AMER GOVT & POLITICS

Title Instructor: KING-MEADOWS, T

Enrollment: 26 Questionnaires: 26

# Baltimore County Fall 2008

University of Maryland

Page 1334 FEB 11, 2009 Job IRBR3029

			Fre	eanei	ncies	3		Ins	tructor	Course	Dept.	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	_	3	4	5	Mean	Rank		Mean	Mean		Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	2	0	0	1	1	7	15	4.50	644/1649	4.50	4.51	4.28	4.11	4.50
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	1	2	4	6	11		1124/1648	4.25	4.31	4.23	4.16	4.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	0	1	1	4	6	12	4.13	901/1375	4.20	4.38	4.27	4.10	4.13
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	1	1	3	3	5	11		1134/1595	4.18	4.33	4.20	4.03	3.96
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	3	0	1	1	2	6	13	4.26	614/1533	4.38	4.47	4.04	3.87	4.26
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	0	2	1	4	6	11	3.96	952/1512	3.81	4.25	4.10	3.86	3.96
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	2	4	3	5	10	3.71	1299/1623	4.00	4.28	4.16	4.08	3.71
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	8	16	4.67	1037/1646	4.70	4.64	4.69	4.67	4.67
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	1	0	5	7	8	4.00	914/1621	4.09	4.23	4.06	3.96	4.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	2	2	19	4.74	517/1568	4.77	4.64	4.43	4.39	4.74
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	0	0	0	22	5.00	1/1572	4.89	4.85	4.70	4.64	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	1	4	3	15	4.39	790/1564	4.51	4.48	4.28	4.20	4.39
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	3	5		4.50	695/1559	4.52	4.49	4.29	4.20	4.50
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	0	0	1	3	4	15	4.43	370/1352		3.95	3.98	3.86	4.43
J. Did additional econniques emance your anderstanding	5	O	U	_	3	-	13	1.15	370/1332	1.05	3.75	3.70	3.00	1.15
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	1	3	5	11	4.30	644/1384	4.18	4.31	4.08	3.86	4.30
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	2	1	3	1	13	4.10	923/1382	4.14	4.48	4.29	4.03	4.10
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	1	0	4	1	14	4.35	784/1368	4.50	4.60	4.30	4.01	4.35
4. Were special techniques successful	6	7	3	2	0	2	6	3.46	717/ 948	3.46	4.00	3.95	3.75	3.46
Laboratory														
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	24	0	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	****/ 243	****	****	4.12	4.08	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	22	2	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 555	****	4.57	4.29	4.14	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	23	1	1	1	0	0	0	1.50	****/ 88	****	5.00	4.54	4.31	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	24	0	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/ 85	****	4.83	4.47	4.30	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	24	0	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	****/ 81	****	4.50	4.43	4.39	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	24	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 92	****	4.33	4.35	4.01	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	19	0	2	2	0	3	0	2.57	252/ 288	3.19	3.67	3.68	3.54	2.57
J. Were effected for grading made effect	1)	O	2		O	J	Ü	2.57	232/ 200	3.17	3.07	3.00	3.31	2.57
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	24	0	1	1	0	0	0	1.50	****/ 52	****	****	4.06	3.72	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	24	0	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.09	3.65	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	24	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.47	4.36	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	24	0	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/ 39	****	****	4.38	4.37	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	16	2	0	0	1	7	0	3.88	177/ 312	3.85	3.74	3.68	3.51	3.88
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	24	0	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/ 53	****	****	4.30	4.17	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	24	0	2	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.16	4.06	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	24	1	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 41	****	****	4.43	4.27	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	24	1	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 24	****	****	4.42	4.24	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	21	1	0	1	1	1	1		****/ 110	****	3.86	3.99	3.83	****
1 Shore change proceed for all the beatened		_	3	_	-	_	_	5.50	, 110		2.00	2.22	2.03	

Title AMER GOVT & POLITICS

Instructor: KING-MEADOWS, T

Enrollment: 26
Questionnaires: 26

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2008 Page 1334 FEB 11, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	d Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	1	 А	2	Required for Majors	2	Graduate	0	Major	8
28-55	8	1.00-1.99	0	В	3						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	2	С	8	General	2	Under-grad	26	Non-major	18
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	5	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	0	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means	there	are not enough	h
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	17	_			
				?	5						

AMER GOVT & POLITICS

Title

Instructor: KING-MEADOWS, T

Enrollment: 45 Questionnaires: 44

# Fall 2008 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

University of Maryland

Baltimore County

Page 1335 FEB 11, 2009 Job IRBR3029

			Fre	eque	ncie	s		Ins	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank		Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Conoral														
General 1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	6	0	1	0	5	14	18	4.26	954/1649	4.50	4.51	4.28	4.11	4.26
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	6	0	2	2	7	11	16		1155/1648	4.25	4.31	4.23	4.16	3.97
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	7	0	1	2	8	16	10		1055/1375	4.20	4.38	4.27	4.10	3.86
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	6	1	0	1	9	11	16	4.14	970/1595	4.18	4.33	4.20	4.03	4.14
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	7	0	1	1	1	12	22		443/1533	4.38	4.47	4.04	3.87	4.43
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	7	1	2	2	12	10	10		1170/1512	3.81	4.25	4.10	3.86	3.67
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	8	0	3	3	12	7	11		1367/1623	4.00	4.28	4.16	4.08	3.56
8. How many times was class cancelled	7	0	0	0	0	15	22		1112/1646	4.70	4.64	4.69	4.67	4.59
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	12	1	1	2	5	15	8	3.87	1087/1621	4.09	4.23	4.06	3.96	3.87
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	6	0	0	0	2	4	32	4.79	424/1568	4.77	4.64	4.43	4.39	4.79
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	6	0	0	0	0	0	38	5.00	1/1572	4.89	4.85	4.70	4.64	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	7	0	1	0	7	8	21	4.30	897/1564	4.51	4.48	4.28	4.20	4.30
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	6	1	3	0	3	13	18	4.16	1031/1559	4.52	4.49	4.29	4.20	4.16
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	6	0	3	1	11	13	10	3.68	960/1352	4.09	3.95	3.98	3.86	3.68
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	15	0	2	1	4	8	14	4.07	774/1384	4.18	4.31	4.08	3.86	4.07
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	15	0	0	0	4	9	16	4.41	706/1382	4.14	4.48	4.29	4.03	4.41
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	15	0	0	2	2	5	20	4.48	673/1368	4.50	4.60	4.30	4.01	4.48
4. Were special techniques successful	15	19	2	2	3	1	2	2.90	****/ 948	3.46	4.00	3.95	3.75	***
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	35	8	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 221	****	****	4.16	4.05	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	38	0	0	0	0	3	3	4.50	****/ 243	****	****	4.12	4.08	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	38	5	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 212	****	****	4.40	4.43	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	40	3	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 209	****	****	4.35	4.38	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	31	4	0	0	2	0	7	4.56	****/ 555	****	4.57	4.29	4.14	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	38	3	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	****/ 88	****	5.00	4.54	4.31	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	39	1	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	****/ 85	****	4.83	4.47	4.30	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	38	3	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	****/ 81	****	4.50	4.43	4.39	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	39	1	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	****/ 92	****	4.33	4.35	4.01	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	31	2	0	2	0	7	2	3.82	166/ 288	3.19	3.67	3.68	3.54	3.82
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	37	0	2	0	2	1	2	3.14	****/ 52	****	****	4.06	3.72	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	38	0	1	0	0	2	3	4.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.09	3.65	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	38	2	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	****/ 39	****	****	4.47	4.36	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	38	3	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/ 39	****	****	4.38	4.37	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	28	4	0	1	1	9	1	3.83	181/ 312	3.85	3.74	3.68	3.51	3.83
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	39	0	1	0	2	1	1	3.20	****/ 53	****	****	4.30	4.17	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	39	3	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.16	4.06	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	40	1	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 41	****	****	4.43	4.27	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	39	3	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 24	****	****	4.42	4.24	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	38	3	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	****/ 110	****	3.86	3.99	3.83	****

Title AMER GOVT & POLITICS

Instructor: KING-MEADOWS, T

Enrollment: 45
Questionnaires: 44

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2008 Page 1335 FEB 11, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits E	Earned	Cum. GPA		Expecte	d Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	5	0.00-0.99	0	 А	8	Required for Majors	12	Graduate	0	Major	8
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	0	В	10						
56-83	5	2.00-2.99	4	C	6	General	5	Under-grad	44	Non-major	36
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	3	D	3						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	7	F	1	Electives	1	#### - Means	there	are not enough	n
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	14	-		_	
				?	3						

Course-Section: POLI 100 0301 University of Maryland Title AMER GOVT & POLITICS

Baltimore County

Frequencies

Instructor: ENGEL, FRANCENE

Enrollment: 50 Questionnaires: 46

Fall 2008 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Instructor

Page 1336

FEB 11, 2009

Job IRBR3029

Course Dept UMBC Level Sect

	Ouestions			MP	NA	1	_	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean			Mean	Mean
	General																
1. Did you gain new in		s from this co	urse	28	0	0	0	1	3	14	4.72	361/1649	4.50	4.51	4.28	4.11	4.72
2. Did the instructor				28	0	0	0	1	2	15	4.78	244/1648		4.31	4.23	4.16	4.78
3. Did the exam question				28	0	1	0	1	1	15	4.61	453/1375	4.20	4.38	4.27	4.10	4.61
4. Did other evaluation				28	5	0	1	1	2	9	4.46	552/1595	4.18	4.33	4.20	4.03	4.46
5. Did assigned reading				28	0	0	1	1	5	11	4.44	432/1533				3.87	4.44
6. Did written assignme	-	_		28	8	0	0	2	3	5	4.30	****/1512	3.81	4.25	4.10	3.86	****
7. Was the grading sys				28	0	0	0	2				251/1623			4.16	4.08	4.72
8. How many times was				28	0	0	0	1				782/1646				4.67	
9. How would you grade			ctiveness	28	1	0	1	1				497/1621				3.96	4.41
	Lecture																
1. Were the instructor		well prepared		28	0	0	0	2	0	16	4.78	442/1568	4.77	4.64	4.43	4.39	4.78
			riect	28	0	0	1	1	-			1071/1572		4.85	4.70		4.67
	Did the instructor seem interested in the subjec Was lecture material presented and explained cle Did the lectures contribute to what you learned Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understa						0	1				234/1564			4.28	4.20	
	Was lecture material presented and explained cle Did the lectures contribute to what you learned						0	1				227/1559		4.49		4.20	
	id the lectures contribute to what you learned id audiovisual techniques enhance your understan					0 2	0	1	2			599/1352				3.86	
5. 21d ddd15/12dd1 555							ŭ	_	_			333, 1332	1.05	3.75	3.70	3.00	
	Discussion																
	Did class discussions contribute to what you learn						0	4	2			726/1384				3.86	4.17
	Were all students actively encouraged to participation						0	4	1			1022/1382			4.29	4.03	
3. Did the instructor			scussion	34	0	0	0	1	2			522/1368			4.30	4.01	
4. Were special technic	ques success	ful		34	8	0	0	2	2	0	3.50	****/ 948	3.46	4.00	3.95	3.75	****
	T - 1 +																
F Warra	Laborato	-		40	0	0	0	0	0	_	г оо	****/ 555	++++	4 57	4 00	1 11	++++
5. Were requirements for	or lab repor	ts clearly spe	clilea	40	U	U	U	U	U	ь	5.00	^^^^/ 555		4.5/	4.29	4.14	
	Seminar																
5. Were criteria for g		clear		38	0	0	1	0	7	0	3.75	****/ 288	3.19	3.67	3.68	3.54	****
0 0					-	-	_		•	-		,					
	Field Wo	rk															
5. Did conferences help	p you carry	out field acti	vities	37	0	1	2	0	6	0	3.22	****/ 312	3.85	3.74	3.68	3.51	****
	Self Pa																
5. Were there enough p	roctors for	all the studer	ts	36	0	1	0	0	9	0	3.70	****/ 110	****	3.86	3.99	3.83	****
			Frequ	iency	/ Dist	ribu	ıtior	า									
				- 2													
Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expect	ed Grades				Rea	asons	5 			Тур	pe 			Majors	
00-27 2 0	0-27 2 0.00-0.99 1 A 8						ed fo	or Ma	ajor	s	3	Graduate	9	0	Majo	r	8
28-55 3 1	8-55 3 1.00-1.99 0 B 7								-						-		
56-83 0 2							_				2	Under-gi	rad 4	:6	Non-	major	38
84-150 1 3	.00-3.49	0 D	0													-	
Grad. 0 3	.50-4.00	2 F	0		Ele	ectiv	res				2	#### - 1	Means t	here a	re not	enoug	h
		P	0									response					
		I	0		Oth	ner					7	-		-			
		?	1														

Course-Section: POLI 100Y 0101 University of Maryland Title Baltimore County

AMER GOVT & POLITICS

Instructor: KING-MEADOWS, T

Enrollment: 17 Questionnaires: 17

# Fall 2008

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Page 1337 FEB 11, 2009 Job IRBR3029

				-	ncies		_		tructor		-		Level	
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	6	0	0	1	2	2	6	4 18	1037/1649	4.18	4.51	4.28	4.11	4.18
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	6	0	0	0	3	4	4		1070/1648	4.09	4.31	4.23	4.16	4.09
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	6	0	0	2	2	2	5		1034/1375	3.91	4.38	4.27	4.10	3.91
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	6	0	0	1	2	3	5		1015/1595	4.09	4.33	4.20	4.03	4.09
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	1	2	1	7	4.27	604/1533	4.27	4.47	4.04	3.87	4.27
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	2	3	4	2	3.55	1240/1512	3.55	4.25	4.10	3.86	3.55
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	6	0	0	1	2	4	4	4.00	1029/1623	4.00	4.28	4.16	4.08	4.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	7	0	0	0	0	5	5	4.50	1193/1646	4.50	4.64	4.69	4.67	4.50
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	7	1	0	0	0	5	4	4.44	456/1621	4.44	4.23	4.06	3.96	4.44
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	6	0	0	1	0	2	8	4.55	803/1568	4.55	4.64	4.43	4.39	4.55
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	6	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1572	5.00	4.85	4.70	4.64	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	6	0	0	0	2	5	4	4.18	1010/1564	4.18	4.48	4.28	4.20	4.18
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	1	0	3	7	4.45	763/1559	4.45	4.49	4.29	4.20	4.45
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	6	0	0	0	4	2	5	4.09	638/1352	4.09	3.95	3.98	3.86	4.09
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	1	7	2	4.10	761/1384		4.31	4.08	3.86	4.10
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	0	0	3	2	5	4.20	869/1382	4.20	4.48	4.29	4.03	4.20
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	0	0	1	3	6	4.50	654/1368	4.50	4.60	4.30	4.01	4.50
4. Were special techniques successful	7	8	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/ 948	****	4.00	3.95	3.75	****
Laboratory														
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	8	0	0	0	1	0	8	4.78	246/ 555	4.78	4.57	4.29	4.14	4.78
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	15	1	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 88	****	5.00	4.54	4.31	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	16	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 85	****	4.83	4.47	4.30	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 81	****	4.50	4.43	4.39	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 92	****	4.33	4.35	4.01	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	13	0	0	0	0	3	1	4.25	****/ 288	****	3.67	3.68	3.54	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 52	****	****	4.06	3.72	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	16	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 48	****	****	4.09	3.65	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.47	4.36	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	16	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 39	****	****	4.38	4.37	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	8	0	0	2	1	6	0	3.44	226/ 312	3.44	3.74	3.68	3.51	3.44
Frequ	iency	Dist	trib	utio	n									

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	l Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	4	0.00-0.99	1	А	1	Required for Majors	2	Graduate	0	Major	2
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	5						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	3	General	4	Under-grad	17	Non-major	15
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D	1						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	0	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	n
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	4	_			
				?	0						

Title SEL TOPICS IN POLI

Instructor: HOFFMAN, DAVID (Instr. A)

Enrollment: 25 Baltimore County Fall 2008

Page 1338 FEB 11, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Questionnaires: 24

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

University of Maryland

		Questions		NR	NA	Fr 1	equei 2	ncies 3	4	5	Ins Mean	tructor Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean		Level Mean	Se Mea
D4 d		General w insights,skills f	hbi	9	0	1	0	1	1	9	4 22	871/1649	4.33	<i>A</i> F1	4.28	4 20	4
_	_	ctor make clear the		9	0	1	3	2	4 5	5		1313/1648		4.31	4.28	4.29 4.25	4. 3.
		lestions reflect the		9	11	0	0	0	0	4		****/1375		4.31	4.27	4.37	**
		uations reflect the		9	1	0	1	2	5	6		956/1595		4.33	4.20	4.22	4.
		eadings contribute to		9	0	0	0	2	4	9		410/1533		4.47			4.
			to what you learned	9	0	0	1	1	8			808/1512		4.25		4.14	
		g system clearly exp		9	0	2	2	4	3			1462/1623		4.28		4.21	
		was class cancelled		9	0	0	0	0	5	10	4.67	1037/1646	4.67	4.64	4.69	4.63	4.
	_		aching effectiveness	11	0	0	0	2	4	7	4.38	535/1621	4.08			4.01	4.
		Lecture															
Were th	e instru	uctor's lectures well	prepared	11	0	0	0	2	4	7	4.38	1002/1568	4.35	4.64	4.43	4.39	4.
Did the	instruc	ctor seem interested	in the subject	11	0	0	0	0	2	11	4.85	740/1572	4.85	4.85	4.70	4.73	4.
Was lec	ture mat	terial presented and	explained clearly	11	0	0	0	2	4	7	4.38	801/1564	4.35	4.48	4.28	4.27	4.
		es contribute to wha		11	0	0	0	2	4	7		851/1559		4.49	4.29		
Did aud	liovisual	l techniques enhance	your understanding	11	2	2	0	2	4	3	3.55	1030/1352	3.55	3.95	3.98	4.07	3.
		Discussion															
		ussions contribute to	_	11	0	0	0	0	3	10	4.77			4.31			4.
		nts actively encoura		11	0	0	1	0	1	11	4.69	455/1382		4.48	4.29		4.
		ctor encourage fair a	and open discussion	11	0	0	1	0	2	10	4.62			4.60			
Were sp	ecial te	echniques successful		11	0	0	0	1	3	9	4.62	167/ 948	4.62	4.00	3.95	3.89	4.
Were re	quiremer	Laboratory nts for lab reports	clearly specified	19	0	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	****/ 555	****	4.57	4.29	4.33	* *
		Seminar															
Were as	signed t	topics relevant to the	ne announced theme	23	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 88	****	5.00	4.54	3.75	* *
Was the	instruc	ctor available for i	ndividual attention	23	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 85	****	4.83	4.47	3.33	* *
		rojects contribute t		23	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 81		4.50			* *
		ons contribute to who		23	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 92		4.33		5.00	* *
Were cr	riteria 1	for grading made clea	ar	17	0	0	0	1	6	0	3.86	164/ 288	3.86	3.67	3.68	3.65	3.
D. 1	-	Field Work	61 11	1.0	0	0	0	0	_	0	4 00	60 / 210	4 00	2 54	2 60	2 50	
DIG CON	irerences	s help you carry out	field activities	18	0	0	0	0	6	0	4.00	68/ 312	4.00	3.74	3.08	3.59	4.
Were th	iere enoi	Self Paced ugh proctors for all	the students	21	0	0	0	0	3	0	4.00	****/ 110	***	3.86	3.99	3.72	**
			Frequ	iency	Dis	trib	utio	ı									
edits Ea	ırned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades				Rea	asons	\$			Ту	pe			Majors	5
 0-27	1	0.00-0.99 0	A 10		 Re	 guir	ed fo	or Ma	ijor		1	 Graduat	 e	0	 Мајо	 or	
8-55	2	1.00-1.99 0	В 3						J						5		
6-83	2	2.00-2.99 0	C 2		Ge	nera	1				6	Under-g	rad 2	24	Non-	-major	1
4-150	2	3.00-3.49 4	D 0														
rad.	0	3.50-4.00 6	F 0 P 0		El	ecti	ves				2	#### - respons				_	gh
			I 0		O+	her					6	respons	cs LU L	e sidi	ıııcdl	16	
			5 0		UL	TICT					J						

SEL TOPICS IN POLI

Title Instructor: GREGG, DELANA S (Instr. B)

Enrollment: 25 Questionnaires: 24

#### University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2008

Page 1339 FEB 11, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Questions	NR	NA	Fre	equer 2	ncies 3	4	5	Ins Mean	tructor Rank		_		Level Mean	
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	9	0	1	0	1	4	9	4.33	871/1649	4.33	4.51	4.28	4.29	4.33
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	9	0	0	3	2	5	5		1313/1648		4.31	4.23	4.25	3.80
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	9	11	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	****/1375	****	4.38	4.27	4.37	***
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	9	1	0	1	2	5	6	4.14	956/1595	4.14	4.33	4.20	4.22	4.14
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	2	4	9	4.47	410/1533	4.47	4.47	4.04	4.04	4.47
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	1	1	8	5	4.13	808/1512	4.13	4.25	4.10	4.14	4.13
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	9	0	2	2	4	3	4	3.33	1462/1623	3.33	4.28	4.16	4.21	3.33
8. How many times was class cancelled	9	0	0	0	0				1037/1646			4.69	4.63	4.67
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	11	0	0	0	6	4	3	3.77	1184/1621	4.08	4.23	4.06	4.01	4.08
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	11	0	0	1	1	4	7	4.31	1080/1568	4.35	4.64	4.43	4.39	4.35
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	11	0	0	0	0	2	11	4.85	740/1572	4.85	4.85	4.70	4.73	4.85
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	11	0	0	1	1	4	7	4.31	887/1564	4.35	4.48	4.28	4.27	4.35
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	2	4	7	4.38	851/1559	4.38	4.49	4.29	4.33	4.38
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	11	2	2	0	2	4	3	3.55	1030/1352	3.55	3.95	3.98	4.07	3.55
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	0	3	10	4.77	238/1384	4.77	4.31	4.08	3.99	4.77
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	11	0	0	1	0	1	11	4.69	455/1382	4.69	4.48	4.29	4.19	4.69
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	11	0	0	1	0	2	10	4.62	569/1368	4.62	4.60	4.30	4.21	4.62
4. Were special techniques successful	11	0	0	0	1	3	9	4.62	167/ 948	4.62	4.00	3.95	3.89	4.62
Laboratory														
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	19	0	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	****/ 555	****	4.57	4.29	4.33	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	23	0	0	0	1	0	0		****/ 88		5.00	4.54	3.75	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	23	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 85		4.83	4.47	3.33	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	23	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 81		4.50	4.43	3.67	***
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	23	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 92		4.33	4.35	5.00	***
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	17	0	0	0	1	6	0	3.86	164/ 288	3.86	3.67	3.68	3.65	3.86
Field Work														
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	18	0	0	0	0	6	0	4.00	68/ 312	4.00	3.74	3.68	3.59	4.00
Self Paced														
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	21	0	0	0	0	3	0	4.00	****/ 110	****	3.86	3.99	3.72	***
Freq	uency	Dist	ribu	atior	ı									
Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades				Res	asons				Ту	pe			Majors	
00-27 1 0.00-0.99 0 A 10 28-55 2 1.00-1.99 0 B 3		Rec	quire	ed fo	or Ma	jors	S	1	Graduat	е	0	Majo	r	6
56-83 2 2.00-2.99 0 C 2		Ger	neral	_				6	Under-g	rad 2	4	Non-	major	18
84-150 2 3.00-3.49 4 D 0 Grad. 0 3.50-4.00 6 F 0		- רקד	- a + d -					2	инии -	Maana +	homo -		0001-	h
Grad. 0 3.50-4.00 6 F 0 P 0		ът€	ectiv	/ E B				∠	#### - : respons				_	11
I 0		Oth	ner					6	-		3			
? 0														

Course-Section: POLI 210 0101 University of Maryland Title

POLITICAL PHILOSOPHY Baltimore County Fall 2008

Instructor: STAUDINGER, ALI

Enrollment: 48 Questionnaires: 47

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Page 1340 FEB 11, 2009 Job IRBR3029

		Question	s		NR	NA		eque: 2	ncie 3	s 4	5	Ins Mean	tructor Rank	Course Mean	_	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
		 Genera	 1															
1. Did yo	ou gain new	w insights,ski		m this course	15	0	0	0	3	8	21	4.56	563/1649	4.35	4.51	4.28	4.29	4.56
		or make clear			16	0	0	0	4	9			629/1648		4.31	4.23	4.25	4.45
3. Did th	e exam que	estions reflec	t the e	expected goals	15	4	0	0	3	4	21	4.64	422/1375	4.59	4.38	4.27	4.37	4.64
4. Did ot	her evalua	ations reflect	the ex	pected goals	15	0	1	0	2	9	20	4.47	552/1595	4.31	4.33	4.20	4.22	4.47
	_	_		what you learned	15	0	0	0	2	9		4.59			4.47		4.04	4.59
				o what you learned		1	0	0	5	8			507/1512			4.10		4.42
		system clearl		ined	15	0	0	0		8			502/1623		4.28		4.21	
		was class canc			16	0	0	0		19			1348/1646		4.64		4.63	
9. How wo	ould you gr	rade the overa	II teac	hing effectiveness	24	0	0	0	1	12	10	4.39	523/1621	4.06	4.23	4.06	4.01	4.39
		Lectur	е															
		ctor's lecture			17	0	0	1	4	7	18	4.40	983/1568	4.58	4.64	4.43	4.39	4.40
		tor seem inter			17	0	0	0	2	1		4.83	765/1572			4.70	4.73	
		_		explained clearly	18	0	0	1	3	5		4.52		4.48	4.48	4.28	4.27	4.52
		s contribute t		-	17	0	0	1	2	7			662/1559			4.29	4.33	
5. Did au	diovisual	our understanding	23	13	2	0	4	2	3	3.36	****/1352	4.26	3.95	3.98	4.07	****		
1. Did cl	ass discus	ssions contrib	ute to	what you learned	24	0	0	0	2	2	19	4.74	266/1384	4.56	4.31	4.08	3.99	4.74
	d class discussions contribute to what you lear ere all students actively encouraged to particin					0	0	0	2	2		4.75	394/1382		4.48	4.29		4.75
		_		d open discussion	23	0	0	0	1	2		4.83	,				4.21	
4. Were s	special ted	chniques succe	ssful		23	2	0	0	4	2	16	4.55	189/ 948	4.55	4.00	3.95	3.89	4.55
		Labora	tory															
1. Did th	ne lab incr	rease understa	nding o	of the material	46	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 221	***	****	4.16	4.45	****
				ground information		0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 243	***		4.12	4.47	****
5. Were r	requirement	ts for lab rep	orts cl	early specified	32	0	0	0	2	0	13	4.73	257/ 555	4.73	4.57	4.29	4.33	4.73
		Semina	r															
5. Were c	riteria fo	or grading mad	e clear	•	32	0	0	1	0	14	0	3.87	163/ 288	3.87	3.67	3.68	3.65	3.87
		Field	Work															
5. Did co	nferences	help you carr	y out f	ield activities	38	0	1	0	0	8	0	3.67	****/ 312	****	3.74	3.68	3.59	****
		Self	Paced															
5. Were t	here enoug	gh proctors fo	r all t	he students	36	0	0	2	0	9	0	3.64	****/ 110	****	3.86	3.99	3.72	****
				Frequ	ency	Dist	trib	utio	n									
Credits E	arned	Expected Grades				Rea	ason	s			Ty	ne			Majors	<b>:</b>		
												- 						
00-27 28-55	1 4	A 15 B 7		Red	quire	ed f	or M	ajor	`s	3	Graduat	е	0	Majo	or	14		
28-55 56-83	2	В / С 2		Cer	nera:	1				4	Under-q	rad /	17	Non	-major	33		
84-150	4	D 0		Gel	лета.	L				7	onder-9	tau 5	I /	INOII-	ilia JUL	33		
Grad.	0	3.00-3.49 3.50-4.00	2 4	F 0		Ele	ectiv	ves				3	#### - 1	Means t	here a	are not	enous	ιh
	-			P 0									respons				_	•
				I 0		Otl	her				1	.5	-		3			
				? 3														

POLITICAL PHILOSOPHY

Title Instructor: CARTER, JOHN W.

Enrollment: 48 Questionnaires: 47

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

University of Maryland

Baltimore County

Fall 2008

Page 1341 FEB 11, 2009 Job IRBR3029

			Fre	eque:	ncie	s		Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
G														
General  1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	18	0	1	0	7	7	14	4 14	1086/1649	4.35	4.51	4.28	4.29	4.14
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	18	0	1	0	1	10	17	4.45	643/1648	4.45	4.31	4.23	4.25	4.45
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	19	0	1	0	1	7	19	4.54	521/1375	4.59	4.38	4.27	4.37	4.54
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	19	0	2	0	3	10	13	4.14	956/1595	4.31	4.33	4.20	4.22	4.14
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	18	0	1	0	4	6	18	4.38	505/1533	4.49	4.47	4.04	4.04	4.38
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	20	0	1	0	2	10	14	4.33	595/1512		4.25	4.10	4.14	4.33
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	18	0	1	3	6		14		1089/1623		4.28	4.16	4.21	3.97
8. How many times was class cancelled	18	0	0	0	0	-	15		1184/1646		4.64	4.69	4.63	4.52
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	27	1	0	1	6	9			1209/1621		4.23	4.06	4.01	3.74
7. Now would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	27	_	U	1	U	,	J	J./1	1205/1021	1.00	1.23	1.00	1.01	J./1
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	18	0	0	0	1	5	23	4.76	480/1568	4.58	4.64	4.43	4.39	4.76
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	18	0	0	0	0	8	21	4.72	985/1572	4.78	4.85	4.70	4.73	4.72
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	18	0	1	0	1	10	17	4.45	728/1564	4.48	4.48	4.28	4.27	4.45
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	18	1	0	1	1	6	20	4.61	586/1559	4.57	4.49	4.29	4.33	4.61
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	18	2	1	1	2	9	14	4.26	515/1352	4.26	3.95	3.98	4.07	4.26
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	23	0	1	0	2	7	14	4.38	571/1384	4.56	4.31	4.08	3.99	4.38
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	24	0	0	1	3	5	14	4.39	724/1382		4.48	4.29	4.19	4.39
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	24	0	0	0	2	4	17	4.65	531/1368	4.74	4.60	4.30	4.21	4.65
4. Were special techniques successful	25	11	1	1	0	3	6	4.09	****/ 948	4.55	4.00	3.95	3.89	****
Laboratory														
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	46	0	0	0	0	0	1	5 00	****/ 243	****	****	4.12	4.47	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	46	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 212	****	****	4.40	4.62	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	43	1	0	0	0	0	3		****/ 555		4.57	4.29	4.33	****
J. Were requirements for lab reports crearry specified	13	_	U	U	U	U	J	3.00	/ 333	1.73	1.57	1.27	1.55	
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	46	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 88	****	5.00	4.54	3.75	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	46	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 85	****	4.83	4.47	3.33	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	46	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 81	****	4.50	4.43	3.67	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	46	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 92	****	4.33	4.35	5.00	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	43	0	0	2	0	1	1	3.25	****/ 288	3.87	3.67	3.68	3.65	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	46	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.06	3.93	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	46	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.09	4.05	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	46	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.47	4.49	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	46	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.38	3.66	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	41	0	0	3	0	2	1	3.17	****/ 312	****	3.74	3.68	3.59	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	46	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 53	****	****	4.30	4.07	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	46	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.16	1.50	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	46	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 41	****	****	4.43	3.50	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	46	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 24	****	****	4.42	2.00	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	37	0	1	1	0	7	1		****/ 110	****	3.86	3.99	3.72	****
J. HELE CHELE CHOUGH PLOCEOLS LOT ALL CHE SCUGETES	٠,	U	_		U	,	_	5.00	/ 110		5.00	٥. ٧ ٢	5.14	

Title POLITICAL PHILOSOPHY

Instructor: CARTER, JOHN W.

Enrollment: 48
Questionnaires: 47

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2008 Page 1341 FEB 11, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	d Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	A	8	Required for Majors	2	Graduate	0	Major	15
28-55	6	1.00-1.99	0	В	10						
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	4	C	3	General	2	Under-grad	47	Non-major	32
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	7	F	0	Electives	2	#### - Means	there	are not enough	n
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	16	_			
				?	2						

Title COMMON LAW&LEGAL ANALY

Instructor: MILLER, KERWIN

Enrollment: 35 Questionnaires: 35

#### University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2008

Page 1342 FEB 11, 2009 Job IRBR3029

			Fre	quer	ncies	3		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	8	0	0	1	0	4	22	4.74	339/1649	4.74	4.51	4.28	4.29	4.74
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	8	0	0	0	0	2	25	4.93	118/1648	4.93	4.31	4.23	4.25	4.93
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	8	0	0	0	2	4	21	4.70	360/1375	4.70	4.38	4.27	4.37	4.70
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	8	1	0	0	0	6	20	4.77	227/1595		4.33	4.20		4.77
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	1	1		4.89	115/1533	4.89	4.47		4.04	4.89
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	1	5	21	4.74	202/1512	4.74	4.25	4.10	4.14	4.74
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	8	0	0	0	1	6			272/1623	4.70	4.28			4.70
8. How many times was class cancelled	9	0	0	0	0	15	11		1268/1646	4.42	4.64	4.69		4.42
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	14	1	0	0	1	6	13	4.60	288/1621	4.60	4.23	4.06	4.01	4.60
T														
Lecture	1.0	0	^	0	1	7	17	1 (1	667/1560	1 (1	1 (1	4 42	4 20	1 (1
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	10	0	0	0	1	7 3	17	4.64	667/1568	4.64	4.64	4.43	4.39	4.64
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	10	0	0	0	0	3 6	22 19	4.88	640/1572	4.88	4.85	4.70	4.73	4.88 4.76
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	10	0	0	0	0	5		4.76	326/1564	4.76	4.48	4.28	4.27	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	10	7		0	2	5	20	4.80	318/1559	4.80	4.49	4.29	4.33	4.80
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	11	/	1	U	2	5	9	4.24	528/1352	4.24	3.95	3.98	4.07	4.24
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	0	3	16	4.84	180/1384	4.84	4.31	4.08	3.99	4.84
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	16	0	0	0	0	4	15	4.79	362/1382	4.79	4.48	4.29	4.19	4.79
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	16	0	0	0	0	2	17	4.89	274/1368	4.89	4.60	4.30		4.89
4. Were special techniques successful	16	2	1	2	1	3	10	4.12	404/ 948	4.12	4.00	3.95	3.89	4.12
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	34	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 221	****	****	4.16	4.45	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	34	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 243	****	****	4.12	4.47	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	34	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 212	****	****	4.40	4.62	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	34	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 209	****	****	4.35	4.64	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	31	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	****/ 555	****	4.57	4.29	4.33	****
Seminar														
	34	0	0	0	0	0	1	E 00	****/ 88	****	5.00	4.54	3.75	****
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	34	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 85	****	4.83	4.47	3.73	***
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	34	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 81	****	4.50	4.43	3.67	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	34	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 92	****	4.33	4.35	5.00	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	32	0	1	0	0	1	1		****/ 288	****	3.67	3.68		****
J. Were criteria for grading made crear	22	U		U	U	1		3.33	/ 200		3.07	3.00	3.03	
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	34	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.06	3.93	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	34	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.09	4.05	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	34	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.47	4.49	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	34	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.38	3.66	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	31	0	0	2	1	1	0	2.75	****/ 312	****	3.74	3.68	3.59	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	34	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 53	****	****	4.30	4.07	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	34	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.16	1.50	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	34	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 41	****	****	4.43	3.50	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	34	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 24	****	****	4.42	2.00	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	29	0	0	1	1	3	1	3.67	****/ 110	***	3.86	3.99	3.72	***

Title COMMON LAW&LEGAL ANALY

Instructor:

Enrollment: 35 Questionnaires: 35

Baltimore County MILLER, KERWIN Fall 2008

Page 1342 FEB 11, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

University of Maryland

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA	A	Expected	d Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	 А	14	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	11
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	0	В	5						
56-83	5	2.00-2.99	2	C	1	General	5	Under-grad	35	Non-major	24
84-150	6	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	11	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	h
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	16	_			
				?	2						

Title STATE & LOCAL POLITICS

Instructor: WAGNER, GEORGE

Enrollment:

39 Questionnaires: 38

# Fall 2008 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

University of Maryland

Baltimore County

Page 1343 FEB 11, 2009 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	_	^	0	0	0	1 1	1.0	4 44	726/1640	4 44	4 51	4 00	4 00	1 11
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	6 6	0	0	0	2 5	14 5	16 22	4.44	736/1649 521/1648	4.44	4.51 4.31	4.28 4.23	4.29 4.25	4.44 4.53
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	6	0	0	1	2	10	19	4.33	593/1375	4.33	4.31	4.23	4.25	4.33
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	7	10	0	0	4	3	14	4.48	538/1595	4.48	4.33	4.20	4.22	4.48
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	6	1	0	0	2	10	19	4.55	334/1533	4.55	4.47	4.04	4.04	4.55
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	7	12	0	0	3	8	8	4.26	675/1512		4.25	4.10	4.14	4.26
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	8	0	0	0	2	8	20	4.60	395/1623		4.28	4.16	4.21	4.60
8. How many times was class cancelled	7	0	0	0	0	6	25	4.81	833/1646	4.81	4.64	4.69	4.63	4.81
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	13	1	1	0	2	17	4	3.96	987/1621	3.96	4.23	4.06	4.01	3.96
Tarkuna														
Lecture 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	8	0	1	2	1	11	15	1 22	1137/1568	4.23	4.64	4.43	4.39	4.23
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	8	0	0	0	1	1	28	4.23	591/1572	4.23	4.85	4.43	4.39	4.23
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	8	0	0	0	4	5	21	4.57	590/1564	4.57	4.48	4.28	4.27	4.57
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	8	0	1	0	5	5	19	4.37	871/1559		4.49	4.29		4.37
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	8	16	1	1	1	2	9	4.21	541/1352		3.95	3.98	4.07	
									,					
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	2	8	16	4.54	418/1384	4.54	4.31	4.08	3.99	4.54
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	12	0	1	0	4	7	14	4.27	825/1382	4.27	4.48	4.29	4.19	4.27
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	12	0	0	0	2	3	21	4.73	449/1368	4.73	4.60	4.30	4.21	4.73
4. Were special techniques successful	12	13	1	1	1	2	8	4.15	385/ 948	4.15	4.00	3.95	3.89	4.15
Laboratory														
Laboratory L. Did the lab increase understanding of the material 36 0 0 0 0 1 1 4.50 ****/ 221 **** **** 4.16 4.45 ****														
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	36	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 243	****	****	4.12	4.47	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	37	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 212	****	****	4.40	4.62	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	36	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 209	****	****	4.35	4.64	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	20	0	0	0	0	1	17	4.94	137/ 555	4.94	4.57	4.29	4.33	4.94
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	37	0	0	0	0	0	1	5 00	****/ 88	****	5.00	4.54	3.75	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	23	0	0	0	0	15	0	4.00	83/ 288		3.67		3.65	
o, nore orrectia for grading made orear	23	Ü	Ü	ŭ	Ü		Ü	1.00	03, 200	1.00	3.07	3.00	3.03	1.00
Field Work														
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	20	0	0	1	0	17	0	3.89	176/ 312	3.89	3.74	3.68	3.59	3.89
Self Paced														
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	31	0	1	0	0	6	0	3.57	****/ 110	****	3.86	3.99	3.72	****
Frequ	ency	Dist	cribu	ıtior	1									

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA	A	Expecte	ed Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	16	Required for Majors	7	Graduate	0	Major	17
28-55	7	1.00-1.99	0	В	11						
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	3	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	38	Non-major	21
84-150	6	3.00-3.49	4	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	11	F	0	Electives	2	#### - Means	there	are not enough	n
				P	0			responses to	be sig	nificant	
				I	0	Other	19	_			
				?	0						

Title INTRO TO PUBLIC ADMIN

Instructor: HUSSEY, LAURA

Enrollment: 22

Questionnaires: 21

Fall 2008

University of Maryland Baltimore County

Page 1344

FEB 11, 2009

Job IRBR3029

			Fre	eauer	ncies	\$		Inst	tructor	Course	Dept.	UMBC:	Level	Sect
Ouestions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank		_		Mean	
× 400 010110														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	11	0	1	0	1	1	7	4.30	912/1649	4.47	4.51	4.28	4.29	4.30
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	11	0	1	0	1	2	6	4.20	966/1648	4.35	4.31	4.23	4.25	4.20
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	11	0	1	0	1	1	7	4.30	763/1375	4.35	4.38	4.27	4.37	4.30
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	11	0	1	0	1	3	5		1010/1595	4.22	4.33	4.20	4.22	4.10
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	12	0	1	1	1	1	5	3.89	935/1533	4.14	4.47	4.04	4.04	3.89
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	13	0	1	1	0	3	_		1119/1512	3.97		4.10	4.14	3.75
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	12	0	1	1	0	2			1029/1623	4.36	4.28	4.16	4.14	4.00
	12	1	0	0	0	1								
8. How many times was class cancelled			0	0	-	_	-	4.88	714/1646	4.71	4.64	4.69	4.63	4.88
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	13	0	U	U	1	5	2	4.13	835/1621	4.18	4.23	4.06	4.01	4.13
T - whome														
Lecture			_				_					4 40	4 00	
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	12	0	1	0	0	0	8	4.56	791/1568	4.71		4.43	4.39	4.56
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	12	0	1	0	0	1	7		1289/1572	4.67	4.85	4.70	4.73	4.44
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	12	0	1	0	0	0	8	4.56	600/1564	4.60	4.48	4.28	4.27	4.56
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	12	0	1	0	0	0	8	4.56	640/1559	4.69	4.49	4.29	4.33	4.56
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	13	0	1	0	1	2	4	4.00	690/1352	4.15	3.95	3.98	4.07	4.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	14	0	1	0	0	1	5	4.29	655/1384	4.36	4.31	4.08	3.99	4.29
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	14	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	435/1382	4.64	4.48	4.29	4.19	4.71
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	14	0	0	0	1	1	5	4.57	601/1368	4.69	4.60	4.30	4.21	4.57
4. Were special techniques successful	15	1	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	****/ 948	4.50	4.00	3.95	3.89	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 221	****	****	4.16	4.45	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 243	***	****	4.12	4.47	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 212	****	****	4.40	4.62	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 209	****	****	4.35	4.64	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	18	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/ 555	5.00	4.57	4.29	4.33	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 88	****	5.00	4.54	3.75	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 85	****	4.83	4.47	3.33	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 81	****	4.50	4.43	3.67	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 92	****	4.33	4.35	5.00	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	19	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/ 288	4.00	3.67		3.65	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.06	3.93	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.09	4.05	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.47	4.49	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	20	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 39	****	****	4.38	3.66	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	19	0	0	0	0	1	1		****/ 312	4.00	3.74	3.68	3.59	****
5. 214 conferences help you carry out freta activities	10	3	9	9	J	-	_	1.50	, 512	1.00	5.71	5.00	5.55	
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 53	****	****	4.30	4.07	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.16	1.50	****
		0		0	0	0		5.00	****/ 41	****	****			****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	20	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 24	****	****	4.43	3.50	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	20	0	0	0	-	-	_	5.00	, 21	****			2.00	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	18	U	U	U	0	2	1	4.33	****/ 110	^^^*	3.86	3.99	3.72	* * * * *

Title INTRO TO PUBLIC ADMIN

Instructor: HUSSEY, LAURA

Enrollment: 22
Questionnaires: 21

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2008 Page 1344 FEB 11, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	 А	1	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	2
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	В	2						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	1	C	1	General	1	Under-grad	21	Non-major	19
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	0	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	0	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	h
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	1	Other	4	_			
				?	0						

Title INTRO TO PUBLIC ADMIN

Instructor: HUSSEY, LAURA

Enrollment: 43
Questionnaires: 36

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2008 Page 1345 FEB 11, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Course Dept UMBC Level Sect

#### Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequencies

Instructor

							Fre	equei	ncie	S		Inst	tructor	Course	e Dept	OMBC	гелет	Sect
		Question	s		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
1 5'1		Genera	_		_	0	•	•	0		1.0	4 60	481 /1640	4 45	4 = 1	4 00	4 00	4 60
		w insights,ski			6	0	0	0	0	11	19	4.63	,		4.51	4.28	4.29	4.63
		ctor make clear			6	0	0	1	2	8	19	4.50	556/1648		4.31	4.23	4.25	4.50
		estions reflec			6	0	0	1	3	9	17	4.40	665/1375		4.38	4.27	4.37	4.40
		ations reflect			6	3	0	1	4	7	15	4.33	722/1595			4.20	4.22	4.33
				what you learned	8	0	1	2	1	5	19	4.39	485/1533		4.47	4.04	4.04	4.39
				o what you learned	10	0	0	2	4	7	13	4.19				4.10		4.19
		g system clearl		ined	8	0	0	0	3	2	23		261/1623			4.16	4.21	
8. How ma	ny times	was class canc	elled		8	0	0	0	0	13	15	4.54	1166/1646	4.71	4.64	4.69	4.63	4.54
9. How wo	uld you g	grade the overa	ll teac	hing effectiveness	14	1	0	0	3	10	8	4.24	709/1621	4.18	4.23	4.06	4.01	4.24
		Lectur	<b>e</b>															
1 Were t	he instru	ctor's lecture		prepared	8	0	0	0	0	4	24	4.86	316/1568	4.71	4.64	4.43	4.39	4.86
		ctor seem inter			8	0	0	0	1	1			615/1572			4.70	4.73	
				explained clearly	8	0	0	1	2	3		4.64				4.28	4.27	
		es contribute t			7	0	0	0	2	1			295/1559		4.49	4.29		4.83
				-	8	1	1	1	5	2	18							
5. Did au	alovisual	. tecnniques en	nance y	our understanding	8	1	Τ	Т	5	2	18	4.30	488/1352	4.15	3.95	3.98	4.07	4.30
		Discus	sion															
1. Did cl	ass discu	ssions contrib	ute to	what you learned	6	0	1	1	1	8	19	4.43	509/1384	4.36	4.31	4.08	3.99	4.43
2. Were a	ll studen	nts actively en	courage	d to participate	6	0	0	0	5	3	22	4.57	570/1382	4.64	4.48	4.29	4.19	4.57
				d open discussion	6	0	0	1	0	3	26	4.80	369/1368	4.69	4.60	4.30	4.21	4.80
4. Were s	pecial te	chniques succe	ssful	-	6	0	1	0	1	9	19	4.50	203/ 948	4.50	4.00	3.95	3.89	4.50
		Labora	tory															
5. Were r	equiremen		-	early specified	22	0	0	0	0	0	14	5.00	1/ 555	5.00	4.57	4.29	4.33	5.00
		Semina	r															
5. Were c	riteria f	or grading mad	e clear		27	0	0	0	0	9	0	4.00	83/ 288	4.00	3.67	3.68	3.65	4.00
		Field	Work															
5. Did co	nferences	s help you carr	y out f	ield activities	23	0	0	0	0	13	0	4.00	68/ 312	4.00	3.74	3.68	3.59	4.00
		Self	Paced															
5. Were t	here enou	igh proctors fo	r all t	he students	32	0	0	1	0	3	0	3.50	****/ 110	****	3.86	3.99	3.72	****
				Frequ	ency	Dis	tribu	ution	n									
Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	ason	S			Ту	pe			Majors	<b>:</b>
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	A 11		Red	quire	ed fo	or M	ajor	s	1	Graduat	е	0	Majo	or	14
28-55	7	1.00-1.99	1	B 12		<b>a</b>		1				г	TTo al a second		2.6	Mari		2.2
56-83	8	2.00-2.99	6	C 5		Gei	nera.	L				5	Under-g	raa .	36	Non-	-major	22
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	5	D 0								_						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	8	F 0		Ele	ectiv	<i>r</i> es				0	#### -					jh
				P 0							_		respons	es to 1	oe sıgr	niticar	1t	
				I 0		Ot1	ner				2	14						
				? 0														

COMPARATIVE POLITICS

Title

Instructor: FORESTIERE, CAR

Enrollment: 48 Questionnaires: 48

## University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2008

Page 1346 FEB 11, 2009 Job IRBR3029

			Fre	quer	ncie	s		Inst	cructor	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	12	0	0	0	1	5	30	4.81	274/1649	4.78	4.51	4.28	4.29	4.81
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	12	0	0	0	2	7	27	4.69	323/1648	4.67	4.31	4.23	4.25	4.69
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	12	0	0	0	2	8	26	4.67	401/1375	4.68	4.38	4.27	4.37	4.67
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	12	15	1	0	1	3	16	4.57	417/1595	4.56	4.33	4.20	4.22	4.57
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	12	0	1	1	1	5	28	4.61	280/1533	4.60	4.47	4.04	4.04	4.61
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	12	18	0	0	2	0	16	4.78	179/1512	4.64	4.25	4.10	4.14	4.78
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	12	0	0	0	1	2	33	4.89	130/1623	4.84	4.28	4.16	4.21	4.89
8. How many times was class cancelled	12	0	0	0	1	23	12		1364/1646	4.29	4.64	4.69	4.63	4.31
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	18	1	1	0	1	13	14	4.34	583/1621	4.47	4.23	4.06	4.01	4.34
T a selection														
Lecture	1.0	0	^	0	0	4	20	4 00	207/1560	4 00	1 (1	1 12	4 20	4 00
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	16	0	0	0	0	4 1	28	4.88	287/1568	4.88	4.64	4.43	4.39	4.88
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	16	0	0	0	1	3	31 28	4.97 4.84	237/1572 225/1564	4.91 4.81	4.85	4.70 4.28	4.73 4.27	4.97
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	16 16	0	0	0	0	3	29	4.91	205/1564	4.88	4.48 4.49	4.29	4.27	4.84 4.91
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	16	1	1	0	4	<i>5</i>	21	4.45	351/1352	4.66	3.95	3.98	4.33	4.45
5. Did addiovisual techniques emmance your understanding	10	_		U	4	5	21	4.45	331/1332	4.43	3.93	3.90	4.07	4.45
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	21	0	2	1	2	5	17	4.26	673/1384	4.32	4.31	4.08	3.99	4.26
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	21	0	1	2	2	3	19	4.37	740/1382	4.58	4.48	4.29	4.19	4.37
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	21	0	0	1	0	3	23	4.78	403/1368	4.78	4.60	4.30	4.21	4.78
4. Were special techniques successful	21	14	1	0	0	3	9	4.46	234/ 948	4.05	4.00	3.95	3.89	4.46
1. Here special commiques successful			_	Ü	Ū			1.10	201, 310	1.05	1.00	3.75	3.03	1.10
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	46	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 221	****	****	4.16	4.45	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	47	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 243	****	****	4.12	4.47	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	46	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 212	****	****	4.40	4.62	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	46	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 209	****	****	4.35	4.64	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	35	1	1	1	4	0	6	3.75	451/ 555	4.11	4.57	4.29	4.33	3.75
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	46	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 88	****	5.00	4.54	3.75	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	46	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 85	****	4.83	4.47	3.33	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	46	0	0	0	0	0	2		****/ 81	****	4.50	4.43	3.67	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	46	0	0	0	0	0	2		****/ 92	****	4.33	4.35	5.00	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	40	0	0	3	0	3	2	3.50	****/ 288	****	3.67	3.68	3.65	****
Field Work			•	•	_	•		- 00						
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	47	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.06	3.93	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	47	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.09	4.05	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	46	1	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 39	****	****	4.47	4.49	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	46 36	1 1	0 1	2	0 1	0 6	1 1		****/ 39 ****/ 312			4.38	3.66	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	30	Т	Т	2	Т	О	Τ.	3.30	***/ 312	3.15	3.74	3.68	3.59	
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	46	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 53	****	****	4.30	4.07	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	46	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.16	1.50	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	46	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 41	****	****	4.43	3.50	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	46	1	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 24	****	****	4.42	2.00	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	36	1	0	3	0	7	1		****/ 110	****	3.86	3.99	3.72	****
1 Should shought products for all the beautiful	50	_	3	3	3	,	_	2.33	, 110		2.00	2.,,,	٥.,2	

Title COMPARATIVE POLITICS

Instructor: FORESTIERE, CAR

Enrollment: 48
Questionnaires: 48

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2008 Page 1346 FEB 11, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expecte	d Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	1	 А	10	Required for Majors	3	Graduate	0	Major	10
28-55	6	1.00-1.99	0	В	8						
56-83	5	2.00-2.99	4	C	7	General	1	Under-grad	48	Non-major	38
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	6	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means	there	are not enough	h
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	22	=			
				?	2						

Title COMPARATIVE POLITICS

Instructor: FORESTIERE, CAR

Enrollment: 44 Questionnaires: 44

#### University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2008

Page 1347 FEB 11, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Questions	NR	NA	Fre	equer 2	ncie:	s 4	5	Ins Mean	tructor Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean		Sect Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	11	0	0	0	2	4	27	4.76	328/1649	4.78	4.51	4.28	4.29	4.76
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	11	0	0	0	2	8	23	4.64	401/1648	4.67	4.31	4.23	4.25	4.64
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	11	0	0	0	2	6	25	4.70	370/1375	4.68	4.38	4.27	4.37	4.70
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	11	15	0	1	0	5	12	4.56	440/1595	4.56	4.33	4.20	4.22	4.56
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	1	0	10	21	4.59	295/1533	4.60	4.47	4.04	4.04	4.59
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	12	18	0	1	0	4	9	4.50	380/1512	4.64	4.25	4.10	4.14	4.50
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	11	0	0	1	0	4	28	4.79	189/1623	4.84	4.28	4.16	4.21	4.79
8. How many times was class cancelled	11	1	0	0	1	21	10	4.28	1377/1646	4.29	4.64	4.69	4.63	4.28
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	15	0	0	0	1	10	18	4.59	305/1621	4.47	4.23	4.06	4.01	4.59
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	12	0	0	0	1	2	29	4.88	287/1568	4.88	4.64	4.43	4.39	4.88
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	12	0	0	0	2	1	29	4.84	740/1572	4.91	4.85	4.70	4.73	4.84
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	12	0	0	0	1	5	26	4.78	294/1564	4.81	4.48	4.28	4.27	4.78
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	1	0	2	29	4.84	272/1559	4.88	4.49	4.29	4.33	4.84
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	13	4	0	1	3	4	19	4.52	297/1352	4.49	3.95	3.98	4.07	4.52
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	20	0	0	1	2	8	13	4.38	571/1384		4.31	4.08	3.99	4.38
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	20	0	0	0	1	3	20	4.79	352/1382	4.58	4.48	4.29	4.19	4.79
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	20	0	0	0	1	3	20	4.79	380/1368	4.78	4.60	4.30	4.21	4.79
4. Were special techniques successful	20	10	2	3	1	0	8	3.64	656/ 948	4.05	4.00	3.95	3.89	3.64
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	42	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 221	****	****	4.16	4.45	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	43	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 243	****	****	4.12	4.47	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	43	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 212	****	****	4.40	4.62	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	43	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 209	****	****	4.35	4.64	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	29	0	0	0	4	0	11	4.47	305/ 555	4.11	4.57	4.29	4.33	4.47
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	42	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 88	****	5.00	4.54	3.75	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	43	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 85	****	4.83	4.47	3.33	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	43	0	0	0	0	0	1	0.00	****/ 81 ****/ 92	****	4.50	4.43	3.67	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned 5. Were criteria for grading made clear	43 34	0 1	0 1	1	0	0 6	1	5.00	****/ 92 ****/ 288	****	4.33 3.67	4.35 3.68	5.00 3.65	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	34	1	Τ	Τ	U	О	1	3.50	****/ 288		3.07	3.08	3.05	
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	43	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.06	3.93	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	43	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.09	4.05	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	43	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.47	4.49	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	43	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.38	3.66	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	31	0	0	6	0	6	1	3.15	253/ 312	3.15	3.74	3.68	3.59	3.15
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	43	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 53	****	****	4.30	4.07	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	43	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.16	1.50	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	43	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 41	****	****	4.43	3.50	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	43	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 24	****	****	4.42	2.00	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	38	1	0	1	0	3	1	3.80	****/ 110	****	3.86	3.99	3.72	****

Title COMPARATIVE POLITICS

Instructor: FORESTIERE, CAR

Enrollment: 44
Questionnaires: 44

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2008 Page 1347 FEB 11, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits E	Earned	Cum. GPA		Expecte	ed Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	 А	8	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	14
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	1	В	12						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	3	C	0	General	3	Under-grad	44	Non-major	30
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	4	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	7	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enoug	h
				P	0			responses to	be sig	nificant	
				I	0	Other	21	-			
				?	4						

Title INTERNATIONAL RELATION

HODY, CYNTHIA (Instr. A) Instructor:

Enrollment: 49 Questionnaires: 35

# Fall 2008

University of Maryland Baltimore County

Page 1348 FEB 11, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Student	Course	Evaluat	ion	Question	ınaire
---------	--------	---------	-----	----------	--------

Questions	NR	NA	Fre	eque:	ncie 3	s 4	5	Ins Mean	tructor Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
General	_		•		_	_				4 00	4 = 4	4 00	4 00	
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	3	0	0 3	1 5	9	10	14 3		1096/1649	4.29	4.51	4.28	4.29 4.25	4.13
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	3	0	<i>3</i> 5	5 4	8	12 9	3 6		1569/1648 1293/1375	3.64 3.62	4.31	4.23	4.25	3.22
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	4	4	1	3	10	9	4		1425/1595	3.76	4.33	4.27	4.22	3.44
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	4	0	2	0	7	7	15	4.06		4.27	4.47	4.04	4.04	4.06
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	4	3	3	1	8	9	7		1221/1512	3.84	4.25	4.10	4.14	3.57
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	4	1	2	3	7	5	13		1241/1623	3.99	4.28	4.16	4.21	3.80
8. How many times was class cancelled	5	0	0	0	0	16			1230/1646	4.44	4.64	4.69	4.63	4.47
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	11	0	2	1	6	13	2		1345/1621			4.06	4.01	
y. Non would you grade one overall codoming directiveness		Ü	_	_	ŭ		_	3.30	1010,1021	3.17	11.25	1.00	1.01	3.10
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	7	8	7	10	3.63	1435/1568	4.12	4.64	4.43	4.39	3.63
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	1	3	28	4.84	740/1572	4.93	4.85	4.70	4.73	4.92
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	1	4	12	10	5	3.44	1415/1564	3.76	4.48	4.28	4.27	3.44
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	4	5	8	7	7	3.26	1440/1559	3.57	4.49	4.29	4.33	3.13
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	11	4	1	8	5	3	3.10	1208/1352	3.59	3.95	3.98	4.07	3.10
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	9	0	2	6	6	8	4		1198/1384		4.31	4.08	3.99	3.23
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	9	0	1	6	4	6	9		1170/1382	3.78	4.48	4.29	4.19	3.62
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	1	3	5	9	8		1090/1368	3.99	4.60	4.30	4.21	
4. Were special techniques successful	9	17	1	3	4	0	1	2.67	901/ 948	2.67	4.00	3.95	3.89	2.67
T all arra h arra														
Laboratory 5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	29	1	0	0	1	0	4	1 60	****/ 555	****	1 57	4.29	4.33	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	29		U	U	1	U	4	4.00	/ 555		4.5/	4.29	4.33	
Seminar														
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	30	1	0	3	0	1	0	2.50	****/ 288	****	3.67	3.68	3.65	****
or here orrectia for grading made crear	50	_	Ü	9	ŭ	_	ŭ	2.50	, 200		3.07	3.00	3.03	
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	34	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.06	3.93	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	34	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.09	4.05	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	22	1	0	2	0	10	0	3.67	207/ 312	3.67	3.74	3.68	3.59	3.67
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	34	0	1	0	0	0	0		****/ 53	****	****	4.30	4.07	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	34	0	0	0	1	0	0		****/ 30	****	****	4.16	1.50	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	34	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 41	****	****	4.43	3.50	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	26	1	0	0	0	7	1	4.13	****/ 110	****	3.86	3.99	3.72	****
Frequency Distribution														
Frequency Distribution														

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	d Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	4	0.00-0.99	0	А	7	Required for Majors	7	Graduate	0	Major	13
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	0	В	8						
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	2	C	9	General	5	Under-grad	35	Non-major	22
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5	F	0	Electives	2	#### - Means	there	are not enough	a
				P	1			responses to	be sig	nificant	
				I	0	Other	16	-			
				?	3						

Course-Section: POLI 280 0101 University of Maryland Title INTERNATIONAL RELATION

Baltimore County

Page 1349

FEB 11, 2009

Job IRBR3029

Instructor: (Instr. B) Fall 2008 Enrollment: 49

Questionnaires: 35 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

		Questions				Fr 1	eque:	ncie 3	s 4	5	Inst Mean	tructor Rank	Cours Mean	e Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
		General															
1 Did	vou gain n		s from this course	3	0	0	1	8	9	14	4 13	1096/1649	4.29	4.51	4.28	4.29	4.13
		ctor make clear t		3	0	3	5	9	12	3		1569/1648			4.23	4.25	3.22
			the expected goals	3	0	5	4	8	9	6		1293/1375			4.27	4.37	3.22
		uations reflect t		4	4	1	3	10	9	4		1425/1595			4.20	4.22	3.44
			e to what you learned	4	0	2	0	7	7	15	4.06				4.04	4.04	4.06
			ute to what you learned	4	3	3	1	8	9	7	3.57	1221/1512			4.10	4.14	3.57
		g system clearly		4	1	2	3	7	5	13	3.80	1241/1623	3.99	4.28	4.16	4.21	3.80
8. How	many times	was class cancel	led	5	0	0	0	0	16	14	4.47	1230/1646	4.44	4.64	4.69	4.63	4.47
9. How	would you	grade the overall	teaching effectiveness	25	0	3	1	3	2	1	2.70	1568/1621	3.47	4.23	4.06	4.01	3.10
		Lecture															
1. Wer	e the instr	uctor's lectures	well prepared	27	0	1	1	1	0	5	3.88	****/1568	4.12	4.64	4.43	4.39	3.63
			ted in the subject	26	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1572	4.93	4.85	4.70	4.73	4.92
			and explained clearly	26	0	2	0	2	2	3		1411/1564		4.48	4.28	4.27	3.44
		es contribute to		26	0	2	1	2	3			1479/1559			4.29		3.13
5. Did	audiovisua	l techniques enha	nce your understanding	26	2	1	0	2	3	1	3.43	****/1352	3.59	3.95	3.98	4.07	3.10
		Discussi			_	_	_		_								
			e to what you learned	9	0	2	6	6	8			1198/1384			4.08	3.99	3.23
			uraged to participate	9	0	1	6	4	6	9		1170/1382		4.48	4.29	4.19	3.62
		_	ir and open discussion	9	0	1	3	5	9			1090/1368		4.60	4.30	4.21	3.77
4. Wer	e special t	echniques success	tul	9	17	1	3	4	0	Ι	2.67	901/ 948	3 2.67	4.00	3.95	3.89	2.67
5. Wer	e requireme	Laborato ents for lab repor	ry ts clearly specified	29	1	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	****/ 555	; ****	4.57	4.29	4.33	****
	-	Seminar															
5. Wer	e criteria	for grading made	clear	30	1	0	3	0	1	0	2.50	****/ 288	****	3.67	3.68	3.65	****
		Field Wo	rk														
1. Did	field expe	rience contribute	to what you learned	34	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.06	3.93	****
2. Did	you clearl	y understand your	evaluation criteria	34	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.09	4.05	****
5. Did	conference	s help you carry	out field activities	22	1	0	2	0	10	0	3.67	207/ 312	3.67	3.74	3.68	3.59	3.67
		Self Pa															
			e to what you learned	34	0	1	0	0	0	0		****/ 53		****	4.30	4.07	****
		tions make clear		34	0	0	0	1	0	0		****/ 30		****	4.16	1.50	****
	-	acts with the ins	-	34	0	1	0	0	0	0		****/ 41		****	4.43	3.50	***
5. Wer	e there eno	ough proctors for	all the students	26	1	0	0	0	7	1	4.13	****/ 110	****	3.86	3.99	3.72	****
			Frequ	ıency	Dis	trib	utio	n									
Credit	s Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades				Re	ason	s			Τχ	pe			Majors	;
00-27	4	0.00-0.99	 O A 7		Re	 quir	 ed f	or M	 ajor	` `S	7	 Graduat	:e	0	Majo	 or	13
28-55 56-83			D B 8 2 C 9		Co	- nera	1				5	Under-c	mad	35	Non	-major	22
84-15		3.00-3.49	3 D 0		Ge.	nerd	1					onaer-6	jiau	رر	11011-	ıııa JOL	44
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5 F 0 P 1		El	ecti	ves				2	#### - respons				_	ſh
			I 0		Ot!	her				1	.6	T CPPOIIS	, ca co .	oc argi	iiiicai	10	
			? 3	Other 16													

Title INTERNATIONAL RELATION

Instructor: HODY, CYNTHIA

Enrollment: 48
Questionnaires: 47

Baltimore County Fall 2008 Page 1350 FEB 11, 2009 Job IRBR3029

#### Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

University of Maryland

		Question	3		NR	Frequencies					5	Inst Mean	tructor Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
1 Did	u godn nou	Genera insights,ski		this source	26	0	0	0	2	4	15	4.62	497/1649	4.29	4.51	4.28	4.29	4.62
		r make clear			26 26	0	0	0	3	4	13	4.62	599/1648		4.31	4.28	4.25	4.62
		stions reflec			26	0	0	2	1	4	14	4.43	641/1375		4.31	4.27	4.37	4.43
		cions reflect			26	0	0	1	1	8		4.38	660/1595	3.76	4.33	4.20	4.22	4.38
				hat you learned	26	0	0	0	2	3	16	4.67	241/1533	4.27	4.47	4.04	4.04	4.67
	_	_		what you learned	26	0	1	0	2	5	13	4.38			4.25	4.10		4.38
		system clearly			26	0	0	1	3	4	13	4.38	659/1623		4.28	4.16	4.21	4.38
		system crearr		nea	26	0	0	0		11	9		1302/1646		4.64	4.69		4.38
				ing effectiveness	31	1	0	1	1	7	-	4.20	754/1621			4.06	4.01	
J. 110	ara you gro			1119 01100011011000	-	_	Ü	_	_	•	ŭ	1120	,01,1021	3.17	1123	1.00	1.01	1.20
1 Wara t	ho inatruat	Lecture or's lecture:		roparod	26	0	1	0	0	4	16	4.62	715/1568	4.12	4.64	4.43	4.39	4.62
		or seem inter	_	-	27	0	0	0	0	1	19	4.02	355/1572		4.85	4.43	4.73	4.02
				plained clearly	27	0	1	0	1	6	12	4.40	780/1564		4.48	4.70	4.73	4.40
		contribute to		-	27	0	0	1	3	2	14	4.45	777/1559	3.70	4.49	4.29	4.33	4.45
				ur understanding	27	7	0	1	3	3	6	4.43	650/1352		3.95	3.98	4.07	
J. Did ad	uiovisuai (	eciniiques en	lance yo	ur understanding	27	,	U	1	,	J	O	4.00	030/1332	3.37	3.93	3.70	4.07	4.00
		Discus																
				hat you learned	30	0	0	0	6	3	8	4.12	,		4.31	4.08	3.99	4.12
				to participate	30	0	1	1	2	4	9	4.12	917/1382		4.48	4.29	4.19	4.12
				open discussion	31	0	0	0	2	5	9	4.44	722/1368		4.60	4.30	4.21	4.44
4. Were s	pecial tech	niques succe	sstul		31	9	1	2	1	0	3	3.29	****/ 948	2.67	4.00	3.95	3.89	****
		Labora	tory															
5. Were r	equirements	for lab rep	orts cle	arly specified	41	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	****/ 555	***	4.57	4.29	4.33	***
		Semina	r															
5. Were c	riteria for	grading made	e clear		42	0	0	2	0	3	0	3.20	****/ 288	***	3.67	3.68	3.65	****
		Field	Work															
5. Did co	nferences h			eld activities	37	0	0	0	1	9	0	3.90	****/ 312	3.67	3.74	3.68	3.59	****
		- 75	_ ,															
5. Were ti	here enough	Self : proctors fo		e students	38	0	0	4	0	4	1	3.22	****/ 110	****	3.86	3.99	3.72	****
3. Weze e.	nore energy	r proceeds re-		o seaderes	50	ŭ	Ü	-	Ü	-	_	3.22	, 110		3.00	3.33	3.72	
				Frequ	ency	Dist	ribu	ıtion	1									
Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	sons				Туј	рe			Majors	;
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	 A 5		 Rec	nuire	d fo	or Ma	ior	 s	0	Graduat	 e	0	Majo	 r	9
28-55	5	1.00-1.99	0	B 10		٠٠٠٠	1411	10	,		~	-	or adda to	_	5	1.10.10	-	
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	1	C 4		Ger	neral	_				1	Under-g	rad 4	17	Non-	major	38
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	3	D 0									9-				5	
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	6	F 0		Ele	ectiv	res				0	#### - I	Means t	here a	re not	enoug	ıh
				P 0									response					
				I 0		Oth	ner				1	.8	_		3			
	? 0																	

Course-Section: POLI 300 0101 University of Maryland QUANT POLI SCI

5. Were there enough proctors for all the students

Questionnaires: 52

Title Baltimore County Instructor: MILLER, NICHOLA Fall 2008 Enrollment: 52

Questions	Quartiana	MD	377		_	ncies		_		cructor	Course	_			
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course 25 0 5 2 8 7 5 3.19 1576/1649 3.19 4.51 4.28 4.27 3.19 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals 25 0 0 5 8 6 8 3.63 1434/1648 3.63 4.31 4.23 4.18 3.63 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals 25 0 0 5 8 6 8 3.63 1434/1648 3.63 4.38 4.27 4.22 3.63 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals 25 6 2 1 5 2 1 3.90 120/1595 3.90 4.33 4.20 4.21 3.90 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 27 6 0 7 3 7 3 5 2.84 1484/1533 2.84 4.47 4.04 4.05 2.84 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 26 0 2 1 5 8 10 3.88 192/1623 3.88 4.28 4.16 4.08 3.88 8. How many times was class cancelled 26 0 2 1 5 8 10 3.88 192/1623 3.88 4.28 4.16 4.08 3.88 8. How many times was class cancelled 27 0 1 2 5 9 2 3.42 1393/1621 3.42 4.23 4.06 4.02 3.42 1.09 1.00 1.00 1.00 1.00 1.00 1.00 1.00	Questions	NK	NA				- <del>4</del> 		mean	Rank	Mean	mean	mean	mean	mean
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course 25 0 5 2 8 7 5 3.19 1576/1649 3.19 4.51 4.28 4.27 3.19 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals 25 0 0 5 8 6 8 3.63 1434/1648 3.63 4.31 4.23 4.18 3.63 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals 25 0 0 5 8 6 8 3.63 1434/1648 3.63 4.38 4.27 4.22 3.63 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals 25 6 2 1 5 2 1 3.90 120/1595 3.90 4.33 4.20 4.21 3.90 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 27 6 0 7 3 7 3 5 2.84 1484/1533 2.84 4.47 4.04 4.05 2.84 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 26 0 2 1 5 8 10 3.88 192/1623 3.88 4.28 4.16 4.08 3.88 8. How many times was class cancelled 26 0 2 1 5 8 10 3.88 192/1623 3.88 4.28 4.16 4.08 3.88 8. How many times was class cancelled 27 0 1 2 5 9 2 3.42 1393/1621 3.42 4.23 4.06 4.02 3.42 1.09 1.00 1.00 1.00 1.00 1.00 1.00 1.00	General														
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals 25 0 2 2 8 7 8 3.63 1434/1648 3.63 4.38 4.23 4.18 3.63 4. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals 25 0 0 5 8 6 8 3.63 1162/1375 3.63 4.28 4.27 4.22 3.63 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals 25 0 0 5 8 6 8 3.63 1162/1375 3.63 4.28 4.27 4.22 3.63 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals 25 0 0 5 8 6 8 3.63 1162/1375 3.63 4.28 4.27 4.22 3.63 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals 25 0 0 5 8 5 2 2 11 3.90 1202/1595 3.90 4.33 4.20 4.21 3.90 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 27 0 7 3 7 3 7 5 5 2.84 1484/1533 2.84 4.47 4.04 4.05 2.84 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 26 0 2 1 5 8 10 3.88 1192/1623 3.88 4.28 4.16 4.11 3.79 7. Was the grading system clearly explained 25 0 0 0 0 6 6 21 4.78 881/1646 4.78 4.64 4.69 4.67 4.78 8. How many times was class cancelled 25 0 0 0 0 6 6 21 4.78 881/1646 4.78 4.64 4.69 4.67 4.78 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 3 0 2 1 5 9 2 3.42 1393/1621 3.42 4.23 4.06 4.02 3.42 7.00 4.04 4.05 4.07 4.05 4.07 4.07 4.07 4.07 4.07 4.07 4.07 4.07		25	0	5	2	8	7	5	3.19	1576/1649	3.19	4.51	4.28	4.27	3.19
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   25				2				8							
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals   25 6 2 1 5 5 2 11 3.90 1202/1595 3.90 4.33 4.20 4.21 3.90 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 27 6 0 3 5 5 4 7 3.79 1101/1512 3.79 4.25 4.10 4.11 3.79 1.84 the grading system clearly explained 26 0 2 1 5 8 10 3.88 1192/1623 3.88 4.28 4.16 4.08 3.88 8. How many times was class cancelled 26 0 2 1 5 8 10 3.88 1192/1623 3.88 4.28 4.16 4.08 3.88 8. How many times was class cancelled 26 0 2 1 5 8 10 3.88 1192/1623 3.88 4.28 4.16 4.08 3.88 8. How mould you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 33 0 2 1 5 9 2 3.42 1393/1621 3.42 4.23 4.06 4.02 3.42    Lecture		25	0	0		8	6	8	3.63	1162/1375	3.63	4.38		4.22	3.63
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 27 0 7 3 7 3 5 2.84 1484/1533 2.84 4.47 4.04 4.05 2.84 6. Did written assigned readings system clearly explained 27 0 0 1 3 7 3 5 2.84 1884/1533 3.88 4.48 4.16 4.09 3.88 7. Was the grading system clearly explained 25 0 0 2 1 5 8 10 3.88 1192/1623 3.88 4.28 4.16 4.09 3.88 8. How many times was class cancelled 25 0 0 0 0 0 6 12 4.78 881/1644 4.78 4.64 4.69 4.67 4.78 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 33 0 2 1 5 9 2 3.42 1393/1621 3.42 4.23 4.06 4.02 3.42			6	2	1	5	2	11							3.90
7. Was the grading system clearly explained 26 0 2 1 5 8 10 3.88 1192/1623 3.88 4.28 4.16 4.08 3.88 8. How many times was class cancelled 25 0 0 0 0 0 6 21 4.78 881/1646 4.78 4.64 4.69 4.67 4.78 8.8 How many times was class cancelled 25 0 0 0 0 0 6 21 4.78 881/1646 4.78 4.64 4.69 4.67 4.78 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 33 0 2 1 5 9 2 3.42 1393/1621 3.42 4.23 4.06 4.02 3.42    Lecture 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 26 0 1 1 4 5 15 4.23 1137/1568 4.23 4.64 4.43 4.39 4.23   2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 27 0 1 2 5 3 14 4.08 1451/1572 4.08 4.85 4.70 4.64 4.08   3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 26 0 3 6 3 8 1 9 3.23 1443/1569 3.23 4.49 4.29 4.25 3.31   4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 26 0 5 3 8 1 9 9 3.23 1443/1569 3.23 4.49 4.29 4.23 3.23   5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 26 2 3 1 4 5 11 3.83 860/1352 3.83 3.95 3.98 3.97 3.83    Discussion 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 35 0 5 2 5 3 2 2.71 1331/1384 2.71 4.31 4.08 4.11 2.71   2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 35 0 2 2 1 6 6 3.71 1128/1382 3.71 4.48 4.29 4.37 3.71   3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 35 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 ****/ 248 **** 4.00 3.95 4.00 ****  Laboratory 2. Were you provided with adequate background information 50 0 0 0 1 0 0 1 3.50 ****/ 243 **** 4.16 4.07 ****  2. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 51 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 248 **** 4.00 3.95 4.00 ****  Seminar 1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 51 0 0 0 0 1 0 0 3.00 ****/ 288 **** 5.00 4.54 4.63 ****  **** Field Work 1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 51 0 0 0 0 1 0 0 3.00 ****/ 288 **** 5.00 4.54 4.63 ****  **** Field Work 2. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 51 0 0 0 0 1 0 0 3.00 ****/ 39 **** 4.06 3.59 ****  **** Did field experience contribute to what you learned 51 0 0 0 0 1 0 0 3.00 ****/ 39 **** 4.09 4.21 ****			0	7	3	7	3							4.05	2.84
8. How many times was class cancelled 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 33 0 2 1 5 9 2 3.42 1393/1621 3.42 4.23 4.06 4.02 3.42  Lecture 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 26 0 1 1 2 5 3 14 4.08 1451/1572 4.08 4.85 4.70 4.64 4.23 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 27 0 1 2 5 3 14 4.08 1451/1572 4.08 4.85 4.70 4.64 4.08 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 26 0 3 6 3 8 6 3.31 1446/1564 3.31 4.48 4.23 4.25 3.31 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 26 0 5 3 8 1 9 3.23 1443/1559 3.23 4.49 4.29 4.23 3.23 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 26 2 3 1 4 5 11 3.83 860/1352 3.83 3.95 3.98 3.97 3.73  1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 35 0 2 2 5 1 6 6 3.71 1128/1382 3.71 4.48 4.29 4.37 3.71 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 35 0 2 2 1 6 6 3.71 1128/1382 3.71 4.48 4.29 4.37 3.71 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 35 0 2 0 0 6 2 9 4.18 886/1368 4.18 4.60 4.30 4.39 4.18 4. Were special techniques successful 35 0 0 0 6 2 9 4.18 886/1368 4.18 4.60 4.30 4.39 4.18 5. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 51 0 0 0 0 1 3.50 *** 21 *** 4.50 *** 4.50 *** 4.20 *** 4.22 ****  Seminar  1. Mere assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 51 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 *** / 28 **** 4.57 4.29 4.22 ****  *** Seminar  1. Mere assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 51 0 0 0 0 1 0 0 3.00 *** / 28 **** 4.57 4.29 4.22 ****  *** Seminar  1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 45 1 0 0 0 0 1 0 0 3.00 **** / 48 **** 4.00 3.59 ****  *** Jeild Work  1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 51 0 0 0 0 1 0 0 3.00 **** / 48 **** 4.07 4.29 ****  5. Did you clearly understand your evaluation 51 0 0 0 0 1 0 0 3.00 **** / 48 **** 5.00 4.54 4.63 *****  4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations 51 0 0 0 0 1 0 0 3.00 **** / 39 ***** 4.09 4.21 ****  5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities 51 0 0 0 0 1 0 0 3.00 **** /	6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	27	6	0	3	5	4	7	3.79	1101/1512	3.79	4.25	4.10	4.11	3.79
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 33 0 2 1 5 9 2 3.42 1393/1621 3.42 4.23 4.06 4.02 3.42 Lecture  Lecture  1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 26 0 1 1 1 4 5 15 4.23 1137/1568 4.23 4.64 4.43 4.39 4.23 2.01 dthe instructor seem interested in the subject 27 0 1 2 5 3 14 4.08 1451/1572 4.08 4.85 4.70 4.64 4.08 3.00 mass lecture material presented and explained clearly 26 0 3 6 3 8 6 3.31 1448/1564 3.31 4.48 4.28 4.25 3.31 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 26 0 5 3 1 4 5 11 3.83 860/1352 3.83 3.95 3.98 3.97 3.83 Diacussion  Discussion  1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 35 0 5 2 5 3 2 2.71 1331/1384 2.71 4.31 4.08 4.11 2.71 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 35 0 2 2 1 6 6 3.71 1128/1382 3.71 4.48 4.29 4.27 3.71 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 35 12 2 1 0 1 1 2.60 ****/ 948 **** 4.00 3.95 4.00 ****  1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material 42 1 0 0 1 1 2.60 ****/ 948 **** 4.00 3.95 4.00 ****  2. Were you provided with adequate background information 3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 51 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 948 **** 4.07 4.21 ****  Seminar  1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 51 0 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0	7. Was the grading system clearly explained	26	0	2	1	5	8	10	3.88	1192/1623	3.88	4.28	4.16	4.08	3.88
Lecture  1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 26 0 1 1 2 5 15 4.23 1137/1568 4.23 4.64 4.43 4.39 4.23 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 27 0 1 2 5 3 14 4.08 1451/1572 4.08 4.85 4.70 4.64 4.08 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 26 0 3 6 3 8 6 3.31 1448/1564 3.31 4.48 4.28 4.25 3.31 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 26 0 5 3 8 1 9 3.23 1443/1559 3.23 4.49 4.29 4.23 3.23 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 26 2 3 1 4 5 11 3.83 860/1352 3.83 3.95 3.96 3.97 3.83  Discussion 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 27 0 5 2 5 3 2 2 2.71 1331/1384 2.71 4.31 4.08 4.11 2.71 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 35 0 2 2 1 6 6 3.71 1128/1382 3.71 4.48 4.29 4.37 3.71 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 35 10 2 2 1 0 1 1 2.60 ****/ 948 **** 4.00 3.95 4.00 ****  Laboratory 1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material 25 0 0 0 1 0 0 1 3.50 ****/ 948 **** 4.00 3.95 4.00 ****  Laboratory 2. Were you provided with adequate background information 3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 3. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 42 1 0 0 2 0 7 4.56 ****/ 555 **** 4.57 4.29 4.22 ****  Seminar  1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 45 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 3.00 ****/ 243 **** **** 4.12 3.89 ****  Seminar 2. Were criteria for grading made clear 45 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 3.00 ****/ 288 **** 5.00 4.54 4.63 ****  Field Work 4. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 51 0 0 0 0 1 0 0 3.00 ****/ 28 **** 4.00 3.59 ****  1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 51 0 0 0 0 1 0 0 3.00 ****/ 28 **** 4.09 4.21 ****  2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 51 0 0 0 0 1 0 0 3.00 ****/ 39 **** 4.47 4.09 4.21 ****  3. Was the instructor available for consultation 51 0 0 0 0 1 0 0 3.00 ****/ 39 **** 4.47 4.38 4.32 ****  5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities 41 0 0 2 0 9 0 3.64 ****/ 312 **** 3.74 3.68 3.60 ****	8. How many times was class cancelled	25	0	0	0	0	6	21	4.78	881/1646	4.78	4.64	4.69	4.67	4.78
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 26 0 1 1 1 4 5 15 4.23 1137/1568 4.23 4.64 4.43 4.39 4.23 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 27 0 1 2 5 3 14 4.08 1451/1572 4.08 4.85 4.70 4.64 4.08 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 26 0 3 6 3 8 6 3.31 1448/1564 3.31 4.48 4.28 4.25 3.31 4.00 bid the lectures contribute to what you learned 26 0 5 3 8 1 9 3.23 1443/1559 3.23 4.49 4.29 4.23 3.23 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 26 2 3 1 4 5 11 3.83 860/1352 3.83 3.95 3.98 3.97 3.83 3.23 6. Dia audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 35 0 5 2 5 3 2 2.71 1331/1384 2.71 4.31 4.08 4.11 2.71 2.71 2.00 2 1 1 0 1 1 2.60 2 1 1 0 1 1 2.60 2 1 1 0 1 1 2.60 2 1 0 1 1 1 2 1 0 1 1 1 2 1 0 1 1 1 1	9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	33	0	2	1	5	9	2	3.42	1393/1621	3.42	4.23	4.06	4.02	3.42
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 27 0 1 1 2 5 3 1 4 4.08 1451/1572 4.08 4.85 4.70 4.64 4.08 3 Mas lecture material presented and explained clearly 26 0 3 6 3 8 6 3.31 1448/1564 3.31 4.48 4.28 4.25 3.31 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 26 0 5 3 8 1 9 3.23 1443/1559 3.23 4.49 4.29 4.23 3.23 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 26 0 5 3 8 1 9 3.23 1443/1559 3.23 4.49 4.29 4.23 3.23 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 26 0 5 3 8 1 9 3.23 1443/1559 3.23 4.49 4.29 4.23 3.23 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 26 0 5 3 8 1 9 3.23 1443/1559 3.23 4.49 4.29 4.23 3.23 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 26 0 5 3 8 1 9 3.23 1443/1559 3.23 4.49 4.29 4.23 3.23 5. Did audiovisual techniques contribute to what you learned 35 0 2 2 1 6 6 3.71 128/1382 3.71 4.31 4.08 4.11 2.71 2.00 2 2 1 6 6 3.71 1128/1382 3.71 4.48 4.29 4.37 3.71 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 35 0 0 0 6 6 2 9 4.18 886/1368 4.18 4.60 4.30 4.39 4.18 4.00 4.00 4.00 4.00 4.18 4.00 4.00 4.30 4.39 4.18 4.00 4.00 4.00 4.00 4.18 4.00 4.00 4.00 4.00 4.00 4.00 4.00 4.0	Lecture														
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 27 0 1 1 2 5 3 1 4 4.08 1451/1572 4.08 4.85 4.70 4.64 4.08 3 Mas lecture material presented and explained clearly 26 0 3 6 3 8 6 3.31 1448/1564 3.31 4.48 4.28 4.25 3.31 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 26 0 5 3 8 1 9 3.23 1443/1559 3.23 4.49 4.29 4.23 3.23 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 26 0 5 3 8 1 9 3.23 1443/1559 3.23 4.49 4.29 4.23 3.23 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 26 0 5 3 8 1 9 3.23 1443/1559 3.23 4.49 4.29 4.23 3.23 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 26 0 5 3 8 1 9 3.23 1443/1559 3.23 4.49 4.29 4.23 3.23 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 26 0 5 3 8 1 9 3.23 1443/1559 3.23 4.49 4.29 4.23 3.23 5. Did audiovisual techniques contribute to what you learned 35 0 2 2 1 6 6 3.71 128/1382 3.71 4.31 4.08 4.11 2.71 2.00 2 2 1 6 6 3.71 1128/1382 3.71 4.48 4.29 4.37 3.71 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 35 0 0 0 6 6 2 9 4.18 886/1368 4.18 4.60 4.30 4.39 4.18 4.00 4.00 4.00 4.00 4.18 4.00 4.00 4.30 4.39 4.18 4.00 4.00 4.00 4.00 4.18 4.00 4.00 4.00 4.00 4.00 4.00 4.00 4.0	1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	26	0	1	1	4	5	15	4.23	1137/1568	4.23	4.64	4.43	4.39	4.23
3. Mas lecture material presented and explained clearly 26 0 3 6 3 8 6 3.31 1448/1564 3.31 4.48 4.28 4.25 3.31 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 26 0 5 3 8 1 9 3.23 1443/1559 3.23 4.49 4.29 4.23 3.23 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 26 2 3 1 4 5 11 3.83 860/1352 3.83 3.95 3.98 3.97 3.83    Discussion  1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 35 0 5 2 5 3 2 2.71 1331/1384 2.71 4.31 4.08 4.11 2.71 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 35 0 2 2 1 6 6 3.71 1128/1382 3.71 4.48 4.29 4.37 3.71 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 35 0 0 0 6 2 9 4.18 886/1368 4.18 4.60 4.30 4.39 4.18 4. Were special techniques successful 35 12 2 1 0 1 1 2.60 ****/948 **** 4.00 3.95 4.00 ****  Laboratory  1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material 50 0 0 0 1 2.5.00 ****/243 **** 4.16 4.07 **** 2. Were you provided with adequate background information 50 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 ****/243 **** 4.12 3.89 **** 3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 51 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/212 **** 4.40 4.21 **** 5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 42 1 0 0 0 2 0 7 4.56 ****/555 **** 4.57 4.29 4.22 **** 5. Were criteria for grading made clear 45 1 0 0 0 0 1 0 0 3.00 ****/288 **** 3.67 3.68 3.58 **** 5. Were criteria for grading made clear 51 0 0 0 0 1 0 0 3.00 ****/288 **** 5.00 4.54 4.63 **** 5. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 51 0 0 0 0 1 0 0 3.00 ****/288 **** 4.09 4.21 **** 4.09 4.21 **** 5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities 41 0 0 0 2 0 9 0 3.64 ****/312 **** 4.47 4.43 **** 5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities 41 0 0 0 2 0 9 0 3.64 ****/312 **** 3.74 3.68 3.60 ****  Self Paced			0	1	2	5	3	14						4.64	4.08
Discussion  Discus		26	0	3	6	3	8	6				4.48	4.28	4.25	3.31
Discussion  1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 35 0 5 2 5 3 2 2.71 1331/1384 2.71 4.31 4.08 4.11 2.71 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 35 0 2 2 1 6 6 3.71 1128/1382 3.71 4.48 4.29 4.37 3.71 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 35 0 0 0 6 2 9 4.18 886/1368 4.18 4.60 4.30 4.39 4.18 4.09 4.21 4.20 4.30 4.39 4.18 4.00 4.30 4.39 4.18 4.00 4.30 4.39 4.18 4.00 4.30 4.39 4.18 4.00 4.30 4.39 4.18 4.00 4.30 4.39 4.18 4.00 4.30 4.39 4.18 4.00 4.30 4.39 4.18 4.00 4.30 4.39 4.18 4.00 4.30 4.39 4.18 4.00 4.30 4.39 4.18 4.00 4.30 4.39 4.18 4.00 4.30 4.39 4.18 4.00 4.30 4.39 4.18 4.00 4.30 4.39 4.18 4.00 4.30 4.39 4.18 4.00 4.30 4.39 4.18 4.00 4.30 4.39 4.18 4.00 4.30 4.39 4.18 4.00 4.20 4.30 4.39 4.18 4.00 4.30 4.39 4.18 4.00 4.20 4.30 4.39 4.18 4.00 4.20 4.30 4.39 4.18 4.00 4.20 4.30 4.39 4.18 4.00 4.20 4.30 4.30 4.39 4.18 4.00 4.20 4.30 4.30 4.39 4.18 4.00 4.20 4.20 4.20 4.20 4.20 4.20 4.20	4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	26	0	5	3	8	1	9	3.23	1443/1559	3.23	4.49	4.29	4.23	3.23
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 35 0 5 2 5 3 2 2.71 1331/1384 2.71 4.31 4.08 4.11 2.71 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 35 0 2 2 1 6 6 3.71 1128/1382 3.71 4.48 4.29 4.37 3.71 3.71 4.31 4.08 4.11 2.71 4.31 4.08 4.11 4.08 4.11 2.71 4.31 4.08 4.11 4.08 4.11 2.71 4.31 4.08 4.11 4.08 4.11 2.71 4.31 4.08 4.11 4.11 4.11 4.11 4.11 4.11 4.11 4.1	5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	26	2	3	1	4	5	11	3.83	860/1352	3.83	3.95	3.98	3.97	3.83
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 35 0 5 2 5 3 2 2.71 1331/1384 2.71 4.31 4.08 4.11 2.71 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 35 0 2 2 1 6 6 3.71 1128/1382 3.71 4.48 4.29 4.37 3.71 3.71 4.31 4.08 4.11 2.71 4.31 4.08 4.11 4.08 4.11 2.71 4.31 4.08 4.11 4.08 4.11 2.71 4.31 4.08 4.11 4.08 4.11 2.71 4.31 4.08 4.11 4.11 4.11 4.11 4.11 4.11 4.11 4.1															
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 35 0 2 2 1 6 6 3.71 1128/1382 3.71 4.48 4.29 4.37 3.71 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 35 10 0 0 6 2 9 4.18 886/1368 4.18 4.60 4.30 4.39 4.18 4.00 4.20 4.20 4.20 4.20 4.20 4.20 4.20	Discussion														
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	35	0	5	2	5	3	2	2.71	1331/1384	2.71	4.31	4.08	4.11	2.71
Laboratory  1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material 50 0 0 1 1 0 0 1 3.50 ****/ 221 **** **** 4.16 4.07 ****  2. Were you provided with adequate background information 50 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 ****/ 243 **** **** 4.12 3.89 ****  3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 51 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 212 **** **** 4.14 4.21 ****  5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 42 1 0 0 2 0 7 4.56 ****/ 555 **** 4.57 4.29 4.22 ****  Seminar  1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 51 0 0 0 1 0 0 3.00 ****/ 88 **** 5.00 4.54 4.63 ****  5. Were criteria for grading made clear 45 1 0 0 0 0 6 0 4.00 ****/ 288 **** 3.67 3.68 3.58 ****  Field Work  1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 51 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 288 **** 4.06 3.59 ****  2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 51 0 0 0 1 0 0 3.00 ****/ 48 **** **** 4.06 3.59 ****  3. Was the instructor available for consultation 51 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 48 **** **** 4.09 4.21 ****  4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations 51 0 0 0 0 1 0 0 3.00 ****/ 39 **** **** 4.47 4.43 ****  5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities 41 0 0 2 0 9 0 3.64 ****/ 312 **** 3.74 3.68 3.60 ****  Self Paced		35	0				6	6	3.71	1128/1382	3.71	4.48	4.29	4.37	3.71
Laboratory  1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material 50 0 0 1 0 0 1 3.50 ****/ 221 **** **** 4.16 4.07 ****  2. Were you provided with adequate background information 50 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 ****/ 243 **** **** 4.12 3.89 ****  3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 51 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 212 **** **** 4.40 4.21 ****  5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 42 1 0 0 2 0 7 4.56 ****/ 555 **** 4.57 4.29 4.22 ****  Seminar  1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 51 0 0 0 1 0 3.00 ****/ 88 **** 5.00 4.54 4.63 ****  5. Were criteria for grading made clear 45 1 0 0 0 6 0 4.00 ****/ 288 **** 3.67 3.68 3.58 ****  Field Work  1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 51 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 52 **** **** 4.06 3.59 ****  2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 51 0 0 0 0 1 0 3.00 ****/ 48 **** **** 4.09 4.21 ****  3. Was the instructor available for consultation 51 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 39 **** **** 4.47 4.43 ****  4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations 51 0 0 0 0 1 0 0 3.00 ****/ 39 **** **** 4.47 4.43 ****  5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities 41 0 0 2 0 9 0 3.64 ****/ 312 **** 3.74 3.68 3.60 ****  Self Paced	3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	35	0	-			2	9	4.18	886/1368	4.18	4.60	4.30	4.39	4.18
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material 50 0 0 1 0 0 1 3.50 ****/ 221 **** **** 4.16 4.07 **** 2. Were you provided with adequate background information 50 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 ****/ 243 **** **** 4.12 3.89 **** 3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 51 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 212 **** **** 4.40 4.21 **** 5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 42 1 0 0 2 0 7 4.56 ****/ 555 **** 4.57 4.29 4.22 **** 5. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 51 0 0 0 0 1 0 0 3.00 ****/ 88 **** 5.00 4.54 4.63 **** 5. Were criteria for grading made clear 45 1 0 0 0 0 6 0 4.00 ****/ 288 **** 3.67 3.68 3.58 **** 5. Did gou clearly understand your evaluation criteria 51 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 52 **** **** 4.06 3.59 **** 2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 51 0 0 0 0 1 0 0 3.00 ****/ 48 **** **** 4.09 4.21 **** 3. Was the instructor available for consultation 51 0 0 0 0 1 0 0 3.00 ****/ 39 **** **** 4.38 4.32 **** 5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities 41 0 0 2 0 9 0 3.64 ****/ 312 **** 3.74 3.68 3.60 ****	4. Were special techniques successful	35	12	2	1	0	1	1	2.60	****/ 948	***	4.00	3.95	4.00	***
2. Were you provided with adequate background information 50 0 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 **** 243 **** **** 4.12 3.89 ****  3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 51 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 **** 212 **** **** 4.40 4.21 ****  5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 42 1 0 0 2 0 7 4.56 **** 555 **** 4.57 4.29 4.22 ****  Seminar  1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 51 0 0 0 1 0 0 3.00 **** 88 **** 5.00 4.54 4.63 ****  5. Were criteria for grading made clear 45 1 0 0 0 0 6 0 4.00 **** 288 **** 3.67 3.68 3.58 ****  Field Work  1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 51 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 **** 52 **** **** 4.06 3.59 ****  2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 51 0 0 0 0 1 0 0 3.00 **** 48 **** 4.09 4.21 ****  3. Was the instructor available for consultation 51 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 **** 49 **** 4.47 4.43 ****  4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations 51 0 0 0 1 0 3.00 **** 39 **** **** 4.38 4.32 ****  5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities 41 0 0 2 0 9 0 3.64 **** 312 **** 3.74 3.68 3.60 ****  Self Paced	Laboratory														
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 51 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 212 **** **** 4.40 4.21 ****  5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 42 1 0 0 0 2 0 7 4.56 ****/ 555 **** 4.57 4.29 4.22 ****  Seminar  1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 51 0 0 0 1 0 0 3.00 ****/ 88 **** 5.00 4.54 4.63 ****  5. Were criteria for grading made clear 45 1 0 0 0 0 6 0 4.00 ****/ 288 **** 3.67 3.68 3.58 ****  Field Work  1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 51 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 52 **** **** 4.06 3.59 ****  2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 51 0 0 0 1 0 0 3.00 ****/ 48 **** **** 4.09 4.21 ****  3. Was the instructor available for consultation 51 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ***/ 39 **** **** 4.47 4.43 ****  4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations 51 0 0 0 1 0 0 3.00 ***/ 39 **** **** 4.38 4.32 ****  5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities 41 0 0 2 0 9 0 3.64 ***/ 312 **** 3.74 3.68 3.60 ****  Self Paced	1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	50	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/ 221	****	****	4.16	4.07	****
Seminar  1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme   51		50	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 243	****	****	4.12	3.89	****
Seminar  1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 51 0 0 0 1 0 0 3.00 ****/ 88 **** 5.00 4.54 4.63 ****  5. Were criteria for grading made clear 45 1 0 0 0 0 6 0 4.00 ****/ 288 **** 3.67 3.68 3.58 ****  Field Work  1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 51 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 52 **** **** 4.06 3.59 ****  2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 51 0 0 0 1 0 3.00 ****/ 48 **** *** 4.09 4.21 ****  3. Was the instructor available for consultation 51 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 39 **** *** 4.47 4.43 ****  4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations 51 0 0 0 1 0 0 3.00 ****/ 39 *** *** 4.47 4.43 ****  5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities 41 0 0 2 0 9 0 3.64 ****/ 312 **** 3.74 3.68 3.60 ****  Self Paced	3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	51	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 212	****	****	4.40	4.21	****
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 51 0 0 0 1 0 0 3.00 ****/ 88 **** 5.00 4.54 4.63 **** 5. Were criteria for grading made clear 45 1 0 0 0 0 6 0 4.00 ****/ 288 **** 3.67 3.68 3.58 ****  Field Work  1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 51 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 52 **** **** 4.06 3.59 ****  2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 51 0 0 0 1 0 0 3.00 ****/ 48 **** **** 4.09 4.21 ****  3. Was the instructor available for consultation 51 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 39 **** **** 4.47 4.43 ****  4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations 51 0 0 0 1 0 0 3.00 ****/ 39 **** **** 4.38 4.32 ****  5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities 41 0 0 2 0 9 0 3.64 ****/ 312 **** 3.74 3.68 3.60 ****  Self Paced	5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	42	1	0	0	2	0	7	4.56	****/ 555	****	4.57	4.29	4.22	****
Field Work  1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned  2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria  3. Was the instructor available for consultation  45 1 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 288 **** 3.67 3.68 3.58 ****  2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria  3. Was the instructor available for consultation  4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations  51 0 0 0 1 0 0 3.00 ****/ 48 **** **** 4.09 4.21 ****  4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations  51 0 0 0 1 0 0 3.00 ****/ 39 **** **** 4.47 4.43 ****  5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities  41 0 0 2 0 9 0 3.64 ****/ 312 **** 3.74 3.68 3.60 ****  Self Paced	Seminar														
Field Work  1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 51 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 52 **** **** 4.06 3.59 ****  2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 51 0 0 0 1 0 0 3.00 ****/ 48 **** **** 4.09 4.21 ****  3. Was the instructor available for consultation 51 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 39 **** **** 4.47 4.43 ****  4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations 51 0 0 0 1 0 0 3.00 ****/ 39 **** **** 4.38 4.32 ****  5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities 41 0 0 2 0 9 0 3.64 ****/ 312 **** 3.74 3.68 3.60 ****  Self Paced	1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	51	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 88	****	5.00	4.54	4.63	****
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 51 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 52 **** **** 4.06 3.59 **** 2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 51 0 0 0 1 0 0 3.00 ****/ 48 **** **** 4.09 4.21 **** 3. Was the instructor available for consultation 51 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 39 **** **** 4.47 4.43 **** 4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations 51 0 0 0 1 0 0 3.00 ****/ 39 **** **** 4.38 4.32 **** 5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities 41 0 0 2 0 9 0 3.64 ****/ 312 **** 3.74 3.68 3.60 ****  Self Paced	5. Were criteria for grading made clear	45	1	0	0	0	6	0	4.00	****/ 288	****	3.67	3.68	3.58	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 51 0 0 0 1 0 0 3.00 ****/ 48 **** **** 4.09 4.21 ****  3. Was the instructor available for consultation 51 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 39 **** **** 4.47 4.43 ****  4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations 51 0 0 0 1 0 0 3.00 ****/ 39 **** **** 4.38 4.32 ****  5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities 41 0 0 2 0 9 0 3.64 ****/ 312 **** 3.74 3.68 3.60 ****  Self Paced	Field Work														
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 51 0 0 0 1 0 0 3.00 ****/ 48 **** **** 4.09 4.21 ****  3. Was the instructor available for consultation 51 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 39 **** **** 4.47 4.43 ****  4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations 51 0 0 0 1 0 0 3.00 ****/ 39 **** **** 4.38 4.32 ****  5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities 41 0 0 2 0 9 0 3.64 ****/ 312 **** 3.74 3.68 3.60 ****  Self Paced	1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	51	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.06	3.59	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations 51 0 0 0 1 0 0 3.00 ****/ 39 **** **** 4.38 4.32 **** 5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities 41 0 0 2 0 9 0 3.64 ****/ 312 **** 3.74 3.68 3.60 ****  Self Paced	2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	51	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.09	4.21	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities 41 0 0 2 0 9 0 3.64 ****/ 312 **** 3.74 3.68 3.60 ****  Self Paced	3. Was the instructor available for consultation	51	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.47	4.43	****
Self Paced	4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	51	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.38	4.32	****
	5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	41	0	0	2	0	9	0	3.64	****/ 312	***	3.74	3.68	3.60	****
	Self Paced														
	1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	51	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 53	****	****	4.30	4.32	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal 51 0 0 1 0 0 2.00 ****/ 30 **** **** 4.16 4.44 ****	2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	51	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.16	4.44	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful 51 0 0 0 1 0 0 3.00 ****/ 41 **** **** 4.43 5.00 ****	3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	51	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 41	****	****	4.43	5.00	****

39 1 0 0 1 10 1 4.00 \*\*\*\*/ 110 \*\*\*\* 3.86 3.99 4.05 \*\*\*\*

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Page 1351

FEB 11, 2009

Job IRBR3029

Course-Section: POLI 300 0101
Title QUANT POLI SCI
Instructor: MILLER, NICHOLA

52

Enrollment:

Questionnaires: 52

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2008 Page 1351 FEB 11, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits E	Earned	Cum. GPA		Expected	Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	 А	9	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	17
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	В	6						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	3	C	7	General	1	Under-grad	52	Non-major	35
84-150	11	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	21	_			
				?	0						

University of Maryland Baltimore County FEB 11, 2009 Fall 2008 Job IRBR3029

Page 1352

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Course-Section: POLI 323 0101

33

THE PRESIDENCY

SCHALLER, THOMA

Title

Instructor:

Enrollment:

Questionnaires: 32

Questions	NR	NA	Fre	equer 2	ncies 3	4	5	Ins Mean	tructor Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean		Level Mean	Sect Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	7	0	0	0	0	5	20	4.80	274/1649	4.80	4.51	4.28	4.27	4.80
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	7	0	1	1	6	4	13	4.08	1076/1648	4.08	4.31	4.23	4.18	4.08
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	8	4	2	1	0	7	10	4.10	915/1375	4.10	4.38	4.27	4.22	4.10
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	7	0	0	0	2	9	14	4.48	524/1595	4.48	4.33	4.20	4.21	4.48
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	7	0	1	0	1	7	16	4.48	388/1533	4.48	4.47	4.04	4.05	4.48
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	7	1	1	0		10	8	4.00	883/1512	4.00	4.25	4.10	4.11	4.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	7	0	0	0	3	6	16	4.52	,	4.52	4.28	4.16	4.08	4.52
8. How many times was class cancelled	7	0	0 1	0	0	11 5	14		1139/1646	4.56	4.64	4.69	4.67	4.56
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	13	0	Т	U	U	5	13	4.53	356/1621	4.53	4.23	4.06	4.02	4.53
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	10	0	0	0	0	2	20	4.91	245/1568	4.91	4.64	4.43	4.39	4.91
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	10	0	0	0	0	0	22	5.00	1/1572	5.00	4.85	4.70	4.64	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	10	0	0	0	1	4	17	4.73	390/1564	4.73	4.48	4.28	4.25	4.73
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	0	2	20	4.91	205/1559	4.91	4.49	4.29	4.23	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	13	0	0	0	1	3	15	4.74	167/1352	4.74	3.95	3.98	3.97	4.74
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	0	5	13	4.72	275/1384	4.72	4.31	4.08	4.11	4.72
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	14	0	0	0	0	2	16	4.89	262/1382	4.89	4.48	4.29	4.37	4.89
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	14	0	0	0	0	2	16	4.89	285/1368	4.89	4.60	4.30	4.39	4.89
4. Were special techniques successful	15	12	0	1	0	0	4	4.40	****/ 948	****	4.00	3.95	4.00	****
Laboratory														
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	28	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	****/ 555	****	4.57	4.29	4.22	****
Seminar 5. Were criteria for grading made clear	24	2	0	2	0	4	0	2 22	****/ 288	****	3.67	3.68	3.58	****
5. Were criteria for grading made crear	21	2	O	_	O	1	U	3.33	, 200		3.07	3.00	3.30	
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	31	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 52	****	****	4.06	3.59	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	31	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 48	****	****	4.09	4.21	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	31	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 39	****	****	4.47	4.43	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	27	0	0	2	0	3	0	3.20	****/ 312	****	3.74	3.68	3.60	***
Self Paced														
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	26	0	0	0	0	5	1	4.17	****/ 110	****	3.86	3.99	4.05	****
Frequ	enas	Diet	-rih	1+ i 01	2									
rrequ	lency	DISC	LIDU	16101	.1									
Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades				Rea	asons	5			Туј	pe			Majors	;
00-27 1 0.00-0.99 0 A 8		Rec	mire		or Ma	ior		1	Graduat	 e	0	Majo	 r	13
28-55 3 1.00-1.99 0 B 9		100	1411	-u =(	- 1·1C	10ر	2	-	or adda to	_	5	1100	-	13
56-83 8 2.00-2.99 2 C 1		Ger	neral	L			1	0	Under-g	rad 3	32	Non-	major	19
84-150 3 3.00-3.49 4 D 0							_		9-				3	
Grad. 0 3.50-4.00 12 F 0		Ele	ectiv	res				0	#### - 1	Means t	here a	re not	enoug	ıh
P 0									response	es to b	e sigr	ifican	ıt	
I 0		Oth	ner		responses to be signific 12									

? 3

Course-Section: POLI 323 8620
Title The Presidency
Instructor: Croatti, Mark

Enrollment:

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2008 Page 11 FEB 11, 2009 Job IRBR3029

		Question	s		NR	NA	Fre	_	ncies 3	4	5	Ins Mean	ructor Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean		Level Mean	Sect Mean
		Genera	1															
1. Did voi	u gain ne	w insights,ski	_	m this course	0	0	2	0	1	4	13	4.30	912/1649	****	4.52	4.28	4.11	4.30
		tor make clear			0	0	1	3	4	2	10		1271/1648	****	4.35	4.23	4.16	3.85
		estions reflec			0	0	1	0	8	0	11	4.00	950/1375	****	4.38	4.27	4.10	4.00
	_	ations reflect		_	0	0	2	1	2	5	10		1067/1595	****	4.38	4.20	4.03	4.00
				what you learned	0	0	3	0	2	7	- 8	3.85	966/1533	****	4.01	4.04	3.87	3.85
	_	_		o what you learned	0	0	3	0	3	6	8		1089/1512	****	4.35	4.10	3.86	3.80
		system clearl		-	0	0	0	1	2	4	13	4.45	581/1623	****	4.22	4.16	4.08	4.45
		was class canc		11100	0	0	0	0	0	2	18	4.90	,	****	4.85	4.69	4.67	4.90
	-			hing effectiveness	8	0	2	0	2	3	5		1192/1621	****	4.07	4.06		3.75
		Lectur																
		ctor's lecture	-		1	0	1	0	3	3	12		1070/1568	****	4.50	4.43	4.39	4.32
		tor seem inter			0	0	0	0	1	2	17	4.80	840/1572	****	4.82	4.70	4.64	4.80
3. Was led	cture mat	erial presente	d and ex	xplained clearly	1	0	2	1	4	2	10	3.89	1224/1564	****	4.29	4.28	4.20	3.89
4. Did the	e lecture	s contribute t	o what	you learned	0	0	3	0	4	3	10	3.85	1221/1559	****	4.34	4.29	4.20	3.85
5. Did aud	diovisual	techniques en	hance yo	our understanding	1	7	1	0	4	3	4	3.75	914/1352	****	3.91	3.98	3.86	3.75
		Discus																
				what you learned	2	0	2	1	4	2	9	3.83	921/1384	****	4.39	4.08	3.86	3.83
				d to participate	2	0	4	2	2	5	5		1268/1382	****	4.49	4.29	4.03	3.28
				d open discussion	2	0	2	1	4	3	8		1085/1368	****	4.43	4.30	4.01	3.78
4. Were sp	pecial te	chniques succe	ssful		2	11	2	0	0	0	5	3.86	555/ 948	****	4.24	3.95	3.75	3.86
F M		Labora	-	1	1.0	0	0	0	0	0	4	F 00	**** / FFF		4 01	4 00	4 1 4	
5. Were re	equiremen	its for lab rep	orts cle	early specified	16	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	****/ 555	***	4.01	4.29	4.14	****
		Semina	r															
5. Were c	riteria f	or grading mad	e clear		14	0	0	0	0	4	2	4.33	58/ 288	****	3.36	3.68	3.54	4.33
		Field																
5. Did com	nferences	help you carr	y out f	ield activities	13	0	0	0	0	5	2	4.29	46/ 312	****	3.81	3.68	3.51	4.29
5 Were +1	here enou	Self		he students	15	0	0	0	0	4	1	4.20	26/ 110	****	4.00	3 00	3.83	4 20
J. Weie Ci	nere enou	igh proceds to	ı aıı u			-		-	Ü	ı	1	1.20	20/ 110		1.00	3.99	3.03	1.20
				Frequ	ency	Dis	trib	utio	n									
Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	asons				ТУ	pe			Majors	
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	A 6		Re	quir	ed fo	or Ma	jor	s	1	Graduat	e	0	Majo	or	0
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	В 7														
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	0	C 3		Ge:	nera:	1				2	Under-g	rad 2	0	Non-	-major	2
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	5	D 0														
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F 0		El	ecti	ves				0	#### - 1				_	ſh
				P 0									respons	es to b	e sign	ificar	ıt	
				I 0		Ot:	her				1	3						
				? 0														

Title INTEREST GROUPS & LOBB

Instructor: SCOTT, JAMES L

The color been and the color been all the color been all the colors been all the color

Enrollment: 31
Questionnaires: 30

## University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2008

Page 1353 FEB 11, 2009 Job IRBR3029

			Fre	auer	ncies	3		Inst	tructor	Course	Dept.	UMBC	Level	Sect
Ouestions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank		Mean			
*****														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	7	0	0	0	0	3	20	4.87	221/1649	4.87	4.51	4.28	4.27	4.87
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	7	0	0	0	0	5	18	4.78	234/1648	4.78	4.31	4.23	4.18	4.78
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	7	0	0	0	0	3	20	4.87	192/1375	4.87	4.38	4.27	4.22	4.87
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	7	0	0	0	2	4	17	4.65	332/1595	4.65	4.33	4.20	4.21	4.65
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	7	0	1	0	0	1	21	4.78	162/1533	4.78	4.47	4.04	4.05	4.78
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	0	2	21	4.91	99/1512	4.91	4.25	4.10	4.11	4.91
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	7	0	0	0	0	5	18	4.78	189/1623	4.78	4.28	4.16	4.08	4.78
8. How many times was class cancelled	7	0	0	0	0	1	22	4.96	332/1646	4.96	4.64	4.69	4.67	4.96
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	9	1	0	0	0	7	13	4.65	243/1621	4.65	4.23	4.06	4.02	4.65
Lecture	_		_	_	_	_								
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	7	0	0	0	0	1		4.96	123/1568		4.64	4.43	4.39	4.96
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	7	0	0	0	0	0	23	5.00	1/1572	5.00	4.85	4.70	4.64	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	7	0	0	0	0	4	19	4.83	244/1564	4.83	4.48	4.28	4.25	4.83
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	0	2			184/1559	4.91	4.49	4.29	4.23	4.91
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	8	17	1	0	0	1	3	4.00	****/1352	****	3.95	3.98	3.97	****
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	0	1	18	4.95	90/1384	4.95	4.31	4.08	4.11	4.95
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	11	0	0	0	0	0	19	5.00	1/1382	5.00	4.48	4.29	4.37	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	11	0	0	1	0	0	18	4.84	327/1368	4.84	4.60	4.30	4.39	4.84
4. Were special techniques successful	11	0	0	0	1	5	13	4.63	161/ 948	4.63	4.00	3.95	4.00	4.63
4. Were special techniques successivi	11	U	U	U	_	J	13	1.05	101/ 540	1.03	1.00	3.75	1.00	1.05
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	29	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 221	****	****	4.16	4.07	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	29	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 243	****	****	4.12	3.89	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	29	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 212	****	****	4.40	4.21	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	29	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 209	****	****	4.35	4.12	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	22	0	0	1	4	0	3	3.63	462/ 555	3.63	4.57	4.29	4.22	3.63
Seminar			_	_	_									
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	28	0	0	0	0	0	2		****/ 88	****	5.00	4.54	4.63	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	28	1	0	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 85	****	4.83	4.47	4.55	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	28	1	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 81	****	4.50	4.43	4.30	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	28	0	0	0	0	0	2		****/ 92	****	4.33	4.35	4.46	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	27	0	0	1	0	1	1	3.6/	****/ 288	***	3.67	3.68	3.58	^ ^ ^ ^
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	29	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.06	3.59	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	29	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.09	4.21	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	29	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 39	****	****	4.47	4.43	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	29	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 39	****	****	4.38	4.32	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	26	0	0	1	0	2	1		****/ 312	****	3.74	3.68	3.60	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out richa accivities	20	Ü	Ü	_	Ü	-	_	3.73	, 312		3.71	3.00	3.00	
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	29	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 53	****	****	4.30	4.32	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	29	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.16	4.44	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	29	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 41	****	****	4.43	5.00	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	29	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 24	****	****	4.42	5.00	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	19	0	0	2	0	7	2	3.82	85/ 110	3.82	3.86	3.99	4.05	3.82

Title INTEREST GROUPS & LOBB

Instructor: SCOTT, JAMES L

Enrollment: 31
Questionnaires: 30

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2008 Page 1353 FEB 11, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expecte	ed Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	 А	14	Required for Majors	2	Graduate	0	Major	6
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	В	7						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	6	C	0	General	1	Under-grad	30	Non-major	24
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	8	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	h
				P	1			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	19	-			
				?	0						

Course-Section:	POLI 328 0101	University of Maryland	Page 1354
Title	WOMEN AND POLITICS	Baltimore County	FEB 11, 2009
Instructor:	GUISEGERRITY, N	Fall 2008	Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Enrollment: 30

Questionnaires: 30

Questions	NR	NA	Fre	eque: 2	ncie 3	s 4	5	Ins Mean	tructor Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
Laboratory 5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	25	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	****/ 555	****	4.57	4.29	4.22	****
Seminar 5. Were criteria for grading made clear	21	0	1	1	0	7	0	3.44	197/ 288	3.44	3.67	3.68	3.58	3.44
Field Work 5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	21	0	0	0	0	9	0	4.00	68/ 312	4.00	3.74	3.68	3.60	4.00
Self Paced 5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	15	0	0	2	0	13	0	3.73	89/ 110	3.73	3.86	3.99	4.05	3.73

Credits Earned Cum. GPA			Expected	d Grades	Reasons		Туре	Majors			
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0		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	30	Non-major	30
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	h
				P	0			responses to	be sig	nificant	
				I	0	Other	0	-			
				2	0						

Course-Section: POLI 334 0101 University of Maryland Title

Baltimore County Fall 2008

JUDICIAL PROCESS SCOTT, KEVIN Instructor:

Enrollment: 25 Questionnaires: 25

FEB 11, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Page 1355

Questions	NR	NA	Fre	equer 2	ncies 3	4	5	Inst Mean	ructor Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean		Level Mean	Sect Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	7	0	1	0	1	7	9	4.28	943/1649	4.28	4.51	4.28	4.27	4.28
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	8	0	1	0	5	3	8		1124/1648		4.31	4.23		4.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	7	0	1	1	2	3	11		831/1375		4.38	4.27	4.22	4.22
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	7	0	1	2	3	1	11		1038/1595		4.33	4.20	4.21	4.06
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	7	0	1	1	1	4	11	4.28	604/1533	4.28	4.47	4.04	4.05	4.28
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	7	2	1	1	2	2	10	4.19	764/1512	4.19	4.25	4.10	4.11	4.19
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	7	0	1	3	1	2	11	4.06	1004/1623	4.06	4.28	4.16	4.08	4.06
8. How many times was class cancelled	7	0	0	0	1	14	3	4.11	1498/1646	4.11	4.64	4.69	4.67	4.11
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	11	0	1	0	4	4	5	3.86	1105/1621	3.86	4.23	4.06	4.02	3.86
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	7	0	1	0	0	4			791/1568		4.64	4.43	4.39	4.56
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	7	0	1	0	1	1	15	4.61	1133/1572	4.61	4.85	4.70	4.64	4.61
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	7	0	1	0	2	4		4.33	,		4.48	4.28	4.25	4.33
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	7	0	1	0	2	4		4.33	901/1559		4.49	4.29	4.23	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	8	2	0	2	1	5	7	4.13	607/1352	4.13	3.95	3.98	3.97	4.13
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	14	0	1	0	4	2			981/1384				4.11	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	13	0	2	0	2	5			1183/1382		4.48	4.29	4.37	3.58
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	16	0	0	0	2	4			915/1368		4.60	4.30	4.39	4.11
4. Were special techniques successful	14	8	1	1	1	0	0	2.00	****/ 948	****	4.00	3.95	4.00	****
Laboratory	0.0	0	0	•	0	0	_	F 00	**** / 555	ate ate ate at	4 55	4 00	4 00	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	20	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	****/ 555	****	4.57	4.29	4.22	****
Seminar														
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	14	1	0	2	0	8	0	3.60	184/ 288	3.60	3.67	3.68	3.58	3.60
Field Work														
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	18	0	0	2	0	5	0	3.43	229/ 312	3.43	3.74	3.68	3.60	3.43
Self Paced														
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	23	0	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	****/ 110	***	3.86	3.99	4.05	****
Frequ	ency	Dist	ribu	ution	1									
Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades				Rea	asons				Ту	pe			Majors	
00-27 0 0.00-0.99 0 A 6		Rec	uire	ed fo	or Ma	ior	 s	0	Graduat	 e	0	Majc	 or	14
28-55 0 1.00-1.99 0 B 5						J 1	-	-			-	) ~		= =
56-83 4 2.00-2.99 2 C 0		Gen	neral					3	Under-g	rad 2	5	Non-	major	11
84-150 3 3.00-3.49 2 D 0									J				-	
Grad. 0 3.50-4.00 4 F 0		Ele	ectiv	res				1		#### - Means there are not enough				h
P 0									respons	es to b	e sign	ifican	ıt	
I 0 ? 2		Oth	ner				1	1						

Course-Section: POLI 337 0101

COMPARATIVE JUSTICE

Title

Instructor: DAVIS, JEFFREY

Enrollment: 28 Questionnaires: 28 University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2008

Page 1356 FEB 11, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Questions						NA	Fro	equer 2	ncies 3	4	5	Ins Mean	tructor Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean		Level Mean	Sect Mean
		Genera:	 l															
1. Did yo	ou gain ne	w insights,ski		this course	8	0	0	1	1	2	16	4.65	446/1649	4.65	4.51	4.28	4.27	4.65
2. Did th	ne instruct	tor make clear	the exp	pected goals	8	0	0	0	1	5	14	4.65	375/1648	4.65	4.31	4.23	4.18	4.65
3. Did th	ne exam que	estions reflect	the ex	spected goals	8	0	0	0	0	3	17	4.85	199/1375	4.85	4.38	4.27	4.22	4.85
		ations reflect			8	1	0	0	1	2	16	4.79	209/1595	4.79	4.33	4.20	4.21	4.79
5. Did as	ssigned rea	adings contribu	ate to v	what you learned	8	0	0	0	0	1	19	4.95	64/1533	4.95	4.47	4.04	4.05	4.95
6. Did wr	8	0	0	0	1	3	16	4.75	194/1512	4.75	4.25	4.10	4.11	4.75				
7. Was the grading system clearly explained							0	0	1	2	17	4.80	169/1623	4.80	4.28	4.16	4.08	4.80
8. How many times was class cancelled							0	0	0	3	15	4.83	782/1646	4.83	4.64	4.69	4.67	4.83
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness							0	0	0	5	11	4.69	216/1621	4.69	4.23	4.06	4.02	4.69
		Lecture	<b>e</b>															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared							0	0	0	0	19	5.00	1/1568	5.00	4.64	4.43	4.39	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject							0	0	0	0	19	5.00	1/1572	5.00	4.85	4.70	4.64	5.00
	3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly							0	2	0	17	4.79	294/1564	4.79	4.48	4.28	4.25	4.79
	4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned							0	0	1	18	4.95	123/1559	4.95	4.49	4.29	4.23	4.95
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding							0	0	2	4	13	4.58	263/1352	4.58	3.95	3.98	3.97	4.58
		Discus	sion															
				what you learned	15	0	0	0	0	3	10	4.77	,	4.77	4.31	4.08	4.11	4.77
				l to participate	15	0	0	0	0	1	12	4.92	194/1382	4.92	4.48	4.29	4.37	4.92
				d open discussion	15	0	0	0	1	3	9	4.62			4.60	4.30	4.39	4.62
4. Were s	special te	chniques succes	ssful		15	8	0	1	0	0	4	4.40	****/ 948	***	4.00	3.95	4.00	****
		Laborat	-															
5. Were r	requirement	ts for lab repo	orts cle	early specified	23	0	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	****/ 555	***	4.57	4.29	4.22	****
		Semina	c															
5. Were o	criteria f	or grading made	e clear		21	0	0	2	0	5	0	3.43	199/ 288	3.43	3.67	3.68	3.58	3.43
		Field V	Work															
5. Did co	onferences	help you carry	y out fi	leld activities	20	0	0	1	0	7	0	3.75	193/ 312	3.75	3.74	3.68	3.60	3.75
		Self I	Paced															
5. Were t	there enoug	gh proctors for	r all th	ne students	19	0	1	1	0	7	0	3.44	97/ 110	3.44	3.86	3.99	4.05	3.44
				Frequ	.ency	Dist	trib	ution	n									
Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades								Rea	asons				Туј	pe			Majors	1
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	 A 7								2	Graduate		0	 Mo≓-		11
00-27 28-55	0	1.00-0.99	0	A 7 B 8		Kec	4u1r	eu I	or Ma	or	Þ	4	Graduat	=	U	Majo	)T	тТ
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	2	в о С 1		Cer	nera	1				4	Under-q	rad ?	:8	Non-	-major	17
84-150 6 3.00-3.49 3 D 0						361	····a	-				-	onder g.	Luu Z		14011-	) U I	± /
Grad. 0 3.50-4.00 7 F 0						E14	ecti <sup>.</sup>	ves				0	#### - 1	Means +	here :	are not	enous	rh
Grad. 0 3.50-4.00 / F 0						11.0						-	response				_	
I O					Oth	ner				1	2	_ CDPOID		- 2191				
? 1										_								

Course-Section: POLI 353 0101

Title GOVERNMENTAL BUDGETING

Instructor: MEYERS, ROY T.

Enrollment:

28

Questionnaires: 28

## University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2008

Page 1357 FEB 11, 2009 Job IRBR3029

			Frequencies				Inst	ructor	Course Dept		t UMBC Level		Sect	
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	9	0	0	0	1	4	14	4.68	408/1649	4.68	4.51	4.28	4.27	4.68
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	9	0	0	0	3	4	12	4.47	599/1648		4.31	4.23	4.18	4.47
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	10	14	0	0	0	2	2		****/1375	****	4.38	4.27	4.22	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	9	0	0	0	1	5	13	4.63	352/1595	4.63	4.33	4.20	4.21	4.63
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	1	4	3	10	4.22	653/1533	4.22	4.47	4.04	4.05	4.22
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	4	4	11	4.37	564/1512	4.37	4.25	4.10	4.11	4.37
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	10	0	0	1	4	3	10	4.22	849/1623	4.22	4.28	4.16	4.08	4.22
8. How many times was class cancelled	9	0	0	1	0	9	9	4.37	1317/1646	4.37	4.64	4.69	4.67	4.37
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	13	0	0	0	2	4	9	4.47	428/1621	4.47	4.23	4.06	4.02	4.47
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	10	0	0	0	0	3	15	4.83	344/1568	4.83	4.64	4.43	4.39	4.83
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	10	0	0	0	0	0	18	5.00	1/1572		4.85	4.70	4.64	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	10	0	0	0	1	4	13	4.67	473/1564			4.28		4.67
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	2	1	15	4.72	434/1559		4.49	4.29		4.72
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	11	2	2	0	4	3	6	3.73	928/1352	3.73	3.95	3.98	3.97	3.73
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	1	4	6	4.45	489/1384	4.45	4.31	4.08	4.11	4.45
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	17	0	0	0	2	1	8	4.55	585/1382		4.48	4.29	4.37	4.55
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	17	0	0	0	1	2	8	4.64			4.60	4.30	4.39	4.64
4. Were special techniques successful	17	1	0	1	2	4	3	3.90	533/ 948			3.95	4.00	
Laboratory														
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	14	0	0	1	0	0	13	4.79	243/ 555	4.79	4.57	4.29	4.22	4.79
Seminar														
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	23	0	0	0	0	5	0	4.00	****/ 288	****	3.67	3.68	3.58	****
Field Work														
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	21	0	0	0	0	7	0	4.00	68/ 312	4.00	3.74	3.68	3.60	4.00
Self Paced														
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	26	0	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	****/ 110	****	3.86	3.99	4.05	****
Frequ	iency	Dist	tribu	ution	n									
Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades	Reasons							Ту	pe		Majors		<b>;</b>	
00-27 1 0.00-0.99 0 A 12		Required for Majors 1							Graduat	e	0	Major		4

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expecte	ed Grades	Reasons		Type	Majors		
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	 А	12	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	4
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	5						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	4	C	0	General	3	Under-grad	28	Non-major	24
84-150	8	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	6	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	n
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	10	-		_	
				2	0						

Course-Section: POLI 354 0101

PUBL MGMNT/PERSONNEL S

Title

Instructor: ADLER, JOSEPH

Enrollment: 29 Questionnaires: 29

## University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2008

Page 1358 FEB 11, 2009 Job IRBR3029

			Frequencies			Instructor		Course Dept		UMBC Level		Sect		
Ouestions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank		_		Mean	
× 400 010110														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	14	0	0	0	3	6	6	4 20	1027/1649	4.20	4 51	4.28	4.27	4.20
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	14	0	0	0	4	3	8	4.27	885/1648	4.27	4.31	4.23	4.18	4.27
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	14	0	0	0	4	2	9	4.33	733/1375	4.33	4.38	4.27	4.22	4.33
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	14	1	0	1	3	3	7	4.14		4.14	4.33	4.20	4.21	4.14
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	2	3	2	8	4.07	774/1533	4.07	4.47	4.04	4.05	4.07
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	14	1	0	1	3	2		4.21	735/1512	4.21	4.25	4.10	4.11	4.21
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	14	0	0	1	1	1		4.60	395/1623	4.60	4.28	4.16	4.08	4.60
8. How many times was class cancelled	14	0	0	0	0	3		4.80	833/1646	4.80		4.69	4.67	4.80
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	14	0	0	1	7	5			1332/1621				4.02	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	14	U	U	Τ	/	5	2	3.55	1332/1021	3.33	4.23	4.00	4.02	3.33
Lecture														
	1.4	0	0	0	_	1	^	4 07	1110/1560	4 07	1 (1	4 42	4 20	4 07
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	14	0	-	-	5	1	9		1112/1568	4.27	4.64	4.43	4.39	4.27
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	14	0	0	1	2	1	11		1273/1572	4.47	4.85	4.70	4.64	4.47
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	14	0	0	0	4	4	7		1001/1564	4.20	4.48	4.28	4.25	4.20
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	14	0	1	2	4	0			1246/1559	3.80	4.49	4.29	4.23	3.80
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	14	0	0	3	3	1	8	3.93	779/1352	3.93	3.95	3.98	3.97	3.93
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	17	0	1	0	4	0	7	4.00	795/1384	4.00	4.31	4.08	4.11	4.00
<ol> <li>Were all students actively encouraged to participate</li> </ol>	17	0	1	0	4	0	7	4.00	946/1382	4.00	4.48	4.29	4.37	4.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	18	0	0	0	3	4	4	4.09	922/1368	4.09	4.60	4.30	4.39	4.09
4. Were special techniques successful	17	2	0	1	4	2	3	3.70	624/ 948	3.70	4.00	3.95	4.00	3.70
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	28	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 221	****	****	4.16	4.07	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	28	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 243	****	****	4.12	3.89	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	28	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 212	****	****	4.40	4.21	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	28	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 209	****	****	4.35	4.12	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	23	0	0	1	1	0	4		****/ 555	****	4.57	4.29	4.22	****
ov ween not an and not not also and a second of the second									,					
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	28	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 88	****	5.00	4.54	4.63	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	28	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 85	****	4.83	4.47	4.55	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	28	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 81	****	4.50	4.43	4.30	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	28	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 92	****	4.33	4.35	4.46	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	27	0	1	0	0	0	1		****/ 288	****	3.67	3.68	3.58	****
5. Were criteria for grading made crear	۷ /	U	1	U	U	U		3.00	7 200		3.07	3.00	3.30	
Field Work														
	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	F 00	****/ 52	****	****	1 00	2 50	****
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	28	0	0	0	0	0	1	3.00	, 52	****		4.06	3.59	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	28	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 48		****	4.09	4.21	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	28	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.47	4.43	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	28	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 39	****	****	4.38	4.32	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	22	1	0	2	0	3	1	3.50	****/ 312	****	3.74	3.68	3.60	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	28	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	,	****	****	4.30	4.32	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	28	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.16	4.44	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	28	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 41	****	****	4.43	5.00	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	28	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 24	****	****	4.42	5.00	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	23	0	0	3	0	2	1	3.17	****/ 110	****	3.86	3.99	4.05	****

Course-Section: POLI 354 0101

Title PUBL MGMNT/PERSONNEL S

Instructor: ADLER, JOSEPH

Enrollment: 29
Questionnaires: 29

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2008 Page 1358 FEB 11, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	l Grades	Reasons		Type	Majors		
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	 А	7	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	2
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	7						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	4	C	0	General	2	Under-grad	29	Non-major	27
84-150	7	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
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	12	-			
				?	0						

Course-Section: POLI 373 0101

Title COMP MID-EAST/N AFR PO

Instructor: LEBSON, MICAH

Enrollment: 23
Questionnaires: 23

Baltimore County Fall 2008 Page 1359 FEB 11, 2009 Job IRBR3029

# Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

University of Maryland

Questions	NR	NA	Fre	equer 2	ncies 3	4	5	Inst Mean	tructor Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean		Level Mean	Sect Mean
General  1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course  2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals  3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals  4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	3 3 4 3	0 0 9 0	1 1 0	0 1 0 0	2 5 0 3	5 5 3 7	12 8 7 9	4.70 4.15	844/1649 1229/1648 370/1375 943/1595	4.35 3.90 4.70 4.15	4.51 4.31 4.38 4.33	4.28 4.23 4.27 4.20	4.27 4.18 4.22 4.21	4.35 3.90 4.70 4.15
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 7. Was the grading system clearly explained 8. How many times was class cancelled 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3 4 3 6	0 0 0 0	0 2 1 0 1	0 0 1 0 2	1 3 3 0 3	6 5 7 7	13 10 9 13 4	4.65	288/1533 859/1512 1004/1623 1048/1646 1274/1621	4.60 4.05 4.05 4.65 3.65	4.47 4.25 4.28 4.64 4.23	4.04 4.10 4.16 4.69 4.06	4.05 4.11 4.08 4.67 4.02	4.60 4.05 4.05 4.65 3.65
Lecture  1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared  2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject  3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly  4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned  5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4 4 4 4	0 0 0 0 6	2 1 2 3 1	1 0 1 0 1	3 2 5 4 4	5 3 4 4 4	8 13 7 8 3	4.42 3.68 3.74	1369/1568 1305/1572 1328/1564 1289/1559 1034/1352	3.84 4.42 3.68 3.74 3.54	4.64 4.85 4.48 4.49 3.95	4.43 4.70 4.28 4.29 3.98	4.39 4.64 4.25 4.23 3.97	3.84 4.42 3.68 3.74 3.54
Discussion  1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned  2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate  3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion  4. Were special techniques successful	6 6 6	0 0 0 1	0 0 0 0	0 0 0 0	2 0 0 2	3 3 4 4	12 14 13 10	4.59 4.82 4.76 4.50	388/1384 322/1382 415/1368 203/ 948	4.59 4.82 4.76 4.50	4.31 4.48 4.60 4.00	4.08 4.29 4.30 3.95	4.11 4.37 4.39 4.00	4.59 4.82 4.76 4.50
Laboratory 5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	19	0	0	0	3	0	1	3.50	****/ 555	***	4.57	4.29	4.22	***
Seminar  1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme  2. Was the instructor available for individual attention  3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned  4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned  5. Were criteria for grading made clear	22 22 22 22 20	0 0 0 0	0 0 0 0	0 0 0 0	0 0 0 0	0 0 0 0 2	1 1 1 1	5.00 5.00 5.00	****/ 88 ****/ 85 ****/ 81 ****/ 92 ****/ 288	* * * * * * * * * * * * * * * *	5.00 4.83 4.50 4.33 3.67	4.54 4.47 4.43 4.35 3.68	4.63 4.55 4.30 4.46 3.58	* * * * * * * * * * * * * * * *
Frequencies of the Frequency of the Freq	iency	Dis	trib						m				26-4	
Credits Earned         Cum. GPA         Expected Grades           00-27         0         0.00-0.99         0         A         4		 Re	quir		asons  or Ma		 s	 1	Tyj  Graduat		0	 Majo	Majors  or	14
28-55			nera:					4 2	Under-g:	Means t		ire not	_	9 h
I 0 ? 2		Otl	her					9	respons	es to D	e sign	ıırıcan	IL	

Course-Section: POLI 380 0101

Title INTERNATIONAL RELATION

Instructor: HODY, CYNTHIA

Enrollment: 28

28

Fall 2008

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Page 1360 FEB 11, 2009

Job IRBR3029

University of Maryland

Baltimore County

Ouestionnaires: 27 Frequencies Instructor Course Dept UMBC Level Sect NR NA 1 2 3 4 5 Mean Rank Mean Mean Mean Mean Mean Mean Ouestions 1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course  $14 \ 0 \ 0 \ 1 \ 6 \ 6 \ 4.38 \ 803/1649 \ 4.38 \ 4.51 \ 4.28 \ 4.27 \ 4.38$ 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals 14 0 0 0 0 2 3 8 4.46 614/1648 4.46 4.31 4.23 4.18 4.46 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals 14 2 0 0 1 3 7 4.55 513/1375 4.55 4.38 4.27 4.22 4.55 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals 14 1 0 0 2 3 7 4.42 622/1595 4.42 4.33 4.20 4.21 4.42 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 14 0 0 0 0 3 10 4.77 174/1533 4.77 4.47 4.04 4.05 4.77 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 14 0 0 0 1 3 9 4.62 302/1512 4.62 4.25 4.10 4.11 4.62 7. Was the grading system clearly explained 14 0 1 0 0 3 9 4.46 555/1623 4.46 4.28 4.16 4.08 4.46 8. How many times was class cancelled 14 0 0 0 0 7 6 4.46 1230/1646 4.46 4.69 4.67 4.46 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 17 0 0 0 1 4 5 4.40 511/1621 4.40 4.23 4.06 4.02 4.40Lecture 14 0 0 1 0 3 9 4.54 815/1568 4.54 4.64 4.43 4.39 4.54 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 14 0 0 0 0 2 11 4.85 740/1572 4.85 4.85 4.70 4.64 4.85 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 14 0 0 0 2 5 6 4.31 887/1564 4.31 4.48 4.28 4.25 4.31 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 14 0 0 0 2 3 8 4.46 749/1559 4.46 4.49 4.29 4.23 4.46 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 15 7 0 0 0 2 3 4.60 \*\*\*\*/1352 \*\*\*\* 3.95 3.98 3.97 \*\*\*\* Discussion 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 17 0 0 0 2 4 4 4.20 708/1384 4.20 4.31 4.08 4.11 4.20 17 0 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 0 0 2 2 6 4.40 716/1382 4.40 4.48 4.29 4.37 4.40 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion  $17 \ 0 \ 0 \ 1 \ 2 \ 7 \ 4.60 \ 579/1368 \ 4.60 \ 4.30 \ 4.39 \ 4.60$ 4. Were special techniques successful 17 7 0 0 0 2 1 4.33 \*\*\*\*/ 948 \*\*\*\* 4.00 3.95 4.00 \*\*\*\* Laboratory 5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 26 0 0 1 0 0 0 2.00 \*\*\*\*/ 555 \*\*\*\* 4.57 4.29 4.22 \*\*\*\* Seminar 5. Were criteria for grading made clear 21 0 1 0 1 4 0 3.33 \*\*\*\*/ 288 \*\*\*\* 3.67 3.68 3.58 \*\*\*\* Field Work 5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities 21 0 0 1 0 5 0 3.67 \*\*\*\* 312 \*\*\*\* 3.74 3.68 3.60 \*\*\*\* Self Paced 5. Were there enough proctors for all the students 23 0 0 1 0 3 0 3.50 \*\*\*\* / 110 \*\*\*\* 3.86 3.99 4.05 \*\*\*\* Frequency Distribution Cum. GPA Expected Grades Reasons Type Credits Earned Majors 0.00-0.99 0 A 5 1.00-1.99 0 B 4 2.00-2.99 1 C 1 Required for Majors 1 Graduate 0 Major 00-27 0 28-55 1 56-83 0 General 2 Under-grad 27 Non-major 21 D 0 3.00-3.49 3 84-150 2 F 0 Electives Grad. 0 3.50-4.00 3 0 #### - Means there are not enough P 0 responses to be significant Ι 0 Other

?

Course-Section: POLI 395 0101

Title U.S. NAT'L SECURITY PO

Instructor: STARKEY, BRIGID

Enrollment:

32 Questionnaires: 31

# University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2008

Page 1361 FEB 11, 2009 Job IRBR3029

# Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

							Fr	eauei	ncies	3		Inst	tructor	Course	e Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
		Questions	S		NR	NA	1	_	3	4	5	Mean	Rank		Mean	Mean		Mean
		 General	 1															
1 Did vo	ou gain n	ew insights,ski		this course	6	0	0	1	2	4	18	4.56	563/1649	4.56	4 51	4.28	4.27	4.56
		ctor make clear			6	0	0	0	3	3	19		388/1648					4.64
		uestions reflect			6	0	0	0	1	6		4.68			4.38		4.22	
	_	uations reflect		_	6	0	0	0	2				342/1595					
				what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	3			115/1533			4.04		4.88
				what you learned by what you learned	6	0	0	0	3			4.40				4.10		4.40
		g system clearly			7	1	0	1	2	6		4.43				4.16		4.43
		was class cance		inea	6	0	0	0	0	2	23	4.43				4.16		
	_					0	0	0	2	8		4.92	,					4.92
9. HOW WO	oula you	grade the overa.	II teacr	ning effectiveness	12	U	U	U	2	8	9	4.3/	559/1621	4.3/	4.23	4.06	4.02	4.3/
		Lecture	е															
1. Were t	the instr	uctor's lecture:	s well p	prepared	7	0	0	0	2	3	19	4.71	573/1568	4.71	4.64	4.43	4.39	4.71
2. Did th	he instru	ctor seem inter	ested ir	n the subject	8	0	0	0	1	0	22	4.91	532/1572	4.91	4.85	4.70	4.64	4.91
3. Was le	ecture ma	terial presented	d and ex	xplained clearly	9	0	0	0	1	4	17	4.73	390/1564	4.73	4.48	4.28	4.25	4.73
4. Did th	Was lecture material presented and explained clear Did the lectures contribute to what you learned Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understand				7	0	0	0	2	4	18	4.67	512/1559	4.67	4.49	4.29	4.23	4.67
5. Did au	udiovisua	l techniques enl	hance yo	our understanding	8	5	1	1	4	3	9	4.00	690/1352	4.00	3.95	3.98	3.97	4.00
		Discus	gion															
1 Did al	lace died			what you learned	14	0	1	0	1	4	11	4.41	530/1384	4.41	4.31	4.08	<i>A</i> 11	4.41
				d to participate	14	0	0	1	0				446/1382			4.29	4.37	
				d open discussion	14	0	0	0	0	_		4.82				4.30		
		echniques succes		open discussion	15	5	1	0	0	4			334/ 948					
T. WEIE	врестат с	eciniiques succei	SSLUI		13	5	1	U	U	1	O	1.2/	334/ 340	4.27	4.00	3.93	4.00	1.2/
		Labora	_															
5. Were r	requireme	nts for lab repo	orts cle	early specified	23	0	0	0	2	0	6	4.50	293/ 555	4.50	4.57	4.29	4.22	4.50
		Semina	r															
5. Were o	criteria	for grading made	e clear		27	0	1	0	0	3	0	3.25	****/ 288	****	3.67	3.68	3.58	****
		Field V	Work															
5. Did co	onference	s help you carr		ield activities	25	0	0	1	0	5	0	3.67	****/ 312	****	3.74	3.68	3.60	****
			-															
5 Were t	there eno	Self I ugh proctors fo		ne students	25	0	1	1	0	4	٥	2 17	****/ 110	****	3.86	3 00	4 05	****
J. WEIE	chere eno	agii proceors ro.	L all CI	ie students	23	U	1	1	U	1	U	3.17	/ 110		3.00	3.99	4.03	
				Frequ	ency	Dist	trib	utio	n									
Credits E	Earned	Expected Grades				Rea	asons	5			Ту	pe			Majors	ı		
00-27	0	 A 11					or Ma			1	 Graduat		 0	Majo		10		
28-55	1	B 11		кес	4urr	eu I	OT MG	ijor	Ö	1	Graduat	C	U	Ma J	JΤ	ΤU		
28-55 56-83	1	C 0		000	2022	1				6	IIndon -	rad 1	31	Moss	-ma = a=	21		
56-83 84-150	10	D 0		Gei	nera	Т				O	Under-g	rau :	эт	non-	-major	21		
	10	D 0 F 0		m1	ecti					0	шшти.	Moore -	-ho			h		
Grad.	U	3.50-4.00	3	ъ О ъ О		F.T.	=CL1	ves				U	#### - respons				_	11
			P 0		0:1					-	_	respons	es lo I	be sign	ıııcar	IL		

Other

15

I

0

1

Course-Section: POLI 401 1501 University of Maryland Title INDIVIDUAL STUDY IN PO

Baltimore County Fall 2008

Page 1362

FEB 11, 2009

Job IRBR3029

Instructor: KING-MEADOWS, T Enrollment: 2 Questionnaires: 2 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

		Question	ıs		NR	NA	Fre	_	ncies 3	5 4	5	Inst Mean	ructor Rank		Dept Mean		Level Mean	Sect Mean
1 544		Genera	_		^	0	^	^	0	0	_	F 00	1 /1 6 4 0	F 00	4 51	4 00	4 50	F 00
		ew insights,ski ctor make clear			0	0	0	0	0	0	2		1/1649 1/1648	5.00		4.28	4.50 4.36	5.00 5.00
		uations reflect			0	0	0	0	0	0	2		1/1548	5.00		4.23	4.36	5.00
				what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	2		1/1533	5.00	4.33	4.20	4.14	5.00
	_	_		what you learned o what you learned		0	0	0	0	0	2		1/1512		4.25	4.10	4.26	5.00
		g system clearl		-	0	0	0	0	0	0	_	5.00	1/1623		4.28	4.16	4.27	5.00
		was class cand		inea	0	0	0	0	0	0	2		1/1646			4.69	4.71	5.00
	-			ning effectiveness	-	0	0	0	0	0	_	5.00	1/1621		4.23			5.00
J. 110W	would you	grade the overa	.ii ceaci	iing effectiveness	U	U	U	U	U	U	2	3.00	1/1021	3.00	1.23	1.00	1.21	3.00
_		Lectur	_								_							
	the instr		0	0	0	0	0	0		5.00	1/1568			4.43				
		n the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	2		1/1572			4.70	4.79	5.00		
		xplained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	0		5.00	1/1564		4.48	4.28	4.40	5.00		
	Did the lectures contribute to what you learned					0	0	0	0	0	2		1/1559	5.00	4.49	4.29	4.41	5.00
5. Did a	Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understand					0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	303/1352	4.50	3.95	3.98	4.07	4.50
		Labora	tory															
5. Were	requireme	nts for lab rep	orts cle	early specified	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 555	5.00	4.57	4.29	4.41	5.00
		Semina	r															
5. Were	criteria	for grading mad	e clear		1	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	83/ 288	4.00	3.67	3.68	3.71	4.00
		Self	Paced															
5. Were	there eno	ugh proctors fo	r all th	ne students	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	40/ 110	4.00	3.86	3.99	4.22	4.00
				Freq	uency	/ Dis	trib	ution	n									
Credits	Farned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Pe:	asons	2			Ту	ne			Majors	
			· 															
00-27	0	0.00-0.99 1.00-1.99	0 0	A 0		Re	quir	ed fo	or Ma	ajors	3	0	Graduat	е	0	Majo	r	2
28-55	0	в 0									_	_						
56-83	0	C 0		Ge	nera	L				0	Under-g	rad	2	Non-	major	0		
84-150		D 0								_								
Grad.	0	F 0		El	ecti	<i>r</i> es				0	#### - 1				_	h		
				P 0								_	respons	es to k	e sign	ifican	ıt	
				I 0		Ot!	her					0						
				? 0														

Course-Section: POLI 405 0101

Title SEMINAR IN POLITICAL S

Instructor: KING-MEADOWS, T

Enrollment: 14
Questionnaires: 14

KING-MEADOWS, T Fall 2008

Page 1363 FEB 11, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Student	Course	Evaluation	Questionnaire

University of Maryland

Baltimore County

				Ε··	00110	ncies	,		Tnat	tructor	Courgo	Dont	TIMDC	Level	Sect
	Questions	NR	NA	1	2 2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Course Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
1 511	General	-	0	0	•	0	•	0	F 00	1 /1 6 4 0	F 00	4 = 1	4 00	4 50	F 00
	insights, skills from this course	5 5	0	0	0 1	0 1	0 5	9 2	5.00	1/1649	5.00	4.51	4.28	4.50	5.00
	or make clear the expected goals stions reflect the expected goals	5	2	0	U T	2	5 1	4	4.29	1245/1648 780/1375	3.89 4.29	4.31	4.23	4.36 4.48	3.89 4.29
	tions reflect the expected goals	5	0	1	0	1	3	4		1067/1595	4.29	4.33	4.27	4.46	4.29
	dings contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	168/1533	4.78	4.47	4.04	4.14	4.78
_	gnments contribute to what you learned		0	0	0	0	5	4	4.44	465/1512	4.44	4.25	4.10	4.26	4.44
	system clearly explained	5 5	0	1	1	1	3	3		1318/1623	3.67	4.28	4.16	4.27	3.67
8. How many times w		5	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1646	5.00	4.64	4.69	4.71	5.00
	as class cancelled ade the overall teaching effectivenes		1	0	0	0	1	5	4.83		4.83	4.23	4.06	4.24	4.83
J. How would you gi	ade the overall teaching effectivenes	7 7	_	Ü	O	U	_	,	1.05	121/1021	1.05	1.25	1.00	1.21	1.05
	Lecture														
	tor's lectures well prepared	5	0	0	0	0	3	6	4.67	636/1568	4.67	4.64	4.43	4.54	4.67
	or seem interested in the subject	5	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1572	5.00	4.85	4.70	4.79	5.00
	rial presented and explained clearly	5	0	0	1	0	5	3		1073/1564		4.48	4.28	4.40	4.11
	contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	1	0	1	7	4.56	640/1559	4.56	4.49	4.29	4.41	4.56
5. Did audiovisual	techniques enhance your understanding	g 6	2	0	0	6	0	0	3.00	1219/1352	3.00	3.95	3.98	4.07	3.00
	Discussion														
1. Did class discus	sions contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	1	0	7	4.75	247/1384	4.75	4.31	4.08	4.35	4.75
	s actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	272/1382	4.88	4.48	4.29	4.56	4.88
	or encourage fair and open discussion		0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1368	5.00	4.60	4.30	4.58	5.00
4. Were special tec	hniques successful	6	0	0	1	3	0	4	3.88	546/ 948	3.88	4.00	3.95	4.31	3.88
	Laboratory														
5 Were requirement	s for lab reports clearly specified	11	0	1	0	0	0	2	3 67	****/ 555	****	4.57	4.29	4.41	****
J. Were requirement	s for fab reports creatry specified	11	U		U	U	U	2	3.07	/ 555		4.57	4.20	1.11	
	Seminar														
	pics relevant to the announced theme	8	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/ 88	5.00	5.00	4.54	4.66	5.00
	or available for individual attention		0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	27/ 85	4.83	4.83	4.47	4.54	4.83
_	jects contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	41/ 81	4.50	4.50	4.43	4.57	4.50
_	s contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	1	2	3	4.33	58/ 92	4.33	4.33	4.35	4.44	4.33
5. Were criteria fo	r grading made clear	8	0	0	0	2	1	3	4.17	75/ 288	4.17	3.67	3.68	3.71	4.17
	Field Work														
5. Did conferences	help you carry out field activities	12	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 312	****	3.74	3.68	3.95	****
	Galf Darad														
5. Were there enoug	Self Paced h proctors for all the students	9	0	0	0	0	5	0	4.00	40/ 110	4.00	3.86	3.99	4.22	4.00
	_														
	Fre	equency	/ Dis	trib	utio:	n									
Credits Earned	Cum. GPA Expected Grade	es			Re	asons	5			Ту	pe			Majors	

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	1	 А	3	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	В	3						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	1	C	1	General	2	Under-grad	14	Non-major	13
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	0	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	7	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	n
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	7	=			
				2	2						

Course-Section: POLI 423 0101

Title PRESIDENTIAL ELECTIONS

Instructor: MILLER, NICHOLA

Enrollment: 24
Questionnaires: 24

# University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2008

Page 1364 FEB 11, 2009 Job IRBR3029

		Question	S		NR	NA	Fro	equer 2	ncies 3	4	5	Ins Mean	tructor Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean		Level Mean	Sect Mean
		Genera	 1															
1. Did vo	ou gain new	insights,ski		this course	12	0	0	2	2	4	4	3.83	1327/1649	3.83	4.51	4.28	4.50	3.83
_	_	or make clear			12	0	0	2	2	4	4	3.83	1287/1648	3.83	4.31	4.23	4.36	3.83
		stions reflec			13	0	0	1	1	4	5		862/1375	4.18	4.38	4.27	4.48	4.18
		tions reflect			12	2	0	1	1	4	4	4.10	1010/1595	4.10	4.33	4.20	4.36	4.10
5. Did as	signed rea	dings contrib	ute to w	hat you learned	12	0	0	2	4	1	5	3.75	1065/1533	3.75	4.47	4.04	4.14	3.75
6. Did wr	itten assi	gnments contr	ibute to	what you learned	12	1	1	0	4	3	3	3.64	1186/1512	3.64	4.25	4.10	4.26	3.64
7. Was th	e grading	system clearly	y explai	ned	12	0	0	2	1	4	5	4.00	1029/1623	4.00	4.28	4.16	4.27	4.00
8. How ma	ny times w	as class canc	elled		12	0	0	0	0	3	9	4.75	913/1646	4.75	4.64	4.69	4.71	4.75
9. How wo	ould you gr	ade the overa	ll teach	ing effectiveness	13	0	1	0	5	3	2	3.45	1375/1621	3.45	4.23	4.06	4.24	3.45
		Lectur	е															
1. Were t	he instruc	tor's lecture	s well p	repared	12	0	0	1	1	1	9	4.50	,		4.64	4.43	4.54	4.50
		or seem inter		-	12	0	0	0	1	1	10	4.75	931/1572	4.75	4.85	4.70	4.79	4.75
3. Was le	Was lecture material presented and explained clea: Did the lectures contribute to what you learned						0	1	1	5	5		1028/1564	4.17	4.48	4.28	4.40	4.17
							1	1	0	4			1084/1559	4.08	4.49	4.29	4.41	
5. Did au	diovisual	techniques en	ur understanding	13	1	1	0	2	3	4	3.90	818/1352	3.90	3.95	3.98	4.07	3.90	
		Discus																
			hat you learned	16	0	1	2	3	0	2	3.00	1254/1384	3.00	4.31	4.08	4.35	3.00	
				to participate	16	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	394/1382	4.75	4.48	4.29	4.56	4.75
				open discussion	16	0	0	0	2	4	2	4.00	948/1368	4.00	4.60	4.30	4.58	4.00
4. Were s	special tec	hniques succe	ssful		16	6	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 948	***	4.00	3.95	4.31	****
		Labora	-															
5. Were r	requirement	s for lab rep	orts cle	arly specified	18	0	0	0	2	0	4	4.33	338/ 555	4.33	4.57	4.29	4.41	4.33
		Semina																
5. Were c	riteria fo	or grading made	e clear		22	0	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/ 288	****	3.67	3.68	3.71	***
		Field																
5. Did co	nferences	help you carry	y out fi	eld activities	20	0	0	2	0	2	0	3.00	****/ 312	***	3.74	3.68	3.95	****
		Self :	Paced															
5. Were t	here enoug	h proctors for	r all th	e students	21	0	0	0	0	3	0	4.00	****/ 110	***	3.86	3.99	4.22	****
				Frequ	ency	Dist	trib	ution	n									
Credits E	Carned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	asons				Ту	pe			Majors	;
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 1					or Ma			1	 Graduat		0	Majo		8	
28-55	0	B 8		rec	4uil (	eu I	or Ma	٤٠٠٠	>	_	Graduat	<b>-</b>	U	Ma JC	) <u> </u>	O		
56-83	1	C 0		Ger	nera	1				3	Under-g	rad 2	4	Non-	-major	16		
84-150	5	2.00-2.99 3.00-3.49	D 0		001						-	222- 9				,		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1 2	F 0		Ele	ecti <sup>.</sup>	ves				0	#### - 1	Means t	here a	are not	enoua	ıh
	-			P 0									respons				_	•
				I 0		Oth	her					5	-		3			
			? 1															

Course-Section: POLI 425 8620

US Campaigns & Elections Goldberg, Marni

Instructor:

Title

Baltimore County
Fall 2008

University of Maryland

Page 13 FEB 11, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Enrollment:	0				
Questionnaires:	21	Student	Course	Evaluation	Questionnaire

		Question	S		NR	NA	Fre	equer 2	ncies 3	3 4	5	Inst Mean	ructor Rank		Dept Mean			Sect Mean
1 54		Genera			1	0	0	1	0	2	1.0	4 70	205 /1640	****	4 50	4 00	4 11	4 70
		w insights,ski tor make clear			1 1	0	0	1 1	0	3	16 13	4.70 4.55	395/1649 498/1648	****	4.52 4.35	4.28	4.11 4.16	4.70 4.55
		estions reflec			3	3	0	0	1	4	10	4.55	498/1048	****	4.35	4.23	4.10	4.55
	_	ations reflect		_	2	0	1	0	0	4	14	4.58	417/1595	***	4.38	4.27	4.10	4.58
				what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	3	16	4.75	180/1533	****	4.01	4.04	3.87	4.75
				o what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	3	16	4.75	194/1512	****	4.35	4.10	3.86	4.75
		system clearly			2	0	0	0	2	2	15	4.68	296/1623	****	4.22	4.16	4.08	4.68
		was class canc		11100	1	0	0	0	0	2	18	4.90	664/1646	****	4.85	4.69	4.67	4.90
	_			hing effectiveness	7	0	0	0	2	4	8	4.43	483/1621	****	4.07	4.06	3.96	4.43
		Lectur	e															
1. Were th	ne instru	ctor's lecture	s well :	prepared	1	0	0	0	0	1	19	4.95	147/1568	****	4.50	4.43	4.39	4.95
2. Did the	e instruc	tor seem inter	ested i	n the subject	1	0	0	0	0	1	19	4.95	355/1572	****	4.82	4.70	4.64	4.95
3. Was led	cture mat	erial presente	d and e	xplained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	4	16	4.80	263/1564	****	4.29	4.28	4.20	4.80
		s contribute t		-	1	0	0	0	1	1	18	4.85	261/1559	****	4.34	4.29	4.20	4.85
5. Did aud	diovisual	techniques en	hance y	our understanding	1	1	0	1	1	3	14	4.58	263/1352	****	3.91	3.98	3.86	4.58
		Discus			2													
	Did class discussions contribute to what you lear					0	0	1	1	2	15	4.63	351/1384	****	4.39	4.08	3.86	4.63
	Were all students actively encouraged to participe				2	0	0	0	0	2	17	4.89	252/1382	****	4.49	4.29	4.03	4.89
	Did the instructor encourage fair and open discuss Were special techniques successful				2	0 6	0	0	0	1	18	4.95	158/1368	****	4.43	4.30	4.01	4.95
4. Were sp	pecial te	cnniques succe	ssiul		2	6	1	1	1	0	10	4.31	323/ 948	****	4.24	3.95	3.75	4.31
F. Wassa		Labora	_		1 2	0	٥	0	0	0	0	F 00	1 / 555	****	4 01	4 20	1 11	г оо
5. Were re	equiremen	ts for lab rep	orts CI	early specified	13	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/ 555		4.01	4.29	4.14	5.00
		Semina											50 / 000				0 = 4	4 00
5. Were ci	riteria i	or grading mad	e clear		15	0	0	0	0	4	2	4.33	58/ 288	***	3.36	3.68	3.54	4.33
		Field					_											
				hat you learned	20	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 52	****	4.18	4.06	3.72	****
_	_	-		uation criteria	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 48	****	4.50	4.09	3.65	****
		tor available			20 20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 39 ****/ 39	****	4.40	4.47 4.38	4.36	****
	_	could you disc	_	r evaluations ield activities	12	0	0	0	0	3	1 6	4.67	****/ 39 21/ 312	****	4.62 3.81	3.68	4.37	4.67
5. Dia coi	irerences	neip you carr	y out I	reid activities	12	U	U	U	U	3	b	4.07	21/ 312		3.01	3.00	3.31	4.07
5. Were th	nere enou	Self : gh proctors for		he students	11	0	0	0	0	8	2	4.20	26/ 110	****	4.00	3.99	3.83	4.20
		J F									_							
								ution	1									
Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades				Rea	sons	5 			Туј	ре			Majors	;	
00-27							quire	ed fo	or Ma	jor	s	0	Graduat	e	0	Majo	or	0
28-55																		_
56-83						Ger	nera!	L				0	Under-g	rad 2	21	Non-	major	3
84-150 Grad.	0	D 0 F 0		E1 <i>e</i>	ectiv	<i>r</i> es				1	#### - 1	Means t	here a	re not	enoue	rh		
craa.	Ü	3.50-4.00	3	P 0								_	respons				_	
				I 0		Oth	ner				1	7	_		-			
				າ 1														

Course-Section: POLI 433 0101

Title FIRST AMENDMENT FREEDO

Instructor: LANOUE, GEORGE

Enrollment: 36
Questionnaires: 35

LANOUE, GEORGE Fall

?

1

University of Maryland
Baltimore County
Fall 2008

Page 1365 FEB 11, 2009 Job IRBR3029

		Question	5		NR	NA	Fre	equer 2	ncies 3	s 4	5	Inst Mean	tructor Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean		Level Mean	Sect Mean
		Genera	 1															
1. Did yo	ou gain new	insights,ski		this course	5	0	0	0	2	6	22	4.67	433/1649	4.67	4.51	4.28	4.50	4.67
2. Did th	ne instruct	or make clear	the exp	pected goals	5	0	0	1	3	7	19	4.47	614/1648	4.47	4.31	4.23	4.36	4.47
3. Did th	ne exam que	estions reflec	t the ex	spected goals	5	1	0	2	6	6	15	4.17	868/1375	4.17	4.38	4.27	4.48	4.17
4. Did ot	her evalua	tions reflect	the exp	pected goals	5	2	0	1	2	11	14	4.36	697/1595	4.36	4.33	4.20	4.36	4.36
				what you learned	6	0	0	0	1	9	19	4.62	272/1533	4.62	4.47	4.04	4.14	4.62
		-		what you learned	6	3	1	1	3	9	12	4.15	791/1512	4.15	4.25	4.10	4.26	4.15
		system clearly		ined	6	0	0	3	3	4	19	4.34	708/1623	4.34	4.28	4.16	4.27	4.34
	_	as class canc			6	0	0	0	0	1	28	4.97		4.97	4.64	4.69	4.71	
9. How wo	ould you gr	rade the overa	ll teach	ning effectiveness	14	0	1	0	1	7	12	4.38	535/1621	4.38	4.23	4.06	4.24	4.38
		Lectur	е															
1. Were t	he instruc	tor's lecture		prepared	8	0	0	0	0	4	23	4.85	316/1568	4.85	4.64	4.43	4.54	4.85
		or seem inter	_	-	8	0	0	0	0	3	24	4.89	640/1572	4.89	4.85	4.70	4.79	4.89
				plained clearly	9	0	0	0	1	8	17	4.62	537/1564	4.62	4.48	4.28	4.40	4.62
4. Did th	Did the lectures contribute to what you learned Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understan						0	1	2	2	21	4.65	524/1559	4.65	4.49	4.29	4.41	4.65
5. Did av	udiovisual	our understanding	10	11	2	1	6	2	3	3.21	1173/1352	3.21	3.95	3.98	4.07	3.21		
		<b>D</b> !																
ו הגם ו		Discus		what you learned	1 2	0	0	2	0	7	13	1 11	E 41 /1204	1 11	1 21	4 00	4 25	4.41
				-	13 13	0	0	1	2	4	15	4.41	541/1384 616/1382	4.41 4.50	4.31	4.08	4.35 4.56	4.41
				l to participate l open discussion	13	0	0	1	3	2	16	4.50	654/1368	4.50	4.48	4.29	4.58	4.50
		chniques succe		open discussion	13	1	1	1	4	4	11	4.10	411/ 948	4.10	4.00	3.95		4.10
T. WEIE S	special tec	initques succe	SSIUI		13			1	1	-	11	4.10	411/ 540	4.10	4.00	3.93	4.51	4.10
		Labora	_															
_	_	_	_	ground information	34	0	1	0	0	0	0		****/ 243	****	****	4.12	4.61	***
5. Were r	requirement	s for lab rep	orts cle	early specified	32	1	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 555	****	4.57	4.29	4.41	****
		Semina	r															
4 Did nr	regentation	ns contribute		you learned	34	0	0	0	0	1	0	4 00	****/ 92	****	4.33	4.35	4.44	****
_		or grading made		you learned	31	0	0	1	1	2	0		****/ 288	****			3.71	****
J. Were e	orrectia re	or grading mad	corcur		31	J	Ü	_	-	-	Ü	3.23	, 200		3.07	3.00	3.71	
		Field	Work															
5. Did co	onferences	help you carry	y out fi	leld activities	28	0	0	2	0	5	0	3.43	****/ 312	****	3.74	3.68	3.95	****
		Self :	baced															
5. Were t	here enoug	th proctors for		ne students	28	0	0	0	0	6	1	4.14	****/ 110	****	3.86	3.99	4.22	***
	_																	
				Frequ	lency	Dist	trib	utior	1									
Credits E	Carned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades				Rea	sons	5			Ту	ре			Majors	3	
			 А 9														1.0	
00-27 28-55	1 0	0.00-0.99 1.00-1.99	0	A 9 B 9		кес	quire	ed fo	or Ma	ajor	S	4	Graduat	е	0	Majo	)r.	12
28-55 56-83	3	2.00-2.99	3	C 6		00-	nera	1				4	IIndon	rad ?	. 5	Max	mo dosc	23
84-150	3 11	D 0		Ger	uera.	L				7	Under-g	rau 3	35	MOI1-	-major	43		
Grad.	0	Б 0 F 1		្ពា⊿	ectiv	760				2	#### - 1	Meane +	here =	re not	enous	rh		
Grau.	U	3.50-4.00	5	P 1		11.7	CCLI	v CD				4	respons				_	1++
				I O		∩+1	her				1	7	T CBPOIIS		,c 5191	ıııcaı	10	
		2 1		OCI						'								

Course-Section: POLI 433 8620

Title First Amendment Freedoms Instructor:

Baltimore County Melcavage, E. Peter

Enrollment:

Fall 2008

University of Maryland

Page 12 FEB 11, 2009 Job IRBR3029

responses to be significant

16

FIII OIIIIIEIIC:	U	
Questionnaires:	22	Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

P 0

I 0

3

							Fre	equei	ncie	S		Ins	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
		Question	s		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		Conora	1															
1 Did vo	nı gəin n	Genera ew insights,ski		m this course	0	0	1	0	2	6	13	4.36	830/1649	****	4.52	4.28	4.11	4.36
_	_	ctor make clear			0	0	1	0	1	7	13	4.41	702/1648	****	4.35	4.23	4.16	4.41
		uestions reflec			0	0	1	0	3	3	15	4.41	665/1375	****	4.38	4.27	4.10	4.41
	_	uations reflect			1	1	1	0	2	7	10	4.25	818/1595	****	4.38	4.20	4.03	4.25
				what you learned	0	0	2	1	1	5	13	4.18	688/1533	****	4.01	4.04	3.87	4.18
				o what you learned	0	0	1	1	1	7	12	4.27	663/1512	****	4.35	4.10	3.86	4.27
		g system clearl			0	0	1	1	5	4	11		1009/1623	****	4.22	4.16	4.08	4.05
	_	was class cand		inea	0	0	0	0	0	0	22	5.00	1/1646	****	4.85	4.69	4.67	5.00
	_			hing effectiveness	8	1	1	0	1	9			1114/1621	****	4.07	4.06		3.85
	_			-														
_		Lectur	_						_	_								
		uctor's lecture			0	0	0	0	1	3	18	4.77	442/1568	****	4.50	4.43	4.39	4.77
		ctor seem inter		-	0	0	0	0	0	3	19	4.86	690/1572	****	4.82	4.70	4.64	4.86
		_		xplained clearly	1	0	1	1	1	5	13	4.33	854/1564	****	4.29	4.28	4.20	4.33
		es contribute t		-	1	0	1	0	1	4	15	4.52	673/1559	****	4.34	4.29	4.20	4.52
5. Did au	ıdiovisua	l techniques en	hance y	our understanding	2	14	1	0	1	0	4	4.00	690/1352	****	3.91	3.98	3.86	4.00
	Discussion																	
1 Did al						0	0	0	0	4	17	4.81	201/1384	****	4.39	4.08	3.86	4.81
	. Did class discussions contribute to what you learn . Were all students actively encouraged to participate				1 2	0	0	0	0	0	20	5.00	1/1382	****	4.49	4.29	4.03	5.00
		_	_	d open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	0	21	5.00	1/1368	****	4.43	4.30	4.01	5.00
		echniques succe		a open arbeabbion	1	10	0	2	1	0	8	4.27	334/ 948	****	4.24	3.95	3.75	4.27
					_			_	_		_							
		Labora	_															
5. Were r	requireme	nts for lab rep	orts cl	early specified	14	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/ 555	****	4.01	4.29	4.14	5.00
		Semina	70															
5 Were	riteria	semina for grading mad			16	0	0	0	0	3	3	4.50	37/ 288	****	3.36	3.68	3.54	4 50
J. Were e	JIICCIIA	ror grading mad	c cicai		10	O	O	O	O	5	,	1.50	377 200		3.30	3.00	3.31	1.50
		Field	Work															
5. Did co	onference	s help you carr	y out f	ield activities	12	0	0	0	0	7	3	4.30	44/ 312	****	3.81	3.68	3.51	4.30
1 544	.16	Self			0.1	0	1	0	0	0	0	1 00	**** / F3		2 67	4 20	4 17	****
	_	system contric ugh proctors fo		what you learned	21 18	0	1 0	0	0	0 2	0		****/ 53 ****/ 110	****	3.67	4.30	4.17	****
J. Wele t	THELE ENO	ugn proctors re	ı aıı t	ne students	10	U	U	U	U	2	4	4.50	/ 110		4.00	3.33	3.03	
							trib	ution	n									
a 1'	Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Gr							_					_					
Credits E	Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Gra							Rea	ason	S 			Ту:	pe 			Majors	
00-27							quire	ed fo	or Ma	ajor	s	0	Graduat	e	0	Majo	or	0
28-55	28-55 1 1.00-1.99 0 B 7						_			-						J -		
56-83							nera	1				0	Under-g	rad 2	12	Non-	-major	3
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	2	D 0									J				_	
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F 0		Ele	ecti	ves				1	#### - 1	Means t	here a	re not	enoug	ſh
													woanona				_	

Other

Course-Section: POLI 445 0101 Universitie LAW/POLITICS/AMER EDUC Be

ER EDUC Baltimore County Fall 2008

Instructor: LANOUE, GEORGE

Enrollment: 12
Questionnaires: 11

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

University of Maryland Page 1366
Baltimore County FEB 11, 2009
Fall 2008 Job IRBR3029

4.28 4.50 4 4.23 4.36 4 4.27 4.48 5 4.20 4.36 4 4.04 4.14 4 4.10 4.26 4 4.16 4.27 4 4.69 4.71 4	4.28 4.23 4.27 4.20 4.04 4.10	4.51 4.31 4.38	4.90	Rank 	Ra 	Mean	5 1		4	3	_2 	1	NA 	NR 		3	Questions		
4.23 4.36 4 4.27 4.48 5 4.20 4.36 4 4.04 4.14 4 4.10 4.26 4 4.16 4.27 4 4.69 4.71 4	4.23 4.27 4.20 4.04 4.10	4.31 4.38		5/1649															
4.23 4.36 4 4.27 4.48 5 4.20 4.36 4 4.04 4.14 4 4.10 4.26 4 4.16 4.27 4 4.69 4.71 4	4.23 4.27 4.20 4.04 4.10	4.31 4.38		5/1649												_	General		
4.27 4.48 5 4.20 4.36 4 4.04 4.14 4 4.10 4.26 4 4.16 4.27 4 4.69 4.71 4	4.27 4.20 4.04 4.10	4.38	4.70		186/	1.90	9	9	1	0	0	0	0	1	om this course	ls from	insights,skil	a gain n	1. Did you
4.20 4.36 4 4.04 4.14 4 4.10 4.26 4 4.16 4.27 4 4.69 4.71 4	4.20 4.04 4.10			3/1648	323/	1.70	7	7	3	0	0	0	0	1	pected goals	the exp	or make clear	e instru	2. Did the
4.04 4.14 4 4.10 4.26 4 4.16 4.27 4 4.69 4.71 4	4.04 4.10	1 22	5.00	L/1375	1/	5.00	3	3	0	0	0	0	6	2	expected goals	the ex	estions reflect	e exam q	3. Did the
4.10 4.26 4 4.16 4.27 4 4.69 4.71 4	4.10	4.33	4.50	7/1595	497/	1.50	5	6	3	1	0	0	0	1	pected goals	the exp	tions reflect	ner eval	4. Did oth
4.16 4.27 4 4.69 4.71 4		4.47	4.90	5/1533	106/	1.90	9	9	1	0	0	0	0	1	what you learned	ite to w	dings contribu	signed r	5. Did ass
4.69 4.71 4	4 16	4.25	4.70	)/1512	240/	1.70	3	8	1	1	0	0	0	1	o what you learned	bute to	gnments contri	itten as:	6. Did wr:
	T. IU	4.28	4.50	2/1623	502/	1.50	7	7	2	0	1	0	0	1	ined	explai:	system clearly	e gradin	7. Was the
4.06 4.24 4	4.69	4.64	4.70	1/1646	1004/	1.70	7	7	3	0	0	0	0	1		elled	as class cance	ny times	8. How man
	4.06	4.23	4.43	3/1621	483/	1.43	3	3	4	0	0	0	1	3	thing effectiveness	l teach	ade the overal	ıld you	9. How wor
																<u> </u>	Lecture		
4.43 4.54 5	4.43	4.64	5.00	L/1568	1/	5.00	C	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	prepared	well p	ctor's lectures	ne instr	1. Were th
4.70 4.79 5	4.70	4.85	5.00	1/1572	1/	5.00	C	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	n the subject	sted in	or seem intere	e instru	2. Did the
4.28 4.40 5	4.28	4.48	5.00	1/1564	1/	5.00	С	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	explained clearly	d and ex	erial presented	cture ma	3. Was led
4.29 4.41 4	4.29	4.49	4.80	3/1559	318/	1.80	3	8	2	0	0	0	0	1	you learned	what y	contribute to	e lectur	4. Did the
3.98 4.07 3	3.98	3.95	3.33	)/1352	1130/	3.33	1	1	3	3	2	0	1	1	our understanding	nance yo	techniques enh	diovisua	5. Did aud
																sion	Discuss		
4.08 4.35 4	4.08	4.31	4.88	5/1384	165/	1.88	7	-	1	0	0	0	0	3	what you learned			ass disc	1. Did cla
4.30 4.58 4																			
3.95 4.31 4		4.00		5/ 948	,	1.43			2	1	0	0	0	4			chniques succes		
																orv	Laborat		
4.29 4.41 4	4.29	4.57	4.40	3/ 555	323/	1.40	4	4	0	0	1	0	0	6	early specified	-		equireme	5. Were re
																Jork	Field W		
3.68 3.95 4	3.68	3.74	4.00	3/ 312	68/	1.00	)	(	3	0	0	0	0	8	ield activities	out fi	help you carry	nference	5. Did con
										1	ıtion	ribu	Dist	ency	Frequ				
Majors			ne	Tvτ					3	sons	Rea				Expected Grades		Cum. GPA	arned	Credits Ea
Major	Majo	2	е	raduate	Gra		0	rs	ajor	or Ma	ed fo	uire	Rec		А б В 2	0	0.00-0.99	1	00-27 28-55
Non-major	Non-	9	rad	nder-qi	Und		3				_	eral	Gen		C 1	0	2.00-2.99	1	56-83
3				J-			-								D 1	3		4	
are not enough	re not	here a	Means t	### - 1	###		0				res	ctiv	Ele		F 0	5		2	Grad.
nificant							-								P 0	-		=	
			~		_ 55		7					er	Oth		I O				
															3 0				
ar	ır.	4.49 3.95 4.31 4.48 4.60 4.00 4.57 3.74	4.80 3.33 4.88 5.00 4.88 4.43 4.40 4.00	3/1559 0/1352 5/1384 1/1382 5/1368 5/ 948 3/ 555 3/ 312 Typeraduate	318/ 1130/ 165/ 295/ 265/ 323/ 68/ Gra Und ###	1.80 3.33 4.88 5.00 4.88 4.43	3 1 7 3 8 7 4 4 4 0 3 0	5. 8. 8. 5. 6. 4. 4. 4. 4. 4. 4. 4. 4. 4. 4. 4. 4. 4.	2 3 1 0 1 2 0	0 0 0 0 0	0 2 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0	0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 ribu	0 1 0 0 0 0 0 Dist	1 1 3 3 3 4 6	you learned your understanding what you learned ed to participate ad open discussion  early specified  field activities  Frequ  Expected Grades  A 6 B 2 C 1 D 1 F 0 P 0 I 0	o what y nance you sion to to with the to with the couraged fair and ssful the cory orts cles fork y out find the couraged fair and ssful the course fair and ssful the couraged fair and ssful the course fair and ssful the couraged fair and ssful the course fair and ssful the couraged fair and ssful the course fair and ssful the co	Discussions contribute to techniques enh Discussions contributes actively end Corrector encourage for the corrector of the co	ass disconsisted as a disconsi	4. Did the 5. Did aud 1. Did cla 2. Were al 3. Did the 4. Were sp. 5. Were re 5. Did con Credits Ea

Course-Section: POLI 460 0101

Title COMP INST DEVELOPMENT

Instructor: FORESTIERE, CAR

Enrollment: 18
Questionnaires: 17

University of Maryland
Baltimore County
Fall 2008

Page 1367 FEB 11, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Lecture  1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared  2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject  3. 0 0 0 0 1 1 1 12 4.79 876/1572 4.79 4.85 4.70 4.79 4.79  3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly  3. 0 0 0 0 2 12 4.86 216/1564 4.86 4.86 4.48 4.28 4.40 4.86  4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned  3. 0 0 0 0 1 2 11 4.71 448/1559 4.71 4.49 4.29 4.41 4.79  5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding  3. 0 0 0 0 2 3 9 4.50 303/1352 4.50 3.95 3.98 4.07 4.50  Discussion  1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned  8. 0 0 0 0 1 1 1 7 7 4.67 326/1384 4.67 4.31 4.08 4.35 4.67  2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate  8. 0 0 0 0 3 6 4.67 483/1382 4.67 4.48 4.29 4.56 4.67  4. Were special techniques successful  8. 0 0 0 0 3 6 4.67 522/1368 4.67 4.06 4.30 4.58  4. Were special techniques successful  8. 0 0 0 0 1 4 2 4.14 389/948 4.14 4.00 3.95 4.31 4.14  Laboratory  5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified  15. O 0 0 1 0 1 4.00 ****/555 **** 4.57 4.29 4.41 ****  Seminar  5. Were criteria for grading made clear  12. O 0 2 0 3 0 3.20 219/288 3.20 3.67 3.68 3.71 3.20  Field Work  5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities  9. O 0 0 0 8 0 4.00 68/312 4.00 3.74 3.68 3.95 4.00  Self Paced			Question	s		NR	NA	Fre	equei 2	ncies 3	4	5		tructor Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean		Level Mean	Sect Mean
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course																			
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals 2 0 0 0 1 14 4 9.3 103/1648 4.93 4.31 4.23 4.36 4.95 4.96 4.01/1375 4.67 4.88 4.72 4.48 4.67 4.01/1375 4.67 4.88 4.72 4.48 4.67 4.01/1375 4.67 4.88 4.72 4.48 4.67 4.01/1375 4.67 4.88 4.72 4.48 4.67 4.01/1375 4.67 4.88 4.72 4.48 4.67 4.01/1375 4.67 4.88 4.72 4.48 4.67 4.01/1375 4.67 4.88 4.72 4.48 4.67 4.01/1375 4.67 4.88 4.72 4.72 4.48 4.67 4.01/1375 4.67 4.01/1375 4.67 4.88 4.72 4.72 4.48 4.67 4.11 4.87 4.72 4.72 4.84 4.67 4.11 4.87 4.72 4.72 4.84 4.67 4.11 4.87 4.72 4.72 4.84 4.67 4.11 4.87 4.72 4.72 4.84 4.67 4.72 4.72 4.72 4.84 4.67 4.72 4.72 4.72 4.84 4.67 4.72 4.72 4.72 4.84 4.67 4.72 4.72 4.72 4.84 4.67 4.72 4.72 4.72 4.72 4.72 4.72 4.72 4.7	1 544			_	*b.i	2	0	0	0	0	1	1 /	4 02	120/1640	4 02	<i>1</i> F1	4 00	4 50	4 02
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   2 0 0 0 1 2 9 4.67 401/1375 4.67 4.88 4.27 4.48 4.67 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals   2 0 0 0 1 2 1 4.60 383/1995 4.60 4.33 4.20 4.36 4.66 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned   2 0 0 0 0 2 1 3 4.87 124/1533 4.87 4.47 4.04 4.14 4.87 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned   2 0 0 0 0 0 1 1 3 4.80 156/1512 4.80 4.25 4.10 4.26 4.86 7. Was the grading system clearly explained   2 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 1 3 4.80 156/1512 4.80 4.56 4.84 4.66 4.71 4.60 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness   7 1 0 0 0 0 0 9 5.00 1/1621 5.00 4.23 4.06 4.71 4.60 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness   7 1 0 0 0 0 0 9 5.00 1/1621 5.00 4.23 4.06 4.71 4.60 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness   7 1 0 0 0 0 0 9 5.00 1/1621 5.00 4.23 4.06 4.71 4.60 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness   7 1 0 0 0 0 0 9 5.00 1/1621 5.00 4.23 4.06 4.71 4.60 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness   7 1 0 0 0 0 0 0 9 5.00 1/1621 5.00 4.23 4.06 4.72 4.72 4.72 4.72 4.72 4.72 4.72 4.72	_	_	J ,				-	-	-	-	_			,					
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals 2 0 0 0 2 2 11 4.60 383/1595 4.60 4.32 4.20 4.36 4.65 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 2 0 0 0 0 1 1 1 13 4.80 156/1512 4.80 4.25 4.10 4.26 4.80 7.25 4.10 4.10 4.10 4.10 4.10 4.10 4.10 4.10							-	•	•	•	_			,					
S. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 2 0 0 0 0 2 13 4.87 124/1533 4.87 4.74 4.04 4.14 4.87 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 2 0 0 0 0 1 13 4.80 166/1512 4.80 4.25 4.10 4.26 4.87 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 2 0 0 1 0 0 2 3 9 4.27 803/1623 4.27 4.28 4.16 4.27 4.27 4.28 8. How many times was class cancelled 2 0 0 0 0 0 0 9 5.00 13/1646 4.60 4.64 4.69 4.71 4.27 4.27 4.27 8. How many times was class cancelled 2 0 0 0 0 0 0 9 5.00 13/1646 4.60 4.64 4.69 4.71 4.27 4.27 4.27 4.27 4.27 4.27 4.27 4.27		_						•											
S. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned   2									-										
Name of the grading system clearly explained   2 0 1 0 0 2 3 9 4.27 803/1623 4.27 4.28 4.16 4.27 4.27		_	-		_			-	-										
Section   Sect			_		-		-		-	_	_			, -					
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 7 1 0 0 0 0 9 5.00 1/1621 5.00 4.23 4.06 4.24 5.00  Lecture 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 3 0 0 0 0 2 12 4.86 316/1568 4.86 4.64 4.43 4.54 4.86 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 3 0 0 0 1 1 12 4.79 876/1572 4.79 4.85 4.70 4.79 4.79 4.79 4.79 4.79 4.79 4.79 4.79			· -		nea .		-		-		-	-							
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 3 0 0 0 0 0 2 12 4 4.66 316/1568 4.86 4.64 4.43 4.54 4.86 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 3 0 0 0 0 1 1 12 4.79 876/1572 4.79 4.85 4.70 4.79 4.79 4.73 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 3 0 0 0 0 2 12 14 4.65 216/1564 4.86 4.86 4.48 4.28 4.40 4.86 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 3 0 0 0 0 1 2 11 4.71 448/1559 4.71 4.49 4.29 4.41 4.71 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 3 0 0 0 0 1 2 11 4.71 448/1559 4.71 4.49 4.29 4.54 4.07 4.57 5. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 8 0 0 0 0 1 1 7 4.67 326/1384 4.67 4.31 4.08 4.35 4.67 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 8 0 0 0 0 0 3 6 4.67 483/1382 4.67 4.48 4.29 4.56 4.67 2. Were special techniques successful 8 0 0 0 0 0 3 6 4.67 522/1368 4.67 4.60 4.30 4.58 4.67 4. Were special techniques successful 8 2 0 0 1 4 2 4.14 389/948 4.14 4.00 3.95 4.31 4.14 5.15 5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 15 0 0 0 1 0 1 4.00 ****/555 **** 4.57 4.29 4.41 ****  Seminar 5. Were criteria for grading made clear 12 0 0 0 0 0 0 8 0 4.00 68/312 4.00 3.74 3.68 3.95 4.00 5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities 9 0 0 0 0 0 8 0 4.00 68/312 4.00 3.74 3.68 3.95 4.00 5. Were there enough proctors for all the students 16 0 0 1 0 0 0 2.00 ****/ 110 **** 3.86 3.99 4.22 ****  Frequency Distribution  Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades Reasons Type Majors 19 Graduate 0 Major 13 68-63 0 2.00-2.99 2 C 0 General 2 Under-grad 17 Non-major 4 88-150 5 3.00-3.49 2 D 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0		_			ing effectiveness	_	-	0	0	0	-	9							5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 3 0 0 0 1 1 1 12 4.79 876/1572 4.79 4.85 4.70 4.79 4.79 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 3 0 0 0 0 2 12 4.86 216/1564 4.86 4.86 4.88 4.28 4.40 4.86 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 3 0 0 0 1 2 11 4.71 444/1559 4.71 4.49 4.28 4.41 4.71 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 3 0 0 0 0 2 3 9 4.50 303/1352 4.50 3.95 3.98 4.07 4.50 Discussion  Discussion  Discussion  Discussion  Discussions contribute to what you learned 8 0 0 0 0 1 1 7 4.67 326/1384 4.67 4.31 4.08 4.35 4.67 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 8 0 0 0 0 0 3 6 4.67 483/1382 4.67 4.68 4.28 4.29 4.56 4.67 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 8 0 0 0 0 0 3 6 4.67 522/1368 4.67 4.60 4.30 4.58 4.67 4. Were special techniques successful  Laboratory  5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 15 0 0 0 1 0 1 4.00 ****/ 555 **** 4.57 4.29 4.41 ****  Seminar  5. Were criteria for grading made clear  12 0 0 2 0 3 0 3.20 219/ 288 3.20 3.67 3.68 3.71 3.20 Field Work  5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities 9 0 0 0 0 8 0 4.00 68/ 312 4.00 3.74 3.68 3.95 4.00 Frequency Distribution  Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades Reasons Type Majors  Type Majors  Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades Reasons Type Majors  Type Majors  O0-27 0 0.00-0.99 0 B 4 5 Required for Majors 1 Graduate 0 Major 13 28-55 1 1.00-1.99 0 B 4 56-63 0 2.00-2.99 2 C 0 General 2 Under-grad 17 Non-major 4 4 56-63 0 2.00-2.99 9 C C 0 General 2 Under-grad 17 Non-major 4 4 56-63 0 2.00-2.99 9 C C 0 General 2 Under-grad 17 Non-major 4 4 56-63 0 2.00-2.99 9 C C 0 General 2 Under-grad 17 Non-major 4 4 56-63 0 2.00-2.99 9 C C D General 2 Under-grad 17 Non-major 4 4 56-63 0 2.00-2.99 9 C C D General 2 Under-grad 17 Non-major 4 4 56-63 0 2.00-2.99 2 C D General 2 Under-grad 17 Non-major 4 4 56-63 0 2.00-2.99 2 C D General 2 Under-grad 17 Non-major 4 4 56-63 0 2.00-2.99 2 C D General 3 C C C C C C C C C C C C C C C C C C			Lectur	e															
3 0 0 0 0 2 12 4.86 216/1564 4.86 4.48 4.28 4.40 4.86 4.40 4.20 4.86 4.00 4.86 4.00 4.86 4.00 4.86 4.00 4.86 4.00 4.86 4.00 4.00 4.86 4.00 4.00 4.00 4.00 4.00 4.00 4.00 4.0				_	-		-	-	-	-	_	12	4.86	316/1568	4.86	4.64	4.43		4.86
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 5 0 0 0 1 2 11 4.71 448/1559 4.71 4.49 4.29 4.41 4.75 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 3 0 0 0 0 1 2 1 1 4.71 448/1559 4.71 4.49 4.29 4.41 4.70 4.50 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 3 0 0 0 0 1 2 3 9 4.50 303/1352 4.50 3.95 3.98 4.07 4.50 5. Did audiovisual techniques pour understanding 3 0 0 0 0 1 2 1 7 4.67 326/1384 4.50 3.95 3.98 4.07 4.50 1.00 1.00 1 1 7 4.67 326/1384 4.50 4.50 4.50 4.50 4.50 4.50 4.50 4.5							0	0	-	_	_			, -		4.85	4.70	4.79	4.79
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 3 0 0 0 0 2 3 9 4.50 303/1352 4.50 3.95 3.98 4.07 4.50  Discussion 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 8 0 0 0 1 1 7 4.67 326/1384 4.67 4.31 4.08 4.35 4.67 3.00 1 1 1 7 4.67 326/1384 4.67 4.31 4.08 4.35 4.67 3.00 1 1 1 7 4.67 326/1384 4.67 4.31 4.08 4.35 4.67 3.00 1 1 1 7 4.67 326/1384 4.67 4.48 4.29 4.50 4.67 3.00 1 1 1 1 7 4.67 326/1384 4.67 4.48 4.29 4.50 4.67 3.00 1 1 1 1 7 4.67 326/1384 4.67 4.48 4.29 4.50 4.67 3.00 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1						3	0	0		0		12	4.86	216/1564	4.86	4.48	4.28	4.40	4.86
Discussion  1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned																			4.71
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 8 0 0 0 1 1 7 4.67 326/1384 4.67 4.31 4.08 4.35 4.67 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 8 0 0 0 0 3 6 4.67 483/1382 4.67 4.48 4.29 4.56 4.67 4.31 4.08 4.35 4.67 4.31 4.05 4.58 4.67 4.31 4.08 4.55 4.57 4.29 4.41 4.00 4.31 4.00 4.31 4.10 4.00 4.31 4.00 4.00 4.00 4.00 4.00 4.00 4.0	5. Did au	diovisual	techniques en	ur understanding	3	0	0	0	2	3	9	4.50	303/1352	4.50	3.95	3.98	4.07	4.50	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 8 0 0 0 0 3 6 4.67 483/1382 4.67 4.48 4.29 4.56 4.67 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 8 0 0 0 0 3 6 4.67 522/1368 4.67 4.60 4.30 4.58 4.67 4.00 4.30 4.58 4.67 4.00 4.00 5.95 4.31 4.14 4.00 5.95 4.31 4.14 4.00 5.95 4.31 4.14 4.00 5.95 4.31 4.14 5.00 5.00 5.00 5.00 5.00 5.00 5.00 5.0																			
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 8 0 0 0 0 3 6 4.67 522/1368 4.67 4.60 4.30 4.58 4.67 4. Were special techniques successful 8 2 0 0 1 4 2 4.14 389/ 948 4.14 4.00 3.95 4.31 4.14    Laboratory  5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 15 0 0 0 1 0 1 4.00 ****/ 555 **** 4.57 4.29 4.41 ****  Seminar  5. Were criteria for grading made clear 12 0 0 2 0 3 0 3.20 219/ 288 3.20 3.67 3.68 3.71 3.20    Field Work  5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities 9 0 0 0 0 8 0 4.00 68/ 312 4.00 3.74 3.68 3.95 4.00    Self Paced  5. Were there enough proctors for all the students 16 0 0 1 0 0 0 2.00 ****/ 110 **** 3.86 3.99 4.22 ****  Frequency Distribution  Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades Reasons Type Majors  00-27 0 0.00-0.99 0 B 4 7 Required for Majors 1 Graduate 0 Major 13 28-55 1 1.00-1.99 0 B 4 56-83 0 2.00-2.99 2 C 0 General 2 Under-grad 17 Non-major 4 88-150 5 3.00-3.49 2 D 0							-	-					,						
4. Were special techniques successful  8 2 0 0 1 4 2 4.14 389/ 948 4.14 4.00 3.95 4.31 4.14  Laboratory  5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 15 0 0 0 1 0 1 4.00 ****/ 555 **** 4.57 4.29 4.41 ****  Seminar  5. Were criteria for grading made clear  12 0 0 2 0 3 0 3.20 219/ 288 3.20 3.67 3.68 3.71 3.20  Field Work  5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities 9 0 0 0 0 8 0 4.00 68/ 312 4.00 3.74 3.68 3.95 4.00  Self Paced  5. Were there enough proctors for all the students  Frequency Distribution  Credits Earned  Cum. GPA  Expected Grades  Reasons  Type  Majors  00-27 0 0.00-0.99 0 A 7 Required for Majors 1 Graduate 0 Major 13 28-55 1 1.00-1.99 0 B 4 56-83 0 2.00-2.99 2 C 0 0 General 2 Under-grad 17 Non-major 4 84-150 5 3.00-3.49 2 D 0									-	-		-							
Laboratory 5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 15 0 0 0 1 0 1 4.00 ****/ 555 **** 4.57 4.29 4.41 ****  Seminar 5. Were criteria for grading made clear 12 0 0 2 0 3 0 3.20 219/ 288 3.20 3.67 3.68 3.71 3.20  Field Work 5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities 9 0 0 0 0 8 0 4.00 68/ 312 4.00 3.74 3.68 3.95 4.00  Self Paced 5. Were there enough proctors for all the students 16 0 0 1 0 0 0 2.00 ****/ 110 **** 3.86 3.99 4.22 ****  Frequency Distribution  Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades Reasons Type Majors  00-27 0 0.00-0.99 0 A 7 Required for Majors 1 Graduate 0 Major 13 28-55 1 1.00-1.99 0 B 4 56-83 0 2.00-2.99 2 C 0 General 2 Under-grad 17 Non-major 4 84-150 5 3.00-3.49 2 D 0					open discussion														
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 15 0 0 0 1 0 1 4.00 ****/ 555 **** 4.57 4.29 4.41 ****  Seminar  5. Were criteria for grading made clear  12 0 0 2 0 3 0 3.20 219/ 288 3.20 3.67 3.68 3.71 3.20  Field Work  5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities 9 0 0 0 0 8 0 4.00 68/ 312 4.00 3.74 3.68 3.95 4.00  Self Paced  5. Were there enough proctors for all the students  16 0 0 1 0 0 0 2.00 ****/ 110 **** 3.86 3.99 4.22 ****  Frequency Distribution  Credits Earned  Cum. GPA  Expected Grades  Reasons  Type  Majors  One of the students  Type  Majors  One of the students  One of the students  One of the students  One of the students  Frequency Distribution  Credits Earned  Cum. GPA  Expected Grades  Reasons  Type  Majors  One of the students  One of the	4. Were s	special te	cnniques succe	ssiul		8	2	0	0	1	4	2	4.14	389/ 948	4.14	4.00	3.95	4.31	4.14
Seminar 5. Were criteria for grading made clear  12 0 0 2 0 3 0 3.20 219/ 288 3.20 3.67 3.68 3.71 3.20  Field Work 5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities  9 0 0 0 0 8 0 4.00 68/ 312 4.00 3.74 3.68 3.95 4.00  Self Paced 5. Were there enough proctors for all the students  Frequency Distribution  Credits Earned  Cum. GPA  Expected Grades  Reasons  Type  Majors  O0-27  0 0.00-0.99 0 A 7  28-55 1 1.00-1.99 0 B 4 56-83 0 2.00-2.99 2 C 0 General  2 Under-grad 17 Non-major 4 84-150 5 3.00-3.49 2 D 0	5 Were r	egui remen		_	arly specified	15	0	0	0	1	0	1	4 00	****/ 555	****	4 57	4 29	4 41	****
Field Work 5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities 9 0 0 0 0 8 0 4.00 68/312 4.00 3.74 3.68 3.95 4.00  Self Paced 5. Were there enough proctors for all the students 16 0 0 1 0 0 0 2.00 ****/ 110 **** 3.86 3.99 4.22 ****  Frequency Distribution  Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades Reasons Type Majors  00-27 0 0.00-0.99 0 A 7 Required for Majors 1 Graduate 0 Major 13 28-55 1 1.00-1.99 0 B 4 56-83 0 2.00-2.99 2 C 0 General 2 Under-grad 17 Non-major 4 84-150 5 3.00-3.49 2 D 0	J. MOIG I	C q a I I C C I	_		arry product		Ü	ŭ	ŭ	_	ŭ	_	1.00	, 333		1.57	1.27		
Field Work  5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities 9 0 0 0 0 8 0 4.00 68/312 4.00 3.74 3.68 3.95 4.00  Self Paced  5. Were there enough proctors for all the students 16 0 0 1 0 0 0 2.00 ****/ 110 **** 3.86 3.99 4.22 ****  Frequency Distribution  Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades Reasons Type Majors  00-27 0 0.00-0.99 0 A 7 Required for Majors 1 Graduate 0 Major 13 28-55 1 1.00-1.99 0 B 4 56-83 0 2.00-2.99 2 C 0 General 2 Under-grad 17 Non-major 4 84-150 5 3.00-3.49 2 D 0	5. Were c	riteria f				12	0	0	2	0	3	0	3.20	219/ 288	3.20	3.67	3.68	3.71	3.20
Self Paced  5. Were there enough proctors for all the students  Frequency Distribution  Credits Earned  Cum. GPA  Expected Grades  Reasons  Type  Majors  O-27  0  0.00-0.99  0  A  7  Required for Majors  1  Graduate  Cum. GPA  B  A  Cum. GPA  Cum																			
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students 16 0 0 1 0 0 0 2.00 ****/ 110 **** 3.86 3.99 4.22 ****  Frequency Distribution  Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades Reasons Type Majors  00-27 0 0.00-0.99 0 A 7 Required for Majors 1 Graduate 0 Major 13 28-55 1 1.00-1.99 0 B 4 56-83 0 2.00-2.99 2 C 0 General 2 Under-grad 17 Non-major 4 84-150 5 3.00-3.49 2 D 0	5. Did co	nferences			eld activities	9	0	0	0	0	8	0	4.00	68/ 312	4.00	3.74	3.68	3.95	4.00
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students 16 0 0 1 0 0 0 2.00 ****/ 110 **** 3.86 3.99 4.22 ****  Frequency Distribution  Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades Reasons Type Majors  00-27 0 0.00-0.99 0 A 7 Required for Majors 1 Graduate 0 Major 13 28-55 1 1.00-1.99 0 B 4 56-83 0 2.00-2.99 2 C 0 General 2 Under-grad 17 Non-major 4 84-150 5 3.00-3.49 2 D 0			Self	Daced															
Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades Reasons Type Majors  00-27 0 0.00-0.99 0 A 7 Required for Majors 1 Graduate 0 Major 13 28-55 1 1.00-1.99 0 B 4 56-83 0 2.00-2.99 2 C 0 General 2 Under-grad 17 Non-major 4 84-150 5 3.00-3.49 2 D 0	5. Were t	here enou			e students	16	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 110	****	3.86	3.99	4.22	****
00-27 0 0.00-0.99 0 A 7 Required for Majors 1 Graduate 0 Major 13 28-55 1 1.00-1.99 0 B 4 56-83 0 2.00-2.99 2 C 0 General 2 Under-grad 17 Non-major 4 84-150 5 3.00-3.49 2 D 0					Frequ	ency	Dis	trib	utio	n									
00-27	Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades				Rea	asons	5			Ty	pe			Majors	<b>;</b>	
28-55 1 1.00-1.99 0 B 4 56-83 0 2.00-2.99 2 C 0 General 2 Under-grad 17 Non-major 4 84-150 5 3.00-3.49 2 D 0													1				 Mo≓-		
56-83 0 2.00-2.99 2 C 0 General 2 Under-grad 17 Non-major 4 84-150 5 3.00-3.49 2 D 0		-		-	== :		ке	quire	eu I	OT. MS	ijor	b	Τ.	Graduat	E	U	мајс	ΣĽ	13
84-150 5 3.00-3.49 2 D 0							Co	ners.	1				2	IInder-a	rad 1	7	Non	-maior	Δ
		-					Gel	пста.	_				4	onder-g.	rau 1	. 1	INOI1-	ilia JUL	7
Grade O D.DO 1.00 I I U BIECCIVED O #### - MEDID CHELE DIC CHOUGH					- *		וק.	ecti	17AC				Λ	#### _ 1	Meane +	here =	re not	enous	rh
P 0 responses to be significant	Grau.	U	3.30-4.00	_			E1.	CCCT	v CD				J					_	111
I 0 Other 9					- *		O+1	her					9	T CBPOILE	CD CO L	C DIGI.	LLLCAI		
? 0							001						-						

Course-Section: POLI 482 8020

Questions

Title INTERNATIONAL LAW

Instructor: DAVIS, JEFFREY

Enrollment: 20
Questionnaires: 20

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2008 Page 1368 FEB 11, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Course Dept UMBC Level Sect

Student Course	Evaluation	Questionnaire
----------------	------------	---------------

Frequencies Instructor

NR NA 1 2 3 4 5 Mean Rank Mean Mean Mean Mean Mean

		Genera	1																
1. Did yo	u gain ne	ew insights,ski	lls from	this cours	e	6	0	0	0	0	2	12	4.86	230/1649	4.69	4.51	4.28	4.50	4.86
2. Did th	e instruc	ctor make clear	the expe	cted goals		6	0	0	0	0	7	7	4.50	556/1648	4.25	4.31	4.23	4.36	4.50
3. Did th	e exam qu	uestions reflec	t the exp	ected goal	s	6	0	0	0	0	5	9	4.64	422/1375	4.47	4.38	4.27	4.48	4.64
4. Did ot	her evalı	uations reflect	the expe	ected goals		6	4	0	0	2	2	6	4.40	636/1595	4.32	4.33	4.20	4.36	4.40
		eadings contrib				7	0	0	0	0	2	11	4.85	133/1533	4.60	4.47	4.04	4.14	4.85
		signments contr				7	0	0	1	3	3	6	4.08	849/1512	4.07	4.25	4.10	4.26	4.08
		g system clearl				7	0	0	0	1	1		4.77	, -			4.16	4.27	
		was class canc				7	0	0	0	0	4	9		1004/1646	4.85			4.71	
	_	grade the overa		ng effecti	veness	7	0	0	0	0	3	10	4.77					4.24	
		Lectur	e																
1. Were t	he instru	uctor's lecture	s well pr	repared		6	0	0	0	0	0	14	5.00	1/1568	4.94	4.64	4.43	4.54	5.00
		ctor seem inter			:t	6	0	0	0	0	0	14	5.00	1/1572	4.97	4.85	4.70	4.79	5.00
		terial presente				6	0	0	0	0	3	11	4.79				4.28	4.40	
		es contribute t			- CAL 1	6	0	0	0	0	2	12	4.86	261/1559	4.77	4.49	4.29	4.41	
		l techniques en			nding	6	4	1	1	1	3		3.80					4.07	
		-	-		3														
1 - 1 1		Discus			,	1.0	0	0	-	•	-	0	4 60	256/1204	4 56	4 21	4 00	4 25	4 60
		ussions contrib		_		10	0	0	1	0	1			376/1384			4.08	4.35	4.60
		nts actively en	_	_	_	10	0	0	1	0	1			540/1382			4.29	4.56	4.60
		ctor encourage		open discu	ssion	10	0	0	0	1	2		4.60		4.71	4.60	4.30	4.58	4.60
4. Were s	pecial te	echniques succe	ssful			10	8	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/ 948	3.36	4.00	3.95	4.31	****
F		Labora		3		1.5	0	•	0	-	0	0	4 22	****	F 00	4 55	4 00	4 41	ale ale ale ale
5. Were r	equiremen	nts for lab rep	orts clea	arly specif	ied	17	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/ 555	5.00	4.57	4.29	4.41	****
F Wassa s		Semina	_			16	0	0	0	0	1	0	4 00	****/ 288	++++	2 67	2 (0	2 71	++++
5. were c	riteria i	for grading mad	e clear			16	U	U	U	U	4	U	4.00	^^^^/ 288	***	3.67	3.68	3./1	
د کاما سما		Field		. 7		1.4	0	1	0	1	1	0	2 22	020/ 210	2 22	2 74	2 (0	2 05	2 22
5. Dia co	nierences	s help you carr	y out ile	eid activit	ies	14	0	1	0	1	4	U	3.33	239/ 312	3.33	3./4	3.68	3.95	3.33
E Wome t	howe energy	Self		atudonta		17	0	1	0	0	2	0	2 00	****/ 110	****	2 06	2 00	4 22	****
5. were t	nere enou	ugh proctors fo	r all the	students		1/	0	1	U	U	۷	U	3.00	****/ IIU		3.80	3.99	4.22	
					Frequ	lency	Dis	trib	utio	n									
	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	Grades				Rea	asons	5			Ту	pe			Majors	
Credits E													0	 Graduat	 e	0	Majo	 or	10
Credits E	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	5		Red	quir	ed i	or Ma	ajor	5							
	0	0.00-0.99 1.00-1.99	0 0	A B	5 7		Re	quir	ed fo	or Ma	ajor	5	_						
00-27	-		-					quir nera		or Ma	ajor		3	Under-g	rad 2	20	3	-major	10
00-27 28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	7			_		or Ma	ajor			Under-g	rad 2	20	3	-major	10
00-27 28-55 56-83	0	1.00-1.99 2.00-2.99	0	B C	7		Gei	_	1	or Ma	ajor			3			Non-	3	
00-27 28-55 56-83 84-150	0 0 6	1.00-1.99 2.00-2.99 3.00-3.49	0 1 4	B C D	7 0 0		Gei	nera:	1	or Ma	ajor		3	#### - 1	Means t	here a	Non- are not	enoug	
00-27 28-55 56-83 84-150	0 0 6	1.00-1.99 2.00-2.99 3.00-3.49	0 1 4	B C D F	7 0 0 0		Ge:	nera:	1	or Ma	ajor		3	3	Means t	here a	Non- are not	enoug	

Course-Section: POLI 482 8620 University of Maryland

Title INTERNATIONAL LAW

Instructor: MELCAVAGE, EUGE

Enrollment: 17
Questionnaires: 17

Baltimore County Fall 2008 Page 1369 FEB 11, 2009 Job IRBR3029

				_	ncies				ructor	Course	_	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	1	0	1	2	13	4 53	617/1649	4.69	4.51	4.28	4.50	4.53
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	1	2	6	7		1124/1648	4.25	4.31	4.23	4.36	4.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	5	9	4.29	771/1375	4.47	4.38	4.27	4.48	4.29
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	1	1	7	7	4.25	818/1595	4.32	4.33	4.20	4.36	4.25
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	2	4	10	4.35	525/1533	4.60	4.47	4.04	4.14	4.35
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	5	6	6	4.06	859/1512	4.07	4.25	4.10	4.26	4.06
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	1	5	2	8	3.88	1192/1623	4.33	4.28	4.16	4.27	3.88
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	17	5.00	1/1646	4.85	4.64	4.69	4.71	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	1	1	0	8	5	4.00	914/1621	4.38	4.23	4.06	4.24	4.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	2	15	4.88	273/1568	4.94	4.64	4.43	4.54	4.88
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	16	4.94	355/1572	4.97	4.85	4.70	4.79	4.94
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	0	0	0	2	11	4.85	225/1564	4.82	4.48	4.28	4.40	4.85
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	0	0	1		4.69	487/1559	4.77	4.49	4.29	4.41	4.69
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	10	1	1	1	0	2	3.20	1177/1352	3.50	3.95	3.98	4.07	3.20
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	4	11	4.53	424/1384	4.56	4.31	4.08	4.35	4.53
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	1	0	1	2	13	4.53	600/1382	4.56	4.48	4.29	4.56	4.53
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0 6	0 2	1 1	0 3	0	16 4	4.82	348/1368	4.71	4.60	4.30	4.58	4.82
4. Were special techniques successful	U	ь	2	Т	3	1	4	3.36	763/ 948	3.36	4.00	3.95	4.31	3.36
Laboratory														
2. Were you provided with adequate background information		0	0	1	0	0	1		****/ 243	****	****	4.12	4.61	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	15	1	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 209	****	****	4.35	4.63	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	4	1	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/ 555	5.00	4.57	4.29	4.41	5.00
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	15	0	0	0	1	0	1		****/ 88	****	5.00	4.54	4.66	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	15	0	0	0	0	1	1		****/ 85	****	4.83	4.47	4.54	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	0	1	1		****/ 81	****	4.50	4.43	4.57	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	1	0	1		****/ 92	****	4.33	4.35	4.44	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	13	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	****/ 288	****	3.67	3.68	3.71	****
Field Work					•									
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.06	4.86	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	16 16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 48 ****/ 39	****	****	4.09 4.47	4.42 4.52	****
<ol> <li>Was the instructor available for consultation</li> <li>To what degree could you discuss your evaluations</li> </ol>	16	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 39	****	****	4.47	4.52	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	13	0	0	0	0	2	2		****/ 312	3.33		3.68	3.95	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out freid activities	13	U	U	U	U	4	2	4.50	/ 312	3.33	3.74	3.00	3.93	
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 53	****	****	4.30	4.64	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	14	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.16	4.24	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	14	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 41	****	****	4.43	4.84	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	14 14	0	0	0	0	0	3 3	5.00	****/ 24	****	****	4.42	4.85	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	14	U	U	U	U	U	3	5.00	****/ 110	^^^*	3.86	3.99	4.22	

Course-Section: POLI 482 8620

Title INTERNATIONAL LAW

Questionnaires: 17

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2008 Page 1369 FEB 11, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

# Frequency Distribution

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	 А	3	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	1	Major	12
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	В	8						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	1	C	1	General	1	Under-grad	16	Non-major	5
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00	1	F	0	Electives	2	#### - Means	there	are not enough	n
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	13	_			
				?	1						

Course-Section: POLI 488 0101

Title POLITICS/IR SOUTH ASIA

Instructor: HAGERTY, DEVIN

Enrollment: 26
Questionnaires: 26

# University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2008

Page 1370 FEB 11, 2009 Job IRBR3029

			Question	5		NR	NA	Fre	equer 2	ncies 3	4	5	Inst Mean	ructor Rank		Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			Genera	 1															
1. I	Did you	ı gain ne	w insights,ski		om this course	8	0	0	0	0	4	14	4.78	306/1649	4.78	4.51	4.28	4.50	4.78
			tor make clear			8	0	0	0	2	2	14	4.67	362/1648	4.67	4.31	4.23	4.36	4.67
			estions reflec			8	0	0	1	0	4	13	4.61	453/1375	4.61	4.38	4.27	4.48	4.61
4. I	Did oth	ner evalu	ations reflect	the e	xpected goals	8	0	0	0	3	4	11	4.44	580/1595	4.44	4.33	4.20	4.36	4.44
		_	-		what you learned	8	0	0	2	0	5		4.39	495/1533	4.39	4.47	4.04	4.14	4.39
					to what you learned	8	0	0	0	4	4		4.33		4.33	4.25	4.10		4.33
			system clearly		ained	8	0	0	1	0	4	13	4.61	,	4.61	4.28	4.16	4.27	
		-	was class canc			8	0	0	0	2	11	5		1462/1646	4.17	4.64	4.69	4.71	
9. I	How wor	ıld you g	rade the overa	ll tea	ching effectiveness	10	0	0	0	1	4	11	4.63	270/1621	4.63	4.23	4.06	4.24	4.63
_			Lectur																
			ctor's lecture			8	0	0	0	0	3		4.83	344/1568	4.83	4.64	4.43	4.54	4.83
			tor seem inter			8	0	0	0	0	2	16	4.89	640/1572	4.89	4.85	4.70	4.79	4.89
			erial presented s contribute to		explained clearly	8 8	0	0	0	1	3		4.72		4.72 4.83	4.48	4.28	4.40	
					you rearned your understanding	8	3	0	2	2	3 6		3.93	284/1559 779/1352		4.49 3.95	4.29	4.41	4.83
J. 1	Jiu auc	iiovisuai	ceciniques em	lance .	your understanding	0	3	U	۷	2	0	5	3.93	119/1332	3.93	3.95	3.90	4.07	3.93
				what you learned	9	0	0	0	1	6		4.53	424/1384		4.31	4.08	4.35	4.53	
			ed to participate	9	0	0	0	2	0	15	4.76	383/1382	4.76	4.48	4.29	4.56	4.76		
			nd open discussion	9	0	0	0	0	_	15	4.88	285/1368	4.88	4.60	4.30	4.58	4.88		
4. \	Were sp	pecial te		9	13	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	****/ 948	****	4.00	3.95	4.31	****		
5. 1	Were re	equiremen	ts for lab rep	orts c	learly specified	18	0	0	0	1	1	6	4.63	278/ 555	4.63	4.57	4.29	4.41	4.63
			Semina	r															
5. 1	Were cr	riteria f	or grading mad	e clea:	r	18	0	0	2	0	6	0	3.50	190/ 288	3.50	3.67	3.68	3.71	3.50
			Field	Work															
5. I	Did cor	nferences			field activities	18	1	0	2	1	4	0	3.29	244/ 312	3.29	3.74	3.68	3.95	3.29
			Self	Paced															
5. 1	Were th	nere enou	gh proctors for	r all	the students	19	0	0	0	0	7	0	4.00	40/ 110	4.00	3.86	3.99	4.22	4.00
		ere there enough proctors for all the students						trib	utior	1									
Cred	dits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Gr								Rea	asons	2			Туј	ne			Majors	
															. <del>-</del> 				
	-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 5		Red	quire	ed fo	or Ma	ajor	s	1	Graduate	е	0	Majo	r	14
	-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В 7				_				_		_				
	-83	0	2.00-2.99	1	C 3		Ger	nera:	T				1	Under-g	rad 2	26	Non-	major	12
	-150	8	3.00-3.49	6	D 0								1			. 1			1-
Gra	aa.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F 0 P 0		Ele	ectiv	ves				1	#### - 1 response				_	n
					I 0		O+1	ner				1	2	response	בם נט ג	e sigi.	iiiidl		
			? 0		001						. 4								

Course-Section: POLI 489A 0101

Title COMP FOREIGN POLICIES

Questions

Instructor: STARKEY, BRIGID Enrollment: 20

Questionnaires: 19

# University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2008

Page 1371 FEB 11, 2009 Job IRBR3029

#### Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

		~																
1 Did vo	ı gain ne	Genera ew insights,ski		n this course	8	0	0	0	0	2	9	4.82	265/1649	4.82	4 51	4.28	4.50	4 82
		ctor make clear			8	0	0	0	0	3	8	4.73		4.73	4.31	4.23		
		uestions reflec			8	0	0	0	1	2			432/1375	4.64		4.27		4.64
4. Did oth	ner evalı	uations reflect	the exp	pected goals	9	1	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	218/1595	4.78	4.33	4.20	4.36	4.78
5. Did ass	signed re	eadings contrib	ute to v	what you learned	8	0	0	0	0	2	9	4.82	146/1533	4.82	4.47	4.04	4.14	4.82
		_		what you learned	8	1	0	0	1	5		4.30	. , -	4.30	4.25	4.10		4.30
		g system clearl		ined	8	0	0	0	1	3		4.55	,	4.55	4.28	4.16	4.27	
	-	was class canc			8	0	0	0	0	0		5.00	1/1646	5.00			4.71	
9. How wor	ıld you g	grade the overa	ll teach	ning effectiveness	10	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	101/1621	4.89	4.23	4.06	4.24	4.89
		Lectur	е															
1. Were th	ne instru	uctor's lecture	s well p	prepared	8	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	245/1568	4.91	4.64	4.43	4.54	4.91
2. Did the	e instruc	ctor seem inter	ested in	n the subject	8	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1572	5.00	4.85	4.70	4.79	5.00
				xplained clearly	8	0	0	0	0	2	9	4.82	253/1564	4.82	4.48	4.28	4.40	
		es contribute t			8	0	0	0	0	2			306/1559	4.82	4.49	4.29		4.82
5. Did aud	diovisual	l techniques en	hance yo	our understanding	9	7	0	1	0	1	1	3.67	****/1352	****	3.95	3.98	4.07	****
		Discus	sion															
				what you learned	11	0	0	0	0	4	4	4.50	437/1384	4.50	4.31	4.08	4.35	4.50
				d to participate	11	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	272/1382	4.88	4.48	4.29	4.56	4.88
				d open discussion	11	0	0	0	0	0		5.00	1/1368	5.00		4.30		
4. Were sp	pecial te	echniques succe	ssful		11	2	0	0	1	3	2	4.17	380/ 948	4.17	4.00	3.95	4.31	4.17
_		Labora	_															
5. Were re	equiremer	nts for lab rep	orts cle	early specified	17	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 555	****	4.57	4.29	4.41	****
_		Semina							_									
5. Were ci	riteria 1	for grading mad	e clear		15	0	0	3	1	0	0	2.25	****/ 288	****	3.67	3.68	3.71	****
	_	Field																
5. Did com	nferences	s help you carr	y out fi	ield activities	16	1	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	****/ 312	****	3.74	3.68	3.95	****
		Self																
5. Were th	nere enou	ugh proctors fo	r all th	ne students	11	0	0	0	0	8	0	4.00	40/ 110	4.00	3.86	3.99	4.22	4.00
				Freq	lency	Dist	trib	ution	n									
Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	asons	S			Тур	e			Majors	;
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	 A 4		Per	 mui r		or Ma	aior		2	Graduate	. – – – – –	0	Majo		7
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	В 4		1000	JUTT (	-u 10	J_ 1,10	المارم	_	_	Graduate	•		1.104		,
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	1	C 1		Ger	nera:	1				1	Under-gr	ad 1	.9	Non-	major	12
84-150	7	3.00-3.49	5	D 0									3-	-			3	
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F 0		Ele	ecti	ves				0	#### - M	leans t	here a	are not	enou	ŗh
				P 0									response				_	
				I 0		Otl	her					7	_					
				? 0														

Course-Section: POLI 623 0101

Title GOVERNMENTAL BUDGETING

Instructor: MEYERS, ROY T.

Enrollment:

20 Questionnaires: 20

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2008

Page 1372

FEB 11, 2009

Job IRBR3029

Questions	NR	NA	Fre	_	ncies 3	4	5	Inst Mean	ructor Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean		Sect Mean
General  1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course  2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals  3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals  4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	3	0 0 15 0	0 0 0 0	0 0 0 0	0 4 1 3	9 6 1 9	8 7 0 5	4.12	683/1649 988/1648 ****/1375 996/1595	4.18 **** 4.12	4.31 4.38 4.33	4.28 4.23 4.27 4.20	4.46 4.34 4.44 4.35	4.47 4.18 **** 4.12
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 7. Was the grading system clearly explained 8. How many times was class cancelled 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3 4 3 7	0 0 0 0	1 0 0 0 0	1 2 3 0 0	4 1 1 0 2	4 7 5 0 9	7 7 7 17 2	4.00	1029/1623 1/1646	4.00 5.00	4.64	4.04 4.10 4.16 4.69 4.06	4.28 4.35 4.29 4.81 4.20	3.88 4.12 4.00 5.00 4.00
Lecture  1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared  2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject  3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly  4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned  5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3 3 3 4	0 0 0 0	0 0 0 0	0 0 1 0	3 0 3 4 5	5 1 6 3	7	4.94	1031/1568 355/1572 1073/1564 881/1559 607/1352	4.94 4.12 4.35	4.85 4.48 4.49	4.43 4.70 4.28 4.29 3.98	4.52 4.83 4.41 4.41 4.10	
Discussion  1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned  2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate  3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion  4. Were special techniques successful	5 5 5 5	0 0 0 4	0 1 0 0	0 0 1 2	3 2 1 2		12	4.40 4.60	774/1384 716/1382 579/1368 614/ 948	4.40 4.60	4.48 4.60	4.08 4.29 4.30 3.95	4.30 4.52 4.56 4.03	4.07 4.40 4.60 3.73
Laboratory 5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	18	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/ 555	***	4.57	4.29	4.66	***
Seminar  5. Were criteria for grading made clear	17	0	1	1	0	1	0	2.33	****/ 288	****	3.67	3.68	3.87	****
Self Paced 5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	18	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 110	****	3.86	3.99	3.92	****
	uency	7 Dis	tribu						m				Ma =	
Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades					asons				Ty]  Graduat				Majors 	 0
28-55 2 1.00-1.99 0 B 4 56-83 0 2.00-2.99 1 C 1			nera:		or Ma	i JOI i		0	Under-g		.0	Majo Non-	major	20
84-150 0 3.00-3.49 5 D 0 Grad. 10 3.50-4.00 7 F 0 P 0 I 0 ? 1			ectiv her	ves				0 7	#### - 1 respons				_	h

Course-Section: POLI 625 0101 University of Maryland Title THEORIES OF PUBLIC ADM

Baltimore County Fall 2008

Instructor: FLETCHER, PATRI Enrollment: 5

Questionnaires: 5

Page 1373 FEB 11, 2009 Job IRBR3029

	Evaluation	

							Fre	eque	ncies	3		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
		Question	3		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		 Genera	 1															
1. Did yo	u gain ne	ew insights,ski	lls fro	om this course	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	274/1649	4.80	4.51	4.28	4.46	4.80
		ctor make clear			0	0	0	0	0	3	2	4.40	702/1648	4.40	4.31	4.23	4.34	4.40
4. Did ot	her evalu	uations reflect	the ex	spected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	383/1595	4.60	4.33	4.20	4.35	4.60
5. Did as	signed re	eadings contrib	ute to	what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	151/1533	4.80	4.47	4.04	4.28	4.80
6. Did wr	itten ass	signments contr	ibute t	to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	0	3	4.20	755/1512	4.20	4.25	4.10	4.35	4.20
7. Was th	e grading	g system clearl	y expla	ained	0	0	0	0	0	3	2	4.40	635/1623	4.40	4.28	4.16	4.29	4.40
		was class canc			0	0	0	0	0	4	1	4.20	1440/1646	4.20	4.64	4.69	4.81	4.20
9. How wo	uld you g	grade the overa	ll tead	ching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	374/1621	4.50	4.23	4.06	4.20	4.50
		Lectur	<b>e</b>															
1. Were t	he instru	actor's lecture	s well	prepared	0	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	731/1568	4.60	4.64	4.43	4.52	4.60
		ctor seem inter			0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1572	5.00	4.85	4.70	4.83	5.00
3. Was le	cture mat	terial presente	d and e	explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	263/1564	4.80	4.48	4.28	4.41	4.80
4. Did th	e lecture	es contribute t	o what	you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	586/1559	4.60	4.49	4.29	4.41	4.60
		Discus																
1 544 -1				what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	_	г оо	1/1384	5.00	4.31	4.08	4.30	5.00
				ed to participate	0	0	0	0	0	0	5 5	5.00 5.00	1/1384		4.48	4.08	4.52	
				nd open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	1	-	4.80	369/1368		4.40	4.29	4.52	4.80
		echniques succe		id Open discussion	0	3	0	0	1	0	1		431/ 948		4.00	3.95		4.00
4. Were a	peciai ce	sciniiques succe	ssiui		U	,	U	U	1	U		1.00	131/ 310	4.00	1.00	3.93	1.03	4.00
		Labora																
5. Were r	equiremen	nts for lab rep	orts cl	learly specified	4	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 555	****	4.57	4.29	4.66	****
		Semina	r															
5. Were c	riteria 1	for grading mad	e clear	£	4	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 288	***	3.67	3.68	3.87	***
				Frequ	iency	Dis	trib	utio	n									
Credits E		Cum. GPA		Demonstrad Consider				Da		_			m				Ma	
	arned	Cuiii. GPA		Expected Grades					asons	5 			Ту:	pe 			Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 3		Red	quir	ed f	or Ma	ajors	3	0	Graduat	е	4	Majo	or	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	В 2														
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C 0		Ger	nera	1				1	Under-g	rad	1	Non-	-major	5
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D 0														
Grad.	4	3.50-4.00	1	F 0		Ele	ecti	ves				1	#### - 1				_	h
				Р 0									respons	es to b	e sign	ifican	ıt	
				т 0		∩+1	har					Δ						

Other

I 0

?

University of Maryland Baltimore County

Fall 2008

Page 1374 FEB 11, 2009

Job IRBR3029

Enrollment:	13	
Questionnaires:	9	Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Course-Section: POLI 652 0101

POLITICS OF HEALTH

MILLER, NANCY A

Title

Instructor:

							Fre	ncies			Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect	
Questions					NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		Conomo																
General  1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course						0	0	0	3	1	5	4.22	996/1649	4.22	4.51	4.28	4.46	4.22
_	2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals					0	0	0	1	2	6		498/1648		4.31	4.23	4.34	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals					0 1	5	0	0	0	1	-		401/1375			4.27		4.67
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals					0	0	0	0	0	3			321/1595		4.33	4.20		4.67
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned						0	0	0	0	2			168/1533		4.47			4.78
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned						0	0	0	2	0		4.56			4.25	4.10		4.56
7. Was the grading system clearly explained						0	0	0	0	2			199/1623		4.28	4.16		4.78
8. How many times was class cancelled						0	0	0	0	2	7		881/1646		4.64		4.81	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness					0 2	0	0	0	1	2	4		483/1621					
Lecture						0	0	0	0	_	-	4 70	440/1560	4 70	1 61	4 42	4 50	4 70
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared						0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	,		4.64	4.43	4.52	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject						0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1572		4.85	4.70		5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly						0	0	0	0	1 1		4.89	187/1564		4.48	4.28	4.41	
	4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned					4	0	0	3	0			,		4.49	4.29	4.41	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding						4	U	U	3	U	2	3.80	879/1352	3.80	3.95	3.98	4.10	3.80
Discussion  1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned						0	0	0	4	1	4	4.00	795/1384	4.00	4.31	4.08	4.30	4.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate						0	0	0	3	1			851/1382		4.48	4.29	4.52	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion					0	0	0	0	0	2			403/1368		4.60		4.56	
4. Were special techniques successful					0	5	0	0	2	1			601/ 948					
_		-																
Laboratory																		
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified					7	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/ 555	****	4.57	4.29	4.66	****
Seminar																		
5. Were criteria for grading made clear					8	0	0	1	0	0	Λ	2 00	****/ 288	****	2 67	2 60	2 07	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear						U	U		U	U	U	2.00	200		3.07	3.00	3.07	
Field Work																		
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities						0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 312	****	3.74	3.68	3.83	****
				Frequ	ency	Dist	cribu	utior	ı									
Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades						Reasons						Type Majors					l	
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	1	A 5		Rec	quire	ed fo	or Ma	jors	5	0	Graduat	9	4	Majo	r	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	В 3			_					_		_	_			
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	1	C 0	General						6	Under-grad 5			Non-major		9	
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	1	D 0													,	
Grad. 4 3.50-4.00 4 F 0					Electives							0	#### - Means there are not enough					
P 0						Other						2	responses to be significant					
				I 0		Oth	ıer					3						
				? 0														