section: POLI 301 02** 

Title: Poli Research Methods

**Instructor:** Forestiere, Caro

**Term - Fall 2013** 

Enrollment: 32

'	_			Fre	quen	cies		Ins	structor	Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	13	0	0	0	1	1	17	4.84	242/1644	4.62	4.49	4.32	4.31	4.84
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	13	0	0	0	1	1	17	4.84	195/1644	4.64	4.36	4.28	4.25	4.84
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	13	1	0	0	2	2	14	4.67	462/1419	4.77	4.48	4.35	4.31	4.67
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	13	0	0	0	0	3	16	4.84	169/1596	4.64	4.33	4.24	4.25	4.84
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	1	6	11	4.56	401/1535	4.61	4.46	4.15	4.14	4.56
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	13	1	0	0	1	2	15	4.78	177/1510	4.75	4.33	4.13	4.16	4.78
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	13	0	1	1	0	2	15	4.53	501/1620	4.40	4.33	4.20	4.18	4.53
8. How many times was class cancelled	13	0	0	0	0	5	14	4.74	943/1642	4.79	4.68	4.68	4.65	4.74
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	16	0	0	0	1	6	9	4.50	382/1596	4.42	4.22	4.12	4.09	4.50
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	13	0	0	0	2	1	16	4.74	559/1534	4.69	4.63	4.48	4.44	4.74
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	13	0	0	0	0	0	19	5.00	1/1539	5.00	4.83	4.76	4.74	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	13	0	0	0	1	1	17	4.84	229/1531	4.63	4.47	4.33	4.30	4.84
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	1	4	14	4.68	544/1530	4.59	4.53	4.35	4.32	4.68
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	14	2	1	0	2	3	10	4.31	569/1409	4.08	3.97	4.08	4.09	4.31
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	20	0	1	1	2	1	7	4.00	862/1366	4.32	4.39	4.18	4.22	4.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	20	0	0	1	2	0	9	4.42	745/1364	4.53	4.50	4.33	4.37	4.42
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	21	0	0	1	2	0	8	4.36	850/1361	4.50	4.58	4.39	4.39	4.36
4. Were special techniques successful	20	2	1	0	1	2	6	4.20	462/1019	4.20	4.05	4.09	4.04	4.20

# **Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires**

**Course-Section: POLI 301 02** 

**Title: Poli Research Methods** 

**Instructor:** Forestiere, Caro

**Term - Fall 2013** 

Enrollment: 32

Questionnaires: 32

				Fre	quen	cies		Ins	structor	Course	Org	<b>UMBC</b>	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	31	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/48	****	****	4.16	4.95	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	31	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/45	****	****	4.19	4.95	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	31	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/30	****	****	4.57	4.93	****

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GP/	4	Expected	Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	Α	8	Required for Majors	16	Graduate	0	Major	12
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	4						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	2	С	2	General	0	Under-grad	32	Non-major	20
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	5	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	0	**** - Means the	re are not e	nough responses	
				Р	0			to be significant			
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	17						

**Course-Section: POLI 315 01** 

**Title: Political Phil From 1600** 

**Instructor: Vetter, Lisa Pac** 

**Term - Fall 2013** 

Enrollment: 28

				Fre	quen	cies		In	structor	Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	20	0	0	0	2	3	3	4.13	1119/1644	4.13	4.49	4.32	4.31	4.13
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	20	0	0	0	1	5	2	4.13	1127/1644	4.13	4.36	4.28	4.25	4.13
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	20	2	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	****/1419	****	4.48	4.35	4.31	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	20	1	1	0	0	2	4	4.14	1030/1596	4.14	4.33	4.24	4.25	4.14
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	20	0	0	0	1	3	4	4.38	612/1535	4.38	4.46	4.15	4.14	4.38
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	20	0	0	0	0	3	5	4.63	312/1510	4.63	4.33	4.13	4.16	4.63
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	20	0	0	0	2	2	4	4.25	894/1620	4.25	4.33	4.20	4.18	4.25
8. How many times was class cancelled	20	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	694/1642	4.88	4.68	4.68	4.65	4.88
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	22	0	0	0	0	4	2	4.33	****/1596	****	4.22	4.12	4.09	****
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	23	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	****/1534	****	4.63	4.48	4.44	****
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	23	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	****/1539	****	4.83	4.76	4.74	****
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	23	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	****/1531	****	4.47	4.33	4.30	****
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	23	0	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	****/1530	****	4.53	4.35	4.32	****
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	23	1	1	0	0	0	3	4.00	****/1409	****	3.97	4.08	4.09	****
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	26	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1366	****	4.39	4.18	4.22	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	26	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1364	****	4.50	4.33	4.37	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	26	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1361	****	4.58	4.39	4.39	****

# **Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires**

Course-Section: POLI 315 01
Title: Political Phil From 1600

**Instructor: Vetter, Lisa Pac** 

**Term - Fall 2013** 

Enrollment: 28

Questionnaires: 28

				Frequencies			Instructor		Course	Org	<b>UMBC</b>	Level	Sect	
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Discussion														
4. Were special techniques successful	26	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1019	****	4.05	4.09	4.04	****

<b>Credits Earned</b>		Cum. GPA		<b>Expected Grades</b>		Reasons		Туре		Majors		
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	Α	0	Required for Majors	7	Graduate	0	Major	6	
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	В	8							
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	С	0	General	0	Under-grad	28	Non-major	22	
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	2	D	0							
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F	0	Electives	1	**** - Means the	re are not e	nough responses		
				Р	0			to be significant				
				1	0	Other	0					
				?	20							

**Course-Section: POLI 323 01** 

**Title: The Presidency** 

**Instructor:** Schaller, Thomas

**Term - Fall 2013** 

Enrollment: 31

			Frequencies			Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect		
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	12	0	0	0	1	6	11	4.56	626/1644	4.56	4.49	4.32	4.31	4.56
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	12	0	0	0	4	3	11	4.39	829/1644	4.39	4.36	4.28	4.25	4.39
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	12	3	0	1	1	3	10	4.47	689/1419	4.47	4.48	4.35	4.31	4.47
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	12	1	0	0	1	3	13	4.71	302/1596	4.71	4.33	4.24	4.25	4.71
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	1	1	5	11	4.44	523/1535	4.44	4.46	4.15	4.14	4.44
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	1	1	6	10	4.39	564/1510	4.39	4.33	4.13	4.16	4.39
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	12	0	0	0	1	3	14	4.72	261/1620	4.72	4.33	4.20	4.18	4.72
8. How many times was class cancelled	12	0	0	0	0	2	16	4.89	673/1642	4.89	4.68	4.68	4.65	4.89
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	16	0	0	0	1	4	9	4.57	322/1596	4.57	4.22	4.12	4.09	4.57
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	13	0	0	0	0	4	13	4.76	507/1534	4.76	4.63	4.48	4.44	4.76
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	13	0	0	0	0	1	16	4.94	365/1539	4.94	4.83	4.76	4.74	4.94
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	13	0	0	0	3	4	10	4.41	839/1531	4.41	4.47	4.33	4.30	4.41
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	0	6	11	4.65	594/1530	4.65	4.53	4.35	4.32	4.65
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	13	1	0	0	1	6	9	4.50	381/1409	4.50	3.97	4.08	4.09	4.50
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	3	6	5	4.14	803/1366	4.14	4.39	4.18	4.22	4.14
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	16	0	0	0	0	4	10	4.71	442/1364	4.71	4.50	4.33	4.37	4.71
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	16	0	0	0	0	2	12	4.86	313/1361	4.86	4.58	4.39	4.39	4.86

# **Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires**

Course-Section: POLI 323 01

Title: The Presidency
Instructor: Schaller, Thomas

**Term - Fall 2013** 

Enrollment: 31

Questionnaires: 30

				Fre	quen	cies		In	structor	Course	Org	<b>UMBC</b>	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Discussion														
4. Were special techniques successful	17	10	0	0	2	0	1	3.67	****/1019	****	4.05	4.09	4.04	****

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA	4	Expected	Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	Α	8	Required for Majors	16	Graduate	0	Major	14
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	6						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	С	3	General	0	Under-grad	30	Non-major	16
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	4	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	1	**** - Means the	re are not e	nough responses	
				Р	0			to be significant			
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	12						

**Course-Section: POLI 324 01** 

**Title: The Congress** 

**Instructor:** Straus, Jacob R

**Term - Fall 2013** 

Enrollment: 29

				Fre	quen	cies		Ins	structor	Course	Org	<b>UMBC</b>	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	1	3	3	20	4.56	626/1644	4.56	4.49	4.32	4.31	4.56
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	5	19	4.59	520/1644	4.59	4.36	4.28	4.25	4.59
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	2	1	23	4.81	265/1419	4.81	4.48	4.35	4.31	4.81
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	1	3	4	18	4.50	567/1596	4.50	4.33	4.24	4.25	4.50
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	3	5	19	4.59	369/1535	4.59	4.46	4.15	4.14	4.59
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	1	5	20	4.63	312/1510	4.63	4.33	4.13	4.16	4.63
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	0	2	3	20	4.72	261/1620	4.72	4.33	4.20	4.18	4.72
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	18	9	4.33	1344/1642	4.33	4.68	4.68	4.65	4.33
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	8	2	1	0	1	8	7	4.18	809/1596	4.18	4.22	4.12	4.09	4.18
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	2	24	4.85	343/1534	4.85	4.63	4.48	4.44	4.85
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	26	4.96	244/1539	4.96	4.83	4.76	4.74	4.96
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	1	2	23	4.85	229/1531	4.85	4.47	4.33	4.30	4.85
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	4	22	4.78	404/1530	4.78	4.53	4.35	4.32	4.78
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	0	0	0	1	4	18	4.74	193/1409	4.74	3.97	4.08	4.09	4.74
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	0	3	2	20	4.54	471/1366	4.54	4.39	4.18	4.22	4.54
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	1	0	0	7	18	4.58	593/1364	4.58	4.50	4.33	4.37	4.58
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	2	6	18	4.62	607/1361	4.62	4.58	4.39	4.39	4.62

# **Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires**

Course-Section: POLI 324 01

Title: The Congress

Instructor: Straus,Jacob R

**Term - Fall 2013** 

Enrollment: 29

Questionnaires: 27

				Fre	quen	cies		In	structor	Course	Org	<b>UMBC</b>	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Discussion														
4. Were special techniques successful	1	10	0	2	3	5	6	3.94	630/1019	3.94	4.05	4.09	4.04	3.94

Credits E	arned	Cum. GP	4	Expected	Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors	
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	1	Α	15	Required for Majors	11	Graduate	0	Major	14
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	7						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	1	С	1	General	6	Under-grad	27	Non-major	13
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	4	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	4	**** - Means the	re are not e	nough responses	
				Р	0			to be significant			
				1	0	Other	1				
				?	4						

**Course-Section: POLI 334 01** 

**Title: Judicial Process** 

**Instructor:** Newton, Brent E

**Term - Fall 2013** 

Enrollment: 27

·	14 0 0 0 1 1 1 11 4.77 344  14 0 1 0 1 2 9 4.38 829  14 0 0 1 0 1 1 1 11 4.77 322  14 1 0 1 0 2 9 4.58 463  14 0 0 1 1 2 9 4.46 496  ed 15 4 1 0 1 2 4 4.00 921  14 0 0 1 0 2 10 4.62 386  14 0 0 0 0 1 12 4.92 505  sss 19 1 0 0 1 4 2 4.14 850  14 0 0 0 0 1 12 4.92 129  15 0 0 0 0 1 11 4.92 181  ng 17 0 1 0 1 1 7 4.30 579					structor	Course	Org	<b>UMBC</b>	Level	Sect			
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	14	0	0	0	1	1	11	4.77	344/1644	4.72	4.49	4.32	4.31	4.77
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	14	0	1	0	1	2	9	4.38	829/1644	4.53	4.36	4.28	4.25	4.38
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	14	0	0	0	1	1	11	4.77	322/1419	4.75	4.48	4.35	4.31	4.77
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	14	1	0	1	0	2	9	4.58	463/1596	4.49	4.33	4.24	4.25	4.58
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	1	1	2	9	4.46	496/1535	4.56	4.46	4.15	4.14	4.46
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	15	4	1	0	1	2	4	4.00	921/1510	4.30	4.33	4.13	4.16	4.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	14	0	0	1	0	2	10	4.62	386/1620	4.61	4.33	4.20	4.18	4.62
8. How many times was class cancelled	14	0	0	0	0	1	12	4.92	505/1642	4.79	4.68	4.68	4.65	4.92
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	19	1	0	0	1	4	2	4.14	850/1596	4.07	4.22	4.12	4.09	4.14
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	14	0	1	0	0	1	11	4.62	755/1534	4.65	4.63	4.48	4.44	4.62
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	14	0	0	0	0	1	12	4.92	487/1539	4.92	4.83	4.76	4.74	4.92
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	14	0	0	0	0	1	12	4.92	129/1531	4.77	4.47	4.33	4.30	4.92
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	181/1530	4.80	4.53	4.35	4.32	4.92
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	17	0	1	0	1	1	7	4.30	579/1409	4.50	3.97	4.08	4.09	4.30
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	16	0	1	0	2	2	6	4.09	836/1366	4.36	4.39	4.18	4.22	4.09
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	16	0	0	2	1	2	6	4.09	967/1364	4.50	4.50	4.33	4.37	4.09
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	16	0	1	1	0	3	6	4.09	1007/1361	4.55	4.58	4.39	4.39	4.09
4. Were special techniques successful	16	2	0	1	1	1	6	4.33	381/1019	4.33	4.05	4.09	4.04	4.33

**Course-Section: POLI 334 01** 

**Title: Judicial Process** 

**Instructor:** Newton, Brent E

**Term - Fall 2013** 

**Enrollment: 27** 

	NR NA 1 2 3 4 5 Mean  24 0 0 1 0 0 2 4.00  on 24 0 0 0 1 0 2 4.33  25 0 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00  25 0 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00						structor	Course	Org	<b>UMBC</b>	Level	Sect		
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	24	0	0	1	0	0	2	4.00	****/185	****	4.00	4.23	4.16	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	24	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/209	****	4.00	4.19	4.18	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	25	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/181	****	4.44	4.53	4.49	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	25	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/183	****	3.88	4.46	4.38	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	25	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/172	****	3.63	4.14	4.07	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	25	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/72	****	5.00	4.53	4.68	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	25	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/71	****	4.67	4.38	4.61	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	25	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/68	****	4.67	4.41	4.59	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	25	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/71	****	3.67	4.40	4.51	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	25	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/73	****	5.00	4.09	4.57	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	25	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/48	****	****	4.16	4.95	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	25	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/45	****	****	4.19	4.95	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	25	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/30	****	****	4.57	4.93	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	25	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/27	****	****	4.25	4.90	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	25	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/25	****	****	4.35	4.90	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	25	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/51	****	****	4.03	4.75	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	25	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/31	****	****	4.18	4.80	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	25	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/36	****	****	4.33	4.83	****

# **Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires**

**Course-Section: POLI 334 01** 

**Title: Judicial Process** 

**Instructor:** Newton, Brent E

**Term - Fall 2013** 

Enrollment: 27

**Questionnaires: 27** 

				Fre	quen	cies		Ins	structor	Course	Org	<b>UMBC</b>	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Self Paced														
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	25	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/19	****	****	4.17	4.20	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	25	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/14	****	****	4.17	4.60	****

Credits E	arned	Cum. GP	4	Expected	Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	Α	6	Required for Majors	4	Graduate	0	Major	7
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	4						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	С	0	General	2	Under-grad	27	Non-major	20
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	0	F	0	Electives	4	**** - Means the	re are not e	nough responses	
				Р	0			to be significant			
				I	0	Other	1				
				?	17						

**Course-Section: POLI 334 02** 

**Title: Judicial Process** 

**Instructor:** Hinkle, Rachael

**Term - Fall 2013** 

Enrollment: 32

				Fre	quen	cies		In	structor	Course	Org	<b>UMBC</b>	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	17	0	0	0	1	3	11	4.67	482/1644	4.72	4.49	4.32	4.31	4.67
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	17	0	0	0	0	5	10	4.67	428/1644	4.53	4.36	4.28	4.25	4.67
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	17	0	0	0	0	4	11	4.73	365/1419	4.75	4.48	4.35	4.31	4.73
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	17	0	0	1	0	6	8	4.40	717/1596	4.49	4.33	4.24	4.25	4.40
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	0	5	10	4.67	300/1535	4.56	4.46	4.15	4.14	4.67
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	0	6	9	4.60	330/1510	4.30	4.33	4.13	4.16	4.60
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	17	0	0	0	1	4	10	4.60	397/1620	4.61	4.33	4.20	4.18	4.60
8. How many times was class cancelled	17	0	0	0	0	5	10	4.67	1038/1642	4.79	4.68	4.68	4.65	4.67
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	22	0	0	0	0	10	0	4.00	971/1596	4.07	4.22	4.12	4.09	4.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	19	0	0	0	0	4	9	4.69	627/1534	4.65	4.63	4.48	4.44	4.69
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	19	0	0	0	0	1	12	4.92	487/1539	4.92	4.83	4.76	4.74	4.92
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	19	0	0	0	1	3	9	4.62	550/1531	4.77	4.47	4.33	4.30	4.62
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	1	2	10	4.69	531/1530	4.80	4.53	4.35	4.32	4.69
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	18	4	0	0	1	1	8	4.70	211/1409	4.50	3.97	4.08	4.09	4.70
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	21	0	0	0	1	2	8	4.64	396/1366	4.36	4.39	4.18	4.22	4.64
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	21	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	215/1364	4.50	4.50	4.33	4.37	4.91
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	21	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1361	4.55	4.58	4.39	4.39	5.00

# **Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires**

Course-Section: POLI 334 02

Title: Judicial Process

Instructor: Hinkle,Rachael

**Term - Fall 2013** 

Enrollment: 32

Questionnaires: 32

				Fre	quend	cies		In	structor	Course	Org	<b>UMBC</b>	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Discussion														
4. Were special techniques successful	21	4	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	****/1019	4.33	4.05	4.09	4.04	****

Credits E	arned	Cum. GP	4	Expected	Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	Α	5	Required for Majors	9	Graduate	0	Major	8
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	9						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	2	С	0	General	2	Under-grad	32	Non-major	24
84-150	6	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	6	F	0	Electives	1	**** - Means the	re are not e	nough responses	
				Р	0			to be significant			
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	18						

**Course-Section: POLI 349 01** 

**Title: Environmental Politics** 

**Instructor:** Meyers, Roy T

**Term - Fall 2013** 

Enrollment: 23

				Fre	quen	cies		Ins	structor	Course	Org	<b>UMBC</b>	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	11	0	0	0	1	1	10	4.75	358/1644	4.75	4.49	4.32	4.31	4.75
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	11	0	0	0	1	5	6	4.42	785/1644	4.42	4.36	4.28	4.25	4.42
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	11	9	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	****/1419	****	4.48	4.35	4.31	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	11	0	0	0	1	2	9	4.67	356/1596	4.67	4.33	4.24	4.25	4.67
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	1	0	5	6	4.33	658/1535	4.33	4.46	4.15	4.14	4.33
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	0	4	8	4.67	278/1510	4.67	4.33	4.13	4.16	4.67
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	11	0	0	0	4	3	5	4.08	1072/1620	4.08	4.33	4.20	4.18	4.08
8. How many times was class cancelled	11	0	0	0	1	5	6	4.42	1277/1642	4.42	4.68	4.68	4.65	4.42
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	13	0	0	0	1	3	6	4.50	382/1596	4.50	4.22	4.12	4.09	4.50
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	11	0	0	0	0	4	8	4.67	675/1534	4.67	4.63	4.48	4.44	4.67
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	11	0	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	548/1539	4.92	4.83	4.76	4.74	4.92
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	11	0	0	0	0	5	7	4.58	596/1531	4.58	4.47	4.33	4.30	4.58
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	0	2	10	4.83	309/1530	4.83	4.53	4.35	4.32	4.83
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	12	1	0	1	2	4	3	3.90	922/1409	3.90	3.97	4.08	4.09	3.90
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	****/1366	****	4.39	4.18	4.22	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	19	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	****/1364	****	4.50	4.33	4.37	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	19	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	****/1361	****	4.58	4.39	4.39	****

# **Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires**

Course-Section: POLI 349 01
Title: Environmental Politics

**Instructor:** Meyers, Roy T

**Term - Fall 2013** 

Enrollment: 23

Questionnaires: 23

				Fre	quend	cies		In	structor	Course	Org	<b>UMBC</b>	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Discussion														
4. Were special techniques successful	19	1	0	0	3	0	0	3.00	****/1019	****	4.05	4.09	4.04	****

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GP	4	Expected	Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	Α	4	Required for Majors	5	Graduate	0	Major	2
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	4						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	2	С	1	General	0	Under-grad	23	Non-major	21
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F	0	Electives	3	**** - Means the	re are not e	nough responses	
				Р	0			to be significant			
				1	0	Other	0				
				?	14						

Course-Section: POLI 350 01

**Title: Policy-Making Process** 

**Instructor:** Bauwens, Fabian

**Term - Fall 2013** 

Enrollment: 28

				Fre	quen	cies		In	structor	Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	5	0	2	4	5	2	4	3.12	1595/1644	3.88	4.49	4.32	4.31	3.12
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	5	0	3	5	3	6	0	2.71	1616/1644	3.58	4.36	4.28	4.25	2.71
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	5	5	1	1	5	2	3	3.42	1327/1419	4.03	4.48	4.35	4.31	3.42
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	5	0	4	5	3	4	1	2.59	1575/1596	3.37	4.33	4.24	4.25	2.59
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	5	0	2	3	4	3	5	3.35	1390/1535	3.86	4.46	4.15	4.14	3.35
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	5	0	5	0	5	6	1	2.88	1462/1510	3.50	4.33	4.13	4.16	2.88
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	5	0	4	1	5	3	4	3.12	1527/1620	3.87	4.33	4.20	4.18	3.12
8. How many times was class cancelled	5	0	0	0	1	12	4	4.18	1450/1642	4.59	4.68	4.68	4.65	4.18
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	7	0	4	3	6	2	0	2.40	1580/1596	3.39	4.22	4.12	4.09	2.40
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	6	0	1	2	5	4	4	3.50	1463/1534	4.18	4.63	4.48	4.44	3.50
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	6	0	1	1	2	7	5	3.88	1503/1539	4.36	4.83	4.76	4.74	3.88
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	6	0	2	2	7	3	2	3.06	1467/1531	3.83	4.47	4.33	4.30	3.06
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	6	0	4	2	5	3	2	2.81	1494/1530	3.78	4.53	4.35	4.32	2.81
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	6	4	4	2	3	2	1	2.50	1379/1409	2.70	3.97	4.08	4.09	2.50
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	1	1	3	4	6	3.87	970/1366	4.07	4.39	4.18	4.22	3.87
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	2	0	2	3	8	4.00	1014/1364	4.31	4.50	4.33	4.37	4.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	2	0	1	3	9	4.13	990/1361	4.37	4.58	4.39	4.39	4.13

# **Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires**

Course-Section: POLI 350 01

Title: Policy-Making Process

Instructor: Bauwens, Fabian

**Term - Fall 2013** 

Enrollment: 28

Questionnaires: 22

				Fre	quen	cies		In	structor	Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Discussion														
4. Were special techniques successful	7	10	1	0	3	1	0	2.80	****/1019	3.89	4.05	4.09	4.04	****

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA	4	Expected	Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	Α	3	Required for Majors	10	Graduate	1	Major	12
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	В	5						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	1	С	2	General	2	Under-grad	21	Non-major	10
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	1	D	1						
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	3	**** - Means the	re are not e	nough responses	
				Р	0			to be significant			
				I	0	Other	1				
				?	7						

Course-Section: POLI 350 02

**Title: Policy-Making Process** 

**Instructor:** Walters, Ronald

**Term - Fall 2013** 

Enrollment: 25

				Fre	quen	cies		Ins	structor	Course	Org	<b>UMBC</b>	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	5	0	0	0	0	7	13	4.65	496/1644	3.88	4.49	4.32	4.31	4.65
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	5	0	0	0	2	7	11	4.45	717/1644	3.58	4.36	4.28	4.25	4.45
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	5	0	0	0	1	5	14	4.65	476/1419	4.03	4.48	4.35	4.31	4.65
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	5	0	1	0	3	7	9	4.15	1019/1596	3.37	4.33	4.24	4.25	4.15
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	2	1	4	12	4.37	624/1535	3.86	4.46	4.15	4.14	4.37
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	7	1	0	1	3	6	7	4.12	866/1510	3.50	4.33	4.13	4.16	4.12
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	6	0	0	0	3	1	15	4.63	364/1620	3.87	4.33	4.20	4.18	4.63
8. How many times was class cancelled	6	0	0	0	0	0	19	5.00	1/1642	4.59	4.68	4.68	4.65	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	1	0	0	0	11	7	4.39	540/1596	3.39	4.22	4.12	4.09	4.39
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	5	0	0	0	0	3	17	4.85	343/1534	4.18	4.63	4.48	4.44	4.85
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	5	0	0	0	1	1	18	4.85	751/1539	4.36	4.83	4.76	4.74	4.85
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	5	0	0	0	1	6	13	4.60	565/1531	3.83	4.47	4.33	4.30	4.60
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	5	15	4.75	437/1530	3.78	4.53	4.35	4.32	4.75
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	8	7	3	1	2	2	2	2.90	1348/1409	2.70	3.97	4.08	4.09	2.90
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	2	2	3	11	4.28	706/1366	4.07	4.39	4.18	4.22	4.28
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	0	0	1	5	12	4.61	558/1364	4.31	4.50	4.33	4.37	4.61
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	0	0	1	5	12	4.61	607/1361	4.37	4.58	4.39	4.39	4.61
4. Were special techniques successful	8	8	0	2	1	2	4	3.89	674/1019	3.89	4.05	4.09	4.04	3.89

Course-Section: POLI 350 02

**Title: Policy-Making Process** 

**Instructor:** Walters, Ronald

**Term - Fall 2013** 

**Enrollment: 25** 

**Questionnaires: 25** 

·				Fre	quen	cies		Ins	structor	Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	24	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/185	****	4.00	4.23	4.16	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	24	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/209	****	4.00	4.19	4.18	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	24	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/181	****	4.44	4.53	4.49	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	24	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/183	****	3.88	4.46	4.38	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	24	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/172	****	3.63	4.14	4.07	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	24	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/72	****	5.00	4.53	4.68	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	24	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/71	****	4.67	4.38	4.61	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	24	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/68	****	4.67	4.41	4.59	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	24	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/71	****	3.67	4.40	4.51	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	24	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/73	****	5.00	4.09	4.57	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	24	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/48	****	****	4.16	4.95	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	24	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/45	****	****	4.19	4.95	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	24	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/30	****	****	4.57	4.93	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	24	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/27	****	****	4.25	4.90	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	24	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/25	****	****	4.35	4.90	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	24	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/51	****	****	4.03	4.75	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	24	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/31	****	****	4.18	4.80	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	24	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/36	****	****	4.33	4.83	****

Run Date: 1/30/2014 2:25:50 PM

# **Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires**

Course-Section: POLI 350 02

**Title: Policy-Making Process** 

**Instructor:** Walters, Ronald

**Term - Fall 2013** 

Enrollment: 25
Questionnaires: 25

				Fre	quen	cies		Ins	structor	Course	Org	<b>UMBC</b>	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Self Paced														
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	24	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/19	****	****	4.17	4.20	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	24	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/14	****	****	4.17	4.60	****

Credits E	arned	Cum. GP	4	Expected	Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors	
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	Α	7	Required for Majors	9	Graduate	0	Major	12
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	7						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	2	С	1	General	5	Under-grad	25	Non-major	13
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	0	**** - Means the	re are not e	nough responses	
				Р	0			to be significant			
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	10						

**Course-Section: POLI 354 01** 

Title: Publ Mgmnt/Personnel Sys

**Instructor: Johnson,Arthur** 

**Term - Fall 2013** 

Enrollment: 23

				Fre	quen	cies		In	structor	Course	Org	<b>UMBC</b>	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	7	0	0	0	2	5	9	4.44	776/1644	4.44	4.49	4.32	4.31	4.44
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	7	0	0	0	2	4	10	4.50	633/1644	4.50	4.36	4.28	4.25	4.50
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	7	0	0	0	2	2	12	4.63	516/1419	4.63	4.48	4.35	4.31	4.63
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	7	4	0	1	2	2	7	4.25	911/1596	4.25	4.33	4.24	4.25	4.25
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	3	4	9	4.38	612/1535	4.38	4.46	4.15	4.14	4.38
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	9	10	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	****/1510	****	4.33	4.13	4.16	****
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	7	0	1	1	5	0	9	3.94	1208/1620	3.94	4.33	4.20	4.18	3.94
8. How many times was class cancelled	7	0	0	0	0	3	13	4.81	819/1642	4.81	4.68	4.68	4.65	4.81
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	10	0	0	0	0	9	4	4.31	642/1596	4.31	4.22	4.12	4.09	4.31
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	7	0	0	0	1	1	14	4.81	419/1534	4.81	4.63	4.48	4.44	4.81
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	7	0	0	0	0	3	13	4.81	865/1539	4.81	4.83	4.76	4.74	4.81
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	7	0	0	0	1	4	11	4.63	536/1531	4.63	4.47	4.33	4.30	4.63
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	0	3	13	4.81	340/1530	4.81	4.53	4.35	4.32	4.81
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	7	6	3	1	4	0	2	2.70	1370/1409	2.70	3.97	4.08	4.09	2.70
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	0	3	7	4.70	332/1366	4.70	4.39	4.18	4.22	4.70
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	13	0	0	1	0	1	8	4.60	570/1364	4.60	4.50	4.33	4.37	4.60
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	13	0	0	0	1	2	7	4.60	619/1361	4.60	4.58	4.39	4.39	4.60

# **Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires**

Course-Section: POLI 354 01

Title: Publ Mgmnt/Personnel Sys

Instructor: Johnson, Arthur

**Term - Fall 2013** 

Enrollment: 23

Questionnaires: 23

				Fre	quen	cies		In	structor	Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Discussion														
4. Were special techniques successful	13	7	1	0	1	0	1	3.00	****/1019	****	4.05	4.09	4.04	****

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA	4	Expected	Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	Α	4	Required for Majors	11	Graduate	0	Major	4
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	8						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	0	С	2	General	1	Under-grad	23	Non-major	19
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	4	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	1	**** - Means the	re are not e	nough responses	
				Р	0			to be significant			
				I	0	Other	2				
				?	9						

**Course-Section: POLI 377 01** 

**Title: Latin American Politics** 

**Instructor:** Paz, Gonzalo

**Term - Fall 2013** 

Enrollment: 27

	_			Fre	quen	cies		In	structor	Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	16	0	0	1	0	3	6	4.40	814/1644	4.40	4.49	4.32	4.31	4.40
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	16	0	1	0	0	4	5	4.20	1038/1644	4.20	4.36	4.28	4.25	4.20
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	16	4	0	1	0	2	3	4.17	****/1419	****	4.48	4.35	4.31	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	16	0	0	0	0	4	6	4.60	437/1596	4.60	4.33	4.24	4.25	4.60
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	2	3	5	4.30	693/1535	4.30	4.46	4.15	4.14	4.30
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	0	3	6	4.67	278/1510	4.67	4.33	4.13	4.16	4.67
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	16	0	1	0	2	2	5	4.00	1134/1620	4.00	4.33	4.20	4.18	4.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	17	0	0	0	0	5	4	4.44	1252/1642	4.44	4.68	4.68	4.65	4.44
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	22	1	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	****/1596	****	4.22	4.12	4.09	****
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	17	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	490/1534	4.78	4.63	4.48	4.44	4.78
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	17	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	666/1539	4.89	4.83	4.76	4.74	4.89
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	19	0	0	0	2	0	5	4.43	826/1531	4.43	4.47	4.33	4.30	4.43
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	0	1	1	6	4.63	619/1530	4.63	4.53	4.35	4.32	4.63
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	18	3	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	****/1409	****	3.97	4.08	4.09	****
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	20	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	****/1366	****	4.39	4.18	4.22	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	20	0	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	****/1364	****	4.50	4.33	4.37	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	20	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	****/1361	****	4.58	4.39	4.39	****
4. Were special techniques successful	20	1	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	****/1019	****	4.05	4.09	4.04	****

**Course-Section: POLI 377 01** 

**Title: Latin American Politics** 

**Instructor:** Paz, Gonzalo

**Term - Fall 2013** 

**Enrollment: 27** 

				Fre	quen	cies		Ins	structor	Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	25	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/185	****	4.00	4.23	4.16	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	25	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/209	****	4.00	4.19	4.18	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	25	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/181	****	4.44	4.53	4.49	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	25	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/183	****	3.88	4.46	4.38	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	25	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/172	****	3.63	4.14	4.07	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	25	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/72	****	5.00	4.53	4.68	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	25	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/71	****	4.67	4.38	4.61	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	25	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/68	****	4.67	4.41	4.59	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	25	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/71	****	3.67	4.40	4.51	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	25	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/73	****	5.00	4.09	4.57	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	25	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/48	****	****	4.16	4.95	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	25	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/45	****	****	4.19	4.95	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	25	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/30	****	****	4.57	4.93	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	25	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/27	****	****	4.25	4.90	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	25	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/25	****	****	4.35	4.90	****
Self Paced														
Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	25	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/51	****	****	4.03	4.75	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	25	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/31	****	****	4.18	4.80	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	25	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/36	****	****	4.33	4.83	****

# **Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires**

**Course-Section: POLI 377 01** 

**Title: Latin American Politics** 

**Instructor:** Paz, Gonzalo

**Term - Fall 2013** 

Enrollment: 27

Questionnaires: 26

				Fre	quen	cies		Ins	structor	Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Self Paced														
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	25	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/19	****	****	4.17	4.20	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	25	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/14	****	****	4.17	4.60	****

Credits E	arned	Cum. GP/	4	Expected	Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	Α	5	Required for Majors	4	Graduate	0	Major	2
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	1						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	0	С	0	General	0	Under-grad	26	Non-major	24
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	3	**** - Means the	re are not e	nough responses	
				Р	0			to be significant			
				I	0	Other	1				
				?	20						

**Course-Section: POLI 395 01** 

Title: U.S. Nat'l Security Pol.

**Instructor:** Starkey, Brigid

**Term - Fall 2013** 

Enrollment: 30

				Fre	quen	cies		Ins	structor	Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	8	0	0	0	2	4	16	4.64	523/1644	4.64	4.49	4.32	4.31	4.64
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	8	0	0	0	2	6	14	4.55	583/1644	4.55	4.36	4.28	4.25	4.55
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	8	0	0	2	0	2	18	4.64	502/1419	4.64	4.48	4.35	4.31	4.64
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	9	0	1	0	2	3	15	4.48	612/1596	4.48	4.33	4.24	4.25	4.48
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	1	4	17	4.73	246/1535	4.73	4.46	4.15	4.14	4.73
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	2	1	1	18	4.59	339/1510	4.59	4.33	4.13	4.16	4.59
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	8	0	0	1	1	3	17	4.64	364/1620	4.64	4.33	4.20	4.18	4.64
8. How many times was class cancelled	8	0	0	0	0	3	19	4.86	715/1642	4.86	4.68	4.68	4.65	4.86
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	15	0	0	0	1	4	10	4.60	297/1596	4.60	4.22	4.12	4.09	4.60
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	8	0	0	0	2	2	18	4.73	576/1534	4.73	4.63	4.48	4.44	4.73
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	8	0	0	0	0	0	22	5.00	1/1539	5.00	4.83	4.76	4.74	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	8	0	0	0	2	5	15	4.59	580/1531	4.59	4.47	4.33	4.30	4.59
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	2	4	16	4.64	606/1530	4.64	4.53	4.35	4.32	4.64
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	8	2	1	1	3	5	10	4.10	765/1409	4.10	3.97	4.08	4.09	4.10
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	20	0	0	0	2	2	6	4.40	604/1366	4.40	4.39	4.18	4.22	4.40
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	20	0	0	0	1	2	7	4.60	570/1364	4.60	4.50	4.33	4.37	4.60
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	20	0	0	0	0	3	7	4.70	503/1361	4.70	4.58	4.39	4.39	4.70

# **Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires**

**Course-Section: POLI 395 01** 

Title: U.S. Nat'l Security Pol.

**Instructor:** Starkey, Brigid

**Term - Fall 2013** 

Enrollment: 30

Questionnaires: 30

				Fre	quen	cies		In	structor	Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Discussion														
4. Were special techniques successful	20	1	0	1	0	3	5	4.33	381/1019	4.33	4.05	4.09	4.04	4.33

Credits E	arned	Cum. GP/	4	Expected	l Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	Α	6	Required for Majors	12	Graduate	0	Major	15
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	11						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	1	С	1	General	1	Under-grad	30	Non-major	15
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	7	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	7	F	0	Electives	3	**** - Means the	re are not e	nough responses	
				Р	0			to be significant			
				1	0	Other	1				
				?	11						

**Course-Section: POLI 433 01** 

**Title: First Amendment Freedoms** 

**Instructor: Parikh, Shikha B** 

**Term - Fall 2013** 

Enrollment: 23

				Fre	quen	cies		In	structor	Course	Org	<b>UMBC</b>	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	13	0	0	1	0	1	7	4.56	626/1644	4.56	4.49	4.32	4.47	4.56
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	13	0	0	0	1	1	7	4.67	428/1644	4.67	4.36	4.28	4.35	4.67
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	13	0	0	1	0	2	6	4.44	717/1419	4.44	4.48	4.35	4.48	4.44
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	13	1	0	1	1	1	5	4.25	911/1596	4.25	4.33	4.24	4.34	4.25
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1535	5.00	4.46	4.15	4.26	5.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	1	2	0	6	4.22	763/1510	4.22	4.33	4.13	4.29	4.22
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	13	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	198/1620	4.78	4.33	4.20	4.25	4.78
8. How many times was class cancelled	13	0	0	0	1	7	1	4.00	1528/1642	4.00	4.68	4.68	4.67	4.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	15	0	0	1	0	3	3	4.14	850/1596	4.14	4.22	4.12	4.20	4.14
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	15	0	0	1	1	1	4	4.14	1234/1534	4.14	4.63	4.48	4.54	4.14
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	15	0	0	0	1	1	5	4.57	1238/1539	4.57	4.83	4.76	4.81	4.57
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	15	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	406/1531	4.71	4.47	4.33	4.38	4.71
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	1	0	2	4	4.29	980/1530	4.29	4.53	4.35	4.41	4.29
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	14	6	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/1409	****	3.97	4.08	4.15	****
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/1366	****	4.39	4.18	4.37	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	19	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/1364	****	4.50	4.33	4.52	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	19	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/1361	****	4.58	4.39	4.59	****

# **Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires**

**Course-Section: POLI 433 01** 

**Title: First Amendment Freedoms** 

**Instructor: Parikh, Shikha B** 

**Term - Fall 2013** 

Enrollment: 23

**Questionnaires: 22** 

				Fre	quen	cies		In	structor	Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Discussion														
4. Were special techniques successful	19	1	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/1019	****	4.05	4.09	4.32	****

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA	4	Expected	Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	Α	6	Required for Majors	7	Graduate	0	Major	7
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	3						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	1	С	0	General	0	Under-grad	22	Non-major	15
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	1	**** - Means the	re are not e	nough responses	
				Р	0			to be significant			
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	13						

Course-Section: POLI 439 01

**Title: Sel Topics Public Law** 

**Instructor: Davis, Katherine** 

**Term - Fall 2013** 

Enrollment: 14

				Fre	quend	cies		In	structor	Course	Org	<b>UMBC</b>	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	1	7	4.67	482/1644	4.67	4.49	4.32	4.47	4.67
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	1	7	4.67	428/1644	4.67	4.36	4.28	4.35	4.67
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	308/1419	4.78	4.48	4.35	4.48	4.78
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	2	6	4.56	502/1596	4.56	4.33	4.24	4.34	4.56
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1535	5.00	4.46	4.15	4.26	5.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	0	8	4.78	177/1510	4.78	4.33	4.13	4.29	4.78
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	1	7	4.67	331/1620	4.67	4.33	4.20	4.25	4.67
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	5	4	4.44	1252/1642	4.44	4.68	4.68	4.67	4.44
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	2	3	4	4.22	742/1596	4.22	4.22	4.12	4.20	4.22
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	286/1534	4.89	4.63	4.48	4.54	4.89
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	694/1539	4.88	4.83	4.76	4.81	4.88
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	195/1531	4.88	4.47	4.33	4.38	4.88
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	0	7	4.75	437/1530	4.75	4.53	4.35	4.41	4.75
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	5	0	1	0	0	2	4.00	825/1409	4.00	3.97	4.08	4.15	4.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1366	5.00	4.39	4.18	4.37	5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1364	5.00	4.50	4.33	4.52	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1361	5.00	4.58	4.39	4.59	5.00

# **Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires**

**Course-Section: POLI 439 01** 

**Title: Sel Topics Public Law** 

**Instructor:** Davis, Katherine

**Term - Fall 2013** 

Enrollment: 14

**Questionnaires:** 9

				Fre	quen	cies		In	structor	Course	Org	<b>UMBC</b>	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Discussion														
4. Were special techniques successful	4	2	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1019	5.00	4.05	4.09	4.32	5.00

Credits E	arned	Cum. GP	4	Expected	Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	Α	6	Required for Majors	7	Graduate	0	Major	5
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	1						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	0	С	1	General	0	Under-grad	9	Non-major	4
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F	0	Electives	0	**** - Means ther	e are not e	nough responses	
				Р	0			to be significant			
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	1						

**Course-Section: POLI 440 01** 

**Title: Urban Politics** 

**Instructor:** Kovossy, Laszlo

**Term - Fall 2013** 

Enrollment: 21

				Fre	quen	cies		Ins	structor	Course	Org	<b>UMBC</b>	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	7	0	0	0	1	3	10	4.64	509/1644	4.64	4.49	4.32	4.47	4.64
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	7	0	0	0	0	4	10	4.71	360/1644	4.71	4.36	4.28	4.35	4.71
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	7	10	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	****/1419	****	4.48	4.35	4.48	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	7	0	0	0	1	7	6	4.36	788/1596	4.36	4.33	4.24	4.34	4.36
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	2	0	5	7	4.21	772/1535	4.21	4.46	4.15	4.26	4.21
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	2	2	10	4.57	359/1510	4.57	4.33	4.13	4.29	4.57
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	7	0	0	0	5	2	7	4.14	1021/1620	4.14	4.33	4.20	4.25	4.14
8. How many times was class cancelled	7	0	0	0	0	4	10	4.71	973/1642	4.71	4.68	4.68	4.67	4.71
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	9	0	0	0	0	6	6	4.50	382/1596	4.50	4.22	4.12	4.20	4.50
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	7	0	0	0	0	0	14	5.00	1/1534	5.00	4.63	4.48	4.54	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	7	0	0	0	0	0	14	5.00	1/1539	5.00	4.83	4.76	4.81	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	7	0	0	0	0	1	13	4.93	129/1531	4.93	4.47	4.33	4.38	4.93
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	0	1	13	4.93	161/1530	4.93	4.53	4.35	4.41	4.93
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	8	1	1	0	1	1	9	4.42	475/1409	4.42	3.97	4.08	4.15	4.42
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	0	1	12	4.92	116/1366	4.92	4.39	4.18	4.37	4.92
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	0	0	0	2	11	4.85	291/1364	4.85	4.50	4.33	4.52	4.85
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	0	0	0	2	11	4.85	326/1361	4.85	4.58	4.39	4.59	4.85

# **Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires**

Course-Section: POLI 440 01

Title: Urban Politics

Instructor: Kovossy,Laszlo

**Term - Fall 2013** 

Enrollment: 21

Questionnaires: 21

				Fre	quen	cies		In	structor	Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Discussion														
4. Were special techniques successful	8	6	1	1	0	1	4	3.86	693/1019	3.86	4.05	4.09	4.32	3.86

Credits E	arned	Cum. GP	4	Expected	Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	Α	8	Required for Majors	10	Graduate	0	Major	7
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	5						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	5	С	1	General	0	Under-grad	21	Non-major	14
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	1	**** - Means the	re are not e	nough responses	
				Р	0			to be significant			
				I	0	Other	1				
				?	7						

**Course-Section: POLI 445 01** 

Title: Law/Politics/Amer Educ

**Instructor:** Lanoue, George R

**Term - Fall 2013** 

Enrollment: 15

				Fre	quen	cies		Ins	structor	Course	Org	<b>UMBC</b>	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	2	4	6	4.33	889/1644	4.33	4.49	4.32	4.47	4.33
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	4	3	5	4.08	1162/1644	4.08	4.36	4.28	4.35	4.08
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	8	0	0	2	1	1	3.75	1212/1419	3.75	4.48	4.35	4.48	3.75
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	3	3	5	4.00	1129/1596	4.00	4.33	4.24	4.34	4.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	4	4	3	3.75	1176/1535	3.75	4.46	4.15	4.26	3.75
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	4	3	4	3.83	1088/1510	3.83	4.33	4.13	4.29	3.83
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	1	4	2	4	3.58	1397/1620	3.58	4.33	4.20	4.25	3.58
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	568/1642	4.92	4.68	4.68	4.67	4.92
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	1	8	2	4.09	911/1596	4.09	4.22	4.12	4.20	4.09
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	2	4	6	4.33	1090/1534	4.33	4.63	4.48	4.54	4.33
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	2	0	10	4.67	1136/1539	4.67	4.83	4.76	4.81	4.67
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	3	4	5	4.17	1069/1531	4.17	4.47	4.33	4.38	4.17
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	2	4	5	4.08	1123/1530	4.08	4.53	4.35	4.41	4.08
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	2	1	2	2	4	1	3.20	1285/1409	3.20	3.97	4.08	4.15	3.20
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	0	3	4	2	3.60	1125/1366	3.60	4.39	4.18	4.37	3.60
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	1	2	3	4	4.00	1014/1364	4.00	4.50	4.33	4.52	4.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	1	2	2	5	4.10	1004/1361	4.10	4.58	4.39	4.59	4.10
4. Were special techniques successful	2	2	1	0	4	2	1	3.25	933/1019	3.25	4.05	4.09	4.32	3.25

# **Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires**

**Course-Section: POLI 445 01** 

Title: Law/Politics/Amer Educ

**Instructor:** Lanoue, George R

**Term - Fall 2013** 

Enrollment: 15
Questionnaires: 12

				Fre	quen	cies		Ins	structor	Course	Org	<b>UMBC</b>	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	9	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/72	5.00	5.00	4.53	4.71	5.00
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	9	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	30/71	4.67	4.67	4.38	4.66	4.67
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	24/68	4.67	4.67	4.41	4.74	4.67
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	1	0	1	1	3.67	64/71	3.67	3.67	4.40	4.50	3.67
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	9	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/73	5.00	5.00	4.09	4.32	5.00

### **Frequency Distribution**

Credits E	arned	Cum. GP/	4	Expected	Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors	
00-27	6	0.00-0.99	0	Α	6	Required for Majors	9	Graduate	0	Major	5
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	6						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	0	С	0	General	0	Under-grad	12	Non-major	7
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	9	F	0	Electives	2	**** - Means the	re are not e	nough responses	
				Р	0			to be significant			
				1	0	Other	0				
				?	0						

Run Date: 1/30/2014 2:25:51 PM

**Course-Section: POLI 446 01** 

**Title: The Politics Of Poverty** 

**Instructor:** Hussey, Laura S.

**Term - Fall 2013** 

Enrollment: 20

				Fre	quen	cies		In	structor	Course	Org	<b>UMBC</b>	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	10	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	175/1644	4.90	4.49	4.32	4.47	4.90
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	10	0	0	0	1	1	8	4.70	375/1644	4.70	4.36	4.28	4.35	4.70
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	10	4	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1419	5.00	4.48	4.35	4.48	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	10	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	207/1596	4.80	4.33	4.24	4.34	4.80
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1535	5.00	4.46	4.15	4.26	5.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	89/1510	4.90	4.33	4.13	4.29	4.90
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	10	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	88/1620	4.90	4.33	4.20	4.25	4.90
8. How many times was class cancelled	10	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1642	5.00	4.68	4.68	4.67	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	12	0	0	0	0	3	5	4.63	280/1596	4.63	4.22	4.12	4.20	4.63
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	11	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	490/1534	4.78	4.63	4.48	4.54	4.78
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	11	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	666/1539	4.89	4.83	4.76	4.81	4.89
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	11	0	0	0	1	2	6	4.56	644/1531	4.56	4.47	4.33	4.38	4.56
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	404/1530	4.78	4.53	4.35	4.41	4.78
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	12	1	1	1	1	0	4	3.71	1057/1409	3.71	3.97	4.08	4.15	3.71
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	172/1366	4.88	4.39	4.18	4.37	4.88
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	12	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1364	5.00	4.50	4.33	4.52	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	12	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1361	5.00	4.58	4.39	4.59	5.00

# **Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires**

Course-Section: POLI 446 01

**Title: The Politics Of Poverty** 

**Instructor:** Hussey, Laura S.

**Term - Fall 2013** 

Enrollment: 20
Questionnaires: 20

Constitution

				Fre	quen	cies		In	structor	Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Discussion														
4. Were special techniques successful	12	3	1	0	0	1	3	4.00	559/1019	4.00	4.05	4.09	4.32	4.00

			_			_		_			
Credits E	arned	Cum. GP/	4	Expected	Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	Α	3	Required for Majors	4	Graduate	0	Major	6
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	2						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	1	С	2	General	0	Under-grad	20	Non-major	14
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	1	**** - Means the	re are not e	nough responses	
				Р	0			to be significant			
				1	0	Other	0				
				?	13						

**Course-Section: POLI 467 01** 

Title: Comparative Foreign Poli

**Instructor:** Starkey, Brigid

**Term - Fall 2013** 

Enrollment: 20

				Fre	quen	cies		Ins	structor	Course	Org	<b>UMBC</b>	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	2	0	0	0	0	1	16	4.94	105/1644	4.94	4.49	4.32	4.47	4.94
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	4	13	4.67	428/1644	4.67	4.36	4.28	4.35	4.67
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	1	0	0	17	4.83	236/1419	4.83	4.48	4.35	4.48	4.83
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	3	14	4.72	283/1596	4.72	4.33	4.24	4.34	4.72
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	2	15	4.78	211/1535	4.78	4.46	4.15	4.26	4.78
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	4	13	4.67	278/1510	4.67	4.33	4.13	4.29	4.67
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	2	3	13	4.61	386/1620	4.61	4.33	4.20	4.25	4.61
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	1	0	0	0	17	4.78	884/1642	4.78	4.68	4.68	4.67	4.78
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	0	0	15	5.00	1/1596	5.00	4.22	4.12	4.20	5.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	0	18	5.00	1/1534	5.00	4.63	4.48	4.54	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	18	5.00	1/1539	5.00	4.83	4.76	4.81	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	2	16	4.89	184/1531	4.89	4.47	4.33	4.38	4.89
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	1	17	4.94	121/1530	4.94	4.53	4.35	4.41	4.94
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	6	0	1	1	0	9	4.55	347/1409	4.55	3.97	4.08	4.15	4.55
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	1	0	12	4.85	200/1366	4.85	4.39	4.18	4.37	4.85
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	0	0	1	12	4.92	172/1364	4.92	4.50	4.33	4.52	4.92
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	0	0	2	0	11	4.69	514/1361	4.69	4.58	4.39	4.59	4.69

# **Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires**

Course-Section: POLI 467 01

Title: Comparative Foreign Poli

**Term - Fall 2013** 

Enrollment: 20
Questionnaires: 19

Instructor: Starkey, Brigid

				Fre	quen	cies		In	structor	Course	Org	<b>UMBC</b>	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Discussion														
4. Were special techniques successful	6	0	0	1	1	0	11	4.62	211/1019	4.62	4.05	4.09	4.32	4.62

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GP/	4	Expected	Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	Α	8	Required for Majors	11	Graduate	0	Major	14
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	8						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	2	С	0	General	0	Under-grad	19	Non-major	5
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	4	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	3	**** - Means the	re are not e	nough responses	
				Р	0			to be significant			
				I	0	Other	1				
				?	3						

Course-Section: POLI 480 01

Title: International Organizati

**Instructor:** Shirk, Mark A

**Term - Fall 2013** 

Enrollment: 17

·	_			Fre	quen	cies		In	structor	Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	5	0	0	0	0	3	8	4.73	400/1644	4.73	4.49	4.32	4.47	4.73
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	5	0	0	0	1	4	6	4.45	717/1644	4.45	4.36	4.28	4.35	4.45
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	6	3	0	0	1	4	2	4.14	1026/1419	4.14	4.48	4.35	4.48	4.14
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	5	0	0	0	0	6	5	4.45	642/1596	4.45	4.33	4.24	4.34	4.45
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	4	7	4.64	330/1535	4.64	4.46	4.15	4.26	4.64
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	1	4	6	4.45	483/1510	4.45	4.33	4.13	4.29	4.45
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	5	0	0	1	1	2	7	4.36	739/1620	4.36	4.33	4.20	4.25	4.36
8. How many times was class cancelled	5	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	632/1642	4.91	4.68	4.68	4.67	4.91
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	9	1	0	0	0	3	3	4.50	382/1596	4.50	4.22	4.12	4.20	4.50
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	6	0	0	0	0	3	7	4.70	611/1534	4.70	4.63	4.48	4.54	4.70
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	6	0	0	0	0	3	7	4.70	1086/1539	4.70	4.83	4.76	4.81	4.70
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	7	0	0	0	0	4	5	4.56	644/1531	4.56	4.47	4.33	4.38	4.56
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	1	5	4	4.30	965/1530	4.30	4.53	4.35	4.41	4.30
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	7	0	0	0	2	5	2	4.00	825/1409	4.00	3.97	4.08	4.15	4.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	1	0	1	8	4.60	424/1366	4.60	4.39	4.18	4.37	4.60
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	342/1364	4.80	4.50	4.33	4.52	4.80
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	380/1361	4.80	4.58	4.39	4.59	4.80
4. Were special techniques successful	6	2	0	1	0	2	5	4.38	357/1019	4.38	4.05	4.09	4.32	4.38

Course-Section: POLI 480 01

Title: International Organizati

Instructor: Shirk, Mark A

**Term - Fall 2013** 

Enrollment: 17

				Fre	quen	cies		Ins	structor	Course	Org	<b>UMBC</b>	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	15	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/185	****	4.00	4.23	4.60	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	15	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/209	****	4.00	4.19	4.27	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	15	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/181	****	4.44	4.53	4.31	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	15	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/183	****	3.88	4.46	4.63	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	15	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/172	****	3.63	4.14	4.02	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/72	****	5.00	4.53	4.71	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	15	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/71	****	4.67	4.38	4.66	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/68	****	4.67	4.41	4.74	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/71	****	3.67	4.40	4.50	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	15	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/73	****	5.00	4.09	4.32	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/48	****	****	4.16	4.39	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	15	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/45	****	****	4.19	4.23	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/30	****	****	4.57	4.82	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	15	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/27	****	****	4.25	4.42	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	15	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/25	****	****	4.35	4.36	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/51	****	****	4.03	3.67	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	15	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/31	****	****	4.18	3.94	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	15	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/36	****	****	4.33	3.80	****

# **Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires**

**Course-Section: POLI 480 01** 

Title: International Organizati

Instructor: Shirk, Mark A

**Term - Fall 2013** 

Enrollment: 17

Questionnaires: 16

				Fre	quen	cies		Ins	structor	Course	Org	<b>UMBC</b>	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mear
Self Paced														
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	15	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/19	****	****	4.17	4.75	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	15	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/14	****	****	4.17	5.00	****

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GP	4	Expected	Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	Α	7	Required for Majors	2	Graduate	0	Major	7
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	В	1						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	С	0	General	2	Under-grad	16	Non-major	9
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F	0	Electives	2	**** - Means the	re are not e	nough responses	
				Р	0			to be significant			
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	8						

Course-Section: POLI 487 02

Title: International Poli Econ

**Instructor:** Mathewson, Jesse

**Term - Fall 2013** 

Enrollment: 20

				Fre	quen	cies		In	structor	Course	Org	<b>UMBC</b>	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	2	0	0	0	2	3	7	4.42	801/1644	4.42	4.49	4.32	4.47	4.42
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	0	1	1	3	7	4.33	897/1644	4.33	4.36	4.28	4.35	4.33
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	1	1	3	8	4.38	800/1419	4.38	4.48	4.35	4.48	4.38
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	3	3	7	4.31	859/1596	4.31	4.33	4.24	4.34	4.31
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	2	6	5	4.23	754/1535	4.23	4.46	4.15	4.26	4.23
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	2	5	6	4.31	668/1510	4.31	4.33	4.13	4.29	4.31
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	2	1	10	4.62	386/1620	4.62	4.33	4.20	4.25	4.62
8. How many times was class cancelled	4	0	0	0	0	6	4	4.40	1286/1642	4.40	4.68	4.68	4.67	4.40
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	0	1	5	3	4.22	742/1596	4.22	4.22	4.12	4.20	4.22
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	1	3	9	4.62	755/1534	4.62	4.63	4.48	4.54	4.62
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	1	2	10	4.69	1098/1539	4.69	4.83	4.76	4.81	4.69
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	2	3	7	4.42	839/1531	4.42	4.47	4.33	4.38	4.42
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	4	2	7	4.23	1020/1530	4.23	4.53	4.35	4.41	4.23
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	0	1	0	3	2	5	3.91	922/1409	3.91	3.97	4.08	4.15	3.91
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	1	2	0	9	4.42	592/1366	4.42	4.39	4.18	4.37	4.42
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	0	3	9	4.75	398/1364	4.75	4.50	4.33	4.52	4.75
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	0	2	10	4.83	340/1361	4.83	4.58	4.39	4.59	4.83

# **Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires**

**Course-Section: POLI 487 02** 

Title: International Poli Econ

**Instructor:** Mathewson, Jesse

**Term - Fall 2013** 

Enrollment: 20

**Questionnaires: 14** 

				Fre	quen	cies		In	structor	Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Discussion														
4. Were special techniques successful	3	3	0	0	2	3	3	4.13	523/1019	4.13	4.05	4.09	4.32	4.13

Credits E	arned	Cum. GP/	4	Expected	Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	Α	5	Required for Majors	3	Graduate	0	Major	8
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	3						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	С	2	General	5	Under-grad	14	Non-major	6
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	2	**** - Means the	re are not e	nough responses	
				Р	0			to be significant			
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	4						

Course-Section: POLI 489 02

Title: Sel Topics:Internatl Rel

**Instructor:** Lieberman, Elli

**Term - Fall 2013** 

Enrollment: 23

				Fre	quen	cies		Ins	structor	Course	Org	<b>UMBC</b>	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	13	0	0	0	2	3	4	4.22	1006/1644	4.22	4.49	4.32	4.47	4.22
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	13	0	0	0	3	2	4	4.11	1138/1644	4.11	4.36	4.28	4.35	4.11
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	13	1	0	0	0	5	3	4.38	812/1419	4.38	4.48	4.35	4.48	4.38
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	13	0	0	0	1	5	3	4.22	942/1596	4.22	4.33	4.24	4.34	4.22
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	2	1	2	4	3.89	1082/1535	3.89	4.46	4.15	4.26	3.89
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	0	7	2	4.22	763/1510	4.22	4.33	4.13	4.29	4.22
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	13	0	1	0	1	3	4	4.00	1134/1620	4.00	4.33	4.20	4.25	4.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	13	1	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	694/1642	4.88	4.68	4.68	4.67	4.88
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	14	0	0	0	1	5	2	4.13	877/1596	4.13	4.22	4.12	4.20	4.13
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	13	0	0	0	0	4	5	4.56	831/1534	4.56	4.63	4.48	4.54	4.56
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	13	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	666/1539	4.89	4.83	4.76	4.81	4.89
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	13	0	0	1	1	3	4	4.11	1110/1531	4.11	4.47	4.33	4.38	4.11
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	13	1	0	0	1	3	4	4.38	906/1530	4.38	4.53	4.35	4.41	4.38
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	13	4	1	0	0	2	2	3.80	****/1409	****	3.97	4.08	4.15	****
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	1	0	1	3	4.20	****/1366	****	4.39	4.18	4.37	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	17	0	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	****/1364	****	4.50	4.33	4.52	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	17	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	****/1361	****	4.58	4.39	4.59	****

# **Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires**

Course-Section: POLI 489 02

Title: Sel Topics:Internatl Rel

**Instructor:** Lieberman, Elli

**Term - Fall 2013** 

Enrollment: 23

**Questionnaires: 22** 

				Fre	quen	cies		In	structor	Course	Org	<b>UMBC</b>	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Discussion														
4. Were special techniques successful	17	2	1	1	0	0	1	2.67	****/1019	****	4.05	4.09	4.32	****

C	·	C CD/		<b>5</b>		<b>D</b>		<b>T</b>		N4	
Credits E	arnea	Cum. GP/	4	Expected	Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	Α	7	Required for Majors	6	Graduate	0	Major	5
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	0						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	1	С	1	General	1	Under-grad	22	Non-major	17
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	0	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	1	**** - Means the	ere are not e	nough responses	
				Р	0			to be significant			
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	14						

**Course-Section: POLI 490 01** 

**Title: Political Violence** 

**Instructor:** Dasgupta, Sunil

**Term - Fall 2013** 

Enrollment: 9

			Frequencies			Instructor		Course	Org	<b>UMBC</b>	Level	Sect		
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	3	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	254/1644	4.83	4.49	4.32	4.47	4.83
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	0	1	2	2	2	3.71	1405/1644	3.71	4.36	4.28	4.35	3.71
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	5	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/1419	****	4.48	4.35	4.48	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	3	0	0	0	2	1	3	4.17	1008/1596	4.17	4.33	4.24	4.34	4.17
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1535	5.00	4.46	4.15	4.26	5.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	538/1510	4.40	4.33	4.13	4.29	4.40
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	3	1	1	0	3	1	0	2.80	1566/1620	2.80	4.33	4.20	4.25	2.80
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	0	0	0	0	3	3	4.50	1203/1642	4.50	4.68	4.68	4.67	4.50
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	1	0	1	1	2	3.60	1338/1596	3.60	4.22	4.12	4.20	3.60
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	0	4	3	4.43	1002/1534	4.43	4.63	4.48	4.54	4.43
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1539	5.00	4.83	4.76	4.81	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	1	0	4	2	4.00	1163/1531	4.00	4.47	4.33	4.38	4.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	502/1530	4.71	4.53	4.35	4.41	4.71
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	4	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/1409	****	3.97	4.08	4.15	****
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	1	1	1	1	2	3.33	1209/1366	3.33	4.39	4.18	4.37	3.33
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	2	0	0	2	2	3.33	1258/1364	3.33	4.50	4.33	4.52	3.33
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	2	0	0	1	3	3.50	1240/1361	3.50	4.58	4.39	4.59	3.50

# **Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires**

Course-Section: POLI 490 01

Title: Political Violence

Instructor: Dasgupta,Sunil

**Term - Fall 2013** 

Enrollment: 9

Questionnaires: 9

				Fre	quen	cies		In	structor	Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Discussion														
4. Were special techniques successful	3	3	0	0	2	0	1	3.67	784/1019	3.67	4.05	4.09	4.32	3.67

<b>Credits Earned</b>		Cum. GPA		<b>Expected Grades</b>		Reasons		Туре		Majors		
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	Α	2	Required for Majors	4	Graduate	0	Major	4	
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	4							
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	С	0	General	1	Under-grad	9	Non-major	5	
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	2	D	0							
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F	0	Electives	1	**** - Means ther	e are not e	nough responses		
				Р	0			to be significant				
				I	0	Other	0					
				?	3							