Baltimore County

Enrollment:

Questionnaires: 27

27

Spring 2007

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Page 1211

JUN 26, 2007

Job IRBR3029

Course-Section: POLI 100 0101 University of Maryland Title AMER GOVT & POLITICS Instructor: KING-MEADOWS, T

			Fre	equei	ncies	S		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	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														
	13	0	0	1	2	6	_	4 07	1159/1440	4.65	4.63	1 15	4.40	4.07
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	13	0	0	1	0	5			1224/1448		4.81		4.63	4.43
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	15	0	1	3	0	5	3		1282/1436		4.45		4.03	3.50
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	1	2	4	6		956/1432		4.52	4.29	4.23	4.15
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	14	7	2	1	1	1	1		****/1221		3.74	3.93	3.86	****
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	14	/	2	Т	Т	1	Τ	2.07	/1221	4.04	3.74	3.93	3.00	
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	****
P		- <b>5</b> 2 - 4												

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	l Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	 А	3	Required for Majors	3	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	5	1.00-1.99	0	В	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	n
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	4	_			
				2	Λ						

Course-Section: POLI 100 0201 University of Maryland Title AMER GOVT & POLITICS Instructor: KING-MEADOWS, T

Baltimore County Spring 2007

Page 1212

JUN 26, 2007

Job IRBR3029

Enrollment: 38 Questionnaires: 40

		Ouestions	S		NR	NA	rre	equei 2	ncies 3	4	5	Inst Mean	ructor Rank	Course Mean	рерт Меап	Mean	Level	Sect Mean
		General	_															
		w insights,ski			26	0	0	0	1	5	8	4.50	605/1522		4.51	4.30	4.14	4.50
		tor make clear	_	_	26	0	0	1	3	0	10	4.36	763/1522		4.40	4.26	4.18	4.36
		estions reflect			26	0	0	2	1	4	7	4.14	849/1285	4.30	4.48	4.30	4.22	4.14
		ations reflect	_	_	26	0	0	2	1	4	7	4.14	913/1476		4.33	4.22	4.09	4.14
	_	-		hat you learned	26	0	0	0	3	0	11	4.57	299/1412	4.40	4.45	4.06	4.01	4.57
		-		what you learned	26	0	1	1	3 1	3	6 10	3.86	977/1381	3.76	4.30	4.08	3.93	3.86
		system clearly was class cance		nea	26 26	0	0	2	3	3	2	4.64	337/1500 1481/1517	4.50 4.10	4.43	4.18	4.16 4.62	4.64 3.64
	-			EE	26 27	0	0	∠ 1	3 1	7	4	4.08	852/1497			4.05		
9. HOW WOL	uia you g	rade the overa.	II teach	ing effectiveness	21	U	U	Τ	Τ	/	4	4.08	852/149/	4.30	4.30	4.11	4.02	4.08
		Lecture	е															
1. Were th	he instru	ctor's lectures	s well p	repared	26	0	0	1	0	0	13	4.79	392/1440	4.65	4.63	4.45	4.40	4.79
2. Did the	e instruc	tor seem intere	ested 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 led	cture mat	erial presented	d and ex	plained 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	e lecture	s contribute to	o what y	ou learned	26	0	1	0	2	2	9	4.29	862/1432	4.59	4.52	4.29	4.23	4.29
5. Did aud	diovisual	techniques enl	hance yo	ur understanding	26	5	1	1	2	2	3	3.56	****/1221	4.04	3.74	3.93	3.86	****
		Discus	sion															
1. Did cla	ass discu			hat you learned	33	0	0	0	1	1	5	4.57	****/1280	4.17	4.43	4.10	3.92	****
					33	0	0	0	1	2	4		****/1277	4.09	4.60	4.34	4.13	****
	e all students actively encouraged to participat the instructor encourage fair and open discussi				33	0	0	0	1	1	5	4.57	****/1269	4.34	4.56	4.31	4.04	****
4. Were sp	pecial te	chniques succes	ssful	-	33	3	0	2	1	0	1	3.00	****/ 854	3.70	3.75	4.02	3.87	****
		Semina	r															
1. Were as	ssigned t			announced theme	39	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 79	****	****	4.58	4.13	****
	_	-		vidual attention	39	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 77	****	****	4.52	4.03	****
				hat you learned	39	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 65	****	****	4.49	3.85	****
		ns contribute t			39	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 78	****	****	4.45	3.88	****
_		or grading made			39	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 80	***	****	4.11	3.79	****
		Self I	Daged															
1. Did sel	lf-paced			hat you learned	39	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 37	***	****	4.63	4.53	****
3. Were yo	our conta	cts with the in	nstructo	r helpful	39	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 33	****	****	4.69	4.57	****
		Frequ	ency	Dist	trib	ution	ı											
Omodita Es								Do					т.				Mojoro	_
CIEUILS E	edits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grad								sons				Ту 	 ħe			Majors 	, 
00-27						Red	quire	ed fo	or Ma	jor	s	5	Graduat	е	0	Majo	or	4
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	В 3														
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	2	C 7		Ger	nera:	L				3	Under-g	rad 4	10	Non-	-major	36
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	D 1											_				
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F 0	Electives 2					2	#### -				_	ηh		
				P 0								_	respons	es to b	e sign	uficar	ıt	
				I 0		Otl	ner					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

			Fre	equei	ncie	s		Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	3	0	0	0	1	6	17	4.67				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		****/1476	3.96	4.33	4.22	4.09	****
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	1 0	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 7. Was the grading system clearly explained	3	22 0	0	0	0 1	1 4	1 19	4.75	****/1381 211/1500	3.76 4.50	4.30	4.08 4.18	3.93 4.16	4.75
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	0	0	0	0	21	3		1343/1517	4.10	4.43	4.16	4.10	4.73
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	1	0	0	1	6	16	4.65	272/1497		4.30	4.11		4.65
7. now would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	_	U	O	_	O	10	1.05	2/2/11//	1.30	1.50	1.11	1.02	1.03
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		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		,	****	****	4.35	4.33	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	24	1	0	0	0	1	1		****/ 217	****	****	4.51	4.51	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	24	1	0	0	0	1	1		****/ 216	****	****	4.42	4.41	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	24	2	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 205	****	****	4.23	4.28	***
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	24	1	0	0	0	1	1		****/ 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			****	****	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		,	****	****	4.30	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		,	****	****	4.31	4.00	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	24	2	0	0	1	0	0		****/ 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:

Enrollment: 48 Questionnaires: 27

Baltimore County SCHALLER, THOMA Spring 2007

Page 1213 JUN 26, 2007 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

University of Maryland

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expecte	d Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	8	0.00-0.99	0	 А	10	Required for Majors	7	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	В	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	n
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	10	_			
				?	0						

Course-Section: POLI 100 0401

AMER GOVT & POLITICS

Title SCHALLER, THOMA

Instructor:

Enrollment: 46 Questionnaires: 45

#### University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2007

Page 1214 JUN 26, 2007 Job IRBR3029

				Fre	eque	ncie	s		Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sec
	Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mea
	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	4.7
	or make clear the expected goals	13	0	0	0	1	8	23	4.69	334/1522	4.38	4.40	4.26	4.18	4.6
	stions reflect the expected goals	13	0	0	0	1	5	26	4.78	248/1285	4.30	4.48	4.30	4.22	4.7
4. Did other evalua	tions 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 rea	dings contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	1	0	9	22	4.63	265/1412	4.40	4.45	4.06	4.01	4.6
6. Did written assi	gnments contribute to what you learned	13	27	1	0	1	0	3	3.80	****/1381	3.76	4.30	4.08	3.93	**:
	system clearly explained	13	0	0	0	0	6	26	4.81	154/1500	4.50	4.43	4.18	4.16	4.8
8. How many times w	as class cancelled	12	0	0	0	0		12	4.36	1193/1517	4.10	4.43	4.65	4.62	4.
9. How would you gr	ade the overall teaching effectiveness	16	1	0	0	1	8	19	4.64	280/1497	4.30	4.30	4.11	4.02	4.
	Lecture														
	tor's lectures well prepared	14	0	0	0	2	4		4.74	472/1440		4.63	4.45	4.40	4.
	or seem interested in the subject	14	0	0	0	0	0	31	5.00	1/1448		4.81	4.71	4.63	5.
	rial presented and explained clearly	14	0	0	0		10	21	4.68	404/1436		4.45	4.29	4.24	4.
	contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	2	1		4.84			4.52	4.29	4.23	4.
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.
	Discussion														
	sions contribute to what you learned	19	0	1	0	2	6	17	4.46	424/1280		4.43	4.10	3.92	4.
	s actively encouraged to participate	19	0	0	0	4	2	20	4.62	517/1277		4.60	4.34	4.13	4.
	or encourage fair and open discussion	19	0	0	0	1	2		4.85	,		4.56		4.04	4.
4. Were special tec	hniques successful	19	21	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	****/ 854	3.70	3.75	4.02	3.87	**:
	Laboratory						_								
	ease understanding of the material	44	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 215	****	****	4.36	4.31	**
	d with adequate background information	43	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 228	****	****	4.35	4.33	**
-	aterials available for lab activities	43	1	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 217	****	****	4.51	4.51	
	ructor provide assistance	44	0	0	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 216	***	***	4.42	4.41	**
. Were requirement	s for lab reports clearly specified	44	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 205	****	****	4.23	4.28	**
1 Maria and an 3 d	Seminar	4.4	0	0	0	0	0	1	F 00	****/ <b>5</b> 0		444	4 50	4 12	dl.
	pics relevant to the announced theme	44	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 79	****	****	4.58	4.13	**
	or available for individual attention	44	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 77	****	****	4.52	4.03	**
	jects contribute to what you learned	44	0	0	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 65 ****/ 78	****	****	4.49	3.85	**
_	s contribute to what you learned	44	0	0	0	0	0	_	5.00	****/ 78 ****/ 80	****	****	4.45	3.88	**
o. Were criteria fo	or grading made clear	44	U	0	0	0	0	Τ	5.00	****/ 80	****	****	4.11	3.79	**
O Did atudu	Self Paced	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	E 00	****/ 23	****	****	1 11	4 10	**.
ב. בום stuay questi	ons make clear the expected goal	44	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 23		0000	4.41	4.19	~ ^ 7
	Frequ	iency	Dist	trib	utio	n									
Credits Earned	Cum. GPA Expected Grades				Rea	ason	s			Ту	pe			Majors	3

Credits E	Carned	Cum. GP	A	Expected	l Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors	
00-27 28-55	11 6	0.00-0.99 1.00-1.99	0		14 16	Required for Majors	9	Graduate	0	Major	5
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	10	С	2	General	9	Under-grad	45	Non-major	40
84-150 Grad.	2 0	3.00-3.49 3.50-4.00	6 7	D F	0 0	Electives	2	#### - Means	there	are not enough	n
				P I	0 0	Other	13	responses to	be si	gnificant	
				?	0						

Course-Section: POLI 100 0501 University of Maryland Title

AMER GOVT & POLITICS

Instructor: EBERLY, TODD E

Enrollment: 49 Questionnaires: 41 Baltimore County Spring 2007

Page 1215 JUN 26, 2007 Job IRBR3029

		Questions		NR	NA	Fre	_	ncies 3	3	5	Ins Mean	tructor Rank		Dept Mean		Level Mean	Sect Mean
1 Did 1	ou goin ne	General	s from this course	3	0	0	0	1	5	32	4.82	239/1522	<i>1</i> E1	4.51	4.30	4.14	4.82
_	_	-	ne expected goals	3	0	0	0	0	5	33	4.87	157/1522		4.40	4.26	4.18	4.87
			the expected goals	3	0	0	0	2	3	33	4.82			4.48	4.30	4.22	4.82
	_	ations reflect th		4	1	0	0	1	5	30	4.81	178/1476		4.33	4.22	4.09	4.81
			to what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	6	29	4.83	129/1412		4.45	4.06	4.01	4.83
	_	_	ite 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
		system clearly e	_	6	0	0	0	2	5	28	4.74	221/1500	4.50	4.43	4.18	4.16	4.74
8. How ma	any times	was class cancel	led	6	0	0	0	0	0	35	5.00	1/1517	4.10	4.43	4.65	4.62	5.00
9. How w	ould you g	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 instru	ctor'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 t	he instruc	ctor seem interest	ted in the subject	3	0	0	0	0	1	37	4.97	148/1448	4.87	4.81	4.71	4.63	4.97
			and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	0	4	34	4.89	132/1436	4.42	4.45	4.29	4.24	4.89
		es contribute to		4	0	0	0	0	2	35	4.95	97/1432	4.59	4.52	4.29	4.23	4.95
5. Did a	udiovisual	techniques enhai	nce your understanding	4	10	3	4	3	2	15	3.81	752/1221	4.04	3.74	3.93	3.86	3.81
		Discussio	on														
1. Did c	lass discu	ussions contribute	e 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 studer	raged 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 t	he instruc	ctor encourage fa:	ir and open discussion	12	0	0	0	0	4	25	4.86	266/1269	4.34	4.56	4.31	4.04	4.86
		chniques success		12	6	2	4	4	2	11	3.70					3.87	
		Laborato	C37														
1 Did ti	he lah inc		ing of the material	40	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 215	****	****	4.36	4.31	****
			background information	40	0	0	0	1	0	0		****/ 228	****	****	4.35	4.33	****
		Seminar															
1 Were	accioned t		the announced theme	40	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 79	****	****	4.58	4.13	****
			individual attention	40	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 77	****	****	4.52	4.03	****
			e to what you learned	39	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 65	****	****	4.49	3.85	****
	_	ons contribute to	_	39	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	,	****	****	4.45	3.88	****
_		for grading made	-	40	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	, -		****	4.11	3.79	****
		Field Wo	clr														
3. Was t	he instruc	ctor available for		40	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.40	3.99	****
			Frequ	onat	. Dia	t wib	1+101	2									
		riedo	iency	DIS	CIID	10101	.1										
Credits 1	lits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Gra						Rea	asons	3			Ту	pe			Majors	3
00-27	-27 6 0.00-0.99 1 A 17					quire	ed f	or Ma	jor	s 1	.0	 Graduat	 е	0	Majo	r	6
28-55																	
56-83	83 7 2.00-2.99 7 C 3					nera:	L				4	Under-g	rad 4	1	Non-	major	35
84-150																	
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5 F 0		Electives						2	#### -	Means t	here a	re not	enoug	jh
			P 0									respons	es to b	e sign	ificar	ıt	
			I O		Other					2	2						

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

		0					ncie	S		Tngt	tructor	Course	Dent	TIMBC	Level	Sect
	Questions		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank		Mean			Mean
	General				_	_	_	_			400/4500					
	insights, skills from		0	0	1	1	2	./	35	4.61	492/1522		4.51	4.30	4.34	4.61
	or make clear the exp		0	0	0	1	2	6	37	4.72	299/1522		4.40	4.26	4.29	4.72
_	stions reflect the ex		1	0	0	0	0	3	42	4.93	105/1285	4.79	4.48	4.30	4.36	4.93
	tions reflect the exp		1	18	0	0	1	5	21	4.74	236/1476	4.51	4.33	4.22	4.20	4.74
_	dings contribute to w	-	1	0	0	1	0	11	33	4.69	214/1412	4.68	4.45	4.06	4.00	4.69
	gnments contribute to		1	23	0	0	1	4	17	4.73	168/1381	4.73	4.30	4.08	3.97	4.73
	system clearly explai	ned	1	0	0	1	4	4	36	4.67			4.43	4.18	4.20	4.67
8. How many times w			1	0	0	0	1	27	17		1201/1517		4.43	4.65		4.36
9. How would you gr	ade the overall teach	ing 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 instruc	tor's lectures well p	repared	0	0	0	0	0	2	44	4.96	96/1440	4.77	4.63	4.45	4.42	4.96
2. Did the instruct	or 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
<ol><li>Was lecture mate</li></ol>	rial presented and ex	plained 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 y	ou 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 yo	ur 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 discus	sions contribute to w	hat vou learned	22	0	0	1	5	2	16	4.38	499/1280	4.33	4.43	4.10	4.08	4.38
	s actively encouraged	-	22	0	0	0	3	6	15	4.50	594/1277	4.53	4.60	4.34	4.33	4.50
	or encourage fair and		22	0	0	0	2	2	20	4.75	381/1269	4.74	4.56	4.31	4.33	4.75
4. Were special tec	_		22	17	0	1	3	0	3		****/ 854			4.02	4.00	***
	Laboratory															
1 Did the lab inam	-	the meterial	11	1	0	0	0	0	1	E 00	****/ 215	****	****	4.36	4.62	****
	ease understanding of d with adequate backg		44 44	1 0	0	0	0	0	2		****/ 228	****	****	4.35	4.62	****
					-		-	_	_		,					
	Field Work			_	_	_			_							
	ence contribute to wh		45	0	0	0	0	1	0	1.00	****/ 47	****	****	4.41	4.83	****
	understand your evalu		45	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 45	****	****	4.30	4.58	****
	or available for cons		45	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 39	****	****	4.40	4.75	****
4. To what degree c	ould you discuss your	evaluations	45	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 35	****	****	4.31	4.75	****
	Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced s	Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned				0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 37	****	****	4.63	****	****
2. Did study questi	Did study questions make clear the expected goal			0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 23	***	****	4.41	****	****
3. Were your contac	. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful			0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 33	****	****	4.69	****	****
		Frequ	iency	r Dist	trib	utio:	n									
Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades				Re	ason	S			Ty	pe			Majors	\$

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA	A	Expecte	d Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors	
00-27	8	0.00-0.99	0	Α	20	Required for Majors	4	Graduate	0	Major	13
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	0	В	21						
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	9	C	0	General	3	Under-grad	46	Non-major	33
84-150	6	3.00-3.49	13	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	7	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means	there	are not enoug	h
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	32				
				2	0						

Course-Section: POLI 210 0201

POLITICAL PHILOSOPHY

Title

Instructor: FURLOW, SHANAYS

Enrollment: 50 Questionnaires: 49

### University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2007

Page 1217 JUN 26, 2007 Job IRBR3029

				equei					tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	10	0	0	0	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		4.40	4.26	4.29	4.54
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	10	0	0	1	0	11	27	4.64			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			4.45	4.42	4.57
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	11	0	0	0	0	3	35	4.92	395/1448		4.81	4.71	4.78	4.92
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	9	0	0	0	4	10		4.55			4.45	4.29	4.29	4.55
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	2				514/1432					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		4.60	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	****	****
Frequ	.ency	Dist	trib	ıtior	n									
Credita Farned Cum CDA Expected Credea				Do.	aan	a			т.	20			Majora	

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

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

			Fre	equer	ncie	s		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	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	****

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA	A	Expecte	d Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	1	 А	11	Required for Majors	3	Graduate	0	Major	17
28-55	5	1.00-1.99	1	В	18						
56-83	9	2.00-2.99	4	C	10	General	5	Under-grad	52	Non-major	35
84-150	8	3.00-3.49	12	D	2						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	7	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means	there	are not enoug	h
				P	1			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	33				
				-	1	<del></del>					

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

			Fre	equer	ncie	s		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	10	0	Ο	2	2	2	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	ρ,	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		4.41
		_	-	_	_				,					
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	***	****

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GP	A	Expecte	d Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	 А	14	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	15
28-55	5	1.00-1.99	0	В	12						
56-83	6	2.00-2.99	1	С	5	General	4	Under-grad	51	Non-major	36
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	6	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	14	F	0	Electives	2	#### - Means	there	are not enough	h
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	28				
				2	0						

Course-Section: POLI 250 0101 University of Maryland Title INTRO TO PUBLIC ADMIN

Baltimore County Spring 2007

Page 1220

JUN 26, 2007

Job IRBR3029

WILLIAMS-RANDAL Instructor: Enrollment: 50

DILL OTTINCITE.	30		
Questionnaires:	50	Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire	ent Course Evaluation Questi

Ouestions								equer		s	_		tructor	Course	_			
		Question	S		NR	NA	Τ	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		Genera	 1															
1. Did yo	ou gain n	ew insights,ski	- lls fro	m this course	21	0	1	3	4	11	10	3.90	1224/1522	3.90	4.51	4.30	4.34	3.90
_	_	ctor make clear			21	0	1	1	5	11	11	4.03	1064/1522	4.03	4.40	4.26	4.29	4.03
		uestions reflec			22	0	1	2	4	8	13	4.07	898/1285	4.07	4.48	4.30	4.36	4.07
	_	uations reflect		_	22	1	2	1	2	13	9	3.96	1056/1476	3.96	4.33	4.22	4.20	3.96
5. Did as	ssigned r	eadings contrib	ute 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
				o 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 th	ne gradin	g system clearl	y expla	ined	21	0	1	2	1	6	19	4.38	660/1500	4.38	4.43	4.18	4.20	4.38
8. How ma	any times	was class canc	elled		22	0	0	0	0	9	19	4.68	921/1517	4.68	4.43	4.65	4.63	4.68
9. How wo	ould you	grade the overa	ll tead	hing effectiveness	27	0	0	0	7	14	2	3.78	1126/1497	3.78	4.30	4.11	4.11	3.78
1 Wara t	the instr	Lectur uctor's lecture	nronarod	21	0	0	0	0	7	22	4.76	452/1440	4.76	4.63	4.45	4.42	4.76	
		n the subject	21	0	0	1	1	7	20		1089/1448		4.81	4.45	4.42	4.59		
		-	21	0	0	0	4	ν	17	4.45	672/1436		4.45	4.71	4.78	4.45		
	Was lecture material presented and explained clear: Did the lectures contribute to what you learned						0	1	4	6	19	4.45	707/1432		4.52	4.29		4.45
				our understanding	21 22	0 4	1	1	2	9		4.17	- ,				4.02	
5. Did at	udiovisua	i tecimiques en	nance y	our understanding	22	4	1	Т	4	9	тт	4.1/	524/1221	4.17	3.74	3.93	4.02	4.17
		Discus	sion															
1. Did cl	lass disc	ussions contrib	ute 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 a	all stude	nts actively en	courage	d 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 th	he instru	ctor encourage	fair ar	d 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 s	special t	echniques succe	ssful		27	14	0	2	2	1	4	3.78	****/ 854	***	3.75	4.02	4.00	****
				Frequ	ency	, Dist	trib	ıt i or	n									
				11040	.01107	215	0112		-									
Credits E	Earned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	ason	s			Ту	pe			Majors	3
00-27	00-27 0 0.00-0.99 0 A 12						quir	ed fo	or M	 ajor	 s	0	 Graduat	 e	0	Majo	 or	10
28-55										J						5		-
56-83						Ger	nera:	L				1	Under-g	rad 5	0	Non-	-major	40
84-150	4-150 8 3.00-3.49 3 D 1												3				-	
Grad.	Grad. 0 3.50-4.00 8 F 0					Ele	ecti	<i>r</i> es				2	#### -	Means t	here a	re not	enous	jh
	Р 0												respons	es to b	e sign	nificar	ıt	
	I 0					Otl	her				2	24	-		5			

Course-Section: POLI 260 0101

Title COMPARATIVE POLITICS

Instructor: CROATTI, MARK

Enrollment: 45 Questionnaires: 40

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

University of Maryland

Baltimore County

Spring 2007

Page 1221 JUN 26, 2007 Job IRBR3029

			Fre	ane	ncies			Tnst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank		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		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		1277/1381		4.30	4.08	3.97	3.11
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	14	1	2	1	6	5			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		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		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		1097/1269	3.60	4.56	4.31	4.33	3.60
4. Were special techniques successful	25	6	1	1	2	3	2		****/ 854	****	3.75	4.02	4.00	****
Laboratory														
Laboratory	2.0	0	0	0	1	1	0	2 50	++++/ 015	++++	++++	1 20	4 ()	****
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	38	0	0	0	1 2	1	0		****/ 215	****	****	4.36	4.62	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	38	0	0	1	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 228 ****/ 217	****	****	4.35 4.51	4.56 4.57	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	38 38	0	0	1			0		****/ 216	****	****	4.42		****
<ol> <li>Did the lab instructor provide assistance</li> <li>Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified</li> </ol>	38	0	1	0	1 1	0	0		****/ 205	****	****	4.42	4.72 4.37	****
5. Were requirements for tab reports creatly specified	30	U	_	U	Τ.	U	U	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		****/ 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

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expecte	d Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	0	 А	7	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	16
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	В	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 enoug	h
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	21				
				?	1						

Course-Section: POLI 280 0101

Title INTERNATIONAL RELATION

Instructor: HAGERTY, DEVIN

Enrollment: 49
Questionnaires: 49

# Baltimore County Spring 2007

University of Maryland

Page 1222 JUN 26, 2007 Job IRBR3029

	Questions						Fre	equer 2	cie:	s 4	5	Inst Mean	ructor Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
1 544		Genera		h.:	1.0	0	0	^	1	7	2.5	4 72	265/1500	4 72	<i>1</i> F1	4 20	1 21	4 72
-	_	insights,ski or make clear			16 16	0	0	0	1	7	25 25	4.73 4.73	365/1522 288/1522		4.51 4.40	4.30	4.34	4.73 4.73
		stions reflect	_	_	16	0	0	0	0	10	23	4.70	337/1285	4.70	4.48	4.30	4.36	4.73
	_	tions reflect		_	16	24	0	0	0	1	8		****/1476	****	4.33	4.22	4.20	****
			_	hat you learned	18	0	0	0	7	9	15	4.26	566/1412	4.26	4.45	4.06	4.00	4.26
	_	-		what you learned	18	25	0	0	0	1	5		****/1381	****	4.30	4.08	3.97	****
	-	system clearly		_	17	1	0	0	3	4	24	4.68	300/1500	4.68	4.43	4.18	4.20	4.68
8. How many	y times wa	as class cance	elled		18	0	0	0	0	27	4	4.13	1343/1517	4.13	4.43	4.65	4.63	4.13
9. How would	ld you gra	ade the overa	ll teach	ning effectiveness	21	0	0	0	1	7	20	4.68	256/1497	4.68	4.30	4.11	4.11	4.68
		Lecture	e															
		tor's lecture	_	-	16 16	0	0	0	0	7	26	4.79	392/1440		4.63	4.45	4.42	4.79
	Did the instructor seem interested in the subject Was lecture material presented and explained clear					0	0	0	0	1	32	4.97	198/1448	4.97	4.81	4.71	4.78	4.97
	Mas lecture material presented and explained clear bid the lectures contribute to what you learned					0	0	0	2	5	26	4.73	341/1436	4.73	4.45	4.29	4.29	4.73
	id the lectures contribute to what you learned					0 27	0	0	0	6	27	4.82	280/1432	4.82	4.52	4.29	4.31	4.82
5. Did aud:	Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understand						0	2	0	0	4	4.00	****/1221	****	3.74	3.93	4.02	****
1 Did ala	aa diaawa	Discus:		hat you learned	23	0	0	0	5	5	16	1 12	4E0 /1200	1 12	1 12	1 10	1 00	4 40
				hat you learned I to participate	23	0	2	0	3	5 6	16 15	4.42	459/1280 819/1277	4.42	4.43 4.60	4.10	4.08	4.42 4.23
				l open discussion	23	0	1	0	1	5	19	4.23	532/1269	4.23	4.56	4.34	4.33	4.23
		nniques succes		open discussion	23	23	0	1	0	1	1		****/ 854	****	3.75	4.02	4.00	****
		Labora	+ 0 2027															
2. Were you	u provideo		-	round information	48	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 228	****	****	4.35	4.56	***
_	-																	
1 Did fic	ld ormowia	Field W		nat rrow loammad	48	0	1	0	0	0	0	1 00	****/ 47	****	****	4.41	1 02	****
				nat you learned Nation criteria	48	0	1	1	0	0	0		****/ 45	****	****	4.41	4.83 4.58	****
z. Dia you	Clearly (	miderstand you	ur evaru	acton Criceria	40	U	U		U	U	U	2.00	45			4.30	4.50	
		Self 1	Paced															
		•		hat you learned	48	0	0	1	0	0	0		****/ 37	****	****	4.63	****	***
2. Did stud	dy questio	ons make clear	r the ex	spected goal	48	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 23	****	****	4.41	****	****
		Frequ	ency.	Dist	ribu	ation	1											
Credits Ear	rned	Expected Grades				Rea	son	3			Ту	pe			Majors			
00-27	redits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Gra 00-27 2 0.00-0.99 1 A 15						uire		 т М:			4	Graduat		0	Majo	 r	 15
28-55						1166	14116	-u _L	× 1.10	⊥∪ر م	2	-	Graduat	_	-	ı-ıa JC	, <u>.</u>	10
56-83						Ger	neral					3	Under-g	rad 4	.9	Non-	major	34
84-150	84-150 3 3.00-3.49 6 D 0					501	0.1					-	2202 9		-			
Grad.	Grad. 0 3.50-4.00 9 F 0					Ele	ectiv	res				2	#### - 1	Means t	here a	re not	enoug	h
	P 1												respons				_	
	I 0					Oth	ıer				2	1						

Course-Section: POLI 301 0101 University of Maryland Title POLI RESEARCH METHODS

Baltimore County

Instructor: FORESTIERE, CAR Enrollment: 32

Questionnaires: 32

Spring 2007 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire Page 1223

JUN 26, 2007

Job IRBR3029

									Fre	equer	ncie	s		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
			Question	S			NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
			 Genera	 1																
1. I	oid yo	u gain ne	ew insights,ski	lls fro	om this cou	rse	9	0	1	0	1	9	12	4.35	802/1522	4.40	4.51	4.30	4.34	4.35
	_	_	ctor make clear				10	0	1	0	0	4	17	4.64	395/1522	4.61	4.40	4.26	4.25	4.64
3. I	oid th	e exam q	uestions reflec	t the e	expected go	als	9	3	0	0	2	3	15	4.65	376/1285	4.70	4.48	4.30	4.30	4.65
4. I	oid ot	her eval	uations reflect	the ex	spected goa	ls	9	0	1	1	1	4	16	4.43	582/1476	4.49	4.33	4.22	4.26	4.43
5. I	oid as	signed re	eadings contrib	ute to	what you 1	earned	9	0	3	1	7	3	9	3.61	1112/1412	3.80	4.45	4.06	4.03	3.61
6. I	oid wr	itten as	signments contr	ibute t	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. V	Was th	e grading	g system clearl	y expla	ained		9	0	1	1	0	4	17	4.52	463/1500	4.56	4.43	4.18	4.13	4.52
8. F	low ma	ny times	was class canc	elled			9	0	1	0	0	15	7	4.17	1313/1517	4.27	4.43	4.65	4.62	4.17
9. F	ow wo	uld you	grade the overa	ll tead	ching effec	tiveness	11	0	0	0	2	6	13	4.52	370/1497	4.35	4.30	4.11	4.13	4.52
1. V	Lecture . Were the instructor's lectures well prepared							0	0	0	0	5	16	4.76	432/1440	4.81	4.63	4.45	4.46	4.76
2. I	oid th	e instru	ctor seem inter	ested :	in the subj	ect	11	0	0	0	0	2	19	4.90	494/1448	4.90	4.81	4.71	4.71	4.90
3. W	Vas le	cture mat	terial presente	d and	explained c	learly	11	0	1	0	0	4	16	4.62	467/1436	4.70	4.45	4.29	4.30	4.62
4. I	oid th	e lecture	es contribute t	o what	you learne	d	11	0	0	0	1	3	17	4.76	338/1432	4.81	4.52	4.29	4.29	4.76
5. I	Did au	diovisua	l techniques en	hance y	your unders	tanding	12	10	1	1	1	2	5	3.90	695/1221	4.05	3.74	3.93	3.94	3.90
			Discus	sion																
1. I	oid cl	ass disc	ussions contrib	ute to	what you 1	earned	15	0	1	0	4	4	8	4.06	701/1280	4.13	4.43	4.10	4.14	4.06
2. W	Vere a	ll stude	nts actively en	courage	ed to parti	cipate	15	0	0	0	1	4	12	4.65	489/1277	4.67	4.60	4.34	4.38	4.65
3. I	oid th	e instru	ctor encourage	fair a	nd open dis	cussion	15	0	0	1	0	4	12	4.59	524/1269	4.64	4.56	4.31	4.39	4.59
4. V	Vere s	pecial te	echniques succe	ssful	-		15	3	1	1	3	1	8	4.00	426/ 854	4.22	3.75	4.02	4.00	4.00
		Frequ	ıency	Dist	trib	ution	n													
Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grad										D -									M	
credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grade										Rea	ason	.s 			Ту:	pe 			Majors	; 
00-27 0 0.00-0.99 0 A 12								Red	quire	ed fo	or M	ajor	s	0	Graduat	е	0	Majo	r	16
28-55 0 1.00-1.99 0 B 7																				
56-	6-83 1 2.00-2.99 3 C 2							Gei	nera:	L				0	Under-q	rad 3	2	Non-	major	16

Credits E	Tarned	Cum. GPA		Expecte	ed Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	 А	12	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	16
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	7						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	3	C	2	General	0	Under-grad	32	Non-major	16
84-150	14	3.00-3.49	6	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	9	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enoug	h
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	22				
				2	Λ						

Course-Section: POLI 301 0201 University of Maryland Title POLI RESEARCH METHODS Baltimore County Instructor: FORESTIERE, CAR Spring 2007

University of Maryland
Baltimore County
Spring 2007

24

Page 1224

JUN 26, 2007

Job IRBR3029

Enrollment:	36		
Questionnaires:	30	Student Course Evaluation Questionnai	re

I

0

1

							Fr	eque:	ncie	s		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
		Questio	ns		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		Gener	 al															
1. Did yo	ou gain n	ew insights,sk	ills fro	om 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 th	ne instru	ctor make clea	r the ex	spected goals	1	0	0	0	1	10	18	4.59	454/1522	4.61	4.40	4.26	4.25	4.59
3. Did th	ne exam q	uestions refle	ct the e	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 ot	ther eval	uations reflec	t the ex	spected goals	1	0	0	1	1	8	19	4.55	425/1476	4.49	4.33	4.22	4.26	4.55
5. Did as	ssigned r	eadings contri	bute 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
				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
		g system clear		ained	2	0	0	1	1	6	20	4.61	387/1500	4.56	4.43	4.18	4.13	4.61
		was class can			2	0	0	1	0	15	12		1201/1517	4.27	4.43	4.65	4.62	4.36
9. How wo	ould you	grade the over	all tead	ching effectiveness	6	0	1	1	2	9	11	4.17	756/1497	4.35	4.30	4.11	4.13	4.17
		Lectu	re															
1. Were t	the instr	uctor's lectur	es 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 th	ne instru	ctor seem inte	rested i	n 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 le	3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly					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 au	udiovisua	l techniques e	nhance y	our understanding	4	11	0	0	3	6	6	4.20	500/1221	4.05	3.74	3.93	3.94	4.20
		Discu	ssion															
1. Did cl	lass disc	ussions contri	bute 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 a	all stude	nts actively e	ncourage	ed 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 th	ne instru	ctor encourage	fair ar	nd 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 s	special t	echniques succ	essful		11	3	1	0	0	5	10	4.44	234/ 854	4.22	3.75	4.02	4.00	4.44
				Frequ	iency	/ Dist	trib	utio:	n									
Credits E	Farned	Cum. GP	Δ	Expected Grades				P.e.	ason	c c			Ту	ne			Majors	•
													·					, 
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 11		Red	quir	ed f	or M	ajor	s	0	Graduat	е	0	Majo	or	23
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B 9		<i>a</i>		,				0	77		0	37		7
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	4	C 4		Gei	nera	Т				0	Under-g	rad 3	0	Non-	-major	7
84-150	16	3.00-3.49	6	D 0 F 0		m <sup>3</sup>						0	#### - Means there are not enough		-la			
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	10	F 0		Ele	ecti <sup>,</sup>	ves				0	#### - 1	weans t	nere a	ire not	. enoug	][]
				P 0									respons	es to b	e sign	nificar	ıt	
				- 0		0.1					_							

Other

Course-Section: POLI 315 0101

POLITICAL PHIL FROM 16

Title Instructor: STACEY, SIMON

Enrollment: 52 Questionnaires: 25

#### University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2007

Page 1225 JUN 26, 2007 Job IRBR3029

			Frequencies		Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect			
Questions	NR	NA	1	_	3	4	5	Mean	Rank		Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General						_			000/4500					
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	4	0	0	0	0	6	15	4.71	380/1522		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 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	4 4	0 1	0	0 1	1 4	4 1	16 14	4.71	191/1412	4.71	4.45	4.06 4.08	4.03	4.71 4.40
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	4	1	0	0	3	4	13	4.40	434/1381 483/1500	4.40 4.50	4.30	4.08	4.13	4.40
8. How many times was class cancelled	4	0	0	1	0	14	13 6		1301/1517	4.19	4.43	4.16	4.13	4.19
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	0	1	6	13	4.19	312/1497		4.30	4.11	4.13	4.19
7. now would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	J	U	U	U		U	13	1.00	312/149/	1.00	1.50	7.11	7.13	1.00
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	4.77
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
1. Wele special techniques successful	12	O	_	2	_	_		3.11	701/ 031	3.11	3.75	1.02	1.00	3.11
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		****/ 18	****	****	4.49	****	***
		-	-	_	•	-	-		, =0					

Course-Section: POLI 315 0101

Title POLITICAL PHIL FROM 16

Instructor: STACEY, SIMO

Enrollment: 52
Questionnaires: 25

STACEY, SIMON

Spring 2007

Page 1225 JUN 26, 2007 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

University of Maryland

Baltimore County

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expecte	d Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	1	 А	8	Required for Majors	2	Graduate	0	Major	13
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	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	h
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	13				
				?	0						

University of Maryland Page 1226
Baltimore County JUN 26, 2007
Spring 2007 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Course-Section: POLI 324 0101

26

THE CONGRESS

KING-MEADOWS, T

Title

Instructor:

Enrollment:

Questionnaires: 26

	Frequencies				<del>_</del>				Sect									
		Question	S		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		Genera																
1 544		Genera w insights,ski	_		11	0	1	1	1	1	11	4.33	814/1522	4.33	4.51	4.30	4.34	4.33
_	_	tor make clear			11	0	1	0	2	6	6		1048/1522		4.40	4.26	4.25	4.33
		estions reflec			12	0	0	1	1	3	9	4.43	626/1285	4.43	4.48	4.30	4.25	4.43
	_	estions reflect		_	11	2	1	0	2	3	9 7		903/1476		4.48	4.22	4.26	4.43
				what you learned	11	0	0	1	1	_	9	4.15			4.33	4.22	4.26	4.15
	_	_		-		0	1	0	2	4	-							
				o what you learned	11	0	0	0	3	4	8	4.20			4.30	4.08	4.13	4.20
		system clearly		inea	11	-			3	3	9	4.40	630/1500		4.43	4.18	4.13	4.40
	-	was class cance			11	0	0	0	1	14	1		1368/1517		4.43	4.65	4.62	4.07
9. How wor	uld you g	rade the overa	II teac	hing effectiveness	14	0	2	0	Τ	4	5	3.83	1089/1497	3.83	4.30	4.11	4.13	3.83
		Lecture	۵															
1. Were th	he instru	ctor's lecture	_	prepared	11	0	0	0	1	2	12	4.73	492/1440	4.73	4.63	4.45	4.46	4.73
		tor seem inter			11	0	0	0	1	1	13	4.80	765/1448	4.80	4.81	4.71	4.71	4.80
				xplained clearly	11	0	0	1	2	6	6	4.13	980/1436		4.45	4.29	4.30	4.13
		s contribute to			11	0	1	0	1	4	9	4.33	820/1432		4.52	4.29	4.29	4.33
				our understanding	11	8	4	0	0	2	1		1177/1221	2.43	3.74	3.93	3.94	2.43
J. Dia aa	alovibaai	ccciniiques em	nance j	our underbeamaring		O	-	Ü	Ü	_	_	2.15	11///1221	2.15	3.71	3.75	3.71	2.15
		Discus	sion															
1. Did cla	ass discu	ssions contrib	ute 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 a	ll studen	ts actively en	courage	d 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	e instruc	tor encourage :	fair an	d 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 sp	pecial te	chniques succe	ssful		16	9	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 854	****	3.75	4.02	4.00	****
				Frequ	ıency	7 Dist	tribu	utio	n									
Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	ason	s			Туј	pe			Majors	}
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 4			 guire					0	Graduat		0	 Majo	·	10
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	В 3		Ked	Jurre	eu r	OI M	a jui	ъ	U	Graduati	<b>C</b>	U	Majc	, T	10
56-83	7	2.00-2.99	4	C 3		Ger	neral	ı				2	Under-q	rad ?	26	Non-	major	16
84-150	3	3.00-2.99	0	D 1		Gei	ici a.	L				4	onder -g.	ruu 2	. 0	11011	ilia JOI	10
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00				1 #### - Means there are not en			enoud	rh								
Grad. 0 3.50-4.00 3 F 0		Electives						oonses to be significant		111								
	I 0 Other 11			T CPPOIIB		c bran	cai											
		I 0 Other																

Course-Section: POLI 334 8020 University of Maryland
Title JUDICIAL PROCESS Baltimore County

Instructor: MELCAVAGE, EUGE (Instr. A)

Enrollment: 8
Questionnaires: 8

Spring 2007
Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Page 1227

JUN 26, 2007

Job IRBR3029

	2 2					Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect		
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	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
_														

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

Course-Section: POLI 334 8020 University of Maryland Page 1228 Title JUDICIAL PROCESS Baltimore County JUN 26, 2007

Job IRBR3029

Instructor: (Instr. B)

Enrollment: 8 Spring 2007

Questionnaires: 8 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

				Frequencies In				Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect		
	Questions		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
	General															
1. Did you gain new	insights, skills from	om 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 instruct	or make clear the ex	spected 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 que	stions reflect the e	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 evalua	tions reflect the ex	spected 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 rea	dings 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 assi	gnments contribute t	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 expla	ained	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	2	6	4.75	802/1517	4.75	4.43	4.65	4.62	4.75
9. How would you gr	ade the overall tead	ching 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 y	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 discus	sions 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 student	s actively encourage	ed 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 instruct	or encourage fair ar	nd 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 tec	hniques successful		0	4	0	1	0	2	1	3.75	588/ 854	3.75	3.75	4.02	4.00	3.75
Frequ					trib	utio	n									
Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades				Rea	asons	3			Туј	pe			Majors	;

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

Course-Section: POLI 350 0101 University of Maryland Title POLICY-MAKING PROCESS

Page 1229 Baltimore County JUN 26, 2007 Spring 2007 Job IRBR3029

Instructor:	MILLER,	CHERYL
Enrollment:	30	

Enrollment:	30
Questionnaires:	29

	Ouestions							eque:	ncie	s		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
		Question	ıs		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		Genera	1															
1. Did vo	ou gain n	ew insights,ski	_	m this course	3	0	0	0	6	5	15	4.35	802/1522	4.35	4.51	4.30	4.34	4.35
		ctor make clear			3	0	0	0	3	11	12	4.35	775/1522		4.40	4.26	4.25	4.35
		uestions reflec			3	0	0	1	2	9	14	4.38	666/1285	4.38	4.48	4.30	4.30	4.38
	_	uations reflect		_	5	2	0	0	6	4	12	4.27	769/1476	4.27	4.33	4.22	4.26	4.27
5. Did as	ssigned r	eadings contrib	ute 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 wr	ritten as:	signments contr	ibute t	o 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 th	ne gradin	g system clearl	y expla	ined	3	0	0	0	2	6	18	4.62	374/1500	4.62	4.43	4.18	4.13	4.62
8. How ma	any times	was class cand	elled		3	0	0	0	0	3	23	4.88	532/1517	4.88	4.43	4.65	4.62	4.88
9. How wo	ould you	grade the overa	ll teac	hing effectiveness	3	1	0	0	3	8	14	4.44	457/1497	4.44	4.30	4.11	4.13	4.44
		Lectur	·e															
1. Were t	the instr	uctor's lecture	s 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 th	ne instru	ctor seem inter	ested i	n 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 le						0	0	0	3	7	16	4.50	601/1436	4.50	4.45	4.29	4.30	4.50
4. Did th	Was lecture material presented and explained clear Did the lectures contribute to what you learned					0	0	0	2	4	20	4.69	418/1432	4.69	4.52	4.29	4.29	4.69
5. Did au	udiovisua	l techniques en	hance y	our understanding	7	17	1	0	2	1	1	3.20	****/1221	****	3.74	3.93	3.94	****
		Discus	sion															
1. Did cl	lass disc	ussions contrib	ute 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 a	all stude	nts actively en	courage	d 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 th	ne instru	ctor encourage	fair an	d 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 s	special to	echniques succe	essful		9	6	6	1	2	2	3	2.64	825/ 854	2.64	3.75	4.02	4.00	2.64
				Frequ	ency	Dist	trib	utio:	n									
Credits E	Earned	Expected Grades				Re	ason	.s			Tyj	pe			Majors	;		
00-27	00-27 0 0.00-0.99 0 A 8							ed f	 or M			2	Graduat		0	 Majo		20
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	В 14		rec	quil	eu I	OT I	a jui	D	4	Graduati	C	U	Ma JC	, <u> </u>	∠∪
26-55 56-83						Co	nera	1				5	Under-q	rad ?	:9	Non-	major	9
	84-150 6 3.00-3.49 5 D 0					GEI	пста	_				J	onder -g.	ruu 2		IVOII-	iia jui	J
Grad.							ecti	ves				1	#### - 1	Means t	here a	re not	enous	rh
52 44.	P 0											_	respons				_	,==.
			I 0		Ot1	her				1	7	_		3				

Course-Section: POLI 360 0101

Title COMPRTIVE POLI ANALYSI

Instructor: GRODSKY, BRIAN

Enrollment: 22 Questionnaires: 15

# Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

University of Maryland Page 1230 Baltimore County JUN 26, 2007 Spring 2007 Job IRBR3029

			Fr	eane:	ncies	3		Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC:	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	_	3	4	5		Rank		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		4.34	4.73
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	4	2	8	4.13	996/1522		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		4.48	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		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
<ol> <li>Was the grading system clearly explained</li> </ol>	0	0	2	5	3	4	1	2.80	1454/1500		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		****/ 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		****/ 33	****	****	4.69	4.75	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	13	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	,	****	****	4.54	****	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	13	1	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 18	****	****	4.49	****	****
	-		-	-	-		-		,					
Frequ	ency	Dis	trib	utio	n									

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	 А	4	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	11
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	В	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	П	Ω						

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

Course-Section: POLI 360 0201 University of Maryland Title COMPRTIVE POLI ANALYSI GRODSKY, BRIAN

Baltimore County Spring 2007

Enrollment: 28

Questionnaires: 15

Instructor:

Page 1231 JUN 26, 2007 Job IRBR3029

	Ouestionnaire

			Fre	eque	ncies	3		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	0	Λ	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		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			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	2	٥	4.29	538/1412		4.45	4.06	4.03	4.29
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	1	0	0	0	5	Ω	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		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		1258/1497	3.85	4.30	4.11	4.13	3.56
J. now would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	O	U	U	_	5	-	_	3.30	1230/149/	3.03	1.50	T.11	1.13	3.30
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
1									,					
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	****
• • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •														
Freq	ency	Dist	rib	utio	n									

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	d Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	9	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	11
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	2						
56-83	5	2.00-2.99	2	C	0	General	1	Under-grad	15	Non-major	4
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	h
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	11	_			
				?	0						

Course-Section: POLI 385 0101 Title

INTERNATIONAL SECURITY

Instructor: HAGERTY, DEVIN

Enrollment: 28 Questionnaires: 28

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

University of Maryland

Baltimore County

Spring 2007

Page 1232 JUN 26, 2007 Job IRBR3029

Questions					eque:		S		Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
	General														
1.	Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	7	0	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		0	0	0	0	0			****/ 78		****	4.45	4.34	****
5.	5. Were criteria for grading made clear		0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 80	****	****	4.11	3.33	****
	Frequ	ency	Dist	trib	utio:	n									
<b>a</b> -	adden Francis Com CD3				ъ.		_							No	

Credits E	Earned	Cum. GPA		Expecte	d Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	 А	5	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	13
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	10						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	4	C	3	General	6	Under-grad	28	Non-major	15
84-150	14	3.00-3.49	6	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	6	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enoug	h
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	14	-		_	
				2	0						

Course-Section: POLI 390 8020 University of Maryland Title AMERICAN FOREIGN POLIC Baltimore County Instructor: MELCAVAGE, EUGE Spring 2007

I

?

0

0

Enrollment:

Questionnaires: 5

5

University of Maryland Page 1233
Baltimore County JUN 26, 2007
Spring 2007 Job IRBR3029

2

- · ·				
Student	('Ollred	Fivaluation	Ouestionnaire	4

							Fre	equei	ncies	5		Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
		Question	s		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		 Genera	1															
1. Did yo	ou gain ne	ew insights,ski	lls fro	om this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1522	5.00	4.51	4.30	4.34	5.00
		ctor make clear			0	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	432/1522	4.60	4.40	4.26	4.25	4.60
		uestions reflec			0	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	650/1285	4.40	4.48	4.30	4.30	4.40
4. Did ot	her evalu	uations reflect	the ex	spected goals	0	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	629/1476	4.40	4.33	4.22	4.26	4.40
5. Did as	signed re	eadings contrib	ute 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 wr	itten ass	signments contr	ibute t	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 th	ne grading	g system clearl	y expla	ined	0	0	0	1	0	1	3	4.20	839/1500	4.20	4.43	4.18	4.13	4.20
8. How ma	ny times	was class cand	elled		0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	714/1517	4.80	4.43	4.65	4.62	4.80
9. How wo	ould you	grade the overa	ll tead	ching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1497	5.00	4.30	4.11	4.13	5.00
		Lectur	е															
1. Were t	he instr	uctor's lecture	s well	prepared	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	353/1440	4.80	4.63	4.45	4.46	4.80
	Did the instructor seem interested in the subject					0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1448	5.00	4.81	4.71	4.71	5.00
3. Was le	Was lecture material presented and explained clear					0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	478/1436	4.60	4.45	4.29	4.30	4.60
4. Did th	Was lecture material presented and explained clear Did the lectures contribute to what you learned					0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	527/1432	4.60	4.52	4.29	4.29	4.60
5. Did au	diovisua	l techniques en	hance y	our understanding	0	0	2	0	1	1	1	2.80	1121/1221	2.80	3.74	3.93	3.94	2.80
		Discus	sion															
1. Did cl	ass disc	ussions contrib	ute 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 a	ıll studer	nts actively en	courage	ed 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 th	e instru	ctor encourage	fair ar	nd 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 s	special to	echniques succe	ssful		0	4	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 854	****	3.75	4.02	4.00	****
				Frequ	ency	Dist	trib	ution	n									
Credits E	'arned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Pe:	asons	2			Туј	ne			Majors	•
	credits Earned Cum. GFA Expected Gra									<i>-</i>								, 
00-27							quire	ed fo	or Ma	ajors	;	0	Graduat	е	0	Majo	r	3
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В 3								_	_		_			_
56-83							nera:	L				1	Under-g	rad	5	Non-	major	2
84-150												_						
Grad.								ves				1	#### - 1				_	jh
		P 0									respons	es to b	e sign	ıficar	ıt			

Other

Course-Section: POLI 409 0101 Title SELECTED TOPICS POLI S Instructor: FORESTIERE, CAR

7

University of Maryland Page 1234 Baltimore County JUN 26, 2007 Spring 2007 Job IRBR3029

Enrollment: Questionnaires: 6 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

?

0

Ouestions							Fre	_	ncies	3		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
		Question	S		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		Genera	1															
1. Did yo	u gain n	ew insights,ski	lls fro	m 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 th	e instru	ctor make clear	the ex	pected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	179/1522	4.83	4.40	4.26	4.34	4.83
3. Did th	e exam q	uestions reflec	t the e	xpected goals	0	2	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	278/1285	4.75	4.48	4.30	4.42	4.75
4. Did ot	her eval	uations reflect	the ex	pected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	162/1476	4.83	4.33	4.22	4.31	4.83
5. Did as	signed re	eadings contrib	ute 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 wr	itten as	signments contr	ibute t	o 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 th	e gradin	g system clearl	y expla	ined	0	0	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	483/1500	4.50	4.43	4.18	4.25	4.50
8. How max	ny times	was class canc	elled		0	0	1	0	1	1	3	3.83	1461/1517	3.83	4.43	4.65	4.71	3.83
9. How wo	uld you	grade the overa	ll teac	hing effectiveness	2	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	189/1497	4.75	4.30	4.11	4.21	4.75
		Lectur	e															
1. Were t	he instr	uctor's lecture	s 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 th	e instru	ctor seem inter	ested i	n 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 le	Did the instructor seem interested in the subject Was lecture material presented and explained clea					0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	478/1436	4.60	4.45	4.29	4.32	4.60
4. Did th					1	0	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	527/1432	4.60	4.52	4.29	4.34	4.60
5. Did au	Did the lectures contribute to what you learned Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understand:					3	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	279/1221	4.50	3.74	3.93	4.04	4.50
		Discus	sion															
1. Did cl	ass disc	ussions contrib	ute 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 a	ll stude	nts actively en	courage	d 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 th	e instru	ctor encourage	fair an	d 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 s	pecial to	echniques succe	ssful		2	0	0	1	0	0	3	4.25	330/ 854	4.25	3.75	4.02	4.31	4.25
				Frequ	iency	Dis	trib	utio	n									
Credits E	arned	Expected Grades				Rea	asons	3			Ту	pe			Majors	;		
00-27									 or Ma	 ajors		0	Graduat		0	Majo		4
28-55	0	0.00-0.99 1.00-1.99	0	A 4 B 0		кес	quir	eu L	⊃τ I⁄Iç	JOES		U	Graduat	E	U	Ma JC	)Τ	4
56-83						Cor	nera	1				1	Under-q	rad	6	Non	-major	2
	04-150 3 3.00-3.49 1 D 0					Gel	пста.	т				_	onder-9	Lau	U	NOII-	iia jui	4
	Grad. 0 3.50-4.00 4 F 0					គារ	ecti	760				0	#### - 1	Meane +	here =	re not	enous	rh
Grad.	P 0					17.17	CCLI	vCD				U	respons				_	111
	I 0					O+1	her					5	T CPPOILE		,c 5191.	ıııcaı		
				I 0		OLI	TICI					J						

Course-Section: POLI 428 0101 University of Maryland Page 1235
Title POLITICS INTERNSHIP Baltimore County JUN 26, 2007
Instructor: SCHALLER, THOMA Spring 2007 Job IRBR3029
Enrollment: 5

Questionnaires: 4

							Fre	equer	ncies	3		Ins	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
		Question	s		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		 Genera	 1															
1. Did vo	ou gain ne	ew insights,ski		om this course	1	0	0	1	1	0	1	3.33	1451/1522	3.33	4.51	4.30	4.42	3.33
		ctor make clear			0	0	0	0	2	1	1		1267/1522		4.40	4.26	4.34	3.75
		uestions reflec			1	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	938/1285	4.00	4.48	4.30	4.42	4.00
4. Did ot	her evalu	uations reflect	the ex	spected goals	0	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	792/1476	4.25	4.33	4.22	4.31	4.25
5. Did as	signed re	eadings contrib	ute 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 wr	itten ass	signments contr	ibute t	o 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 th	e grading	g system clearl	y expla	ined	0	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	483/1500	4.50	4.43	4.18	4.25	4.50
8. How ma	ny times	was class cand	elled		2	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	1389/1517	4.00	4.43	4.65	4.71	4.00
9. How wo	ould you g	grade the overa	ll tead	ching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	1277/1497	3.50	4.30	4.11	4.21	3.50
		Lectur	e															
1. Were t	he instru	actor's lecture	s well	prepared	0	0	0	1	0	0	3	4.25	1047/1440	4.25	4.63	4.45	4.52	4.25
		ctor seem inter			0	0	0	2	0	0	2	3.50	1419/1448		4.81	4.71	4.75	3.50
				explained clearly	0	0	0	2	0	0	2	3.50	1282/1436	3.50	4.45	4.29	4.32	3.50
		es contribute t			0	0	1	1	0	1	1	3.00	1364/1432	3.00	4.52	4.29	4.34	3.00
5. Did au	diovisual	l techniques en	hance y	our understanding	0	0	1	0	2	0	1	3.00	1064/1221	3.00	3.74	3.93	4.04	3.00
		Discus	sion															
1. Did cl	ass disc			what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	286/1280	4.67	4.43	4.10	4.28	4.67
				ed to participate	1	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1277	5.00	4.60	4.34	4.50	5.00
				nd open discussion	1	0	2	0	1	0	0	1.67	1267/1269		4.56	4.31	4.49	1.67
		echniques succe		-	1	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 854	5.00	3.75	4.02	4.31	5.00
				Frequ	ency	Dist	trib	ıtioı	า									
				_	2													
Credits E	larned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	asons	3			Ту	pe 			Majors	; 
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 2		Red	quire	ed fo	or Ma	jors	3	0	Graduat	e	0	Majo	or	2
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	в 1														
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C 0		Ger	nera:	L				3	Under-g	rad	4	Non-	major	2
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	0	D 0														
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F 0		Ele	ecti	<i>r</i> es				0	#### - 1				_	ιh
				Р 0									respons	es to b	e sign	ificar	ıt	
				_								_						

Other

1

I

?

0

1

Course-Section: POLI 429 0101 University of Maryland Title SEL TOP AMERICAN GOVT

Baltimore County Spring 2007

Page 1236

JUN 26, 2007

Job IRBR3029

Enrollment: 24 Questionnaires: 24 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Instructor:

GLENN, PAUL F

								_	ncie	5			tructor		Dept			
		Question	S		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		Genera	 1															
1. Did vo	nı gain ne	ew insights,ski		n this course	7	0	0	0	1	5	11	4.59	514/1522	4.59	4.51	4.30	4.42	4.59
_	_	ctor make clear			7	0	0	3	3	4	7		1200/1522		4.40	4.26	4.34	3.88
		estions reflec			7		0	0	0	1	2		****/1285		4.48	4.30	4.42	****
		ations reflect			7	2	0	1	1	5	8	4.33	703/1476	4.33	4.33	4.22	4.31	4.33
			-	what you learned	7	0	0	0	3	1	13	4.59	294/1412		4.45	4.06	4.11	4.59
				what you learned	7	0	0	0	1	0	16	4.88	92/1381	4.88	4.30	4.08	4.21	4.88
		system clearl		-	7	0	1	2	3	3	8	3.88	1099/1500	3.88	4.43	4.18	4.25	3.88
		was class canc			7	0	0	0	0	14	3	4.18	1313/1517	4.18	4.43	4.65	4.71	4.18
	-			ning effectiveness	9	0	0	1	1	7	6		718/1497			4.11	4.21	4.20
		Lectur		,	_			_	_	_			===					
		actor's lecture	-	-	7	0	0	0	2		14	4.71			4.63	4.45	4.52	4.71
		ctor seem inter		-	7	0	0	0	1			4.76	840/1448		4.81	4.71	4.75	4.76
		-		xplained clearly	7		1		0		10	4.41			4.45	4.29	4.32	4.41
		es contribute t	-		7	-	0	0	2			4.53	. ,		4.52	4.29	4.34	4.53
5. Did au	diovisual	l techniques en	hance yo	our understanding	8	12	1	0	0	1	2	3.75	****/1221	****	3.74	3.93	4.04	****
		Discus	sion															
1. Did cl	ass discu			what you learned	9	0	0	0	1	1	13	4.80	184/1280	4.80	4.43	4.10	4.28	4.80
				d to participate	9	0	0	0	1	1	13	4.80	317/1277		4.60	4.34	4.50	4.80
				d open discussion	9	0	0	0	1	0	14	4.87	266/1269		4.56	4.31	4.49	4.87
		chniques succe			9	5	2	1	3	2	2	3.10	771/ 854					3.10
				Frequ	iency	/ Dis	trib	utio	n									
Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	ason	5			Ту	pe			Majors	5
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A 9		Red	quir	ed f	or Ma	 aior	 s	1	 Graduat	 e	0	Majo	 or	15
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	В 7						,				-	-	) -		
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	2	C 0		Gei	nera	1				4	Under-g	rad 2	24	Non-	-major	9
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	5	D 0									9				5	-
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5	F 0		Ele	ecti	ves				0	#### - 1	Means t	here a	re not	enous	ηh
	-	2.22 2.30	-	P 0								-	respons				_	,
				I 0		O±1	her				1	.1					-	
				? 0		00.					_	_						
				. 0														

University of Maryland Page 1237
Baltimore County JUN 26, 2007
Spring 2007 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Course-Section: POLI 432 0101

40

CIVIL RIGHTS

LANOUE, GEORGE

Title

Instructor:

Enrollment:

Questionnaires: 40

							Fre	eque	ncie	s		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
		Question	ıs		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		Genera	1															
1. Did vo	ou gain n	new insights,ski		m this course	18	0	1	0	3	5	13	4.32	837/1522	4.32	4.51	4.30	4.42	4.32
		ctor make clear			18	0	0	0	3	3	16	4.59	443/1522	4.59	4.40	4.26	4.34	4.59
		uestions reflec			18	0	0	0	3	2	17	4.64	395/1285	4.64	4.48	4.30	4.42	4.64
	-	.uations reflect		_	18	0	0	1	4	5	12	4.27	769/1476	4.27	4.33	4.22	4.31	4.27
5. Did as	ssigned r	eadings contrib	ute 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 wr	ritten as	signments contr	ibute t	o what you learned	19	4	0	0	5	4	8	4.18	683/1381	4.18	4.30	4.08	4.21	4.18
		ng system clearl			19	0	0	0	2	3	16	4.67	312/1500	4.67	4.43	4.18	4.25	4.67
		was class cand			19	0	0	0	0	3	18	4.86	600/1517	4.86	4.43	4.65	4.71	4.86
				hing effectiveness	22	0	0	0	1	11	6	4.28	633/1497	4.28	4.30	4.11	4.21	4.28
1 77	ula a dan ara	Lectur			1.0	0	0	0	_	2	1.0	4 06	070/1440	1 00	4 62	4 45	4 50	4 06
		ructor's lecture			19	0	0	0	0			4.86	272/1440	4.86			4.52	
		ctor seem inter			19	0	0	0	1			4.81	,	4.81	4.81	4.71		4.81
				explained clearly	19	0	0	0 1	2		15	4.62	467/1436	4.62	4.45	4.29		4.62
		res contribute t		-	19	0	0	_	2		14	4.48	669/1432	4.48	4.52	4.29	4.34	
5. Did at	udiovisua	il techniques en	nance y	our understanding	21	4	0	2	2	Τ	10	4.27	455/1221	4.27	3.74	3.93	4.04	4.27
		Discus	sion															
1. Did cl	lass disc	ussions contrib	ute 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 a	all stude	nts actively en	courage	ed to participate	26	0	0	0	0	1	13	4.93	182/1277	4.93	4.60	4.34	4.50	4.93
				d 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 s	special t	echniques succe	essful	-	26	1	0	0	2	3	8	4.46	217/ 854	4.46	3.75	4.02	4.31	4.46
				<b></b>		- <b>-</b>												
				Frequ	ıency	/ Dis	trib	utio	n									
Credits E	Earned	Cum. GPA	1	Expected Grades				Rea	ason	s			ТУ	pe			Majors	;
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A 1		Red	quir	ed f	or M	aior		1	Graduat		0	Majo	 or	11
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В 8										-	-	) ~		
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	2	C 6		Gei	nera	1				4	Under-q	rad 4	10	Non-	major	29
84-150	10	3.00-3.49	4	D 0									J		-		5 2	
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	7	F 1		Ele	ecti	ves				0	#### - 1	Means t	here a	re not	enou	ıh
				P 0									respons				_	•
				I O		Ot1	her				1	.1			5			
				? 1														

Course-Section: POLI 438 0101 University of Maryland Title LEGAL INTERNSHIP Baltimore County Instructor: DAVIS, JEFFREY Spring 2007

Enrollment:

14

Page 1238 JUN 26, 2007 Job IRBR3029

Ω	uestionnaires:	14	Student	Course	Evaluation	Ouestionnaire

			Fre	equer	ncies	3		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	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	Δ	0	Λ	Λ	0	Λ	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		3.93		4.75
5. Did additioning teeliniques cimanee your anderstanding	3	_	O	U	O	2	O	1.75	121/1221	1.75	3.71	3.75	1.01	1.75
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	****
Freq	ıency	Dist	rib	ution	ı									

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	d Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	 А	10	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	11
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	2						
56-83	5	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	3	Under-grad	14	Non-major	3
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	5	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	n
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				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

			Fre		ncies				uctor	Course		UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	 А	0	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	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	1
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	0						

University of Maryland Page 1240
Baltimore County JUN 26, 2007
Spring 2007 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Course-Section: POLI 440 0101

21

URBAN POLITICS

HANLON, BERNADE

Title

Instructor:

Enrollment:

Questionnaires: 20

		Fre	eque	ncies	3		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
10	0	0	0	2	3	5	4.30	849/1522	4.30	4.51	4.30	4.42	4.30
	0	0	0	1	3	6	4.50	, -			4.26	4.34	4.50
10	0	0	0	1	0	9		, -				4.42	4.80
10	0	0	0	2	1	7						4.31	4.50
10	0	0	0	0	2	8				4.45	4.06	4.11	4.80
d 10	0	0	0	2	2	6	4.40	434/1381	4.40	4.30	4.08	4.21	4.40
10	0	0	1	1	1	7	4.40	630/1500	4.40	4.43	4.18	4.25	4.40
11	0	0	0	0	6	3	4.33	1217/1517	4.33	4.43	4.65	4.71	4.33
s 11	0	0	0	1	7	1	4.00	898/1497	4.00	4.30	4.11	4.21	4.00
11	0	0	0	0	4	_	1 E C	740/1440	1 E C	1 62	1 15	4 E2	1 56
	•	-	-	•	1	-		- ,					4.89
	-			-	_	-		,					4.69
						-							4.44
	-	-		-	_	-							
11	3	U	U	U	۷	4	4.07	1/5/1221	4.07	3.74	3.93	4.04	4.07
12	0	0	0	1	2	5	4.50	390/1280	4.50	4.43	4.10	4.28	4.50
12	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	254/1277	4.88	4.60	4.34	4.50	4.88
12	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	255/1269	4.88	4.56	4.31	4.49	4.88
12	2	1	0	1	2	2	3.67	625/ 854	3.67	3.75	4.02	4.31	3.67
mienas	, Die	tri b	1+ 1 01	n									
quency	DIS	CIID	10101	11									
S			Rea	asons	5			Ту	ре			Majors	5
	Re	 quir	ed f	or Ma	ijors	 3	0	Graduat	 e	0	Majo	or	6
	_				J						5		-
	Gei	nera:	L				2	Under-q	rad 2	0	Non-	major	14
												3 -	
	Ele	ecti	<i>r</i> es				0	#### - 1	Means t	here a	re not	enous	gh
												_	
								TCDPOILD					
	Otl	her					6	I CBPOIIB	CB CO L	C Digi			
	10 10 10 10 10 10 10 11 11 11 11 11 11 1	10 0 10 0 10 0 10 0 10 0 10 0 10 0 11 0 11 0 11 0 11 0 11 0 11 0 11 3	NR NA 1  10 0 0 10 0 0 10 0 0 10 0 0 10 0 0 10 0 0 10 0 0 11 0 0	NR NA 1 2  10 0 0 0 0 10 0 0 0 10 0 0 0 10 0 0 0 10 0 0 0 10 0 0 0 10 0 0 0 11 0 0 0 0	NR NA 1 2 3  10 0 0 0 2 10 0 0 0 1 10 0 0 0 2 10 0 0 0 2 10 0 0 0 2 10 0 0 0 2 10 0 0 0 2 10 0 0 0 2 10 0 0 0 2 10 0 0 0 1 11 0 0 0 0 0 11 0 0 0 0 1 11 0 0 0 0	10 0 0 0 2 3 10 0 0 0 1 3 10 0 0 0 1 3 10 0 0 0 0 2 1 10 0 0 0 0 2 1 10 0 0 0 0 2 2 10 0 0 0 1 1 1 11 0 0 0 0 6 11 0 0 0 0 1 7  11 0 0 0 0 1 7  11 0 0 0 0 1 7  11 0 0 0 0 1 3 11 0 0 0 0 1 11 0 0 0 1 3 11 0 0 0 0 1 11 3 0 0 0 2 12 0 0 0 1 12 0 0 0 0 1 12 2 1 0 1 2 quency Distribution  Required for Majors  General	NR NA 1 2 3 4 5  10 0 0 0 0 2 3 5 10 0 0 0 1 3 6 10 0 0 0 0 1 0 9 10 0 0 0 0 2 1 7 10 0 0 0 0 2 2 6 10 0 0 0 2 2 6 10 0 0 0 2 2 6 10 0 0 1 1 7 11 0 0 0 0 6 3 11 0 0 0 0 1 7 11 0 0 0 0 1 8 11 0 0 0 1 3 5 11 0 0 0 1 8 11 0 0 0 1 8 11 0 0 0 1 8 11 0 0 0 1 7 12 0 0 0 1 7 12 0 0 0 1 7 12 2 1 0 1 2 2  quency Distribution  Required for Majors  General	NR NA 1 2 3 4 5 Mean  10 0 0 0 2 3 5 4.30 10 0 0 0 1 3 6 4.50 10 0 0 0 1 0 9 4.80 10 0 0 0 2 1 7 4.50 10 0 0 0 0 2 2 6 4.40 10 0 0 0 2 2 6 4.40 10 0 0 0 1 1 7 4.40 11 0 0 0 0 6 3 4.33 s 11 0 0 0 0 1 7 1 4.00  11 0 0 0 0 1 3 5 4.44 11 0 0 0 0 1 3 5 4.44 11 0 0 0 0 1 3 5 4.44 11 0 0 0 0 1 3 5 4.44 11 0 0 0 0 1 8 4.89 11 3 0 0 0 2 4 4.67  12 0 0 0 1 2 5 4.50 12 0 0 0 1 7 4.88 12 0 0 0 0 1 7 4.88 12 0 0 0 0 1 7 4.88 12 0 0 0 0 1 7 4.88 12 2 1 0 1 2 2 3.67  quency Distribution  Required for Majors 0  General 2	NR NA 1 2 3 4 5 Mean Rank  10 0 0 0 2 3 5 4.30 849/1522 10 0 0 0 1 3 6 4.50 545/1522 10 0 0 0 1 0 9 4.80 228/1285 10 0 0 0 0 2 1 7 4.50 473/1476 10 0 0 0 0 2 2 8 4.80 137/1412 d 10 0 0 0 0 2 2 6 4.40 434/1381 10 0 0 1 1 1 7 4.40 630/1500 11 0 0 0 0 6 3 4.33 1217/1517 s 11 0 0 0 0 1 7 1 4.00 898/1497  11 0 0 0 0 1 7 1 4.00 898/1497  11 0 0 0 0 1 8 4.89 548/1448 11 0 0 0 0 1 8 4.89 548/1448 11 0 0 0 0 1 8 4.89 187/1432 11 3 0 0 0 2 4 4.67 175/1221  12 0 0 0 1 2 5 4.50 390/1280 12 0 0 0 1 7 4.88 254/1277 12 0 0 0 0 1 7 4.88 254/1277 12 0 0 0 0 1 7 4.88 255/1269 12 2 1 0 1 2 2 3.67 625/ 854  quency Distribution  S Reasons Ty  Required for Majors 0 Graduat  General 2 Under-g  Electives 0 #### - 1	NR NA 1 2 3 4 5 Mean Rank Mean  10 0 0 0 2 3 5 4.30 849/1522 4.30 10 0 0 0 1 3 6 4.50 545/1522 4.50 10 0 0 0 0 1 0 9 4.80 228/1285 4.80 10 0 0 0 0 2 1 7 4.50 473/1476 4.50 10 0 0 0 0 2 8 4.80 137/1412 4.80 d 10 0 0 0 2 2 6 4.40 434/1381 4.40 10 0 0 0 1 1 1 7 4.40 630/1500 4.40 11 0 0 0 0 6 3 4.33 1217/1517 4.33 s 11 0 0 0 0 1 7 1 4.00 898/1497 4.00  11 0 0 0 0 1 7 1 4.00 898/1497 4.00  11 0 0 0 0 1 8 4.89 548/1448 4.89 11 0 0 0 0 1 8 4.89 187/1432 4.89 11 0 0 0 0 1 8 4.89 187/1432 4.89 11 3 0 0 0 2 4 4.67 175/1221 4.67  12 0 0 0 1 2 5 4.50 390/1280 4.50 12 0 0 0 0 1 7 4.88 254/1277 4.88 12 0 0 0 0 1 7 4.88 255/1269 4.88 12 2 1 0 1 2 2 3.67 625/854 3.67  quency Distribution  Required for Majors 0 Graduate  General 2 Under-grad 2  Electives 0 #### - Means t	NR NA 1 2 3 4 5 Mean Rank Mean Mean  10 0 0 0 0 2 3 5 4.30 849/1522 4.30 4.51 10 0 0 0 1 3 6 4.50 545/1522 4.50 4.40 10 0 0 0 1 0 9 4.80 228/1285 4.80 4.48 10 0 0 0 0 2 1 7 4.50 473/1476 4.50 4.33 10 0 0 0 0 2 8 4.80 137/1412 4.80 4.45 d 10 0 0 0 0 2 2 6 4.40 434/1381 4.40 4.30 10 0 0 0 1 1 1 7 4.40 630/1500 4.40 4.43 11 0 0 0 0 6 3 4.33 1217/1517 4.33 4.43 s 11 0 0 0 0 1 7 1 4.00 898/1497 4.00 4.30  11 0 0 0 0 1 3 5 4.44 672/1436 4.44 4.45 11 0 0 0 0 1 8 4.89 548/1448 4.89 4.81 11 0 0 0 0 1 8 4.89 187/1432 4.89 4.52 11 3 0 0 0 2 4 4.67 175/1221 4.67 3.74  12 0 0 0 1 2 5 4.50 390/1280 4.50 4.43 12 0 0 0 0 1 7 4.88 254/1277 4.88 4.60 12 0 0 0 0 1 7 4.88 254/1277 4.88 4.60 12 0 0 0 0 1 7 4.88 254/1277 4.88 4.60 12 0 0 0 0 1 7 4.88 255/1269 4.88 4.56 12 2 1 0 1 2 2 3.67 625/854 3.67 3.75  quency Distribution  S Reasons Type  Required for Majors 0 Graduate 0  General 2 Under-grad 20  Electives 0 #### - Means there a	NR NA 1 2 3 4 5 Mean Rank Mean Mean Mean  10 0 0 0 2 3 5 4.30 849/1522 4.30 4.51 4.30  10 0 0 0 1 3 6 4.50 545/1522 4.50 4.40 4.26  10 0 0 0 1 0 9 4.80 228/1285 4.80 4.48 4.30  10 0 0 0 0 2 1 7 4.50 473/1476 4.50 4.33 4.22  10 0 0 0 0 2 2 6 4.40 434/1381 4.40 4.30 4.08  10 0 0 1 1 1 7 4.40 630/1500 4.40 4.43 4.18  11 0 0 0 0 6 3 4.33 1217/1517 4.33 4.43 4.65  11 0 0 0 0 1 7 1 4.00 898/1497 4.00 4.30 4.11  11 0 0 0 0 1 8 4.89 548/1448 4.89 4.81 4.71  11 0 0 0 0 1 3 5 4.44 672/1436 4.44 4.45 4.29  11 0 0 0 0 1 8 4.89 187/1432 4.89 4.81 4.71  11 0 0 0 0 1 8 4.89 187/1432 4.89 4.52 4.29  11 3 0 0 0 1 2 5 4.50 390/1280 4.50 4.43 4.10  12 0 0 0 1 7 4.88 254/1277 4.88 4.60 4.34  12 0 0 0 0 1 7 4.88 255/1269 4.88 4.56 4.31  12 2 1 0 1 2 2 3.67 625/854 3.67 3.75 4.02  quency Distribution  S Reasons Type  Required for Majors 0 Graduate 0 Major  General 2 Under-grad 20 Non-	NR NA 1 2 3 4 5 Mean Rank Mean Mean Mean Mean Mean  10 0 0 0 2 3 5 4.30 849/1522 4.30 4.51 4.30 4.42 10 0 0 0 1 3 6 4.50 545/1522 4.50 4.40 4.26 4.34 10 0 0 0 1 0 9 4.80 228/1285 4.80 4.48 4.30 4.42 10 0 0 0 0 2 1 7 4.50 473/1476 4.50 4.33 4.22 4.31 10 0 0 0 0 2 2 8 4.80 137/1412 4.80 4.45 4.06 4.11 d 10 0 0 0 0 2 2 6 4.40 434/1381 4.40 4.30 4.08 4.21 10 0 0 1 1 1 7 4.40 630/1500 4.40 4.43 4.18 4.25 11 0 0 0 0 6 3 4.33 1217/1517 4.33 4.43 4.65 4.71 s 11 0 0 0 0 1 7 1 4.00 898/1497 4.00 4.30 4.11 4.21  11 0 0 0 0 1 8 4.89 548/1448 4.89 4.81 4.71 4.75 11 0 0 0 0 1 8 4.89 548/1448 4.89 4.81 4.71 4.75 11 0 0 0 0 1 8 4.89 187/1432 4.89 4.52 4.29 4.34 11 3 0 0 0 0 2 4 4.67 175/1221 4.67 3.74 3.93 4.04  12 0 0 0 1 2 5 4.50 390/1280 4.50 4.43 4.10 4.28 12 0 0 0 0 1 7 4.88 254/1277 4.88 4.60 4.34 4.50 12 0 0 0 0 1 7 4.88 254/1277 4.88 4.60 4.34 4.50 12 0 0 0 0 1 7 4.88 254/1277 4.88 4.60 4.34 4.50 12 0 0 0 0 1 7 4.88 254/1277 4.88 4.60 4.34 4.50 12 0 0 0 0 1 7 4.88 255/1269 4.88 4.56 4.31 4.49 12 2 1 0 1 2 3 3.67 625/854 3.67 3.75 4.02 4.31  quency Distribution  Required for Majors 0 Graduate 0 Major  Required for Majors 0 Graduate 0 Major

Course-Section: POLI 486 0101 University of Maryland Title MIDDLE EAST INTL RELAT

Baltimore County Spring 2007

Page 1241

JUN 26, 2007

Job IRBR3029

Instructor: MIKHAIL, NABIL Enrollment: 29

Questionnaires: 28

							Fr	eque	ncie	S		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
		Question	ns		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		Genera	 al															
1. Did yo	ou gain n	ew insights,sk	ills fro	om this course	5	0	1	0	2	2	18	4.57	537/1522	4.57	4.51	4.30	4.42	4.57
		ctor make clea:			5	0	0	0	2	1	20	4.78	222/1522	4.78	4.40	4.26	4.34	4.78
3. Did th	ne exam q	questions refle	ct the e	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 ot	her eval	uations reflect	t the ex	spected goals	5	4	0	0	2	2	15	4.68	295/1476	4.68	4.33	4.22	4.31	4.68
5. Did as	ssigned r	eadings contril	bute 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 wr	ritten as	signments cont	ribute t	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 th	ne gradin	g system clear:	ly expla	ained	5	0	0	0	0	4	19	4.83	149/1500	4.83	4.43	4.18	4.25	4.83
8. How ma	any times	was class can	celled		5	0	2	2	5	11	3	3.48	1492/1517	3.48	4.43	4.65	4.71	3.48
9. How wo	ould you	grade the over	all tead	ching effectiveness	6	3	0	0	2	4	13	4.58	333/1497	4.58	4.30	4.11	4.21	4.58
		Lectu:	re															
1. Were t	the instr	uctor's lecture	es 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 th	ne instru	ctor seem inte	rested i	n 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 le	ecture ma	terial presente	ed and e	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 th	ne lectur	es 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 au	ıdiovisua	l techniques e	nhance y	our understanding	5	17	1	0	1	0	4	4.00	****/1221	****	3.74	3.93	4.04	****
		Discu	ssion															
1. Did cl	lass disc	ussions contril	bute 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 a	all stude	nts actively e	ncourage	ed 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 th	ne instru	ctor encourage	fair ar	nd 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 s	special t	echniques succ	essful		10	8	1	0	1	0	8	4.40	252/ 854	4.40	3.75	4.02	4.31	4.40
				Frequ	iency	/ Dis	trib	utio	n									
Credits E	Earned	Cum. GP	A	Expected Grades				Rea	ason	s			Туј	pe			Majors	5
												1						17
00-27	1	0.00-0.99				Red	quir	ea I	or Ma	ajor	S	Т	Graduat	е	U	мајс	or	17
28-55	0	1.00-1.99				<b>a</b>		1				2	TTrades		10	Mar		11
56-83	1 10	2.00-2.99	eflect the expected goals 5 4 0 0 2 2 15 4.68 295/1476 4.68 4.33 4.22 4.3 ontribute to what you learned 5 0 0 0 0 3 2 18 4.65 240/1412 4.65 4.45 4.06 4.1 contribute to what you learned 5 2 0 1 2 1 17 4.62 240/1381 4.62 4.30 4.08 4.2 clearly explained 5 0 0 0 0 0 4 19 4.83 149/1500 4.83 4.43 4.18 4.2 s cancelled 5 0 2 2 5 11 3 3.48 149/1517 3.48 4.43 4.65 4.7 overall teaching effectiveness 6 3 0 0 2 4 13 4.58 333/1497 4.58 4.30 4.11 4.2 Lecture ectures well prepared 5 0 0 0 0 2 2 19 4.74 492/1440 4.74 4.63 4.45 4.5 esented and explained clearly 5 0 0 0 0 2 2 19 4.74 492/1440 4.74 4.63 4.45 4.5 esented and explained clearly 5 0 0 0 0 2 2 19 4.74 326/1436 4.74 4.45 4.29 4.3 bute to what you learned 5 0 0 0 1 0 22 4.91 145/1432 4.91 4.52 4.29 4.3 uses enhance your understanding 5 17 1 0 1 0 4 4.00 ****/1221 **** 3.74 3.93 4.0 Discussion ontribute to what you learned 10 0 0 1 1 2 14 4.61 317/1280 4.61 4.43 4.10 4.2 ely encouraged to participate 10 0 1 1 1 2 14 4.61 317/1280 4.61 4.43 4.10 4.2 ely encouraged to participate 10 0 1 1 1 1 0 15 4.50 594/1277 4.50 4.60 4.34 4.5 urage fair and open discussion 10 0 0 0 1 1 1 6 4.83 299/1269 4.83 4.56 4.31 4.6 successful 10 8 1 0 1 0 8 4.40 252/854 4.40 3.75 4.02 4.3 ely encouraged to participate 10 0 1 1 1 1 6 4.83 299/1269 4.83 4.56 4.31 4.6 successful 10 8 1 0 1 0 8 4.40 252/854 4.40 3.75 4.02 4.3 ely encouraged and open discussion 10 0 0 0 1 1 1 1 6 4.83 299/1269 4.83 4.56 4.31 4.6 successful 10 8 1 0 1 0 8 4.40 252/854 4.40 3.75 4.02 4.3 ely encouraged and open discussion 10 0 0 0 1 1 1 1 6 4.83 299/1269 4.83 4.56 4.31 4.6 successful 10 8 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2	-major	11													
84-150	0	3.00-3.49 3.50-4.00				ma.	0 a t d .					0	инии ,	Moona +	homo -	*** ***		-h
Grad.	U	3.50-4.00	Т			ET.	ect1	ves				U					_	]11
				I O		Ot1	her				1	.4	-					

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

							Fr	eque	ncie	S		Inst	tructor		Course	e Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
		Question	s		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean			Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
1 Did 110	u gain n	Genera ew insights,ski		m this sourse	7	0	0	0	2	6	5	4.23	010/1	E22	4.23	A 51	4.30	4.42	4.23
_	_	ew insignes,ski ctor make clear			8	0	0	1	2	3	6	4.17				4.40	4.26		4.17
		uestions reflec		-	7	0	0	1	2	3		4.23				4.48		4.42	
	_	uations reflect			7	0	0	0	3	5			903/1			4.33		4.31	
				what you learned	7	0	0	1	4	2	-		760/1				4.06	4.11	
	_	_		to what you learned	7	0	0	2	2	4	-		911/1				4.08	4.21	
		g system clearl		_	7	0	0	0	3	4			799/1				4.18		4.23
	-	was class canc		rined	8	0	0	0	0	11			1361/1				4.65	4.71	
	-			ching effectiveness	9	1	0	1	4	4			1277/1						
		<b>5</b>		. 5									,						
_		Lectur		_	_		_			_									
		uctor's lecture			7	0	1	1	2	9			1365/1		3.46	4.63	4.45	4.52	3.46
		ctor seem inter		_	7	0	0	1	0	1			965/1		4.69	4.81		4.75	4.69
				explained clearly	7	0	1	2	2	6			1295/1			4.45		4.32	
		es contribute t		-	7	0	2	1	4	4			1338/1					4.34	
5. Did au	diovisua	l techniques en	hance y	our understanding	8	2	0	2	6	2	0	3.00	1064/1	221	3.00	3.74	3.93	4.04	3.00
		Discus	sion																
1. Did cl	ass disc			what you learned	8	0	0	0	4	2	6	4.17	644/1	280	4.17	4.43	4.10	4.28	4.17
				ed to participate	8	0	0	1	1	1		4.50				4.60			4.50
		_	_	nd open discussion	8	0	0	2	1	0		4.33	,			4.56		4.49	
		echniques succe		ia opon arboabbion	8	5	0	2	2	2		3.29			3.29			4.31	
0		Labora	-		1.0	0	1	_	0	0	_	1 00	/	000			4 25	4 20	
2. were y	ou provi	ded with adequa	te back	ground information	19	0	1	0	U	U	U	1.00	****/	228		* * * * *	4.35	4.32	
		Semina	r																
2. Was th	ne instru	ctor available	for ind	dividual attention	19	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/	77	****	****	4.52	4.60	****
		Self	Paced																
1. Did se	elf-paced	system contrib	ute to	what you learned	19	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/	37	****	****	4.63	4.33	****
		tions make clea			19	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/	23	***	****	4.41	4.00	****
		acts with the i		-	19	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/	33	***	****	4.69	4.92	****
_		ck/tutoring by		_	19	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/	22	****	****	4.54	4.25	****
				_		<u> </u>													
				Frequ	lency	Dist	trib	utio	n										
Credits E	Carned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	ason	S				Туј	pe			Majors	3
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 7		Red	guir	ed f	or Ma	ajor	 s	1	Grad	uate	e	0	Majo	 or	8
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В 4						J							3		
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	1	C 1		Gei	nera	1				3	Unde	r-a	rad 2	20	Non-	-major	12
84-150	7	3.00-3.49	3	D 0										J-				3	
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F 0		Ele	ecti	ves				0	####	- I	Means t	here a	re not	enou	<sub>i</sub> h
				P 0											es to k			_	
				± 0		O+1						0	E			. 5-			

Other

9

I

0

0

Course-Section: POLI 489 0101

SEL TOPICS: INTERNATL R

Title 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

			Frequencies					Inst	tructor	Course Dept		UMBC Level		Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	4	0	Ο	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		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		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	1	0	0	0	1	1	_	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	4.83	4.45	4.54	4.86
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	0	1	1	2	3		1056/1436	4.00	4.45	4.71	4.75	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		3.93	4.04	
3. Did addiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	_	U	U	3	2		3.07	032/1221	3.07	3.74	3.93	4.04	3.07
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	****
<u> </u>														

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

Course-Section: POLI 652 0101 University of Maryland Page 1244 POLITICS OF HEALTH Baltimore County JUN 26, 2007 MILLER, NANCY A Spring 2007 Job IRBR3029 6

			Frequencies					Inst	ructor	Course Dept		UMBC Level		Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	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

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Title

Instructor:

Enrollment:

Questionnaires: 6

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