Course-Section: AGNG 200 0101

THE AGING EXPERIENCE

Instructor: FREIBERG, KAREN

Enrollment: 29
Questionnaires: 26

Title

# University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2007

Page 42 FEB 13, 2008 Job IRBR3029

### Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Fre	equer 2	ncie 3	s 4	5	Inst Mean	ructor Rank	Course Mean	-	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
General	1	0	0	0	1	_	1.0	1 60	404/1630	4 50	4 50	4 07	4 25	1 (0
<ol> <li>Did you gain new insights, skills from this course</li> <li>Did the instructor make clear the expected goals</li> </ol>	4	0	0	0	3	5	16	4.68	404/1639 735/1639	4.58	4.52 4.38	4.27 4.22	4.35	4.68 4.36
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	4 5	0	0	0	3 6	8 1	11 11	4.36	813/1397	4.53	4.38	4.22	4.27 4.39	4.24
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	5 5	3	0	1	7	2	ДΙ		1098/1583	4.14	4.47	4.19	4.28	3.94
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	5	2	15	4.45	388/1532	4.39	4.19	4.01	4.09	4.45
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	4	8	1	2	2	2	7	3.86	977/1504	4.10	4.29	4.05	4.09	3.86
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	3	1	1	0	7	5	9		1109/1612	4.22	4.00	4.16	4.21	3.95
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	0	0	0	1	14	8		1311/1635	4.51	4.70	4.65		4.30
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	7	0	0	0	2	11	6	4.21	702/1579	4.15	4.06	4.08	4.14	
									,					
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	0	0	3	2	17	4.64	643/1518	4.63	4.45	4.43	4.48	4.64
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	5	0	0	0	2	0	19	4.81	802/1520	4.74	4.76	4.70	4.78	4.81
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	1	0	2	4	16	4.48	635/1517	4.55	4.38	4.27	4.34	4.48
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	1	1	0	1	3	16	4.57	556/1550	4.54	4.42	4.22	4.33	4.57
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	0	0	1	4	3	15	4.39	353/1295	4.35	4.15	3.94	4.07	4.39
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	0	3	15	4.83	200/1398		4.59	4.07	4.14	4.83
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	0	0	1	2	16	4.79	356/1391	4.70	4.81	4.30	4.35	4.79
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	0	0	0	2	17	4.89	234/1388	4.83	4.77	4.28	4.37	4.89
4. Were special techniques successful	8	3	1	1	2	3	8	4.07	444/ 958	4.09	4.13	3.93	4.00	4.07
Laboratory			_	_	_									
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	24	0	1	0	0	0	1		****/ 224	****	****	4.10	4.33	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	25	0	0	0	0	0	Τ	5.00	****/ 240	***	****	4.11	4.47	***
Seminar														
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	25	Λ	0	Λ	Λ	Λ	1	5 00	****/ 82	****	4.33	4.16	4.00	****
J. Were criteria for grauting made crear	20	U	U	U	U	U	Т	5.00	/ 02		4.33	4.10	4.00	

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	l Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	10	0.00-0.99	0	 А	6	Required for Majors	3	 Graduate	0	Major	3
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	В	9						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	2	C	0	General	6	Under-grad	26	Non-major	23
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	0	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means	there	are not enough	า
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	6	-			
				?	0						

University of Maryland
Baltimore County
Fall 2007

Title THE AGING EXPERIENCE

Page 43 FEB 13, 2008 Job IRBR3029

Instructor: MAJESKI, ROBIN

Enrollment: 53
Questionnaires: 29

Questions	NR	NA	Fre	equer 2	ncie:	s 4	5	Inst Mean	ructor Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	1	1	1	6	20	4.48	642/1639	4.58	4.52	4.27	4.35	4.48
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	5	22	4.69	327/1639	4.53	4.38	4.22	4.27	4.69
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	2	1	2	10	14	4.14	906/1397	4.19	4.47	4.28	4.39	4.14
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	3	2	6	18	4.34	683/1583	4.14	4.08	4.19	4.28	4.34
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	1	2	1	7	17	4.32	516/1532	4.39	4.19	4.01	4.09	4.32
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	5	6	17	4.34	537/1504	4.10	4.29	4.05	4.09	4.34
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	3	2	2	22	4.48	518/1612	4.22	4.00	4.16	4.21	4.48
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	8	21	4.72	928/1635	4.51	4.70	4.65	4.63	4.72
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	1	0	0	3	14	5	4.09	835/1579	4.15	4.06	4.08	4.14	4.09
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	1	1	0	3	21		670/1518	4.63	4.45	4.43	4.48	4.62
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	1	2	1	21		1019/1520	4.74	4.76	4.70	4.78	4.68
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	5	0	0	1	1	4	18	4.63	451/1517	4.55	4.38	4.27	4.34	4.63
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	5	0	1 1	0 2	2	4	17 16	4.50	638/1550	4.54	4.42	4.22	4.33	4.50
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	6	U	Τ	2	2	2	Τ0	4.30	421/1295	4.35	4.15	3.94	4.07	4.30
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	2	4	15	4.62	362/1398	4.73	4.59	4.07	4.14	4.62
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	0	0	2	4	15	4.62	534/1391	4.70	4.81	4.30	4.35	4.62
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	0	0	0	5	16	4.76	375/1388	4.83	4.77	4.28	4.37	4.76
4. Were special techniques successful	8	3	0	1	4	5	8	4.11	430/ 958	4.09	4.13	3.93	4.00	4.11
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	25	2	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 224	****	****	4.10	4.33	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	26	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 240	****	****	4.11	4.47	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	26	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 219	****	****	4.44	4.61	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	26	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 215	****	****	4.35	4.43	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	26	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 198	***	****	4.18	4.08	***
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	25	1	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 85	****	4.44	4.58	4.00	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	25	1	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 82	****	3.28	4.52	3.00	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	25	1	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 78	****	3.44	4.47	****	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	25	1	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 80	****	5.00	4.47	2.00	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	25	1	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 82	***	4.33	4.16	4.00	***
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	25	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.04	4.78	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	25	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	****/ 53	****	****	4.05	4.28	***
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	25	1	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 42	****	****	4.75	****	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	25	1	0	0	0	0	3	0.00	****/ 37	****	****	4.58	****	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	25	1	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 32	****	****	4.56	****	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	25	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	****/ 50	****	****	4.45	3.24	****

2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	25	1	0	0	0	0	3	5.00 ****/	32	****	****	4.51	4.33	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	25	1	0	0	0	0	3	5.00 ****/	43	****	****	4.69	****	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	25	1	0	0	0	0	3	5.00 ****/	32	****	****	4.37	1.00	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	25	1	0	0	0	0	3	5.00 ****/	21	****	****	4.52	3.00	****

Course-Section: AGNG 200 0201

Title THE AGING EXPERIENCE

Instructor: MAJESKI, ROBIN

Enrollment: 53
Questionnaires: 29

University of Maryland
Baltimore County
Fall 2007

Page 43 FEB 13, 2008 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	d Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	5	0.00-0.99	0	A	17	Required for Majors	10	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	В	6						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	0	C	1	General	6	Under-grad	29	Non-major	29
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	ı
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	8	_			
				?	0						

Course-Section: AGNG 300 0101

Questionnaires: 7

OVERVIEW: AGING SERVIC

Title

MAJESKI, ROBIN (Instr. A)

Instructor: Enrollment: 11

Page 44 FEB 13, 2008 Job IRBR3029

### Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

University of Maryland

Baltimore County

Fall 2007

	Frequencies							Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	366/1639	4.71	4.52	4.27	4.28	4.71
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	4	2	4.33	774/1639	4.33	4.38	4.22	4.20	4.33
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	2	4	4.43	632/1397	4.43	4.47	4.28	4.26	4.43
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	402/1583	4.57	4.08	4.19	4.24	4.57
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	1	0	4	1	3.43	1288/1532	3.43	4.19	4.01	4.05	3.43
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	3	3	4.29	585/1504	4.29	4.29	4.05	4.12	4.29
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	0	0	3	2	4.40	632/1612	4.40	4.00	4.16	4.12	4.40
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1635	5.00	4.70	4.65	4.66	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	3	1	2	3.83	1109/1579	4.17	4.06	4.08	4.07	4.17
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	2	2	3	4.14	1175/1518	4.40	4.45	4.43	4.39	4.40
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	961/1520	4.77	4.76	4.70	4.68	4.77
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	1	1	2	2	3.83	1223/1517	4.25	4.38	4.27	4.23	4.25
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	2	2	2	4.00	1077/1550	4.33	4.42	4.22	4.20	4.33
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	0	4	3	4.43	329/1295	4.38	4.15	3.94	3.95	4.38
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	369/1398	4.60	4.59	4.07	4.13	4.60
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	543/1391	4.60	4.81	4.30	4.35	4.60
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	571/1388	4.60	4.77	4.28	4.34	4.60
4. Were special techniques successful	2	1	0	0	0	3	1	4.25	349/ 958	4.25	4.13	3.93	3.97	4.25

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

Course-Section: AGNG 300 0101

Baltimore County

Title OVERVIEW: AGING SERVIC Instructor: (Instr. B)

Enrollment: 11 Questionnaires: 7 University of Maryland Fall 2007

Page 45 FEB 13, 2008 Job IRBR3029

~	~			
Student	('Ollrge	Evaluation	()llegtionr	IAITA
Deddelle	COULDC	II V a I a a c I O I I	QUED CIOIII.	LUTIC

		Frequencies						Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	366/1639	4 71	4.52	4.27	4.28	4.71
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	4	2	4.33	774/1639	4.33	4.38	4.22	4.20	4.33
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	2	4	4.43	632/1397	4.43	4.47	4.28	4.26	4.43
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	402/1583	4.57	4.08	4.19	4.24	4.57
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	1	0	4	1	3.43	1288/1532	3.43	4.19	4.01	4.05	3.43
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	3	3	4.29	585/1504	4.29	4.29	4.05	4.12	4.29
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	0	0	3	2	4.40	632/1612	4.40	4.00	4.16	4.12	4.40
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1635	5.00	4.70	4.65	4.66	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	3	3	4.50	382/1579	4.17	4.06	4.08	4.07	4.17
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	602/1518	4.40	4.45	4.43	4.39	4.40
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	725/1520	4.77	4.76	4.70	4.68	4.77
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	405/1517	4.25	4.38	4.27	4.23	4.25
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	457/1550	4.33	4.42	4.22	4.20	4.33
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	0	0	4	2	4.33	398/1295	4.38	4.15	3.94		4.38
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	369/1398	4.60	4.59	4.07	4.13	4.60
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	543/1391	4.60	4.81	4.30	4.35	4.60
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	571/1388	4.60	4.77	4.28	4.34	4.60
4. Were special techniques successful	2	1	0	0	0	3	1	4.25	349/ 958	4.25	4.13	3.93	3.97	4.25

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	d Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	А	3	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	7
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	3						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	С	0	General	0	Under-grad	7	Non-major	0
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	0	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	0	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means	there	are not enough	L
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	6				
				?	0						

Course-Section: AGNG 401 0101

Title FOUNDATIONS - AGING SV

Instructor: RONCH, JUDAH

Enrollment: 10
Questionnaires: 9

### University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2007

Page 46 FEB 13, 2008 Job IRBR3029

### Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

	Frequencies							Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	Λ	0	Λ	Λ	Λ	1	5	4.56	561/1639	1 56	4.52	4.27	4.42	4.56
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	-	7	4.44	617/1639	4.44	4.38	4.22	4.29	4.44
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	1	2	2	4.29	767/1397		4.47	4.28	4.38	4.44
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	T	2	2		1171/1583	3.89	4.47	4.19	4.31	3.89
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	<i>5</i>	4.67	236/1532	4.67	4.19	4.19	4.07	4.67
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	2	5	4.44	441/1504	4.44	4.19	4.01	4.20	4.44
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.38	669/1612		4.00	4.16	4.18	4.38
8. How many times was class cancelled	υ Τ	0	0	0	0	7	2		1374/1635	4.30	4.70	4.16	4.10	4.22
	2	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.43	473/1579		4.70	4.08	4.72	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	U	U	U	U	4	3	4.43	4/3/15/9	4.43	4.06	4.08	4.21	4.43
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	3	6	4.67	602/1518	4.67	4.45	4.43	4.51	4.67
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	597/1520	4.89	4.76	4.70	4.75	4.89
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	4	5	4.56	535/1517	4.56	4.38	4.27	4.34	4.56
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	3	6	4.67	457/1550	4.67	4.42	4.22	4.24	4.67
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	1	0	3	1	3	1	3.25	1101/1295	3.25	4.15	3.94	4.01	3.25
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1398	5.00	4.59	4.07	4.23	5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1391	5.00	4.81	4.30	4.48	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	1	2	5	4.50	647/1388		4.77	4.28	4.50	4.50
4. Were special techniques successful	1	1	1	0	1	2	3	3.86	554/ 958		4.13	3.93	4.24	3.86
	_	_	_	,	_	_			,	2.00				2.00

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	5	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	7
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	4						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	0	С	0	General	0	Under-grad	9	Non-major	2
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	1
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	9				
				?	0						

Course-Section: AGNG 422 0101

RESEARCH APPLICATIONS

Instructor: MAJESKI, ROBIN (Instr. A)

Enrollment: 9
Questionnaires: 6

Title

## University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2007

Page 47 FEB 13, 2008 Job IRBR3029

~	~		
Student	('0117'04)	k'tra liiati on	Ouestionnaire
Deddelle	COULBC	Evaluation	Oucacionnatic

			Fre	equei	ncies	3		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	1	0	1	2	2	3.67	1416/1639	3.67	4.52	4.27	4.42	3.67
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	1	2	3.67	1410/1639	3.67	4.38	4.22	4.29	3.67
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	3	2	4.17	878/1397	4.17	4.47	4.28	4.38	4.17
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	0	4	0	1	3.00	1532/1583	3.00	4.08	4.19	4.31	3.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	2	2	4.00	774/1532	4.00	4.19	4.01	4.07	4.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	1	2	2	3.67	1116/1504	3.67	4.29	4.05	4.20	3.67
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	1	2	1	1		1441/1612		4.00	4.16	4.18	3.40
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	2	3		1067/1635		4.70	4.65	4.72	4.60
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	5	0	0	3.00	1477/1579	3.50	4.06	4.08	4.21	3.50
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	1	1	3	0	3.40	1442/1518	4.00	4.45	4.43	4.51	4.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	2	1	2	4.00	1414/1520	4.50	4.76	4.70	4.75	4.50
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	3	0	2	0	2.80	1482/1517	3.70	4.38	4.27	4.34	3.70
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	1	2	1	3.60	1297/1550	4.20	4.42	4.22	4.24	4.20
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	3	1	1	0	0	0	1.50	1290/1295	1.50	4.15	3.94	4.01	1.50
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	1	0	0	0	2	3.67	1030/1398	3.67	4.59	4.07	4.23	3.67
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1391	5.00	4.81	4.30	4.48	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	496/1388	4.67	4.77	4.28	4.50	4.67
4. Were special techniques successful	3	1	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	841/ 958	3.00	4.13	3.93	4.24	3.00

Credits Ea	Earned Cum. GPA			Expected	d Grades	Reasons		Type	Majors		
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	Α	2	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	5
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	4						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	2	С	0	General	0	Under-grad	6	Non-major	1
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	0	D	0			_		-	
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	1
				P	0			responses to	be sid	nificant	
				I	0	Other	6	-			
				2	^						

Course-Section: AGNG 422 0101

RESEARCH APPLICATIONS

Instructor: (Instr. B)

Enrollment: 9

Baltimore County Fall 2007 Page 48 FEB 13, 2008 Job IRBR3029

Questionnaires: 6

Title

### Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

University of Maryland

	Frequencies		3	Instructor			Course Dept		UMBC Level		Sect			
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	Ω	1	Λ	1	2	2	3 67	1416/1639	3.67	4.52	4.27	4.42	3.67
Did the instructor make clear the expected goals		0	0	1	2	1	2		1410/1639	3.67	4.38	4.22	4.29	3.67
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	3	2	4.17	878/1397	4.17	4.47	4.28	4.38	4.17
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	0	4	0	1		1532/1583	3.00	4.08	4.19	4.31	3.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	2	7	4.00	774/1532	4.00	4.19	4.19	4.07	4.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	1	2	2		1116/1504	3.67	4.19	4.01	4.20	3.67
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	1	2	1	1		1441/1612		4.29	4.16	4.18	3.40
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	Τ		J			1067/1635	4.60	4.70	4.16	4.10	4.60
-	1	0	0	1	0	2	2				4.70	4.03	4.72	3.50
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	Τ.	U	U	Т	U	2	4	4.00	009/13/9	3.50	4.00	4.00	4.21	3.50
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	684/1518	4.00	4.45	4.43	4.51	4.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1520	4.50	4.76	4.70	4.75	4.50
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	474/1517	3.70	4.38	4.27	4.34	3.70
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	288/1550	4.20	4.42	4.22	4.24	4.20
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	4	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/1295	1.50	4.15	3.94	4.01	1.50
1														
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	1	0	0	0	2	3.67	1030/1398	3.67	4.59	4.07	4.23	3.67
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1391	5.00	4.81	4.30	4.48	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	496/1388		4.77	4.28	4.50	4.67
4. Were special techniques successful	3	1	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	841/ 958	3.00	4.13	3.93	4.24	3.00
1. Here Special Commiques Successful	5	_	3	3	_	3	O	3.00	011/ )30	3.00	1.13	3.75	1.21	3.00

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

Course-Section: AGNG 440 0101

DIVERSITY - AGING SVCS

Instructor: FRANKOWSKI, ANN

Enrollment: 5
Questionnaires: 4

Title

### University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2007

Page 49 FEB 13, 2008 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

			Fre	equei	ncies	3		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	615/1639	4.50	4.52	4.27	4.42	4.50
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	517/1639	4.50	4.38	4.22	4.29	4.50
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1397	5.00	4.47	4.28	4.38	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	476/1583	4.50	4.08	4.19	4.31	4.50
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	178/1532	4.75	4.19	4.01	4.07	4.75
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1504	5.00	4.29	4.05	4.20	5.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	3	0	3.75	1279/1612	3.75	4.00	4.16	4.18	3.75
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1635	5.00	4.70	4.65	4.72	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	4	0	4.00	889/1579	4.00	4.06	4.08	4.21	4.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	807/1518	4.50	4.45	4.43	4.51	4.50
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1520	5.00	4.76	4.70	4.75	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1517	5.00	4.38	4.27	4.34	5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1550	5.00	4.42	4.22	4.24	5.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1295	5.00	4.15	3.94	4.01	5.00
~.														
Discussion	1	0	0	0	0	2	1	4 22	F.CO./1200	4 22	4 50	4 07	4 02	4 22
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	∠ 1	T	4.33	560/1398	4.33	4.59	4.07	4.23	4.33
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	0	Τ	2	4.67 5.00	489/1391 1/1388	4.67 5.00	4.81 4.77	4.30 4.28	4.48	4.67
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	Т	U	U	U	U	U	3	5.00	1/1388	5.00	4.//	4.28	4.50	5.00

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

Course-Section: AGNG 454 0101

Title AGING & SOCIAL INSURAN

Instructor: GRIBBIN, JOSEPH

Enrollment: 15
Questionnaires: 10

## University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2007

Page 50 FEB 13, 2008 Job IRBR3029

	Ouestionnaire

			Fre	equer	ncies	3		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	171/1639	4.90	4.52	4.27	4.42	4.90
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	2	7	4.60	415/1639	4.60	4.38	4.22	4.29	4.60
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	3	6	4.50	517/1397	4.50	4.47	4.28	4.38	4.50
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	143/1583	4.90	4.08	4.19	4.31	4.90
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1532	5.00	4.19	4.01	4.07	5.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	111/1504	4.90	4.29	4.05	4.20	4.90
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	0	9	4.80	166/1612	4.80	4.00	4.16	4.18	4.80
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	811/1635	4.80	4.70	4.65	4.72	4.80
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	159/1579	4.78	4.06	4.08	4.21	4.78
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1518	5.00	4.45	4.43	4.51	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1520	5.00	4.76	4.70	4.75	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	157/1517	4.90	4.38	4.27	4.34	4.90
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1550	5.00	4.42	4.22	4.24	5.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	0	1	0	8	4.78	124/1295	4.78	4.15	3.94	4.01	4.78
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1398	5.00	4.59	4.07	4.23	5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	1	0	7	4.75	393/1391	4.75	4.81	4.30	4.48	4.75
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	255/1388	4.88	4.77	4.28	4.50	4.88
4. Were special techniques successful	3	0	0	0	1	2	4	4.43	253/ 958	4.43	4.13	3.93	4.24	4.43
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	1	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	38/ 85	4.89	4.44	4.58	4.83	4.89
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	1	0	0	0	2	0	7	4.56	45/ 82	4.56	3.28	4.52	4.49	4.56
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	36/ 78	4.89	3.44	4.47	4.56	4.89
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/ 80	5.00	5.00	4.47	4.59	5.00
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	1	0	0	0	2	2	5	4.33	42/ 82	4.33	4.33	4.16	4.02	4.33

Credits Ea	arned Cum. GPA			Expected	Grades	Reasons		Туре	Majors		
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	 А	3	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	2
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	6						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	5	C	1	General	2	Under-grad	10	Non-major	8
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	7	-			
				2	0						

Course-Section: AGNG 461 0101 University of Maryland Title INTERNSHIP/AGING SVCS Baltimore County FEB 13, 2008

ADLER, DEBORAH Instructor:

Enrollment: 2 Questionnaires: 1

Fall 2007 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire Page 51

Job IRBR3029

			Fr	eque	ncies	}		Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1138/1639	4.00	4.52	4.27	4.42	4.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1090/1639	4.00	4.38	4.22	4.29	4.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	1578/1583	2.00	4.08	4.19	4.31	2.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	1524/1532	2.00	4.19	4.01	4.07	2.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	. 0	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	1415/1504	3.00	4.29	4.05	4.20	3.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	1606/1612	1.00	4.00	4.16	4.18	1.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1497/1635	4.00	4.70	4.65	4.72	4.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	1477/1579	3.00	4.06	4.08	4.21	3.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	1481/1518	3.00	4.45	4.43	4.51	3.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1414/1520	4.00	4.76	4.70	4.75	4.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	1453/1517	3.00	4.38	4.27	4.34	3.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	1518/1550	2.00	4.42	4.22	4.24	2.00
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	69/ 85	4.00	4.44	4.58	4.83	4.00
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	82/ 82	2.00	3.28	4.52	4.49	2.00
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	78/ 78	2.00	3.44	4.47	4.56	2.00
Freq	uency	/ Dis	strib	oution	n									
Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades				Rea	asons	}			Ту	pe			Majors	
00-27 0 0.00-0.99 0 A 1		Re	quir	ed f	or Ma	jors	 3	0	 Graduat	.e	0	Majo	or	0

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

University of Maryland

LEADERSHIP & ORG CHG I Instructor: SACHS, DAVID (Instr. A) Baltimore County Fall 2007

Page 52 FEB 13, 2008 Job IRBR3029

Enrollment: 28 Questionnaires: 26

Title

			Frequencies				Inst	ructor	Course Dept		ot UMBC Level		Sect	
Ouestions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	_	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	1	25	4.96	69/1639	4.96	4.52	4.27	4.42	4.96
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	3	21	4.80	199/1639	4.80	4.38	4.22	4.26	4.80
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	14	0	0	0	3	9	4.75	282/1397	4.75	4.47	4.28	4.37	4.75
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	4	0	0	1	3	18	4.77	217/1583	4.77	4.08	4.19	4.31	4.77
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	1	3	20	4.79	152/1532	4.79	4.19	4.01	4.10	4.79
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	1	3	20	4.79	156/1504	4.79	4.29	4.05	4.29	4.79
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	0	2		18	4.67	317/1612		4.00	4.16	4.27	4.67
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	1	23	4.96	331/1635	4.96	4.70	4.65	4.81	4.96
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	7	0	0	0	0	7	12	4.63	262/1579	4.31	4.06	4.08	4.17	4.31
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	0	25	5.00	1/1518	4.87	4.45	4.43	4.49	4.87
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	25	5.00	1/1520	4.99	4.76	4.70	4.79	4.99
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	0	25	5.00	1/1517	4.82	4.38	4.27	4.32	4.82
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	1	24	4.96	70/1550	4.88	4.42	4.22	4.23	4.88
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	1	0	3	3	19	4.50	265/1295		4.15	3.94		4.55
5. Did dadiovibual teelmiques emidiee your understanding	O	O	_	O	5	5	10	1.50	203/12/3	1.55	1.13	3.71	3.73	1.33
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	0	24	4.92	129/1398	4.92	4.59	4.07	4.22	4.92
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	0	3	22	4.88	248/1391	4.88	4.81	4.30	4.47	4.88
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	3	22	4.88	244/1388	4.88	4.77	4.28	4.49	4.88
4. Were special techniques successful	1	0	0	0	1	2	22	4.84	89/ 958	4.84	4.13	3.93	4.01	4.84
T - la														
Laboratory	20	4	^	0	0	0	_	F 00	**** / 004		4444	4 10	4 42	****
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	20	4 0	0	0	0	0	Z 1		****/ 224	****	****	4.10	4.43	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	22 21	3	0	0	0	0	4 2		****/ 240 ****/ 219	****	****	4.11	3.96 4.23	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	21	3	0	0	0	0	2		****/ 219	****	****	4.44	4.23	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	21	3	0	0	0	0	2		****/ 198	****	****	4.35	4.74	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	21	3	U	U	U	U	2	5.00	***/ 198			4.18	4./4	
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	21	1	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	****/ 85	****	4.44	4.58	4.58	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	21	1	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	****/ 82	****	3.28	4.52	4.74	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	21	2	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 78	****	3.44	4.47	4.52	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	21	1	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	****/ 80	****	5.00	4.47	4.50	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	21	1	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	****/ 82	***	4.33	4.16	4.37	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	23	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.04	3.64	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	25	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 53	****	****	4.05	4.03	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	24	1	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 42	****	****	4.75	4.78	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	24	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 37	****	****	4.58	4.33	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	24	1	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 32	****	****	4.56	4.59	****
1. 11. Sometimes here 100 carry out recta desivitates		_	J	3	3	3	_	2.00	, 52			2.50	,	
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	23	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 50	***	****	4.45	4.39	****

2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	23	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00 ****/	32	****	****	4.51	4.50	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	23	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33 ****/	43	****	****	4.69	4.61	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	23	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00 ****/	32	****	****	4.37	4.31	***
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	23	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00 ****/	21	****	****	4.52	4.42	***

Course-Section: AGNG 610 0101

LEADERSHIP & ORG CHG I

Title Instructor: SACHS, DAVID (Instr. A) University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2007

Page 52 FEB 13, 2008 Job IRBR3029

Enrollment: 28 Questionnaires: 26

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits Earned Cum. GPA			Expected	l Grades	Reasons		Туре	Majors			
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	1	 А	9	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	12	Major	25
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	2						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	С	0	General	0	Under-grad	14	Non-major	1
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D	0						
Grad.	12	3.50-4.00	0	F	0	Electives	2	#### - Means	there	are not enough	a
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	14				
				?	0						

University of Maryland

Title LEADERSHIP & ORG CHG I

(Instr. B)

Baltimore County Fall 2007 Page 53 FEB 13, 2008 Job IRBR3029

Enrollment: 28
Questionnaires: 26

Instructor:

				Frequencies		Instructor			Course Dept		pt UMBC Level		Sect		
	Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank		Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
	<b>~</b>														
	General														
1	. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	1	25	4.96	69/1639	4.96	4.52	4.27	4.42	4.96
2	. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	3	21	4.80	199/1639	4.80	4.38	4.22	4.26	4.80
3	. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	14	0	0	0	3	9	4.75	282/1397	4.75	4.47	4.28	4.37	4.75
4	Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	4	0	0	1	3	18	4.77	217/1583	4.77	4.08	4.19	4.31	4.77
5	. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	1	3	20	4.79	152/1532	4.79	4.19	4.01	4.10	4.79
6	. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	1	3	20	4.79	156/1504	4.79	4.29	4.05	4.29	4.79
7	. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	0	2	4	18	4.67	317/1612	4.67	4.00	4.16	4.27	4.67
8	. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	1	23	4.96	331/1635	4.96	4.70	4.65	4.81	4.96
9	. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	0	2	13	6	4.19	725/1579	4.31	4.06	4.08	4.17	4.31
	Lecture														
	. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	3	22	4.81	360/1518	4.87	4.45	4.43	4.49	4.87
	Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	25	4.96	219/1520	4.99	4.76	4.70	4.79	4.99
	. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	2	4	19	4.68	394/1517	4.82	4.38	4.27	4.32	4.82
	. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	3	23	4.88	196/1550	4.88	4.42	4.22	4.23	4.88
5	. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	1	2	0	1	4	18	4.44	313/1295	4.55	4.15	3.94	3.95	4.55
	Discussion		_	_	_		_								
	Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	0	24	4.92	129/1398	4.92	4.59	4.07	4.22	4.92
	. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	0	3	22	4.88	248/1391	4.88	4.81	4.30	4.47	4.88
	Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	3	22	4.88	244/1388	4.88	4.77	4.28	4.49	4.88
4	. Were special techniques successful	1	0	0	0	1	2	22	4.84	89/ 958	4.84	4.13	3.93	4.01	4.84
	Laboratory														
1	Did the lab increase understanding of the material	20	4	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 224	****	****	4.10	4.43	****
	. Were you provided with adequate background information	22	0	0	0	0	0	<u>ک</u> ۱		****/ 240	***	****	4.11	3.96	***
	. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	21	3	0	0	0	0	2		****/ 219	***	****	4.44	4.23	***
	Did the lab instructor provide assistance	21	3	0	0	0	0	2		****/ 215	***	****	4.35	4.72	***
	. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	21	3	0	0	0	0	2		****/ 198	***	***	4.18	4.74	***
5	were requirements for tab reports crearry specified	ZΙ	3	U	U	U	U	۷	5.00	/ 190			4.10	4./4	
	Seminar														
1	. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	21	1	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	****/ 85	****	4.44	4.58	4.58	****
	. Was the instructor available for individual attention	21	1	0	0	0	0	4		****/ 82	****	3.28	4.52	4.74	****
	Did research projects contribute to what you learned	21	2	0	0	0	0	3		****/ 78	****	3.44	4.47	4.52	****
	Did presentations contribute to what you learned	21	1	0	0	0	1	3		****/ 80	****	5.00	4.47	4.50	****
	. Were criteria for grading made clear	21	1	0	0	0	0	4		****/ 82	****	4.33	4.16	4.37	***
	, m, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,									, -					
	Field Work														
1	. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	23	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.04	3.64	****
	. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	25	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 53	****	****	4.05	4.03	****
	. Was the instructor available for consultation	24	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 42	****	****	4.75	4.78	***
4	. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	24	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 37	****	****	4.58	4.33	****
	. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	24	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 32	***	****	4.56	4.59	***
	Self Paced														
1	. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	23	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 50	***	****	4.45	4.39	****

2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	23	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00 ****/	32	****	****	4.51	4.50	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	23	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33 ****/	43	****	****	4.69	4.61	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	23	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00 ****/	32	****	****	4.37	4.31	***
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	23	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00 ****/	21	****	****	4.52	4.42	***

Course-Section: AGNG 610 0101

LEADERSHIP & ORG CHG I

Instructor:

Title

(Instr. B)

Page 53 FEB 13, 2008 Job IRBR3029

Enrollment: 28
Questionnaires: 26

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

University of Maryland

Baltimore County

Fall 2007

Credits Earned Cum. GPA			Expected	Grades	Reasons		Type	Majors			
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	1	 А	9	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	12	Major	25
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	2						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	14	Non-major	1
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D	0						
Grad.	12	3.50-4.00	0	F	0	Electives	2	#### - Means	there	are not enough	1
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	14				
				?	0						

University of Maryland Baltimore County

Title LEADERSHIP & ORG CHG I

Instructor:

(Instr. C) Fall 2007

Page 54 FEB 13, 2008 Job IRBR3029

Enrollment:	28
Questionnaires:	26

			Frequencies			Inst	ructor	Course Dept		ot UMBC Level		Sect		
Ouestions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	_	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	1	25	4.96	69/1639	4.96	4.52	4.27	4.42	4.96
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	3	21	4.80	199/1639	4.80	4.38	4.22	4.26	4.80
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	14	0	0	0	3	9	4.75	282/1397	4.75	4.47	4.28	4.37	4.75
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	4	0	0	1	3	18	4.77	217/1583	4.77	4.08	4.19	4.31	4.77
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	1	3	20	4.79	152/1532	4.79	4.19	4.01	4.10	4.79
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	1	3	20	4.79	156/1504	4.79	4.29	4.05	4.29	4.79
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	0	2	4		4.67	317/1612		4.00	4.16	4.27	4.67
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	1	23	4.96	331/1635	4.96	4.70	4.65	4.81	4.96
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	0	5	9	7	4.10	835/1579	4.31	4.06	4.08	4.17	4.31
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	2	1	23	4.81	360/1518	4.87	4.45	4.43	4.49	4.87
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	26	5.00	1/1520	4.99	4.76	4.70	4.79	4.99
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	2	1	21	4.79	251/1517	4.82	4.38	4.27	4.32	4.82
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	3	22	4.81	288/1550	4.88	4.42	4.22	4.23	4.88
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	1	1	2	21	4.72	155/1295		4.15	3.94		4.55
J. Did addiovisual teelmiques chilanee your anderstanding		U	U	_		2	21	4.72	133/12/3	4.55	4.13	3.74	3.75	4.55
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	0	24	4.92	129/1398	4.92	4.59	4.07	4.22	4.92
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	0	3	22	4.88	248/1391	4.88	4.81	4.30	4.47	4.88
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	3	22	4.88	244/1388	4.88	4.77	4.28	4.49	4.88
4. Were special techniques successful	1	0	0	0	1	2	22	4.84	89/ 958	4.84	4.13	3.93	4.01	4.84
- 1														
Laboratory	0.0	4	_	0	0	0	_	F 00	**** / 004			4 10	4 42	****
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	20	4	0	0	0	0	2		****/ 224	****	***	4.10	4.43	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	22	0	0	0	0	0	4		****/ 240	****	****	4.11	3.96	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	21	3 3	0	0	0	0	2		****/ 219	****	****	4.44	4.23	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	21	3		0	0	0	2		****/ 215			4.35	4.72	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	21	3	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 198	***	****	4.18	4.74	* * * *
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	21	1	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	****/ 85	****	4.44	4.58	4.58	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	21	1	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	****/ 82	****	3.28	4.52	4.74	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	21	2	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 78	****	3.44	4.47	4.52	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	21	1	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	****/ 80	****	5.00	4.47	4.50	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	21	1	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	****/ 82	****	4.33	4.16	4.37	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	23	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.04	3.64	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	25	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 53	***	***	4.05	4.03	***
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	24	1	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 42	***	****	4.75	4.78	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	24	1	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 37	***	****	4.73	4.78	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	24	1	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 32	***	****	4.56	4.59	****
J. Dia conferences help you early out field accivities	27		J	J	J	J		5.00	, 32			1.50	1.57	
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	23	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 50	***	****	4.45	4.39	****

2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	23	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00 ****/	32	****	****	4.51	4.50	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	23	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33 ****/	43	****	****	4.69	4.61	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	23	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00 ****/	32	****	****	4.37	4.31	***
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	23	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00 ****/	21	****	****	4.52	4.42	***