

Course-Section: GERO 742 0101
 Title ECONAGING GERO
 Instructor: SILVA, AJITH (Instr. A)
 Enrollment: 5
 Questionnaires: 5

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 811
 JUN 14, 2005
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect		
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean		

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	416/1504	4.60	4.24	4.27	4.44	4.60
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	0	1	3	4.20	910/1503	4.20	4.22	4.20	4.28	4.20
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	3	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1290	****	4.32	4.28	4.36	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	844/1453	4.20	4.22	4.21	4.34	4.20
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	0	1	3	4.20	596/1421	4.20	4.08	4.00	4.27	4.20
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	297/1365	4.50	4.11	4.08	4.35	4.50
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	830/1485	4.20	4.20	4.16	4.24	4.20
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1504	5.00	4.68	4.69	4.79	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	0	3	0	4.00	850/1483	4.25	4.07	4.06	4.20	4.25
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	784/1425	4.75	4.41	4.41	4.51	4.75
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1426	5.00	4.72	4.69	4.80	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	3	1	4.25	848/1418	4.38	4.29	4.25	4.36	4.38
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	623/1416	4.75	4.34	4.26	4.38	4.75
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	636/1199	3.75	3.95	3.97	4.04	3.75
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1312	5.00	4.12	4.00	4.31	5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	450/1303	4.67	4.39	4.24	4.58	4.67
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1299	5.00	4.34	4.25	4.56	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	2	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 758	****	4.05	4.01	4.24	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	4	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 76	****	4.60	4.61	4.57	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 70	****	4.54	4.35	4.21	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 67	****	4.32	4.34	4.48	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 76	****	4.41	4.44	4.39	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	4	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 73	****	4.17	4.17	4.15	****

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: GERO 742 0101
 Title ECONAGING GERO
 Instructor: (Instr. B)
 Enrollment: 5
 Questionnaires: 5

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 812
 JUN 14, 2005
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies						Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect	
	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	1	0	4	4.60	416/1504	4.60	4.24	4.27	4.44	4.60
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	0	1	3	4.20	910/1503	4.20	4.22	4.20	4.28	4.20
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	3	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1290	****	4.32	4.28	4.36	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	844/1453	4.20	4.22	4.21	4.34	4.20
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	0	1	3	4.20	596/1421	4.20	4.08	4.00	4.27	4.20
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	297/1365	4.50	4.11	4.08	4.35	4.50
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	830/1485	4.20	4.20	4.16	4.24	4.20
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1504	5.00	4.68	4.69	4.79	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	338/1483	4.25	4.07	4.06	4.20	4.25
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1425	4.75	4.41	4.41	4.51	4.75
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1426	5.00	4.72	4.69	4.80	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	578/1418	4.38	4.29	4.25	4.36	4.38
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1416	4.75	4.34	4.26	4.38	4.75
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	919/1199	3.75	3.95	3.97	4.04	3.75
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1312	5.00	4.12	4.00	4.31	5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	450/1303	4.67	4.39	4.24	4.58	4.67
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1299	5.00	4.34	4.25	4.56	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	2	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 758	****	4.05	4.01	4.24	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	4	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 76	****	4.60	4.61	4.57	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 70	****	4.54	4.35	4.21	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 67	****	4.32	4.34	4.48	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 76	****	4.41	4.44	4.39	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	4	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 73	****	4.17	4.17	4.15	****

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: GERO 786 0101
 Title PSYC ASPECTS OF AGING
 Instructor: GRUBER-BALDINI,
 Enrollment: 8
 Questionnaires: 6

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 813
 JUN 14, 2005
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect		
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean		

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	183/1504	4.83	4.24	4.27	4.44	4.83
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	3	4.50	495/1503	4.50	4.22	4.20	4.28	4.50
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	4	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	507/1290	4.50	4.32	4.28	4.36	4.50
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	2	3	4.33	680/1453	4.33	4.22	4.21	4.34	4.33
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	115/1421	4.83	4.08	4.00	4.27	4.83
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	297/1365	4.50	4.11	4.08	4.35	4.50
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	134/1485	4.83	4.20	4.16	4.24	4.83
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	983/1504	4.67	4.68	4.69	4.79	4.67
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	258/1483	4.60	4.07	4.06	4.20	4.60
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	285/1425	4.83	4.41	4.41	4.51	4.83
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1426	5.00	4.72	4.69	4.80	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	0	5	4.67	378/1418	4.67	4.29	4.25	4.36	4.67
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	221/1416	4.83	4.34	4.26	4.38	4.83
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	96/1199	4.83	3.95	3.97	4.04	4.83
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1312	5.00	4.12	4.00	4.31	5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1303	5.00	4.39	4.24	4.58	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1299	5.00	4.34	4.25	4.56	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	1	3	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	680/ 758	3.00	4.05	4.01	4.24	3.00

Frequency Distribution

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