| | | | Frequencies | | | | | 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	5	0	0	0	2	1	10	4.62	485/1576	4.62	4.39	4.30	4.11	4.62
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	5	0	0	0	3	1	9	4.46	668/1576	4.46	4.38	4.27	4.18	4.46
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	5	1	0	1	2	1	8	4.33	770/1342	4.33	4.50	4.32	4.19	4.33
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	4	0	0	1	2	3	8	4.29	826/1520	4.29	4.52	4.25	4.09	4.29
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	2	1	4	7	4.14	758/1465	4.14	4.26	4.12	4.02	4.14
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	2	4	8	4.43	498/1434	4.43	4.33	4.14	3.94	4.43
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	4	0	0	0	2	4	8	4.43	657/1547	4.43	4.55	4.19	4.10	4.43
8. How many times was class cancelled	5	0	0	0	0	5	8	4.62	987/1574	4.62	4.77	4.64	4.59	4.62
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	8	0	0	0	0	5	5	4.50	395/1554	4.50	4.11	4.10	4.01	4.50
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures 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 the instructor seem interested in 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 lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	0	0	1	1	12	4.79	298/1486	4.79	4.56	4.32	4.26	4.79
4. Did 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 audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	5	0	0	0	2	3	8	4.46	347/1277	4.46	4.25	4.03	3.91	4.46
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	1	3	8	4.58	393/1279	4.58	4.66	4.17	3.96	4.58
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	0	2	1	9	4.58	574/1270	4.58	4.74	4.35	4.09	4.58
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	0	0	1	1	10	4.75	444/1269	4.75	4.74	4.35	4.09	4.75
4. Were special techniques successful	7	1	1	0	2	0	7	4.20	400/ 878	4.20	4.34	4.05	3.91	4.20
Laboratory														
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	17	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 379	****	****	4.20	4.15	****
Seminar														
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	17	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 375	****	4.54	4.01	3.78	****
Field Work														
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	16	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/ 326	****	5.00	4.03	3.64	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	6	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	2
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	1	B	2						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	0	C	1	General	6	Under-grad	18	Non-major	16
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough			
				P	0			responses to be significant			
				I	0	Other	2				
				?	0						

```
Course-Section: AGNG 100Y 0101                    University of Maryland                              Page   21
Title       REVOLUTIONIZING AGING                     Baltimore County                            JUL  2, 2009
Instructor:    RONCH, JUDAH    (Instr. A)              Spring 2009                                 Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:    4
Questionnaires:  3                         Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire
```

```
                                                    Frequencies       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   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 0 0 1 0 0 0 2 3.67   1227/1554  3.89  4.11  4.10  4.01  3.89

                 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
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

                                Frequency Distribution
```

```
Credits Earned         Cum. GPA        Expected Grades        Reasons              Type                 Majors
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
  00-27     0        0.00-0.99   0        A    2       Required for Majors  0     Graduate     0      Major       0
  28-55     1        1.00-1.99   0        B    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
                                          P    0                                 responses to be significant
                                          I    0       Other                0
                                          ?    0
```

```
Course-Section: AGNG 100Y 0101              University of Maryland                        Page   22
Title      REVOLUTIONIZING AGING            Baltimore County                              JUL  2, 2009
Instructor:              (Instr. B)         Spring 2009                                   Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:     4
Questionnaires:  3                    Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire


                                           Frequencies      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   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


                              Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned        Cum. GPA         Expected Grades        Reasons              Type                Majors
-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
  00-27     0      0.00-0.99   0        A    2      Required for Majors   0    Graduate      0     Major      0
  28-55     1      1.00-1.99   0        B    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
                                        P    0                                 responses to be significant
                                        I    0      Other                 0
                                        ?    0
```

```
Course-Section: AGNG 100Y 0101                University of Maryland                          Page   23
Title      REVOLUTIONIZING AGING                 Baltimore County                           JUL  2, 2009
Instructor:                (Instr. C)             Spring 2009                               Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:      4
Questionnaires:  3                      Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire
```

```
                                         Frequencies       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   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


                                Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned        Cum. GPA        Expected Grades        Reasons              Type              Majors
----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
  00-27      0     0.00-0.99   0        A   2      Required for Majors  0    Graduate     0      Major       0
  28-55      1     1.00-1.99   0        B   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
                                        P   0                               responses to be significant
                                        I   0      Other                0
                                        ?   0
```

```
Course-Section: AGNG 200  0101              University of Maryland                                      Page   24
Title        AGNG PEOPLE, POL & MNG          Baltimore County                                          JUL  2, 2009
Instructor:  MAJESKI, ROBIN                  Spring 2009                                               Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:     24
Questionnaires:  20                       Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire
```

```
                                                   Frequencies        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   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  13  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  4.10  994/1520  4.28  4.52  4.25 4.26  4.10
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0  0   3   0   1   6  10  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  12  4.40  524/1434  4.29  4.33  4.14 4.06  4.40
7. Was the grading system clearly explained            0   0   1   0   1   7  11  4.35  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  12  4.42 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   2  3.35 1362/1554  3.81  4.11  4.10 4.05  3.35

                   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  4.45 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  4.26  951/1486  4.36  4.56  4.32 4.29  4.26
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     0   0   1   2   2   5  10  4.05 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  12  4.16  615/1277  3.98  4.25  4.03 4.01  4.16

                   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  736/1270  4.38  4.74  4.35 4.30  4.40
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 5 0  1   1   1   3   9  4.20  852/1269  4.37  4.74  4.35 4.29  4.20
4. Were special techniques successful                  5   1   1   0   0   2  11  4.57  197/ 878  4.34  4.34  4.05 3.92  4.57

                   Laboratory
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material  17  1   0   0   0   0   2  5.00 ****/ 234  ****  ****  4.23 4.44  ****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information 18 0 0   0   0   1   1  4.50 ****/ 240  ****  ****  4.35 4.47  ****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 18 0  0   0   0   0   2  5.00 ****/ 229  ****  ****  4.51 4.65  ****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance           18  0   0   0   0   1   1  4.50 ****/ 232  ****  ****  4.29 4.38  ****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 18  0   0   0   0   1   1  4.50 ****/ 379  ****  ****  4.20 4.29  ****

                   Seminar
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 18 0  0   0   0   1   1  4.50 ****/  85  ****  4.63  4.72 4.78  ****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 18 0 0   0   0   0   2  5.00 ****/  79  ****  4.92  4.69 4.72  ****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 18 0  0   0   0   0   2  5.00 ****/  72  ****  4.25  4.64 4.83  ****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned    18  0   0   0   0   0   2  5.00 ****/  80  ****  4.54  4.61 4.80  ****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear                18  0   0   0   0   0   2  5.00 ****/ 375  ****  4.54  4.01 4.21  ****

                   Field Work
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 18  0   0   0   0   0   2  5.00 ****/  52  ****  5.00  4.48 4.74  ****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 18  0   0   0   0   1   1  4.50 ****/  48  ****  4.00  4.40 4.71  ****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation       18  0   0   0   0   0   2  5.00 ****/  44  ****  5.00  4.73 4.69  ****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations   18  0   0   0   0   1   1  4.50 ****/  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  ****

                   Self  Paced
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  ****  ****  4.67 5.00  ****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful       18  0   0   0   0   1   1  4.50 ****/  28  ****  ****  4.78 5.00  ****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students     18  0   0   0   0   1   1  4.50 ****/ 382  ****  ****  4.08 4.39  ****
```

```
                                          Frequency Distribution


Credits Earned          Cum. GPA          Expected 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      B    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
                                           P    0                                         responses to be significant
                                           I    0          Other                 5
                                           ?    0
```

```
Course-Section: AGNG 200  0201              University of Maryland                              Page  25
Title      AGNG PEOPLE, POL & MNG           Baltimore County                                   JUL  2, 2009
Instructor:   MAJESKI, ROBIN                Spring 2009                                        Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:   31
Questionnaires: 12                      Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire


                                              Frequencies        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    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
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  4.56  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  6  4.10  446/ 878  4.34  4.34  4.05  3.92  4.10


              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  ****


              Seminar
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 10  0  0  0  0  1  1  4.50 ****/  85  ****  4.63  4.72  4.78  ****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 10 0  0  1  0  0  1  3.50 ****/  79  ****  4.92  4.69  4.72  ****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 10  0  0  1  0  0  1  3.50 ****/  72  ****  4.25  4.64  4.83  ****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned    10   0  0  1  0  0  1  3.50 ****/  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  4.00 ****/  48  ****  4.00  4.40  4.71  ****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation       10   0  0  1  0  0  1  3.50 ****/  44  ****  5.00  4.73  4.69  ****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations   10   0  0  1  0  0  1  3.50 ****/  45  ****  4.50  4.57  4.64  ****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities 10   0  0  1  0  0  1  3.50 ****/ 326  ****  5.00  4.03  4.43  ****


              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   Baltimore County   JUL 2, 2009
Instructor: MAJESKI, ROBIN   Spring 2009   Job IRBR3029
Enrollment: 31
Questionnaires: 12   Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

                                                Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned   Cum. GPA   Expected Grades   Reasons   Type   Majors
----
 00-27   2   0.00-0.99   0   A   5   Required for Majors   2   Graduate   0   Major   0
 28-55   0   1.00-1.99   0   B   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
                                          P   0   responses to be significant
                                          I   0   Other   3
                                          ?   0

```
Course-Section: AGNG 401  0101              University of Maryland                              Page  26
Title        FOUNDATIONS - AGING SV          Baltimore County                                  JUL  2, 2009
Instructor:  STEWART, MARGAR                  Spring 2009                                       Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:      14
Questionnaires:  14                    Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire
```

```
                                            Frequencies        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   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  0   5   0  0  1  0  8  4.78  275/1342  4.78  4.50  4.32  4.46  4.78
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals   0   0   0  0  0  2 12  4.86  167/1520  4.86  4.52  4.25  4.38  4.86
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0 0   0  0  1  1 12  4.79  187/1465  4.79  4.26  4.12  4.22  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  4.57 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  4.10  4.24  5.00

                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
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 2 0  0  0  0  1 11  4.92  152/1279  4.92  4.66  4.17  4.31  4.92
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 2 0  0  0  0  0 12  5.00    1/1270  5.00  4.74  4.35  4.53  5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 2 0 0  0  0  0 12  5.00    1/1269  5.00  4.74  4.35  4.55  5.00
4. Were special techniques successful                 2   0   0  0  0  2 10  4.83  125/ 878  4.83  4.34  4.05  4.33  4.83

                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  5.00 ****/  85  ****  4.63  4.72  4.77  ****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 13 0 0 0 0 0  1  5.00 ****/  79  ****  4.92  4.69  4.69  ****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 13 0 0 0 0 0  1  5.00 ****/  72  ****  4.25  4.64  4.64  ****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned   13  0   0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  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  5.00 ****/  48  ****  4.00  4.40  4.30  ****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation      13  0   0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  44  ****  5.00  4.73  4.60  ****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations  13  0   0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  45  ****  4.50  4.57  4.34  ****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities 13 0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/ 326  ****  5.00  4.03  3.97  ****
```

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	10	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	12
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	1	B	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			
				P	0			responses to be significant			
				I	0	Other	13				
				?	1						

Enrollment: 9
Questionnaires: 7   Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

```
                                                    Frequencies          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   0   0   0   1   2   4  4.43   757/1576   4.43  4.39  4.30  4.46  4.43
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    0   0   0   0   2   3   2  4.00  1138/1576   4.00  4.38  4.27  4.35  4.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   0   0   0   0   1   3   3  4.29   812/1342   4.29  4.50  4.32  4.46  4.29
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    0   0   0   0   1   2   4  4.43   648/1520   4.43  4.52  4.25  4.38  4.43
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0  0   2   1   2   1   1  2.71  1435/1465   2.71  4.26  4.12  4.22  2.71
6. Did written assignments contribute to 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 grading system clearly explained            0   0   0   1   0   0   6  4.57   445/1547   4.57  4.55  4.19  4.24  4.57
8. How many times was class cancelled                  0   0   0   0   0   3   4  4.57  1025/1574   4.57  4.77  4.64  4.69  4.57
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 0 0 0  0   3   2   2  3.86  1096/1554   3.86  4.11  4.10  4.24  3.86

              Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        0   0   0   1   0   4   2  4.00  1233/1488   4.00  4.67  4.47  4.55  4.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   0   0   0   0   0   1   6  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   2   3   2  4.00  1101/1486   4.00  4.56  4.32  4.41  4.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     0   0   0   0   1   4   2  4.14  1035/1489   4.14  4.58  4.32  4.38  4.14
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 0 6 0  0   1   0   0  3.00  ****/1277   ****  4.25  4.03  4.04  ****

              Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute 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 all students actively encouraged 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 instructor encourage fair and 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 special techniques successful                  1   2   0   0   0   1   3  4.75   139/ 878   4.75  4.34  4.05  4.33  4.75
```

                                        Frequency Distribution

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

```
Course-Section: AGNG 440  0101                   University of Maryland                              Page   28
Title      DIVERSITY - AGING SVCS                Baltimore County                                   JUL  2, 2009
Instructor:  FRANKOWSKI, ANN                     Spring 2009                                        Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:    12
Questionnaires:  9                        Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire


                                              Frequencies        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   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  3.56 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  3.78 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  3.86 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  3.56 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  4.00 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  4.67  911/1574  4.67  4.77  4.64  4.69  4.67
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 2  0   1   0   2   4   0  3.29 1381/1554  3.29  4.11  4.10  4.24  3.29


              Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared         0   0   0   0   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  3.89 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  4.00 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  4.04  4.22


              Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 0   0   1   0   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  4.17  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  ****

                                       Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned        Cum. GPA       Expected 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      B   6
 56-83     3          2.00-2.99   1      C   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
                                         P   0                                responses to be significant
                                         I   0       Other                8
                                         ?   0
```

```
Course-Section: AGNG 460  0101                University of Maryland                          Page   29
Title      INTERNSHIP - AGING SVC              Baltimore County                             JUL  2, 2009
Instructor:  MAJESKI, ROBIN Jarmin-Reisch,Lily          Spring 2009                        Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:     4
Questionnaires:  3                     Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire
```

```
                                                  Frequencies        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  0  0  0  0  2  1  4.33   861/1576  4.33  4.39  4.30  4.46  4.33
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals   0  0  0  0  0  0  3  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  1  2  4.67   339/1520  4.67  4.52  4.25  4.38  4.67
6. Did written assignments contribute to 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 the grading system clearly explained           0  0  0  0  0  0  3  5.00     1/1547  5.00  4.55  4.19  4.24  5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled                 0  0  0  0  0  0  3  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  2  4.67  263/1554  4.67  4.11  4.10  4.24  4.67

              Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures 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 the instructor seem interested in 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 lecture material presented and explained clearly  0  0  0  0  0  0  3  5.00    1/1486  5.00  4.56  4.32  4.41  5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned    0  0  0  0  0  0  3  5.00     1/1489  5.00  4.58  4.32  4.38  5.00

              Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to 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 all students actively encouraged 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 the instructor encourage fair and open discussion  0  0  0  0  0  0  3  5.00   1/1269  5.00  4.74  4.35  4.55  5.00

              Seminar
1. Were assigned topics 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 the instructor available for individual attention  0  0  0  0  0  1  2  4.67   52/  79  4.67  4.92  4.69  4.69  4.67
3. Did research projects contribute 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
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned   0  0  0  0  0  1  2  4.67   40/  80  4.67  4.54  4.61  4.52  4.67
5. Were criteria for grading made clear               0  0  0  0  0  1  2  4.67  146/ 375  4.67  4.54  4.01  3.90  4.67

              Field Work
1. Did field experience contribute to what 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 you clearly understand your evaluation criteria  1  0  0  0  1  0  1  4.00   35/  48  4.00  4.00  4.40  4.30  4.00
3. Was the instructor available for consultation      1  0  0  0  0  0  2  5.00    1/  44  5.00  5.00  4.73  4.60  5.00
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations  1  0  0  0  0  1  1  4.50   27/  45  4.50  4.50  4.57  4.34  4.50
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities  1  0  0  0  0  0  2  5.00    1/ 326  5.00  5.00  4.03  3.97  5.00

                                       Frequency Distribution

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

```
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
```

```
                                           Frequencies      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   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
```

```
                                  Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned        Cum. GPA        Expected Grades        Reasons              Type               Majors
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
  00-27      0     0.00-0.99    0      A    0      Required for Majors  0   Graduate     0     Major        1
  28-55      0     1.00-1.99    0      B    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
                                       P    1                              responses to be significant
                                       I    0      Other                1
                                       ?    0
```

```
Course-Section: AGNG 470  0101            University of Maryland                        Page   31
Title       CAPSTONE SEMINAR              Baltimore County                             JUL  2, 2009
Instructor:  BEIMFOHR, E    (Instr. A)    Spring 2009                                  Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:     8
Questionnaires:  8                        Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

                                        Frequencies        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    1  0  0  0  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 2 5 0  0  0  1  0  4.00 ****/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  1  3  4.75  505/1488  4.63  4.67  4.47  4.55  4.63
 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject    4  0  0  0  0  0  4  5.00    1/1493  4.75  4.84  4.73  4.80  4.75
 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 4  0  0  0  1  0  3  4.50  678/1486  4.63  4.56  4.32  4.41  4.63
 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned      4  0  0  0  0  1  3  4.75  378/1489  4.63  4.58  4.32  4.38  4.63
 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 4 0  0  0  0  1  3  4.75  159/1277  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

                               Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned        Cum. GPA        Expected Grades         Reasons                 Type                    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       B    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
                                        P    0                                   responses to be significant
                                        I    0        Other                7
                                        ?    1
```

```
                                                        Frequencies       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  1   0   0  0  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
```

Frequency Distribution

```
Credits Earned         Cum. GPA          Expected Grades            Reasons                  Type                    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        B    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
                                          P    0                                      responses to be significant
                                          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 explained				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 explained 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
B	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             University of Maryland                              Page   33
Title      STRATEGY & MARKETING             Baltimore County                              JUL  2, 2009
Instructor:  FULMER, WILLIAM                   Spring 2009                                Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:     28
Questionnaires:  27                 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire


                                          Frequencies       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    1   0  1  0  0 10 15  4.46  697/1576  4.46  4.39  4.30  4.43  4.46
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals     1   0  0  1  5  6 14  4.27  929/1576  4.27  4.38  4.27  4.32  4.27
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals    2  16  0  0  1  4  4  4.33  770/1342  4.33  4.50  4.32  4.38  4.33
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals     1   1  0  2  5 13  5  3.84 1205/1520  3.84  4.52  4.25  4.36  3.84
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 2   0  0  1  2  6 16  4.48  395/1465  4.48  4.26  4.12  4.25  4.48
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 2 0  1  2  6 11  5  3.68 1132/1434  3.68  4.33  4.14  4.35  3.68
7. Was the grading system clearly explained             2   1  0  2  3  6 13  4.25  838/1547  4.25  4.55  4.19  4.24  4.25
8. How many times was class cancelled                   2   0  0  0  0  0 25  5.00    1/1574  5.00  4.77  4.64  4.75  5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 6 0  0  1  0  9 11  4.43  504/1554  4.43  4.11  4.10  4.18  4.43


            Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared         2   0  0  0  0  2 23  4.92  198/1488  4.92  4.67  4.47  4.52  4.92
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject    2   0  0  0  0  1 24  4.96  223/1493  4.96  4.84  4.73  4.80  4.96
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 2   0  0  0  2  3 20  4.72  393/1486  4.72  4.56  4.32  4.37  4.72
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned      2   0  1  0  1  7 16  4.48  719/1489  4.48  4.58  4.32  4.38  4.48
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 2  0  0  1  0 10 14  4.48  328/1277  4.48  4.25  4.03  4.08  4.48


            Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 2   0  0  0  2 10 13  4.44  510/1279  4.44  4.66  4.17  4.34  4.44
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 2   0  0  1  2  7 15  4.44  696/1270  4.44  4.74  4.35  4.53  4.44
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 2  0  1  0  0  5 19  4.64  551/1269  4.64  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 assigned topics 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 25 0  0  0  0  1  1  4.50 ****/  79  ****  4.92  4.69  4.77  ****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 25  0  0  1  0  0  1  3.50 ****/  72  ****  4.25  4.64  4.70  ****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned     25  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  Paced
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 study questions make clear the expected goal     26  0  0  0  0  1  0  4.00 ****/  24  ****  ****  4.83  4.80  ****

                                    Frequency Distribution


Credits Earned        Cum. GPA        Expected Grades         Reasons              Type             Majors
----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
  00-27     1      0.00-0.99    0       A    3        Required for Majors  0    Graduate     8     Major       0
  28-55     0      1.00-1.99    0       B    9
  56-83     0      2.00-2.99    0       C    0        General              0    Under-grad  19     Non-major  27
  84-150    0      3.00-3.49    0       D    0
  Grad.     8      3.50-4.00    1       F    0        Electives            0    #### - Means there are not enough
                                        P    0                                 responses to be significant
                                        I    0        Other               16
                                        ?    1
```