```
Course Section: POLI 100  0101          University of Maryland                      Page 1349
Title      AMER GOVT & POLITICS          Baltimore County                           JAN 18, 2007
Instructor:   CROATTI, MARK                    Fall  2006                            Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:     39
Questionnaires:  39              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    7  0  1  4  3  6 18  4.13 1077/1669  4.34  4.46  4.23  4.02  4.13
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals     7  0  3  2  9  8 10  3.63 1417/1666  3.82  4.26  4.19  4.11  3.63
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals    7  0  3  2  9  7 11  3.66 1170/1421  3.88  4.41  4.24  4.11  3.66
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals     8  3  2  3  7  5 11  3.71 1273/1617  4.04  4.27  4.15  3.99  3.71
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 7  1  3  4  6  6 12  3.65 1148/1555  4.15  4.38  4.00  3.92  3.65
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 9 4 3 4 6 7 6  3.35 1319/1543  3.87  4.27  4.06  3.86  3.35
7. Was the grading system clearly explained             8  0  3  4  1  7 16  3.94 1125/1647  4.25  4.25  4.12  4.06  3.94
8. How many times was class cancelled                   7  1  0  0  0  2 29  4.94  499/1668  4.59  4.42  4.67  4.62  4.94
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 10 1 0 3 8 8 9  3.82 1156/1605  3.94  4.25  4.07  3.96  3.82


            Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared         8  0  1  1  4 11 14  4.16 1136/1514  4.62  4.62  4.39  4.32  4.16
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject    8  0  0  0  1  3 27  4.84  705/1551  4.91  4.87  4.66  4.55  4.84
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 9  0  0  3  4  7 16  4.20  932/1503  4.16  4.46  4.24  4.17  4.20
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned      8  0  1  3  5  8 14  4.00 1069/1506  4.35  4.49  4.26  4.17  4.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 8 9 3 0 4 3 12  3.95  643/1311  2.99  3.77  3.85  3.68  3.95


            Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 13 0  3  2  5  7  9  3.65 1093/1490  4.03  4.33  4.05  3.85  3.65
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 13 0  4  1  1  5 15  4.00 1013/1502  4.20  4.60  4.26  4.06  4.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 13 0 3 2 0 8 13  4.00 1038/1489  4.32  4.61  4.29  4.07  4.00
4. Were special techniques successful                   12 15  3  0  2  3  4  3.42  804/1006  3.86  3.98  4.00  3.81  3.42

            Laboratory
2. Were you provided with adequate background information 37 0 1 0 0 1 0  2.50 ****/ 233  ****  ****  4.19  4.09  ****


            Seminar
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 37 1  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/ 112  ****  4.80  4.38  4.04  ****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 38 0 0 0 1 0 0  3.00 ****/  97  ****  4.60  4.36  4.19  ****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 38 0  0  0  0  1  0  4.00 ****/  92  ****  4.60  4.22  3.79  ****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned     38 0  0  0  0  1  0  4.00 ****/ 105  ****  4.20  4.20  3.94  ****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear                 38 0  0  1  0  0  0  2.00 ****/  98  ****  3.80  3.95  3.90  ****


            Field Work
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned  36 0  1  0  0  0  2  3.67 ****/  58  ****  ****  4.22  4.00  ****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria  37 0  0  0  0  0  2  5.00 ****/  52  ****  ****  4.06  3.81  ****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation        37 1  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  39  ****  ****  4.39  4.30  ****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations    37 1  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  40  ****  ****  3.97  4.00  ****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities  37 1  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  30  ****  ****  4.33  4.30  ****
```

Frequency Distribution

```
Credits Earned        Cum. GPA        Expected Grades       Reasons                  Type                     Majors
---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
00-27     3           0.00-0.99   1      A    6       Required for Majors  13    Graduate     0        Major       4
28-55     1           1.00-1.99   0      B   17
56-83     2           2.00-2.99   3      C    4       General               4    Under-grad  39        Non-major  35
84-150    2           3.00-3.49   3      D    1
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                12
                                         ?    1
```

```
Course Section: POLI 100  0201          University of Maryland                              Page 1350
Title        AMER GOVT & POLITICS        Baltimore County                                   JAN 18, 2007
Instructor:  MELCAVAGE, EUGE             Fall  2006                                         Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:      43
Questionnaires: 31                  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	2	2	5	22	4.52	578/1669	4.34	4.46	4.23	4.02	4.52
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	3	6	21	4.52	538/1666	3.82	4.26	4.19	4.11	4.52
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	0	0	6	24	4.68	380/1421	3.88	4.41	4.24	4.11	4.68
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	9	1	0	1	3	17	4.59	404/1617	4.04	4.27	4.15	3.99	4.59
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	2	1	6	5	15	4.03	753/1555	4.15	4.38	4.00	3.92	4.03
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	19	0	1	2	0	9	4.42	503/1543	3.87	4.27	4.06	3.86	4.42
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	2	3	25	4.68	292/1647	4.25	4.25	4.12	4.06	4.68
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	12	19	4.61	1115/1668	4.59	4.42	4.67	4.62	4.61
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	10	1	0	1	2	6	11	4.35	565/1605	3.94	4.25	4.07	3.96	4.35
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	1	0	0	0	29	4.87	257/1514	4.62	4.62	4.39	4.32	4.87
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	1	0	0	29	4.90	512/1551	4.91	4.87	4.66	4.55	4.90
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	2	4	24	4.73	300/1503	4.16	4.46	4.24	4.17	4.73
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	2	0	2	26	4.73	380/1506	4.35	4.49	4.26	4.17	4.73
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	16	4	4	3	1	2	2.50	1227/1311	2.99	3.77	3.85	3.68	2.50
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	1	1	1	5	18	4.46	490/1490	4.03	4.33	4.05	3.85	4.46
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	0	3	4	19	4.62	531/1502	4.20	4.60	4.26	4.06	4.62
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	1	0	4	21	4.73	456/1489	4.32	4.61	4.29	4.07	4.73
4. Were special techniques successful	5	20	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	****/1006	3.86	3.98	4.00	3.81	****
Laboratory														
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	30	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 233	****	****	4.19	4.09	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	29	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 112	****	4.80	4.38	4.04	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	29	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 97	****	4.60	4.36	4.19	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	29	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 92	****	4.60	4.22	3.79	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	29	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 105	****	4.20	4.20	3.94	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	29	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 98	****	3.80	3.95	3.90	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	29	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 58	****	****	4.22	4.00	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	30	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.06	3.81	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	29	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.39	4.30	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	29	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 40	****	****	3.97	4.00	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	29	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.33	4.30	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	29	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 55	****	****	4.34	4.17	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	29	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 42	****	****	4.31	4.08	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	29	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 46	****	****	4.45	4.26	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	29	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 33	****	****	4.25	4.25	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	29	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 29	****	****	4.34	4.22	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	A	12	Required for Majors	6	Graduate	0	Major	4
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	B	15						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	6	C	1	General	3	Under-grad	31	Non-major	27
84-150	7	3.00-3.49	6	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5	F	0	Electives	6	#### - Means there are not enough			
				P	1			responses to be significant			
				I	0	Other	15				
				?	1						

```
Course Section: POLI 100  0301            University of Maryland                              Page 1351
Title      AMER GOVT & POLITICS           Baltimore County                                  JAN 18, 2007
Instructor:    KING-MEADOWS, T            Fall   2006                                        Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:     38
Questionnaires: 38                    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  14  0  0  0  3 10 11 4.33  816/1669 4.34  4.46  4.23 4.02  4.33
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals   14  0  2  1  6 10  5 3.63 1417/1666 3.82  4.26  4.19 4.11  3.63
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals  14  0  0  5  5  7  7 3.67 1166/1421 3.88  4.41  4.24 4.11  3.67
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals   14  0  2  0  8  5  9 3.79 1229/1617 4.04  4.27  4.15 3.99  3.79
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 14 0  0  0  3  5 16 4.54  308/1555 4.15  4.38  4.00 3.92  4.54
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 13 0 1 1 7 10  6 3.76 1130/1543 3.87  4.27  4.06 3.86  3.76
7. Was the grading system clearly explained           14  0  0  1  3 12  8 4.13  977/1647 4.25  4.25  4.12 4.06  4.13
8. How many times was class cancelled                 14  0  0  0  0 19  5 4.21 1412/1668 4.59  4.42  4.67 4.62  4.21
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 16 0 1 1 5 10 5 3.77 1195/1605 3.94 4.25  4.07 3.96  3.77


        Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared       14  0  0  0  0  3 21 4.88  240/1514 4.62  4.62  4.39 4.32  4.88
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject  14  0  0  0  0  1 23 4.96  256/1551 4.91  4.87  4.66 4.55  4.96
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 14 0  0  1  7  9  7 3.92 1157/1503 4.16  4.46  4.24 4.17  3.92
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned    14  0  0  0  2  7 15 4.54  604/1506 4.35  4.49  4.26 4.17  4.54
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 14 14 3  0  5  2  0 2.60 1213/1311 2.99  3.77  3.85 3.68  2.60


        Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 20 0  0  1  4  7  6 4.00  849/1490 4.03  4.33  4.05 3.85  4.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 21 0 0  2  5  4  6 3.82 1166/1502 4.20  4.60  4.26 4.06  3.82
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 20 0 0  1  1  6 10 4.39  818/1489 4.32  4.61  4.29 4.07  4.39
4. Were special techniques successful                 20  2  0  0  3  5  8 4.31  354/1006 3.86  3.98  4.00 3.81  4.31


        Laboratory
2. Were you provided with adequate background information 37 0 0  0  0  0  1 5.00 ****/ 233 ****  ****  4.19 4.09  ****


        Seminar
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 36 1 0  0  0  0  1 5.00 ****/ 112 ****  4.80  4.38 4.04  ****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 37 0 0  0  0  0  1 5.00 ****/  97 ****  4.60  4.36 4.19  ****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 37 0 0  0  0  0  1 5.00 ****/  92 ****  4.60  4.22 3.79  ****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned   37  0  0  0  0  0  1 5.00 ****/ 105 ****  4.20  4.20 3.94  ****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear               37  0  0  0  0  0  1 5.00 ****/  98 ****  3.80  3.95 3.90  ****


        Field Work
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 37 0 1  0  0  0  0 1.00 ****/  58 ****  ****  4.22 4.00  ****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 37 0 0  0  0  0  1 5.00 ****/  52 ****  ****  4.06 3.81  ****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation      37  0  0  0  0  0  1 5.00 ****/  39 ****  ****  4.39 4.30  ****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations  37  0  1  0  0  0  0 1.00 ****/  40 ****  ****  3.97 4.00  ****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities 37 0 0  0  0  0  1 5.00 ****/  30 ****  ****  4.33 4.30  ****


        Self  Paced
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 37 0 0  0  0  0  1 5.00 ****/  55 ****  ****  4.34 4.17  ****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal   37  0  0  0  0  0  1 5.00 ****/  42 ****  ****  4.31 4.08  ****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful     37  0  0  0  0  0  1 5.00 ****/  46 ****  ****  4.45 4.26  ****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful      37  0  0  0  0  0  1 5.00 ****/  33 ****  ****  4.25 4.25  ****
```

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	6	0.00-0.99	2	A	2	Required for Majors	8	Graduate	0	Major	11
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	11						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	1	C	7	General	1	Under-grad	38	Non-major	27
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D	1						
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	13				
				?	1						

```
Course Section: POLI 100  0401                University of Maryland                              Page 1352
Title       AMER GOVT & POLITICS              Baltimore County                                   JAN 18, 2007
Instructor:    KING-MEADOWS, T                Fall   2006                                        Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:     44
Questionnaires: 44                    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  14  0  0  2  4  5  19  4.37  781/1669  4.34  4.46  4.23  4.02  4.37
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals   14  0  2  4  6 12   6  3.53 1455/1666  3.82  4.26  4.19  4.11  3.53
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals  14  0  2  3  8 12   5  3.50 1222/1421  3.88  4.41  4.24  4.11  3.50
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals   14  1  0  2  4 13  10  4.07  993/1617  4.04  4.27  4.15  3.99  4.07
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 14 0 1  0  3  9  17  4.37  469/1555  4.15  4.38  4.00  3.92  4.37
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 14 1 0 1 7 13  8  3.97  944/1543  3.87  4.27  4.06  3.86  3.97
7. Was the grading system clearly explained           14  0  1  0  3 12  14  4.27  851/1647  4.25  4.25  4.12  4.06  4.27
8. How many times was class cancelled                 14  0  0  0  0 12  18  4.60 1125/1668  4.59  4.42  4.67  4.62  4.60
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 20 2 1 1 5 9  6  3.82 1164/1605  3.94  4.25  4.07  3.96  3.82

            Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared       14  0  0  1  2  6  21  4.57  727/1514  4.62  4.62  4.39  4.32  4.57
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject  14  0  0  0  0  2  28  4.93  358/1551  4.91  4.87  4.66  4.55  4.93
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 14 0 2 2 7  8  11  3.80 1210/1503  4.16  4.46  4.24  4.17  3.80
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned    14  0  2  0  4 10  14  4.13 1002/1506  4.35  4.49  4.26  4.17  4.13
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 14 17 3 2 3 3  2  2.92 1151/1311  2.99  3.77  3.85  3.68  2.92

            Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 18 0 1 1 3 13  8  4.00  849/1490  4.03  4.33  4.05  3.85  4.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 18 0 0 1 3  8  14  4.35  809/1502  4.20  4.60  4.26  4.06  4.35
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 17 0 1 3 1 8  14  4.15  986/1489  4.32  4.61  4.29  4.07  4.15
4. Were special techniques successful                 17  5  1  2  4  7  8  3.86  621/1006  3.86  3.98  4.00  3.81  3.86

            Laboratory
2. Were you provided with adequate background information 43 0 1 0 0 0 0  1.00 ****/ 233  ****  ****  4.19  4.09  ****

            Seminar
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 43 0 0 0 0 1 0  4.00 ****/ 112  ****  4.80  4.38  4.04  ****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 43 0 0 0 1 0 0  3.00 ****/  97  ****  4.60  4.36  4.19  ****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 43 0 0 0 0 1 0  4.00 ****/  92  ****  4.60  4.22  3.79  ****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned   43  0  0  0  1  0  0  3.00 ****/ 105  ****  4.20  4.20  3.94  ****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear               43  0  0  0  0  1  0  4.00 ****/  98  ****  3.80  3.95  3.90  ****

            Field Work
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 42 0 1 0 0 1 0  2.50 ****/  58  ****  ****  4.22  4.00  ****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 42 0 1 0 0 0 1  3.00 ****/  52  ****  ****  4.06  3.81  ****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations  42  0  0  0  0  2  0  4.00 ****/  40  ****  ****  3.97  4.00  ****

            Self  Paced
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 42 0 0 0 1 0 1  4.00 ****/  55  ****  ****  4.34  4.17  ****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal   42  0  0  0  0  2  0  4.00 ****/  42  ****  ****  4.31  4.08  ****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful     42  0  0  0  1  1  0  3.50 ****/  46  ****  ****  4.45  4.26  ****
```

Frequency Distribution

```
Credits Earned        Cum. GPA        Expected Grades        Reasons            Type               Majors
-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
 00-27     11       0.00-0.99    1      A    2        Required for Majors  5    Graduate      0      Major      13
 28-55      3       1.00-1.99    0      B   10
 56-83      0       2.00-2.99    1      C    7        General              3    Under-grad   44      Non-major  31
 84-150     0       3.00-3.49    2      D    3
 Grad.      0       3.50-4.00    2      F    0        Electives            3    #### - Means there are not enough
                                        P    0                                  responses to be significant
```

```
I      0              Other              15
?      4
```

```
Course Section: POLI 100H 0101           University of Maryland                            Page 1353
Title        AMER GOVT/POLITICS-HON       Baltimore County                                 JAN 18, 2007
Instructor:  KING-MEADOWS, T              Fall  2006                                        Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:     5
Questionnaires: 5                      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  0  2  2 4.50  590/1669  4.50 4.46  4.23 4.02 4.50
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    2  0  0  0  0  2  1 4.33  777/1666  4.33 4.26  4.19 4.11 4.33
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   1  0  0  0  0  1  3 4.75  280/1421  4.75 4.41  4.24 4.11 4.75
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    1  0  0  0  0  2  2 4.50  496/1617  4.50 4.27  4.15 3.99 4.50
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 2  0  0  0  0  1  2 4.67  225/1555  4.67 4.38  4.00 3.92 4.67
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 1  0  0  0  0  2  2 4.50  390/1543  4.50 4.27  4.06 3.86 4.50
7. Was the grading system clearly explained            1  0  0  0  1  1  2 4.25  862/1647  4.25 4.25  4.12 4.06 4.25
8. How many times was class cancelled                  1  0  0  0  0  4  0 4.00 1530/1668  4.00 4.42  4.67 4.62 4.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 2  0  0  0  1  2  0 3.67 1274/1605  3.67 4.25  4.07 3.96 3.67


              Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        2  0  0  0  0  0  3 5.00    1/1514  5.00 4.62  4.39 4.32 5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   2  0  0  0  0  0  3 5.00    1/1551  5.00 4.87  4.66 4.55 5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 3  0  0  0  0  0  2 5.00    1/1503  5.00 4.46  4.24 4.17 5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     2  0  0  0  0  1  2 4.67  471/1506  4.67 4.49  4.26 4.17 4.67


              Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 1  0  0  0  0  2  2 4.50  445/1490  4.50 4.33  4.05 3.85 4.50
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 1  0  0  0  0  2  2 4.50  632/1502  4.50 4.60  4.26 4.06 4.50
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 1  0  0  0  0  0  4 5.00    1/1489  5.00 4.61  4.29 4.07 5.00
4. Were special techniques successful                  1  2  0  0  2  0  0 3.00  923/1006  3.00 3.98  4.00 3.81 3.00

                                   Frequency Distribution

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

```
Course Section: POLI 210  0101              University of Maryland                              Page 1354
Title        POLITICAL PHILOSOPHY            Baltimore County                                   JAN 18, 2007
Instructor:  STACEY, SIMON                   Fall  2006                                         Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:     45
Questionnaires: 36                    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    3   0  1  2  2 11 17  4.24  926/1669  4.39  4.46  4.23 4.34  4.24
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals     3   0  1  0  6 10 16  4.21  935/1666  4.27  4.26  4.19 4.29  4.21
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals    3   1  0  0  2  8 22  4.63  441/1421  4.49  4.41  4.24 4.35  4.63
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals     3   6  1  2  4  8 12  4.04 1011/1617  4.30  4.27  4.15 4.24  4.04
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 4   0  0  2  2  8 20  4.44  408/1555  4.50  4.38  4.00 3.96  4.44
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 5 10  1  1  8  5  6  3.67 1195/1543  4.02  4.27  4.06 4.10  3.67
7. Was the grading system clearly explained             5   0  0  2  6  6 17  4.23  896/1647  4.34  4.25  4.12 4.19  4.23
8. How many times was class cancelled                   5   0  0  0  0 22  9  4.29 1358/1668  4.28  4.42  4.67 4.59  4.29
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 7 1  0  0  2 13 13  4.39  512/1605  4.35  4.25  4.07 4.15  4.39


            Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared         4   0  0  0  0  3 29  4.91  189/1514  4.65  4.62  4.39 4.39  4.91
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject    3   0  0  0  0  4 29  4.88  594/1551  4.85  4.87  4.66 4.72  4.88
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 4   0  0  0  4 14 14  4.31  823/1503  4.37  4.46  4.24 4.29  4.31
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned      3   0  0  0  2  7 24  4.67  471/1506  4.58  4.49  4.26 4.33  4.67
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 4 26  2  0  2  1  1  2.83 ****/1311  4.00  3.77  3.85 3.96  ****


            Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 11  0  1  2  3  7 12  4.08  816/1490  4.10  4.33  4.05 4.11  4.08
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 11  0  0  1  3  8 13  4.32  827/1502  4.41  4.60  4.26 4.31  4.32
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 11 0  0  0  3  7 15  4.48  707/1489  4.59  4.61  4.29 4.36  4.48
4. Were special techniques successful                   11 19  0  1  2  1  2  3.67 ****/1006  3.55  3.98  4.00 3.99  ****


            Seminar
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 35  0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/ 112  ****  4.80  4.38 4.59  ****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 35 0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  97  ****  4.60  4.36 4.60  ****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 35  0  0  0  0  1  0  4.00 ****/  92  ****  4.60  4.22 4.50  ****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear                 35  0  0  0  0  1  0  4.00 ****/  98  ****  3.80  3.95 4.20  ****

                              Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned        Cum. GPA        Expected Grades        Reasons              Type                 Majors
------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
  00-27      4      0.00-0.99    2      A   10      Required for Majors  1      Graduate     0      Major       16
  28-55      5      1.00-1.99    0      B   16
  56-83      4      2.00-2.99    3      C    4      General              4      Under-grad  36      Non-major   20
  84-150     2      3.00-3.49    2      D    0
  Grad.      0      3.50-4.00    7      F    0      Electives            0      #### - Means there are not enough
                                       P    0                                 responses to be significant
                                       I    0      Other               24
                                       ?    0
```

```
Course Section: POLI 210  0201              University of Maryland                              Page 1355
Title        POLITICAL PHILOSOPHY           Baltimore County                                   JAN 18, 2007
Instructor:  STACEY, SIMON                  Fall   2006                                        Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:     49
Questionnaires: 19                     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  1  3  5  10  4.26  901/1669  4.39  4.46  4.23  4.34  4.26
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals     0   0  1  0  3  4  11  4.26  868/1666  4.27  4.26  4.19  4.29  4.26
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals    0   0  0  1  1  5  12  4.47  594/1421  4.49  4.41  4.24  4.35  4.47
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals     0   5  0  1  1  2  10  4.50  496/1617  4.30  4.27  4.15  4.24  4.50
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0   0  1  0  1  3  14  4.53  324/1555  4.50  4.38  4.00  3.96  4.53
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 11  0  0  2  1   5  4.38  543/1543  4.02  4.27  4.06  4.10  4.38
7. Was the grading system clearly explained             0   0  0  1  4  1  13  4.37  713/1647  4.34  4.25  4.12  4.19  4.37
8. How many times was class cancelled                   0   0  0  0  1 10   8  4.37 1305/1668  4.28  4.42  4.67  4.59  4.37
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 2 0  0  0  2  9   6  4.24  713/1605  4.35  4.25  4.07  4.15  4.24

              Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared         1   0  0  0  2  1  15  4.72  489/1514  4.65  4.62  4.39  4.39  4.72
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject    1   0  0  0  1  2  15  4.78  843/1551  4.85  4.87  4.66  4.72  4.78
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 1   0  0  1  2  2  13  4.50  556/1503  4.37  4.46  4.24  4.29  4.50
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned      1   0  1  1  0  3  13  4.44  718/1506  4.58  4.49  4.26  4.33  4.44
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 1 13  1  0  0  1   3  4.00  587/1311  4.00  3.77  3.85  3.96  4.00

              Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 4   0  0  1  0  5   9  4.47  490/1490  4.10  4.33  4.05  4.11  4.47
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 4   0  0  0  3  3   9  4.40  754/1502  4.41  4.60  4.26  4.31  4.40
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 4  0  0  0  1  2  12  4.73  456/1489  4.59  4.61  4.29  4.36  4.73
4. Were special techniques successful                   4  12  1  0  0  1   1  3.33 ****/1006  3.55  3.98  4.00  3.99  ****

              Laboratory
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material  17   1  0  0  0  1   0  4.00 ****/ 226  ****  ****  4.20  4.42  ****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information 17 0  1  0  0  1   0  2.50 ****/ 233  ****  ****  4.19  4.36  ****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 17 0  0  0  1  0   1  4.00 ****/ 225  ****  ****  4.50  4.74  ****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance           17   0  0  0  0  1   1  4.50 ****/ 223  ****  ****  4.35  4.71  ****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 17   1  0  0  1  0   0  3.00 ****/ 206  ****  ****  4.15  4.59  ****

              Seminar
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 17  0  0  0  0  1   1  4.50 ****/ 112  ****  4.80  4.38  4.59  ****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 17 0  0  0  0  1   1  4.50 ****/  97  ****  4.60  4.36  4.60  ****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 17  0  0  0  0  0   2  5.00 ****/  92  ****  4.60  4.22  4.50  ****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned    17   0  0  0  0  1   1  4.50 ****/ 105  ****  4.20  4.20  4.63  ****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear                17   0  0  0  1  0   1  4.00 ****/  98  ****  3.80  3.95  4.20  ****

              Field Work
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 17   0  0  0  0  1   1  4.50 ****/  58  ****  ****  4.22  4.20  ****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 17   0  0  0  0  1   1  4.50 ****/  52  ****  ****  4.06  5.00  ****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation       17   0  0  0  0  1   1  4.50 ****/  39  ****  ****  4.39  5.00  ****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations   17   0  0  0  0  1   1  4.50 ****/  40  ****  ****  3.97  5.00  ****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities 17   1  0  0  0  1   0  4.00 ****/  30  ****  ****  4.33  5.00  ****

              Self  Paced
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 17  0  0  0  0  1   1  4.50 ****/  55  ****  ****  4.34  4.67  ****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal    17   0  0  0  0  1   1  4.50 ****/  42  ****  ****  4.31  5.00  ****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful      16   1  0  0  0  1   1  4.50 ****/  46  ****  ****  4.45  5.00  ****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful       17   0  0  0  1  0   1  4.00 ****/  33  ****  ****  4.25  5.00  ****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students     17   0  0  0  1  0   1  4.00 ****/  29  ****  ****  4.34  5.00  ****
```

```
Course Section: POLI 210  0201              University of Maryland                    Page 1355
Title      POLITICAL PHILOSOPHY               Baltimore County                        JAN 18, 2007
Instructor:    STACEY, SIMON                     Fall   2006                          Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:    49
Questionnaires: 19                 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire


                                      Frequency Distribution


Credits Earned          Cum. GPA          Expected Grades          Reasons                Type                    Majors
------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
 00-27     1          0.00-0.99    1       A    5       Required for Majors   3     Graduate     0      Major        10
 28-55     6          1.00-1.99    0       B   10
 56-83     0          2.00-2.99    4       C    1       General               2     Under-grad  19      Non-major     9
 84-150    0          3.00-3.49    2       D    0
 Grad.     0          3.50-4.00    1       F    0       Electives             1     #### - Means there are not enough
                                           P    0                                   responses to be significant
                                           I    0       Other                10
                                           ?    1
```

```
Course Section: POLI 210  0301              University of Maryland                              Page 1356
Title        POLITICAL PHILOSOPHY           Baltimore County                                   JAN 18, 2007
Instructor:  SAULS, SHANAYSH                Fall   2006                                        Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:     42
Questionnaires:  40                     Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire
```

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies 1	2	3	4	5	Instructor Mean	Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	10	0	0	0	1	8	21	4.67	389/1669	4.39	4.46	4.23	4.34	4.67
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	11	0	0	1	4	8	16	4.34	764/1666	4.27	4.26	4.19	4.29	4.34
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	10	1	1	0	3	8	17	4.38	710/1421	4.49	4.41	4.24	4.35	4.38
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	11	13	0	1	1	5	9	4.38	673/1617	4.30	4.27	4.15	4.24	4.38
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	1	2	6	19	4.54	316/1555	4.50	4.38	4.00	3.96	4.54
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	12	19	2	0	0	2	5	3.89	****/1543	4.02	4.27	4.06	4.10	****
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	12	0	0	2	3	4	19	4.43	617/1647	4.34	4.25	4.12	4.19	4.43
8. How many times was class cancelled	12	0	0	0	1	21	6	4.18	1431/1668	4.28	4.42	4.67	4.59	4.18
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	18	0	0	0	1	11	10	4.41	499/1605	4.35	4.25	4.07	4.15	4.41
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	11	0	0	2	4	6	17	4.31	1042/1514	4.65	4.62	4.39	4.39	4.31
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	11	0	0	0	1	1	27	4.90	539/1551	4.85	4.87	4.66	4.72	4.90
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	11	0	0	1	3	11	14	4.31	823/1503	4.37	4.46	4.24	4.29	4.31
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	1	1	6	21	4.62	521/1506	4.58	4.49	4.26	4.33	4.62
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	15	19	0	2	1	1	2	3.50	****/1311	4.00	3.77	3.85	3.96	****
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	15	0	4	2	1	7	11	3.76	1029/1490	4.10	4.33	4.05	4.11	3.76
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	15	0	0	1	1	7	16	4.52	613/1502	4.41	4.60	4.26	4.31	4.52
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	15	0	0	1	0	8	16	4.56	631/1489	4.59	4.61	4.29	4.36	4.56
4. Were special techniques successful	15	5	1	3	6	4	6	3.55	744/1006	3.55	3.98	4.00	3.99	3.55
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	35	3	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 226	****	****	4.20	4.42	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	38	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 233	****	****	4.19	4.36	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	38	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 225	****	****	4.50	4.74	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	38	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 223	****	****	4.35	4.71	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	39	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 206	****	****	4.15	4.59	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	37	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/ 112	****	4.80	4.38	4.59	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	38	0	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/ 97	****	4.60	4.36	4.60	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	38	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 92	****	4.60	4.22	4.50	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	38	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 105	****	4.20	4.20	4.63	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	39	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 98	****	3.80	3.95	4.20	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	37	0	1	0	0	1	1	3.33	****/ 58	****	****	4.22	4.20	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	38	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 52	****	****	4.06	5.00	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	38	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.39	5.00	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	38	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 40	****	****	3.97	5.00	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	39	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.33	5.00	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	38	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 55	****	****	4.34	4.67	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	39	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 42	****	****	4.31	5.00	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	38	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 46	****	****	4.45	5.00	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	38	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 33	****	****	4.25	5.00	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	39	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 29	****	****	4.34	5.00	****

Title   POLITICAL PHILOSOPHY   Baltimore County   JAN 18, 2007
Instructor: SAULS, SHANAYSH   Fall   2006   Job IRBR3029
Enrollment: 42
Questionnaires: 40   Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

                                          Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned   Cum. GPA   Expected Grades   Reasons   Type   Majors
----
00-27   3   0.00-0.99   2   A   6   Required for Majors   4   Graduate   0   Major   1
28-55   3   1.00-1.99   0   B   19
56-83   2   2.00-2.99   1   C   0   General   6   Under-grad 40   Non-major 39
84-150   3   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   14
                                       ?   0

```
Course Section: POLI 233  0101              University of Maryland                            Page 1357
Title       COMMON LAW&LEGAL ANALY              Baltimore County                            JAN 18, 2007
Instructor:   BARNER-BARRY, C                   Fall   2006                                 Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:    29
Questionnaires: 29                      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  6  0  0  2  2  6 13  4.30  852/1669  4.30  4.46  4.23 4.34  4.30
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals   7  0  0  1  3  8 10  4.23  922/1666  4.23  4.26  4.19 4.29  4.23
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals  6  1  0  3  4  5 10  4.00  969/1421  4.00  4.41  4.24 4.35  4.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals   6  3  0  1  4  6  9  4.15  911/1617  4.15  4.27  4.15 4.24  4.15
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 6  0  0  0  3  3 17  4.61  262/1555  4.61  4.38  4.00 3.96  4.61
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 6  2  0  1  3  9  8  4.14  783/1543  4.14  4.27  4.06 4.10  4.14
7. Was the grading system clearly explained           6  0  1  4  6  4  8  3.61 1353/1647  3.61  4.25  4.12 4.19  3.61
8. How many times was class cancelled                 6  0  0  0  5 11  7  4.09 1487/1668  4.09  4.42  4.67 4.59  4.09
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 11  0  0  0  4 11  3  3.94 1022/1605  3.94  4.25  4.07 4.15  3.94


              Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared       8  0  0  0  2  7 12  4.48  845/1514  4.48  4.62  4.39 4.39  4.48
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject  7  0  0  0  1  4 17  4.73  936/1551  4.73  4.87  4.66 4.72  4.73
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 7  0  0  0  3  8 11  4.36  765/1503  4.36  4.46  4.24 4.29  4.36
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned    7  0  0  0  5  5 12  4.32  858/1506  4.32  4.49  4.26 4.33  4.32
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 9 17  1  0  0  0  2  3.67 ****/1311  ****  3.77  3.85 3.96  ****


              Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 9  0  0  0  2  5 13  4.55  417/1490  4.55  4.33  4.05 4.11  4.55
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 9  0  0  2  1  2 15  4.50  632/1502  4.50  4.60  4.26 4.31  4.50
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 9  0  0  0  2  2 16  4.70  500/1489  4.70  4.61  4.29 4.36  4.70
4. Were special techniques successful                10  2  0  0  2  6  9  4.41  299/1006  4.41  3.98  4.00 3.99  4.41


                                          Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned        Cum. GPA       Expected Grades         Reasons                Type               Majors
------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
  00-27     1      0.00-0.99   0        A    4      Required for Majors   2     Graduate     0      Major      12
  28-55     2      1.00-1.99   0        B   11
  56-83     6      2.00-2.99   3        C    4      General               2     Under-grad  29      Non-major  17
  84-150    4      3.00-3.49   8        D    1
  Grad.     0      3.50-4.00   5        F    0      Electives             0     #### - Means there are not enough
                                        P    0                                 responses to be significant
                                        I    0      Other                17
                                        ?    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	2	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	128/1669	4.90	4.46	4.23	4.34	4.90
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	0	0	0	3	7	4.70	319/1666	4.70	4.26	4.19	4.29	4.70
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	217/1421	4.80	4.41	4.24	4.35	4.80
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	1	0	0	1	2	6	4.56	445/1617	4.56	4.27	4.15	4.24	4.56
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	141/1555	4.80	4.38	4.00	3.96	4.80
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	5	5	4.50	390/1543	4.50	4.27	4.06	4.10	4.50
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	0	1	3	6	4.50	481/1647	4.50	4.25	4.12	4.19	4.50
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	9	1	4.10	1477/1668	4.10	4.42	4.67	4.59	4.10
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	1	4	5	4.40	499/1605	4.40	4.25	4.07	4.15	4.40
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	0	0	1	3	4	4.38	984/1514	4.38	4.62	4.39	4.39	4.38
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	594/1551	4.88	4.87	4.66	4.72	4.88
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	5	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	173/1503	4.86	4.46	4.24	4.29	4.86
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	1	3	2	2	3.63	1292/1506	3.63	4.49	4.26	4.33	3.63
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	155/1490	4.89	4.33	4.05	4.11	4.89
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1502	5.00	4.60	4.26	4.31	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1489	5.00	4.61	4.29	4.36	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	3	1	0	0	3	3	2	3.88	617/1006	3.88	3.98	4.00	3.99	3.88

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	7	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	6
28-55	5	1.00-1.99	0	B	2						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	1	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	12	Non-major	6
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	7	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough			
				P	0			responses to be significant			
				I	0	Other	10				
				?	1						

```
Course Section: POLI 240  0101          University of Maryland                              Page 1359
Title       STATE & LOCAL POLITICS          Baltimore County                              JAN 18, 2007
Instructor:  CROATTI, MARK                      Fall  2006                                 Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:     37
Questionnaires:  36                 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   8  0  2  2  6  7 11  3.82 1339/1669  3.82  4.46  4.23 4.34  3.82
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    9  0  5  0 10  6  6  3.30 1535/1666  3.30  4.26  4.19 4.29  3.30
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   8  0  3  3  8  4 10  3.54 1212/1421  3.54  4.41  4.24 4.35  3.54
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    8  1  2  3  6  8  8  3.63 1323/1617  3.63  4.27  4.15 4.24  3.63
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 8 0  2  5  6  8  7  3.46 1257/1555  3.46  4.38  4.00 3.96  3.46
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 8 2 4 3 9 6 4  3.12 1389/1543  3.12  4.27  4.06 4.10  3.12
7. Was the grading system clearly explained            8  0  3  1  6  9  9  3.71 1295/1647  3.71  4.25  4.12 4.19  3.71
8. How many times was class cancelled                  8  0  0  0  0  4 24  4.86  807/1668  4.86  4.42  4.67 4.59  4.86
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 11 1 3 1 4 10 6 3.63 1299/1605  3.63  4.25  4.07 4.15  3.63


           Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        9  0  2  0  7  6 12  3.96 1227/1514  3.96  4.62  4.39 4.39  3.96
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   9  0  1  0  3  2 21  4.56 1152/1551  4.56  4.87  4.66 4.72  4.56
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 10 0 2  2  5  4 13  3.92 1147/1503  3.92  4.46  4.24 4.29  3.92
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     9  0  3  2  6  3 13  3.78 1236/1506  3.78  4.49  4.26 4.33  3.78
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 9 3 2  4  4  5  9  3.63  875/1311  3.63  3.77  3.85 3.96  3.63


           Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 18 0 2 2  7  4  3  3.22 1278/1490  3.22  4.33  4.05 4.11  3.22
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 18 0 3 1  5  2  7  3.50 1301/1502  3.50  4.60  4.26 4.31  3.50
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 18 0 3 2 3  4  6  3.44 1302/1489  3.44  4.61  4.29 4.36  3.44
4. Were special techniques successful                  17  7  1  3  4  1  3  3.17  902/1006  3.17  3.98  4.00 3.99  3.17

           Field Work
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 35 0 0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  58  ****  ****  4.22 4.20  ****
```

```
                                        Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned          Cum. GPA           Expected Grades          Reasons                Type                   Majors
------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
 00-27      0       0.00-0.99   0       A  12          Required for Majors  2      Graduate     0       Major       17
 28-55      8       1.00-1.99   0       B  10
 56-83      0       2.00-2.99   5       C   2          General              1      Under-grad  36       Non-major   19
 84-150     2       3.00-3.49   4       D   1
 Grad.      0       3.50-4.00   1       F   0          Electives            0      #### - Means there are not enough
                                        P   1                                      responses to be significant
                                        I   0          Other               22
                                        ?   1
```

```
Enrollment:      40
Questionnaires:  40               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   5  0  2  5 10 10  8  3.49 1489/1669  3.49  4.46  4.23  4.34  3.49
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    5  0  3  7 12  7  6  3.17 1554/1666  3.17  4.26  4.19  4.29  3.17
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   5  0  3  9  6  6 11  3.37 1284/1421  3.37  4.41  4.24  4.35  3.37
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    6  2  3  3 12  5  9  3.44 1409/1617  3.44  4.27  4.15  4.24  3.44
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 5  0  4  6 10  7  8  3.26 1359/1555  3.26  4.38  4.00  3.96  3.26
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 6 11 4  3  6  4  6  3.22 1355/1543  3.22  4.27  4.06  4.10  3.22
7. Was the grading system clearly explained            5  0  1  2  4 11 17  4.17  940/1647  4.17  4.25  4.12  4.19  4.17
8. How many times was class cancelled                  6  0  0  0  0  6 28  4.82  863/1668  4.82  4.42  4.67  4.59  4.82
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 9 0 2  2 12 10  5  3.45 1378/1605  3.45  4.25  4.07  4.15  3.45


             Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        5  0  0  7 10 10  8  3.54 1381/1514  3.54  4.62  4.39  4.39  3.54
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   6  0  2  2  1  5 24  4.38 1279/1551  4.38  4.87  4.66  4.72  4.38
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 6  0  2  6  4 16  6  3.53 1324/1503  3.53  4.46  4.24  4.29  3.53
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     6  0  5  4  9  7  9  3.32 1363/1506  3.32  4.49  4.26  4.33  3.32
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 6  4  7  5  9  4  5  2.83 1178/1311  2.83  3.77  3.85  3.96  2.83


             Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 13 0  5  5  4  7  6  3.15 1305/1490  3.15  4.33  4.05  4.11  3.15
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 13 0  2  2  6  5 12  3.85 1148/1502  3.85  4.60  4.26  4.31  3.85
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 13 0  4  5  2  6 10  3.48 1286/1489  3.48  4.61  4.29  4.36  3.48
4. Were special techniques successful                  13 17  3  2  2  1  2  2.70  960/1006  2.70  3.98  4.00  3.99  2.70


                              Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned        Cum. GPA        Expected Grades        Reasons              Type                Majors
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
  00-27      0     0.00-0.99    2       A   15       Required for Majors   1   Graduate      0     Major      23
  28-55      8     1.00-1.99    0       B   14
  56-83      5     2.00-2.99    4       C    4       General               2   Under-grad   40     Non-major  17
  84-150     1     3.00-3.49    8       D    0
  Grad.      0     3.50-4.00    3       F    0       Electives             0   #### - Means there are not enough
                                        P    0                                responses to be significant
                                        I    0       Other                28
                                        ?    0
```

```
Course Section: POLI 260  0101              University of Maryland                            Page 1361
Title      COMPARATIVE POLITICS             Baltimore County                                 JAN 18, 2007
Instructor:    FORESTIERE, CAR              Fall   2006                                       Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:    51
Questionnaires: 50                  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   15   0   0   3   3   9  20  4.31  840/1669  4.51  4.46  4.23  4.34  4.31
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    15   0   0   2   3   8  22  4.43  662/1666  4.62  4.26  4.19  4.29  4.43
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   15   0   2   2   5  10  16  4.03  961/1421  4.27  4.41  4.24  4.35  4.03
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    15  11   1   1   8   3  11  3.92 1154/1617  3.79  4.27  4.15  4.24  3.92
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 15   0   0   1   6  12  16  4.23  584/1555  4.31  4.38  4.00  3.96  4.23
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 19 14   0   0   6   5   6  4.00  895/1543  4.07  4.27  4.06  4.10  4.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained            15   0   0   0   5   7  23  4.51  469/1647  4.66  4.25  4.12  4.19  4.51
8. How many times was class cancelled                  16   0   0   0   0   5  29  4.85  807/1668  4.81  4.42  4.67  4.59  4.85
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 23  2  0   0   1   9  15  4.56  328/1605  4.61  4.25  4.07  4.15  4.56

              Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        16   0   0   0   1   4  29  4.82  325/1514  4.91  4.62  4.39  4.39  4.82
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   16   0   0   0   0   1  33  4.97  154/1551  4.99  4.87  4.66  4.72  4.97
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 16   0   1   0   1   2  30  4.76  266/1503  4.83  4.46  4.24  4.29  4.76
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     16   0   0   0   2   7  25  4.68  458/1506  4.79  4.49  4.26  4.33  4.68
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 17  1  2   0   2   6  22  4.44  312/1311  4.39  3.77  3.85  3.96  4.44

              Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 20  0   0   0   8   9  13  4.17  764/1490  4.26  4.33  4.05  4.11  4.17
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 20  0   0   0   5   6  19  4.47  680/1502  4.54  4.60  4.26  4.31  4.47
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 20  0   0   0   2   8  20  4.60  596/1489  4.73  4.61  4.29  4.36  4.60
4. Were special techniques successful                  20  17   2   0   5   2   4  3.46  779/1006  3.46  3.98  4.00  3.99  3.46

              Laboratory
2. Were you provided with adequate background information 47  0   0   0   0   0   3  5.00 ****/ 233 ****  ****  4.19  4.36  ****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 48  1   0   0   0   0   1  5.00 ****/ 225 ****  ****  4.50  4.74  ****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance           48   1   0   0   0   0   1  5.00 ****/ 223 ****  ****  4.35  4.71  ****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 48   1   0   0   0   0   1  5.00 ****/ 206 ****  ****  4.15  4.59  ****

              Seminar
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 48  1   0   0   0   0   1  5.00 ****/ 112 ****  4.80  4.38  4.59  ****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 48  1   0   0   0   0   1  5.00 ****/  97 ****  4.60  4.36  4.60  ****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned    48   1   0   0   0   0   1  5.00 ****/ 105 ****  4.20  4.20  4.63  ****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear                48   1   0   0   0   0   1  5.00 ****/  98 ****  3.80  3.95  4.20  ****

              Field Work
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 48  0   1   0   0   0   1  3.00 ****/  58 ****  ****  4.22  4.20  ****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 47   0   2   1   0   0   0  1.33 ****/  52 ****  ****  4.06  5.00  ****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation       49   0   0   0   0   0   1  5.00 ****/  39 ****  ****  4.39  5.00  ****

              Self  Paced
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 49  0   0   0   1   0   0  3.00 ****/  55 ****  ****  4.34  4.67  ****
```

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	10	Required for Majors	2	Graduate	0	Major	23
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	1	B	14						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	1	C	4	General	1	Under-grad	50	Non-major	27
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough			
				P	0			responses to be significant			

```
I    0              Other              22
?    0
```

```
Course Section: POLI 260  0201              University of Maryland                          Page 1362
Title       COMPARATIVE POLITICS              Baltimore County                              JAN 18, 2007
Instructor:     FORESTIERE, CAR                Fall  2006                                   Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:     45
Questionnaires: 45                     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	14	0	0	0	3	3	25	4.71	331/1669	4.51	4.46	4.23	4.34	4.71
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	14	0	0	0	1	4	26	4.81	181/1666	4.62	4.26	4.19	4.29	4.81
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	14	0	0	1	1	10	19	4.52	547/1421	4.27	4.41	4.24	4.35	4.52
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	14	16	3	0	2	4	6	3.67	1301/1617	3.79	4.27	4.15	4.24	3.67
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	14	1	1	2	0	8	19	4.40	438/1555	4.31	4.38	4.00	3.96	4.40
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	14	17	1	0	3	2	8	4.14	783/1543	4.07	4.27	4.06	4.10	4.14
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	14	0	0	0	0	6	25	4.81	167/1647	4.66	4.25	4.12	4.19	4.81
8. How many times was class cancelled	16	0	0	0	0	7	22	4.76	965/1668	4.81	4.42	4.67	4.59	4.76
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	16	0	0	0	0	10	19	4.66	249/1605	4.61	4.25	4.07	4.15	4.66
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	14	0	0	0	0	0	31	5.00	1/1514	4.91	4.62	4.39	4.39	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	14	0	0	0	0	0	31	5.00	1/1551	4.99	4.87	4.66	4.72	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	14	0	0	0	0	3	28	4.90	126/1503	4.83	4.46	4.24	4.29	4.90
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	0	3	28	4.90	164/1506	4.79	4.49	4.26	4.33	4.90
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	14	5	2	0	1	7	16	4.35	381/1311	4.39	3.77	3.85	3.96	4.35
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	22	0	0	1	3	6	13	4.35	613/1490	4.26	4.33	4.05	4.11	4.35
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	22	0	0	0	3	3	17	4.61	540/1502	4.54	4.60	4.26	4.31	4.61
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	22	0	0	0	0	3	20	4.87	319/1489	4.73	4.61	4.29	4.36	4.87
4. Were special techniques successful	22	15	1	1	0	1	5	4.00	****/1006	3.46	3.98	4.00	3.99	****
Laboratory														
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	44	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 233	****	****	4.19	4.36	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	44	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 112	****	4.80	4.38	4.59	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	44	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 58	****	****	4.22	4.20	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	44	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.06	5.00	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	44	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.39	5.00	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	44	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 40	****	****	3.97	5.00	****
Self Paced														
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	44	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 46	****	****	4.45	5.00	****

```
                                         Frequency Distribution
```

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	15	Required for Majors	2	Graduate	0	Major	21
28-55	5	1.00-1.99	0	B	8			Under-grad	45	Non-major	24
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	3	C	6	General	1				
84-150	9	3.00-3.49	5	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	10	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough			
				P	0			responses to be significant			
				I	0	Other	27				
				?	0						

```
Course Section: POLI 280  0101            University of Maryland                           Page 1363
Title      INTERNATIONAL RELATION          Baltimore County                               JAN 18, 2007
Instructor:   HAGERTY, DEVIN                    Fall   2006                                Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:    49
Questionnaires: 35                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  0  7 27  4.79  219/1669  4.74  4.46  4.23  4.34  4.79
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    1  0  0  1  1  6 26  4.68  345/1666  4.60  4.26  4.19  4.29  4.68
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   1  0  0  3  4  5 22  4.35  728/1421  4.47  4.41  4.24  4.35  4.35
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    1 18  0  2  3  2  9  4.13  946/1617  4.13  4.27  4.15  4.24  4.13
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 4  0  3  1  5  7 15  3.97  839/1555  4.07  4.38  4.00  3.96  3.97
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 2 22  0  1  2  2  6  4.18  735/1543  4.18  4.27  4.06  4.10  4.18
7. Was the grading system clearly explained            2  0  2  4  4  4 19  4.03 1027/1647  4.09  4.25  4.12  4.19  4.03
8. How many times was class cancelled                  3  0  1  3  9 16  3  3.53 1637/1668  3.42  4.42  4.67  4.59  3.53
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 8  0  0  0  1  8 18  4.63  278/1605  4.39  4.25  4.07  4.15  4.63


                Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        1  0  0  0  2  5 27  4.74  473/1514  4.71  4.62  4.39  4.39  4.74
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   1  0  0  0  0  3 31  4.91  460/1551  4.93  4.87  4.66  4.72  4.91
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 2  0  0  0  0  6 27  4.82  210/1503  4.80  4.46  4.24  4.29  4.82
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     1  1  0  0  1  5 27  4.79  313/1506  4.84  4.49  4.26  4.33  4.79
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 3 18  1  1  3  1  8  4.00  587/1311  4.00  3.77  3.85  3.96  4.00


                Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 12  0  1  0  3  3 16  4.43  524/1490  4.40  4.33  4.05  4.11  4.43
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 12  0  0  0  2  2 19  4.74  415/1502  4.56  4.60  4.26  4.31  4.74
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 12  0  0  0  3  0 20  4.74  456/1489  4.65  4.61  4.29  4.36  4.74
4. Were special techniques successful                  12 14  0  1  1  1  6  4.33  344/1006  4.33  3.98  4.00  3.99  4.33


                              Frequency Distribution
```

```
Credits Earned         Cum. GPA          Expected Grades         Reasons              Type              Majors
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
00-27     1      0.00-0.99   1       A     8     Required for Majors  1    Graduate      0    Major       22
28-55    10      1.00-1.99   0       B    20
56-83     4      2.00-2.99   5       C     4     General              2    Under-grad   35    Non-major   13
84-150    1      3.00-3.49   6       D     0
Grad.     0      3.50-4.00   8       F     0     Electives            1    #### - Means there are not enough
                                      P     0                              responses to be significant
                                      I     0     Other               26
                                      ?     0
```

```
Course Section: POLI 280  0201            University of Maryland                    Page 1364
Title         INTERNATIONAL RELATION        Baltimore County                        JAN 18, 2007
Instructor:   HAGERTY, DEVIN                Fall   2006                             Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:      31
Questionnaires:  29                   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  10  0  0  0  1  4 14  4.68  360/1669  4.74 4.46  4.23 4.34  4.68
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals   10  0  0  0  1  7 11  4.53  527/1666  4.60 4.26  4.19 4.29  4.53
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals  10  0  0  0  2  4 13  4.58  493/1421  4.47 4.41  4.24 4.35  4.58
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals   10 13  0  1  0  2  3  4.17 ****/1617  4.13 4.27  4.15 4.24  ****
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 10  1  0  1  4  4  9  4.17  644/1555  4.07 4.38  4.00 3.96  4.17
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 10 16  0  0  0  0  3  5.00 ****/1543  4.18 4.27  4.06 4.10  ****
7. Was the grading system clearly explained           10  0  0  0  6  4  9  4.16  955/1647  4.09 4.25  4.12 4.19  4.16
8. How many times was class cancelled                 10  0  0  0 14  4  1  3.32 1644/1668  3.42 4.42  4.67 4.59  3.32
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 10  0  0  0  4  8  7  4.16  800/1605  4.39 4.25  4.07 4.15  4.16


              Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared       10  0  0  0  1  4 14  4.68  553/1514  4.71 4.62  4.39 4.39  4.68
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject  10  0  0  0  0  1 18  4.95  307/1551  4.93 4.87  4.66 4.72  4.95
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 10  0  0  0  0  4 15  4.79  243/1503  4.80 4.46  4.24 4.29  4.79
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned    10  0  0  0  1  0 18  4.89  176/1506  4.84 4.49  4.26 4.33  4.89
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 10 17  0  0  0  1  1  4.50 ****/1311  4.00 3.77  3.85 3.96  ****


              Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 13  0  0  1  2  3 10  4.38  585/1490  4.40 4.33  4.05 4.11  4.38
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 13  0  0  0  4  2 10  4.38  781/1502  4.56 4.60  4.26 4.31  4.38
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 13  0  0  0  3  1 12  4.56  631/1489  4.65 4.61  4.29 4.36  4.56
4. Were special techniques successful                 13 13  2  0  0  0  1  2.33 ****/1006  4.33 3.98  4.00 3.99  ****


                              Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned        Cum. GPA        Expected Grades        Reasons               Type                 Majors
----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
  00-27      0      0.00-0.99    0      A    3      Required for Majors  0    Graduate     0      Major      10
  28-55      4      1.00-1.99    0      B   10
  56-83      4      2.00-2.99    1      C    0      General              7    Under-grad  29      Non-major  19
  84-150     3      3.00-3.49    1      D    0
  Grad.      0      3.50-4.00    7      F    0      Electives            0    #### - Means there are not enough
                                       P    0                                responses to be significant
                                       I    0      Other                9
                                       ?    2
```

```
Course Section: POLI 280H 0201          University of Maryland                              Page 1365
Title                                      Baltimore County                                JAN 18, 2007
Instructor:    HAGERTY, DEVIN                 Fall   2006                                  Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:     11
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    5   0  0  0  0  0  7  5.00    1/1669  5.00  4.46  4.23  4.34  5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals     5   0  0  0  0  2  5  4.71  293/1666  4.71  4.26  4.19  4.29  4.71
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals    5   0  0  0  0  1  6  4.86  184/1421  4.86  4.41  4.24  4.35  4.86
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals     5   3  0  0  0  1  3  4.75  219/1617  4.75  4.27  4.15  4.24  4.75
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 5   0  0  0  2  3  2  4.00  773/1555  4.00  4.38  4.00  3.96  4.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 5 2  0  0  1  2  2  4.20  723/1543  4.20  4.27  4.06  4.10  4.20
7. Was the grading system clearly explained             5   0  0  0  1  1  5  4.57  401/1647  4.57  4.25  4.12  4.19  4.57
8. How many times was class cancelled                   5   0  0  0  4  3  0  3.43 1641/1668  3.43  4.42  4.67  4.59  3.43
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 6 0  0  0  0  3  3  4.50  373/1605  4.50  4.25  4.07  4.15  4.50

          Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared         5   0  0  0  0  1  6  4.86  274/1514  4.86  4.62  4.39  4.39  4.86
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject    5   0  0  0  0  0  7  5.00    1/1551  5.00  4.87  4.66  4.72  5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 5   0  0  0  0  1  6  4.86  173/1503  4.86  4.46  4.24  4.29  4.86
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned      5   0  0  0  0  1  6  4.86  225/1506  4.86  4.49  4.26  4.33  4.86

          Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 5   0  0  0  0  5  2  4.29  667/1490  4.29  4.33  4.05  4.11  4.29
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 5   0  0  0  0  0  7  5.00    1/1502  5.00  4.60  4.26  4.31  5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 5  0  0  0  0  2  5  4.71  478/1489  4.71  4.61  4.29  4.36  4.71

          Seminar
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 10  0  0  0  0  0  2  5.00 ****/ 112  ****  4.80  4.38  4.59  ****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 11 0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  97  ****  4.60  4.36  4.60  ****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 11  0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  92  ****  4.60  4.22  4.50  ****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned     11  0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/ 105  ****  4.20  4.20  4.63  ****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear                 11  0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  98  ****  3.80  3.95  4.20  ****
```

Frequency Distribution

```
Credits Earned        Cum. GPA        Expected Grades        Reasons             Type              Majors
---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
 00-27      1      0.00-0.99   1       A   1        Required for Majors  1     Graduate     0     Major      3
 28-55      2      1.00-1.99   0       B   4                                                       
 56-83      1      2.00-2.99   0       C   0        General              0     Under-grad  12     Non-major  9
 84-150     1      3.00-3.49   0       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                6
                                       ?   2
```

```
Course Section: POLI 300  0101              University of Maryland                              Page 1366
Title      QUANT POLI SCI                       Baltimore County                               JAN 18, 2007
Instructor:    MILLER, NICHOLA                      Fall  2006                                 Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:    49
Questionnaires: 49                     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   30   0  2  4  6  3  4 3.16 1582/1669  3.16  4.46  4.23 4.28  3.16
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    30   0  1  3  3  6  6 3.68 1372/1666  3.68  4.26  4.19 4.20  3.68
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   30   0  2  2  1  4 10 3.95 1024/1421  3.95  4.41  4.24 4.25  3.95
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    31   9  1  0  0  2  6 4.33 ****/1617  ****  4.27  4.15 4.22  ****
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 30  1  7  2  2  2  5 2.78 1487/1555  2.78  4.38  4.00 4.03  2.78
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 30 4 2 0 2 1 10 4.13  795/1543  4.13  4.27  4.06 4.14  4.13
7. Was the grading system clearly explained            30   0  1  0  6  4  8 3.95 1113/1647  3.95  4.25  4.12 4.14  3.95
8. How many times was class cancelled                  30   0  0  0  0  5 14 4.74  991/1668  4.74  4.42  4.67 4.68  4.74
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 33 0 1 2 5 7 1 3.31 1436/1605  3.31  4.25  4.07 4.09  3.31

               Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        31   0  1  0  2  2 13 4.44  892/1514  4.44  4.62  4.39 4.46  4.44
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   31   0  1  2  2  2 11 4.11 1387/1551  4.11  4.87  4.66 4.70  4.11
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 32  0  1  2  3  6  5 3.71 1261/1503  3.71  4.46  4.24 4.28  3.71
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     31   0  1  2  7  4  4 3.44 1335/1506  3.44  4.49  4.26 4.30  3.44
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 32 0 0 1 4 6 6 4.00  587/1311  4.00  3.77  3.85 3.97  4.00

               Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 36  0  5  1  3  2  2 2.62 1422/1490  2.62  4.33  4.05 4.11  2.62
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 36  0  3  1  0  2  7 3.69 1241/1502  3.69  4.60  4.26 4.28  3.69
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 36 0 2 1 1 3 6 3.77 1186/1489  3.77  4.61  4.29 4.35  3.77

               Laboratory
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material  48   0  0  0  0  0  1 5.00 ****/ 226  ****  ****  4.20 4.17  ****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information 48 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 233  ****  ****  4.19 4.13  ****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 48 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 225  ****  ****  4.50 4.45  ****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance           48   0  0  0  0  0  1 5.00 ****/ 223  ****  ****  4.35 4.27  ****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 48   0  0  0  0  0  1 5.00 ****/ 206  ****  ****  4.15 4.08  ****

               Seminar
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 48  0  0  0  0  0  1 5.00 ****/ 112  ****  4.80  4.38 4.53  ****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 48 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/  97  ****  4.60  4.36 4.12  ****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 48  0  0  0  0  0  1 5.00 ****/  92  ****  4.60  4.22 4.47  ****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned    48   0  0  0  0  0  1 5.00 ****/ 105  ****  4.20  4.20 4.45  ****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear                48   0  0  0  0  0  1 5.00 ****/  98  ****  3.80  3.95 4.15  ****

               Field Work
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 48  0  0  0  0  0  1 5.00 ****/  58  ****  ****  4.22 4.29  ****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 48   0  0  0  0  0  1 5.00 ****/  52  ****  ****  4.06 3.59  ****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation       48   0  0  0  0  0  1 5.00 ****/  39  ****  ****  4.39 3.82  ****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations   48   0  0  0  0  0  1 5.00 ****/  40  ****  ****  3.97 3.34  ****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities 48   0  0  0  0  0  1 5.00 ****/  30  ****  ****  4.33 3.49  ****

               Self  Paced
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 48  0  0  0  0  0  1 5.00 ****/  55  ****  ****  4.34 4.03  ****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal    48   0  0  0  0  0  1 5.00 ****/  42  ****  ****  4.31 4.13  ****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful      48   0  0  0  0  0  1 5.00 ****/  46  ****  ****  4.45 4.13  ****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful       48   0  0  0  0  0  1 5.00 ****/  33  ****  ****  4.25 3.00  ****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students     48   0  0  0  0  0  1 5.00 ****/  29  ****  ****  4.34 4.13  ****
```

```
Course Section: POLI 300  0101                    University of Maryland                         Page 1366
Title          QUANT POLI SCI                      Baltimore County                             JAN 18, 2007
Instructor:    MILLER, NICHOLA                       Fall   2006                                Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:      49
Questionnaires:  49                          Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire


                                                Frequency Distribution


Credits Earned          Cum. GPA          Expected Grades              Reasons                    Type                     Majors
-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
 00-27      0       0.00-0.99    0         A    7        Required for Majors  0     Graduate     0       Major        16
 28-55      2       1.00-1.99    2         B    4                                                        
 56-83      1       2.00-2.99    1         C    4        General              0     Under-grad  49       Non-major    33
 84-150     8       3.00-3.49    3         D    1                                                        
 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               15
                                           ?    0
```

```
Course Section: POLI 309  0101              University of Maryland                            Page 1367
Title        SELECTED TOPICS IN POL          Baltimore County                                 JAN 18, 2007
Instructor:  MILLER, NICHOLA                 Fall  2006                                       Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:     25
Questionnaires: 24                      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	9	0	0	2	2	3	8	4.13	1064/1669	4.13	4.46	4.23	4.28	4.13
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	10	0	0	2	2	5	5	3.93	1206/1666	3.93	4.26	4.19	4.20	3.93
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	10	0	0	2	1	0	11	4.43	657/1421	4.43	4.41	4.24	4.25	4.43
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	9	0	0	0	1	4	10	4.60	394/1617	4.60	4.27	4.15	4.22	4.60
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	9	0	1	1	2	2	9	4.13	676/1555	4.13	4.38	4.00	4.03	4.13
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	9	2	0	0	2	2	9	4.54	362/1543	4.54	4.27	4.06	4.14	4.54
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	9	0	1	1	0	3	10	4.33	759/1647	4.33	4.25	4.12	4.14	4.33
8. How many times was class cancelled	9	0	0	0	0	4	11	4.73	991/1668	4.73	4.42	4.67	4.68	4.73
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	12	1	0	1	1	8	1	3.82	1164/1605	3.82	4.25	4.07	4.09	3.82

Lecture

1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	9	0	0	1	1	5	8	4.33	1022/1514	4.33	4.62	4.39	4.46	4.33
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	9	0	0	0	1	1	13	4.80	788/1551	4.80	4.87	4.66	4.70	4.80
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	9	0	0	1	2	8	4	4.00	1066/1503	4.00	4.46	4.24	4.28	4.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	9	0	1	0	2	3	9	4.27	901/1506	4.27	4.49	4.26	4.30	4.27
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	9	0	0	1	1	2	11	4.53	250/1311	4.53	3.77	3.85	3.97	4.53

Discussion

1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	11	0	2	2	2	3	4	3.38	1220/1490	3.38	4.33	4.05	4.11	3.38
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	11	0	0	2	1	1	9	4.31	846/1502	4.31	4.60	4.26	4.28	4.31
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	11	0	0	0	2	2	9	4.54	657/1489	4.54	4.61	4.29	4.35	4.54
4. Were special techniques successful	12	11	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1006	****	3.98	4.00	4.10	****

Laboratory

2. Were you provided with adequate background information	23	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 233	****	****	4.19	4.13	****

Seminar

1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	23	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 112	****	4.80	4.38	4.53	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	22	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 97	****	4.60	4.36	4.12	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	22	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 92	****	4.60	4.22	4.47	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	22	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 105	****	4.20	4.20	4.45	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	22	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 98	****	3.80	3.95	4.15	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	1	A	6	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	7
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	1	B	5						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	1	C	2	General	1	Under-grad	24	Non-major	17
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough			
				P	0			responses to be significant			
				I	0	Other	10				
				?	0						

```
Course Section: POLI 309A 0101           University of Maryland                              Page 1368
Title          CNTMP.AM. FOREIGN POLI    Baltimore County                                    JAN 18, 2007
Instructor:    MIKHAIL, NABIL            Fall   2006                                          Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:    30
Questionnaires: 28                       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    6   0   0  1  0  7 14  4.55  545/1669  4.55  4.46  4.23 4.28  4.55
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals     6   0   0  1  2  8 11  4.32  801/1666  4.32  4.26  4.19 4.20  4.32
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals    6   0   0  0  3  4 15  4.55  520/1421  4.55  4.41  4.24 4.25  4.55
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals     6   0   0  1  5  3 13  4.27  780/1617  4.27  4.27  4.15 4.22  4.27
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 7   0   0  0  3  4 14  4.52  324/1555  4.52  4.38  4.00 4.03  4.52
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 7 3   0  0  3  5 10  4.39  534/1543  4.39  4.27  4.06 4.14  4.39
7. Was the grading system clearly explained             7   0   0  1  2  6 12  4.38  682/1647  4.38  4.25  4.12 4.14  4.38
8. How many times was class cancelled                   8   0   0  0  1 12  7  4.30 1353/1668  4.30  4.42  4.67 4.68  4.30
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 10 0  0  0  3  5 10  4.39  525/1605  4.39  4.25  4.07 4.09  4.39


          Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared         7   0   1  0  1  4 15  4.52  775/1514  4.52  4.62  4.39 4.46  4.52
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject    7   0   0  0  1  1 19  4.86  650/1551  4.86  4.87  4.66 4.70  4.86
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 7   0   0  1  5  2 13  4.29  852/1503  4.29  4.46  4.24 4.28  4.29
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned      7   0   0  1  2  3 15  4.52  623/1506  4.52  4.49  4.26 4.30  4.52
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 8  6   2  2  1  4  5  3.57  904/1311  3.57  3.77  3.85 3.97  3.57


          Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 11  0   0  0  2  6  9  4.41  546/1490  4.41  4.33  4.05 4.11  4.41
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 11  0   0  0  1  4 12  4.65  504/1502  4.65  4.60  4.26 4.28  4.65
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 11 0   0  0  1  1 15  4.82  358/1489  4.82  4.61  4.29 4.35  4.82
4. Were special techniques successful                   11 11   1  1  1  0  3  3.50 ****/1006  ****  3.98  4.00 4.10  ****

          Laboratory
2. Were you provided with adequate background information 27 0  0  0  0  1  0  4.00 ****/ 233  ****  ****  4.19 4.13  ****


          Seminar
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 26  1   0  0  0  1  0  4.00 ****/ 112  ****  4.80  4.38 4.53  ****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 27 0  0  0  0  1  0  4.00 ****/  97  ****  4.60  4.36 4.12  ****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 27  0   0  0  0  1  0  4.00 ****/  92  ****  4.60  4.22 4.47  ****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned     27  0   0  0  0  1  0  4.00 ****/ 105  ****  4.20  4.20 4.45  ****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear                 27  0   0  0  0  1  0  4.00 ****/  98  ****  3.80  3.95 4.15  ****


          Field Work
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned  27  0   0  0  0  1  0  4.00 ****/  58  ****  ****  4.22 4.29  ****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria  27  0   0  0  0  1  0  4.00 ****/  52  ****  ****  4.06 3.59  ****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation        27  0   0  0  0  1  0  4.00 ****/  39  ****  ****  4.39 3.82  ****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations    27  0   0  0  0  1  0  4.00 ****/  40  ****  ****  3.97 3.34  ****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities  27  0   0  0  0  1  0  4.00 ****/  30  ****  ****  4.33 3.49  ****


          Self  Paced
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 27  0   0  0  0  1  0  4.00 ****/  55  ****  ****  4.34 4.03  ****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful       27  0   0  0  0  1  0  4.00 ****/  46  ****  ****  4.45 4.13  ****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful        27  0   0  0  0  1  0  4.00 ****/  33  ****  ****  4.25 3.00  ****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students      27  0   0  0  0  1  0  4.00 ****/  29  ****  ****  4.34 4.13  ****
```

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	7	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	12
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	10						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	2	C	2	General	4	Under-grad	28	Non-major	16
84-150	10	3.00-3.49	5	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough			
				P	0			responses to be significant			
				I	0	Other	14				
				?	1						

Title   AMER POLITICAL THOUGHT   Baltimore County   JAN 18, 2007
Instructor: STACEY, SIMON   Fall   2006   Job IRBR3029
Enrollment: 28
Questionnaires: 28   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  13   0   0  0  1  4 10  4.60  478/1669   4.60  4.46  4.23  4.28  4.60
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals   13   0   0  0  3  2 10  4.47  605/1666   4.47  4.26  4.19  4.20  4.47
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals  15   9   0  0  0  1  3  4.75 ****/1421   ****  4.41  4.24  4.25  ****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals   14   3   0  0  2  4  5  4.27  780/1617   4.27  4.27  4.15  4.22  4.27
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 13 0   0  0  0  1 14  4.93   70/1555   4.93  4.38  4.00  4.03  4.93
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 13 3 0  0  0  5  7  4.58  316/1543   4.58  4.27  4.06  4.14  4.58
7. Was the grading system clearly explained           13   1   0  1  1  4  8  4.36  728/1647   4.36  4.25  4.12  4.14  4.36
8. How many times was class cancelled                 13   0   0  0  0 12  3  4.20 1418/1668   4.20  4.42  4.67  4.68  4.20
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 17 0 0  0  0  3  8  4.73  188/1605   4.73  4.25  4.07  4.09  4.73

              Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared       14   0   0  0  0  2 12  4.86  274/1514   4.86  4.62  4.39  4.46  4.86
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject  14   0   0  0  0  0 14  5.00    1/1551   5.00  4.87  4.66  4.70  5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 14 0   0  0  0  1 13  4.93  101/1503   4.93  4.46  4.24  4.28  4.93
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned    14   0   0  1  0  1 12  4.71  407/1506   4.71  4.49  4.26  4.30  4.71
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 16 11 0 0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/1311   ****  3.77  3.85  3.97  ****

              Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 16 0  0  0  0  1 11  4.92  127/1490   4.92  4.33  4.05  4.11  4.92
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 16 0  0  0  0  1 11  4.92  213/1502   4.92  4.60  4.26  4.28  4.92
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 16 0 0  0  0  1 11  4.92  252/1489   4.92  4.61  4.29  4.35  4.92
4. Were special techniques successful                 17   9   0  0  0  0  2  5.00 ****/1006   ****  3.98  4.00  4.10  ****
```

                                        Frequency Distribution

```
Credits Earned         Cum. GPA          Expected Grades           Reasons                Type                    Majors
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
  00-27      0       0.00-0.99    0        A    4         Required for Majors   1     Graduate      0        Major       11
  28-55      0       1.00-1.99    0        B    9
  56-83      5       2.00-2.99    4        C    0         General               3     Under-grad   28        Non-major   17
  84-150     4       3.00-3.49    4        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                 9
                                           ?    0
```

```
Course Section: POLI 323  0101              University of Maryland                           Page 1370
Title       THE PRESIDENCY                     Baltimore County                              JAN 18, 2007
Instructor:    SCHALLER, THOMA                    Fall  2006                                 Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:     24
Questionnaires:  23                    Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire
```

| | | | Freq | uenc | ies | | | 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	3	0	0	0	0	3	17	4.85	167/1669	4.85	4.46	4.23	4.28	4.85
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	3	0	0	0	2	4	14	4.60	439/1666	4.60	4.26	4.19	4.20	4.60
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	3	4	0	0	2	2	12	4.63	441/1421	4.63	4.41	4.24	4.25	4.63
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	3	1	0	0	1	4	14	4.68	300/1617	4.68	4.27	4.15	4.22	4.68
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	1	19	4.95	60/1555	4.95	4.38	4.00	4.03	4.95
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	2	4	14	4.60	298/1543	4.60	4.27	4.06	4.14	4.60
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	3	0	0	2	2	1	15	4.45	583/1647	4.45	4.25	4.12	4.14	4.45
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	0	0	0	0	6	14	4.70	1039/1668	4.70	4.42	4.67	4.68	4.70
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	1	0	1	0	4	13	4.61	288/1605	4.61	4.25	4.07	4.09	4.61
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	2	2	16	4.70	537/1514	4.70	4.62	4.39	4.46	4.70
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	0	0	20	5.00	1/1551	5.00	4.87	4.66	4.70	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	2	2	16	4.70	347/1503	4.70	4.46	4.24	4.28	4.70
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	2	3	15	4.65	484/1506	4.65	4.49	4.26	4.30	4.65
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	2	2	0	1	5	9	4.12	531/1311	4.12	3.77	3.85	3.97	4.12
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	3	5	10	4.39	576/1490	4.39	4.33	4.05	4.11	4.39
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	0	0	1	17	4.94	142/1502	4.94	4.60	4.26	4.28	4.94
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	1	0	1	16	4.78	411/1489	4.78	4.61	4.29	4.35	4.78
4. Were special techniques successful	5	5	0	0	1	1	11	4.77	139/1006	4.77	3.98	4.00	4.10	4.77
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 58	****	****	4.22	4.29	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	22	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.06	3.59	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.39	3.82	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	22	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 40	****	****	3.97	3.34	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.33	3.49	****

```
                                      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	14
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B	7						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	1	C	2	General	1	Under-grad	23	Non-major	9
84-150	6	3.00-3.49	5	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough			
				P	0			responses to be significant			
				I	0	Other	13				
				?	0						

```
Course Section: POLI 327  0101           University of Maryland                        Page 1371
Title         INTEREST GROUPS & LOBB        Baltimore County                          JAN 18, 2007
Instructor:   SCOTT, JAMES L                Fall  2006                                Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:      27
Questionnaires: 24                       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 10  0  0  0  1  0 13  4.86  167/1669  4.86  4.46  4.23  4.28  4.86
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals  10  0  0  0  1  4  9  4.57  472/1666  4.57  4.26  4.19  4.20  4.57
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals 10  0  0  0  0  3 11  4.79  242/1421  4.79  4.41  4.24  4.25  4.79
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals  10  0  0  0  1  3 10  4.64  347/1617  4.64  4.27  4.15  4.22  4.64
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 11  0  0  0  2  3  8  4.46  379/1555  4.46  4.38  4.00  4.03  4.46
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 11  0  0  0  1  3  9  4.62  290/1543  4.62  4.27  4.06  4.14  4.62
7. Was the grading system clearly explained          12  0  0  0  1  3  8  4.58  389/1647  4.58  4.25  4.12  4.14  4.58
8. How many times was class cancelled                10  0  0  0  0  0 14  5.00    1/1668  5.00  4.42  4.67  4.68  5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 11  0  0  0  0  2 11  4.85  123/1605  4.85  4.25  4.07  4.09  4.85


              Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared      11  0  0  0  0  1 12  4.92  151/1514  4.92  4.62  4.39  4.46  4.92
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 11  0  0  0  0  0 13  5.00    1/1551  5.00  4.87  4.66  4.70  5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 11  0  0  0  1  3  9  4.62  451/1503  4.62  4.46  4.24  4.28  4.62
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned   11  0  0  0  0  1 12  4.92  131/1506  4.92  4.49  4.26  4.30  4.92
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 11  6  1  2  1  1  2  3.14 1091/1311  3.14  3.77  3.85  3.97  3.14


              Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 11  0  0  0  1  3  9  4.62  380/1490  4.62  4.33  4.05  4.11  4.62
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 11  0  0  0  0  2 11  4.85  296/1502  4.85  4.60  4.26  4.28  4.85
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 11  0  0  0  1  0 12  4.85  338/1489  4.85  4.61  4.29  4.35  4.85
4. Were special techniques successful                11  1  0  1  0  4  7  4.42  299/1006  4.42  3.98  4.00  4.10  4.42


              Laboratory
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material 23  0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/ 226  ****  ****  4.20  4.17  ****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information 23  0  0  0  0  1  0  4.00 ****/ 233  ****  ****  4.19  4.13  ****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 23  0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/ 225  ****  ****  4.50  4.45  ****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance         23  0  0  0  0  1  0  4.00 ****/ 223  ****  ****  4.35  4.27  ****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 23  0  0  0  0  1  0  4.00 ****/ 206  ****  ****  4.15  4.08  ****


              Seminar
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 23  0  0  0  0  1  0  4.00 ****/ 112  ****  4.80  4.38  4.53  ****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 23  0  0  0  1  0  0  3.00 ****/  97  ****  4.60  4.36  4.12  ****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 23  0  0  0  0  1  0  4.00 ****/  92  ****  4.60  4.22  4.47  ****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned  23  0  0  0  0  1  0  4.00 ****/ 105  ****  4.20  4.20  4.45  ****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear              23  0  0  0  0  1  0  4.00 ****/  98  ****  3.80  3.95  4.15  ****


              Field Work
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 23  0  0  0  0  1  0  4.00 ****/  58  ****  ****  4.22  4.29  ****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 23  0  0  0  0  1  0  4.00 ****/  52  ****  ****  4.06  3.59  ****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation     23  0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  39  ****  ****  4.39  3.82  ****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations 23  0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  40  ****  ****  3.97  3.34  ****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities 23  0  0  0  0  1  0  4.00 ****/  30  ****  ****  4.33  3.49  ****


              Self  Paced
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 23  0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  55  ****  ****  4.34  4.03  ****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal  23  0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  42  ****  ****  4.31  4.13  ****
```

                                      Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned   Cum. GPA   Expected Grades   Reasons   Type   Majors
----
 00-27   1   0.00-0.99   0   A   7   Required for Majors   5   Graduate   0   Major   4
 28-55   2   1.00-1.99   0   B   6
 56-83   2   2.00-2.99   3   C   0   General   3   Under-grad 24   Non-major   20
 84-150   2   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   5
                                     ?   0

```
Title        WOMEN AND POLITICS                    Baltimore County                              JAN 18, 2007
Instructor:  JONESDEWEEVER,                          Fall   2006                                 Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:     31
Questionnaires: 31                        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
-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
```

```
                                    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        0
  28-55      0       1.00-1.99    0      B    0
  56-83      0       2.00-2.99    0      C    0      General              0    Under-grad  31    Non-major   31
  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    0                               responses to be significant
                                         I    0      Other                0
                                         ?    0
```

```
Course Section: POLI 328  0101            University of Maryland                          Page 1373
Title      WOMEN & POLITICS                Baltimore County                             JAN 18, 2007
Instructor: JONESDEWEEVER                  Fall   2006                                  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  10   0  0  1  0  6 10  4.47  633/1669  4.47  4.46  4.23  4.28  4.47
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    9   0  0  1  2  8  7  4.17  984/1666  4.17  4.26  4.19  4.20  4.17
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals  10   0  0  1  0  6 10  4.47  594/1421  4.47  4.41  4.24  4.25  4.47
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals   10   0  0  1  1 10  5  4.12  958/1617  4.12  4.27  4.15  4.22  4.12
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 10  0  0  1  1  5 10  4.41  428/1555  4.41  4.38  4.00  4.03  4.41
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 10 0 0  1  1  6  9  4.35  562/1543  4.35  4.27  4.06  4.14  4.35
7. Was the grading system clearly explained           10   0  0  0  1  8  8  4.41  634/1647  4.41  4.25  4.12  4.14  4.41
8. How many times was class cancelled                 10   0  0  0  6 10  1  3.71 1622/1668  3.71  4.42  4.67  4.68  3.71
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 13 1 0  1  0  6  6  4.31  631/1605  4.31  4.25  4.07  4.09  4.31

              Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared       10   0  0  0  1  6 10  4.53  775/1514  4.53  4.62  4.39  4.46  4.53
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject  10   0  0  0  0  4 13  4.76  862/1551  4.76  4.87  4.66  4.70  4.76
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 10 0 0  0  1  5 11  4.59  482/1503  4.59  4.46  4.24  4.28  4.59
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned    10   0  0  1  0  5 11  4.53  623/1506  4.53  4.49  4.26  4.30  4.53
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 13 11 0 0  1  1  1  4.00 ****/1311  ****  3.77  3.85  3.97  ****

              Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 10  0  0  1  0  3 13  4.65  356/1490  4.65  4.33  4.05  4.11  4.65
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 10  0  0  0  1  1 15  4.82  316/1502  4.82  4.60  4.26  4.28  4.82
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 10 0 0  0  1  3 13  4.71  490/1489  4.71  4.61  4.29  4.35  4.71
4. Were special techniques successful                 11  14  1  0  1  0  0  2.00 ****/1006  ****  3.98  4.00  4.10  ****


                                     Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned        Cum. GPA        Expected Grades        Reasons              Type              Majors
-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
 00-27      0      0.00-0.99   0      A   13      Required for Majors  2    Graduate     0      Major      10
 28-55      0      1.00-1.99   0      B    3                                                            
 56-83      2      2.00-2.99   2      C    0      General              7    Under-grad  27      Non-major  17
 84-150     5      3.00-3.49   3      D    0                                                            
 Grad.      0      3.50-4.00   6      F    0      Electives            1    #### - Means there are not enough
                                      P    0                               responses to be significant
                                      I    0      Other                6
                                      ?    0
```

```
Course Section: POLI 353  0101            University of Maryland                          Page 1374
Title       GOVERNMENTAL BUDGETING          Baltimore County                             JAN 18, 2007
Instructor:  MEYERS, ROY T.                 Fall  2006                                    Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:      32
Questionnaires: 30                      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    6   0  0  0  7  8  9  4.08 1117/1669  4.08  4.46  4.23 4.28  4.08
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals     6   0  1  2  4  7 10  3.96 1164/1666  3.96  4.26  4.19 4.20  3.96
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals    6   3  0  3  3  6  9  4.00  969/1421  4.00  4.41  4.24 4.25  4.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals     6   0  1  1  4  8 10  4.04 1005/1617  4.04  4.27  4.15 4.22  4.04
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 6   0  2  2  4  6 10  3.83  996/1555  3.83  4.38  4.00 4.03  3.83
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 6 0  2  1  3  8 10  3.96  957/1543  3.96  4.27  4.06 4.14  3.96
7. Was the grading system clearly explained             6   0  3  2  1  9  9  3.79 1255/1647  3.79  4.25  4.12 4.14  3.79
8. How many times was class cancelled                   6   0  0  0  0 18  6  4.25 1382/1668  4.25  4.42  4.67 4.68  4.25
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 9 0  2  0  6  8  5  3.67 1274/1605  3.67  4.25  4.07 4.09  3.67

            Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared         6   0  1  0  1  8 14  4.42  939/1514  4.42  4.62  4.39 4.46  4.42
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject    6   0  0  0  1  4 19  4.75  880/1551  4.75  4.87  4.66 4.70  4.75
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 6   0  2  0  5  7 10  3.96 1117/1503  3.96  4.46  4.24 4.28  3.96
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned      7   0  0  3  5  6  9  3.91 1163/1506  3.91  4.49  4.26 4.30  3.91
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 8  3  1  0  5  2 11  4.16  507/1311  4.16  3.77  3.85 3.97  4.16

            Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 11  0  0  1  4  5  9  4.16  771/1490  4.16  4.33  4.05 4.11  4.16
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 11  0  1  0  1  3 14  4.53  613/1502  4.53  4.60  4.26 4.28  4.53
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 11 0  1  0  2  5 11  4.32  883/1489  4.32  4.61  4.29 4.35  4.32
4. Were special techniques successful                   11  3  0  1  3  5  7  4.13  447/1006  4.13  3.98  4.00 4.10  4.13

            Laboratory
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material   29  0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/ 226  ****  ****  4.20 4.17  ****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information 29 0 0  0  0  1  0  4.00 ****/ 233  ****  ****  4.19 4.13  ****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 28 1  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/ 225  ****  ****  4.50 4.45  ****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance            29  0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/ 223  ****  ****  4.35 4.27  ****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified  29  0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/ 206  ****  ****  4.15 4.08  ****

            Seminar
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 29  0  0  0  0  1  0  4.00 ****/ 112  ****  4.80  4.38 4.53  ****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 29 0  0  0  0  1  0  4.00 ****/  97  ****  4.60  4.36 4.12  ****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 29  0  0  0  0  1  0  4.00 ****/  92  ****  4.60  4.22 4.47  ****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned     29  0  0  0  0  1  0  4.00 ****/ 105  ****  4.20  4.20 4.45  ****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear                 29  0  0  0  0  1  0  4.00 ****/  98  ****  3.80  3.95 4.15  ****

            Field Work
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned  29  0  0  0  0  1  0  4.00 ****/  58  ****  ****  4.22 4.29  ****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria  29  0  0  0  0  1  0  4.00 ****/  52  ****  ****  4.06 3.59  ****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation        29  0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  39  ****  ****  4.39 3.82  ****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations    29  0  0  0  0  1  0  4.00 ****/  40  ****  ****  3.97 3.34  ****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities  29  0  0  0  0  1  0  4.00 ****/  30  ****  ****  4.33 3.49  ****

            Self  Paced
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 29  0  0  0  0  1  0  4.00 ****/  55  ****  ****  4.34 4.03  ****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal     29  0  0  0  0  1  0  4.00 ****/  42  ****  ****  4.31 4.13  ****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful       29  0  0  0  0  1  0  4.00 ****/  46  ****  ****  4.45 4.13  ****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful        29  0  0  0  0  1  0  4.00 ****/  33  ****  ****  4.25 3.00  ****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students      29  0  0  0  1  0  0  3.00 ****/  29  ****  ****  4.34 4.13  ****
```

Title   GOVERNMENTAL BUDGETING   Baltimore County   JAN 18, 2007
Instructor: MEYERS, ROY T.   Fall   2006   Job IRBR3029
Enrollment: 32
Questionnaires: 30   Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

                                        Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned   Cum. GPA   Expected Grades   Reasons   Type   Majors
----
 00-27   0   0.00-0.99   0   A   8   Required for Majors   0   Graduate   0   Major   5
 28-55   0   1.00-1.99   1   B   6
 56-83   3   2.00-2.99   1   C   2   General   2   Under-grad   30   Non-major   25
 84-150   10   3.00-3.49   7   D   0
 Grad.   0   3.50-4.00   5   F   0   Electives   1   #### - Means there are not enough
                                            P   0   responses to be significant
                                            I   0   Other   15
                                            ?   1

```
Course Section: POLI 354  0101                University of Maryland                                Page 1375
Title        PUBL MGMNT/PERSONNEL S            Baltimore County                                     JAN 18, 2007
Instructor:  ADLER, JOSEPH                         Fall  2006                                       Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:     25
Questionnaires:  24                       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  10  0  0  0  1  5  8  4.50   590/1669   4.50  4.46  4.23  4.28  4.50
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals   10  0  0  0  0  3 11  4.79   206/1666   4.79  4.26  4.19  4.20  4.79
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals  10  0  0  0  0  3 11  4.79   242/1421   4.79  4.41  4.24  4.25  4.79
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals   10  0  0  0  0  3 11  4.79   184/1617   4.79  4.27  4.15  4.22  4.79
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 10  0  0  0  1  3 10  4.64   237/1555   4.64  4.38  4.00  4.03  4.64
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 10 0 0 0 2 2 10 4.57   325/1543   4.57  4.27  4.06  4.14  4.57
7. Was the grading system clearly explained           10  0  0  0  0  3 11  4.79   185/1647   4.79  4.25  4.12  4.14  4.79
8. How many times was class cancelled                 10  0  0  0  0  2 12  4.86   807/1668   4.86  4.42  4.67  4.68  4.86
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 12 0 0 0 2 6 4 4.17   789/1605   4.17  4.25  4.07  4.09  4.17

                    Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared       10  0  0  0  1  2 11  4.71   505/1514   4.71  4.62  4.39  4.46  4.71
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject  10  0  0  0  1  1 12  4.79   825/1551   4.79  4.87  4.66  4.70  4.79
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 10  0  0  0  1  3 10  4.64   412/1503   4.64  4.46  4.24  4.28  4.64
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned    10  0  0  0  2  3  9  4.50   642/1506   4.50  4.49  4.26  4.30  4.50
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 10 4 0 2 2 2 4  3.80   764/1311   3.80  3.77  3.85  3.97  3.80

                    Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 12 0 0 0 1 2 9 4.67   340/1490   4.67  4.33  4.05  4.11  4.67
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 12 0 0 0 1 1 10 4.75   393/1502   4.75  4.60  4.26  4.28  4.75
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 12 0 0 0 1 2 9 4.67   532/1489   4.67  4.61  4.29  4.35  4.67
4. Were special techniques successful                 12  1  0  0  3  1  7  4.36   328/1006   4.36  3.98  4.00  4.10  4.36
```

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      0       Major        5
 28-55      0      1.00-1.99    1       B    6
 56-83      0      2.00-2.99    5       C    0       General               1     Under-grad   24       Non-major   19
 84-150     7      3.00-3.49    0       D    0
 Grad.      0      3.50-4.00    3       F    0       Electives             0     #### - Means there are not enough
                                        P    0                                  responses to be significant
                                        I    0       Other                11
                                        ?    0
```

```
Course Section: POLI 371  0101            University of Maryland                              Page 1376
Title         COMP ASIAN POLITICS          Baltimore County                                  JAN 18, 2007
Instructor:   GRODSKY, BRIAN                    Fall  2006                                    Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:      29
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    9   0  0  4  5  4  5  3.56 1458/1669  3.56  4.46  4.23  4.28  3.56
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals     9   0  2  4  7  3  2  2.94 1585/1666  2.94  4.26  4.19  4.20  2.94
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals    9   0  0  3  6  3  6  3.67 1166/1421  3.67  4.41  4.24  4.25  3.67
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals     9   2  4  1  5  4  2  2.94 1541/1617  2.94  4.27  4.15  4.22  2.94
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 11  0  2  2  6  5  1  3.06 1418/1555  3.06  4.38  4.00  4.03  3.06
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 10 3  1  3  3  5  2  3.29 1336/1543  3.29  4.27  4.06  4.14  3.29
7. Was the grading system clearly explained            10   0  2  2  4  6  3  3.35 1464/1647  3.35  4.25  4.12  4.14  3.35
8. How many times was class cancelled                  10   1  0  0  0  3 13  4.81  882/1668  4.81  4.42  4.67  4.68  4.81
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 10 0  1  2  7  5  2  3.29 1443/1605  3.29  4.25  4.07  4.09  3.29


              Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        10   0  2  0  5  8  2  3.47 1394/1514  3.47  4.62  4.39  4.46  3.47
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   10   0  0  0  1  2 14  4.76  862/1551  4.76  4.87  4.66  4.70  4.76
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 11  0  2  2  7  4  1  3.00 1423/1503  3.00  4.46  4.24  4.28  3.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     10   0  2  1  3  5  6  3.71 1262/1506  3.71  4.49  4.26  4.30  3.71
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 11 3  0  1  4  6  2  3.69  825/1311  3.69  3.77  3.85  3.97  3.69


              Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 12 0  0  1  7  4  3  3.60 1117/1490  3.60  4.33  4.05  4.11  3.60
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 12 0  0  0  4  1 10  4.40  754/1502  4.40  4.60  4.26  4.28  4.40
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 12 0  0  2  2  2  9  4.20  953/1489  4.20  4.61  4.29  4.35  4.20
4. Were special techniques successful                  12  12  2  0  1  0  0  1.67 ****/1006  ****  3.98  4.00  4.10  ****


              Seminar
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 26 0  0  0  0  1  0  4.00 ****/ 112  ****  4.80  4.38  4.53  ****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 26 0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  97  ****  4.60  4.36  4.12  ****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 26 0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  92  ****  4.60  4.22  4.47  ****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned    26   0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/ 105  ****  4.20  4.20  4.45  ****


                                    Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned        Cum. GPA          Expected Grades       Reasons              Type               Majors
          -----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
 00-27      0       0.00-0.99    0        A    4       Required for Majors   0    Graduate      0     Major        8
 28-55      1       1.00-1.99    0        B    5
 56-83      3       2.00-2.99    3        C    2       General               6    Under-grad   27     Non-major   19
 84-150     3       3.00-3.49    3        D    3
 Grad.      0       3.50-4.00    5        F    0       Electives             0    #### - Means there are not enough
                                          P    1                                  responses to be significant
                                          I    0       Other                10
                                          ?    2
```

```
Course Section: POLI 373  0101            University of Maryland                        Page 1377
Title           COMP MID-EAST/N AFR PO     Baltimore County                             JAN 18, 2007
Instructor:     MIKHAIL, NABIL             Fall  2006                                   Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:     52
Questionnaires: 47                        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  27  0  0  0  5  5 10  4.25  914/1669  4.25  4.46  4.23  4.28  4.25
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals   27  0  0  0  5  4 11  4.30  814/1666  4.30  4.26  4.19  4.20  4.30
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals  27  0  0  1  4  2 13  4.35  728/1421  4.35  4.41  4.24  4.25  4.35
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals   27  2  0  1  1  4 12  4.50  496/1617  4.50  4.27  4.15  4.22  4.50
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned  27  1  0  0  2  4 13  4.58  285/1555  4.58  4.38  4.00  4.03  4.58
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned  27  1  0  0  3  2 14  4.58  325/1543  4.58  4.27  4.06  4.14  4.58
7. Was the grading system clearly explained           27  0  1  1  6  3  9  3.90 1161/1647  3.90  4.25  4.12  4.14  3.90
8. How many times was class cancelled                 27  0  0  1  0 12  7  4.25 1382/1668  4.25  4.42  4.67  4.68  4.25
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 33  0  0  0  2  3  9  4.50  373/1605  4.50  4.25  4.07  4.09  4.50

                Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared       28  0  0  1  2  3 13  4.47  845/1514  4.47  4.62  4.39  4.46  4.47
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject  28  0  0  0  1  1 17  4.84  677/1551  4.84  4.87  4.66  4.70  4.84
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly  28  0  0  0  2  2 15  4.68  360/1503  4.68  4.46  4.24  4.28  4.68
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned    28  0  0  0  3  2 14  4.58  575/1506  4.58  4.49  4.26  4.30  4.58
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 31  6  0  0  1  1  8  4.70 ****/1311  ****  3.77  3.85  3.97  ****

                Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned  34  0  1  0  1  3  8  4.31  650/1490  4.31  4.33  4.05  4.11  4.31
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate  33  0  1  0  2  2  9  4.29  859/1502  4.29  4.60  4.26  4.28  4.29
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 34  0  0  0  1  1 11  4.77  422/1489  4.77  4.61  4.29  4.35  4.77
4. Were special techniques successful                 35  6  0  0  1  0  5  4.67 ****/1006  ****  3.98  4.00  4.10  ****


                                    Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned        Cum. GPA        Expected Grades        Reasons              Type              Majors
--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
  00-27      0      0.00-0.99   0       A   9      Required for Majors  1     Graduate     0      Major       9
  28-55      0      1.00-1.99   0       B   6
  56-83      2      2.00-2.99   2       C   1      General              3     Under-grad  47      Non-major  38
  84-150     5      3.00-3.49   4       D   0
  Grad.      0      3.50-4.00   4       F   0      Electives            2     #### - Means there are not enough
                                        P   0                                responses to be significant
                                        I   0      Other               11
                                        ?   0
```

```
Course Section: POLI 409  0101            University of Maryland                                   Page 1378
Title       SELECTED TOPICS POLI S         Baltimore County                                        JAN 18, 2007
Instructor: GRODSKY, BRIAN                    Fall  2006                                            Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:    10
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    1   0  0  0  0  3  5  4.63  448/1669  4.63  4.46   4.23 4.39  4.63
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals     2   0  0  0  3  2  2  3.86 1273/1666  3.86  4.26   4.19 4.22  3.86
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals    1   7  0  0  1  0  0  3.00 ****/1421  ****  4.41   4.24 4.38  ****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals     1   1  0  1  1  3  2  3.86 1196/1617  3.86  4.27   4.15 4.22  3.86
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 1   0  0  0  0  1  7  4.88  112/1555  4.88  4.38   4.00 4.08  4.88
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 1 0  0  1  0  1  6  4.50  390/1543  4.50  4.27   4.06 4.18  4.50
7. Was the grading system clearly explained             1   1  6  1  0  0  0  1.14 1643/1647  1.14  4.25   4.12 4.14  1.14
8. How many times was class cancelled                   1   0  0  0  0  1  7  4.88  769/1668  4.88  4.42   4.67 4.70  4.88
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 1 0  0  0  3  4  1  3.75 1210/1605  3.75  4.25   4.07 4.16  3.75


           Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared         1   0  0  0  1  2  5  4.50  799/1514  4.50  4.62   4.39 4.45  4.50
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject    1   0  0  0  0  1  7  4.88  594/1551  4.88  4.87   4.66 4.73  4.88
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 1   0  0  1  1  2  4  4.13  996/1503  4.13  4.46   4.24 4.27  4.13
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned      1   0  0  2  0  2  4  4.00 1069/1506  4.00  4.49   4.26 4.29  4.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 1  7  0  0  1  0  0  3.00 ****/1311  ****  3.77   3.85 3.88  ****


           Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 2   0  0  0  0  1  6  4.86  177/1490  4.86  4.33   4.05 4.26  4.86
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 2   0  0  0  0  0  7  5.00    1/1502  5.00  4.60   4.26 4.46  5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 2  0  0  0  0  1  6  4.86  329/1489  4.86  4.61   4.29 4.52  4.86
4. Were special techniques successful                   2   2  0  0  2  3  0  3.60  729/1006  3.60  3.98   4.00 4.21  3.60


                              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      8
  28-55    0        1.00-1.99   0          B   1
  56-83    1        2.00-2.99   0          C   0          General              1      Under-grad    9       Non-major  1
  84-150   3        3.00-3.49   3          D   0
  Grad.    0        3.50-4.00   3          F   0          Electives            0      #### - Means there are not enough
                                           P   0                                      responses to be significant
                                           I   0          Other                5
                                           ?   6
```

```
Course Section: POLI 409A 0101         University of Maryland                                    Page 1379
Title       MOCK TRIAL                   Baltimore County                                        JAN 18, 2007
Instructor:  VAN HOVEN, JONA                 Fall  2006                                          Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:     19
Questionnaires: 19                  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    3   0  0  0  1  1  14  4.81   199/1669   4.81  4.46  4.23  4.39  4.81
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals     3   0  0  0  1  2  13  4.75   243/1666   4.75  4.26  4.19  4.22  4.75
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals    3   0  0  0  1  2  13  4.75   280/1421   4.75  4.41  4.24  4.38  4.75
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals     3   0  0  0  0  2  14  4.88   128/1617   4.88  4.27  4.15  4.22  4.88
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 3   0  0  0  0  2  14  4.88   112/1555   4.88  4.38  4.00  4.08  4.88
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 3 1  0  0  2  1  12  4.67   250/1543   4.67  4.27  4.06  4.18  4.67
7. Was the grading system clearly explained             3   0  0  0  1  3  12  4.69   281/1647   4.69  4.25  4.12  4.14  4.69
8. How many times was class cancelled                   3   0  0  0  0  9   7  4.44  1248/1668   4.44  4.42  4.67  4.70  4.44
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 6 0  0  0  0  2  11  4.85   123/1605   4.85  4.25  4.07  4.16  4.85


              Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared         3   0  0  0  0  3  13  4.81   342/1514   4.81  4.62  4.39  4.45  4.81
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject    3   0  0  0  0  1  15  4.94   358/1551   4.94  4.87  4.66  4.73  4.94
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 3   0  0  0  1  4  11  4.63   438/1503   4.63  4.46  4.24  4.27  4.63
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned      3   0  0  0  0  2  14  4.88   200/1506   4.88  4.49  4.26  4.29  4.88
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 4 10  1  0  1  0   3  3.80   764/1311   3.80  3.77  3.85  3.88  3.80


              Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 6   0  0  0  1  0  12  4.85   184/1490   4.85  4.33  4.05  4.26  4.85
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 6   0  0  1  0  0  12  4.77   381/1502   4.77  4.60  4.26  4.46  4.77
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 6  0  0  1  0  0  12  4.77   422/1489   4.77  4.61  4.29  4.52  4.77
4. Were special techniques successful                   6   0  1  0  0  0  12  4.69   167/1006   4.69  3.98  4.00  4.21  4.69


                                          Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned        Cum. GPA        Expected Grades        Reasons              Type                Majors
-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
  00-27      0      0.00-0.99    1      A   11       Required for Majors   1    Graduate      0     Major       10
  28-55      0      1.00-1.99    0      B    2
  56-83      2      2.00-2.99    3      C    0       General               4    Under-grad   19     Non-major    9
  84-150     6      3.00-3.49    3      D    0
  Grad.      0      3.50-4.00    2      F    0       Electives             0    #### - Means there are not enough
                                       P    0                                  responses to be significant
                                       I    0       Other                 8
                                       ?    0
```

```
Course Section: POLI 419  0101              University of Maryland                              Page 1380
Title        TOPICS IN POLITICAL TH          Baltimore County                                   JAN 18, 2007
Instructor:  STACEY, SIMON                    Fall  2006                                        Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:      18
Questionnaires: 13                    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  4  9  4.69  345/1669  4.69  4.46  4.23  4.39  4.69
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals     0   0  0  0  1  3  9  4.62  425/1666  4.62  4.26  4.19  4.22  4.62
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals    0   7  0  0  0  1  5  4.83  197/1421  4.83  4.41  4.24  4.38  4.83
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals     0   5  1  0  0  1  6  4.38  673/1617  4.38  4.27  4.15  4.22  4.38
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0   0  0  0  0  1 12  4.92   80/1555  4.92  4.38  4.00  4.08  4.92
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0  3  0  0  1  2  7  4.60  298/1543  4.60  4.27  4.06  4.18  4.60
7. Was the grading system clearly explained             0   0  0  1  0  2 10  4.62  356/1647  4.62  4.25  4.12  4.14  4.62
8. How many times was class cancelled                   1   0  0  0  0  7  5  4.42 1265/1668  4.42  4.42  4.67  4.70  4.42
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 1  0  0  0  0  2 10  4.83  127/1605  4.83  4.25  4.07  4.16  4.83


              Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared         1   0  0  0  0  1 11  4.92  170/1514  4.92  4.62  4.39  4.45  4.92
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject    1   0  0  0  0  0 12  5.00    1/1551  5.00  4.87  4.66  4.73  5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 1   0  0  0  0  1 11  4.92  113/1503  4.92  4.46  4.24  4.27  4.92
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned      1   0  0  0  0  1 11  4.92  147/1506  4.92  4.49  4.26  4.29  4.92
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 1  8  0  0  0  0  4  5.00    1/1311  5.00  3.77  3.85  3.88  5.00


              Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 3   0  0  0  0  1  9  4.90  141/1490  4.90  4.33  4.05  4.26  4.90
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 3   0  0  0  0  0 10  5.00    1/1502  5.00  4.60  4.26  4.46  5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 2  0  0  0  0  0 11  5.00    1/1489  5.00  4.61  4.29  4.52  5.00
4. Were special techniques successful                   2   9  0  0  0  0  2  5.00 ****/1006  ****  3.98  4.00  4.21  ****

                                    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       9
 28-55      1      1.00-1.99    0      B    5
 56-83      2      2.00-2.99    4      C    1       General              2     Under-grad   13       Non-major   4
 84-150     7      3.00-3.49    3      D    0
 Grad.      0      3.50-4.00    3      F    0       Electives            0     #### - Means there are not enough
                                       P    0                                 responses to be significant
                                       I    0       Other                9
                                       ?    0
```

```
Course Section: POLI 427  0101            University of Maryland                              Page 1381
Title        AFRICAN AMERICAN POLIT          Baltimore County                              JAN 18, 2007
Instructor:  KING-MEADOWS, T                  Fall  2006                                    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   10  0  0  0  0  1  3 4.75  269/1669  4.75  4.46  4.23 4.39  4.75
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    10  0  0  0  3  1  0 3.25 1541/1666  3.25  4.26  4.19 4.22  3.25
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   10  0  0  0  2  1  1 3.75 1135/1421  3.75  4.41  4.24 4.38  3.75
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    10  0  0  0  1  2  1 4.00 1029/1617  4.00  4.27  4.15 4.22  4.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 10  0  0  0  0  1  3 4.75  171/1555  4.75  4.38  4.00 4.08  4.75
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 10  0  0  0  1  1  2 4.25  659/1543  4.25  4.27  4.06 4.18  4.25
7. Was the grading system clearly explained            10  0  0  0  1  0  3 4.50  481/1647  4.50  4.25  4.12 4.14  4.50
8. How many times was class cancelled                  10  0  0  0  0  2  2 4.50 1190/1668  4.50  4.42  4.67 4.70  4.50
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 10  0  0  0  1  1  2 4.25  690/1605  4.25  4.25  4.07 4.16  4.25

              Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        10  0  0  0  0  1  3 4.75  441/1514  4.75  4.62  4.39 4.45  4.75
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   10  0  0  0  0  0  4 5.00    1/1551  5.00  4.87  4.66 4.73  5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 10  0  0  1  1  1  1 3.50 1330/1503  3.50  4.46  4.24 4.27  3.50
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     10  0  0  0  1  0  3 4.50  642/1506  4.50  4.49  4.26 4.29  4.50
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 10  0  0  0  1  1  2 4.25  445/1311  4.25  3.77  3.85 3.88  4.25

              Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 10  0  0  0  0  1  3 4.75  261/1490  4.75  4.33  4.05 4.26  4.75
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 10  0  0  0  0  0  4 5.00    1/1502  5.00  4.60  4.26 4.46  5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 10  0  0  0  0  2  2 4.50  684/1489  4.50  4.61  4.29 4.52  4.50
4. Were special techniques successful                  10  3  0  0  0  1  0 4.00 ****/1006  ****  3.98  4.00 4.21  ****


                                    Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned        Cum. GPA          Expected Grades         Reasons              Type                 Majors
-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
  00-27      0      0.00-0.99    0        A    3       Required for Majors  0     Graduate      0     Major       4
  28-55      0      1.00-1.99    0        B    0                                                      
  56-83      0      2.00-2.99    1        C    1       General       2           Under-grad    14    Non-major   10
  84-150     2      3.00-3.49    1        D    0
  Grad.      0      3.50-4.00    1        F    0       Electives     0           #### - Means there are not enough
                                          P    0                                 responses to be significant
                                          I    0       Other         2
                                          ?    0
```

```
Course Section: POLI 433  0101            University of Maryland                              Page 1382
Title       FIRST AMENDMENT FREEDO           Baltimore County                                JAN 18, 2007
Instructor:  LANOUE, GEORGE                     Fall  2006                                    Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:    33
Questionnaires: 25                        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  6 18  4.68  375/1669  4.68  4.46  4.23  4.39  4.68
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals      0   0  0  0  2  5 18  4.64  385/1666  4.64  4.26  4.19  4.22  4.64
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals     0   0  0  0  0  5 20  4.80  217/1421  4.80  4.41  4.24  4.38  4.80
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals      0   0  0  0  2  7 16  4.56  434/1617  4.56  4.27  4.15  4.22  4.56
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned  0   0  0  0  0  4 21  4.84  124/1555  4.84  4.38  4.00  4.08  4.84
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0  1  0  0  2  7 15  4.54  353/1543  4.54  4.27  4.06  4.18  4.54
7. Was the grading system clearly explained              0   0  0  0  4  2 19  4.60  367/1647  4.60  4.25  4.12  4.14  4.60
8. How many times was class cancelled                    0   0  0  0  0  2 23  4.92  570/1668  4.92  4.42  4.67  4.70  4.92
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 5  1  0  0  1  9  9  4.42  473/1605  4.42  4.25  4.07  4.16  4.42


              Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared          0   0  0  0  0  3 22  4.88  223/1514  4.88  4.62  4.39  4.45  4.88
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject     0   0  0  0  0  3 22  4.88  567/1551  4.88  4.87  4.66  4.73  4.88
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly  0   0  0  0  2  5 18  4.64  412/1503  4.64  4.46  4.24  4.27  4.64
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned       0   0  0  0  0  4 21  4.84  237/1506  4.84  4.49  4.26  4.29  4.84
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 3  10  1  1  4  4  2  3.42  989/1311  3.42  3.77  3.85  3.88  3.42


              Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned  2   0  0  0  2 11 10  4.35  613/1490  4.35  4.33  4.05  4.26  4.35
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate  2   0  0  0  1  1 21  4.87  276/1502  4.87  4.60  4.26  4.46  4.87
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 2   0  0  0  1  1 21  4.87  319/1489  4.87  4.61  4.29  4.52  4.87
4. Were special techniques successful                    2   2  1  0  1  6 13  4.43  292/1006  4.43  3.98  4.00  4.21  4.43


                               Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned        Cum. GPA        Expected Grades          Reasons               Type                 Majors
------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
  00-27     0      0.00-0.99   0       A    8      Required for Majors  0     Graduate    1      Major     14
  28-55     0      1.00-1.99   0       B   10
  56-83     3      2.00-2.99   2       C    3      General              5     Under-grad  24     Non-major 11
  84-150   12      3.00-3.49   7       D    0
  Grad.     1      3.50-4.00  10       F    0      Electives            0     #### - Means there are not enough
                                       P    0                                responses to be significant
                                       I    0      Other               18
                                       ?    0
```

| | | | 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	0	0	9	5.00	1/1669	5.00	4.46	4.23	4.39	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1666	5.00	4.26	4.19	4.22	5.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1421	5.00	4.41	4.24	4.38	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	123/1617	4.89	4.27	4.15	4.22	4.89
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1555	5.00	4.38	4.00	4.08	5.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1543	5.00	4.27	4.06	4.18	5.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1647	5.00	4.25	4.12	4.14	5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	1	4	4	4.33	1329/1668	4.33	4.42	4.67	4.70	4.33
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	239/1605	4.67	4.25	4.07	4.16	4.67
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	223/1514	4.89	4.62	4.39	4.45	4.89
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1551	5.00	4.87	4.66	4.73	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1503	5.00	4.46	4.24	4.27	5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	0	0	0	8	4.56	594/1506	4.56	4.49	4.26	4.29	4.56
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	6	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1311	****	3.77	3.85	3.88	****
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1490	5.00	4.33	4.05	4.26	5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1502	5.00	4.60	4.26	4.46	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1489	5.00	4.61	4.29	4.52	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	4	0	0	0	2	0	4	4.33	344/1006	4.33	3.98	4.00	4.21	4.33

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	1	Major	4
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	3						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	1	C	0	General	3	Under-grad	9	Non-major	6
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough			
				P	0			responses to be significant			
				I	0	Other	4				
				?	0						

```
Course Section: POLI 445  0101            University of Maryland                          Page 1384
Title       LAW/POLITICS/AMER EDUC        Baltimore County                               JAN 18, 2007
Instructor:    LANOUE, GEORGE             Fall   2006                                    Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:    15
Questionnaires: 15                     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

Question	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	2	0	0	0	0	2	11	4.85	175/1669	4.85	4.46	4.23	4.39	4.85
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	0	1	0	5	7	4.38	715/1666	4.38	4.26	4.19	4.22	4.38
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	6	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	331/1421	4.71	4.41	4.24	4.38	4.71
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	0	0	0	1	3	9	4.62	382/1617	4.62	4.27	4.15	4.22	4.62
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	1	12	4.92	80/1555	4.92	4.38	4.00	4.08	4.92
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	1	0	0	1	1	10	4.75	180/1543	4.75	4.27	4.06	4.18	4.75
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	2	1	7	3	3.85	1214/1647	3.85	4.25	4.12	4.14	3.85
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	1	12	4.92	570/1668	4.92	4.42	4.67	4.70	4.92
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	0	2	4	4	4.20	759/1605	4.20	4.25	4.07	4.16	4.20

Lecture

Question	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	0	1	12	4.92	151/1514	4.92	4.62	4.39	4.45	4.92
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	0	13	5.00	1/1551	5.00	4.87	4.66	4.73	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	0	2	11	4.85	182/1503	4.85	4.46	4.24	4.27	4.85
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	1	0	12	4.85	237/1506	4.85	4.49	4.26	4.29	4.85
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	10	2	0	1	0	0	1.67	****/1311	****	3.77	3.85	3.88	****

Discussion

Question	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	2	11	4.85	184/1490	4.85	4.33	4.05	4.26	4.85
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	0	1	12	4.92	189/1502	4.92	4.60	4.26	4.46	4.92
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	1	0	1	11	4.69	500/1489	4.69	4.61	4.29	4.52	4.69
4. Were special techniques successful	2	5	1	1	0	2	4	3.88	617/1006	3.88	3.98	4.00	4.21	3.88

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	6	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	2	Major	7
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	3						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	1	General	1	Under-grad	13	Non-major	8
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	4	D	0						
Grad.	2	3.50-4.00	5	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough			
				P	1			responses to be significant			
				I	0	Other	11				
				?	1						

```
Course Section: POLI 446  0101              University of Maryland                           Page 1385
Title        THE POLITICS OF POVERT          Baltimore County                                JAN 18, 2007
Instructor:  BOUCHET, STACEY                 Fall  2006                                      Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:     13
Questionnaires: 13                    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    3   0  0  0  1  4  5  4.40  734/1669  4.40  4.46  4.23 4.39  4.40
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals     3   0  0  0  2  2  6  4.40  691/1666  4.40  4.26  4.19 4.22  4.40
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals    3   0  0  0  1  1  8  4.70  356/1421  4.70  4.41  4.24 4.38  4.70
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals     4   1  0  1  1  3  3  4.00 1029/1617  4.00  4.27  4.15 4.22  4.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 4   0  0  1  0  1  7  4.56  301/1555  4.56  4.38  4.00 4.08  4.56
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 5 1  0  1  2  1  3  3.86 1060/1543  3.86  4.27  4.06 4.18  3.86
7. Was the grading system clearly explained             3   0  0  1  1  2  6  4.30  806/1647  4.30  4.25  4.12 4.14  4.30
8. How many times was class cancelled                   3   0  0  0  0  6  4  4.40 1274/1668  4.40  4.42  4.67 4.70  4.40
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 4 1  0  0  2  3  3  4.13  830/1605  4.13  4.25  4.07 4.16  4.13

            Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared         3   0  0  1  0  3  6  4.40  955/1514  4.40  4.62  4.39 4.45  4.40
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject    3   0  0  0  0  1  9  4.90  512/1551  4.90  4.87  4.66 4.73  4.90
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 3   0  0  0  0  1  9  4.90  126/1503  4.90  4.46  4.24 4.27  4.90
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned      3   0  0  0  1  1  8  4.70  433/1506  4.70  4.49  4.26 4.29  4.70
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 3  0  1  1  0  3  5  4.00  587/1311  4.00  3.77  3.85 3.88  4.00

            Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 3   0  0  0  0  1  9  4.90  141/1490  4.90  4.33  4.05 4.26  4.90
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 4   0  0  0  1  0  8  4.78  370/1502  4.78  4.60  4.26 4.46  4.78
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 3  0  0  0  0  2  8  4.80  378/1489  4.80  4.61  4.29 4.52  4.80
4. Were special techniques successful                   3   3  1  2  0  2  2  3.29  862/1006  3.29  3.98  4.00 4.21  3.29

            Seminar
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 11  0  0  0  0  1  1  4.50 ****/ 112  ****  4.80  4.38 4.74  ****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 12 0  0  0  0  1  0  4.00 ****/  97  ****  4.60  4.36 4.69  ****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 12  0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  92  ****  4.60  4.22 4.48  ****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned     12  0  0  0  0  1  0  4.00 ****/ 105  ****  4.20  4.20 4.27  ****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear                 12  0  0  0  0  1  0  4.00 ****/  98  ****  3.80  3.95 3.86  ****

                                    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      0    Major        5
 28-55      0      1.00-1.99    0      B    3
 56-83      4      2.00-2.99    2      C    1      General              4    Under-grad   13    Non-major    8
 84-150     5      3.00-3.49    2      D    0
 Grad.      0      3.50-4.00    5      F    0      Electives            0    #### - Means there are not enough
                                       P    0                               responses to be significant
                                       I    0      Other               6
                                       ?    0
```

```
Course Section: POLI 452  0101              University of Maryland                              Page 1386
Title      POLITICS OF HEALTH               Baltimore County                                    JAN 18, 2007
Instructor:   BANKS, DAVID B                Fall   2006                                         Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:      11
Questionnaires:  11                  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   3   0   0   0   0   4   4  4.50  590/1669  4.50  4.46  4.23  4.39  4.50
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    4   0   0   0   1   3   3  4.29  841/1666  4.29  4.26  4.19  4.22  4.29
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   3   2   0   0   0   2   4  4.67  392/1421  4.67  4.41  4.24  4.38  4.67
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    3   1   0   0   0   3   4  4.57  424/1617  4.57  4.27  4.15  4.22  4.57
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 3  0   0   1   1   3   3  4.00  773/1555  4.00  4.38  4.00  4.08  4.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 3 0   0   0   1   4   3  4.25  659/1543  4.25  4.27  4.06  4.18  4.25
7. Was the grading system clearly explained            3   0   0   0   3   3   2  3.88 1187/1647  3.88  4.25  4.12  4.14  3.88
8. How many times was class cancelled                  3   0   0   0   0   1   7  4.88  769/1668  4.88  4.42  4.67  4.70  4.88
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 4 0  0   0   2   2   3  4.14  810/1605  4.14  4.25  4.07  4.16  4.14


             Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        3   0   0   0   0   3   5  4.63  647/1514  4.63  4.62  4.39  4.45  4.63
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   3   0   0   0   0   1   7  4.88  594/1551  4.88  4.87  4.66  4.73  4.88
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 3  0   0   0   0   4   4  4.50  556/1503  4.50  4.46  4.24  4.27  4.50
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     3   0   0   0   1   2   5  4.50  642/1506  4.50  4.49  4.26  4.29  4.50


             Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 3  0   0   0   1   3   4  4.38  585/1490  4.38  4.33  4.05  4.26  4.38
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 3  0   0   0   0   0   8  5.00    1/1502  5.00  4.60  4.26  4.46  5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 3 0  0   0   0   0   8  5.00    1/1489  5.00  4.61  4.29  4.52  5.00

             Seminar
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 10 0   0   0   0   1   0  4.00 ****/ 112  ****  4.80  4.38  4.74  ****


                                   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       4
  28-55     0        1.00-1.99    0       B    1
  56-83     1        2.00-2.99    0       C    0        General              1     Under-grad   11      Non-major   7
  84-150    3        3.00-3.49    4       D    0
  Grad.     0        3.50-4.00    1       F    0        Electives            0     #### - Means there are not enough
                                          P    0                                   responses to be significant
                                          I    0        Other                4
                                          ?    0
```

```
Course Section: POLI 469  0101              University of Maryland                              Page 1387
Title       TOPICS IN COMP POLITIC              Baltimore County                              JAN 18, 2007
Instructor:    FORESTIERE, CAR                    Fall   2006                                 Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:      19
Questionnaires:  19                    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    2   0  0  0  1  3 13  4.71  331/1669  4.71  4.46  4.23 4.39  4.71
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals     2   0  0  0  0  3 14  4.82  165/1666  4.82  4.26  4.19 4.22  4.82
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals    2   4  0  0  0  1 12  4.92  121/1421  4.92  4.41  4.24 4.38  4.92
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals     2   0  0  0  0  3 14  4.82  151/1617  4.82  4.27  4.15 4.22  4.82
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 2   0  0  0  0  2 15  4.88  108/1555  4.88  4.38  4.00 4.08  4.88
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 2 0  0  0  0  4 13  4.76  172/1543  4.76  4.27  4.06 4.18  4.76
7. Was the grading system clearly explained             2   0  0  0  0  3 14  4.82  156/1647  4.82  4.25  4.12 4.14  4.82
8. How many times was class cancelled                   2   0  0  0  0  4 13  4.76  952/1668  4.76  4.42  4.67 4.70  4.76
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 6 0  0  0  0  4  9  4.69  210/1605  4.69  4.25  4.07 4.16  4.69


                Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared         2   0  0  0  0  2 15  4.88  223/1514  4.88  4.62  4.39 4.45  4.88
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject    2   0  0  0  0  0 17  5.00    1/1551  5.00  4.87  4.66 4.73  5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 2   0  0  0  0  3 14  4.82  201/1503  4.82  4.46  4.24 4.27  4.82
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned      2   0  0  0  0  4 13  4.76  340/1506  4.76  4.49  4.26 4.29  4.76
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 2  0  0  0  4  6  7  4.18  495/1311  4.18  3.77  3.85 3.88  4.18


                Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 5   0  0  0  1  2 11  4.71  298/1490  4.71  4.33  4.05 4.26  4.71
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 5   0  0  0  0  1 13  4.93  189/1502  4.93  4.60  4.26 4.46  4.93
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 5  0  0  0  0  2 12  4.86  329/1489  4.86  4.61  4.29 4.52  4.86
4. Were special techniques successful                   6   0  0  0  2  3  8  4.46  263/1006  4.46  3.98  4.00 4.21  4.46


                Seminar
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 16  0  0  0  0  1  2  4.67 ****/ 112  ****  4.80  4.38 4.74  ****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 16 2  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  97  ****  4.60  4.36 4.69  ****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 16  2  0  0  0  1  0  4.00 ****/  92  ****  4.60  4.22 4.48  ****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned     16  0  0  0  1  0  2  4.33 ****/ 105  ****  4.20  4.20 4.27  ****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear                 16  0  0  0  0  2  1  4.33 ****/  98  ****  3.80  3.95 3.86  ****


                Field Work
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned  18  0  1  0  0  0  0  1.00 ****/  58  ****  ****  4.22 3.94  ****


                Self  Paced
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal     18  0  0  0  0  1  0  4.00 ****/  42  ****  ****  4.31 5.00  ****

                              Frequency Distribution
```

```
Credits Earned          Cum. GPA          Expected Grades          Reasons                  Type                    Majors
----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
00-27     0       0.00-0.99   0         A   8       Required for Majors   0       Graduate     0         Major        15
28-55     0       1.00-1.99   0         B   7                                                                   
56-83     4       2.00-2.99   2         C   1       General               4       Under-grad   19        Non-major     4
84-150    5       3.00-3.49   6         D   0                                                             
Grad.     0       3.50-4.00   5         F   0       Electives             0       #### - Means there are not enough
                                        P   0                                     responses to be significant
                                        I   0       Other                12
                                        ?   0
```

```
Course Section: POLI 473  0101              University of Maryland                          Page 1388
Title        GANDHI POL EXPMT TRUTH          Baltimore County                              JAN 18, 2007
Instructor:  LEVY, HAROLD L                  Fall  2006                                    Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:      11
Questionnaires:  11                  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   4   0  0  1  1  2  3  4.00 1173/1669  4.00  4.46  4.23 4.39  4.00
 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    4   0  0  0  1  4  2  4.14 1001/1666  4.14  4.26  4.19 4.22  4.14
 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   4   6  0  0  0  1  0  4.00 ****/1421  ****  4.41  4.24 4.38  ****
 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    4   0  0  0  3  3  1  3.71 1273/1617  3.71  4.27  4.15 4.22  3.71
 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 4  0  0  0  0  1  6  4.86  120/1555  4.86  4.38  4.00 4.08  4.86
 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 4 0 0  0  1  1  5  4.57  325/1543  4.57  4.27  4.06 4.18  4.57
 7. Was the grading system clearly explained            4   0  0  1  1  1  4  4.14  962/1647  4.14  4.25  4.12 4.14  4.14
 8. How many times was class cancelled                  4   0  0  0  0  5  2  4.29 1364/1668  4.29  4.42  4.67 4.70  4.29
 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 8 0 0  0  0  2  1  4.33  591/1605  4.33  4.25  4.07 4.16  4.33

            Lecture
 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        4   0  0  0  0  2  5  4.71  505/1514  4.71  4.62  4.39 4.45  4.71
 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   4   0  0  0  0  0  7  5.00    1/1551  5.00  4.87  4.66 4.73  5.00
 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 4  0  0  0  1  2  4  4.43  686/1503  4.43  4.46  4.24 4.27  4.43
 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     4   0  0  0  2  0  5  4.43  744/1506  4.43  4.49  4.26 4.29  4.43
 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 4 6 0  0  1  0  0  3.00 ****/1311  ****  3.77  3.85 3.88  ****

            Discussion
 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 6  0  0  0  2  1  2  4.00  849/1490  4.00  4.33  4.05 4.26  4.00
 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 6  0  0  0  1  0  4  4.60  540/1502  4.60  4.60  4.26 4.46  4.60
 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 6 0 0  0  0  2  3  4.60  596/1489  4.60  4.61  4.29 4.52  4.60
 4. Were special techniques successful                  6   4  0  0  1  0  0  3.00 ****/1006  ****  3.98  4.00 4.21  ****

            Seminar
 1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 6  0  0  0  0  1  4  4.80   46/ 112  4.80  4.80  4.38 4.74  4.80
 2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 6 0 0  0  1  0  4  4.60   47/  97  4.60  4.60  4.36 4.69  4.60
 3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 6  0  0  0  1  0  4  4.60   40/  92  4.60  4.60  4.22 4.48  4.60
 4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned    6   0  0  0  1  2  2  4.20   61/ 105  4.20  4.20  4.20 4.27  4.20
 5. Were criteria for grading made clear                6   0  0  1  0  3  1  3.80   68/  98  3.80  3.80  3.95 3.86  3.80

                                   Frequency Distribution
```

```
Credits Earned         Cum. GPA         Expected Grades        Reasons                 Type                Majors
-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
  00-27      0      0.00-0.99     0      A    1      Required for Majors  1      Graduate      0      Major       5
  28-55      0      1.00-1.99     0      B    4
  56-83      2      2.00-2.99     0      C    0      General              4      Under-grad   11      Non-major   6
  84-150     3      3.00-3.49     4      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                3
                                        ?    2
```

```
Course Section: POLI 482  0101             University of Maryland                        Page 1389
Title       INTERNATIONAL LAW               Baltimore County                            JAN 18, 2007
Instructor:  MELCAVAGE, EUGE                 Fall   2006                                 Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:     17
Questionnaires: 17                    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    3   0  0  0  0  2 12  4.86  167/1669  4.86  4.46  4.23  4.39  4.86
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals     3   0  0  1  1  1 11  4.57  472/1666  4.57  4.26  4.19  4.22  4.57
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals    3   0  0  0  0  2 12  4.86  184/1421  4.86  4.41  4.24  4.38  4.86
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals     3   0  0  1  1  2 10  4.50  496/1617  4.50  4.27  4.15  4.22  4.50
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 3   0  0  0  0  2 12  4.86  120/1555  4.86  4.38  4.00  4.08  4.86
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 3 0  1  0  0  3 10  4.50  390/1543  4.50  4.27  4.06  4.18  4.50
7. Was the grading system clearly explained             3   0  0  0  1  2 11  4.71  250/1647  4.71  4.25  4.12  4.14  4.71
8. How many times was class cancelled                   3   0  0  0  0  8  6  4.43 1257/1668  4.43  4.42  4.67  4.70  4.43
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 6 0  0  0  1  3  7  4.55  343/1605  4.55  4.25  4.07  4.16  4.55


                Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared         3   0  0  0  0  1 13  4.93  151/1514  4.93  4.62  4.39  4.45  4.93
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject    3   0  0  0  0  0 14  5.00    1/1551  5.00  4.87  4.66  4.73  5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 3   0  0  0  0  2 12  4.86  173/1503  4.86  4.46  4.24  4.27  4.86
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned      3   0  0  0  0  0 14  5.00    1/1506  5.00  4.49  4.26  4.29  5.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 3  7  2  1  2  0  2  2.86 1173/1311  2.86  3.77  3.85  3.88  2.86


                Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 7   0  0  0  1  2  7  4.60  389/1490  4.60  4.33  4.05  4.26  4.60
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 7   0  0  0  0  1  9  4.90  237/1502  4.90  4.60  4.26  4.46  4.90
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 7  0  0  0  1  1  8  4.70  500/1489  4.70  4.61  4.29  4.52  4.70
4. Were special techniques successful                   7   2  1  1  1  2  3  3.63  717/1006  3.63  3.98  4.00  4.21  3.63


                              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        11
  28-55      0        1.00-1.99   0        B    6                                                         
  56-83      2        2.00-2.99   4        C    3        General               3     Under-grad   17      Non-major     6
  84-150     7        3.00-3.49   2        D    0                                                         
  Grad.      0        3.50-4.00   3        F    0        Electives             0     #### - Means there are not enough
                                           P    0                                    responses to be significant
                                           I    0        Other                 9
                                           ?    1
```

```
Course Section: POLI 488  0101            University of Maryland                           Page 1390
Title       POLITICS/IR SOUTH ASIA        Baltimore County                              JAN 18, 2007
Instructor:  HAGERTY, DEVIN                   Fall  2006                                  Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:     26
Questionnaires: 25                    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  14  0  0  0  1  0 10 4.82  199/1669 4.82 4.46 4.23 4.39 4.82
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals   14  0  0  0  2  1  8 4.55  505/1666 4.55 4.26 4.19 4.22 4.55
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals  14  0  0  0  1  1  9 4.73  318/1421 4.73 4.41 4.24 4.38 4.73
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals   14  5  0  0  0  0  6 5.00 ****/1617 **** 4.27 4.15 4.22 ****
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 14 0 0 1 1 3 6 4.27 541/1555 4.27 4.38 4.00 4.08 4.27
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 14 6 0 0 0 0 5 5.00 ****/1543 **** 4.27 4.06 4.18 ****
7. Was the grading system clearly explained           14  0  0  0  1  1  9 4.73  241/1647 4.73 4.25 4.12 4.14 4.73
8. How many times was class cancelled                 14  0  0  0  5  5  1 3.64 1631/1668 3.64 4.42 4.67 4.70 3.64
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 16 0 0 0 0 1 8 4.89 107/1605 4.89 4.25 4.07 4.16 4.89

                Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared       14  0  0  0  0  1 10 4.91  189/1514 4.91 4.62 4.39 4.45 4.91
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject  14  0  0  0  0  1 10 4.91  512/1551 4.91 4.87 4.66 4.73 4.91
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 14 0 0 0 0 2 9 4.82 210/1503 4.82 4.46 4.24 4.27 4.82
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned    14  0  0  0  0  1 10 4.91  164/1506 4.91 4.49 4.26 4.29 4.91
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 16 3 1 1 1 1 2 3.33 ****/1311 **** 3.77 3.85 3.88 ****

                Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 17 0 0 0 3 0 5 4.25 692/1490 4.25 4.33 4.05 4.26 4.25
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 17 0 0 0 2 0 6 4.50 632/1502 4.50 4.60 4.26 4.46 4.50
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 17 0 0 0 2 0 6 4.50 684/1489 4.50 4.61 4.29 4.52 4.50
4. Were special techniques successful                 17  7  0  0  0  0  1 5.00 ****/1006 **** 3.98 4.00 4.21 ****


                              Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned        Cum. GPA        Expected Grades        Reasons              Type                 Majors
-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
  00-27      0      0.00-0.99    0      A    3     Required for Majors  0    Graduate     0     Major       11
  28-55      0      1.00-1.99    0      B    5
  56-83      2      2.00-2.99    0      C    1     General              1    Under-grad  25     Non-major   14
  84-150     3      3.00-3.49    2      D    0
  Grad.      0      3.50-4.00    3      F    0     Electives            0    #### - Means there are not enough
                                       P    0                               responses to be significant
                                       I    0     Other                8
                                       ?    0
```

```
Course Section: POLI 489  0101              University of Maryland                        Page 1391
Title        SEL TOPICS:INTERNATL R          Baltimore County                           JAN 18, 2007
Instructor:   MIKHAIL, NABIL                 Fall   2006                                 Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:    35
Questionnaires: 35                    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      9   0  1  0  2  3 20  4.58  511/1669  4.58  4.46  4.23 4.39  4.58
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals      10   0  1  0  3  4 17  4.44  634/1666  4.44  4.26  4.19 4.22  4.44
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals      9   0  1  0  3  3 19  4.50  557/1421  4.50  4.41  4.24 4.38  4.50
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals       9   3  0  1  1  3 18  4.65  335/1617  4.65  4.27  4.15 4.22  4.65
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned  10   0  1  0  4  3 17  4.40  438/1555  4.40  4.38  4.00 4.08  4.40
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 11   1  1  0  3  2 17  4.48  427/1543  4.48  4.27  4.06 4.18  4.48
7. Was the grading system clearly explained              11   0  0  0  4  1 19  4.63  345/1647  4.63  4.25  4.12 4.14  4.63
8. How many times was class cancelled                    11   0  1  2  2 15  4  3.79 1608/1668  3.79  4.42  4.67 4.70  3.79
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 15   1  1  1  1  4 12  4.32  617/1605  4.32  4.25  4.07 4.16  4.32


           Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared          10   0  0  0  5  4 16  4.44  892/1514  4.44  4.62  4.39 4.45  4.44
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject     11   0  0  0  0  2 22  4.92  460/1551  4.92  4.87  4.66 4.73  4.92
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly  10   0  1  0  3  5 16  4.40  719/1503  4.40  4.46  4.24 4.27  4.40
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned       10   0  0  0  2  5 18  4.64  496/1506  4.64  4.49  4.26 4.29  4.64
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 11  12  3  0  2  0  7  3.67  846/1311  3.67  3.77  3.85 3.88  3.67


           Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned  15   0  0  0  0  2 18  4.90  141/1490  4.90  4.33  4.05 4.26  4.90
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate  15   0  0  0  2  1 17  4.75  393/1502  4.75  4.60  4.26 4.46  4.75
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 14   0  0  0  1  1 19  4.86  329/1489  4.86  4.61  4.29 4.52  4.86
4. Were special techniques successful                    14  10  0  0  1  1  9  4.73  155/1006  4.73  3.98  4.00 4.21  4.73


           Laboratory
2. Were you provided with adequate background information 34   0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/ 233  ****  ****  4.19 4.40  ****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 33   0  0  0  0  0  2  5.00 ****/ 225  ****  ****  4.50 4.39  ****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance             33   0  0  0  0  0  2  5.00 ****/ 223  ****  ****  4.35 4.56  ****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified   33   0  0  0  0  1  1  4.50 ****/ 206  ****  ****  4.15 4.20  ****


           Seminar
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme  33   1  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/ 112  ****  4.80  4.38 4.74  ****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 34   0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  97  ****  4.60  4.36 4.69  ****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned  33   0  0  0  0  0  2  5.00 ****/  92  ****  4.60  4.22 4.48  ****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned      33   0  0  0  0  0  2  5.00 ****/ 105  ****  4.20  4.20 4.27  ****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear                  33   0  0  0  0  1  1  4.50 ****/  98  ****  3.80  3.95 3.86  ****


           Field Work
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned   33   0  0  0  0  0  2  5.00 ****/  58  ****  ****  4.22 3.94  ****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria   33   0  0  0  0  0  2  5.00 ****/  52  ****  ****  4.06 3.80  ****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation         33   0  0  0  0  1  1  4.50 ****/  39  ****  ****  4.39 3.78  ****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations     33   0  0  0  0  0  2  5.00 ****/  40  ****  ****  3.97 3.81  ****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities   33   0  0  1  0  0  1  3.50 ****/  30  ****  ****  4.33 4.50  ****


           Self  Paced
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned  33   0  0  0  0  1  1  4.50 ****/  55  ****  ****  4.34 5.00  ****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal      33   0  0  0  0  1  1  4.50 ****/  42  ****  ****  4.31 5.00  ****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful        33   0  0  0  0  1  1  4.50 ****/  46  ****  ****  4.45 4.92  ****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful         33   0  0  0  0  0  2  5.00 ****/  33  ****  ****  4.25 3.00  ****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students       33   0  0  0  0  0  2  5.00 ****/  29  ****  ****  4.34 2.00  ****
```

Title   SEL TOPICS:INTERNATL R   Baltimore County   JAN 18, 2007
Instructor: MIKHAIL, NABIL   Fall   2006   Job IRBR3029
Enrollment: 35
Questionnaires: 35   Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

                                              Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned   Cum. GPA   Expected Grades   Reasons   Type   Majors
----
 00-27   0   0.00-0.99   0   A   14   Required for Majors   0   Graduate   0   Major   17
 28-55   2   1.00-1.99   0   B   7
 56-83   3   2.00-2.99   2   C   0   General   6   Under-grad   35   Non-major 18
 84-150   9   3.00-3.49   7   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
                                             ?   0

```
Course Section: POLI 623  0101            University of Maryland                            Page 1392
Title      GOVERNMENTAL BUDGETING           Baltimore County                             JAN 18, 2007
Instructor: MEYERS, ROY T.                     Fall  2006                                 Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:    18
Questionnaires: 18                    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   2  0  0  0  0  7  9  4.56  522/1669  4.56 4.46 4.23 4.35 4.56
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    2  0  0  0  0  6 10  4.63  412/1666  4.63 4.26 4.19 4.19 4.63
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   3  9  0  0  0  2  4  4.67  392/1421  4.67 4.41 4.24 4.33 4.67
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    2  0  0  0  1  4 11  4.63  370/1617  4.63 4.27 4.15 4.24 4.63
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 2 0  0  1  1  2 12  4.56  293/1555  4.56 4.38 4.00 4.07 4.56
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 2 0 0 0 1 0 15 4.88  115/1543  4.88 4.27 4.06 4.27 4.88
7. Was the grading system clearly explained            2  0  0  0  1  4 11  4.63  345/1647  4.63 4.25 4.12 4.15 4.63
8. How many times was class cancelled                  2  0  0  0  0  0 16  5.00    1/1668  5.00 4.42 4.67 4.83 5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 6 0 0 0 0 4 8  4.67  239/1605  4.67 4.25 4.07 4.13 4.67


             Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        2  0  0  0  0  1 15  4.94  132/1514  4.94 4.62 4.39 4.37 4.94
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   2  0  0  0  0  0 16  5.00    1/1551  5.00 4.87 4.66 4.72 5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 2 0  0  0  0  6 10  4.63  438/1503  4.63 4.46 4.24 4.22 4.63
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     2  0  0  0  0  4 12  4.75  353/1506  4.75 4.49 4.26 4.24 4.75
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 2 0  0  0  2  7  7  4.31  405/1311  4.31 3.77 3.85 3.89 4.31


             Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 3 0  0  0  0  5 10  4.67  340/1490  4.67 4.33 4.05 4.18 4.67
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 3 0  0  0  0  1 14  4.93  166/1502  4.93 4.60 4.26 4.46 4.93
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 3 0 0 0 0 1 14  4.93  196/1489  4.93 4.61 4.29 4.44 4.93
4. Were special techniques successful                  4  0  0  0  0  4 10  4.71  159/1006  4.71 3.98 4.00 4.11 4.71

             Laboratory
2. Were you provided with adequate background information 17 0 0 0 0 0 1  5.00 ****/ 233  **** **** 4.19 4.41 ****


             Seminar
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 17 0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/ 112  **** 4.80 4.38 4.39 ****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 17 0 0 0 0 0 1  5.00 ****/  97  **** 4.60 4.36 4.38 ****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 17 0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  92  **** 4.60 4.22 4.36 ****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned    17  0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/ 105  **** 4.20 4.20 4.23 ****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear                17  0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  98  **** 3.80 3.95 3.93 ****


                                    Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned        Cum. GPA        Expected Grades        Reasons              Type               Majors
----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
 00-27     5        0.00-0.99    1      A   14       Required for Majors  0    Graduate    9      Major       0
 28-55     0        1.00-1.99    0      B    1
 56-83     0        2.00-2.99    0      C    0       General              1    Under-grad  9      Non-major  18
 84-150    0        3.00-3.49    2      D    0
 Grad.     9        3.50-4.00    6      F    0       Electives            0    #### - Means there are not enough
                                        P    0                                responses to be significant
                                        I    0       Other               14
                                        ?    0
```