Course-Section: GERO 703 0101 University of Maryland Page 943 Title POLI ANA AGING Baltimore County JAN 21, 2006 Instructor: MILLER, NANCY A Fall 2005 Job IRBR3029 Enrollment: 8

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

		Frequencies

Questionnaires: 6

	Frequencies					Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect		
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	2	3	4.33	854/1674	4.33	4.23	4.27	4.44	4.33
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	3	4.50	578/1674	4.50	4.26	4.23	4.34	4.50
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	1	0	0	2	2	3.80	1285/1609	3.80	4.23	4.22	4.34	3.80
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	224/1585	4.67	4.04	3.96	4.23	4.67
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	283/1535	4.60	4.08	4.08	4.27	4.60
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	330/1651	4.67	4.20	4.18	4.32	4.67
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1673	5.00	4.65	4.69	4.78	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	4	2	4.33	615/1656	4.33	4.06	4.07	4.15	4.33
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	663/1586	4.67	4.43	4.43	4.50	4.67
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1585	5.00	4.72	4.69	4.79	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	3	2	4.17	1025/1582	4.17	4.30	4.26	4.33	4.17
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	3	3	4.50	692/1575	4.50	4.32	4.27	4.30	4.50
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	3	1	1	1	0	0	2.00	1359/1380	2.00	3.94	3.94	3.85	2.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	173/1520	4.83	4.14	4.01	4.19	4.83
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1515	5.00	4.37	4.24	4.47	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	323/1511	4.83	4.37	4.27	4.49	4.83
4. Were special techniques successful	0	4	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	881/ 994	3.00	3.97	3.94	4.07	3.00

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: GERO 750 0101 University of Maryland Title THEORY/METHODS I Baltimore County JAN 21, 2006

Instructor: MORGAN, LESLIE (Instr. A)

Enrollment: 5

Questionnaires: 5

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Fall 2005

Page 944

Job IRBR3029

							Frequencies				Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect	
	Questions			NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
		Genera	 1															
1 Did voi	u dain ne	ew insights,ski	_	m this course	0	0	0	0	2	2	1	3 80	1385/1674	3.80	4.23	4.27	4.44	3.80
			ke clear the expected goals					0	1	3	1		1146/1674	4.00	4.26	4.23	4.34	4.00
		ations reflect			0	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	374/1609	4.60	4.23	4.22	4.34	4.60
				what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60		4.60	4.04	3.96	4.23	4.60
				o what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	283/1535	4.60	4.08	4.08	4.27	4.60
		g system clearl			0	0	0	1	1	1	2		1289/1651	3.80	4.20	4.18	4.32	3.80
		was class cance			0	1	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	958/1673	4.75	4.65	4.69	4.78	4.75
				hing effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	3	1	4.25	719/1656	4.29	4.06	4.07	4.15	4.29
		Lecture	_															
1 Were th	he instr	actor's lecture	_	prepared	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	389/1586	4.53	4.43	4.43	4.50	4.53
		ctor seem inter			0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1585	5.00	4.72	4.69	4.79	5.00
				explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	525/1582	4.55	4.30	4.26	4.33	4.55
		es contribute to			0	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	579/1575	4.55	4.32	4.27	4.30	4.55
				our understanding	0	2	1	0	0	0	2		962/1380		3.94			3.50
J. Dia au	aiovibaai	r ccciniiques em	nance y	our understanding	Ü	2	_	O	Ü	O	2	3.07	702/1300	3.30	3.71	3.71	3.03	3.30
		Discus			_		_	_		_	_							
				what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	338/1520		4.14		4.19	4.60
				d to participate	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1515	5.00	4.37	4.24	4.47	5.00
				d open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1511	5.00	4.37	4.27	4.49	5.00
4. Were sp	pecial te	echniques succe	sstul		0	4	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 994	****	3.97	3.94	4.07	****
		Semina	r															
1. Were as	ssigned t	opics relevant	to the	announced theme	0	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	53/ 103	4.60	4.39	4.41	4.56	4.60
2. Was the	e instruc	ctor available :	for ind	lividual attention	0	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	65/ 101	4.40	4.33	4.48	4.62	4.40
3. Did re	search pr	rojects contrib	ute to	what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	1	3		50/ 95	4.40	4.15	4.31	4.43	4.40
4. Did pre	esentatio	ons contribute	to what	you learned	0	0	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	63/ 99	4.20	4.36	4.39	4.54	4.20
5. Were c	riteria f	for grading made	e clear		0	0	1	1	0	1	2	3.40	83/ 97	3.40	3.76	4.14	4.26	3.40
				Frequ	iency	, Dist	rib	ution	า									
- 31								_					_					
Credits Ea	arned 	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	asons	; 			Ту]	pe 			Majors	;
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	1	A 2		Red	quire	ed fo	or Ma	jors	3	0	Graduat	е	3	Majo	or	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	в 1														
56-83	56-83 0 2.00-2.99 0 C 0					Ger	nera:	L				0	Under-g	rad	2	Non-	-major	0
84-150 0 3.00-3.49 0 D 0																		
Grad.	3	3.50-4.00	0	F 0		Ele	ectiv	<i>r</i> es				0	#### - 1					jh
				P 0									respons	es to b	e sign	ifican	ıt	
				Ι 0		Otl	ner					4						
				3 0														

Course-Section: GERO 750 0101 University of Maryland Page 945 Title THEORY/METHODS I Baltimore County JAN 21, 2006

Instructor: (Instr. B)

Enrollment: 5
Questionnaires: 5

Fall 2005 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire Job IRBR3029

			Frequencies				Ins	tructor		Dept		Level	Sect		
	Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
1. Did vou gair	General new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	2	2	1	3.80	1385/1674	3.80	4.23	4.27	4.44	3.80
	ructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	3	1		1146/1674	4.00	4.26	4.23	4.34	4.00
	aluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60		4.60	4.23	4.22	4.34	4.60
	readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60		4.60	4.04	3.96	4.23	4.60
	assignments contribute to what you learned		0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	,	4.60	4.08	4.08	4.27	4.60
	ling system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	1	1	2	3.80	1289/1651	3.80	4.20	4.18	4.32	3.80
	mes was class cancelled	0	1	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	958/1673	4.75	4.65	4.69	4.78	4.75
-	ou grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	615/1656	4.29	4.06	4.07	4.15	4.29
	Lecture														
1. Were the ins	tructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	3	1	4.25	1144/1586	4.53	4.43	4.43	4.50	4.53
	ructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1585	5.00	4.72	4.69	4.79	5.00
	material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	2	2				4.30	4.26	4.33	4.55
	ures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	692/1575	4.55	4.32	4.27	4.30	4.55
5. Did audiovis	ual techniques enhance your understanding	1	1	1	0	0	1	1	3.33	1127/1380	3.50	3.94	3.94	3.85	3.50
	Discussion														
1. Did class di	scussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	338/1520	4.60	4.14	4.01	4.19	4.60
2. Were all stu	dents actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1515	5.00	4.37	4.24	4.47	5.00
3. Did the inst	ructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1511	5.00	4.37	4.27	4.49	5.00
4. Were special	techniques successful	0	4	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 994	****	3.97	3.94	4.07	****
	Seminar														
1. Were assigne	d topics relevant to the announced theme	0	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	53/ 103	4.60	4.39	4.41	4.56	4.60
2. Was the inst	ructor available for individual attention	0	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	65/ 101	4.40	4.33	4.48	4.62	4.40
3. Did research	projects contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	50/ 95	4.40	4.15	4.31	4.43	4.40
4. Did presenta	tions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	63/ 99	4.20	4.36	4.39	4.54	4.20
5. Were criteri	a for grading made clear	0	0	1	1	0	1	2	3.40	83/ 97	3.40	3.76	4.14	4.26	3.40
	Free	uency	/ Dis	strik	outio	n									
Credits Earned	Cum. GPA Expected Grades	;			Re	ason	s			Туј	pe			Majors	;
00-27 0	0.00-0.99 1 A 2		 Re	 eauir	red f	or Ma	aior	 s	0	Graduat	 e	3	Majo	 or	0
28-55 0	1.00-1.99 0 B 1		Required for Majors 0 Gradu										3 -		-

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