

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	POLI 100 1
Title:	Amer Govt & Politics
Instructor:	Miller,Nicholas

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	51
Questionnaires:	37

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	1	2	7	12	14	4.00	1140/1528	4.06	4.45	4.31	4.16	4.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	3	12	21	4.50	575/1527	4.14	4.35	4.28	4.23	4.50
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	0	1	0	7	7	20	4.29	810/1333	4.13	4.38	4.34	4.26	4.29
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	7	17	12	4.08	1011/1495	3.90	4.24	4.25	4.11	4.08
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	1	7	12	14	4.06	824/1439	4.17	4.43	4.11	3.97	4.06
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	1	9	11	13	3.97	916/1425	3.85	4.19	4.12	3.93	3.97
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	0	4	9	22	4.51	438/1508	4.18	4.31	4.18	4.11	4.51
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	1	0	0	1	11	22	4.62	968/1526	4.37	4.64	4.66	4.57	4.62
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	1	0	10	18	4	3.73	1167/1490	3.91	4.20	4.11	4.02	3.73
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	1	6	29	4.78	441/1428	4.75	4.64	4.49	4.43	4.78
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	1	0	4	30	4.80	839/1436	4.81	4.83	4.74	4.70	4.80
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	2	11	22	4.57	541/1427	4.35	4.47	4.32	4.27	4.57
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	1	9	25	4.69	448/1425	4.43	4.54	4.34	4.31	4.69
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	4	1	0	10	9	10	3.90	836/1291	3.87	4.10	4.05	3.97	3.90
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	11	0	3	1	5	9	8	3.69	992/1271	3.76	4.27	4.16	3.98	3.69
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	11	0	0	3	7	6	10	3.88	1003/1276	3.67	4.40	4.33	4.14	3.88
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	11	0	0	0	7	6	13	4.23	839/1273	4.24	4.55	4.38	4.18	4.23
4. Were special techniques successful	11	16	3	2	2	3	0	2.50	898/922	2.89	3.91	4.02	3.87	2.50

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	POLI 100 1
Title:	Amer Govt & Politics
Instructor:	Miller,Nicholas

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	51
Questionnaires:	37

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	35	1	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/198	****	****	4.16	3.90	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	35	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/208	****	****	4.27	4.23	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	36	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/194	****	****	4.56	4.54	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	36	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/194	****	****	4.37	4.30	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	36	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/176	****	****	4.23	4.19	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	35	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/76	****	****	4.51	4.44	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	36	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/74	****	****	4.31	4.43	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	36	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/66	****	****	4.27	4.15	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	36	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/76	****	****	4.27	4.21	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	36	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/73	****	****	3.94	3.82	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	35	0	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/42	****	****	4.00	4.08	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	36	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/41	****	****	4.06	4.10	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	36	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/30	****	****	4.74	5.00	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	36	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/32	****	****	4.20	4.09	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	36	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/29	****	****	4.34	4.87	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	35	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/43	****	****	4.43	4.68	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	36	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/31	****	****	4.53	4.51	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	36	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/36	****	****	4.43	4.33	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	POLI 100 1
Title:	Amer Govt & Politics
Instructor:	Miller,Nicholas

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	51
Questionnaires:	37

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Self Paced														
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	36	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/21	****	****	4.54	4.63	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	36	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/20	****	****	4.45	4.39	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors				
00-27	4	0.00-0.99	1 A 11	Required for Majors	23	Graduate	0	Major	11
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	0 B 11						
56-83	6	2.00-2.99	3 C 9	General	4	Under-grad	37	Non-major	26
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	6 D 0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2 F 1	Electives	2	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
			P 0						
			I 0	Other	2				
			? 5						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	POLI 100 2
Title:	Amer Govt & Politics
Instructor:	Miller,Nicholas

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	51
Questionnaires:	40

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	3	0	0	1	9	16	11	4.00	1140/1528	4.06	4.45	4.31	4.16	4.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	3	0	1	0	10	8	18	4.14	1016/1527	4.14	4.35	4.28	4.23	4.14
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	3	0	0	1	8	11	17	4.19	880/1333	4.13	4.38	4.34	4.26	4.19
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	3	2	1	3	5	19	7	3.80	1213/1495	3.90	4.24	4.25	4.11	3.80
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	3	0	2	2	10	11	12	3.78	1037/1439	4.17	4.43	4.11	3.97	3.78
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	4	5	15	13	4.00	891/1425	3.85	4.19	4.12	3.93	4.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	3	0	0	3	5	8	21	4.27	758/1508	4.18	4.31	4.18	4.11	4.27
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	0	0	0	0	17	20	4.54	1027/1526	4.37	4.64	4.66	4.57	4.54
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	8	1	0	0	8	19	4	3.87	1067/1490	3.91	4.20	4.11	4.02	3.87
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	3	5	29	4.70	572/1428	4.75	4.64	4.49	4.43	4.70
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	3	10	24	4.57	1141/1436	4.81	4.83	4.74	4.70	4.57
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	2	7	8	20	4.24	925/1427	4.35	4.47	4.32	4.27	4.24
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	1	0	0	6	6	24	4.50	667/1425	4.43	4.54	4.34	4.31	4.50
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	7	2	2	8	7	11	3.77	930/1291	3.87	4.10	4.05	3.97	3.77
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	18	0	4	4	5	4	5	3.09	1188/1271	3.76	4.27	4.16	3.98	3.09
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	18	0	5	5	4	5	3	2.82	1250/1276	3.67	4.40	4.33	4.14	2.82
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	18	0	1	4	4	6	7	3.64	1134/1273	4.24	4.55	4.38	4.18	3.64
4. Were special techniques successful	18	14	1	3	2	2	0	2.63	****/922	2.89	3.91	4.02	3.87	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	POLI 100 2
Title:	Amer Govt & Politics
Instructor:	Miller,Nicholas

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	51
Questionnaires:	40

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	39	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/42	****	****	4.00	4.08	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	39	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/43	****	****	4.43	4.68	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	16	0.00-0.99 11	A 12	Required for Majors 22	Graduate 0 Major 12
28-55	2	1.00-1.99 0	B 9		
56-83	4	2.00-2.99 4	C 11	General 10	Under-grad 40 Non-major 28
84-150	2	3.00-3.49 3	D 2		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 3	F 0	Electives 4	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 1	
			? 5		

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	POLI 100 3
Title:	Amer Govt & Politics
Instructor:	King-Meadows,Ty

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	45
Questionnaires:	27

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			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	2	2	2	11	10	3.93	1214/1528	4.06	4.45	4.31	4.16	3.93
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	3	7	9	8	3.81	1273/1527	4.14	4.35	4.28	4.23	3.81
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	6	5	7	8	3.65	1201/1333	4.13	4.38	4.34	4.26	3.65
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	7	5	4	10	3.56	1349/1495	3.90	4.24	4.25	4.11	3.56
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	2	3	6	15	4.31	605/1439	4.17	4.43	4.11	3.97	4.31
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	3	6	4	3	10	3.42	1251/1425	3.85	4.19	4.12	3.93	3.42
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	2	3	5	5	11	3.77	1226/1508	4.18	4.31	4.18	4.11	3.77
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	1	0	21	4	4.08	1401/1526	4.37	4.64	4.66	4.57	4.08
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	2	3	11	7	4.00	911/1490	3.91	4.20	4.11	4.02	4.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	1	1	3	22	4.70	572/1428	4.75	4.64	4.49	4.43	4.70
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	27	5.00	1/1436	4.81	4.83	4.74	4.70	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	2	3	9	13	4.22	942/1427	4.35	4.47	4.32	4.27	4.22
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	3	3	6	14	4.07	1054/1425	4.43	4.54	4.34	4.31	4.07
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	2	3	3	7	11	3.85	875/1291	3.87	4.10	4.05	3.97	3.85
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	1	0	5	7	11	4.13	733/1271	3.76	4.27	4.16	3.98	4.13
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	1	6	8	9	4.04	911/1276	3.67	4.40	4.33	4.14	4.04
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	1	8	15	4.58	577/1273	4.24	4.55	4.38	4.18	4.58
4. Were special techniques successful	3	12	2	1	2	4	3	3.42	773/922	2.89	3.91	4.02	3.87	3.42

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	POLI 100 3
Title:	Amer Govt & Politics
Instructor:	King-Meadows,Ty

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	45
Questionnaires:	27

Questions	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect		
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
Laboratory														
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	26	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/208	****	****	4.27	4.23	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	25	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/76	****	****	4.51	4.44	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	26	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/74	****	****	4.31	4.43	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	26	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/66	****	****	4.27	4.15	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	26	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/76	****	****	4.27	4.21	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	26	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/73	****	****	3.94	3.82	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	25	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/42	****	****	4.00	4.08	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	26	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/41	****	****	4.06	4.10	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	26	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/30	****	****	4.74	5.00	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	25	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/43	****	****	4.43	4.68	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	25	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/31	****	****	4.53	4.51	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	25	1	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/36	****	****	4.43	4.33	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	25	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/21	****	****	4.54	4.63	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	25	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/20	****	****	4.45	4.39	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	4	0.00-0.99	1	A	4	Required for Majors	19	Graduate	0	Major	4
28-55	6	1.00-1.99	0	B	10						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section: POLI 100 3		Term - Fall 2010					Enrollment: 45									
Title: Amer Govt & Politics							Questionnaires: 27									
Instructor: King-Meadows,Ty																
Questions		NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect	
				1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
Self Paced																
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	2	C	8	General			4	Under-grad	27	Non-major			23	
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	3	D	2											
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	7	F	0	Electives			3	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant						
				P	0											
				I	0	Other			1							
				?	2											

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	POLI 100 4
Title:	Amer Govt & Politics
Instructor:	King-Meadows,Ty

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	46
Questionnaires:	25

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			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	2	0	1	7	15	4.32	845/1528	4.06	4.45	4.31	4.16	4.32
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	1	1	3	8	11	4.13	1025/1527	4.14	4.35	4.28	4.23	4.13
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	1	3	2	18	4.40	704/1333	4.13	4.38	4.34	4.26	4.40
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	1	0	4	8	11	4.17	942/1495	3.90	4.24	4.25	4.11	4.17
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	0	2	3	17	4.52	352/1439	4.17	4.43	4.11	3.97	4.52
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	1	5	10	7	4.00	891/1425	3.85	4.19	4.12	3.93	4.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	1	1	3	6	12	4.17	883/1508	4.18	4.31	4.18	4.11	4.17
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	17	6	4.26	1276/1526	4.37	4.64	4.66	4.57	4.26
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	1	1	2	10	8	4.05	884/1490	3.91	4.20	4.11	4.02	4.05
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	1	1	0	23	4.80	385/1428	4.75	4.64	4.49	4.43	4.80
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	1	23	4.88	580/1436	4.81	4.83	4.74	4.70	4.88
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	1	1	2	5	16	4.36	812/1427	4.35	4.47	4.32	4.27	4.36
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	2	5	17	4.48	696/1425	4.43	4.54	4.34	4.31	4.48
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	5	1	9	10	3.96	771/1291	3.87	4.10	4.05	3.97	3.96
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	1	0	5	5	11	4.14	725/1271	3.76	4.27	4.16	3.98	4.14
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	10	3	9	3.95	960/1276	3.67	4.40	4.33	4.14	3.95
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	1	0	3	1	17	4.50	637/1273	4.24	4.55	4.38	4.18	4.50
4. Were special techniques successful	3	10	1	5	3	2	1	2.75	887/922	2.89	3.91	4.02	3.87	2.75

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	POLI 100 4
Title:	Amer Govt & Politics
Instructor:	King-Meadows,Ty

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	46
Questionnaires:	25

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	22	1	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/198	****	****	4.16	3.90	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	22	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/208	****	****	4.27	4.23	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	22	1	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/194	****	****	4.56	4.54	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	23	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/194	****	****	4.37	4.30	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	23	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/76	****	****	4.51	4.44	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	23	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/76	****	****	4.27	4.21	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	23	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/73	****	****	3.94	3.82	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	23	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/42	****	****	4.00	4.08	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	23	0	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/41	****	****	4.06	4.10	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	23	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/30	****	****	4.74	5.00	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	23	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/32	****	****	4.20	4.09	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	23	1	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/29	****	****	4.34	4.87	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	23	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/43	****	****	4.43	4.68	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	23	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/31	****	****	4.53	4.51	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	6	0.00-0.99	0	A	6
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B	13
		Required for Majors		14	Graduate
				0	Major
					6

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section: POLI 100 4		Term - Fall 2010					Enrollment: 46									
Title: Amer Govt & Politics							Questionnaires: 25									
Instructor: King-Meadows,Ty																
Questions		NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect	
				1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
Self Paced																
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	3	C	4	General			9	Under-grad	25	Non-major			19	
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	1	D	0											
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F	0	Electives			0	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant						
				P	0											
				I	0	Other			1							
				?	2											

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	POLI 210 1
Title:	Political Philosophy
Instructor:	Carter,John

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	48
Questionnaires:	36

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			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	2	4	9	20	4.25	919/1528	4.25	4.45	4.31	4.34	4.25
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	2	3	7	8	16	3.92	1213/1527	3.92	4.35	4.28	4.32	3.92
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	2	3	8	23	4.44	648/1333	4.44	4.38	4.34	4.40	4.44
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	5	3	1	4	7	15	4.00	1047/1495	4.00	4.24	4.25	4.28	4.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	3	0	5	6	21	4.20	710/1439	4.20	4.43	4.11	4.12	4.20
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	4	3	2	6	7	14	3.84	1024/1425	3.84	4.19	4.12	4.11	3.84
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	2	3	5	10	16	3.97	1075/1508	3.97	4.31	4.18	4.19	3.97
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	2	21	11	4.26	1276/1526	4.26	4.64	4.66	4.64	4.26
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	11	2	3	1	8	7	4	3.35	1334/1490	3.35	4.20	4.11	4.11	3.35
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	1	1	4	4	23	4.42	942/1428	4.42	4.64	4.49	4.48	4.42
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	1	0	2	3	27	4.67	1043/1436	4.67	4.83	4.74	4.76	4.67
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	2	7	9	15	4.12	1024/1427	4.12	4.47	4.32	4.33	4.12
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	2	1	6	6	17	4.09	1048/1425	4.09	4.54	4.34	4.37	4.09
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	6	1	2	1	11	7	8	3.62	1013/1291	3.62	4.10	4.05	4.14	3.62
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	20	0	1	0	5	3	7	3.94	840/1271	3.94	4.27	4.16	4.21	3.94
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	20	0	2	0	5	0	9	3.88	1007/1276	3.88	4.40	4.33	4.37	3.88
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	20	0	1	0	5	0	10	4.13	898/1273	4.13	4.55	4.38	4.43	4.13
4. Were special techniques successful	20	1	1	3	3	5	3	3.40	779/922	3.40	3.91	4.02	4.11	3.40

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	POLI 210 1
Title:	Political Philosophy
Instructor:	Carter,John

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	48
Questionnaires:	36

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	34	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/198	****	****	4.16	4.41	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	35	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/208	****	****	4.27	4.30	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	35	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/194	****	****	4.56	4.57	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	1	A	9	Required for Majors	25	Graduate	0	Major	20
28-55	6	1.00-1.99	0	B	15						
56-83	5	2.00-2.99	4	C	2	General	3	Under-grad	36	Non-major	16
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	5	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	6	F	0	Electives	0	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	8						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	POLI 233 1
Title:	Common Law&Legal Analys
Instructor:	Miller,Kerwin

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	53
Questionnaires:	40

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	3	10	27	4.60	521/1528	4.60	4.45	4.31	4.34	4.60
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	5	6	29	4.60	453/1527	4.60	4.35	4.28	4.32	4.60
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	3	6	30	4.63	436/1333	4.63	4.38	4.34	4.40	4.63
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	1	4	9	25	4.49	528/1495	4.49	4.24	4.25	4.28	4.49
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	0	5	10	23	4.30	605/1439	4.30	4.43	4.11	4.12	4.30
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	2	0	2	11	24	4.41	501/1425	4.41	4.19	4.12	4.11	4.41
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	1	3	7	28	4.50	448/1508	4.50	4.31	4.18	4.19	4.50
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	1	0	0	0	14	24	4.63	948/1526	4.63	4.64	4.66	4.64	4.63
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	13	2	0	1	0	10	14	4.48	374/1490	4.48	4.20	4.11	4.11	4.48
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	2	6	31	4.74	497/1428	4.74	4.64	4.49	4.48	4.74
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	3	36	4.92	413/1436	4.92	4.83	4.74	4.76	4.92
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	4	8	27	4.59	529/1427	4.59	4.47	4.32	4.33	4.59
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	4	6	28	4.56	600/1425	4.56	4.54	4.34	4.37	4.56
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	24	2	1	2	1	7	3.77	930/1291	3.77	4.10	4.05	4.14	3.77
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	1	3	0	22	4.65	327/1271	4.65	4.27	4.16	4.21	4.65
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	14	0	0	0	1	6	19	4.69	406/1276	4.69	4.40	4.33	4.37	4.69
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	14	0	0	0	2	2	22	4.77	395/1273	4.77	4.55	4.38	4.43	4.77
4. Were special techniques successful	14	14	0	0	3	2	7	4.33	316/922	4.33	3.91	4.02	4.11	4.33

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	POLI 233 1
Title:	Common Law&Legal Analys
Instructor:	Miller,Kerwin

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	53
Questionnaires:	40

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	39	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/198	****	****	4.16	4.41	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	39	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/208	****	****	4.27	4.30	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	39	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/194	****	****	4.56	4.57	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	39	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/194	****	****	4.37	4.43	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	39	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/176	****	****	4.23	4.18	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	1	A	25	Required for Majors	29	Graduate	0	Major	17
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B	5						
56-83	7	2.00-2.99	2	C	2	General	0	Under-grad	40	Non-major	23
84-150	8	3.00-3.49	7	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	15	F	0	Electives	3	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	2				
				?	7						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	POLI 240 1
Title:	State & Local Politics
Instructor:	Hussey,Laura S.

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	39
Questionnaires:	21

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	2	0	0	0	2	8	9	4.37	805/1528	4.45	4.45	4.31	4.34	4.37
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	8	11	4.50	575/1527	4.53	4.35	4.28	4.32	4.50
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	1	1	6	12	4.45	634/1333	4.46	4.38	4.34	4.40	4.45
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	1	0	0	1	5	13	4.63	341/1495	4.36	4.24	4.25	4.28	4.63
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	0	3	7	9	4.15	753/1439	4.31	4.43	4.11	4.12	4.15
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	1	0	2	2	5	10	4.21	714/1425	4.13	4.19	4.12	4.11	4.21
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	1	3	5	11	4.30	722/1508	4.35	4.31	4.18	4.19	4.30
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	12	8	4.40	1163/1526	4.39	4.64	4.66	4.64	4.40
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	1	0	0	2	9	5	4.19	756/1490	4.12	4.20	4.11	4.11	4.19
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	3	17	4.85	303/1428	4.81	4.64	4.49	4.48	4.85
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	3	17	4.85	677/1436	4.85	4.83	4.74	4.76	4.85
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	3	2	15	4.60	506/1427	4.61	4.47	4.32	4.33	4.60
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	1	1	17	4.70	422/1425	4.66	4.54	4.34	4.37	4.70
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	1	4	5	10	4.20	574/1291	4.34	4.10	4.05	4.14	4.20
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	1	4	8	4.54	421/1271	4.47	4.27	4.16	4.21	4.54
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	0	0	1	0	12	4.85	257/1276	4.76	4.40	4.33	4.37	4.85
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	0	0	0	0	13	5.00	1/1273	4.93	4.55	4.38	4.43	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	8	9	0	0	2	1	1	3.75	****/922	3.90	3.91	4.02	4.11	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section: POLI 240 1	Term - Fall 2010	Enrollment: 39
Title: State & Local Politics		Questionnaires: 21
Instructor: Hussey, Laura S.		

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

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	1	0.00-0.99 0	A 5 Required for Majors	16	Graduate 0 Major 12
28-55	4	1.00-1.99 0	B 8		
56-83	3	2.00-2.99 1	C 5 General	1	Under-grad 21 Non-major 9
84-150	0	3.00-3.49 5	D 0		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 2	F 0 Electives	2	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 0		
			I 0 Other	0	
			? 3		

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	POLI 240 2
Title:	State & Local Politics
Instructor:	Hussey,Laura S.

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	36
Questionnaires:	22

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	0	0	3	4	14	4.52	613/1528	4.45	4.45	4.31	4.34	4.52
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	0	0	0	9	11	4.55	514/1527	4.53	4.35	4.28	4.32	4.55
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	2	7	12	4.48	606/1333	4.46	4.38	4.34	4.40	4.48
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	1	2	1	7	10	4.10	1006/1495	4.36	4.24	4.25	4.28	4.10
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	1	6	13	4.48	406/1439	4.31	4.43	4.11	4.12	4.48
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	2	1	1	7	10	4.05	865/1425	4.13	4.19	4.12	4.11	4.05
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	1	2	5	12	4.40	586/1508	4.35	4.31	4.18	4.19	4.40
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	1	11	9	4.38	1178/1526	4.39	4.64	4.66	4.64	4.38
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	0	4	8	5	4.06	878/1490	4.12	4.20	4.11	4.11	4.06
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	1	3	17	4.76	459/1428	4.81	4.64	4.49	4.48	4.76
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	3	18	4.86	677/1436	4.85	4.83	4.74	4.76	4.86
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	8	13	4.62	491/1427	4.61	4.47	4.32	4.33	4.62
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	6	14	4.62	542/1425	4.66	4.54	4.34	4.37	4.62
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	2	0	2	1	2	14	4.47	356/1291	4.34	4.10	4.05	4.14	4.47
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	1	0	2	1	11	4.40	549/1271	4.47	4.27	4.16	4.21	4.40
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	0	1	1	0	13	4.67	439/1276	4.76	4.40	4.33	4.37	4.67
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	0	0	0	2	13	4.87	279/1273	4.93	4.55	4.38	4.43	4.87
4. Were special techniques successful	7	5	1	1	1	2	5	3.90	551/922	3.90	3.91	4.02	4.11	3.90

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section: POLI 240 2	Term - Fall 2010	Enrollment: 36
Title: State & Local Politics		Questionnaires: 22
Instructor: Hussey, Laura S.		

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

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	2	A	4	Required for Majors	17	Graduate	0	Major	11
28-55	6	1.00-1.99	0	B	15						
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	3	C	1	General	1	Under-grad	22	Non-major	11
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	1	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	2						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	POLI 260 1
Title:	Comparative Politics
Instructor:	Grodsky,Brian

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	48
Questionnaires:	33

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	0	1	4	4	23	4.53	601/1528	4.55	4.45	4.31	4.34	4.53
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	3	17	12	4.28	872/1527	4.31	4.35	4.28	4.32	4.28
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	2	5	12	14	4.15	907/1333	4.12	4.38	4.34	4.40	4.15
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	18	3	1	3	5	3	3.27	1425/1495	3.54	4.24	4.25	4.28	3.27
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	1	5	9	17	4.21	699/1439	4.39	4.43	4.11	4.12	4.21
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	30	1	0	1	1	0	2.67	****/1425	4.00	4.19	4.12	4.11	****
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	6	5	21	4.39	599/1508	4.26	4.31	4.18	4.19	4.39
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	9	23	4.72	867/1526	4.72	4.64	4.66	4.64	4.72
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	12	2	0	0	1	9	9	4.42	464/1490	4.21	4.20	4.11	4.11	4.42
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	6	26	4.81	368/1428	4.76	4.64	4.49	4.48	4.81
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	1	2	28	4.87	612/1436	4.82	4.83	4.74	4.76	4.87
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	2	2	9	19	4.41	772/1427	4.45	4.47	4.32	4.33	4.41
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	3	5	23	4.65	502/1425	4.65	4.54	4.34	4.37	4.65
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	3	2	2	5	6	13	3.93	814/1291	4.15	4.10	4.05	4.14	3.93
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	10	0	1	2	4	11	5	3.74	971/1271	3.87	4.27	4.16	4.21	3.74
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	10	0	0	1	4	5	13	4.30	774/1276	4.35	4.40	4.33	4.37	4.30
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	10	0	0	1	2	5	15	4.48	663/1273	4.53	4.55	4.38	4.43	4.48
4. Were special techniques successful	11	6	1	1	3	4	7	3.94	525/922	4.14	3.91	4.02	4.11	3.94

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section: POLI 260 1	Term - Fall 2010	Enrollment: 48
Title: Comparative Politics		Questionnaires: 33
Instructor: Grodsky,Brian		

	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	30	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/198	****	****	4.16	4.41	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27 0	0.00-0.99 0	A 9	Required for Majors 22	Graduate 0	Major 20
28-55 7	1.00-1.99 0	B 13			
56-83 4	2.00-2.99 4	C 7	General 0	Under-grad 33	Non-major 13
84-150 5	3.00-3.49 13	D 0			
Grad. 0	3.50-4.00 2	F 0	Electives 2	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	
		P 0			
		I 0	Other 0		
		? 4			

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	POLI 260 2
Title:	Comparative Politics
Instructor:	Grodsky,Brian

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	45
Questionnaires:	33

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	0	0	4	6	22	4.56	567/1528	4.55	4.45	4.31	4.34	4.56
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	6	10	17	4.33	818/1527	4.31	4.35	4.28	4.32	4.33
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	2	9	5	16	4.09	957/1333	4.12	4.38	4.34	4.40	4.09
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	10	2	3	2	5	10	3.82	1207/1495	3.54	4.24	4.25	4.28	3.82
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	2	10	20	4.56	322/1439	4.39	4.43	4.11	4.12	4.56
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	19	1	1	2	2	7	4.00	891/1425	4.00	4.19	4.12	4.11	4.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	1	7	8	16	4.12	946/1508	4.26	4.31	4.18	4.19	4.12
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	9	24	4.73	853/1526	4.72	4.64	4.66	4.64	4.73
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	3	0	0	7	10	7	4.00	911/1490	4.21	4.20	4.11	4.11	4.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	3	3	25	4.71	572/1428	4.76	4.64	4.49	4.48	4.71
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	1	5	25	4.77	886/1436	4.82	4.83	4.74	4.76	4.77
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	2	1	8	20	4.48	654/1427	4.45	4.47	4.32	4.33	4.48
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	1	1	5	22	4.66	489/1425	4.65	4.54	4.34	4.37	4.66
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	0	0	0	4	10	15	4.38	448/1291	4.15	4.10	4.05	4.14	4.38
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	1	1	6	7	11	4.00	780/1271	3.87	4.27	4.16	4.21	4.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	0	0	5	5	15	4.40	696/1276	4.35	4.40	4.33	4.37	4.40
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	0	0	2	7	17	4.58	584/1273	4.53	4.55	4.38	4.43	4.58
4. Were special techniques successful	8	5	0	0	3	7	10	4.35	303/922	4.14	3.91	4.02	4.11	4.35

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	POLI 260 2
Title:	Comparative Politics
Instructor:	Grodsky,Brian

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	45
Questionnaires:	33

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	31	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/198	****	****	4.16	4.41	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	31	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/208	****	****	4.27	4.30	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	31	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/194	****	****	4.56	4.57	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	31	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/194	****	****	4.37	4.43	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	31	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/176	****	****	4.23	4.18	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	31	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/76	****	****	4.51	4.17	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	32	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/74	****	****	4.31	3.91	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	32	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/66	****	****	4.27	3.85	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	32	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/76	****	****	4.27	4.15	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	32	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/73	****	****	3.94	3.95	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	31	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/42	****	****	4.00	3.68	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	31	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/41	****	****	4.06	3.81	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	31	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/30	****	****	4.74	4.50	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	31	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/32	****	****	4.20	4.32	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	31	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/29	****	****	4.34	4.11	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	31	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/43	****	****	4.43	3.95	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	31	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/31	****	****	4.53	4.00	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	31	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/36	****	****	4.43	3.75	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section: POLI 260 2	Term - Fall 2010	Enrollment: 45
Title: Comparative Politics		Questionnaires: 33
Instructor: Grodsky,Brian		

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Self Paced														
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	31	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/21	****	****	4.54	3.63	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	31	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/20	****	****	4.45	3.77	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	6	Required for Majors	23	Graduate	0	Major	23
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	B	16						
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	2	C	3	General	1	Under-grad	33	Non-major	10
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	8	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	0	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	3				
				?	5						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	POLI 280 1
Title:	International Relations
Instructor:	Hody,Cynthia A

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	50
Questionnaires:	28

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	3	0	0	1	3	5	16	4.44	713/1528	4.44	4.45	4.31	4.34	4.44
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	3	0	0	2	3	7	13	4.24	912/1527	4.24	4.35	4.28	4.32	4.24
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	3	0	0	0	5	11	9	4.16	898/1333	4.16	4.38	4.34	4.40	4.16
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	3	1	1	1	3	7	12	4.17	942/1495	4.17	4.24	4.25	4.28	4.17
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	3	0	1	0	2	5	17	4.48	393/1439	4.48	4.43	4.11	4.12	4.48
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	3	2	2	1	2	5	13	4.13	796/1425	4.13	4.19	4.12	4.11	4.13
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	3	0	0	0	6	5	14	4.32	694/1508	4.32	4.31	4.18	4.19	4.32
8. How many times was class cancelled	4	0	0	0	0	10	14	4.58	994/1526	4.58	4.64	4.66	4.64	4.58
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	8	1	0	1	3	7	8	4.16	789/1490	4.16	4.20	4.11	4.11	4.16
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	2	0	2	5	16	4.32	1029/1428	4.32	4.64	4.49	4.48	4.32
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	0	4	21	4.84	709/1436	4.84	4.83	4.74	4.76	4.84
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	1	1	5	2	15	4.21	959/1427	4.21	4.47	4.32	4.33	4.21
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	1	0	1	5	3	15	4.33	870/1425	4.33	4.54	4.34	4.37	4.33
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	7	15	0	0	2	0	4	4.33	****/1291	****	4.10	4.05	4.14	****
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	3	5	10	4.39	563/1271	4.39	4.27	4.16	4.21	4.39
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	10	0	0	0	2	1	15	4.72	376/1276	4.72	4.40	4.33	4.37	4.72
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	11	0	0	0	0	1	16	4.94	141/1273	4.94	4.55	4.38	4.43	4.94
4. Were special techniques successful	11	9	1	2	1	1	3	3.38	787/922	3.38	3.91	4.02	4.11	3.38

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	POLI 280 1
Title:	International Relations
Instructor:	Hody,Cynthia A

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	50
Questionnaires:	28

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	27	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/198	****	****	4.16	4.41	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	27	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/208	****	****	4.27	4.30	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	27	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/194	****	****	4.56	4.57	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	27	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/194	****	****	4.37	4.43	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	27	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/176	****	****	4.23	4.18	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	27	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/76	****	****	4.51	4.17	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	27	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/74	****	****	4.31	3.91	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	27	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/66	****	****	4.27	3.85	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	27	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/76	****	****	4.27	4.15	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	27	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/73	****	****	3.94	3.95	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	27	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/42	****	****	4.00	3.68	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	27	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/41	****	****	4.06	3.81	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	27	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/30	****	****	4.74	4.50	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	27	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/32	****	****	4.20	4.32	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	27	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/29	****	****	4.34	4.11	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	27	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/43	****	****	4.43	3.95	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	27	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/31	****	****	4.53	4.00	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	27	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/36	****	****	4.43	3.75	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	POLI 280 1
Title:	International Relations
Instructor:	Hody,Cynthia A

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	50
Questionnaires:	28

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Self Paced														
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	27	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/21	****	****	4.54	3.63	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	27	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/20	****	****	4.45	3.77	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	10	Required for Majors	17	Graduate	0	Major	13
28-55	6	1.00-1.99	0	B	8						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	1	C	1	General	1	Under-grad	28	Non-major	15
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	5	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5	F	0	Electives	0	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	2				
				?	7						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	POLI 300 1
Title:	Quant Poli Sci
Instructor:	Miller,Nicholas

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	54
Questionnaires:	28

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	2	0	1	2	7	10	6	3.69	1337/1528	3.69	4.45	4.31	4.34	3.69
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	0	1	6	6	13	4.19	961/1527	4.19	4.35	4.28	4.27	4.19
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	0	1	1	4	4	16	4.27	823/1333	4.27	4.38	4.34	4.34	4.27
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	3	0	0	3	6	14	4.48	544/1495	4.48	4.24	4.25	4.28	4.48
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	4	6	2	5	5	4	2.95	1379/1439	2.95	4.43	4.11	4.13	2.95
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	3	3	1	0	5	8	8	4.00	891/1425	4.00	4.19	4.12	4.17	4.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	3	0	1	2	3	7	12	4.08	987/1508	4.08	4.31	4.18	4.17	4.08
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	0	0	0	0	5	20	4.80	742/1526	4.80	4.64	4.66	4.68	4.80
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	7	0	1	1	6	10	3	3.62	1233/1490	3.62	4.20	4.11	4.11	3.62
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	1	3	22	4.81	385/1428	4.81	4.64	4.49	4.48	4.81
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	1	1	8	16	4.50	1183/1436	4.50	4.83	4.74	4.74	4.50
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	2	6	8	10	4.00	1080/1427	4.00	4.47	4.32	4.31	4.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	2	0	5	6	13	4.08	1054/1425	4.08	4.54	4.34	4.34	4.08
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	4	1	1	2	7	10	4.14	634/1291	4.14	4.10	4.05	4.09	4.14
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	11	0	6	1	1	6	3	2.94	1210/1271	2.94	4.27	4.16	4.19	2.94
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	11	0	2	1	2	2	10	4.00	926/1276	4.00	4.40	4.33	4.37	4.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	11	0	1	2	1	4	9	4.06	928/1273	4.06	4.55	4.38	4.40	4.06
4. Were special techniques successful	12	12	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	****/922	****	3.91	4.02	4.02	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	POLI 300 1
Title:	Quant Poli Sci
Instructor:	Miller,Nicholas

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	54
Questionnaires:	28

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	26	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/198	****	****	4.16	4.26	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	26	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/208	****	****	4.27	4.31	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	26	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/194	****	****	4.56	4.59	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	26	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/194	****	****	4.37	4.37	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	27	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/176	****	****	4.23	4.33	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	27	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/76	****	****	4.51	4.02	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	27	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/74	****	****	4.31	3.86	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	27	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/66	****	****	4.27	4.00	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	27	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/76	****	****	4.27	3.68	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	27	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/73	****	****	3.94	4.27	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	27	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/42	****	****	4.00	3.20	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	27	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/41	****	****	4.06	3.86	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	27	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/30	****	****	4.74	4.80	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	27	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/32	****	****	4.20	3.38	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	27	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/29	****	****	4.34	4.79	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	27	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/43	****	****	4.43	3.75	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	27	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/31	****	****	4.53	4.75	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	27	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/36	****	****	4.43	5.00	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	POLI 300 1
Title:	Quant Poli Sci
Instructor:	Miller,Nicholas

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	54
Questionnaires:	28

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Self Paced														
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	27	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/21	****	****	4.54	5.00	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	27	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/20	****	****	4.45	5.00	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	A	6	Required for Majors	21	Graduate	0	Major	17
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	5						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	2	C	7	General	0	Under-grad	28	Non-major	11
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	4	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	6	F	1	Electives	1	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	8						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	POLI 315 1
Title:	Political Phil From 1600
Instructor:	Vetter,Lisa Pac

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	27
Questionnaires:	22

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	0	0	0	1	20	4.95	80/1528	4.95	4.45	4.31	4.34	4.95
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	0	0	0	1	19	4.95	59/1527	4.95	4.35	4.28	4.27	4.95
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	2	19	4.90	147/1333	4.90	4.38	4.34	4.34	4.90
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	4	16	4.59	381/1495	4.59	4.24	4.25	4.28	4.59
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	2	19	4.82	128/1439	4.82	4.43	4.11	4.13	4.82
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	1	3	17	4.59	310/1425	4.59	4.19	4.12	4.17	4.59
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	2	20	4.91	95/1508	4.91	4.31	4.18	4.17	4.91
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	22	5.00	1/1526	5.00	4.64	4.66	4.68	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	1	0	0	1	5	12	4.61	258/1490	4.61	4.20	4.11	4.11	4.61
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	2	19	4.82	368/1428	4.82	4.64	4.49	4.48	4.82
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	22	5.00	1/1436	5.00	4.83	4.74	4.74	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	1	0	2	19	4.77	270/1427	4.77	4.47	4.32	4.31	4.77
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	2	1	18	4.64	515/1425	4.64	4.54	4.34	4.34	4.64
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	1	3	0	3	4	11	3.95	782/1291	3.95	4.10	4.05	4.09	3.95
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	1	3	15	4.74	263/1271	4.74	4.27	4.16	4.19	4.74
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	1	1	17	4.84	257/1276	4.84	4.40	4.33	4.37	4.84
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	0	0	19	5.00	1/1273	5.00	4.55	4.38	4.40	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	4	0	0	0	3	5	10	4.39	284/922	4.39	3.91	4.02	4.02	4.39

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	POLI 315 1
Title:	Political Phil From 1600
Instructor:	Vetter,Lisa Pac

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	27
Questionnaires:	22

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	20	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/198	****	****	4.16	4.26	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	20	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/208	****	****	4.27	4.31	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	20	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/194	****	****	4.56	4.59	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	20	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/194	****	****	4.37	4.37	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	20	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/176	****	****	4.23	4.33	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	19	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/76	****	****	4.51	4.02	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	20	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/74	****	****	4.31	3.86	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	20	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/66	****	****	4.27	4.00	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	20	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/76	****	****	4.27	3.68	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	20	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/73	****	****	3.94	4.27	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	20	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/42	****	****	4.00	3.20	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	20	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/41	****	****	4.06	3.86	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	20	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/30	****	****	4.74	4.80	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/32	****	****	4.20	3.38	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	20	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/29	****	****	4.34	4.79	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	20	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/43	****	****	4.43	3.75	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	20	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/31	****	****	4.53	4.75	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	20	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/36	****	****	4.43	5.00	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	POLI 315 1
Title:	Political Phil From 1600
Instructor:	Vetter,Lisa Pac

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	27
Questionnaires:	22

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Self Paced														
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	20	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/21	****	****	4.54	5.00	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	20	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/20	****	****	4.45	5.00	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	11	Required for Majors	12	Graduate	0	Major	8
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	1	B	9						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	3	C	1	General	2	Under-grad	22	Non-major	14
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	7	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	4	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	1						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	POLI 317 01
Title:	American Political Devel
Instructor:	Straus,Jacob R

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	32
Questionnaires:	22

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	9	13	4.59	532/1528	4.59	4.45	4.31	4.34	4.59
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	4	17	4.73	290/1527	4.73	4.35	4.28	4.27	4.73
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	2	19	4.82	228/1333	4.82	4.38	4.34	4.34	4.82
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	7	14	4.67	313/1495	4.67	4.24	4.25	4.28	4.67
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	6	15	4.64	265/1439	4.64	4.43	4.11	4.13	4.64
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	5	17	4.77	159/1425	4.77	4.19	4.12	4.17	4.77
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	4	18	4.82	139/1508	4.82	4.31	4.18	4.17	4.82
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	6	16	4.73	853/1526	4.73	4.64	4.66	4.68	4.73
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	1	0	0	1	6	9	4.50	344/1490	4.50	4.20	4.11	4.11	4.50
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	6	16	4.73	534/1428	4.73	4.64	4.49	4.48	4.73
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	2	19	4.90	516/1436	4.90	4.83	4.74	4.74	4.90
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	4	17	4.81	230/1427	4.81	4.47	4.32	4.31	4.81
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	4	17	4.81	277/1425	4.81	4.54	4.34	4.34	4.81
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	0	0	0	1	7	11	4.53	312/1291	4.53	4.10	4.05	4.09	4.53
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	3	4	13	4.38	563/1271	4.38	4.27	4.16	4.19	4.38
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	3	4	14	4.52	574/1276	4.52	4.40	4.33	4.37	4.52
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	1	3	17	4.76	395/1273	4.76	4.55	4.38	4.40	4.76
4. Were special techniques successful	1	7	0	0	5	3	6	4.07	449/922	4.07	3.91	4.02	4.02	4.07

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	POLI 317 01
Title:	American Political Devel
Instructor:	Straus,Jacob R

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	32
Questionnaires:	22

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

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	2	0.00-0.99 0	A 11	Required for Majors 9	Graduate 0 Major 14
28-55	1	1.00-1.99 0	B 7		
56-83	1	2.00-2.99 2	C 1	General 3	Under-grad 22 Non-major 8
84-150	5	3.00-3.49 2	D 0		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 5	F 0	Electives 5	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 1	
			? 2		

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	POLI 323 1
Title:	The Presidency
Instructor:	Schaller,Thomas

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	32
Questionnaires:	22

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	0	0	0	2	19	4.90	160/1528	4.90	4.45	4.31	4.34	4.90
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	7	14	4.67	368/1527	4.67	4.35	4.28	4.27	4.67
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	3	0	0	0	4	13	4.76	282/1333	4.76	4.38	4.34	4.34	4.76
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	0	7	14	4.55	445/1495	4.55	4.24	4.25	4.28	4.55
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	4	16	4.80	132/1439	4.80	4.43	4.11	4.13	4.80
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	3	5	12	4.45	454/1425	4.45	4.19	4.12	4.17	4.45
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	1	4	16	4.71	229/1508	4.71	4.31	4.18	4.17	4.71
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	2	19	4.90	566/1526	4.90	4.64	4.66	4.68	4.90
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	1	1	0	2	4	9	4.25	675/1490	4.25	4.20	4.11	4.11	4.25
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	2	2	18	4.73	534/1428	4.73	4.64	4.49	4.48	4.73
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	21	4.95	258/1436	4.95	4.83	4.74	4.74	4.95
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	6	16	4.73	337/1427	4.73	4.47	4.32	4.31	4.73
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	0	21	4.91	163/1425	4.91	4.54	4.34	4.34	4.91
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	0	0	5	16	4.76	136/1291	4.76	4.10	4.05	4.09	4.76
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	1	3	12	4.69	304/1271	4.69	4.27	4.16	4.19	4.69
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	0	0	4	12	4.75	348/1276	4.75	4.40	4.33	4.37	4.75
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	0	1	0	3	12	4.63	543/1273	4.63	4.55	4.38	4.40	4.63
4. Were special techniques successful	6	8	2	0	1	0	5	3.75	617/922	3.75	3.91	4.02	4.02	3.75

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section: POLI 323 1	Term - Fall 2010	Enrollment: 32
Title: The Presidency		Questionnaires: 22
Instructor: Schaller,Thomas		

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

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 6	Required for Majors	16
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	B 11	Graduate	0
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	C 0	General	0
84-150	9	3.00-3.49	D 0	Under-grad	22
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	2
			P 0	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	
			I 0		
			? 4		
			Other		0

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	POLI 328 1
Title:	Women And Politics
Instructor:	Guise-Gerrity,N

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	29
Questionnaires:	18

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			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	8	5	3	1	1	2.00	1521/1528	2.00	4.45	4.31	4.34	2.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	8	4	4	1	1	2.06	1524/1527	2.06	4.35	4.28	4.27	2.06
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	4	5	2	4	0	3	2.57	1324/1333	2.57	4.38	4.34	4.34	2.57
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	2	6	2	4	1	2	2.40	1486/1495	2.40	4.24	4.25	4.28	2.40
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	7	2	3	3	3	2.61	1417/1439	2.61	4.43	4.11	4.13	2.61
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	9	1	4	2	2	2.28	1414/1425	2.28	4.19	4.12	4.17	2.28
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	2	8	5	1	1	1	1.88	1501/1508	1.88	4.31	4.18	4.17	1.88
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	3	14	1	3.89	1488/1526	3.89	4.64	4.66	4.68	3.89
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	5	2	7	1	0	2.27	1478/1490	2.27	4.20	4.11	4.11	2.27
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	9	2	3	2	1	2.06	1425/1428	2.06	4.64	4.49	4.48	2.06
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	2	5	6	5	3.78	1408/1436	3.78	4.83	4.74	4.74	3.78
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	7	2	5	1	2	2.35	1409/1427	2.35	4.47	4.32	4.31	2.35
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	1	7	2	5	1	1	2.19	1414/1425	2.19	4.54	4.34	4.34	2.19
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	8	5	1	1	0	2	2.22	1274/1291	2.22	4.10	4.05	4.09	2.22
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	5	1	4	2	3	2.80	1227/1271	2.80	4.27	4.16	4.19	2.80
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	3	0	3	3	6	3.60	1128/1276	3.60	4.40	4.33	4.37	3.60
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	3	3	2	1	6	3.27	1212/1273	3.27	4.55	4.38	4.40	3.27
4. Were special techniques successful	3	3	0	1	4	5	2	3.67	659/922	3.67	3.91	4.02	4.02	3.67

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	POLI 334 2
Title:	Judicial Process
Instructor:	Newton,Brent E

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	16
Questionnaires:	11

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	0	0	0	3	7	4.70	376/1528	4.70	4.45	4.31	4.34	4.70
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	1	9	4.73	290/1527	4.73	4.35	4.28	4.27	4.73
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	147/1333	4.90	4.38	4.34	4.34	4.90
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	124/1495	4.88	4.24	4.25	4.28	4.88
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1439	5.00	4.43	4.11	4.13	5.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	5	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1425	5.00	4.19	4.12	4.17	5.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	95/1508	4.90	4.31	4.18	4.17	4.90
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1526	5.00	4.64	4.66	4.68	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	1	3	6	4.50	344/1490	4.50	4.20	4.11	4.11	4.50
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	385/1428	4.80	4.64	4.49	4.48	4.80
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	516/1436	4.90	4.83	4.74	4.74	4.90
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	4	6	4.60	506/1427	4.60	4.47	4.32	4.31	4.60
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	163/1425	4.90	4.54	4.34	4.34	4.90
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	5	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	253/1291	4.60	4.10	4.05	4.09	4.60
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	2	1	6	4.44	507/1271	4.44	4.27	4.16	4.19	4.44
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	2	2	5	4.33	750/1276	4.33	4.40	4.33	4.37	4.33
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	2	1	6	4.44	689/1273	4.44	4.55	4.38	4.40	4.44
4. Were special techniques successful	2	4	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/922	5.00	3.91	4.02	4.02	5.00

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section: POLI 334 2	Term - Fall 2010	Enrollment: 16
Title: Judicial Process		Questionnaires: 11
Instructor: Newton, Brent E		

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

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	1	0.00-0.99 0	A 5 Required for Majors	4 Graduate	0 Major
28-55	0	1.00-1.99 0	B 4		
56-83	2	2.00-2.99 0	C 0 General	2	Under-grad
84-150	1	3.00-3.49 4	D 0		11 Non-major
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 1	F 0 Electives	3	
			P 0		
			I 0 Other	0	
			? 2		

**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	POLI 337 1
Title:	Comparative Justice
Instructor:	Davis,Jeffrey

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	30
Questionnaires:	20

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	1	1	0	5	12	4.37	805/1528	4.37	4.45	4.31	4.34	4.37
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	1	4	5	9	4.16	998/1527	4.16	4.35	4.28	4.27	4.16
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	1	1	1	6	10	4.21	856/1333	4.21	4.38	4.34	4.34	4.21
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	1	2	2	6	8	3.95	1114/1495	3.95	4.24	4.25	4.28	3.95
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	0	2	2	14	4.47	406/1439	4.47	4.43	4.11	4.13	4.47
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	1	1	7	9	4.16	776/1425	4.16	4.19	4.12	4.17	4.16
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	1	2	8	8	4.21	832/1508	4.21	4.31	4.18	4.17	4.21
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	4	15	4.79	769/1526	4.79	4.64	4.66	4.68	4.79
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	3	9	4	4.06	871/1490	4.06	4.20	4.11	4.11	4.06
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	1	3	15	4.74	515/1428	4.74	4.64	4.49	4.48	4.74
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	1	2	16	4.79	870/1436	4.79	4.83	4.74	4.74	4.79
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	1	2	7	9	4.26	908/1427	4.26	4.47	4.32	4.31	4.26
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	2	5	11	4.37	846/1425	4.37	4.54	4.34	4.34	4.37
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	3	0	2	2	6	6	4.00	728/1291	4.00	4.10	4.05	4.09	4.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	10	0	1	0	1	3	5	4.10	750/1271	4.10	4.27	4.16	4.19	4.10
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	10	0	1	0	1	2	6	4.20	837/1276	4.20	4.40	4.33	4.37	4.20
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	10	0	0	1	1	2	6	4.30	799/1273	4.30	4.55	4.38	4.40	4.30
4. Were special techniques successful	10	4	1	0	1	2	2	3.67	659/922	3.67	3.91	4.02	4.02	3.67

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section: POLI 337 1	Term - Fall 2010	Enrollment: 30
Title: Comparative Justice		Questionnaires: 20
Instructor: Davis, Jeffrey		

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

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99 0	A 7	Required for Majors 11	Graduate 0 Major 9
28-55	0	1.00-1.99 0	B 9		
56-83	3	2.00-2.99 2	C 1	General 1	Under-grad 20 Non-major 11
84-150	7	3.00-3.49 0	D 0		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 8	F 0	Electives 2	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 0	
			? 3		

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	POLI 339 1
Title:	Legal Advocacy
Instructor:	Newton,Brent E

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	16
Questionnaires:	15

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	1	14	4.93	112/1528	4.93	4.45	4.31	4.34	4.93
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	13	4.87	152/1527	4.87	4.35	4.28	4.27	4.87
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	0	1	13	4.73	316/1333	4.73	4.38	4.34	4.34	4.73
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	14	4.93	71/1495	4.93	4.24	4.25	4.28	4.93
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	3	12	4.80	132/1439	4.80	4.43	4.11	4.13	4.80
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	0	0	2	11	4.33	583/1425	4.33	4.19	4.12	4.17	4.33
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	1	13	4.80	144/1508	4.80	4.31	4.18	4.17	4.80
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	15	5.00	1/1526	5.00	4.64	4.66	4.68	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	1	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	122/1490	4.80	4.20	4.11	4.11	4.80
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	0	14	5.00	1/1428	5.00	4.64	4.49	4.48	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	14	5.00	1/1436	5.00	4.83	4.74	4.74	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	0	14	5.00	1/1427	5.00	4.47	4.32	4.31	5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	14	5.00	1/1425	5.00	4.54	4.34	4.34	5.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	3	2	0	2	0	7	3.91	836/1291	3.91	4.10	4.05	4.09	3.91
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	1	12	4.92	112/1271	4.92	4.27	4.16	4.19	4.92
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	0	0	13	5.00	1/1276	5.00	4.40	4.33	4.37	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	0	1	12	4.92	188/1273	4.92	4.55	4.38	4.40	4.92
4. Were special techniques successful	2	0	2	0	0	1	10	4.31	335/922	4.31	3.91	4.02	4.02	4.31

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	POLI 339 1
Title:	Legal Advocacy
Instructor:	Newton,Brent E

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	16
Questionnaires:	15

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

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	1	A	10	Required for Majors	8	Graduate	0	Major	9
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	4						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	1	Under-grad	15	Non-major	6
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	6	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F	0	Electives	3	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	1						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	POLI 354 1
Title:	Publ Mgmt/Personnel Sys
Instructor:	Johnson,Arthur

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	32
Questionnaires:	28

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	5	5	18	4.46	687/1528	4.45	4.45	4.31	4.34	4.46
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	4	6	18	4.50	575/1527	4.50	4.35	4.28	4.27	4.50
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	4	6	17	4.39	713/1333	4.45	4.38	4.34	4.34	4.39
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	18	0	0	1	2	7	4.60	369/1495	4.59	4.24	4.25	4.28	4.60
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	2	6	19	4.50	367/1439	4.32	4.43	4.11	4.13	4.50
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	19	0	0	1	1	6	4.63	283/1425	4.28	4.19	4.12	4.17	4.63
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	1	2	6	18	4.39	599/1508	4.45	4.31	4.18	4.17	4.39
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	7	20	4.74	825/1526	4.73	4.64	4.66	4.68	4.74
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	3	13	8	4.21	734/1490	4.23	4.20	4.11	4.11	4.21
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	0	6	19	4.76	459/1428	4.80	4.64	4.49	4.48	4.76
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	0	4	21	4.84	709/1436	4.84	4.83	4.74	4.74	4.84
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	2	8	15	4.52	601/1427	4.67	4.47	4.32	4.31	4.52
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	1	1	3	20	4.68	448/1425	4.76	4.54	4.34	4.34	4.68
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	6	9	2	0	3	2	6	3.77	930/1291	4.16	4.10	4.05	4.09	3.77
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	14	0	3	0	1	3	7	3.79	944/1271	4.05	4.27	4.16	4.19	3.79
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	14	0	1	1	0	2	10	4.36	735/1276	4.33	4.40	4.33	4.37	4.36
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	14	0	1	2	1	3	7	3.93	1002/1273	4.39	4.55	4.38	4.40	3.93
4. Were special techniques successful	14	11	1	0	0	1	1	3.33	****/922	4.29	3.91	4.02	4.02	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	POLI 354 1
Title:	Publ Mgmt/Personnel Sys
Instructor:	Johnson,Arthur

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	32
Questionnaires:	28

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

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	1	A	2	Required for Majors	19	Graduate	0	Major	14
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	9						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	3	C	7	General	0	Under-grad	28	Non-major	14
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	0	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	1				
				?	10						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	POLI 354 2
Title:	Publ Mgmt/Personnel Sys
Instructor:	Adler,Joseph

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	16
Questionnaires:	15

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	0	1	0	5	8	4.43	739/1528	4.45	4.45	4.31	4.34	4.43
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	1	0	4	9	4.50	575/1527	4.50	4.35	4.28	4.27	4.50
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	2	3	9	4.50	564/1333	4.45	4.38	4.34	4.34	4.50
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	4	9	4.57	407/1495	4.59	4.24	4.25	4.28	4.57
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	0	3	2	8	4.14	762/1439	4.32	4.43	4.11	4.13	4.14
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	2	1	3	7	3.93	959/1425	4.28	4.19	4.12	4.17	3.93
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	3	1	10	4.50	448/1508	4.45	4.31	4.18	4.17	4.50
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	4	10	4.71	867/1526	4.73	4.64	4.66	4.68	4.71
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	0	9	3	4.25	675/1490	4.23	4.20	4.11	4.11	4.25
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	0	2	10	4.83	335/1428	4.80	4.64	4.49	4.48	4.83
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	0	2	10	4.83	742/1436	4.84	4.83	4.74	4.74	4.83
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	0	0	0	2	9	4.82	220/1427	4.67	4.47	4.32	4.31	4.82
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	2	10	4.83	242/1425	4.76	4.54	4.34	4.34	4.83
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	0	0	0	1	3	7	4.55	297/1291	4.16	4.10	4.05	4.09	4.55
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	0	1	3	8	4.31	620/1271	4.05	4.27	4.16	4.19	4.31
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	1	2	2	8	4.31	774/1276	4.33	4.40	4.33	4.37	4.31
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	1	0	13	4.86	290/1273	4.39	4.55	4.38	4.40	4.86
4. Were special techniques successful	1	0	0	1	2	3	8	4.29	345/922	4.29	3.91	4.02	4.02	4.29

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	POLI 354 2
Title:	Publ Mgmt/Personnel Sys
Instructor:	Adler,Joseph

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	16
Questionnaires:	15

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	12	2	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/198	****	****	4.16	4.26	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	12	0	0	1	0	1	1	3.67	****/208	****	****	4.27	4.31	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	13	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/194	****	****	4.56	4.59	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	13	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/176	****	****	4.23	4.33	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	13	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/76	****	****	4.51	4.02	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	13	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/74	****	****	4.31	3.86	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/66	****	****	4.27	4.00	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/76	****	****	4.27	3.68	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	13	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/73	****	****	3.94	4.27	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/42	****	****	4.00	3.20	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/41	****	****	4.06	3.86	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/30	****	****	4.74	4.80	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	13	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/32	****	****	4.20	3.38	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/43	****	****	4.43	3.75	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/31	****	****	4.53	4.75	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/36	****	****	4.43	5.00	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/21	****	****	4.54	5.00	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/20	****	****	4.45	5.00	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section: POLI 354 2	Term - Fall 2010	Enrollment: 16
Title: Publ Mgmt/Personnel Sys		Questionnaires: 15
Instructor: Adler, Joseph		

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

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	2	0.00-0.99 0	A 7 Required for Majors 9	Graduate 0	Major 13
28-55	1	1.00-1.99 0	B 7		
56-83	4	2.00-2.99 1	C 0 General 3	Under-grad 15	Non-major 2
84-150	2	3.00-3.49 4	D 0		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 2	F 0 Electives 2	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	
			P 0		
			I 0 Other 0		
			? 1		

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	POLI 374 1
Title:	European Politics
Instructor:	Forestiery,Caro

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	31
Questionnaires:	20

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	0	0	1	3	15	4.74	334/1528	4.74	4.45	4.31	4.34	4.74
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	2	2	15	4.68	340/1527	4.68	4.35	4.28	4.27	4.68
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	2	0	1	0	3	13	4.65	415/1333	4.65	4.38	4.34	4.34	4.65
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	2	0	1	1	2	13	4.59	394/1495	4.59	4.24	4.25	4.28	4.59
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	2	0	5	11	4.21	699/1439	4.21	4.43	4.11	4.13	4.21
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	1	1	0	2	3	12	4.39	533/1425	4.39	4.19	4.12	4.17	4.39
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	2	5	12	4.53	428/1508	4.53	4.31	4.18	4.17	4.53
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	8	11	4.58	1002/1526	4.58	4.64	4.66	4.68	4.58
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	1	0	0	1	3	11	4.67	221/1490	4.67	4.20	4.11	4.11	4.67
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	0	1	17	4.94	133/1428	4.94	4.64	4.49	4.48	4.94
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	0	0	17	5.00	1/1436	5.00	4.83	4.74	4.74	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	1	1	16	4.83	202/1427	4.83	4.47	4.32	4.31	4.83
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	1	2	15	4.78	320/1425	4.78	4.54	4.34	4.34	4.78
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	2	0	0	2	3	10	4.53	304/1291	4.53	4.10	4.05	4.09	4.53
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	2	1	7	4.50	446/1271	4.50	4.27	4.16	4.19	4.50
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	10	0	0	0	1	0	9	4.80	302/1276	4.80	4.40	4.33	4.37	4.80
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	10	0	0	0	1	0	9	4.80	345/1273	4.80	4.55	4.38	4.40	4.80
4. Were special techniques successful	10	2	2	0	0	3	3	3.63	680/922	3.63	3.91	4.02	4.02	3.63

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section: POLI 374 1	Term - Fall 2010	Enrollment: 31
Title: European Politics		Questionnaires: 20
Instructor: Forestiere,Caro		

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect	
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
Self Paced															
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/31	****	****	4.53	4.75	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 8	Graduate	Major 12
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	B 6		
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	C 2	Under-grad	Non-major 8
84-150	9	3.00-3.49	D 0		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0		
			P 0		
			I 0		
			? 4		
			Other 0		

**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	POLI 380 1
Title:	International Relations
Instructor:	Hody,Cynthia A

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	25
Questionnaires:	19

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	1	2	3	13	4.47	674/1528	4.47	4.45	4.31	4.34	4.47
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	2	2	8	7	4.05	1078/1527	4.05	4.35	4.28	4.27	4.05
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	8	0	0	2	4	5	4.27	816/1333	4.27	4.38	4.34	4.34	4.27
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	1	4	4	9	4.17	942/1495	4.17	4.24	4.25	4.28	4.17
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	2	1	4	12	4.37	541/1439	4.37	4.43	4.11	4.13	4.37
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	2	1	5	10	4.28	646/1425	4.28	4.19	4.12	4.17	4.28
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	3	5	10	4.26	771/1508	4.26	4.31	4.18	4.17	4.26
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	2	17	4.89	583/1526	4.89	4.64	4.66	4.68	4.89
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	1	9	8	4.39	518/1490	4.42	4.20	4.11	4.11	4.42
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	4	15	4.79	422/1428	4.81	4.64	4.49	4.48	4.81
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	2	17	4.89	548/1436	4.91	4.83	4.74	4.74	4.91
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	1	1	5	12	4.47	669/1427	4.53	4.47	4.32	4.31	4.53
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	3	1	15	4.63	515/1425	4.61	4.54	4.34	4.34	4.61
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	14	1	0	0	0	3	4.00	****/1291	****	4.10	4.05	4.09	****
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1271	5.00	4.27	4.16	4.19	5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	9	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	302/1276	4.80	4.40	4.33	4.37	4.80
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	0	0	0	3	7	4.70	471/1273	4.70	4.55	4.38	4.40	4.70
4. Were special techniques successful	9	8	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/922	****	3.91	4.02	4.02	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	POLI 380 1
Title:	International Relations
Instructor:	Hagerty,Devin T

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	25
Questionnaires:	19

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	1	2	3	13	4.47	674/1528	4.47	4.45	4.31	4.34	4.47
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	2	2	8	7	4.05	1078/1527	4.05	4.35	4.28	4.27	4.05
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	8	0	0	2	4	5	4.27	816/1333	4.27	4.38	4.34	4.34	4.27
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	1	4	4	9	4.17	942/1495	4.17	4.24	4.25	4.28	4.17
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	2	1	4	12	4.37	541/1439	4.37	4.43	4.11	4.13	4.37
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	2	1	5	10	4.28	646/1425	4.28	4.19	4.12	4.17	4.28
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	3	5	10	4.26	771/1508	4.26	4.31	4.18	4.17	4.26
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	2	17	4.89	583/1526	4.89	4.64	4.66	4.68	4.89
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	7	1	0	0	1	4	6	4.45	419/1490	4.42	4.20	4.11	4.11	4.42
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	7	0	0	0	0	2	10	4.83	335/1428	4.81	4.64	4.49	4.48	4.81
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	7	0	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	464/1436	4.91	4.83	4.74	4.74	4.91
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	7	0	0	0	0	5	7	4.58	529/1427	4.53	4.47	4.32	4.31	4.53
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	7	0	1	0	0	1	10	4.58	578/1425	4.61	4.54	4.34	4.34	4.61
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	9	9	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1291	****	4.10	4.05	4.09	****
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1271	5.00	4.27	4.16	4.19	5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	9	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	302/1276	4.80	4.40	4.33	4.37	4.80
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	0	0	0	3	7	4.70	471/1273	4.70	4.55	4.38	4.40	4.70
4. Were special techniques successful	9	8	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/922	****	3.91	4.02	4.02	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	POLI 380 1
Title:	International Relations
Instructor:	Hagerty,Devin T

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	25
Questionnaires:	19

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

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	1	Required for Majors	9	Graduate	0	Major	16
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	11						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	2	C	4	General	0	Under-grad	19	Non-major	3
84-150	6	3.00-3.49	5	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5	F	0	Electives	7	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	3						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	POLI 381 1
Title:	Intl Rels Asia Pacific
Instructor:	Dasgupta,Sunil

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	19
Questionnaires:	14

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	3	4	7	4.29	886/1528	4.29	4.45	4.31	4.34	4.29
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	5	5	4	3.93	1202/1527	3.93	4.35	4.28	4.27	3.93
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	8	0	1	1	2	2	3.83	1127/1333	3.83	4.38	4.34	4.34	3.83
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	3	3	3	5	3.71	1274/1495	3.71	4.24	4.25	4.28	3.71
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	12	4.86	115/1439	4.86	4.43	4.11	4.13	4.86
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	3	5	6	4.21	714/1425	4.21	4.19	4.12	4.17	4.21
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	2	0	3	5	4	3.64	1278/1508	3.64	4.31	4.18	4.17	3.64
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	6	6	4.50	1061/1526	4.50	4.64	4.66	4.68	4.50
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	1	0	0	6	3	3	3.75	1149/1490	3.75	4.20	4.11	4.11	3.75
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	6	4	4	3.86	1280/1428	3.86	4.64	4.49	4.48	3.86
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	2	12	4.86	677/1436	4.86	4.83	4.74	4.74	4.86
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	1	0	2	6	5	4.00	1080/1427	4.00	4.47	4.32	4.31	4.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	3	2	8	4.21	958/1425	4.21	4.54	4.34	4.34	4.21
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	3	2	1	2	5	1	3.18	1165/1291	3.18	4.10	4.05	4.09	3.18
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	3	3	7	4.31	620/1271	4.31	4.27	4.16	4.19	4.31
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	2	2	3	6	4.00	926/1276	4.00	4.40	4.33	4.37	4.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	4	9	4.69	480/1273	4.69	4.55	4.38	4.40	4.69
4. Were special techniques successful	1	10	0	0	2	1	0	3.33	****/922	****	3.91	4.02	4.02	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	POLI 381 1
Title:	Intl Rels Asia Pacific
Instructor:	Dasgupta,Sunil

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	19
Questionnaires:	14

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

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99 0	A 5 Required for Majors	9	Graduate 0 Major 11
28-55	0	1.00-1.99 0	B 8		
56-83	4	2.00-2.99 0	C 0 General	2	Under-grad 14 Non-major 3
84-150	2	3.00-3.49 3	D 0		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 2	F 0 Electives	0	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 0		
			I 0 Other	0	
			? 1		

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	POLI 395 1
Title:	U.S. Nat'l Security Pol.
Instructor:	Starkey,Brigid

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	23
Questionnaires:	11

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	3	8	4.73	348/1528	4.73	4.45	4.31	4.34	4.73
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	8	4.73	290/1527	4.73	4.35	4.28	4.27	4.73
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	4	6	4.45	634/1333	4.45	4.38	4.34	4.34	4.45
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	1	8	4.45	576/1495	4.45	4.24	4.25	4.28	4.45
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	3	8	4.73	190/1439	4.73	4.43	4.11	4.13	4.73
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	1	1	8	4.70	215/1425	4.70	4.19	4.12	4.17	4.70
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	2	9	4.82	139/1508	4.82	4.31	4.18	4.17	4.82
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1526	5.00	4.64	4.66	4.68	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	156/1490	4.75	4.20	4.11	4.11	4.75
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	0	10	4.82	368/1428	4.82	4.64	4.49	4.48	4.82
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1436	5.00	4.83	4.74	4.74	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	3	8	4.73	337/1427	4.73	4.47	4.32	4.31	4.73
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	9	4.82	265/1425	4.82	4.54	4.34	4.34	4.82
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	4	0	0	1	0	6	4.71	167/1291	4.71	4.10	4.05	4.09	4.71
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	159/1271	4.88	4.27	4.16	4.19	4.88
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	223/1276	4.88	4.40	4.33	4.37	4.88
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	268/1273	4.88	4.55	4.38	4.40	4.88
4. Were special techniques successful	3	1	0	0	2	0	5	4.43	261/922	4.43	3.91	4.02	4.02	4.43

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section: POLI 395 1	Term - Fall 2010	Enrollment: 23
Title: U.S. Nat'l Security Pol.		Questionnaires: 11
Instructor: Starkey, Brigid		

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

Frequency Distribution

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

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	POLI 425 1
Title:	US Campaigns & Elections
Instructor:	Schaller,Thomas

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	20
Questionnaires:	16

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	0	0	1	3	11	4.67	434/1528	4.67	4.45	4.31	4.39	4.67
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	1	1	6	7	4.27	892/1527	4.27	4.35	4.28	4.30	4.27
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	1	1	0	2	4	7	4.14	916/1333	4.14	4.38	4.34	4.37	4.14
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	1	0	3	5	6	4.00	1047/1495	4.00	4.24	4.25	4.33	4.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	2	4	9	4.47	419/1439	4.47	4.43	4.11	4.20	4.47
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	0	7	7	4.33	583/1425	4.33	4.19	4.12	4.26	4.33
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	3	4	8	4.33	681/1508	4.33	4.31	4.18	4.24	4.33
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	2	13	4.87	636/1526	4.87	4.64	4.66	4.71	4.87
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	1	0	1	0	5	6	4.33	579/1490	4.33	4.20	4.11	4.19	4.33
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	1	1	1	11	4.57	770/1428	4.57	4.64	4.49	4.54	4.57
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	15	5.00	1/1436	5.00	4.83	4.74	4.75	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	1	4	8	4.54	589/1427	4.54	4.47	4.32	4.37	4.54
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	1	0	2	10	4.62	542/1425	4.62	4.54	4.34	4.37	4.62
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	0	0	0	0	0	13	5.00	1/1291	5.00	4.10	4.05	4.10	5.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	1	2	5	5	4.08	759/1271	4.08	4.27	4.16	4.33	4.08
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	1	2	5	5	4.08	900/1276	4.08	4.40	4.33	4.49	4.08
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	1	6	6	4.38	739/1273	4.38	4.55	4.38	4.55	4.38
4. Were special techniques successful	3	7	0	1	2	3	0	3.33	799/922	3.33	3.91	4.02	4.23	3.33

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	POLI 425 1
Title:	US Campaigns & Elections
Instructor:	Schaller,Thomas

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	20
Questionnaires:	16

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	14	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/76	****	****	4.51	4.83	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	14	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/74	****	****	4.31	4.42	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	14	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/66	****	****	4.27	4.26	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/76	****	****	4.27	4.42	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/73	****	****	3.94	4.23	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	1 A 4	Required for Majors	7 Graduate 0 Major 5
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0 B 9		
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	0 C 0	General	1 Under-grad 16 Non-major 11
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	3 D 0		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2 F 0	Electives	2
			P 0		
			I 0	Other	2
			? 2		

**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	POLI 427 1
Title:	African American Politic
Instructor:	King-Meadows,Ty

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	17
Questionnaires:	16

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	1	15	4.94	112/1528	4.94	4.45	4.31	4.39	4.94
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	5	9	4.44	688/1527	4.44	4.35	4.28	4.30	4.44
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	3	4	8	4.19	880/1333	4.19	4.38	4.34	4.37	4.19
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	1	2	3	9	4.33	746/1495	4.33	4.24	4.25	4.33	4.33
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	16	5.00	1/1439	5.00	4.43	4.11	4.20	5.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	2	1	5	7	4.13	796/1425	4.13	4.19	4.12	4.26	4.13
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	1	3	2	9	4.06	1003/1508	4.06	4.31	4.18	4.24	4.06
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	12	4	4.25	1285/1526	4.25	4.64	4.66	4.71	4.25
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	1	0	0	0	6	6	4.50	344/1490	4.50	4.20	4.11	4.19	4.50
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	1	2	12	4.73	515/1428	4.73	4.64	4.49	4.54	4.73
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	15	5.00	1/1436	5.00	4.83	4.74	4.75	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	1	2	3	9	4.33	843/1427	4.33	4.47	4.32	4.37	4.33
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	1	3	10	4.47	726/1425	4.47	4.54	4.34	4.37	4.47
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	1	0	0	3	3	8	4.36	464/1291	4.36	4.10	4.05	4.10	4.36
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	4	10	4.60	365/1271	4.60	4.27	4.16	4.33	4.60
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	0	3	12	4.80	302/1276	4.80	4.40	4.33	4.49	4.80
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	1	3	11	4.67	507/1273	4.67	4.55	4.38	4.55	4.67
4. Were special techniques successful	1	6	0	2	1	1	5	4.00	467/922	4.00	3.91	4.02	4.23	4.00

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	POLI 427 1
Title:	African American Politic
Instructor:	King-Meadows,Ty

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	17
Questionnaires:	16

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	14	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/198	****	****	4.16	4.37	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/208	****	****	4.27	4.21	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/194	****	****	4.56	4.52	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/194	****	****	4.37	4.45	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/176	****	****	4.23	3.87	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/76	****	****	4.51	4.83	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/74	****	****	4.31	4.42	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/66	****	****	4.27	4.26	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/76	****	****	4.27	4.42	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/73	****	****	3.94	4.23	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/42	****	****	4.00	4.73	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/41	****	****	4.06	4.33	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/30	****	****	4.74	4.57	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/32	****	****	4.20	4.24	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/29	****	****	4.34	4.11	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/43	****	****	4.43	4.63	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/31	****	****	4.53	4.17	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/36	****	****	4.43	4.38	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	POLI 427 1
Title:	African American Politic
Instructor:	King-Meadows,Ty

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	17
Questionnaires:	16

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Self Paced														
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/21	****	****	4.54	4.33	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/20	****	****	4.45	4.00	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	4	Required for Majors	10	Graduate	0	Major	12
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	3						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	3	C	5	General	0	Under-grad	16	Non-major	4
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	3	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	1				
				?	2						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	POLI 433 1
Title:	First Amendment Freedoms
Instructor:	Jones,Gary

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	41
Questionnaires:	21

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			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	4	5	11	4.19	983/1528	4.19	4.45	4.31	4.39	4.19
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	3	0	5	12	4.14	1007/1527	4.14	4.35	4.28	4.30	4.14
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	1	5	14	4.65	404/1333	4.65	4.38	4.34	4.37	4.65
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	12	1	1	0	3	4	3.89	1169/1495	3.89	4.24	4.25	4.33	3.89
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	1	0	0	4	15	4.60	292/1439	4.60	4.43	4.11	4.20	4.60
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	10	5	1	0	1	3	2.60	1394/1425	2.60	4.19	4.12	4.26	2.60
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	2	0	6	12	4.24	808/1508	4.24	4.31	4.18	4.24	4.24
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	17	3	4.15	1362/1526	4.15	4.64	4.66	4.71	4.15
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	1	1	0	7	9	1	3.50	1269/1490	3.50	4.20	4.11	4.19	3.50
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	1	0	2	5	11	4.32	1037/1428	4.32	4.64	4.49	4.54	4.32
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	2	0	3	3	11	4.11	1371/1436	4.11	4.83	4.74	4.75	4.11
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	1	0	3	5	10	4.21	950/1427	4.21	4.47	4.32	4.37	4.21
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	1	0	3	2	3	10	4.11	1037/1425	4.11	4.54	4.34	4.37	4.11
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	15	3	0	0	0	1	2.00	****/1291	****	4.10	4.05	4.10	****
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	3	2	2	3	4	3.21	1165/1271	3.21	4.27	4.16	4.33	3.21
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	1	3	5	3	2	3.14	1218/1276	3.14	4.40	4.33	4.49	3.14
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	1	3	3	3	4	3.43	1184/1273	3.43	4.55	4.38	4.55	3.43
4. Were special techniques successful	7	11	1	0	1	0	1	3.00	****/922	****	3.91	4.02	4.23	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	POLI 433 1
Title:	First Amendment Freedoms
Instructor:	Jones,Gary

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	41
Questionnaires:	21

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

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	8	Required for Majors	15	Graduate	0	Major	18
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	7						
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	4	C	2	General	1	Under-grad	21	Non-major	3
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	1	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	1				
				?	2						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	POLI 439 1
Title:	Sel Topics Public Law
Instructor:	Davis,Jeffrey

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	23
Questionnaires:	18

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	2	15	4.78	279/1528	4.78	4.45	4.31	4.39	4.78
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	5	11	4.50	575/1527	4.50	4.35	4.28	4.30	4.50
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	7	0	0	2	2	6	4.40	704/1333	4.40	4.38	4.34	4.37	4.40
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	2	3	4	8	4.06	1024/1495	4.06	4.24	4.25	4.33	4.06
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	2	1	14	4.71	205/1439	4.71	4.43	4.11	4.20	4.71
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	4	3	10	4.35	563/1425	4.35	4.19	4.12	4.26	4.35
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	2	5	10	4.33	681/1508	4.33	4.31	4.18	4.24	4.33
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	1	0	0	0	0	17	5.00	1/1526	5.00	4.64	4.66	4.71	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	1	7	7	4.40	494/1490	4.40	4.20	4.11	4.19	4.40
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	1	16	4.83	335/1428	4.83	4.64	4.49	4.54	4.83
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	17	4.94	310/1436	4.94	4.83	4.74	4.75	4.94
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	2	2	14	4.67	420/1427	4.67	4.47	4.32	4.37	4.67
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	1	1	14	4.65	502/1425	4.65	4.54	4.34	4.37	4.65
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	0	4	7	6	4.12	664/1291	4.12	4.10	4.05	4.10	4.12
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	1	1	3	8	4.38	563/1271	4.38	4.27	4.16	4.33	4.38
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	0	0	1	12	4.92	152/1276	4.92	4.40	4.33	4.49	4.92
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	0	0	0	13	5.00	1/1273	5.00	4.55	4.38	4.55	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	5	9	1	1	1	0	1	2.75	****/922	****	3.91	4.02	4.23	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	POLI 439 1
Title:	Sel Topics Public Law
Instructor:	Davis,Jeffrey

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	23
Questionnaires:	18

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	14	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	****/76	****	****	4.51	4.83	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	14	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	****/74	****	****	4.31	4.42	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	2	1	1	3.75	****/66	****	****	4.27	4.26	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	14	2	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/76	****	****	4.27	4.42	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	14	1	0	0	2	0	1	3.67	****/73	****	****	3.94	4.23	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	10	Required for Majors	14	Graduate	1	Major	7
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	0	B	5						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	17	Non-major	11
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00	12	F	0	Electives	1	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	2						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	POLI 446 1
Title:	The Politics Of Poverty
Instructor:	Hussey,Laura S.

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	20
Questionnaires:	15

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	15	5.00	1/1528	5.00	4.45	4.31	4.39	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	12	4.80	206/1527	4.80	4.35	4.28	4.30	4.80
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	12	4.80	237/1333	4.80	4.38	4.34	4.37	4.80
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	1	13	4.93	81/1495	4.93	4.24	4.25	4.33	4.93
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	14	4.93	69/1439	4.93	4.43	4.11	4.20	4.93
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	3	12	4.80	136/1425	4.80	4.19	4.12	4.26	4.80
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	3	11	4.67	284/1508	4.67	4.31	4.18	4.24	4.67
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	1	10	4	4.20	1332/1526	4.20	4.64	4.66	4.71	4.20
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	0	4	8	4.67	221/1490	4.67	4.20	4.11	4.19	4.67
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	0	14	5.00	1/1428	5.00	4.64	4.49	4.54	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	14	5.00	1/1436	5.00	4.83	4.74	4.75	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	1	13	4.93	110/1427	4.93	4.47	4.32	4.37	4.93
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	1	13	4.93	130/1425	4.93	4.54	4.34	4.37	4.93
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	6	1	1	2	1	3	3.50	1061/1291	3.50	4.10	4.05	4.10	3.50
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	2	10	4.83	184/1271	4.83	4.27	4.16	4.33	4.83
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	171/1276	4.92	4.40	4.33	4.49	4.92
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	211/1273	4.92	4.55	4.38	4.55	4.92
4. Were special techniques successful	3	11	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/922	****	3.91	4.02	4.23	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section: POLI 446 1	Term - Fall 2010	Enrollment: 20
Title: The Politics Of Poverty		Questionnaires: 15
Instructor: Hussey,Laura S.		

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

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	2	0.00-0.99 0	A 5 Required for Majors	8	Graduate 0 Major 3
28-55	1	1.00-1.99 0	B 4		
56-83	2	2.00-2.99 3	C 2 General	4	Under-grad 15 Non-major 12
84-150	5	3.00-3.49 4	D 1		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 4	F 0 Electives	1	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 1		
			I 0 Other	0	
			? 1		

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	POLI 460 1
Title:	Comp Inst Development
Instructor:	Forestiery,Caro

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	20
Questionnaires:	12

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/1528	5.00	4.45	4.31	4.39	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	10	4.83	179/1527	4.83	4.35	4.28	4.30	4.83
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	0	1	10	4.67	393/1333	4.67	4.38	4.34	4.37	4.67
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	10	4.83	154/1495	4.83	4.24	4.25	4.33	4.83
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	10	4.83	122/1439	4.83	4.43	4.11	4.20	4.83
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	3	9	4.75	175/1425	4.75	4.19	4.12	4.26	4.75
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	1	1	9	4.50	448/1508	4.50	4.31	4.18	4.24	4.50
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	5	7	4.58	994/1526	4.58	4.64	4.66	4.71	4.58
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	1	0	0	0	7	4.50	344/1490	4.50	4.20	4.11	4.19	4.50
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	2	9	4.67	637/1428	4.67	4.64	4.49	4.54	4.67
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/1436	5.00	4.83	4.74	4.75	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	2	10	4.83	202/1427	4.83	4.47	4.32	4.37	4.83
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	146/1425	4.92	4.54	4.34	4.37	4.92
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	0	2	1	8	4.55	297/1291	4.55	4.10	4.05	4.10	4.55
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1271	5.00	4.27	4.16	4.33	5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1276	5.00	4.40	4.33	4.49	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1273	5.00	4.55	4.38	4.55	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	1	0	0	0	1	2	8	4.64	167/922	4.64	3.91	4.02	4.23	4.64

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	POLI 460 1
Title:	Comp Inst Development
Instructor:	Forestiére,Caro

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	20
Questionnaires:	12

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/198	****	****	4.16	4.37	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/208	****	****	4.27	4.21	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/194	****	****	4.56	4.52	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/194	****	****	4.37	4.45	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/176	****	****	4.23	3.87	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/76	****	****	4.51	4.83	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/74	****	****	4.31	4.42	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/66	****	****	4.27	4.26	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/76	****	****	4.27	4.42	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/73	****	****	3.94	4.23	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/42	****	****	4.00	4.73	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/41	****	****	4.06	4.33	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/30	****	****	4.74	4.57	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/32	****	****	4.20	4.24	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/29	****	****	4.34	4.11	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/43	****	****	4.43	4.63	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/31	****	****	4.53	4.17	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/36	****	****	4.43	4.38	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	POLI 460 1
Title:	Comp Inst Development
Instructor:	Forestiére,Caro

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	20
Questionnaires:	12

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Self Paced														
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/21	****	****	4.54	4.33	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/20	****	****	4.45	4.00	****

Frequency Distribution

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

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	POLI 482 1
Title:	International Law
Instructor:	Davis,Jeffrey

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	20
Questionnaires:	15

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	0	1	0	2	11	4.64	463/1528	4.64	4.45	4.31	4.39	4.64
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	1	1	2	10	4.50	575/1527	4.50	4.35	4.28	4.30	4.50
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	1	0	0	2	11	4.57	489/1333	4.57	4.38	4.34	4.37	4.57
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	2	1	0	0	1	10	4.58	394/1495	4.58	4.24	4.25	4.33	4.58
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	1	13	4.93	79/1439	4.93	4.43	4.11	4.20	4.93
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	1	0	0	2	1	10	4.62	292/1425	4.62	4.19	4.12	4.26	4.62
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	1	2	1	9	4.38	613/1508	4.38	4.31	4.18	4.24	4.38
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	14	5.00	1/1526	5.00	4.64	4.66	4.71	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	0	6	5	4.45	419/1490	4.45	4.20	4.11	4.19	4.45
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	1	0	0	2	11	4.57	770/1428	4.57	4.64	4.49	4.54	4.57
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	14	5.00	1/1436	5.00	4.83	4.74	4.75	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	1	1	12	4.79	256/1427	4.79	4.47	4.32	4.37	4.79
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	3	11	4.79	306/1425	4.79	4.54	4.34	4.37	4.79
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	2	0	1	2	0	9	4.42	415/1291	4.42	4.10	4.05	4.10	4.42
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	1	1	8	4.70	289/1271	4.70	4.27	4.16	4.33	4.70
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	190/1276	4.90	4.40	4.33	4.49	4.90
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	235/1273	4.90	4.55	4.38	4.55	4.90
4. Were special techniques successful	5	5	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	272/922	4.40	3.91	4.02	4.23	4.40

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section: POLI 482 1	Term - Fall 2010	Enrollment: 20
Title: International Law		Questionnaires: 15
Instructor: Davis,Jeffrey		

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

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	5	Required for Majors	7	Graduate	0	Major	4
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	6						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	4	C	1	General	1	Under-grad	15	Non-major	11
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	4	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	3						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	POLI 489 2
Title:	Sel Topics: Internatl Rel
Instructor:	Starkey, Brigid

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	21
Questionnaires:	18

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	0	0	0	4	13	4.76	293/1528	4.76	4.45	4.31	4.39	4.76
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	4	13	4.76	248/1527	4.76	4.35	4.28	4.30	4.76
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	1	16	4.94	88/1333	4.94	4.38	4.34	4.37	4.94
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	1	0	0	0	2	14	4.88	124/1495	4.88	4.24	4.25	4.33	4.88
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	5	12	4.71	205/1439	4.71	4.43	4.11	4.20	4.71
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	4	12	4.65	266/1425	4.65	4.19	4.12	4.26	4.65
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	1	3	13	4.71	239/1508	4.71	4.31	4.18	4.24	4.71
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	1	16	4.94	340/1526	4.94	4.64	4.66	4.71	4.94
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	0	1	14	4.93	57/1490	4.93	4.20	4.11	4.19	4.93
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	0	0	16	5.00	1/1428	5.00	4.64	4.49	4.54	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	0	16	5.00	1/1436	5.00	4.83	4.74	4.75	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	0	2	14	4.88	165/1427	4.88	4.47	4.32	4.37	4.88
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	0	16	5.00	1/1425	5.00	4.54	4.34	4.37	5.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	4	1	0	1	3	7	4.25	539/1291	4.25	4.10	4.05	4.10	4.25
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	0	14	5.00	1/1271	5.00	4.27	4.16	4.33	5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	0	1	4	9	4.57	531/1276	4.57	4.40	4.33	4.49	4.57
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	0	0	3	11	4.79	370/1273	4.79	4.55	4.38	4.55	4.79
4. Were special techniques successful	4	0	1	0	0	4	9	4.43	261/922	4.43	3.91	4.02	4.23	4.43

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	POLI 489 2
Title:	Sel Topics: Internatl Rel
Instructor:	Starkey, Brigid

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	21
Questionnaires:	18

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

Frequency Distribution

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