Course-Section: AGNG 200 0101

Title THE AGING EXPERIENCE

Instructor: MAJESKI, ROBIN

Enrollment: 34 Ouestionnaires: 21

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2007

25

Page

JUN 26, 2007

Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Ouestionnaire

Frequencies Instructor Course Dept UMBC Level Sect Ouestions NR NA 1 2 3 4 5 Mean Rank Mean Mean Mean Mean Mean 1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course 0 0 1 2 4 5 9 3.90 1220/1522 4.23 3.97 4.30 4.34 3.90 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals 0 0 0 1 2 7 11 4.33 706/1222 4.23 3.97 4.30 4.34 3.90 3.91 the exam questions reflect the expected goals 0 0 0 1 2 7 11 4.33 706/1285 4.63 4.09 4.30 4.36 4.33 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals 0 0 0 1 5 9 6 3.95 1068/1476 4.32 4.01 4.22 4.20 3.95 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0 0 0 1 5 8 7 4.00 760/1412 4.48 3.86 4.06 4.00 4.00 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned $0 \quad 0 \quad 0 \quad 3 \quad 4 \quad 5 \quad 9 \quad 3.95$ 872/1381 4.15 3.94 4.08 3.97 3.95 7. Was the grading system clearly explained
8. How many times was class cancelled 2 0 0 2 1 6 10 4.26 770/1500 4.41 4.24 4.18 4.20 4.26 8. How many times was class cancelled 2 0 0 0 0 0 19 5.00 1/1517 4.92 4.92 4.65 4.63 5.00 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 4 1 0 0 4 6 6 4.13 807/1497 4.37 3.74 4.11 4.11 4.13 Lecture 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 0 0 0 0 0 5 16 4.76 432/1440 4.67 4.24 4.45 4.42 4.76 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject $0 \quad 0$ 0 0 4 17 4.81 765/1448 4.88 4.37 4.71 4.78 4.81 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0 0 0 0 0 8 13 4.62 467/1436 4.68 4.08 4.29 4.29 4.62 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 0 0 0 0 3 5 13 4.48 669/1432 4.65 4.25 4.29 4.31 4.48 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 1 1 0 0 1 4 14 4.68 162/1221 4.47 4.14 3.93 4.02 4.68 Discussion 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 4 0 0 1 2 6 8 4.24 598/1280 4.21 4.10 4.10 4.08 4.24 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 4 0 0 0 0 6 11 4.65 489/1277 4.66 4.19 4.34 4.33 4.65 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 4 0 0 0 2 5 10 4.47 611/1269 4.61 4.27 4.31 4.33 4.47 4 3 0 0 1 7 6 4.36 277/854 4.36 3.94 4.02 4.00 4.36 4. Were special techniques successful Laboratory 1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material 18 1 0 0 1 1 0 3.50 **** 215 **** 4.36 4.62 **** 0 0 2 1 4.33 ****/ 228 **** **** 4.35 4.56 **** 2. Were you provided with adequate background information 18 0 0 3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 18 0 0 0 0 1 2 4.67 **** 217 **** 4.51 4.57 **** 4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance 18 0 0 0 0 1 2 4.67 **** / 216 **** **** 4.42 4.72 **** 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 205 **** **** 4.23 4.37 **** 5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 19 1 0 Seminar 20 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 **** / 79 **** **** 4.58 4.58 **** 1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 77 **** *** 4.52 5.00 **** 2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 20 0 3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 20 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 65 **** **** 4.49 5.00 **** 4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned 20 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 **** / 78 **** **** 4.45 5.00 **** 20 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 **** / 80 **** 4.11 4.00 **** 5. Were criteria for grading made clear Field Work 20 0 1 0 0 0 0 1.00 ****/ 47 **** **** 4.41 4.83 **** 1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned Frequency Distribution Expected Grades Credits Earned Cum. GPA Majors Reasons ______ 00 - 271 0.00-0.99 0 A 7 Required for Majors 3 Graduate 0 Major 1.00-1.99 0 28-55 0 в 5 56-83 1 2.00-2.99 4 C 2 General Under-grad 21 Non-major 21 3.00-3.49 5 D 0 84-150 6 Grad. 3.50-4.00 2 F 0 Electives #### - Means there are not enough P 1 responses to be significant I 0 3 Other

?

Course-Section: AGNG 200 0201

THE AGING EXPERIENCE

Title Instructor: FREIBERG, KAREN

Enrollment: 36 Questionnaires: 25

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2007

Page 26 JUN 26, 2007 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

		Questions	5		NR	NA	Fre	equei 2	ncies 3	4	5	Inst Mean	tructor Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean		Level Mean	Sect Mean
		General	 1															
1. Did yo	u gain ne	w insights,skil	lls from	this course	0	0	0	0	1	9	15	4.56	537/1522	4.23	3.97	4.30	4.34	4.56
2. Did th	e instruc	tor make clear	the expe	ected goals	0	0	0	0	3	3	19	4.64	383/1522	4.51	4.08	4.26	4.29	4.64
3. Did th	ie exam qu	estions reflect	t the exp	ected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	23	4.92	120/1285	4.63	4.09	4.30	4.36	4.92
		ations reflect	_	_	0	6	0	0	1	4	14	4.68	295/1476	4.32	4.01	4.22	4.20	4.68
	_	eadings contribu		_	0	0	0	0	0	1	24	4.96	41/1412	4.48	3.86	4.06	4.00	4.96
		-		what you learned	0	11	0	2	1	1	10	4.36	495/1381	4.15	3.94	4.08	3.97	4.36
		system clearly	-	ied	0	0	0	1	1	6	17	4.56	425/1500	4.41	4.24	4.18	4.20	4.56
	-	was class cance			0	0	0	0	0	4	21	4.84	623/1517	4.92	4.92	4.65	4.63	4.84
9. How wo	uld you g	grade the overa	ll teachi	ng effectiveness	3	1	0	0	1	6	14	4.62	304/1497	4.37	3.74	4.11	4.11	4.62
		Lecture	e															
1. Were t	he instru	ctor's lectures	s well pr	repared	1	0	0	0	3	4	17	4.58	705/1440	4.67	4.24	4.45	4.42	4.58
2. Did th	e instruc	tor seem intere	ested in	the subject	1	0	0	0	0	1	23	4.96	247/1448	4.88	4.37	4.71	4.78	4.96
3. Was le	cture mat	erial presented	d and exp	lained clearly	2	0	0	1	1	1	20	4.74	326/1436	4.68	4.08	4.29	4.29	4.74
		es contribute to			3	0	0	0	2	0	20	4.82	280/1432	4.65	4.25	4.29	4.31	4.82
5. Did au	diovisual	techniques enl	nance you	ır understanding	1	0	1	2	3	2	16	4.25	461/1221	4.47	4.14	3.93	4.02	4.25
		Discuss	sion															
1. Did cl	ass discu	ssions contribu	ute to wh	nat you learned	9	0	2	0	1	3	10	4.19	631/1280	4.21	4.10	4.10	4.08	4.19
		its actively end		_	10	0	0	0	1	3	11	4.67	470/1277	4.66	4.19	4.34	4.33	4.67
3. Did th	e instruc	tor encourage f	fair and	open discussion	9	0	0	0	1	2	13	4.75	381/1269	4.61	4.27	4.31	4.33	4.75
4. Were s	pecial te	chniques succes	ssful		10	10	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	****/ 854	4.36	3.94	4.02	4.00	***
		Field V	Work															
1. Did fi	eld exper	ience contribut	te to wha	at you learned	23	0	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/ 47	****	****	4.41	4.83	***
	_	understand you		_	23	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 45	****	****	4.30	4.58	***
		tor available f			23	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 39	****	****	4.40	4.75	***
4. To wha	t degree	could you discu	uss your	evaluations	22	1	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 35	****	****	4.31	4.75	***
5. Did co	nferences	help you carry	y out fie	eld activities	22	1	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 34	****	****	4.30	4.17	***
		Self I	Paced															
1. Did se	lf-paced	system contribu	ute to wh	nat you learned	24	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 37	****	****	4.63	****	***
	_	ions make clear		_	23	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 23	****	****	4.41	****	***
3. Were y	our conta	cts with the in	nstructor	helpful	23	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 33	****	****	4.69	****	***
4. Was th	e feedbac	k/tutoring by p	proctors	helpful	23	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 22	****	****	4.54	****	***
5. Were t	here enou	igh proctors for	r all the	students	23	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 18	****	****	4.49	***	****
				Frequ	iency	Dis	trib	ution	ı									
Guadia a		G GD.		Down a which County				ъ.									M	
Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades					sons	; -			Ту.	pe 			Majors 	
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	0	A 14		Red	quire	ed fo	or Ma	jor	s	4	Graduat	е	0	Majo	or	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	В 9		~					_	-	1	, ,				0.5
56-83	2 6	2.00-2.99	3 7	C 0 D 0		Gei	nera!	L			1	.7	Under-g	rad 2	25	Non-	-major	25
84-150 Crad	0	3.00-3.49	4	D 0 F 0		E-7 -	ectiv	70.5				1	####	Moona +	horo -	.xo xo+	ono	rh
Grad.	U	3.50-4.00	4	F 0		F.T.	=CL1	ves				1	#### -				_	111
				P 0		∩ +1	ner					2	respons	es lo E	e sign	ıııcar	ıL	
				5 0		ULI	161					4						
				. 0														

Course-Section: AGNG 300 0101 University of Maryland Title OVERVIEW: AGING SERVIC

Ρ

I

0

0

Baltimore County Spring 2007

Page 27

JUN 26, 2007

Job IRBR3029

responses to be significant

Instructor: GRIBBIN, JOSEPH (Instr. A)

Enrollment: 24 Questionnaires: 17

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Ouestions	MD	NA	Fro	_	ncies	3 4	5	Inst Mean	tructor Rank	Course	Dept Mean		Level Mean	Sect Mean
Quescions										Mean			Mean	
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	1	1	1	5	9	4.18	980/1522	4.18	3.97	4.30	4.34	4.18
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	2	4	5	5	3.65	1309/1522	3.65	4.08	4.26	4.25	3.65
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	1	1	3	5	2	5	3.44	1189/1285	3.44	4.09	4.30	4.30	3.44
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	3	0	2	3	5	3	3.69	1227/1476	3.69	4.01	4.22	4.26	3.69
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	1	3	1	3	3	5	3.40	1225/1412	3.40	3.86	4.06	4.03	3.40
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	2	2	2	2	3	5	3.50	1152/1381	3.50	3.94	4.08	4.13	3.50
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	1	1	4	0	2	8		1147/1500	3.80	4.24	4.18	4.13	3.80
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	1	0	0	0	3	11	4.79	- , -		4.92	4.65	4.62	4.79
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	2	1	0	3	3	7	4.07	852/1497	3.39	3.74	4.11	4.13	3.39
Lecture	_		_			_								
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	1	0	2	0	13	4.50			4.24	4.45	4.46	4.13
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	1	0	1		13		1106/1448	4.22	4.37	4.71	4.71	4.22
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	1	1	1		11	4.31		3.72	4.08	4.29		3.72
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	1	0	2	0			4.47	, -			4.29		3.90
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	Τ	1	2	2	3	7	3.87	720/1221	3.77	4.14	3.93	3.94	3.77
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	1	3	3	7	4.14	657/1280	4.14	4.10	4.10	4.14	4.14
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	1	4	3	6	4.00	,	4.00	4.19	4.34	4.38	4.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	4	5	5	4.07	/	4.07	4.27	4.31	4.39	4.07
4. Were special techniques successful	3	9	1	0	1	2		3.40			3.94	4.02		3.40
Frequ	.ency	Dis	trib	utio	n									
Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades				Rea	asons	5			Ту	pe			Majors	
00-27 2 0.00-0.99 0 A 3		Re	guir	ed f	or Ma	ajor	 s	0	Graduat	 e	0	Majo	r r	12
28-55 1 1.00-1.99 0 B 5			_			-								
56-83 7 2.00-2.99 5 C 5		Ge:	nera	1				2	Under-g	rad 1	7	Non-	major	5
84-150 2 3.00-3.49 4 D 0														
Grad. $0 3.50-4.00 2 F 0$		El	ecti	ves				0	#### - 1	Means t	here a	re not	enoug	h

Other

10

Course-Section: AGNG 300 0101 University of Maryland Title OVERVIEW: AGING SERVIC

? 0

Baltimore County Spring 2007

Page 28

JUN 26, 2007

Job IRBR3029

Enrollment: 24 Questionnaires: 17 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

(Instr. B)

Instructor:

							Fr	eque	ncies	3		Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
		Question	s		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		 Genera	 1															
1. Did vo	nı gain ne	ew insights,ski	_	m this course	0	0	1	1	1	5	9	4.18	980/1522	4.18	3.97	4.30	4.34	4.18
_	-	ctor make clear			0	0	1	2	4	5	5		1309/1522	3.65	4.08	4.26	4.25	3.65
		uestions reflec		_	0	1	1	3	5	2	5		1189/1285	3.44	4.09	4.30	4.30	3.44
	_	uations reflect		_	1	3	0	2	3	5	3		1227/1476		4.01	4.22	4.26	3.69
				what you learned	1	1	3	1	3	3	5		1225/1412		3.86	4.06	4.03	3.40
	_			o what you learned	1	2	2	2	2	3	5		1152/1381		3.94	4.08	4.13	3.50
		g system clearl		_	1	1	1	4	0	2	8		1147/1500		4.24	4.18	4.13	3.80
		was class canc		11100	2	1	0	0	0	3	11		749/1517		4.92		4.62	4.79
	-			hing effectiveness	1	2	3	1	7	3	- 0		1464/1497		3.74			3.39
J. 110W WO	ara you	grade the overa	II ccac	ning circuiveness	_	2	3	_	,	5	O	2.71	1101/1107	3.35	3.71	1.11	1.13	3.37
		Lectur																
		uctor's lecture			1	0	1	3	3	1	8		1304/1440		4.24	4.45	4.46	4.13
		ctor seem inter		3	1	0	1	1	4	3	7		1388/1448		4.37	4.71	4.71	4.22
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly				1	0	3	4	2	2	5	3.13	1370/1436	3.72	4.08	4.29	4.30	3.72	
4. Did th	4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned				1	1	4	1	1	4	5	3.33	1320/1432	3.90	4.25	4.29	4.29	3.90
5. Did au	diovisua	l techniques en	hance y	our understanding	1	4	1	2	2	2	5	3.67	832/1221	3.77	4.14	3.93	3.94	3.77
		Discus	sion															
1 Did cl	agg dige			what you learned	3	0	0	1	3	3	7	4.14	657/1280	4.14	4.10	4.10	4.14	4.14
				d to participate	3	0	0	1	4	3	6	4.00	930/1277	4.00	4.19	4.34	4.38	4.00
				d open discussion	3	0	0	0	4	5	5	4.07	859/1269	4.07	4.27	4.31	4.39	4.07
		echniques succe		a open arbeablion	3	9	1	0	1	2	1	3.40	705/ 854		3.94	4.02	4.00	3.40
1. Were b	pecial c	commiques succe	DDIGI		3		_	Ü	_	_	_	3.10	,03, 031	3.10	3.71	1.02	1.00	3.10
				Frequ	ıency	Dis	trib	utio	n									
Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	asons	3			Ту	pe			Majors	}
																		1.0
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	A 3		ке	quir	ea i	or Ma	ajor	S	0	Graduat	e	0	Majo	or	12
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B 5		~		,				0	77 J		7	37		_
56-83	7	2.00-2.99	5	C 5		Ge:	nera	Т				2	Under-g	rad 1	. /	Non-	-major	5
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	4	D 0								0			,			,
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F 0		ΕŢ	ecti [,]	ves				0	#### - 1				_	m
				P 0							_		respons	es to b	e sign	niicar	1T	
				I 0		Ot:	her				1	.0						

Course-Section: AGNG 422 0101 University of Maryland Title RESEARCH APPLICATIONS Baltimore County Instructor: MAJESKI, ROBIN (Instr. A) Spring 2007

University of Maryland Page 29
Baltimore County JUN 26, 2007
Spring 2007 Job IRBR3029

2

Enrollment:	5					
Questionnaires:	4	St	udent	Course	Evaluation	Questionnaire

I

?

0

0

							Fre	eque	ncies	3		Inst	tructor	Course	e Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
		Question	ıs		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		Genera	 .1															
1. Did	d vou gain n	new insights,ski		om this course	0	0	0	0	3	1	0	3.25	1464/1522	3.25	3.97	4.30	4.42	3.25
		ctor make clear			0	0	0	0	2	1	1	3.75	1267/1522		4.08	4.26	4.34	3.75
		questions reflec			1	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	938/1285	4.00	4.09	4.30	4.42	4.00
4. Did	d other eval	- luations reflect	the ex	spected goals	1	0	0	0	1	2	0	3.67	1245/1476	3.67	4.01	4.22	4.31	3.67
5. Did	d assigned r	readings contrib	oute to	what you learned	0	0	0	0	3	1	0	3.25	1287/1412	3.25	3.86	4.06	4.11	3.25
6. Did	d written as	ssignments contr	ribute t	to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	1	1	3.75	1046/1381	3.75	3.94	4.08	4.21	3.75
7. Was	s the gradin	ng system clearl	y expla	ined	0	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	780/1500	4.25	4.24	4.18	4.25	4.25
8. How	w many times	s was class cand	elled		0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1517	5.00	4.92	4.65	4.71	5.00
9. How	w would you	grade the overa	ill teac	ching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	2	2	0	3.50	1277/1497	3.08	3.74	4.11	4.21	3.08
		Lectur		1	•	0	0	0	-	•	-	4 00	1106/1440	2 65	4 0 4	4 45	4 50	2 68
		ructor's lecture			0	0	0	0	1	2	Ţ		1186/1440		4.24	4.45	4.52	3.67
		actor seem inter		_	0	0	0	0	1	3	0		1402/1448		4.37	4.71	4.75	3.71
		res contribute t		explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	4 1	0	4.00	1056/1436 884/1432		4.08	4.29 4.29	4.32	3.50
				you rearned your understanding	0	0	0	0	1	2		4.25				3.93	4.04	4.00
5. DIC	ı audiovisua	ar teciniiques en	mance y	our understanding	U	U	U	U	1	2	Т	4.00	606/1221	4.00	4.14	3.93	4.04	4.00
		Discus	sion															
1. Did	d class disc	cussions contrib	oute to	what you learned	0	0	0	1	0	3	0	3.50	1031/1280	3.50	4.10	4.10	4.28	3.50
				ed to participate	0	0	1	0	0	2	1	3.50	1136/1277	3.50	4.19	4.34	4.50	3.50
3. Did	d the instru	ctor encourage	fair an	nd open discussion	0	0	0	0	1	3	0	3.75	1030/1269	3.75	4.27	4.31	4.49	3.75
4. Wer	re special t	echniques succe	essful	-	0	0	0	0	1	3	0	3.75	588/ 854	3.75	3.94	4.02	4.31	3.75
				Frequ	ency	7 Dist	trib	utio	n									
Credit	ts Earned	Cum. GPA	1	Expected Grades				Rea	asons	3			Ту	pe			Majors	3
00-27		0.00-0.99	0	A 1		Red	quir	ed f	or Ma	ajors	\$	0	Graduat	е	0	Majo	r	2
28-55		1.00-1.99	0	В 2														
56-83		2.00-2.99	0	C 0		Ger	nera	1				1	Under-g	rad	4	Non-	major	2
84-15		3.00-3.49	1	D 0														
Grad.	. 0	3.50-4.00	1	F 0		Ele	ecti	ves				0	#### - 1				_	βh
				P 0									respons	es to b	oe sign	nifican	ıt	

Other

Course-Section: AGNG 422 0101 University of Maryland Title RESEARCH APPLICATIONS Baltimore County

Ρ

I

0

0

Instructor: (Instr. B) Spring 2007

3.50-4.00

Enrollment: 5 Questionnaires: 4

Grad.

0

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Page 30

JUN 26, 2007

Job IRBR3029

- Means there are not enough

responses to be significant

							Fre	equei	ncies	3		Ins	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
		Questions	3		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		General	 															
1. Did	vou gain n	ew insights,skil	=	m this course	0	0	0	0	3	1	0	3.25	1464/1522	3.25	3.97	4.30	4.42	3.25
		ctor make clear			0	0	0	0	2	1	1		1267/1522		4.08	4.26	4.34	3.75
		uestions reflect			1	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	938/1285	4.00	4.09	4.30	4.42	4.00
4. Did	other eval	uations reflect	the ex	pected goals	1	0	0	0	1	2	0	3.67	1245/1476	3.67	4.01	4.22	4.31	3.67
5. Did	assigned r	eadings contribu	ite to	what you learned	0	0	0	0	3	1	0	3.25	1287/1412	3.25	3.86	4.06	4.11	3.25
6. Did	written as	signments contri	bute t	o what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	1	1	3.75	1046/1381	3.75	3.94	4.08	4.21	3.75
7. Was	the gradin	g system clearly	/ expla	ined	0	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	780/1500	4.25	4.24	4.18	4.25	4.25
	-	was class cance			0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1517	5.00	4.92	4.65	4.71	5.00
9. How	would you	grade the overal	ll teac	hing effectiveness	1	0	1	0	1	1	0	2.67	1469/1497	3.08	3.74	4.11	4.21	3.08
		Lecture	2															
1 Were	the instr	uctor's lectures	_	prepared	1	0	0	1	0	2	0	3 33	1385/1440	3.67	4 24	4.45	4.52	3.67
		ctor seem intere			1	0	0	0	1	2	0		1411/1448	3.71	4.37	4.71	4.75	3.71
				xplained clearly	1	0	1	0	0	2	0		1378/1436		4.08	4.29		3.50
		es contribute to		-	1	0	1	0	0	0			1224/1432		4.25	4.29	4.34	3.96
5. Did	audiovisua	l techniques enh	nance y	our understanding	1	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	606/1221	4.00	4.14	3.93	4.04	4.00
1 511		Discuss			^	0	0	1	0	2	0	2 50	1021/1000	2 50	4 10	4 10	4 00	2 50
				what you learned d to participate	0	0	0 1	1	0	3			1031/1280		4.10	4.10	4.28	3.50
		-	_	d to participate d open discussion	0	0	0	0	0 1	2 3			1136/1277 1030/1269		4.19 4.27	4.34	4.50	3.50 3.75
		echniques succes		a open arscussion	0	0	0	0	1	3	0		,		3.94			3.75
	o aprocess	1000 00000																
				Freq	uency	7 Dist	trib	ution	ı									
Credits	s Earned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	asons	3			Ty	pe			Majors	3
														- 				
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 1		Red	quir	ed fo	or Ma	ajors	3	0	Graduat	е	0	Majo	r	2
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В 2								_	1					
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C 0		Ger	nera	T				1	Under-g	rad	4	Non-	major	2
84-150) 1	3.00-3.49	1	D 0														

Electives

Other

Course-Section: AGNG 440 0101 University of Maryla
Title DIVERSITY - AGING SVCS Baltimore County
Instructor: FRANKOWSKI, ANN Spring 2007

Enrollment:

Questionnaires: 4

5

University of Maryland Page 31
Baltimore County JUN 26, 2007
Spring 2007 Job IRBR3029

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

							Fr	eque	ncies	5		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
		Question	s		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		 Genera	1															
1. Did yo	u gain ne	ew insights,ski	lls fro	om this course	0	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	605/1522	4.50	3.97	4.30	4.42	4.50
2. Did th	e instru	ctor make clear	the ex	pected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	255/1522	4.75	4.08	4.26	4.34	4.75
3. Did th	e exam q	uestions reflec	t the e	expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	531/1285	4.50	4.09	4.30	4.42	4.50
4. Did ot	her eval	uations reflect	the ex	spected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	226/1476	4.75	4.01	4.22	4.31	4.75
5. Did as	signed re	eadings contrib	ute to	what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	167/1412	4.75	3.86	4.06	4.11	4.75
6. Did wr	itten as:	signments contr	ibute t	to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	149/1381	4.75	3.94	4.08	4.21	4.75
7. Was th	e gradin	g system clearl	y expla	ined	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	211/1500	4.75	4.24	4.18	4.25	4.75
8. How man	ny times	was class cand	elled		1	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1517	5.00	4.92	4.65	4.71	5.00
9. How wo	uld you	grade the overa	ll teac	ching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	385/1497	4.50	3.74	4.11	4.21	4.50
		Lectur	е															
1. Were t	he instr	uctor's lecture	s well	prepared	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	452/1440	4.75	4.24	4.45	4.52	4.75
2. Did the	e instru	ctor seem inter	ested i	n the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1448	5.00	4.37	4.71	4.75	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly				0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	295/1436	4.75	4.08	4.29	4.32	4.75	
4. Did the	e lecture	es contribute t	o what	you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	350/1432	4.75	4.25	4.29	4.34	4.75
5. Did au	diovisua	l techniques en	hance y	our understanding	0	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	279/1221	4.50	4.14	3.93	4.04	4.50
		Discus	sion															
1. Did cl	ass disc	ussions contrib	ute to	what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1280	5.00	4.10	4.10	4.28	5.00
2. Were a	.ll stude	nts actively en	courage	ed to participate	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1277	5.00	4.19	4.34	4.50	5.00
3. Did the	e instru	ctor encourage	fair ar	nd open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1269	5.00	4.27	4.31	4.49	5.00
4. Were s	pecial te	echniques succe	ssful		0	2	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 854	5.00	3.94	4.02	4.31	5.00
				Frequ	iency	/ Dis	trib	utio	n									
Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Re	asons	5			Туј	pe			Majors	\$
00-27	0	 0.00-0.99	0	A 2					or Ma			0	Graduat		0	Majo		3
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B 2		r.e.	quil	eu I	OT IAIG	JUL	>	U	Graduati	=	U	Majo	/ <u>T</u>	3
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	В 2 С 0		Ce	nera	1				1	Under-g	rad	4	Non-	-major	1
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	0	D 0		GE	пста	_				*	onder -g.	Luu	1	INOII	ilia JOI	±.
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F 0		EJ.	ecti [.]	ves				0	#### - 1	Means t	here a	re not	. enonc	rh
JI aa.	J	3.30 1.00	4	P 0		111	CCCI	v CD				0				ere are not enough significant		,
				I 0		O±1	her					3	I CDPOID	L	.c bigi	cai		
				± 0		00						_						