

Course-Section: POLI 100 0101  
 Title AMER GOVT & POLITICS  
 Instructor: KING-MEADOWS, T  
 Enrollment: 27  
 Questionnaires: 27

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2007

Page 1211  
 JUN 26, 2007  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	13	0	0	2	4	2	6	3.86	1244/1522	4.51	4.51	4.30	4.14	3.86	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	13	0	1	2	2	4	5	3.71	1285/1522	4.38	4.40	4.26	4.18	3.71	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	13	0	1	4	1	5	3	3.36	1208/1285	4.30	4.48	4.30	4.22	3.36	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	13	0	4	2	1	5	2	2.93	1429/1476	3.96	4.33	4.22	4.09	2.93	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	2	4	4	4	3.71	1045/1412	4.40	4.45	4.06	4.01	3.71	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	13	0	7	1	1	2	3	2.50	1350/1381	3.76	4.30	4.08	3.93	2.50	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	13	0	0	3	2	7	2	3.57	1272/1500	4.50	4.43	4.18	4.16	3.57	
8. How many times was class cancelled	13	0	0	2	5	7	0	3.36	1498/1517	4.10	4.43	4.65	4.62	3.36	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	15	1	1	3	1	4	2	3.27	1364/1497	4.30	4.30	4.11	4.02	3.27	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	13	0	0	1	2	6	5	4.07	1159/1440	4.65	4.63	4.45	4.40	4.07	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	13	0	0	1	0	5	8	4.43	1224/1448	4.87	4.81	4.71	4.63	4.43	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	15	0	1	3	0	5	3	3.50	1282/1436	4.42	4.45	4.29	4.24	3.50	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	1	2	4	6	4.15	956/1432	4.59	4.52	4.29	4.23	4.15	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	14	7	2	1	1	1	1	2.67	****/1221	4.04	3.74	3.93	3.86	****	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	19	0	1	1	0	2	4	3.88	839/1280	4.17	4.43	4.10	3.92	3.88	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	19	0	1	1	2	2	2	3.38	1176/1277	4.09	4.60	4.34	4.13	3.38	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	19	0	2	0	1	3	2	3.38	1149/1269	4.34	4.56	4.31	4.04	3.38	
4. Were special techniques successful	19	6	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/ 854	3.70	3.75	4.02	3.87	****	

Frequency Distribution

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

Enrollment: 38  
 Questionnaires: 40

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	26	0	0	0	1	5	8	4.50	605/1522	4.51	4.51	4.30	4.14	4.50
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	26	0	0	1	3	0	10	4.36	763/1522	4.38	4.40	4.26	4.18	4.36
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	26	0	0	2	1	4	7	4.14	849/1285	4.30	4.48	4.30	4.22	4.14
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	26	0	0	2	1	4	7	4.14	913/1476	3.96	4.33	4.22	4.09	4.14
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	26	0	0	0	3	0	11	4.57	299/1412	4.40	4.45	4.06	4.01	4.57
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	26	0	1	1	3	3	6	3.86	977/1381	3.76	4.30	4.08	3.93	3.86
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	26	0	0	0	1	3	10	4.64	337/1500	4.50	4.43	4.18	4.16	4.64
8. How many times was class cancelled	26	0	0	2	3	7	2	3.64	1481/1517	4.10	4.43	4.65	4.62	3.64
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	27	0	0	1	1	7	4	4.08	852/1497	4.30	4.30	4.11	4.02	4.08
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	26	0	0	1	0	0	13	4.79	392/1440	4.65	4.63	4.45	4.40	4.79
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	26	0	0	0	0	0	14	5.00	1/1448	4.87	4.81	4.71	4.63	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	26	0	0	1	2	1	10	4.43	696/1436	4.42	4.45	4.29	4.24	4.43
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	26	0	1	0	2	2	9	4.29	862/1432	4.59	4.52	4.29	4.23	4.29
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	26	5	1	1	2	2	3	3.56	****/1221	4.04	3.74	3.93	3.86	****
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	33	0	0	0	1	1	5	4.57	****/1280	4.17	4.43	4.10	3.92	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	33	0	0	0	1	2	4	4.43	****/1277	4.09	4.60	4.34	4.13	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	33	0	0	0	1	1	5	4.57	****/1269	4.34	4.56	4.31	4.04	****
4. Were special techniques successful	33	3	0	2	1	0	1	3.00	****/ 854	3.70	3.75	4.02	3.87	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	39	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 79	****	****	4.58	4.13	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	39	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 77	****	****	4.52	4.03	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	39	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 65	****	****	4.49	3.85	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	39	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 78	****	****	4.45	3.88	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	39	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 80	****	****	4.11	3.79	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	39	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 37	****	****	4.63	4.53	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	39	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 33	****	****	4.69	4.57	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	5	0.00-0.99	0	A	2	Required for Majors	5	Graduate	0	Major	4
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	3						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	2	C	7	General	3	Under-grad	40	Non-major	36
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	3	D	1						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	2	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	5				
				?	1						

Course-Section: POLI 100 0301  
 Title AMER GOVT & POLITICS  
 Instructor: SCHALLER, THOMA  
 Enrollment: 48  
 Questionnaires: 27

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2007

Page 1213  
 JUN 26, 2007  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sept
	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	6	17	4.67	433/1522	4.51	4.51	4.30	4.14	4.67	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	3	0	0	1	5	4	14	4.29	834/1522	4.38	4.40	4.26	4.18	4.29	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	3	0	0	1	2	7	14	4.42	638/1285	4.30	4.48	4.30	4.22	4.42	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	3	19	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	****/1476	3.96	4.33	4.22	4.09	****	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	1	4	7	12	4.25	566/1412	4.40	4.45	4.06	4.01	4.25	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	3	22	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/1381	3.76	4.30	4.08	3.93	****	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	3	0	0	0	1	4	19	4.75	211/1500	4.50	4.43	4.18	4.16	4.75	
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	0	0	0	0	21	3	4.13	1343/1517	4.10	4.43	4.65	4.62	4.13	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	1	0	0	1	6	16	4.65	272/1497	4.30	4.30	4.11	4.02	4.65	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	1	6	17	4.67	604/1440	4.65	4.63	4.45	4.40	4.67	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	1	24	4.96	198/1448	4.87	4.81	4.71	4.63	4.96	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	0	10	15	4.60	478/1436	4.42	4.45	4.29	4.24	4.60	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	1	5	19	4.72	394/1432	4.59	4.52	4.29	4.23	4.72	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	1	1	1	4	9	9	4.00	606/1221	4.04	3.74	3.93	3.86	4.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	10	0	2	0	6	1	8	3.76	900/1280	4.17	4.43	4.10	3.92	3.76	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	10	0	1	2	4	5	5	3.65	1100/1277	4.09	4.60	4.34	4.13	3.65	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	10	0	0	0	3	6	8	4.29	749/1269	4.34	4.56	4.31	4.04	4.29	
4. Were special techniques successful	10	14	1	0	0	1	1	3.33	****/ 854	3.70	3.75	4.02	3.87	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	24	1	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 215	****	****	4.36	4.31	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	24	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 228	****	****	4.35	4.33	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	24	1	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 217	****	****	4.51	4.51	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	24	1	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 216	****	****	4.42	4.41	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	24	2	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 205	****	****	4.23	4.28	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	24	1	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 79	****	****	4.58	4.13	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	24	1	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 77	****	****	4.52	4.03	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	24	2	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 65	****	****	4.49	3.85	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	24	2	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 78	****	****	4.45	3.88	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	24	2	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 80	****	****	4.11	3.79	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	24	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 47	****	****	4.41	3.90	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	24	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/ 45	****	****	4.30	3.90	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	24	2	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.40	3.99	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	24	2	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 35	****	****	4.31	4.00	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	24	2	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 34	****	****	4.30	4.11	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	24	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/ 37	****	****	4.63	4.53	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	24	2	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 23	****	****	4.41	4.19	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	24	1	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 33	****	****	4.69	4.57	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	24	2	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 22	****	****	4.54	4.31	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	24	2	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 18	****	****	4.49	4.11	****	

Course-Section: POLI 100 0301  
 Title AMER GOVT & POLITICS  
 Instructor: SCHALLER, THOMA  
 Enrollment: 48  
 Questionnaires: 27

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2007

Page 1213  
 JUN 26, 2007  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	8	0.00-0.99	0	A	10	Required for Majors	7	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B	8						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	7	C	5	General	4	Under-grad	27	Non-major	26
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	4	D	1						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	10				
				?	0						

Course-Section: POLI 100 0401  
 Title AMER GOVT & POLITICS  
 Instructor: SCHALLER, THOMA  
 Enrollment: 46  
 Questionnaires: 45

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2007

Page 1214  
 JUN 26, 2007  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	12	0	0	0	1	7	25	4.73	365/1522	4.51	4.51	4.30	4.14	4.73	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	13	0	0	0	1	8	23	4.69	334/1522	4.38	4.40	4.26	4.18	4.69	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	13	0	0	0	1	5	26	4.78	248/1285	4.30	4.48	4.30	4.22	4.78	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	12	22	0	0	1	1	9	4.73	****/1476	3.96	4.33	4.22	4.09	****	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	1	0	9	22	4.63	265/1412	4.40	4.45	4.06	4.01	4.63	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	13	27	1	0	1	0	3	3.80	****/1381	3.76	4.30	4.08	3.93	****	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	13	0	0	0	0	6	26	4.81	154/1500	4.50	4.43	4.18	4.16	4.81	
8. How many times was class cancelled	12	0	0	0	0	21	12	4.36	1193/1517	4.10	4.43	4.65	4.62	4.36	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	16	1	0	0	1	8	19	4.64	280/1497	4.30	4.30	4.11	4.02	4.64	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	14	0	0	0	2	4	25	4.74	472/1440	4.65	4.63	4.45	4.40	4.74	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	14	0	0	0	0	0	31	5.00	1/1448	4.87	4.81	4.71	4.63	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	14	0	0	0	0	10	21	4.68	404/1436	4.42	4.45	4.29	4.24	4.68	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	2	1	28	4.84	254/1432	4.59	4.52	4.29	4.23	4.84	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	14	1	1	1	2	10	16	4.30	430/1221	4.04	3.74	3.93	3.86	4.30	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	19	0	1	0	2	6	17	4.46	424/1280	4.17	4.43	4.10	3.92	4.46	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	19	0	0	0	4	2	20	4.62	517/1277	4.09	4.60	4.34	4.13	4.62	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	19	0	0	0	1	2	23	4.85	288/1269	4.34	4.56	4.31	4.04	4.85	
4. Were special techniques successful	19	21	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	****/ 854	3.70	3.75	4.02	3.87	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	44	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 215	****	****	4.36	4.31	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	43	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 228	****	****	4.35	4.33	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	43	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 217	****	****	4.51	4.51	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	44	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 216	****	****	4.42	4.41	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	44	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 205	****	****	4.23	4.28	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	44	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 79	****	****	4.58	4.13	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	44	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 77	****	****	4.52	4.03	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	44	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 65	****	****	4.49	3.85	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	44	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 78	****	****	4.45	3.88	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	44	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 80	****	****	4.11	3.79	****	
Self Paced															
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	44	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 23	****	****	4.41	4.19	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	11	0.00-0.99 0	A 14	Required for Majors	9
28-55	6	1.00-1.99 0	B 16		Graduate 0
56-83	3	2.00-2.99 10	C 2	General	9
84-150	2	3.00-3.49 6	D 0		Under-grad 45
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 7	F 0		Non-major 40
			P 0		
			I 0		
			? 0		
				Electives	2
				Other	13
				#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	

Course-Section: POLI 100 0501  
 Title AMER GOVT & POLITICS  
 Instructor: EBERLY, TODD E  
 Enrollment: 49  
 Questionnaires: 41

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2007

Page 1215  
 JUN 26, 2007  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	3	0	0	0	1	5	32	4.82	239/1522	4.51	4.51	4.30	4.14	4.82	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	3	0	0	0	0	5	33	4.87	157/1522	4.38	4.40	4.26	4.18	4.87	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	3	0	0	0	2	3	33	4.82	220/1285	4.30	4.48	4.30	4.22	4.82	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	4	1	0	0	1	5	30	4.81	178/1476	3.96	4.33	4.22	4.09	4.81	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	6	29	4.83	129/1412	4.40	4.45	4.06	4.01	4.83	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	6	2	0	0	0	3	30	4.91	86/1381	3.76	4.30	4.08	3.93	4.91	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	6	0	0	0	2	5	28	4.74	221/1500	4.50	4.43	4.18	4.16	4.74	
8. How many times was class cancelled	6	0	0	0	0	0	35	5.00	1/1517	4.10	4.43	4.65	4.62	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	15	1	0	0	0	4	21	4.84	129/1497	4.30	4.30	4.11	4.02	4.84	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	0	0	39	5.00	1/1440	4.65	4.63	4.45	4.40	5.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	0	1	37	4.97	148/1448	4.87	4.81	4.71	4.63	4.97	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	0	4	34	4.89	132/1436	4.42	4.45	4.29	4.24	4.89	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	2	35	4.95	97/1432	4.59	4.52	4.29	4.23	4.95	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	10	3	4	3	2	15	3.81	752/1221	4.04	3.74	3.93	3.86	3.81	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	4	5	21	4.57	350/1280	4.17	4.43	4.10	3.92	4.57	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	12	0	0	0	2	4	23	4.72	409/1277	4.09	4.60	4.34	4.13	4.72	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	12	0	0	0	0	4	25	4.86	266/1269	4.34	4.56	4.31	4.04	4.86	
4. Were special techniques successful	12	6	2	4	4	2	11	3.70	612/ 854	3.70	3.75	4.02	3.87	3.70	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	40	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 215	****	****	4.36	4.31	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	40	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 228	****	****	4.35	4.33	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	40	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 79	****	****	4.58	4.13	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	40	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 77	****	****	4.52	4.03	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	39	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 65	****	****	4.49	3.85	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	39	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 78	****	****	4.45	3.88	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	40	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 80	****	****	4.11	3.79	****	
Field Work															
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	40	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.40	3.99	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	6	0.00-0.99	1	A	17	Required for Majors	10	Graduate	0	Major	6
28-55	5	1.00-1.99	0	B	15						
56-83	7	2.00-2.99	7	C	3	General	4	Under-grad	41	Non-major	35
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	4	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5	F	0	Electives	2	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0						
				?	1		Other		22		

Course-Section: POLI 210 0101  
 Title POLITICAL PHILOSOPHY  
 Instructor: STACEY, SIMON  
 Enrollment: 61  
 Questionnaires: 46

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2007

Page 1216  
 JUN 26, 2007  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	1	1	2	7	35	4.61	492/1522	4.57	4.51	4.30	4.34	4.61	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	6	37	4.72	299/1522	4.63	4.40	4.26	4.29	4.72	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	3	42	4.93	105/1285	4.79	4.48	4.30	4.36	4.93		
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	18	0	0	1	5	21	4.74	236/1476	4.51	4.33	4.22	4.20	4.74	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	0	11	33	4.69	214/1412	4.68	4.45	4.06	4.00	4.69	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	23	0	0	1	4	17	4.73	168/1381	4.73	4.30	4.08	3.97	4.73	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	1	4	4	36	4.67	312/1500	4.56	4.43	4.18	4.20	4.67	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	1	27	17	4.36	1201/1517	4.14	4.43	4.65	4.63	4.36	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	7	0	0	0	0	16	23	4.59	326/1497	4.41	4.30	4.11	4.11	4.59	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	2	44	4.96	96/1440	4.77	4.63	4.45	4.42	4.96	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	45	4.98	148/1448	4.95	4.81	4.71	4.78	4.98	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	2	43	4.91	110/1436	4.73	4.45	4.29	4.29	4.91	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	4	42	4.91	145/1432	4.76	4.52	4.29	4.31	4.91	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	28	3	1	0	1	11	4.00	606/1221	3.03	3.74	3.93	4.02	4.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	22	0	0	1	5	2	16	4.38	499/1280	4.33	4.43	4.10	4.08	4.38	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	22	0	0	0	3	6	15	4.50	594/1277	4.53	4.60	4.34	4.33	4.50	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	22	0	0	0	2	2	20	4.75	381/1269	4.74	4.56	4.31	4.33	4.75	
4. Were special techniques successful	22	17	0	1	3	0	3	3.71	****/ 854	3.32	3.75	4.02	4.00	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	44	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 215	****	****	4.36	4.62	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	44	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 228	****	****	4.35	4.56	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	45	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 47	****	****	4.41	4.83	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	45	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 45	****	****	4.30	4.58	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	45	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.40	4.75	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	45	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 35	****	****	4.31	4.75	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	45	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 37	****	****	4.63	****	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	45	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 23	****	****	4.41	****	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	45	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 33	****	****	4.69	****	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	8	0.00-0.99 0	A 20	Required for Majors	4
28-55	4	1.00-1.99 0	B 21		Graduate 0
56-83	4	2.00-2.99 9	C 0	General	3
84-150	6	3.00-3.49 13	D 0		Under-grad 46
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 7	F 0	Electives	1
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	32
			? 0		

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sept
	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	3	12	24	4.54	571/1522	4.57	4.51	4.30	4.34	4.54	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	10	0	0	0	1	16	22	4.54	511/1522	4.63	4.40	4.26	4.29	4.54	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	10	0	0	1	0	11	27	4.64	386/1285	4.79	4.48	4.30	4.36	4.64	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	9	18	0	0	3	10	9	4.27	769/1476	4.51	4.33	4.22	4.20	4.27	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	2	9	28	4.67	231/1412	4.68	4.45	4.06	4.00	4.67	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	9	28	2	0	3	5	2	3.42	****/1381	4.73	4.30	4.08	3.97	****	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	9	0	0	1	5	9	25	4.45	571/1500	4.56	4.43	4.18	4.20	4.45	
8. How many times was class cancelled	10	0	0	0	9	24	6	3.92	1437/1517	4.14	4.43	4.65	4.63	3.92	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	19	0	0	0	1	21	8	4.23	674/1497	4.41	4.30	4.11	4.11	4.23	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	9	0	0	0	4	9	27	4.57	716/1440	4.77	4.63	4.45	4.42	4.57	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	11	0	0	0	0	3	35	4.92	395/1448	4.95	4.81	4.71	4.78	4.92	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	9	0	0	0	4	10	26	4.55	539/1436	4.73	4.45	4.29	4.29	4.55	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	2	11	26	4.62	514/1432	4.76	4.52	4.29	4.31	4.62	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	9	24	9	3	0	2	2	2.06	1196/1221	3.03	3.74	3.93	4.02	2.06	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	13	0	1	0	7	8	20	4.28	572/1280	4.33	4.43	4.10	4.08	4.28	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	13	0	0	1	3	7	25	4.56	560/1277	4.53	4.60	4.34	4.33	4.56	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	13	0	0	0	1	8	27	4.72	410/1269	4.74	4.56	4.31	4.33	4.72	
4. Were special techniques successful	13	5	2	7	7	9	6	3.32	729/ 854	3.32	3.75	4.02	4.00	3.32	
Laboratory															
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	47	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 228	****	****	4.35	4.56	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	47	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 79	****	****	4.58	4.58	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	47	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 77	****	****	4.52	5.00	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	47	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 78	****	****	4.45	5.00	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	47	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 80	****	****	4.11	4.00	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	48	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 47	****	****	4.41	4.83	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	48	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 45	****	****	4.30	4.58	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	48	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 37	****	****	4.63	****	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	48	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 33	****	****	4.69	****	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors	
00-27	9	0.00-0.99 2	A 10	Required for Majors	4	Graduate 0 Major 18
28-55	5	1.00-1.99 0	B 17	General	2	Under-grad 49 Non-major 31
56-83	7	2.00-2.99 4	C 3			
84-150	2	3.00-3.49 7	D 0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 7	F 0			
			P 1			
			I 0			
			? 2	Other	27	



Course-Section: POLI 230 0101  
 Title INTRO CONSTITUTIONAL L  
 Instructor: DAVIS, JEFFREY  
 Enrollment: 63  
 Questionnaires: 52

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2007

Page 1218  
 JUN 26, 2007  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	4	0	0	2	3	13	30	4.48	643/1522	4.58	4.51	4.30	4.34	4.48	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	4	0	1	1	3	10	33	4.52	522/1522	4.62	4.40	4.26	4.29	4.52	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	4	0	0	1	5	8	34	4.56	467/1285	4.61	4.48	4.30	4.36	4.56	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	4	9	1	0	7	11	20	4.26	792/1476	4.30	4.33	4.22	4.20	4.26	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	1	3	10	32	4.59	294/1412	4.63	4.45	4.06	4.00	4.59	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	5	1	3	2	5	16	20	4.04	784/1381	4.22	4.30	4.08	3.97	4.04	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	6	0	0	0	2	8	36	4.74	232/1500	4.79	4.43	4.18	4.20	4.74	
8. How many times was class cancelled	6	1	0	0	0	2	43	4.96	244/1517	4.95	4.43	4.65	4.63	4.96	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	15	1	0	0	4	14	18	4.39	525/1497	4.40	4.30	4.11	4.11	4.39	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	5	0	0	0	4	5	38	4.72	512/1440	4.77	4.63	4.45	4.42	4.72	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	5	0	0	0	1	6	40	4.83	710/1448	4.90	4.81	4.71	4.78	4.83	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	5	0	0	2	1	9	35	4.64	446/1436	4.68	4.45	4.29	4.29	4.64	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	5	1	0	2	2	5	37	4.67	442/1432	4.71	4.52	4.29	4.31	4.67	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	6	7	1	2	3	7	26	4.41	351/1221	4.28	3.74	3.93	4.02	4.41	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	19	0	1	0	5	7	20	4.36	507/1280	4.50	4.43	4.10	4.08	4.36	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	19	0	0	1	3	6	23	4.55	567/1277	4.61	4.60	4.34	4.33	4.55	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	19	0	1	1	1	5	25	4.58	532/1269	4.63	4.56	4.31	4.33	4.58	
4. Were special techniques successful	19	22	2	0	1	2	6	3.91	****/ 854	****	3.75	4.02	4.00	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	3	0.00-0.99 1	A 11	Required for Majors	3
28-55	5	1.00-1.99 1	B 18		Graduate 0
56-83	9	2.00-2.99 4	C 10	General	5
84-150	8	3.00-3.49 12	D 2		Under-grad 52
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 7	F 0	Electives	1
			P 1		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	33
			? 1		

Course-Section: POLI 230 0201  
 Title INTRO CONSTITUTIONAL L  
 Instructor: DAVIS, JEFFREY  
 Enrollment: 53  
 Questionnaires: 51

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2007

Page 1219  
 JUN 26, 2007  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	10	0	0	2	2	3	34	4.68	414/1522	4.58	4.51	4.30	4.34	4.68	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	12	0	0	0	2	7	30	4.72	299/1522	4.62	4.40	4.26	4.29	4.72	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	11	0	1	1	0	7	31	4.65	376/1285	4.61	4.48	4.30	4.36	4.65	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	11	3	1	0	6	8	22	4.35	682/1476	4.30	4.33	4.22	4.20	4.35	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	1	3	4	33	4.68	214/1412	4.63	4.45	4.06	4.00	4.68	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	12	1	0	1	5	10	22	4.39	446/1381	4.22	4.30	4.08	3.97	4.39	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	11	0	0	0	1	4	35	4.85	134/1500	4.79	4.43	4.18	4.20	4.85	
8. How many times was class cancelled	11	0	0	0	0	2	38	4.95	292/1517	4.95	4.43	4.65	4.63	4.95	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	18	1	0	2	1	11	18	4.41	506/1497	4.40	4.30	4.11	4.11	4.41	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	11	0	0	1	0	4	35	4.82	320/1440	4.77	4.63	4.45	4.42	4.82	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	12	0	0	0	0	1	38	4.97	148/1448	4.90	4.81	4.71	4.78	4.97	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	11	0	1	0	1	5	33	4.72	341/1436	4.68	4.45	4.29	4.29	4.72	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	1	2	3	34	4.75	350/1432	4.71	4.52	4.29	4.31	4.75	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	11	5	2	2	3	10	18	4.14	540/1221	4.28	3.74	3.93	4.02	4.14	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	20	0	1	0	1	5	24	4.65	298/1280	4.50	4.43	4.10	4.08	4.65	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	20	0	0	1	0	7	23	4.68	461/1277	4.61	4.60	4.34	4.33	4.68	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	20	0	1	1	1	1	27	4.68	453/1269	4.63	4.56	4.31	4.33	4.68	
4. Were special techniques successful	22	23	1	0	1	0	4	4.00	****/ 854	****	3.75	4.02	4.00	****	
Self Paced															
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	50	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 33	****	****	4.69	****	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	50	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 22	****	****	4.54	****	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	1	0.00-0.99 0	A 14	Required for Majors	1
28-55	5	1.00-1.99 0	B 12		Graduate 0
56-83	6	2.00-2.99 1	C 5	General	4
84-150	5	3.00-3.49 6	D 0		Under-grad 51
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 14	F 0	Electives	2
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	28
			? 0		

Course-Section: POLI 250 0101  
 Title INTRO TO PUBLIC ADMIN  
 Instructor: WILLIAMS-RANDAL  
 Enrollment: 50  
 Questionnaires: 50

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2007

Page 1220  
 JUN 26, 2007  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	21	0	1	3	4	11	10	3.90	1224/1522	3.90	4.51	4.30	4.34	3.90	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	21	0	1	1	5	11	11	4.03	1064/1522	4.03	4.40	4.26	4.29	4.03	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	22	0	1	2	4	8	13	4.07	898/1285	4.07	4.48	4.30	4.36	4.07	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	22	1	2	1	2	13	9	3.96	1056/1476	3.96	4.33	4.22	4.20	3.96	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	21	0	2	0	2	7	18	4.34	484/1412	4.34	4.45	4.06	4.00	4.34	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	21	0	2	2	3	8	14	4.03	790/1381	4.03	4.30	4.08	3.97	4.03	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	21	0	1	2	1	6	19	4.38	660/1500	4.38	4.43	4.18	4.20	4.38	
8. How many times was class cancelled	22	0	0	0	0	9	19	4.68	921/1517	4.68	4.43	4.65	4.63	4.68	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	27	0	0	0	7	14	2	3.78	1126/1497	3.78	4.30	4.11	4.11	3.78	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	21	0	0	0	0	7	22	4.76	452/1440	4.76	4.63	4.45	4.42	4.76	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	21	0	0	1	1	7	20	4.59	1089/1448	4.59	4.81	4.71	4.78	4.59	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	21	0	0	0	4	8	17	4.45	672/1436	4.45	4.45	4.29	4.29	4.45	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	21	0	0	1	4	5	19	4.45	707/1432	4.45	4.52	4.29	4.31	4.45	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	22	4	1	1	2	9	11	4.17	524/1221	4.17	3.74	3.93	4.02	4.17	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	27	0	2	0	2	7	12	4.17	637/1280	4.17	4.43	4.10	4.08	4.17	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	27	0	0	1	4	4	14	4.35	736/1277	4.35	4.60	4.34	4.33	4.35	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	27	0	0	0	1	4	18	4.74	400/1269	4.74	4.56	4.31	4.33	4.74	
4. Were special techniques successful	27	14	0	2	2	1	4	3.78	****/ 854	****	3.75	4.02	4.00	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99 0	A 12	Required for Majors 0	Graduate 0 Major 10
28-55	1	1.00-1.99 0	B 8		
56-83	8	2.00-2.99 4	C 3	General 1	Under-grad 50 Non-major 40
84-150	8	3.00-3.49 3	D 1		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 8	F 0	Electives 2	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 24	
			? 2		

Course-Section: POLI 260 0101  
 Title COMPARATIVE POLITICS  
 Instructor: CROATTI, MARK  
 Enrollment: 45  
 Questionnaires: 40

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2007

Page 1221  
 JUN 26, 2007  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	14	0	1	0	5	7	13	4.19	959/1522	4.19	4.51	4.30	4.34	4.19	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	14	0	2	3	12	3	6	3.31	1426/1522	3.31	4.40	4.26	4.29	3.31	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	14	0	3	3	10	6	4	3.19	1236/1285	3.19	4.48	4.30	4.36	3.19	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	14	1	2	1	10	5	7	3.56	1298/1476	3.56	4.33	4.22	4.20	3.56	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	14	0	3	1	8	8	6	3.50	1165/1412	3.50	4.45	4.06	4.00	3.50	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	15	7	3	0	9	4	2	3.11	1277/1381	3.11	4.30	4.08	3.97	3.11	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	14	1	2	1	6	5	11	3.88	1099/1500	3.88	4.43	4.18	4.20	3.88	
8. How many times was class cancelled	14	0	0	0	1	1	24	4.88	532/1517	4.88	4.43	4.65	4.63	4.88	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	19	1	1	1	5	6	7	3.85	1073/1497	3.85	4.30	4.11	4.11	3.85	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	16	0	0	3	7	4	10	3.88	1262/1440	3.88	4.63	4.45	4.42	3.88	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	16	0	0	0	2	3	19	4.71	954/1448	4.71	4.81	4.71	4.78	4.71	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	16	0	2	1	7	3	11	3.83	1185/1436	3.83	4.45	4.29	4.29	3.83	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	16	0	3	3	3	5	10	3.67	1224/1432	3.67	4.52	4.29	4.31	3.67	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	18	1	0	1	5	3	12	4.24	474/1221	4.24	3.74	3.93	4.02	4.24	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	25	0	2	1	5	2	5	3.47	1051/1280	3.47	4.43	4.10	4.08	3.47	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	25	0	1	1	8	0	5	3.47	1150/1277	3.47	4.60	4.34	4.33	3.47	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	25	0	2	1	4	2	6	3.60	1097/1269	3.60	4.56	4.31	4.33	3.60	
4. Were special techniques successful	25	6	1	1	2	3	2	3.44	****/ 854	****	3.75	4.02	4.00	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	38	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 215	****	****	4.36	4.62	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	38	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/ 228	****	****	4.35	4.56	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	38	0	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/ 217	****	****	4.51	4.57	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	38	0	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/ 216	****	****	4.42	4.72	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	38	0	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/ 205	****	****	4.23	4.37	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	38	0	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/ 79	****	****	4.58	4.58	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	38	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/ 77	****	****	4.52	5.00	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	38	0	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	****/ 65	****	****	4.49	5.00	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	38	0	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	****/ 78	****	****	4.45	5.00	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	38	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 80	****	****	4.11	4.00	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	38	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 47	****	****	4.41	4.83	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	38	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 45	****	****	4.30	4.58	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	38	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 39	****	****	4.40	4.75	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	38	0	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	****/ 35	****	****	4.31	4.75	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	38	0	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	****/ 34	****	****	4.30	4.17	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	38	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 37	****	****	4.63	****	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	38	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 23	****	****	4.41	****	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	38	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 33	****	****	4.69	****	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	38	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 22	****	****	4.54	****	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	38	0	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/ 18	****	****	4.49	****	****	

Course-Section: POLI 260 0101  
 Title: COMPARATIVE POLITICS  
 Instructor: CROATTI, MARK  
 Enrollment: 45  
 Questionnaires: 40

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2007

Page 1221  
 JUN 26, 2007  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	0	A	7	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	16
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	B	12						
56-83	5	2.00-2.99	7	C	3	General	1	Under-grad	40	Non-major	24
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	7	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	21				
				?	1						

Course-Section: POLI 280 0101  
 Title INTERNATIONAL RELATION  
 Instructor: HAGERTY, DEVIN  
 Enrollment: 49  
 Questionnaires: 49

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2007

Page 1222  
 JUN 26, 2007  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	16	0	0	0	1	7	25	4.73	365/1522	4.73	4.51	4.30	4.34	4.73	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	16	0	0	0	1	7	25	4.73	288/1522	4.73	4.40	4.26	4.29	4.73	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	16	0	0	0	0	10	23	4.70	337/1285	4.70	4.48	4.30	4.36	4.70	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	16	24	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	****/1476	****	4.33	4.22	4.20	****	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	0	7	9	15	4.26	566/1412	4.26	4.45	4.06	4.00	4.26	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	18	25	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	****/1381	****	4.30	4.08	3.97	****	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	17	1	0	0	3	4	24	4.68	300/1500	4.68	4.43	4.18	4.20	4.68	
8. How many times was class cancelled	18	0	0	0	0	27	4	4.13	1343/1517	4.13	4.43	4.65	4.63	4.13	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	21	0	0	0	1	7	20	4.68	256/1497	4.68	4.30	4.11	4.11	4.68	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	16	0	0	0	0	7	26	4.79	392/1440	4.79	4.63	4.45	4.42	4.79	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	16	0	0	0	0	1	32	4.97	198/1448	4.97	4.81	4.71	4.78	4.97	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	16	0	0	0	2	5	26	4.73	341/1436	4.73	4.45	4.29	4.29	4.73	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	0	6	27	4.82	280/1432	4.82	4.52	4.29	4.31	4.82	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	16	27	0	2	0	0	4	4.00	****/1221	****	3.74	3.93	4.02	****	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	23	0	0	0	5	5	16	4.42	459/1280	4.42	4.43	4.10	4.08	4.42	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	23	0	2	0	3	6	15	4.23	819/1277	4.23	4.60	4.34	4.33	4.23	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	23	0	1	0	1	5	19	4.58	532/1269	4.58	4.56	4.31	4.33	4.58	
4. Were special techniques successful	23	23	0	1	0	1	1	3.67	****/ 854	****	3.75	4.02	4.00	****	
Laboratory															
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	48	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 228	****	****	4.35	4.56	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	48	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 47	****	****	4.41	4.83	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	48	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 45	****	****	4.30	4.58	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	48	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 37	****	****	4.63	****	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	48	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 23	****	****	4.41	****	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors								
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	1	A	15	Required for Majors	4	Graduate	0	Major	15		
28-55	7	1.00-1.99	1	B	11								
56-83	9	2.00-2.99	6	C	2	General	3	Under-grad	49	Non-major	34		
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	6	D	0								
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	9	F	0	Electives	2	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant					
				P	1								
				I	0							Other	21
				?	0								

Course-Section: POLI 301 0101  
 Title POLI RESEARCH METHODS  
 Instructor: FORESTIERE, CAR  
 Enrollment: 32  
 Questionnaires: 32

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2007

Page 1223  
 JUN 26, 2007  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	9	0	1	0	1	9	12	4.35	802/1522	4.40	4.51	4.30	4.34	4.35	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	10	0	1	0	0	4	17	4.64	395/1522	4.61	4.40	4.26	4.25	4.64	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	9	3	0	0	2	3	15	4.65	376/1285	4.70	4.48	4.30	4.30	4.65	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	9	0	1	1	1	4	16	4.43	582/1476	4.49	4.33	4.22	4.26	4.43	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	9	0	3	1	7	3	9	3.61	1112/1412	3.80	4.45	4.06	4.03	3.61	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	9	0	1	0	0	6	16	4.57	280/1381	4.59	4.30	4.08	4.13	4.57	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	9	0	1	1	0	4	17	4.52	463/1500	4.56	4.43	4.18	4.13	4.52	
8. How many times was class cancelled	9	0	1	0	0	15	7	4.17	1313/1517	4.27	4.43	4.65	4.62	4.17	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	11	0	0	0	2	6	13	4.52	370/1497	4.35	4.30	4.11	4.13	4.52	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	11	0	0	0	0	5	16	4.76	432/1440	4.81	4.63	4.45	4.46	4.76	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	11	0	0	0	0	2	19	4.90	494/1448	4.90	4.81	4.71	4.71	4.90	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	11	0	1	0	0	4	16	4.62	467/1436	4.70	4.45	4.29	4.30	4.62	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	1	3	17	4.76	338/1432	4.81	4.52	4.29	4.29	4.76	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	12	10	1	1	1	2	5	3.90	695/1221	4.05	3.74	3.93	3.94	3.90	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	15	0	1	0	4	4	8	4.06	701/1280	4.13	4.43	4.10	4.14	4.06	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	15	0	0	0	1	4	12	4.65	489/1277	4.67	4.60	4.34	4.38	4.65	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	15	0	0	1	0	4	12	4.59	524/1269	4.64	4.56	4.31	4.39	4.59	
4. Were special techniques successful	15	3	1	1	3	1	8	4.00	426/ 854	4.22	3.75	4.02	4.00	4.00	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99 0	A 12	Required for Majors	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99 0	B 7		Graduate 0
56-83	1	2.00-2.99 3	C 2	General	0
84-150	14	3.00-3.49 6	D 0		Under-grad 32
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 9	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	22
			? 0		

Course-Section: POLI 301 0201  
 Title POLI RESEARCH METHODS  
 Instructor: FORESTIERE, CAR  
 Enrollment: 36  
 Questionnaires: 30

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2007

Page 1224  
 JUN 26, 2007  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	0	2	3	4	20	4.45	681/1522	4.40	4.51	4.30	4.34	4.45	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	10	18	4.59	454/1522	4.61	4.40	4.26	4.25	4.59	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	9	0	0	1	3	16	4.75	278/1285	4.70	4.48	4.30	4.30	4.75	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	1	1	8	19	4.55	425/1476	4.49	4.33	4.22	4.26	4.55	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	0	2	0	6	8	12	4.00	760/1412	3.80	4.45	4.06	4.03	4.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	3	1	0	1	2	3	20	4.62	240/1381	4.59	4.30	4.08	4.13	4.62	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	1	1	6	20	4.61	387/1500	4.56	4.43	4.18	4.13	4.61	
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	1	0	15	12	4.36	1201/1517	4.27	4.43	4.65	4.62	4.36	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	0	1	1	2	9	11	4.17	756/1497	4.35	4.30	4.11	4.13	4.17	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	1	2	25	4.86	272/1440	4.81	4.63	4.45	4.46	4.86	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	1	1	26	4.89	521/1448	4.90	4.81	4.71	4.71	4.89	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	0	6	22	4.79	248/1436	4.70	4.45	4.29	4.30	4.79	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	1	2	25	4.86	227/1432	4.81	4.52	4.29	4.29	4.86	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	11	0	0	3	6	6	4.20	500/1221	4.05	3.74	3.93	3.94	4.20	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	11	0	1	0	3	5	10	4.21	611/1280	4.13	4.43	4.10	4.14	4.21	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	11	0	0	0	1	4	14	4.68	451/1277	4.67	4.60	4.34	4.38	4.68	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	11	0	0	0	1	4	14	4.68	445/1269	4.64	4.56	4.31	4.39	4.68	
4. Were special techniques successful	11	3	1	0	0	5	10	4.44	234/ 854	4.22	3.75	4.02	4.00	4.44	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99 0	A 11	Required for Majors 0	Graduate 0 Major 23
28-55	0	1.00-1.99 0	B 9		
56-83	1	2.00-2.99 4	C 4	General 0	Under-grad 30 Non-major 7
84-150	16	3.00-3.49 6	D 0		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 10	F 0	Electives 0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 24	
			? 1		



Course-Section: POLI 315 0101  
 Title POLITICAL PHIL FROM 16  
 Instructor: STACEY, SIMON  
 Enrollment: 52  
 Questionnaires: 25

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2007

Page 1225  
 JUN 26, 2007  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	4	0	0	0	0	6	15	4.71	380/1522	4.71	4.51	4.30	4.34	4.71	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	4	0	0	1	0	6	14	4.57	465/1522	4.57	4.40	4.26	4.25	4.57	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	4	11	0	0	2	1	7	4.50	531/1285	4.50	4.48	4.30	4.30	4.50	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	4	1	0	0	4	2	14	4.50	473/1476	4.50	4.33	4.22	4.26	4.50	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	1	4	16	4.71	191/1412	4.71	4.45	4.06	4.03	4.71	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	4	1	0	1	4	1	14	4.40	434/1381	4.40	4.30	4.08	4.13	4.40	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	4	1	0	0	3	4	13	4.50	483/1500	4.50	4.43	4.18	4.13	4.50	
8. How many times was class cancelled	4	0	0	1	0	14	6	4.19	1301/1517	4.19	4.43	4.65	4.62	4.19	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	0	1	6	13	4.60	312/1497	4.60	4.30	4.11	4.13	4.60	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	0	0	1	1	19	4.86	272/1440	4.86	4.63	4.45	4.46	4.86	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	0	1	1	19	4.86	629/1448	4.86	4.81	4.71	4.71	4.86	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	6	0	0	0	1	1	17	4.84	179/1436	4.84	4.45	4.29	4.30	4.84	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	1	2	18	4.81	294/1432	4.81	4.52	4.29	4.29	4.81	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	6	14	1	0	1	1	2	3.60	****/1221	****	3.74	3.93	3.94	****	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	0	3	10	4.77	214/1280	4.77	4.43	4.10	4.14	4.77	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	12	0	0	0	2	1	10	4.62	517/1277	4.62	4.60	4.34	4.38	4.62	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	12	0	0	0	1	1	11	4.77	371/1269	4.77	4.56	4.31	4.39	4.77	
4. Were special techniques successful	12	6	1	2	1	1	2	3.14	761/ 854	3.14	3.75	4.02	4.00	3.14	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	24	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 215	****	****	4.36	4.21	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	24	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 228	****	****	4.35	4.29	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	24	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 217	****	****	4.51	4.45	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	24	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 216	****	****	4.42	4.35	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	24	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 205	****	****	4.23	4.26	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	24	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 79	****	****	4.58	4.53	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	24	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 77	****	****	4.52	4.30	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	24	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 65	****	****	4.49	4.33	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	24	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 78	****	****	4.45	4.34	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	24	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 80	****	****	4.11	3.33	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	24	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 47	****	****	4.41	4.56	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	24	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 45	****	****	4.30	4.39	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	24	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.40	4.68	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	24	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 35	****	****	4.31	4.26	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	24	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 34	****	****	4.30	4.12	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	24	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 37	****	****	4.63	5.00	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	24	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 23	****	****	4.41	****	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	24	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 33	****	****	4.69	4.75	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	24	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 22	****	****	4.54	****	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	24	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 18	****	****	4.49	****	****	

Course-Section: POLI 315 0101  
 Title POLITICAL PHIL FROM 16  
 Instructor: STACEY, SIMON  
 Enrollment: 52  
 Questionnaires: 25

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2007

Page 1225  
 JUN 26, 2007  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	1	A	8	Required for Majors	2	Graduate	0	Major	13
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	10						
56-83	5	2.00-2.99	1	C	0	General	3	Under-grad	25	Non-major	12
84-150	7	3.00-3.49	5	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	13				
				?	0						

Course-Section: POLI 324 0101  
 Title THE CONGRESS  
 Instructor: KING-MEADOWS, T  
 Enrollment: 26  
 Questionnaires: 26

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2007

Page 1226  
 JUN 26, 2007  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	11	0	1	1	1	1	11	4.33	814/1522	4.33	4.51	4.30	4.34	4.33
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	11	0	1	0	2	6	6	4.07	1048/1522	4.07	4.40	4.26	4.25	4.07
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	12	0	0	1	1	3	9	4.43	626/1285	4.43	4.48	4.30	4.30	4.43
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	11	2	1	0	2	3	7	4.15	903/1476	4.15	4.33	4.22	4.26	4.15
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	1	1	4	9	4.40	430/1412	4.40	4.45	4.06	4.03	4.40
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	11	0	1	0	2	4	8	4.20	663/1381	4.20	4.30	4.08	4.13	4.20
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	11	0	0	0	3	3	9	4.40	630/1500	4.40	4.43	4.18	4.13	4.40
8. How many times was class cancelled	11	0	0	0	0	14	1	4.07	1368/1517	4.07	4.43	4.65	4.62	4.07
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	14	0	2	0	1	4	5	3.83	1089/1497	3.83	4.30	4.11	4.13	3.83
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	11	0	0	0	1	2	12	4.73	492/1440	4.73	4.63	4.45	4.46	4.73
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	11	0	0	0	1	1	13	4.80	765/1448	4.80	4.81	4.71	4.71	4.80
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	11	0	0	1	2	6	6	4.13	980/1436	4.13	4.45	4.29	4.30	4.13
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	11	0	1	0	1	4	9	4.33	820/1432	4.33	4.52	4.29	4.29	4.33
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	11	8	4	0	0	2	1	2.43	1177/1221	2.43	3.74	3.93	3.94	2.43
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	16	0	1	0	2	4	3	3.80	874/1280	3.80	4.43	4.10	4.14	3.80
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	16	0	0	0	0	3	7	4.70	442/1277	4.70	4.60	4.34	4.38	4.70
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	16	0	0	0	1	3	6	4.50	586/1269	4.50	4.56	4.31	4.39	4.50
4. Were special techniques successful	16	9	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 854	****	3.75	4.02	4.00	****

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 10
28-55	1	1.00-1.99 0	B 3		
56-83	7	2.00-2.99 4	C 3	General 2	Under-grad 26 Non-major 16
84-150	3	3.00-3.49 0	D 1		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 3	F 0	Electives 1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 11	
			? 1		

Course-Section: POLI 334 8020  
 Title JUDICIAL PROCESS  
 Instructor: MELCAVAGE, EUGE (Instr. A)  
 Enrollment: 8  
 Questionnaires: 8

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2007

Page 1227  
 JUN 26, 2007  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	320/1522	4.75	4.51	4.30	4.34	4.75	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	1	6	4.63	407/1522	4.63	4.40	4.26	4.25	4.63	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	173/1285	4.88	4.48	4.30	4.30	4.88	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	5	4.63	357/1476	4.63	4.33	4.22	4.26	4.63	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	1	6	4.63	265/1412	4.63	4.45	4.06	4.03	4.63	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	3	4	4.38	470/1381	4.38	4.30	4.08	4.13	4.38	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	1	6	4.63	362/1500	4.63	4.43	4.18	4.13	4.63	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	802/1517	4.75	4.43	4.65	4.62	4.75	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1497	5.00	4.30	4.11	4.13	5.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	3	5	4.63	656/1440	4.63	4.63	4.45	4.46	4.63	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	575/1448	4.88	4.81	4.71	4.71	4.88	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	2	5	4.50	601/1436	4.50	4.45	4.29	4.30	4.50	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	1	6	4.63	502/1432	4.63	4.52	4.29	4.29	4.63	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	3	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	1165/1221	3.25	3.74	3.93	3.94	3.25	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	222/1280	4.75	4.43	4.10	4.14	4.75	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	254/1277	4.88	4.60	4.34	4.38	4.88	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	255/1269	4.88	4.56	4.31	4.39	4.88	
4. Were special techniques successful	0	4	0	1	0	2	1	3.75	588/ 854	3.75	3.75	4.02	4.00	3.75	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: POLI 334 8020  
 Title JUDICIAL PROCESS  
 Instructor: (Instr. B)  
 Enrollment: 8  
 Questionnaires: 8

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2007

Page 1228  
 JUN 26, 2007  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	320/1522	4.75	4.51	4.30	4.34	4.75	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	1	6	4.63	407/1522	4.63	4.40	4.26	4.25	4.63	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	173/1285	4.88	4.48	4.30	4.30	4.88	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	5	4.63	357/1476	4.63	4.33	4.22	4.26	4.63	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	1	6	4.63	265/1412	4.63	4.45	4.06	4.03	4.63	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	3	4	4.38	470/1381	4.38	4.30	4.08	4.13	4.38	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	1	6	4.63	362/1500	4.63	4.43	4.18	4.13	4.63	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	802/1517	4.75	4.43	4.65	4.62	4.75	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1497	5.00	4.30	4.11	4.13	5.00	
Lecture															
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	6	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	606/1221	3.25	3.74	3.93	3.94	3.25	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	222/1280	4.75	4.43	4.10	4.14	4.75	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	254/1277	4.88	4.60	4.34	4.38	4.88	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	255/1269	4.88	4.56	4.31	4.39	4.88	
4. Were special techniques successful	0	4	0	1	0	2	1	3.75	588/ 854	3.75	3.75	4.02	4.00	3.75	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: POLI 350 0101  
 Title POLICY-MAKING PROCESS  
 Instructor: MILLER, CHERYL  
 Enrollment: 30  
 Questionnaires: 29

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2007

Page 1229  
 JUN 26, 2007  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	3	0	0	0	6	5	15	4.35	802/1522	4.35	4.51	4.30	4.34	4.35	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	3	0	0	0	3	11	12	4.35	775/1522	4.35	4.40	4.26	4.25	4.35	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	3	0	0	1	2	9	14	4.38	666/1285	4.38	4.48	4.30	4.30	4.38	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	5	2	0	0	6	4	12	4.27	769/1476	4.27	4.33	4.22	4.26	4.27	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	1	3	6	16	4.42	411/1412	4.42	4.45	4.06	4.03	4.42	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	3	0	2	2	3	10	9	3.85	984/1381	3.85	4.30	4.08	4.13	3.85	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	3	0	0	0	2	6	18	4.62	374/1500	4.62	4.43	4.18	4.13	4.62	
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	0	0	0	0	3	23	4.88	532/1517	4.88	4.43	4.65	4.62	4.88	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	1	0	0	3	8	14	4.44	457/1497	4.44	4.30	4.11	4.13	4.44	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	3	5	18	4.58	716/1440	4.58	4.63	4.45	4.46	4.58	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	2	3	21	4.73	897/1448	4.73	4.81	4.71	4.71	4.73	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	3	7	16	4.50	601/1436	4.50	4.45	4.29	4.30	4.50	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	2	4	20	4.69	418/1432	4.69	4.52	4.29	4.29	4.69	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	7	17	1	0	2	1	1	3.20	****/1221	****	3.74	3.93	3.94	****	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	2	0	2	6	12	4.18	631/1280	4.18	4.43	4.10	4.14	4.18	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	0	0	1	2	19	4.82	308/1277	4.82	4.60	4.34	4.38	4.82	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	0	0	1	5	16	4.68	445/1269	4.68	4.56	4.31	4.39	4.68	
4. Were special techniques successful	9	6	6	1	2	2	3	2.64	825/ 854	2.64	3.75	4.02	4.00	2.64	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 8	Required for Majors	2
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	B 14	Graduate	0
56-83	13	2.00-2.99	C 4	General	5
84-150	6	3.00-3.49	D 0	Under-grad	29
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	1
			P 0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	
			I 0	Other	17
			? 0		

Course-Section: POLI 360 0101  
 Title COMPRTIVE POLI ANALYSI  
 Instructor: GRODSKY, BRIAN  
 Enrollment: 22  
 Questionnaires: 15

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2007

Page 1230  
 JUN 26, 2007  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sept
	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	0	1	13	4.73	350/1522	4.51	4.51	4.30	4.34	4.73	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	4	2	8	4.13	996/1522	4.00	4.40	4.26	4.25	4.13	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	9	0	1	1	0	4	4.17	833/1285	4.33	4.48	4.30	4.30	4.17	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	1	3	4	5	4.00	1009/1476	3.96	4.33	4.22	4.26	4.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	0	4	10	4.47	375/1412	4.38	4.45	4.06	4.03	4.47	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	2	3	9	4.27	594/1381	4.44	4.30	4.08	4.13	4.27	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	2	5	3	4	1	2.80	1454/1500	2.75	4.43	4.18	4.13	2.80	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	1	13	4.93	389/1517	4.86	4.43	4.65	4.62	4.93	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	1	1	6	5	4.15	769/1497	3.85	4.30	4.11	4.13	4.15	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	1	0	4	10	4.53	763/1440	4.23	4.63	4.45	4.46	4.53	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	2	12	4.73	897/1448	4.69	4.81	4.71	4.71	4.73	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	1	0	1	5	8	4.27	865/1436	4.13	4.45	4.29	4.30	4.27	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	1	2	11	4.53	600/1432	4.27	4.52	4.29	4.29	4.53	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	2	2	0	2	2	6	3.83	739/1221	3.60	3.74	3.93	3.94	3.83	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	0	1	1	11	4.50	390/1280	4.55	4.43	4.10	4.14	4.50	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	2	1	11	4.64	489/1277	4.47	4.60	4.34	4.38	4.64	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	2	0	12	4.71	420/1269	4.51	4.56	4.31	4.39	4.71	
4. Were special techniques successful	1	6	2	1	2	0	3	3.13	766/ 854	3.13	3.75	4.02	4.00	3.13	
Laboratory															
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	14	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 228	****	****	4.35	4.29	****	
Seminar															
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	13	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 78	****	****	4.45	4.34	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	13	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 80	****	****	4.11	3.33	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 47	****	****	4.41	4.56	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	14	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 45	****	****	4.30	4.39	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	13	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.40	4.68	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	13	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 35	****	****	4.31	4.26	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	13	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 34	****	****	4.30	4.12	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 37	****	****	4.63	5.00	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	14	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 23	****	****	4.41	****	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	13	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 33	****	****	4.69	4.75	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	13	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 22	****	****	4.54	****	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	13	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 18	****	****	4.49	****	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	4	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	11
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	B	6						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	1	General	1	Under-grad	15	Non-major	4
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						

Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
				P	0			
				I	0	Other	7	
				?	0			



Course-Section: POLI 360 0201  
 Title COMPRTIVE POLI ANALYSI  
 Instructor: GRODSKY, BRIAN  
 Enrollment: 28  
 Questionnaires: 15

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2007

Page 1231  
 JUN 26, 2007  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	0	0	3	4	7	4.29	869/1522	4.51	4.51	4.30	4.34	4.29	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	7	2	5	3.86	1217/1522	4.00	4.40	4.26	4.25	3.86	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	10	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	531/1285	4.33	4.48	4.30	4.30	4.50	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	2	0	3	0	4	5	3.92	1115/1476	3.96	4.33	4.22	4.26	3.92	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	2	3	8	4.29	538/1412	4.38	4.45	4.06	4.03	4.29	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	1	0	0	0	5	8	4.62	240/1381	4.44	4.30	4.08	4.13	4.62	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	1	2	5	3	1	2	2.69	1462/1500	2.75	4.43	4.18	4.13	2.69	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	3	11	4.79	749/1517	4.86	4.43	4.65	4.62	4.79	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	0	0	1	3	4	1	3.56	1258/1497	3.85	4.30	4.11	4.13	3.56	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	3	1	4	6	3.93	1238/1440	4.23	4.63	4.45	4.46	3.93	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	1	0	2	11	4.64	1024/1448	4.69	4.81	4.71	4.71	4.64	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	2	1	6	5	4.00	1056/1436	4.13	4.45	4.29	4.30	4.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	0	2	5	5	4.00	1036/1432	4.27	4.52	4.29	4.29	4.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	3	0	2	5	2	2	3.36	971/1221	3.60	3.74	3.93	3.94	3.36	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	4	6	4.60	324/1280	4.55	4.43	4.10	4.14	4.60	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	0	1	5	4	4.30	766/1277	4.47	4.60	4.34	4.38	4.30	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	0	1	5	4	4.30	743/1269	4.51	4.56	4.31	4.39	4.30	
4. Were special techniques successful	5	7	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	****/ 854	3.13	3.75	4.02	4.00	****	

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
28-55	0	1.00-1.99 0	B 2		Graduate 0
56-83	5	2.00-2.99 2	C 0	General	1
84-150	2	3.00-3.49 1	D 0		Under-grad 15
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 3	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	11
			? 0		

Course-Section: POLI 385 0101  
 Title INTERNATIONAL SECURITY  
 Instructor: HAGERTY, DEVIN  
 Enrollment: 28  
 Questionnaires: 28

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2007

Page 1232  
 JUN 26, 2007  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	7	0	0	0	0	3	18	4.86	211/1522	4.86	4.51	4.30	4.34	4.86	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	7	0	0	1	0	6	14	4.57	465/1522	4.57	4.40	4.26	4.25	4.57	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	7	0	0	1	1	4	15	4.57	456/1285	4.57	4.48	4.30	4.30	4.57	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	9	1	0	0	3	2	13	4.56	425/1476	4.56	4.33	4.22	4.26	4.56	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	2	5	14	4.57	299/1412	4.57	4.45	4.06	4.03	4.57	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	3	5	13	4.48	361/1381	4.48	4.30	4.08	4.13	4.48	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	7	0	0	0	1	2	18	4.81	160/1500	4.81	4.43	4.18	4.13	4.81	
8. How many times was class cancelled	7	0	0	0	0	10	11	4.52	1062/1517	4.52	4.43	4.65	4.62	4.52	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	9	0	0	0	0	3	16	4.84	129/1497	4.84	4.30	4.11	4.13	4.84	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	7	0	0	0	0	2	19	4.90	192/1440	4.90	4.63	4.45	4.46	4.90	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	7	0	0	0	0	0	21	5.00	1/1448	5.00	4.81	4.71	4.71	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	7	0	0	0	0	3	18	4.86	170/1436	4.86	4.45	4.29	4.30	4.86	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	0	2	19	4.90	161/1432	4.90	4.52	4.29	4.29	4.90	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	8	15	2	0	1	0	2	3.00	****/1221	****	3.74	3.93	3.94	****	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	1	5	14	4.65	292/1280	4.65	4.43	4.10	4.14	4.65	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	0	0	1	1	18	4.85	272/1277	4.85	4.60	4.34	4.38	4.85	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	0	0	0	2	18	4.90	223/1269	4.90	4.56	4.31	4.39	4.90	
4. Were special techniques successful	8	14	1	0	0	0	5	4.33	****/ 854	****	3.75	4.02	4.00	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	27	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 79	****	****	4.58	4.53	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	27	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 77	****	****	4.52	4.30	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	27	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 65	****	****	4.49	4.33	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	27	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 78	****	****	4.45	4.34	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	27	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 80	****	****	4.11	3.33	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 5	Required for Majors	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	B 10		Graduate 0
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	C 3	General	6
84-150	14	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad 28
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	14
			? 0		

Course-Section: POLI 390 8020  
 Title AMERICAN FOREIGN POLIC  
 Instructor: MELCAVAGE, EUGE  
 Enrollment: 5  
 Questionnaires: 5

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2007

Page 1233  
 JUN 26, 2007  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1522	5.00	4.51	4.30	4.34	5.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	432/1522	4.60	4.40	4.26	4.25	4.60	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	650/1285	4.40	4.48	4.30	4.30	4.40	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	629/1476	4.40	4.33	4.22	4.26	4.40	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	137/1412	4.80	4.45	4.06	4.03	4.80	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	663/1381	4.20	4.30	4.08	4.13	4.20	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	0	1	3	4.20	839/1500	4.20	4.43	4.18	4.13	4.20	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	714/1517	4.80	4.43	4.65	4.62	4.80	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1497	5.00	4.30	4.11	4.13	5.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	353/1440	4.80	4.63	4.45	4.46	4.80	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1448	5.00	4.81	4.71	4.71	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	478/1436	4.60	4.45	4.29	4.30	4.60	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	527/1432	4.60	4.52	4.29	4.29	4.60	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	2	0	1	1	1	2.80	1121/1221	2.80	3.74	3.93	3.94	2.80	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	324/1280	4.60	4.43	4.10	4.14	4.60	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1277	5.00	4.60	4.34	4.38	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1269	5.00	4.56	4.31	4.39	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	0	4	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 854	****	3.75	4.02	4.00	****	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: POLI 409 0101  
 Title SELECTED TOPICS POLI S  
 Instructor: FORESTIERE, CAR  
 Enrollment: 7  
 Questionnaires: 6

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2007

Page 1234  
 JUN 26, 2007  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	2	1	3	4.17	991/1522	4.17	4.51	4.30	4.42	4.17	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	179/1522	4.83	4.40	4.26	4.34	4.83	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	278/1285	4.75	4.48	4.30	4.42	4.75	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	162/1476	4.83	4.33	4.22	4.31	4.83	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	0	0	5	4.33	493/1412	4.33	4.45	4.06	4.11	4.33	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	0	5	4.67	207/1381	4.67	4.30	4.08	4.21	4.67	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	483/1500	4.50	4.43	4.18	4.25	4.50	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	1	0	1	1	3	3.83	1461/1517	3.83	4.43	4.65	4.71	3.83	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	189/1497	4.75	4.30	4.11	4.21	4.75	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	353/1440	4.80	4.63	4.45	4.52	4.80	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	765/1448	4.80	4.81	4.71	4.75	4.80	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	478/1436	4.60	4.45	4.29	4.32	4.60	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	527/1432	4.60	4.52	4.29	4.34	4.60	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	3	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	279/1221	4.50	3.74	3.93	4.04	4.50	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	390/1280	4.50	4.43	4.10	4.28	4.50	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1277	5.00	4.60	4.34	4.50	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1269	5.00	4.56	4.31	4.49	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	2	0	0	1	0	0	3	4.25	330/ 854	4.25	3.75	4.02	4.31	4.25	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: POLI 428 0101  
 Title POLITICS INTERNSHIP  
 Instructor: SCHALLER, THOMA  
 Enrollment: 5  
 Questionnaires: 4

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2007

Page 1235  
 JUN 26, 2007  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	0	1	1	0	1	3.33	1451/1522	3.33	4.51	4.30	4.42	3.33	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	1	1	3.75	1267/1522	3.75	4.40	4.26	4.34	3.75	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	938/1285	4.00	4.48	4.30	4.42	4.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	792/1476	4.25	4.33	4.22	4.31	4.25	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	566/1412	4.25	4.45	4.06	4.11	4.25	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	0	2	4.00	806/1381	4.00	4.30	4.08	4.21	4.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	483/1500	4.50	4.43	4.18	4.25	4.50	
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	1389/1517	4.00	4.43	4.65	4.71	4.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	1277/1497	3.50	4.30	4.11	4.21	3.50	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	1	0	0	3	4.25	1047/1440	4.25	4.63	4.45	4.52	4.25	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	2	0	0	2	3.50	1419/1448	3.50	4.81	4.71	4.75	3.50	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	2	0	0	2	3.50	1282/1436	3.50	4.45	4.29	4.32	3.50	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	1	0	1	1	3.00	1364/1432	3.00	4.52	4.29	4.34	3.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	1	0	2	0	1	3.00	1064/1221	3.00	3.74	3.93	4.04	3.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	286/1280	4.67	4.43	4.10	4.28	4.67	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1277	5.00	4.60	4.34	4.50	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	2	0	1	0	0	1.67	1267/1269	1.67	4.56	4.31	4.49	1.67	
4. Were special techniques successful	1	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 854	5.00	3.75	4.02	4.31	5.00	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: POLI 429 0101  
 Title SEL TOP AMERICAN GOVT  
 Instructor: GLENN, PAUL F  
 Enrollment: 24  
 Questionnaires: 24

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2007

Page 1236  
 JUN 26, 2007  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	7	0	0	0	1	5	11	4.59	514/1522	4.59	4.51	4.30	4.42	4.59	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	7	0	0	3	3	4	7	3.88	1200/1522	3.88	4.40	4.26	4.34	3.88	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	7	14	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/1285	****	4.48	4.30	4.42	****	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	7	2	0	1	1	5	8	4.33	703/1476	4.33	4.33	4.22	4.31	4.33	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	3	1	13	4.59	294/1412	4.59	4.45	4.06	4.11	4.59	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	1	0	16	4.88	92/1381	4.88	4.30	4.08	4.21	4.88	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	7	0	1	2	3	3	8	3.88	1099/1500	3.88	4.43	4.18	4.25	3.88	
8. How many times was class cancelled	7	0	0	0	0	14	3	4.18	1313/1517	4.18	4.43	4.65	4.71	4.18	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	9	0	0	1	1	7	6	4.20	718/1497	4.20	4.30	4.11	4.21	4.20	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	7	0	0	0	2	1	14	4.71	552/1440	4.71	4.63	4.45	4.52	4.71	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	7	0	0	0	1	2	14	4.76	840/1448	4.76	4.81	4.71	4.75	4.76	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	7	0	1	0	0	6	10	4.41	708/1436	4.41	4.45	4.29	4.32	4.41	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	2	4	11	4.53	611/1432	4.53	4.52	4.29	4.34	4.53	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	8	12	1	0	0	1	2	3.75	****/1221	****	3.74	3.93	4.04	****	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	1	1	13	4.80	184/1280	4.80	4.43	4.10	4.28	4.80	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	9	0	0	0	1	1	13	4.80	317/1277	4.80	4.60	4.34	4.50	4.80	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	0	0	1	0	14	4.87	266/1269	4.87	4.56	4.31	4.49	4.87	
4. Were special techniques successful	9	5	2	1	3	2	2	3.10	771/ 854	3.10	3.75	4.02	4.31	3.10	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	1	0.00-0.99 0	A 9	Required for Majors	1
28-55	1	1.00-1.99 0	B 7		Graduate 0
56-83	2	2.00-2.99 2	C 0	General	4
84-150	4	3.00-3.49 5	D 0		Under-grad 24
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 5	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	11
			? 0		

Course-Section: POLI 432 0101  
 Title CIVIL RIGHTS  
 Instructor: LANOUE, GEORGE  
 Enrollment: 40  
 Questionnaires: 40

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2007

Page 1237  
 JUN 26, 2007  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	18	0	1	0	3	5	13	4.32	837/1522	4.32	4.51	4.30	4.42	4.32	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	18	0	0	0	3	3	16	4.59	443/1522	4.59	4.40	4.26	4.34	4.59	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	18	0	0	0	3	2	17	4.64	395/1285	4.64	4.48	4.30	4.42	4.64	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	18	0	0	1	4	5	12	4.27	769/1476	4.27	4.33	4.22	4.31	4.27	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	2	5	14	4.57	299/1412	4.57	4.45	4.06	4.11	4.57	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	19	4	0	0	5	4	8	4.18	683/1381	4.18	4.30	4.08	4.21	4.18	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	19	0	0	0	2	3	16	4.67	312/1500	4.67	4.43	4.18	4.25	4.67	
8. How many times was class cancelled	19	0	0	0	0	3	18	4.86	600/1517	4.86	4.43	4.65	4.71	4.86	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	22	0	0	0	1	11	6	4.28	633/1497	4.28	4.30	4.11	4.21	4.28	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	19	0	0	0	0	3	18	4.86	272/1440	4.86	4.63	4.45	4.52	4.86	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	19	0	0	0	1	2	18	4.81	765/1448	4.81	4.81	4.71	4.75	4.81	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	19	0	0	0	2	4	15	4.62	467/1436	4.62	4.45	4.29	4.32	4.62	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	1	2	4	14	4.48	669/1432	4.48	4.52	4.29	4.34	4.48	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	21	4	0	2	2	1	10	4.27	455/1221	4.27	3.74	3.93	4.04	4.27	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	26	0	0	0	1	3	10	4.64	298/1280	4.64	4.43	4.10	4.28	4.64	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	26	0	0	0	0	1	13	4.93	182/1277	4.93	4.60	4.34	4.50	4.93	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	26	0	0	0	1	2	11	4.71	420/1269	4.71	4.56	4.31	4.49	4.71	
4. Were special techniques successful	26	1	0	0	2	3	8	4.46	217/ 854	4.46	3.75	4.02	4.31	4.46	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	A 1	Required for Majors	1
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	B 8		Graduate 0
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	C 6	General	4
84-150	10	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad 40
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 1	Electives	0
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	11
			? 1		

Course-Section: POLI 438 0101  
 Title LEGAL INTERNSHIP  
 Instructor: DAVIS, JEFFREY  
 Enrollment: 14  
 Questionnaires: 14

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2007

Page 1238  
 JUN 26, 2007  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	2	0	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/1522	5.00	4.51	4.30	4.42	5.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	115/1522	4.92	4.40	4.26	4.34	4.92	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	3	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	165/1285	4.89	4.48	4.30	4.42	4.89	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	0	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	112/1476	4.92	4.33	4.22	4.31	4.92	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	2	10	4.83	126/1412	4.83	4.45	4.06	4.11	4.83	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	3	9	4.75	149/1381	4.75	4.30	4.08	4.21	4.75	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/1500	5.00	4.43	4.18	4.25	5.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	487/1517	4.91	4.43	4.65	4.71	4.91	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	1	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	189/1497	4.75	4.30	4.11	4.21	4.75	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1440	5.00	4.63	4.45	4.52	5.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1448	5.00	4.81	4.71	4.75	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	123/1436	4.90	4.45	4.29	4.32	4.90	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	187/1432	4.89	4.52	4.29	4.34	4.89	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	5	1	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	124/1221	4.75	3.74	3.93	4.04	4.75	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1280	5.00	4.43	4.10	4.28	5.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1277	5.00	4.60	4.34	4.50	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	255/1269	4.88	4.56	4.31	4.49	4.88	
4. Were special techniques successful	6	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	78/ 854	4.88	3.75	4.02	4.31	4.88	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 215	****	****	4.36	4.47	****	

Frequency Distribution

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



Course-Section: POLI 438H 0101  
 Title  
 Instructor: DAVIS, JEFFREY  
 Enrollment: 2  
 Questionnaires: 2

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2007

Page 1239  
 JUN 26, 2007  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

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	2	Non-major	2
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 responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	0						

Course-Section: POLI 440 0101  
 Title URBAN POLITICS  
 Instructor: HANLON, BERNADE  
 Enrollment: 21  
 Questionnaires: 20

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2007

Page 1240  
 JUN 26, 2007  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	10	0	0	0	2	3	5	4.30	849/1522	4.30	4.51	4.30	4.42	4.30	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	10	0	0	0	1	3	6	4.50	545/1522	4.50	4.40	4.26	4.34	4.50	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	10	0	0	0	1	0	9	4.80	228/1285	4.80	4.48	4.30	4.42	4.80	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	10	0	0	0	2	1	7	4.50	473/1476	4.50	4.33	4.22	4.31	4.50	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	137/1412	4.80	4.45	4.06	4.11	4.80	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	2	2	6	4.40	434/1381	4.40	4.30	4.08	4.21	4.40	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	10	0	0	1	1	1	7	4.40	630/1500	4.40	4.43	4.18	4.25	4.40	
8. How many times was class cancelled	11	0	0	0	0	6	3	4.33	1217/1517	4.33	4.43	4.65	4.71	4.33	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	11	0	0	0	1	7	1	4.00	898/1497	4.00	4.30	4.11	4.21	4.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	11	0	0	0	0	4	5	4.56	740/1440	4.56	4.63	4.45	4.52	4.56	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	11	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	548/1448	4.89	4.81	4.71	4.75	4.89	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	11	0	0	0	1	3	5	4.44	672/1436	4.44	4.45	4.29	4.32	4.44	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	187/1432	4.89	4.52	4.29	4.34	4.89	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	11	3	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	175/1221	4.67	3.74	3.93	4.04	4.67	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	1	2	5	4.50	390/1280	4.50	4.43	4.10	4.28	4.50	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	12	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	254/1277	4.88	4.60	4.34	4.50	4.88	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	12	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	255/1269	4.88	4.56	4.31	4.49	4.88	
4. Were special techniques successful	12	2	1	0	1	2	2	3.67	625/ 854	3.67	3.75	4.02	4.31	3.67	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	1	0.00-0.99 0	A 7	Required for Majors 0	Graduate 0 Major 6
28-55	0	1.00-1.99 0	B 1		
56-83	1	2.00-2.99 3	C 1	General 2	Under-grad 20 Non-major 14
84-150	5	3.00-3.49 0	D 0		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 4	F 0	Electives 0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 6	
			? 0		

Course-Section: POLI 486 0101  
 Title MIDDLE EAST INTL RELAT  
 Instructor: MIKHAIL, NABIL  
 Enrollment: 29  
 Questionnaires: 28

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2007

Page 1241  
 JUN 26, 2007  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	5	0	1	0	2	2	18	4.57	537/1522	4.57	4.51	4.30	4.42	4.57	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	5	0	0	0	2	1	20	4.78	222/1522	4.78	4.40	4.26	4.34	4.78	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	5	0	0	0	1	1	21	4.87	181/1285	4.87	4.48	4.30	4.42	4.87	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	5	4	0	0	2	2	15	4.68	295/1476	4.68	4.33	4.22	4.31	4.68	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	3	2	18	4.65	240/1412	4.65	4.45	4.06	4.11	4.65	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	5	2	0	1	2	1	17	4.62	240/1381	4.62	4.30	4.08	4.21	4.62	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	5	0	0	0	0	4	19	4.83	149/1500	4.83	4.43	4.18	4.25	4.83	
8. How many times was class cancelled	5	0	2	2	5	11	3	3.48	1492/1517	3.48	4.43	4.65	4.71	3.48	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	3	0	0	2	4	13	4.58	333/1497	4.58	4.30	4.11	4.21	4.58	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	5	0	0	0	2	2	19	4.74	492/1440	4.74	4.63	4.45	4.52	4.74	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	5	0	0	0	0	0	23	5.00	1/1448	5.00	4.81	4.71	4.75	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	5	0	0	0	2	2	19	4.74	326/1436	4.74	4.45	4.29	4.32	4.74	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	1	0	22	4.91	145/1432	4.91	4.52	4.29	4.34	4.91	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	5	17	1	0	1	0	4	4.00	****/1221	****	3.74	3.93	4.04	****	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	1	1	2	14	4.61	317/1280	4.61	4.43	4.10	4.28	4.61	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	10	0	1	1	1	0	15	4.50	594/1277	4.50	4.60	4.34	4.50	4.50	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	10	0	0	0	1	1	16	4.83	299/1269	4.83	4.56	4.31	4.49	4.83	
4. Were special techniques successful	10	8	1	0	1	0	8	4.40	252/ 854	4.40	3.75	4.02	4.31	4.40	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: POLI 487 0101  
 Title INTERNATIONAL POLI ECO  
 Instructor: THIBIDEAU, PHIL  
 Enrollment: 20  
 Questionnaires: 20

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2007

Page 1242  
 JUN 26, 2007  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	7	0	0	0	2	6	5	4.23	919/1522	4.23	4.51	4.30	4.42	4.23	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	8	0	0	1	2	3	6	4.17	965/1522	4.17	4.40	4.26	4.34	4.17	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	7	0	0	1	2	3	7	4.23	780/1285	4.23	4.48	4.30	4.42	4.23	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	7	0	0	0	3	5	5	4.15	903/1476	4.15	4.33	4.22	4.31	4.15	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	1	4	2	6	4.00	760/1412	4.00	4.45	4.06	4.11	4.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	2	2	4	5	3.92	911/1381	3.92	4.30	4.08	4.21	3.92	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	7	0	0	0	3	4	6	4.23	799/1500	4.23	4.43	4.18	4.25	4.23	
8. How many times was class cancelled	8	0	0	0	0	11	1	4.08	1361/1517	4.08	4.43	4.65	4.71	4.08	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	9	1	0	1	4	4	1	3.50	1277/1497	3.50	4.30	4.11	4.21	3.50	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	7	0	1	1	2	9	0	3.46	1365/1440	3.46	4.63	4.45	4.52	3.46	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	7	0	0	1	0	1	11	4.69	965/1448	4.69	4.81	4.71	4.75	4.69	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	7	0	1	2	2	6	2	3.46	1295/1436	3.46	4.45	4.29	4.32	3.46	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	7	0	2	1	4	4	2	3.23	1338/1432	3.23	4.52	4.29	4.34	3.23	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	8	2	0	2	6	2	0	3.00	1064/1221	3.00	3.74	3.93	4.04	3.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	4	2	6	4.17	644/1280	4.17	4.43	4.10	4.28	4.17	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	0	1	1	1	9	4.50	594/1277	4.50	4.60	4.34	4.50	4.50	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	0	2	1	0	9	4.33	721/1269	4.33	4.56	4.31	4.49	4.33	
4. Were special techniques successful	8	5	0	2	2	2	1	3.29	737/ 854	3.29	3.75	4.02	4.31	3.29	
Laboratory															
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	19	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 228	****	****	4.35	4.32	****	
Seminar															
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	19	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 77	****	****	4.52	4.60	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 37	****	****	4.63	4.33	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	19	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 23	****	****	4.41	4.00	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 33	****	****	4.69	4.92	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	19	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 22	****	****	4.54	4.25	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 7	Required for Majors	1
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	B 4		Graduate 0
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	C 1	General	20
84-150	7	3.00-3.49	D 0		Major 8
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	9
			? 0		

Course-Section: POLI 489 0101  
 Title SEL TOPICS:INTERNATL R  
 Instructor: LEBSON, MICAH  
 Enrollment: 11  
 Questionnaires: 11

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2007

Page 1243  
 JUN 26, 2007  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	4	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1522	5.00	4.51	4.30	4.42	5.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	4	0	0	0	2	3	2	4.00	1080/1522	4.00	4.40	4.26	4.34	4.00	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	4	0	0	0	3	2	2	3.86	1046/1285	3.86	4.48	4.30	4.42	3.86	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	4	1	0	0	1	3	2	4.17	892/1476	4.17	4.33	4.22	4.31	4.17	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	1	0	6	4.71	191/1412	4.71	4.45	4.06	4.11	4.71	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	108/1381	4.83	4.30	4.08	4.21	4.83	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	5	0	0	0	1	0	5	4.67	312/1500	4.67	4.43	4.18	4.25	4.67	
8. How many times was class cancelled	4	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	600/1517	4.86	4.43	4.65	4.71	4.86	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	1	4	2	4.14	782/1497	4.14	4.30	4.11	4.21	4.14	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	0	0	1	1	5	4.57	716/1440	4.57	4.63	4.45	4.52	4.57	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	629/1448	4.86	4.81	4.71	4.75	4.86	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	0	1	1	2	3	4.00	1056/1436	4.00	4.45	4.29	4.32	4.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	2	1	4	4.29	862/1432	4.29	4.52	4.29	4.34	4.29	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	1	0	0	3	2	1	3.67	832/1221	3.67	3.74	3.93	4.04	3.67	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	1	0	6	4.71	253/1280	4.71	4.43	4.10	4.28	4.71	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1277	5.00	4.60	4.34	4.50	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1269	5.00	4.56	4.31	4.49	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	4	3	0	1	0	0	3	4.25	330/ 854	4.25	3.75	4.02	4.31	4.25	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 79	****	****	4.58	4.67	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	10	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 77	****	****	4.52	4.60	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 65	****	****	4.49	4.65	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 78	****	****	4.45	4.58	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	10	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 80	****	****	4.11	4.14	****	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: POLI 652 0101  
 Title POLITICS OF HEALTH  
 Instructor: MILLER, NANCY A  
 Enrollment: 6  
 Questionnaires: 6

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2007

Page 1244  
 JUN 26, 2007  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1522	5.00	4.51	4.30	4.45	5.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	179/1522	4.83	4.40	4.26	4.29	4.83	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1285	5.00	4.48	4.30	4.31	5.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	316/1476	4.67	4.33	4.22	4.31	4.67	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	137/1412	4.80	4.45	4.06	4.25	4.80	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	118/1381	4.80	4.30	4.08	4.25	4.80	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1500	5.00	4.43	4.18	4.22	5.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1517	5.00	4.43	4.65	4.73	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	0	3	1	4.25	654/1497	4.25	4.30	4.11	4.21	4.25	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	304/1440	4.83	4.63	4.45	4.48	4.83	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1448	5.00	4.81	4.71	4.80	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	188/1436	4.83	4.45	4.29	4.37	4.83	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	254/1432	4.83	4.52	4.29	4.33	4.83	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	4	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	899/1221	3.50	3.74	3.93	3.83	3.50	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1280	5.00	4.43	4.10	4.24	5.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1277	5.00	4.60	4.34	4.52	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1269	5.00	4.56	4.31	4.51	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	2	2	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	847/ 854	2.00	3.75	4.02	4.08	2.00	

Frequency Distribution

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