Title REVOLUTIONIZING AGING

Instructor: RONCH, JUDAH

Enrollment:

21 Questionnaires: 18 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

University of Maryland Page 20 Baltimore County JUL 2, 2009 Spring 2009 Job IRBR3029

	Ouestions), TD	373	Fro		ncies		_		tructor	Course	_		Level	
		Question	5 		NR 	NA 			3 	4 	5 	Mean	Rank 	Mean 	Mean	Mean 	Mean	Mean
		Genera	1															
		ew insights,ski			5	0	0	0	2	1	10	4.62	,		4.39	4.30	4.11	
		ctor make clear			5	0	0	0	3	1	9	4.46	668/1576	4.46	4.38	4.27	4.18	4.46
	_	uestions reflec		_	5	1	0	1	2	1	8	4.33	770/1342		4.50	4.32	4.19	4.33
		uations reflect			4	0	0	1	2	3	8	4.29	826/1520	4.29	4.52	4.25	4.09	4.29
				what you learned	4	0	0	2	1	4	7		758/1465		4.26	4.12	4.02	4.14
		_		what you learned	4	0	0	0	2	4	8		498/1434		4.33	4.14	3.94	4.43
	_	g system clearl		ined	4	0	0	0	2	4	8		657/1547		4.55	4.19	4.10	4.43
	-	was class canc			5	0	0	0	0	5	8		987/1574		4.77	4.64	4.59	4.62
9. How wo	ould you	grade the overa	ll teac	ning effectiveness	8	0	0	0	0	5	5	4.50	395/1554	4.50	4.11	4.10	4.01	4.50
		Lectur	е															
1. Were t	the instr	uctor's lecture	s well]	prepared	4	0	0	0	0	1	13	4.93	198/1488	4.93	4.67	4.47	4.41	4.93
2. Did th	he instru	ctor seem inter	ested i	n the subject	4	0	0	0	1	0	13	4.86	683/1493	4.86	4.84	4.73	4.65	4.86
3. Was le	s lecture material presented and explained clear d the lectures contribute to what you learned			xplained clearly	4	0	0	0	1	1	12	4.79	298/1486	4.79	4.56	4.32	4.26	4.79
4. Did th	the lectures contribute to what you learned				5	0	0	0	0	2	11	4.85	263/1489	4.85	4.58	4.32	4.22	4.85
5. Did au	id audiovisual techniques enhance your understand:				5	0	0	0	2	3	8	4.46	347/1277	4.46	4.25	4.03	3.91	4.46
		Disque	gion															
1 Did al	Discussion d class discussions contribute to what you lear				6	0	0	0	1	3	8	4.58	393/1279	4.58	4.66	4.17	3.96	4.58
	d class discussions contribute to what you learn				6	0	0	0	2	1	9	4.58		4.58	4.74	4.35	4.09	4.58
	re all students actively encouraged to participa				6	0	0	0	1	1	10	4.75	444/1269	4.75	4.74	4.35	4.09	
	ere all students actively encouraged to participa id the instructor encourage fair and open discuss ere special techniques successful				7	1	1	0	2	0	7		,				3.91	
		T -1																
5. Were r	requireme	Labora nts for lab rep	-	early specified	17	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 379	****	****	4.20	4.15	****
J. Were I	requireme	iicb for tab fep	oreb er	sarry specifica	Ξ,	Ü	Ü	Ü	Ü	_	J	1.00	, 313			1.20	1.15	
F		Semina	=		1.0	0	0	0	-	0	0	2 00	**** / 255	ate ate ate ate	4 - 4	4 01	2 50	ale ale ale ale
5. Were	criteria	for grading mad	e clear		17	0	0	0	1	0	U	3.00	****/ 375	***	4.54	4.01	3.78	****
		Field	Work															
5. Did co	onference	s help you carr	y out f	ield activities	16	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/ 326	****	5.00	4.03	3.64	****
				Frequ	ıency	Dist	trib	ution	ı									
	_ ,							_					_				'	
Credits H	edits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Gra							Rea	asons				Ту]	pe 			Majors	
00-27						Red	quir	ed fo	or Ma	jor	s	1	Graduat	е	0	Majo	or	2
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	1	В 2														
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	0	C 1		Gei	nera	1				6	Under-g	rad 1	.8	Non-	-major	16
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	1	D 0														
Grad.						Ele	ecti	ves				0	#### - 1	Means t	here a	are not	enoug	h
	Р 0												respons	es to b	e sign	nifican	ıt	
				I 0		Otl	her					2						
				? 0														

Course-Section: AGNG 100Y 0101 University of Maryland Title REVOLUTIONIZING AGING

Baltimore County Spring 2009 RONCH, JUDAH (Instr. A)

Page 21

JUL 2, 2009

Instructor:	RONCH, JUDAH	(Instr. A)	Spring 2009
Enrollment:	4		
Questionnaires:	3		Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

	Frequencies							Ins	tructor	Course	Dept.	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank		Mean	-	Mean	Mean
General	0	^	^	0	1	0	0	4 22	061/1576	4 22	4 20	4 20	4 11	4 22
 Did you gain new insights, skills from this course Did the instructor make clear the expected goals 	0	0	0	0	1 1	0	2	4.33	861/1576 851/1576	4.33	4.39 4.38	4.30	4.11 4.18	4.33
	0	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1342	5.00	4.50	4.27	4.18	5.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1542	5.00	4.50	4.25	4.19	5.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1465	5.00	4.26	4.12	4.02	5.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	878/1434		4.33	4.14	3.94	4.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1547	5.00	4.55	4.19	4.10	5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	911/1574	4.67	4.77	4.64	4.59	4.67
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	1	0	0	0	2		1227/1554		4.11	4.10	4.01	
J. How would jou grade one overdir oddoning crreotiveness	ŭ	Ü	-	ŭ	ŭ	ŭ	_	3.07	122,,1331	3.03		1.10	1.01	5.05
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1488	5.00	4.67	4.47	4.41	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1493	5.00	4.84	4.73	4.65	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1486	5.00	4.56	4.32	4.26	5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1489	5.00	4.58	4.32	4.22	5.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	1020/1277	3.50	4.25	4.03	3.91	3.50
Discussion														
	_	0	^	0	0	0	1	F 00	1 /1 070	F 00	1	4 1 7	2 06	г оо
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1279 1/1270	5.00 5.00	4.66 4.74	4.17	3.96 4.09	5.00 5.00
 Were all students actively encouraged to participate Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/12/0	5.00	4.74	4.35	4.09	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	2	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	464/ 878	4.00	4.74	4.35	3.91	4.00
4. Were special techniques successful	2	U	U	U	U	1	U	4.00	404/ 0/0	4.00	4.34	4.05	3.91	4.00
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	61/ 85	4.50	4.63	4.72	4.52	4.50
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	1	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 79	5.00	4.92	4.69	4.52	5.00
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	1	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	59/ 72	4.00	4.25	4.64	4.43	4.00
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	48/ 80	4.50	4.54	4.61	4.55	4.50
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	152/ 375	4.50	4.54	4.01	3.78	4.50
Theorem					_									
Frequ	ency	DIS	Lripi	10101	[]									

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	l Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	 А	2	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	В	0						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	1	General	2	Under-grad	3	Non-major	3
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	1	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	nificant	
				I	0	Other	0	_			
				2	0						

Course-Section: AGNG 100Y 0101 University of Maryland Title REVOLUTIONIZING AGING Baltimore County JUL 2, 2009

Instructor: (Instr. B)

Enrollment: 4 Questionnaires: 3

Spring 2009 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire Page 22

Job IRBR3029

	Overtions						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 vo	nı gain n	ew insights,ski	_	om this course	0	0	0	Ο	1	0	2	4.33	861/1576	4.33	4.39	4.30	4.11	4.33
_	-	ctor make clear			0	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	851/1576	4.33	4.38	4.27	4.18	4.33
		uestions reflec			0	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1342	5.00	4.50	4.32	4.19	5.00
	_	uations reflect		1 5	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1520	5.00	4.52	4.25	4.09	5.00
				what you learned	0	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1465	5.00	4.26	4.12	4.02	5.00
	-	_		to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	878/1434	4.00	4.33	4.14	3.94	4.00
		g system clearl		-	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1547	5.00	4.55	4.19	4.10	5.00
	_	was class cand		zinca	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	911/1574	4.67	4.77	4.64	4.59	4.67
				ching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	924/1554		4.11	4.10		3.89
J. 110W WO	would you grade the overall teaching effectiv Discussion				_	Ü	Ü	o	J	_	O	1.00	J21/1331	3.05		1.10	1.01	3.05
1. Did cl	class discussions contribute to what you learn				2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1279	5.00	4.66	4.17	3.96	5.00
2. Were a	e all students actively encouraged to participa				2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1270	5.00	4.74	4.35	4.09	5.00
3. Did th	the instructor encourage fair and open discuss				2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1269	5.00	4.74	4.35	4.09	5.00
4. Were s	old the instructor encourage fair and open discuss. Were special techniques successful				2	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	464/ 878	4.00	4.34	4.05	3.91	4.00
		Semina																
1 1/2					1	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	61/ 05	4.50	1 (2	4.72	4 50	4 50
	_	-		e announced theme	1	-	•	0	0	T	1		61/ 85		4.63		4.52	4.50
				dividual attention	1	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 79	5.00	4.92	4.69	4.52	5.00
	_	-		what you learned	1	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	59/ 72	4.00	4.25	4.64	4.43	4.00
_		ons contribute		-	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	48/ 80	4.50	4.54	4.61	4.55	4.50
5. Were c	riteria	for grading mad	e clea	C .	1	0	U	U	U	1	1	4.50	152/ 375	4.50	4.54	4.01	3.78	4.50
				Frequ	iency	Dis	trib	utio:	n									
a 1'. =		a an-						_					_					
Credits E	cs Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grad							Re	asons				Ту]	pe 			Majors	;
00-27	-27 0 0.00-0.99 0 A 2					Red	quir	ed f	or Ma	jor	3	0	Graduat	e	0	Majo	or	0
28-55	5 1 1.00-1.99 0 B 0			в 0			_			-								
56-83						Ger	nera	1				2	Under-g	rad	3	Non-	-major	3
84-150																		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	0	F 0		Ele	ecti [.]	ves				1	#### - 1	Means t	here a	are not	enoug	ſh
				P 0									respons	es to b	e sign	nifican	ıt	
												•	-		_			

Other

0

Ι

?

0

0

Course-Section: AGNG 100Y 0101 University of Maryland Title REVOLUTIONIZING AGING Baltimore County JUL 2, 2009

Instructor: (Instr. C)

Enrollment: 4 Questionnaires: 3

Spring 2009 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire Page 23

			Fre	-	ncies		_		ructor	Course	_	UMBC		
Questions	NR	NA	Τ	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	0	2	4.33	861/1576	4.33	4.39	4.30	4.11	4.33
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	851/1576	4.33	4.38	4.27	4.18	4.33
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1342	5.00	4.50	4.32	4.19	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1520	5.00	4.52	4.25	4.09	5.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1465	5.00	4.26	4.12	4.02	5.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	878/1434	4.00	4.33	4.14	3.94	4.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1547	5.00	4.55	4.19	4.10	5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	911/1574	4.67	4.77	4.64	4.59	4.67
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	924/1554	3.89	4.11	4.10	4.01	3.89
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1279	5.00	4.66	4.17	3.96	5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1270	5.00	4.74	4.35	4.09	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1269	5.00	4.74	4.35	4.09	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	2	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	464/ 878	4.00	4.34	4.05	3.91	4.00
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	61/ 85	4.50	4.63	4.72	4.52	4.50
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	1	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 79	5.00	4.92	4.69	4.52	5.00
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	1	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	59/ 72	4.00	4.25	4.64	4.43	4.00
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	48/ 80	4.50	4.54	4.61	4.55	4.50
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	152/ 375	4.50	4.54	4.01	3.78	4.50
Frequ	ency	Dist	tribu	ution	n									
Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades				Rea	asons	3			Ту	pe			Majors	;
00-27 0 0.00-0.99 0 A 2		Red	quire	ed fo	or Ma	ajors	3	0	Graduat	e	0	Majo	r	0
28-55 1 1.00-1.99 0 B 0														

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	d Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	А	2	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	В	0						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	1	General	2	Under-grad	3	Non-major	3
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	1	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	0	-			
				2	0						

Title AGNG PEOPLE, POL & MNG

Instructor: MAJESKI, ROBIN

Enrollment: 24 Questionnaires: 20

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

University of Maryland

Baltimore County

Spring 2009

Page 24 JUL 2, 2009 Job IRBR3029

			Fre	equer	ncies	\$		Inst	tructor	Course	Dept.	UMBC:	Level	Sect
Ouestions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank		_		Mean	
× · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	1	2	2	5	10	4.05	1118/1576	4.21	4.39	4.30	4.35	4.05
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	0	3	3	13	4.35	825/1576	4.40	4.38	4.27	4.32	4.35
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	2	0	2	3		4.25	835/1342	4.49	4.50	4.32	4.41	4.25
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	0	5			4.10	994/1520	4.28		4.25	4.26	4.10
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	3	0	1	6		4.00	850/1465	3.95	4.26	4.12	4.09	4.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	1	6		4.40	524/1434	4.29		4.14	4.06	4.40
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	0	1	7			737/1547	4.38	4.55	4.19	4.22	4.35
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	1	0	1	5			1177/1574	4.71	4.77	4.64	4.62	4.42
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	2	1	5	7			1362/1554				4.05	
J. now would you grade the overall reaching effectiveness	3	O	2	_	3	,	2	3.33	1302/1331	3.01	1.11	1.10	1.05	3.33
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	1	1	1	6	11	4 25	1111/1488	4.40	4.67	4.47	4.44	4.25
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	1	1	0	4	14		1255/1493	4.63	4.84	4.73	4.75	4.45
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	1	1	1	5	11		951/1486	4.36		4.32	4.29	4.26
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	2	2	5	10		1091/1489	4.39	4.58	4.32	4.31	4.05
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	2	1	1	3		4.16	615/1277	3.98	4.25	4.03	4.01	4.16
5. Did addiovisual techniques enhance your understanding		U	2	1	1	3	12	4.10	015/12//	3.90	4.25	4.03	4.01	4.10
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	1	0	0	4	10	4.47	488/1279	4.46	4.66	4.17	4.14	4.47
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	1	0	2	1	11	4.40	736/1279	4.38		4.17	4.14	4.47
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	1	1	1	3	9	4.20	852/1269	4.30	4.74	4.35	4.30	4.40
4. Were special techniques successful	5 5	1	1	0	0	2		4.57	197/ 878		4.74			4.57
4. Were special techniques successiul	5	Τ.	1	U	U	2	TT	4.57	19// 0/0	4.34	4.34	4.05	3.94	4.57
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	17	1	0	0	0	0	2	г оо	****/ 234	++++	****	4.23	1 11	****
9		0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	, -	****	****	4.23	4.44	****
 Were you provided with adequate background information Were necessary materials available for lab activities 	18	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 240	****	****		4.47 4.65	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	18 18	0	0	0	0	1	1		****/ 229 ****/ 232	****	****	4.51 4.29	4.05	****
<u>-</u>	18	0	0	0	0	1	1		****/ 379	****	****	4.29	4.38	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	18	U	U	U	U	Т	Τ.	4.50	***/ 3/9		* * * *	4.20	4.29	
Comingu														
Seminar	18	0	0	0	0	1	1	4 50	****/ 85	****	1 (2	4.72	4 70	***
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	18	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 85 ****/ 79	****	4.63 4.92		4.78	****
 Was the instructor available for individual attention Did research projects contribute to what you learned 	18	0	0	0	0	0	2		****/ 72	****		4.69	4.72 4.83	****
	18	0	0	0	0	0	2		****/ 80	****	4.25	4.64		****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned 5. Were criteria for grading made clear	18	0	0	0	0	0	2		****/ 375	****	4.54 4.54	4.61 4.01	4.80 4.21	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	18	U	U	U	U	U	2	5.00	****/ 3/5		4.54	4.01	4.21	
Field Work														
	1.0	0	0	0	0	0	2	г оо	****/ 52	****	г оо	4 40	4.74	****
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	18	-	•	-	0	-			,	****	5.00	4.48		****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	18	0	0	0		1	1	4.50	,	****	4.00	4.40	4.71	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	18	0	0	0	0	0	2		****/ 44	****	5.00	4.73	4.69	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	18	-	-	-	-	1	1		****/ 45		4.50	4.57	4.64	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	18	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 326	****	5.00	4.03	4.43	* * * * *
0.15 7 1														
Self Paced	1.0	0	0	0	1	0	1	4 00	 / 40	****	****	4 60	F 00	****
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 40	****	****	4.60	5.00	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	18	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 24	****	****	4.83	5.00	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	18	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 35 ****/ 28	****	****	4.67	5.00	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	18	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	, 20	****	****	4.78	5.00	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	18	U	U	U	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 382	****	^ ^ * *	4.08	4.39	^ ^ * *

Title AGNG PEOPLE, POL & MNG

Instructor: MAJESKI, ROBIN

Enrollment: 24 Questionnaires: 20

Spring 2009

Page 24 JUL 2, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

University of Maryland

Baltimore County

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	d Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	4	0.00-0.99	1	A	10	Required for Majors	4	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	В	4						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	3	C	0	General	5	Under-grad	20	Non-major	20
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	1	Electives	2	#### - Means	there	are not enough	ı
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	5	_			
				?	0						

Title AGNG PEOPLE, POL & MNG

Instructor: MAJESKI, ROBIN

Enrollment: 31 Questionnaires: 12 University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2009

Page 25 JUL 2, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

			Fre	miar	ncies			Inct	ructor	Course	Dent	TIMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NΑ	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	_	Mean	Mean	Mean
׫«» «														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	0	0	2	3	6	4.36	829/1576	4.21	4.39	4.30	4.35	4.36
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	2	2	7	4.45	683/1576	4.40	4.38	4.27	4.32	4.45
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	1	9	4.73	333/1342	4.49	4.50	4.32	4.41	4.73
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	2	2	7	4.45	597/1520	4.28	4.52	4.25	4.26	4.45
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	2	0	1	2	6	3.91	989/1465	3.95	4.26	4.12	4.09	3.91
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	4	1	6	4.18	758/1434	4.29	4.33	4.14	4.06	4.18
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	1	0	3	6	4.40	690/1547	4.38	4.55	4.19	4.22	4.40
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/1574	4.71	4.77	4.64	4.62	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	3	2	6	4.27	692/1554	3.81	4.11	4.10	4.05	4.27
Lecture	_				•	_	_		000/4400	4 40				
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	2	1	8	4.55	822/1488	4.40	4.67	4.47	4.44	4.55
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	2	9	4.82	784/1493	4.63	4.84	4.73	4.75	4.82
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	2	2	7	4.45	749/1486	4.36		4.32	4.29	4.45
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	1	9	4.73	420/1489	4.39	4.58	4.32	4.31	4.73
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	1	1	1	1	3	4	3.80	856/1277	3.98	4.25	4.03	4.01	3.80
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	1	1	8	4.45	499/1279	4.46	4.66	4.17	4.14	4.45
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	2	3	6	4.36	763/1270	4.38	4.74	4.35	4.30	4.36
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	2	1	8	4.55	620/1269	4.37	4.74	4.35	4.29	4.55
4. Were special techniques successful	1	1	1	0	2	1		4.10	446/ 878		4.34			4.10
1. Here breefar teelmiques buccessiai	_	_	-	Ü	_	_	Ü	1.10	1107 070	1.51	1.51	1.05	3.72	1.10
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	10	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 234	****	****	4.23	4.44	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	10	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/ 240	****	****	4.35	4.47	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	10	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 229	****	****	4.51	4.65	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	10	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/ 232	****	****	4.29	4.38	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	10	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/ 379	****	****	4.20	4.29	****
O and a sec														
Seminar	1.0	_	^	^	0	-	1	4 50	****/ OF	****	1 (2	4 70	4 70	***
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	10	0	0	0	0	1	1		****/ 85	****	4.63	4.72	4.78	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	10	0	0	1	0	0	1		****/ 79		4.92	4.69	4.72	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	1	0	0	1		****/ 72	***	4.25	4.64	4.83	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	1	0	0	1		****/ 80	****	4.54	4.61	4.80	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	10	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/ 375	****	4.54	4.01	4.21	***
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	10	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 52	****	5.00	4.48	4.74	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	10	0	0	0	1	0	1		****/ 48	****	4.00	4.40	4.71	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	10	0	0	1	0	0	1		****/ 44	****	5.00	4.73	4.69	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	10	0	0	1	0	0	1		****/ 45	****	4.50	4.57	4.64	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	10	0	0	1	0	0	1		****/ 326	****	5.00	4.03	4.43	****
11. 11. 11. 11. 11. 11. 11. 11. 11. 11.		-	-	_	-	-	_	2.20	, 120					
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 40	****	****	4.60	5.00	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	10	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 24	****	****	4.83	5.00	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	10	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/ 35	****	****	4.67	5.00	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	10	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/ 28	****	****	4.78	5.00	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	10	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/ 382	****	****	4.08	4.39	****

Title AGNG PEOPLE, POL & MNG

Instructor: MAJESKI, ROBIN

Enrollment: 31
Questionnaires: 12

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2009 Page 25 JUL 2, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	 А	5	Required for Majors	2	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	3						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	3	C	0	General	5	Under-grad	12	Non-major	12
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	0	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	h
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	3	-		_	
				?	0						

Title FOUNDATIONS - AGING SV

STEWART, MARGAR

Instructor:

Enrollment: 14 Questionnaires: 14

University of Maryland

Baltimore County Spring 2009

Page 26 JUL 2, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

			Fre	equer	ncies	S		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General		•	_	•	_	_			0	4 50		4 00		4 50
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	1	12	4.79	266/1576	4.79	4.39	4.30	4.46	4.79
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	2	11	4.71	324/1576	4.71	4.38	4.27	4.35	4.71
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	5 0	0	0	1	0	8 12	4.78 4.86	275/1342 167/1520	4.78 4.86	4.50 4.52	4.32	4.46 4.38	4.78 4.86
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	1	12	4.79	187/1465	4.79	4.32	4.25	4.30	4.79
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	2	11	4.71	226/1434	4.71	4.33	4.14	4.30	4.71
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	2	11	4.71	280/1547	4.71	4.55	4.19	4.24	4.71
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	6	8		1025/1574	4.57	4.77	4.64	4.69	4.57
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1554	5.00	4.11		4.24	
J. now would for grade the overall codening circultumess	,	Ü	Ü	O	O	O		3.00	1/1331	3.00		1.10	1.21	3.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	14	5.00	1/1488	5.00	4.67	4.47	4.55	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	0	13	4.86	683/1493	4.86	4.84	4.73	4.80	4.86
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	1	12	4.79	298/1486	4.79	4.56	4.32	4.41	4.79
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	12	4.86	251/1489	4.86	4.58	4.32	4.38	4.86
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	0	0	2	11	4.85	121/1277	4.85	4.25	4.03	4.04	4.85
_,														
Discussion	•	0	0	0	0	-		4 00	150/1050	4 00	1	4 1 1	4 21	4 00
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	U T	11	4.92	152/1279	4.92	4.66	4.17	4.31	4.92
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	0	0	12 12	5.00	1/1270 1/1269	5.00 5.00	4.74	4.35	4.53	5.00 5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	2	0	0	0	0	0	10	4.83	1/1269	4.83	4.74 4.34	4.35	4.55	
4. Were special techniques successiul	۷	U	U	U	U	۷	10	4.03	125/ 0/0	4.03	4.34	4.05	4.33	4.03
Laboratory														
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 240	****	****	4.35	4.45	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 229	****	****	4.51	4.70	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	13	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 85	****	4.63	4.72	4.77	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	13	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 79	****	4.92	4.69	4.69	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 72	****	4.25	4.64	4.64	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 80	****	4.54	4.61	4.52	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 375	****	4.54	4.01	3.90	***
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 52	****	5.00	4.48	4.70	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	13	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 48	****	4.00	4.40	4.30	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	13	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 44	****	5.00	4.73	4.60	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	13	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 45	****	4.50	4.57	4.34	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	13	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 326	****	5.00	4.03	3.97	****
	-	-	-	-	-				,					
_														

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	d Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	 А	10	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	12
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	1	В	2						
56-83	5	2.00-2.99	4	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	14	Non-major	2
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	n
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	13	_			
				2	1						

Course-Section: AGNG 422 0101 University of Maryland Title RESEARCH APPLICATIONS Baltimore County Instructor: ASH, JEFFREY R Spring 2009

Enrollment:

Questionnaires: 7

9

University of Maryland Page 27
Baltimore County JUL 2, 2009
Spring 2009 Job IRBR3029

- · ·			
Student	Course	Evaluation	Ouestionnaire

							Fre	equer	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	vou gain n	ew insights,ski	_	m this course	0	0	0	0	1	2	4	4.43	757/1576	4.43	4.39	4.30	4.46	4.43
		ctor make clear			0	0	0	0	2	3	2		1138/1576	4.00	4.38	4.27	4.35	4.00
		uestions reflec			0	0	0	0	1	3	3	4.29	812/1342	4.29	4.50	4.32	4.46	4.29
		uations reflect			0	0	0	0	1	2	4	4.43	648/1520	4.43	4.52	4.25	4.38	4.43
				what you learned	0	0	2	1	2	1	1	2.71	1435/1465	2.71	4.26	4.12	4.22	2.71
	_	-		o what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	226/1434	4.71	4.33	4.14	4.30	4.71
7. Was	the gradin	g system clearl	y expla	ined	0	0	0	1	0	0	6	4.57	445/1547	4.57	4.55	4.19	4.24	4.57
		was class canc			0	0	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	1025/1574	4.57	4.77	4.64	4.69	4.57
				hing effectiveness	0	0	0	0	3	2	2	3.86	1096/1554	3.86	4.11	4.10	4.24	3.86
		Lectur																
1 Were	e the instr	uctor's lecture		nrenared	0	0	0	1	Λ	1	2	4 00	1233/1488	4.00	4.67	4.47	4.55	4.00
		ctor seem inter			0	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	683/1493	4.86	4.84	4.73	4.80	4.86
			0	0	0	0	2	3	2		1101/1486	4.00	4.56	4.32	4.41	4.00		
	s lecture material presented and explained clear d the lectures contribute to what you learned					0	0	0	1	4	2		1035/1489	4.14	4.58	4.32	4.38	4.14
	id the lectures contribute to what you learned id audiovisual techniques enhance your understand					6	0	0	1	0	0		****/1277	****	4.25	4.03	4.04	****
					_	-	-	-	_	-	•		,					
		Discus	sion															
1. Did	class disc	ussions contrib	ute to	what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	335/1279	4.67	4.66	4.17	4.31	4.67
2. Were	e all stude	nts actively en	courage	d to participate	1	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	326/1270	4.83	4.74	4.35	4.53	4.83
3. Did	the instru	ctor encourage	fair an	d open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	353/1269	4.83	4.74	4.35	4.55	4.83
4. Were	e special t	echniques succe	ssful		1	2	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	139/ 878	4.75	4.34	4.05	4.33	4.75
				Frequ	encs	, Die	trib	1+ i 01	า									
				11040	circy	DIB	CLID	20101	1									
Credits	s Earned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	asons	5			Ty	pe			Majors	;
00-27	 2	A 3		Re	 guire	ed fo	or Ma	ijors	 }	0	Graduat	 e	0	Majo	 r	 5		
28-55						_				J								-
56-83						Gei	nera:	L				0	Under-g	rad	7	Non-	major	2
84-150	150 0 3.00-3.49 2 D 0																3	
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	0	F 0		Ele	ecti	<i>r</i> es				0	#### - 1	Means t	here a	re not	enoue	jh
				P 0									respons	es to b	e sign	ifican	ıt	•
				I 0		Ot1	her					7	-					
				? 0														

Course-Section: AGNG 440 0101 Title

University of Maryland DIVERSITY - AGING SVCS Baltimore County Spring 2009

Instructor: FRANKOWSKI, ANN

Enrollment: 12 Questionnaires: 9

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Page 28 JUL 2, 2009 Job IRBR3029

			Fre	equei	ncies	5		Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	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	3	4	2	3.89	1257/1576	3.89	4.39	4.30	4.46	3.89
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	2	3	1	3		1380/1576	3.56	4.38	4.27	4.35	3.56
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	3	2	3		1123/1342	3.78	4.50	4.32	4.46	3.78
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	1	0	0	3	2	2		1199/1520	3.86	4.52	4.25	4.38	3.86
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	2	1	1	4		1225/1465	3.56	4.26	4.12	4.22	3.56
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	1	3	4	4.00	878/1434	4.00	4.33	4.14	4.30	4.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	1	1	0	6		1041/1547	4.00	4.55	4.19	4.24	4.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	3	6		911/1574		4.77	4.64	4.69	4.67
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	1	0	2	4	0		1381/1554		4.11	4.10		3.29
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	Ο	0	5	4	4.44	945/1488	4.44	4.67	4.47	4.55	4.44
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	607/1493	4.89	4.84	4.73	4.80	4.89
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	4	2	3		1204/1486	3.89	4.56	4.32	4.41	3.89
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	2	2	4		1118/1489	4.00	4.58	4.32	4.38	4.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	1	1	2	5	4.22	560/1277	4.22	4.25	4.03		4.22
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	Ο	1	3	4	4.00	802/1279	4.00	4.66	4.17	4.31	4.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	1	0	2	1	5	4.00	928/1270	4.00	4.74	4.35	4.53	4.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	1	0	2	1	5	4.00	928/1269	4.00	4.74	4.35	4.55	4.00
4. Were special techniques successful	0	3	0	1	0	2	3	4.17	415/ 878		4.34	4.05	4.33	4.17
Self Paced														
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	8	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 382	****	****	4.08	3.88	****
Frequ	ency	Dist	trib	ution	ı									
Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades	-			De	asons				Τv				Maiors	

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expecte	d Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	3	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	8
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	6						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	1	С	0	General	0	Under-grad	9	Non-major	1
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	1
				P	0			responses to	be sig	nificant	
				I	0	Other	8	-	_		
				2	Ω						

Course-Section: AGNG 460 0101 University of Maryland Page Title INTERNSHIP - AGING SVC Baltimore County JUL 2, 2009

Spring 2009

Instructor: MAJESKI, ROBIN Jarmin-Reisch, Lily

Enrollment: 4 Questionnaires: 3

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

29

							Fr	equei	ncies	5		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
		Question	ıs		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		Genera	 .1															
1. Did vo	u gain ne	w insights,ski		m this course	0	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	861/1576	4.33	4.39	4.30	4.46	4.33
		tor make clear			0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1576	5.00	4.38	4.27	4.35	5.00
4. Did ot	her evalu	ations reflect	the ex	pected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	339/1520	4.67	4.52	4.25	4.38	4.67
6. Did wr	itten ass	ignments contr	ribute t	o what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	270/1434	4.67	4.33	4.14	4.30	4.67
7. Was th	e grading	system clearl	y expla	ined	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1547	5.00	4.55	4.19	4.24	5.00
8. How ma	ny times	was class cand	elled		0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1574	5.00	4.77	4.64	4.69	5.00
9. How wo	uld you g	rade the overa	ll teac	hing effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	263/1554	4.67	4.11	4.10	4.24	4.67
		Lectur	re .															
1. Were t	he instru	ctor's lecture	es well	prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1488	5.00	4.67	4.47	4.55	5.00
2. Did th	e instruc	tor seem inter	ested i	n the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1493	5.00	4.84	4.73	4.80	5.00
3. Was le	cture mat	erial presente	ed and e	xplained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1486	5.00	4.56	4.32	4.41	5.00
4. Did th	e lecture	s contribute t	o what	you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1489	5.00	4.58	4.32	4.38	5.00
		Discus																
			what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	335/1279	4.67	4.66	4.17	4.31	4.67	
2. Were a	ll studen	its actively en	d to participate	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1270	5.00	4.74	4.35	4.53	5.00	
3. Did th	e instruc	tor encourage	d open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1269	5.00	4.74	4.35	4.55	5.00	
		Semina																
1. Were a	ssigned t	opics relevant	to the	announced theme	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/ 85	5.00	4.63	4.72	4.77	5.00
2. Was th	e instruc	tor available	for ind	ividual attention	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	52/ 79	4.67	4.92	4.69	4.69	4.67
3. Did re	search pr	ojects contrib	oute to	what you learned	0	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 72	5.00	4.25	4.64	4.64	5.00
_		ns contribute		-	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	40/ 80	4.67	4.54	4.61	4.52	4.67
5. Were c	riteria f	or grading mad	le clear		0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	146/ 375	4.67	4.54	4.01	3.90	4.67
		Field	Work															
				hat you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 52	5.00	5.00	4.48	4.70	5.00
2. Did yo	u clearly	understand yo	ur eval	uation criteria	1	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	35/ 48	4.00	4.00	4.40	4.30	4.00
3. Was th	e instruc	tor available	for con	sultation	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 44	5.00	5.00	4.73	4.60	5.00
	_	could you disc	-		1	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	27/ 45	4.50	4.50	4.57	4.34	4.50
5. Did co	nferences	help you carr	y out f	ield activities	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 326	5.00	5.00	4.03	3.97	5.00
			Frequ	iency	Dis	trib	utio	n										
Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades				Rea	asons	5			Ту	pe			Majors	1	
														- 				
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 1		Re	quir	ed fo	or Ma	ijors	S	0	Graduat	e	0	Majo	or	1
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B 0		~		1				0	TT1		2	37		2
56-83	1 1	2.00-2.99	0 1	C 0		Ge	nera	Т				0	Under-g	rad	3	Non-	-major	2
84-150 Grad.	U	3.00-3.49 3.50-4.00	0	D 0 F 0		E J	0a+ -					0	#### - 1	Moana +	horo -	.xo	ono	·h
Grad.	U	3.50-4.00	U	P 2		Electives						U	respons				_	11
				I O		O+1	her					3	respons	בט נט ג	c argi	ııııcaı		
				? 0		00.						J						

Course-Section: AGNG 462 0101 University of Maryland Page 30
Title INTERNSHIP AGING SVCS Baltimore County JUL 2, 2009
Instructor: MAJESKI, ROBIN Jarman-Reisch, Lily Spring 2009 Job IRBR3029

Enrollment: 1
Questionnaires: 1 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

			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	0	1	5.00	1/1576	5.00	4.39	4.30	4.46	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1576	5.00	4.38	4.27	4.35	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1520	5.00	4.52	4.25	4.38	5.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1434	5.00	4.33	4.14	4.30	5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1574	5.00	4.77	4.64	4.69	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	924/1554	4.00	4.11	4.10	4.24	4.00

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	 А	0	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	1
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	0
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	1
				P	1			responses to	be sig	nificant	
				I	0	Other	1	-			
				2	Λ						

Course-Section: AGNG 470 0101 University of Maryland Title Baltimore County JUL 2, 2009 CAPSTONE SEMINAR

Instructor: BEIMFOHR, E (Instr. A)

Enrollment: 8 Questionnaires: 8

Spring 2009 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire Page 31

		Fr	eque:	ncie	S		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
1	0	0	0	2	1	4	4.29	916/1576	4.29	4.39	4.30	4.46	4.29
0	0	0	0	2	2	4	4.25	939/1576	4.25	4.38	4.27	4.35	4.25
1	3	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	835/1342	4.25	4.50	4.32	4.46	4.25
1	0	0	0	0	4	3	4.43	648/1520	4.43	4.52	4.25	4.38	4.43
0	4	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	647/1465	4.25	4.26	4.12	4.22	4.25
l 0	3	0	0	0	3	2	4.40	524/1434	4.40	4.33	4.14	4.30	4.40
0	0	0	1	0	3	4	4.25	838/1547	4.25	4.55	4.19	4.24	4.25
0	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1574	5.00	4.77	4.64	4.69	5.00
2	5	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1554	4.43	4.11	4.10	4.24	4.43
4	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	505/1488	4.63	4.67	4.47	4.55	4.63
4	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1493		4.84	4.73	4.80	4.75
4	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	678/1486	4.63	4.56	4.32	4.41	4.63
4	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	378/1489	4.63	4.58	4.32	4.38	4.63
4	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	159/1277	4.38	4.25	4.03	4.04	4.38
1	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	296/1279	4.71	4.66	4.17	4.31	4.71
1		0	0	0	0	7		,					5.00
1	0	0	0	0	1	6		,		4.74	4.35	4.55	4.86
1	1	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	164/ 878	4.67	4.34	4.05	4.33	4.67
quency	7 Dis	trib	utio:	n									
\$			Re	ason	s			Ту	pe			Majors	;
	1 0 1 1 1 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0	1 0 0 0 1 3 1 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0	NR NA 1 1 0 0 0 0 0 1 3 0 1 0 0 0 4 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 0 0 1 0 0 1 0 0 1 0 0 1 0 0 1 0 0 1 0 0 1 0 0 1 0 0 1 0 0 1 0 0 1 0 0 1 0 0 1 0 0 1 0 0 1 0 0 1 0 0 1 0 0 1 0 0 1 0 0 1 0 0 1 0 0 1 0 0 1 0 0 1 0 0 1 0 0 1 0 0 1 0 0 1 0 0 1 0 0 1 0 0 1 0 0 1 0 0 1 0 0 1 0 0 1 0 0 1 0 0 1 0 0 1 0 0 1 0 0 1 0 0 1 0 0 1 0 0 1 0 0 1 0 0 1 0 0 1 0 0 1 0 0 1 0 0 1 0 0 1 0 0 1 0 0 1 0 0 1 0 0 1 0 0 1 0 0 1 0 0 1 0 0 1 0 0 1 0 0 1 0 0 1 0 0 1 0 0 1 0 0 1 0 0 1 0 0 1 0 0 1 0 0 1 0 0 1 0 0 1 0 0 1 0 0 1 0 0 1 0 0 1 0 0 1 0 0 1 0 0 1 0 0 1 0 0 1 0 0 1 0 0 1 0 0 1 0 0 1 0 0 1 0 0 1 0 0 1 0 0 1 0 0 1 0 0 1 0 0 1 0 0 1 0 0 1 0 0 1 0 0 1 0 0 1 0 0 1 0 0 1 0 0 1 0 0 1 0 0 1 0 0 1 0 0 1 0 0 1 0 0 1 0 0 1 0 0 1 0 0 1 0 0 1 0 0 1 0 0 1 0 0 1 0 0 1 0 0 1 0 0 1 0 0 1 0 0 1 0 0 1 0 0 1 0 0 1 0 0 1 0 0 1 0 0 1 0 0 1 0 0 1 0 0 1 0 0 1 0 0 1 0 0 1 0 0 1 0 0 1 0 0 1 0 0 1 0 0 1 0 0 1 0 0 1 0 0 1 0 0 1 0 0 1 0 0 1 0 0 1 0 0 1 0 0 1 0 0 1 0 0 1 0 0 1 0 0 1 0 0 1 0 0 1 0 0 1 0 0 1 0 0 1 0 0 1 0 0 1 0 0 1 0 0 1 0 0 1 0 0 1 0 0 1 0 0 1 0 0 1 0 0 1 0 0 1 0 0 1 0 0 1 0 0 1 0 0 1 0 0 1 0 0 1 0 0 1 0 0 1 0 0 1 0 0 1 0 0 1 0 0 1 0 0 1 0 0 1 0 0 1 0 0 1 0 0 1 0 0 1 0 0 1 0 0 1 0 0 1 0 0 1 0 0 1 0 0 1 0 0 1 0 0 1 0 0 1 0 0 1 0 0 1 0 0 1 0 0 1 0 0 1 0 0 1 0 0 1 0 0 1 0 0 1 0 0 1 0 0 1 0 0 1 0 0 1 0 0 1 0 0 1 0 0 1 0 0 1 0 0 1 0 0 1 0 0 1 0 0 1 0 0 1 0 0 1 0 0 1 0 0 1 0 0 1 0 0 1 0 0 1 0 0 1 0 0 1 0 0 1 0 0 1 0 0 1 0 0 1 0 0 1 0 0 1 0 0 1 0 0 1 0 0 1 0 0 1 0 0 1 0 0 1 0 0 1 0 0 1 0 0 1 0 0 1 0 0 1 0 0 1 0 0 1 0 0 1 0 0 1 0 0 1 0 0 1 0 0 1 0 0 1 0 0 1 0 0 1 0 0 1 0 0 1 0 0 1 0 0 1 0 0 1 0 0 1 0 0 1 0 0 1 0 0 1 0 0 1 0 0 1 0 0 1 0 0 1 0 0 1 0 0 1 0 0 1 0 0 1 0 0 1 0 0 1 0 0 1 0 0 1 0 0 1 0 0 1 0 0 1 0 0 1 0 0 1 0 0 1 0 0 1 0 0 1 0 0 1 0 0 1 0 0 1 0 0 1 0 0 1 0 0 1 0 0 1 0 0 1 0 0 1 0 0 1 0 0 1 0 0 1 0 0 1 0 0 1 0 0 1 0 0 1 0 0 1 0 0 1 0 0 1 0 0 1 0 0 1 0 0 1 0 0 1 0 0 1 0 0 1 0 0 1 0 0 1 0 0 1 0 0 1 0 0 1 0 0 1 0 0 1 0 0 1 0 0 1 0 0 1 0 0 1 0 0 1 0 0 1 0 0 1 0 0 1 0 0 1 0 0 1 0 0 1 0 0 1 0 0 1 0 0 1 0 0 1 0 0 1 0 0 1 0 0 1 0 0 1 0	NR NA 1 2 1 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 3 0 0 1 0 0 0 0 4 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 0	NR NA 1 2 3 1 0 0 0 2 0 0 0 0 2 1 3 0 0 1 1 0 0 0 0 0 4 0 0 1 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0	1 0 0 0 2 1 0 0 0 0 2 2 1 3 0 0 1 1 1 0 0 0 0 4 0 4 0 0 1 1 1 0 0 0 0 3 0 0 0 1 0 3 0 0 0 0 1 0 3 0 0 0 0 1 0 3 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 4 0 0 0 0 1 1 0 0 0 0 1 1 0 0 0 0 1 1 0 0 0 0	NR NA 1 2 3 4 5 1 0 0 0 0 2 1 4 0 0 0 0 0 2 2 4 1 3 0 0 1 1 2 1 0 0 0 0 0 4 3 0 4 0 0 1 1 2 0 0 0 0 0 3 2 0 0 0 1 0 3 4 0 0 0 0 0 0 3 4 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 8 2 5 0 0 0 1 3 4 0 0 0 0 1 0 3 4 0 0 0 0 1 3 4 0 0 0 0 1 3 4 0 0 0 0 1 3 4 0 0 0 0 1 3 4 0 0 0 0 1 3 4 0 0 0 0 1 3 4 0 0 0 0 1 3 4 0 0 0 0 1 3 4 0 0 0 0 1 3 4 0 0 0 0 1 3 4 0 0 0 0 1 3 4 0 0 0 0 1 3 4 0 0 0 0 1 3 4 0 0 0 0 1 3 4 0 0 0 0 1 3 4 0 0 0 0 1 3 4 0 0 0 0 1 3 4 0 0 0 0 1 3 4 0 0 0 0 1 3 4 0 0 0 0 1 3 4 0 0 0 0 0 1 3 4 0 0 0 0 0 1 3 4 0 0 0 0 0 1 3 4 0 0 0 0 0 1 3 4 0 0 0 0 0 1 3 4 0 0 0 0 0 1 3 4 0 0 0 0 0 1 3 4 0 0 0 0 0 1 3 4 0 0 0 0 0 1 3 4 0 0 0 0 0 1 3 4 0 0 0 0 0 1 3 4 0 0 0 0 0 1 3 4 0 0 0 0 0 1 3 4 0 0 0 0 0 1 3 4 0 0 0 0 0 1 3 4 0 0 0 0 0 1 3 4 0 0 0 0 0 1 3 4 0 0 0 0 0 1 3 4 0 0 0 0 0 1 3 4 0 0 0 0 0 1 3 4 0 0 0 0 0 1 3 4 0 0 0 0 0 1 3 4 0 0 0 0 0 1 3 4 0 0 0 0 0 1 3 4 0 0 0 0 0 1 3 4 0 0 0 0 0 1 3 4 0 0 0 0 0 1 3 4 0 0 0 0 0 1 3 4 0 0 0 0 0 1 3 4 0 0 0 0 0 1 3 4 0 0 0 0 0 1 3 4 0 0 0 0 0 1 3 4 0 0 0 0 0 1 3 4 0 0 0 0 0 1 3 4 0 0 0 0 0 1 3 4 0 0 0 0 0 1 3 4 0 0 0 0 0 1 3 4 0 0 0 0 0 1 3 4 0 0 0 0 0 1 3 4 0 0 0 0 0 1 3 4 0 0 0 0 0 1 3 4 0 0 0 0 0 1 3 4 0 0 0 0 0 1 3 4 0 0 0 0 0 1 3 4 0 0 0 0 0 1 3 4 0 0 0 0 0 1 3 4 0 0 0 0 0 1 3 4 0 0 0 0 0 1 3 4 0 0 0 0 0 1 3 4 0 0 0 0 0 1 3 4 0 0 0 0 0 1 3 4 0 0 0 0 0 1 3 4 0 0 0 0 0 1 3 4 0 0 0 0 0 1 3 4 0 0 0 0 0 1 3 4 0 0 0 0 0 1 3 4 0 0 0 0 0 1 3 4 0 0 0 0 0 1 3 4 0 0 0 0 0 1 3 4 0 0 0 0 0 1 3 4 0 0 0 0 0 1 3 4 0 0 0 0 0 1 3 4 0 0 0 0 0 1 3 4 0 0 0 0 0 1 3 4 0 0 0 0 0 1 3 4 0 0 0 0 0 1 3 4 0 0 0 0 0 1 3 4 0 0 0 0 0 1 3 4 0 0 0 0 0 1 3 4 0 0 0 0 0 1 3 4 0 0 0 0 0 1 3 4 0 0 0 0 0 1 3 4 0 0 0 0 0 1 3 4 0 0 0 0 0 1 3 4 0 0 0 0 0 1 3 4 0 0 0 0 0 1 3 4 0 0 0 0 0 1 3 4 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 3 4 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 3 4 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 3 4 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 3 4 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 3 4 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 3 4 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 1 3 4 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 1 3 4 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 1 3 4 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 1 3 4 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 1 3 4 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 1 3 4 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 1 3 4 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 1 3 4 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 1 3	NR NA 1 2 3 4 5 Mean 1 0 0 0 0 2 1 4 4.29 0 0 0 0 0 2 2 4 4.25 1 3 0 0 1 1 2 4.25 1 0 0 0 0 4 3 4.43 0 4 0 0 1 1 2 4.25 0 0 0 0 0 3 2 4.40 0 0 0 1 0 3 4 4.25 0 0 0 0 0 0 8 5.00 8 2 5 0 0 0 1 3 4.75 4 0 0 0 0 1 3 4.75 4 0 0 0 0 1 3 4.75 4 0 0 0 0 1 3 4.75 4 0 0 0 0 1 3 4.75 4 0 0 0 0 1 3 4.75 1 0 0 0 0 1 3 4.75 1 0 0 0 0 1 3 4.75 4 0 0 0 0 1 3 4.75 4 0 0 0 0 1 3 4.75 4 0 0 0 0 1 3 4.75 4 0 0 0 0 1 3 4.75 4 0 0 0 0 1 3 4.75 4 0 0 0 0 1 3 4.75 4 0 0 0 0 1 3 4.75 4 0 0 0 0 1 3 4.75 4 0 0 0 0 1 3 4.75 4 0 0 0 0 1 3 4.75 4 0 0 0 0 1 3 4.75 4 0 0 0 0 1 3 4.75 4 0 0 0 0 1 3 4.75 4 0 0 0 0 1 3 4.75 4 0 0 0 0 0 1 3 4.75 4 0 0 0 0 0 1 3 4.75	NR NA 1 2 3 4 5 Mean Rank 1 0 0 0 2 1 4 4.29 916/1576 0 0 0 0 2 2 4 4.25 939/1576 1 3 0 0 1 1 2 4.25 835/1342 1 0 0 0 0 4 3 4.43 648/1520 0 4 0 0 1 1 2 4.25 647/1465 1 0 3 0 0 0 3 2 4.40 524/1434 0 0 0 1 0 3 4 4.25 838/1547 0 0 0 0 1 0 3 4 4.25 838/1547 0 0 0 0 0 1 0 3 4 4.25 838/1547 0 0 0 0 0 1 0 3 4 4.25 838/1547 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 8 5.00 1/1574 5 2 5 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/1554 4 0 0 0 0 0 1 3 4.75 505/1488 4 0 0 0 0 1 3 4.75 505/1488 4 0 0 0 0 1 3 4.75 378/1489 4 0 0 0 0 1 3 4.75 378/1489 4 0 0 0 0 1 3 4.75 159/1277 1 0 0 0 0 2 5 4.71 296/1279 1 0 0 0 0 0 7 5.00 1/1270 1 0 0 0 0 0 2 4 4.67 164/ 878 Quency Distribution	NR NA 1 2 3 4 5 Mean Rank Mean 1 0 0 0 2 1 4 4.29 916/1576 4.29 0 0 0 0 0 2 2 4 4.25 939/1576 4.25 1 3 0 0 1 1 2 4.25 835/1342 4.25 1 0 0 0 0 4 3 4.43 648/1520 4.43 0 4 0 0 1 1 2 4.25 647/1465 4.25 3 0 3 0 0 0 3 2 4.40 524/1434 4.40 0 0 0 1 0 3 4 4.25 838/1547 4.25 0 0 0 0 0 1 0 3 4 4.25 838/1547 4.25 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 8 5.00 1/1574 5.00 8 2 5 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/1554 4.43 4 0 0 0 0 1 0 3 4.75 505/1488 4.63 4 0 0 0 0 1 0 3 4.50 678/1486 4.63 4 0 0 0 0 1 3 4.75 378/1489 4.63 4 0 0 0 0 1 3 4.75 378/1489 4.63 4 0 0 0 0 1 3 4.75 378/1489 4.63 4 0 0 0 0 0 1 3 4.75 159/1277 4.38 1 0 0 0 0 2 5 4.71 296/1279 4.71 1 0 0 0 0 0 7 5.00 1/1270 5.00 1 0 0 0 0 1 6 4.86 332/1269 4.86 1 1 0 0 0 2 4 4.67 164/ 878 4.67	NR NA 1 2 3 4 5 Mean Rank Mean Mean 1 0 0 0 2 1 4 4.29 916/1576 4.29 4.39 0 0 0 0 0 2 2 4 4.25 939/1576 4.25 4.38 1 3 0 0 1 1 2 4.25 835/1342 4.25 4.50 1 0 0 0 0 0 4 3 4.43 648/1520 4.43 4.52 0 4 0 0 1 1 2 4.25 647/1465 4.25 4.26 1 0 3 0 0 0 3 2 4.40 524/1434 4.40 4.33 0 0 0 1 0 3 4 4.25 838/1547 4.25 4.55 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 8 5.00 1/1574 5.00 4.77 8 2 5 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/1554 4.43 4.11 4 0 0 0 0 0 1 3 4.75 505/1488 4.63 4.67 4 0 0 0 0 1 0 3 4.50 678/1486 4.63 4.56 4 0 0 0 0 1 3 4.75 378/1489 4.63 4.58 4 0 0 0 0 1 3 4.75 159/1277 4.38 4.25 1 0 0 0 0 0 2 5 4.71 296/1279 4.71 4.66 1 0 0 0 0 0 1 6 4.86 332/1269 4.86 4.74 1 1 0 0 0 0 2 4 4.67 164/878 4.67 4.34 Quency Distribution	NR NA 1 2 3 4 5 Mean Rank Mean Mean Mean 1 0 0 0 0 2 1 4 4.29 916/1576 4.29 4.39 4.30 0 0 0 0 0 2 2 4 4.25 939/1576 4.25 4.38 4.27 1 3 0 0 1 1 2 4.25 835/1342 4.25 4.50 4.32 1 0 0 0 0 0 4 3 4.43 648/1520 4.43 4.52 4.25 0 4 0 0 1 1 2 4.25 647/1465 4.25 4.26 4.12 1 0 0 0 0 3 2 4.40 524/1434 4.40 4.33 4.14 0 0 0 0 1 0 3 4 4.25 838/1547 4.25 4.55 4.19 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 8 5.00 1/1574 5.00 4.77 4.64 2 5 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/1554 4.43 4.11 4.10 4 0 0 0 0 1 0 3 4.75 505/1488 4.63 4.67 4.47 4 0 0 0 0 1 0 3 4.50 678/1486 4.63 4.56 4.32 4 0 0 0 0 1 3 3 4.75 378/1489 4.63 4.58 4.32 4 0 0 0 0 1 3 4.75 159/1277 4.38 4.25 4.03 1 0 0 0 0 0 2 5 4.71 296/1279 4.71 4.66 4.17 1 0 0 0 0 0 1 6 4.86 332/1269 4.86 4.74 4.35 1 1 0 0 0 0 2 4 4.67 164/ 878 4.67 4.34 4.05	NR NA 1 2 3 4 5 Mean Rank Mean Mean Mean Mean Mean 1 0 0 0 0 2 1 4 4.29 916/1576 4.29 4.39 4.30 4.46 0 0 0 0 0 2 2 4 4.25 939/1576 4.25 4.38 4.27 4.35 1 3 0 0 1 1 2 4.25 835/1342 4.25 4.50 4.32 4.46 1 0 0 0 0 0 4 3 4.43 648/1520 4.43 4.52 4.25 4.38 0 4 0 0 1 1 2 4.25 647/1465 4.25 4.26 4.12 4.22 1 0 3 0 0 0 3 2 4.40 524/1434 4.40 4.33 4.14 4.30 0 0 0 1 0 3 4 4.25 838/1547 4.25 4.55 4.19 4.24 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 8 5.00 1/1574 5.00 4.77 4.64 4.69 1 0 0 0 0 0 1 0 3 4.00 ****/1554 4.43 4.11 4.10 4.24 4 0 0 0 0 0 1 0 3 4.50 678/1488 4.63 4.67 4.47 4.55 4 0 0 0 0 0 1 3 4.75 505/1488 4.63 4.56 4.32 4.41 4 0 0 0 0 1 3 3 4.75 505/1488 4.63 4.56 4.32 4.41 4 0 0 0 0 1 3 3 4.75 578/1489 4.63 4.58 4.32 4.38 4 0 0 0 0 1 3 3 4.75 578/1489 4.63 4.58 4.32 4.38 4 0 0 0 0 1 3 3 4.75 159/1277 4.38 4.25 4.03 4.04

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

Course-Section: AGNG 470 0101 University of Maryland Page 32
Title CAPSTONE SEMINAR Baltimore County JUL 2, 2009

Instructor: (Instr. B)

Enrollment: 8
Questionnaires: 8

Spring 2009
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	1	Ω	Λ	Λ	2	1	4	4.29	916/1576	4.29	4.39	4.30	4.46	4.29
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	2	4	4.25	939/1576	4.25	4.38	4.27	4.35	4.25
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	3	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	835/1342	4.25	4.50	4.32	4.46	4.25
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	4	3	4.43	648/1520	4.43	4.52	4.25	4.38	4.43
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	4	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	647/1465	4.25	4.26	4.12	4.22	4.25
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	3	0	0	0	3	2	4.40	524/1434	4.40	4.33	4.14	4.30	4.40
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	0	3	4	4.25	838/1547	4.25	4.55	4.19	4.24	4.25
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1574	5.00	4.77	4.64	4.69	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	4	3	4.43	504/1554	4.43	4.11	4.10	4.24	4.43
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	870/1488	4.63	4.67	4.47	4.55	4.63
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	1210/1493	4.75	4.84	4.73	4.80	4.75
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	339/1486	4.63	4.56	4.32	4.41	4.63
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	696/1489	4.63	4.58	4.32	4.38	4.63
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	1	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	692/1277	4.38	4.25	4.03	4.04	4.38
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	296/1279	4.71	4.66	4.17	4.31	4.71
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1270	5.00	4.74	4.35	4.53	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	332/1269	4.86	4.74	4.35	4.55	4.86
4. Were special techniques successful	1	1	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	164/ 878	4.67	4.34	4.05	4.33	4.67
Frequ	iency	Dist	ribu	ution	n									
_	_													

Credits E	Carned	Cum. GPA		Expected	d Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	6	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	8
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	1						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	8	Non-major	0
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	L
				P	0			responses to	be sig	nificant	
				I	0	Other	7				
				?	1						

SCEQ Data for Spring 2009 MAGS 605 0101 - MANAG & POLI ECONOMICS - Joseph Gribbin

	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean
General								
Did you gain new insights, skills from this course					3	3	20	4.65
Did the instructor make clear the expected goals				1	2	8	15	4.42
Did exam questions reflect expected goals		4			2	14	6	3.54
Did other evaluations reflect expected goals	1	1	1		7	8	8	3.76
Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned					2	6	18	4.62
Did written assignments contribute to what you learned				2	11	7	6	3.65
Was the grading system clearly explaned				1	1	3	21	4.69
How many times was class cancled							26	5.00
How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness					1	3	22	4.81
Lecture								
Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1					2	23	4.92
Did the isstructor seem interested in the subject							26	5.00
Was lecture material presented and explaned clearly	1				2	9	14	4.48
Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1				2	6	17	4.60
Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding				1	2	5	18	4.54
Discussion								
Did class dicussions contrubute to what you learned				1		10	15	4.50
Were all students actively encouraged to participate				1	1	10	14	4.42
Encourage diverse points of view?					6	9	11	4.19
Were special techniques successfull in producing relevant discussion		2			3	11	10	3.96

Credits Earned	N
00-27	23
Don't Recall	3
Cum GPA	
3.00-3.49	1
3.50-4.00	2
Don't Recall	23
Expected Grades	
A	6
В	15
?	5
Reasons	
Required for majors	22
Missing	4
Student Type	
Graduate	10
Missing	16

Majors	
MAGS	24
Blank	2

Course-Section: AGNG 624 0100 Title

STRATEGY & MARKETING

Instructor: FULMER, WILLIAM

Enrollment: 28 Questionnaires: 27

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

University of Maryland Page 33 Baltimore County JUL 2, 2009 Spring 2009 Job IRBR3029

Questions				NR	NA	Fre	eque: 2	ncie 3	s 4	5	Inst Mean	tructor Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean		
		General																	
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course							1	0	0	10	15	4.46	697/1576	4.46	4.39	4.30	4.43	4.46	
			1	0	0	1	5	6	14	4.27	929/1576		4.38	4.27	4.32	4.27			
	Did the instructor make clear the expected goals Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals								1	4	4	4.33	770/1342		4.50	4.32	4.38	4.33	
4. Did oth	2 1	16 1	0	0 2	5	13	5		1205/1520		4.52	4.25	4.36	3.84					
5. Did ass	2	0	0	1	2	6	16	4.48	395/1465		4.26	4.12	4.25	4.48					
	2	0	1	2	6	11	5		1132/1434		4.33	4.14	4.35	3.68					
	6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 7. Was the grading system clearly explained							2	3	6	13	4.25	838/1547		4.55	4.19	4.24	4.25	
	8. How many times was class cancelled							0	0	0	25	5.00	1/1574		4.77	4.64	4.75	5.00	
	-			ning effectiveness	2 6	0	0	1	0	9	11	4.43	504/1554		4.11	4.10	4.18	4.43	
		Lecture	<u>:</u>																
1. Were th	he instru	ctor's lectures		prepared	2	0	0	0	0	2	23	4.92	198/1488	4.92	4.67	4.47	4.52	4.92	
		tor seem intere			2	0	0	0	0	1	24	4.96	223/1493		4.84	4.73	4.80	4.96	
				xplained clearly	2	0	0	0	2	3	20	4.72	393/1486		4.56	4.32	4.37	4.72	
		s contribute to			2	0	1	0	1	7	16	4.48	719/1489		4.58	4.32	4.38	4.48	
				our understanding	2	0	0	1	0	10		4.48	328/1277		4.25	4.03	4.08	4.48	
		Discuss	sion																
1. Did cla	ass discu	ssions contribu	ite to v	what vou learned	2	0	0	0	2	10	13	4.44	510/1279	4.44	4.66	4.17	4.34	4.44	
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate							0	1	2	7	15	4.44	696/1270		4.74	4.35	4.53	4.44	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion						0 0	1	0	0	5	19	4.64	551/1269		4.74	4.35	4.55	4.64	
4. Were special techniques successful					2	5	0	1	5	5	9	4.10	446/ 878	4.10	4.34	4.05	4.11	4.10	
		Seminar	:																
1. Were as	ssigned t	opics relevant	to the	announced theme	25	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 85	****	4.63	4.72	4.79	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention						0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 79	****	4.92	4.69	4.77	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned						0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/ 72	***	4.25	4.64	4.70	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned						0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 80	***	4.54	4.61	4.70	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear				25	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 375	****	4.54	4.01	4.10	****		
		Self F	aced																
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned				26	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 40	****	****	4.60	4.50	****		
2. Did st	udy quest	ions make clear	the ex	xpected goal	26	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 24	****	****	4.83	4.80	****	
				Frequ	ency	Dis	trib	utio:	n										
Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades			Reasons					Ту	ype		Majors		5		
00-27	 1	0.00-0.99	0	A 3		Red	quired for Major				0	 Graduat	 e 8		Major		0		
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В 9			,	_		. ,								-	
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C 0		Gei	nera:	1				0	Under-grad 19			Non-	major	27	
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D 0									3				1.011		
Grad.	8	3.50-4.00	1	F 0		Ele	ecti	ves			0		#### - Means there a				are not enough		
				P 0									respons				_		
				I 0		Otl	her				1	.6	<u> </u>						
				? 1															