Course-Section: POLI 100 0101

Title AMER GOVT & POLITICS

MILLER, NICHOLA Instructor:

Enrollment: 35 Questionnaires: 33

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2008

Page 1321 AUG 6, 2008 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

			Fre	equer	ncies	5		Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	_	3	4	5	Mean	Rank		Mean		Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	8	0	3	3	3	6	10	3.68	1478/1670	4.12	4.47	4.31	4.23	3.68
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	8	0	1	1	7	5	11		1246/1666	4.15	4.43	4.27	4.30	3.96
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	8	0	0	3	5	7	10	3.96	1086/1406	4.21	4.50	4.32	4.31	3.96
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	8	0	0	1	7	6	11	4.08	1039/1615	3.95	4.36	4.24	4.17	4.08
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	2	4	6	13	4.20	706/1566	3.99	4.29	4.07	4.03	4.20
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	8	0	1	1	5	8	10	4.00	899/1528	3.83	4.36	4.12	4.00	4.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	8	0	1	1	3	3	17	4.36	769/1650	4.33	4.42	4.22	4.28	4.36
8. How many times was class cancelled	8	2	0	0	0	10	13		1112/1667		4.67	4.67	4.61	4.57
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	15	1	0	2	4	10	1	3.59	1354/1626	3.83	4.21	4.11	4.07	3.59
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	9	0	0	2	0	5	17	4.54	846/1559	4.71	4.74	4.46	4.47	4.54
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	10	0	1	0	2	6	14	4.39	1333/1560	4.65	4.83	4.72	4.68	4.39
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	11	0	0	3	1	7	11	4.18	1036/1549	4.40	4.59	4.31	4.32	4.18
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	10	1	1	3	2	5	11		1139/1546	4.34	4.58	4.32	4.32	4.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	12	4	1	1	3	4	8	4.00	692/1323	3.77	3.90	4.00	3.91	4.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	14	0	6	2	3	4	4	2.89	1299/1384	3.64	4.37	4.10	3.92	2.89
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	14	0	2	2	5	3	7	3.58	1167/1378	3.87	4.57	4.29	4.09	3.58
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	14	0	1	1	3	5	9	4.05	962/1378	4.29	4.69	4.31	4.08	4.05
4. Were special techniques successful	14	14	0	1	2	1	1	3.40	****/ 904	****	3.95	4.03	3.94	***
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	29	2	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 232	****	****	4.19	4.25	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	31	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 239	****	****	4.21	4.35	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	31	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 230	****	****	4.44	4.58	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	29	2	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 87	****	3.83	4.65	4.67	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	31	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 79	****	4.00	4.64	4.72	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	31	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 75	****	4.17	4.57	4.46	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	31	1	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 79	****	3.67	4.45	4.59	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	31	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 80	****	3.83	3.97	3.99	***
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	31	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 41	****	****	4.50	3.91	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	31	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/ 38	****	****	4.19	4.07	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	31	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/ 38	****	****	4.62	4.63	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	31	1	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.27	4.42	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	31	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.47	4.28	***
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	31	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/ 28	****	****	4.64	4.59	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	31	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 16	****	****	4.67	4.83	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	31	1	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 27	****	****	4.54	4.46	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	31	1	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 10	****	***	4.84	4.75	***
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	31	1	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 6	****	****	4.92	4.83	***

Course-Section: POLI 100 0101

AMER GOVT & POLITICS

Title Instructor: MILLER, NICHOLA

Enrollment: 35 Questionnaires: 33

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2008

Page 1321 AUG 6, 2008 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expecte	d Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors	
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	1	A	4	Required for Majors	6	Graduate	0	Major	8
28-55	5	1.00-1.99	2	В	10						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	2	C	5	General	0	Under-grad	33	Non-major	25
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	1	D	1						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	1	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	n
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	15				
				?	0						

Course-Section: POLI 100 0201

Title AMER GOVT & POLITICS MILLER, NICHOLA

Instructor:

Enrollment: 49 Questionnaires: 40

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2008

Page 1322 AUG 6, 2008 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

			Fre	eaue	ncie	s		Ins	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank		_		Mean	
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	5	0	0	1	6	12	16	4.23	1027/1670	4.12	4.47	4.31	4.23	4.23
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	6	0	0	4	5	8	17	4.12	1125/1666	4.15	4.43	4.27	4.30	4.12
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	5	0	0	2	7	11	15	4.11	988/1406	4.21	4.50	4.32	4.31	4.11
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	5	0	1	5	9	9	11	3.69	1368/1615	3.95	4.36	4.24	4.17	3.69
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	7	0	1	1	11	10	10	3.82	1098/1566	3.99	4.29	4.07	4.03	3.82
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	8	0	2	0	10	11	9	3.78	1134/1528	3.83	4.36	4.12	4.00	3.78
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	8	0	1	3	3	5	20	4.25	903/1650	4.33	4.42	4.22	4.28	4.25
8. How many times was class cancelled	7	0	0	0	1	10	22	4.64	1052/1667	4.72	4.67	4.67	4.61	4.64
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	12	3	0	1	7	13	4	3.80	1220/1626	3.83	4.21	4.11	4.07	3.80
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	9	0	0	0	0	7	24	4.77	486/1559	4.71	4.74	4.46	4.47	4.77
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	9	0	0	0	1	7	23		1042/1560	4.65	4.83	4.72	4.68	4.71
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	9	0	0	0	4	9	18	4.45	749/1549	4.40	4.59	4.31	4.32	4.45
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	9	1	1	1	2	9	17	4.33	919/1546	4.34	4.58	4.32	4.32	4.33
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	9	2	0	1	7	11	10	4.03	681/1323	3.77	3.90	4.00	3.91	4.03
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	16	0	1	2	6	5	10	3.88	944/1384	3.64	4.37	4.10	3.92	3.88
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	16	0	1	1	6	8	8		1067/1378	3.87	4.57	4.10	4.09	3.88
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	16	0	1	1	4	5	13	4.17	915/1378	4.29	4.69	4.29	4.09	4.17
4. Were special techniques successful	18	15	0	1	2	2			****/ 904	****		4.03	3.94	****
4. Were special techniques successiul	10	15	U	1	۷	2	4	3.71	/ 904		3.95	4.03	3.94	
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	38	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 232	****	****	4.19	4.25	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	38	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 239	****	****	4.21	4.35	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	38	1	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 230	****	****	4.44	4.58	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	38	1	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 231	****	****	4.31	4.45	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	38	1	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 218	****	****	4.18	4.47	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	38	1	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 87	****	3.83	4.65	4.67	***
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	38	0	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	****/ 79	****	4.00	4.64	4.72	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	38	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 75	****	4.17	4.57	4.46	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	38	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 79	****	3.67	4.45	4.59	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	38	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 80	****	3.83	3.97	3.99	****
ni di wash														
Field Work	2.0	0	1	0	^	1	0	0 50	4444/ 111	****	****	4 50	2 01	****
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	38	0	1	-	0	1	•		****/ 41	****	****	4.50	3.91	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	38	0	0	0	1	1	0		****/ 38			4.19	4.07	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	39	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 38	****	***	4.62	4.63	***
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	38	1	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 39	****	****	4.27	4.42	***
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	38	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.47	4.28	***
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	38	0	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/ 28	****	****	4.64	4.59	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	38	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 16	****	****	4.67	4.83	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	38	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 27	****	****	4.54	4.46	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	38	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 10	****	****	4.84	4.75	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	38	1	0	0	0	1	•		****/ 6	****	****	4.92	4.83	****
The second control of the second seco	- 0	_	-	•	•	_	•		, 0				00	

Course-Section: POLI 100 0201 Title

AMER GOVT & POLITICS

Instructor: MILLER, NICHOLA

Enrollment: 49 Questionnaires: 40

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2008

Page 1322 AUG 6, 2008 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expecte	d Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors	
00-27	9	0.00-0.99	1	 А	10	Required for Majors	12	Graduate	0	Major	12
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	1	В	11						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	4	C	6	General	3	Under-grad	40	Non-major	28
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	4	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means	there	are not enough	ı
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	16				
				?	2						

Course-Section: POLI 100 0301 University of Ma.
Title AMER GOVT & POLITICS Baltimore Cou.
Instructor: MELCAVAGE, EUGE Spring 200

University of Maryland
Baltimore County
Spring 2008

Page 1323

AUG 6, 2008

Job IRBR3029

Enrollment: 50
Questionnaires: 38
Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

							Fre	equer	ncie	s		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
		Questions	3		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		Genera	 1															
1. Did you	ı qain ne	w insights,ski		m this course	1	0	1	0	1	14	21	4.46	737/1670	4.12	4.47	4.31	4.23	4.46
-	_	tor make clear			1	0	0	1	4	12	20	4.38	821/1666	4.15	4.43	4.27	4.30	4.38
3. Did the	e exam qu	estions reflect	t the e	xpected goals	1	0	0	0	3	10	24	4.57	535/1406	4.21	4.50	4.32	4.31	4.57
4. Did oth	ner evalu	ations reflect	the ex	pected goals	1	12	2	1	2	8	12	4.08	1039/1615	3.95	4.36	4.24	4.17	4.08
5. Did ass	signed re	adings contrib	ute to	what you learned	2	0	3	2	6	8	17	3.94	946/1566	3.99	4.29	4.07	4.03	3.94
6. Did wri	tten ass	signments contr	ibute t	o what you learned	3	17	2	1	5	2	8	3.72	1170/1528	3.83	4.36	4.12	4.00	3.72
		g system clearly		ined	2	0	2	1	3	5	25	4.39	744/1650	4.33	4.42	4.22	4.28	4.39
		was class cance			2	0	0	0	0	1	35	4.97	203/1667	4.72	4.67	4.67	4.61	4.97
9. How wou	ıld you g	grade the overa	ll teac	hing effectiveness	8	2	0	1	2	18	7	4.11	900/1626	3.83	4.21	4.11	4.07	4.11
		Lecture	e															
1. Were th	ne instru	ctor's lectures	prepared	3	0	0	0	2	3	30	4.80	435/1559	4.71	4.74	4.46	4.47	4.80	
		tor seem inter		4	0	0	0	0	5	29	4.85	725/1560	4.65	4.83	4.72	4.68	4.85	
3. Was led	ture mat	erial presented	xplained clearly	3	0	0	0	1	13	21	4.57	598/1549	4.40	4.59	4.31	4.32	4.57	
4. Did the	e lecture	es contribute to	you learned	3	0	0	0	2	7	26	4.69	495/1546	4.34	4.58	4.32	4.32	4.69	
5. Did aud	diovisual	techniques enl	nance y	our understanding	5	14	4	2	4	3	6	3.26	1121/1323	3.77	3.90	4.00	3.91	3.26
		Discus	sion															
1. Did cla	ass discu			what you learned	10	0	0	2	3	12	11	4.14	758/1384	3.64	4.37	4.10	3.92	4.14
				d to participate	11	0	0	2	6	5	14	4.15	915/1378	3.87	4.57	4.29	4.09	4.15
				d open discussion	12	0	0	0	2	5	19	4.65	541/1378	4.29	4.69	4.31	4.08	4.65
4. Were sp	ecial te	chniques succes	ssful	-	12	17	1	1	4	1	2	3.22	****/ 904	****	3.95	4.03	3.94	***
		Labora	tory															
2. Were vo	u provid		-	ground information	37	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 239	****	****	4.21	4.35	****
				or lab activities	37	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 230	****	****	4.44	4.58	***
				Frequ	encv	Dist	ribu	ıt.i.or	า									
				_					-									
Credits Ea	rned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	ason	s			Туј	pe			Majors	
00-27	5	0.00-0.99	1	A 16		Red	quire	ed fo	or M	ajor	s	9	Graduat	e	0	Majo	r	4
28-55	7	1.00-1.99	1	в 14														
56-83	6	2.00-2.99	3	C 3		Ger	neral	L				6	Under-g	rad 3	8	Non-	major	34
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	7	D 0											_			
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	15	F 0 P 0		Ele	ectiv	res				3	#### - 1 respons					h
				I O		Otl	ner				1	9	T Cabolla		c argi	ıııcaı		

Course-Section: POLI 210 0101

POLITICAL PHILOSOPHY

Title

Instructor: CARTER, JOHN W.

Enrollment: 45 Questionnaires: 39

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2008

Page 1324 AUG 6, 2008 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

			Fre	eaue	ncie	S		Ins	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank		Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General	0	0	2	2	0	10	1 /	2 00	1400/1670	2 00	4 47	4 21	4 20	2 00
 Did you gain new insights, skills from this course Did the instructor make clear the expected goals 	0	0	3 2	2	8 10	12 9	14 15		1400/1670 1370/1666		4.47 4.43	4.31 4.27	4.32 4.27	3.82 3.82
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	3	3	3	10	20		1027/1406		4.43	4.32	4.39	4.05
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	3	3 4	5	8	8	10		1486/1615		4.36		4.39	3.43
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	1	1	2	6	13	15	4.05	820/1566		4.29	4.24	4.29	4.05
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	5	4	11	9	9		1362/1528		4.36	4.12	4.11	3.34
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	3	0	1	6	8		10		1417/1650		4.42	4.22	4.20	3.64
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	1	0	1	35	4.89	693/1667		4.67	4.67	4.64	4.89
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	13	1	3	1	10	9			1494/1626		4.21	4.11	4.06	3.24
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	7	0	1	1	9	5	16	4.06	1265/1559	4.06	4.74	4.46	4.40	4.06
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	8	0	0	1	4	4	22	4.52	1239/1560	4.52	4.83	4.72	4.73	4.52
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	8	0	0	2	7	9	13	4.06	1120/1549	4.06	4.59	4.31	4.25	4.06
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	8	0	1	2	5	7	16	4.13	1087/1546	4.13	4.58	4.32	4.30	4.13
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	9	25	3	1	0	0	1	2.00	****/1323	****	3.90	4.00	4.08	****
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	16	0	1	1	6	9	6	3.78	983/1384		4.37	4.10	4.07	3.78
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	16	0	0	0	5	3	15	4.43			4.57	4.29	4.25	4.43
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	16	0	1	0	7	7	8		1047/1378		4.69	4.31	4.26	3.91
4. Were special techniques successful	16	5	1	2	4	8	3	3.56	708/ 904	3.56	3.95	4.03	4.01	3.56
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	37	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 232	****	****	4.19	4.35	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	37	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 239	****	****	4.21	4.33	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	37	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 230	****	****	4.44	4.61	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	37	0	0	0	1	0	1		,	****	****	4.31	4.52	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	37	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 218	****	****	4.18	4.25	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	37	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 87	****	3.83	4.65	5.00	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	37	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 79	****	4.00	4.64	4.75	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	37	0	0	0	1	0	1		, -	****	4.17	4.57	4.25	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	37	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 79	****	3.67	4.45	3.95	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	37	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 80	****	3.83	3.97	4.30	***
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	37	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 41	****	****	4.50	2.00	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	37	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 38	****	****	4.19	2.50	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	37	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 38	****	****	4.62	4.50	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	37	0	0	0	1	0	1			****	****	4.27	4.00	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	37	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.47	4.00	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	37	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 28	****	****	4.64	****	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	37	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 16	****	****	4.67	****	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	37	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 27	****	****	4.54	****	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	37	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 10	****	****	4.84	****	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	37	0	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/ 6	****	****	4.92	***	****

Course-Section: POLI 210 0101

POLITICAL PHILOSOPHY

Title Instructor: CARTER, JOHN W.

Enrollment: 45 Questionnaires: 39

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2008

Page 1324 AUG 6, 2008 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA	A	Expecte	d Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	 7	0.00-0.99	0	Α	12	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	22
28-55	9	1.00-1.99	0	В	12						
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	7	C	6	General	3	Under-grad	39	Non-major	17
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	7	D	1						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	10	F	0	Electives	2	#### - Means	there	are not enough	a
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	28				
				?	2						

Course-Section: POLI 230 0101

University of Maryland

INTRO CONSTITUTIONAL L Baltimore County Spring 2008

DAVIS, JEFFREY

Enrollment: 51 Questionnaires: 34

Title

Instructor:

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Page 1325 AUG 6, 2008 Job IRBR3029

Questions	NR	NA	Fre	equer 2	ncie:	s 4	5	Inst Mean	tructor Rank	Course Mean	_		Level Mean	Sect Mean
General	0	0	0	_	1	7	0.0	4 74	200/1670	4 00	4 47	4 21	4 20	4 7 4
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0 0	0	0	1	7 7	26 24	4.74	388/1670	4.80	4.47	4.31	4.32	4.74
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	1	0	0 0	1		21	4.62 4.61	477/1666 495/1406	4.61 4.59	4.43 4.50	4.27 4.32	4.27 4.39	4.62 4.61
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals		6	0	1	3	11 5	19	4.51					4.39	4.50
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0 1	1	1	0	0	5 5		4.72	552/1615 258/1566	4.39 4.58	4.36 4.29	4.24 4.07	4.29	4.50
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	3	1	0	5	6		4.33	631/1528	4.35	4.29	4.12	4.11	4.72
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	1	0	0	2	10	20	4.56	485/1650	4.64	4.42	4.12	4.20	4.56
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	1	0	0	1	14	17		1157/1667	4.48	4.67	4.67	4.64	4.50
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	1	0	3	14		4.20	797/1626		4.21	4.11		4.20
7. now would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	•	Ü	_	0	3			1.20	75771020	1.10	1.21		1.00	1.20
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	1	1	29	4.90	276/1559	4.86	4.74	4.46	4.40	4.90
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	0	0	31	5.00	1/1560	4.95	4.83	4.72	4.73	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	2	6	23	4.68	475/1549	4.60	4.59	4.31	4.25	4.68
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	1	0	0	2	4	24	4.73	432/1546	4.63	4.58	4.32	4.30	4.73
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	5	4	2	1	4	7	11	3.96	743/1323	3.89	3.90	4.00	4.08	3.96
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	12	0	2	0	3	8	9	4.00	820/1384		4.37	4.10	4.07	4.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	13	0	1	0	3	4	13	4.33	797/1378	4.54	4.57	4.29	4.25	4.33
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	12	0	1	0	1	5	15	4.50	653/1378		4.69	4.31	4.26	4.50
4. Were special techniques successful	12	19	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 904	****	3.95	4.03	4.01	****
Laboratory	2.2	•	-	•	•	0	0	1 00		****	ale ale ale ale	4 10	4 25	****
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	33	0	1	0	0	0	0		****/ 232	****	****	4.19	4.35	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	33	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 239 ****/ 230	****	****	4.21 4.44	4.33	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	33 33	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 231	****	****		4.61	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance 5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	33	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 218	****	****	4.31	4.52 4.25	****
5. Were requirements for tab reports clearly specified	33	U	U	U	U	U	Τ	5.00	/ 210			4.10	4.25	
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	33	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 87	****	3.83	4.65	5.00	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	33	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 79	****	4.00	4.64	4.75	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	33	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 75	****	4.17	4.57	4.25	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	33	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 79	****	3.67	4.45	3.95	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	33	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 80	****	3.83	3.97	4.30	***
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	33	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 41	****	****	4.50	2.00	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	33	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 38	****	****	4.19	2.50	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	33	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 38	****	****	4.62	4.50	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	33	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.27	4.00	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	33	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.47	4.00	****
Self Paced	2.2	^		6		_	_	F 0.5		4.4	at at 1 1		at at 1 1	at at 1 1
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	33	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 28	***	***	4.64	***	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	33	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 16	****	****	4.67	****	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	33	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 27 ****/ 10	****	****	4.54	****	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	33	0	0	0	0	0 1	1	5.00	****/ 10 ****/ 6		****	4.84	****	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	33	U	U	U	U	Τ	U	4.00	/ 6			4.92		

Course-Section: POLI 230 0101

Title INTRO CONSTITUTIONAL L

Instructor: DAVIS, JEFFREY

Enrollment: 51
Questionnaires: 34

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2008 Page 1325 AUG 6, 2008 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA	A	Expecte	d Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	0	A	8	Required for Majors	4	Graduate	0	Major	11
28-55	10	1.00-1.99	1	В	15						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	2	C	3	General	2	Under-grad	34	Non-major	23
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	3	D	1						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	12	F	1	Electives	2	#### - Means	there	are not enough	n
				P	0			responses to	be sig	nificant	
				I	0	Other	20				
				?	1						

Course-Section: POLI 230 0201 University of Maryland Page 1326 AUG 6, 2008 Title INTRO CONSTITUTIONAL L Baltimore County

Instructor: DAVIS, JEFFREY

Enrollment: 49 Questionnaires: 48

Spring 2008 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequencies

Instructor

Job IRBR3029

Course Dept UMBC Level Sect

							T.T.	-quc	1010	0		TILD	LIUCCOL	COULDO	. DCPC	OLIDC	псист	טכככ
		Question	s		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		 Genera	 1															
1. Did you	u gain ne	ew insights,ski	lls fro	m this course	25	0	0	0	1	1	21	4.87	243/1670	4.80	4.47	4.31	4.32	4.87
2. Did the	e instruc	ctor make clear	the ex	pected goals	25	0	0	0	1	7	15	4.61	490/1666	4.61	4.43	4.27	4.27	4.61
3. Did the	e exam qı	estions reflec	t the e	xpected goals	25	0	0	0	2	6	15	4.57	535/1406	4.59	4.50	4.32	4.39	4.57
4. Did oth	her evalı	ations reflect	the ex	pected goals	26	1	1	0	3	5	12	4.29	837/1615	4.39	4.36	4.24	4.29	4.29
5. Did ass	signed re	eadings contrib	ute to	what you learned	25	0	0	1	3	4	15	4.43	460/1566	4.58	4.29	4.07	4.00	4.43
6. Did wr:	itten ass	signments contr	ibute t	o what you learned	26	0	0	0	3	8	11	4.36	600/1528	4.35	4.36	4.12	4.11	4.36
7. Was the	e grading	g system clearl	y expla	ined	26	0	0	0	2	2	18	4.73	298/1650	4.64	4.42	4.22	4.20	4.73
8. How man	ny times	was class canc	elled		25	1	0	0	0	12	10	4.45	1206/1667	4.48	4.67	4.67	4.64	4.45
9. How wor	uld you g	grade the overa	ll teac	hing effectiveness	30	1	1	0	1	9	6	4.12	888/1626	4.16	4.21	4.11	4.06	4.12
		Lectur	e															
1. Were th	he instri	actor's lecture	prepared	26	0	0	0	1	2	19	4.82	419/1559	4.86	4.74	4.46	4.40	4.82	
		ctor seem inter		27	0	0	0	1	0	20	4.90	596/1560		4.83	4.72	4.73		
			xplained clearly	27	0	0	0	3	4	14				4.59	4.31	4.25	4.52	
		es contribute t			27	0	1	0	1	4		4.52				4.32	4.30	
				our understanding	30	2	1	2	2	5	6	3.81					4.08	
		1	2															
		Discus	sion															
1. Did cla	ass discu	assions contrib	ute to	what you learned	32	0	0	0	1	4	11	4.63	356/1384	4.31	4.37	4.10	4.07	4.63
2. Were a	ll studer	nts actively en	courage	d to participate	32	0	0	0	1	2	13	4.75	400/1378	4.54	4.57	4.29	4.25	4.75
3. Did the	e instruc	ctor encourage	fair an	d open discussion	32	0	0	0	1	3	12	4.69	511/1378	4.59	4.69	4.31	4.26	4.69
4. Were sp	pecial te	echniques succe	ssful		33	9	2	0	0	1	3	3.50	****/ 904	****	3.95	4.03	4.01	****
				Frequ	ıency	/ Dis	trib	utio	n									
Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Po:	ason	c			Ty	ne.			Majors	,
00-27	2	0.00-0.99 1.00-1.99	0	A 3		Re	quir	ed f	or M	ajor	s	0	Graduat	е	0	Majo	or	12
28-55	6	В 10				_				_	_	_						
56-83	3	C 3		Ge	nera	L				0	Under-g	rad 4	18	Non-	-major	36		
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	D 0														,	
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5	F 0		El	ecti	ves				0	#### - 1				_	h
				P 0							_		respons	es to b	e sign	nificar	ıt	
				I 0		Ot	her				1	.9						

Course-Section: POLI 250 0101

· POLI 230 0101

Title INTRO TO PUBLIC ADMIN

Instructor: WILLIAMS-RANDAL

Enrollment: 44
Questionnaires: 42

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2008

Page 1327 AUG 6, 2008 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

			Fre	equer	ncie	s		Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	12	0	0	3	7	6	14		1199/1670	4.03	4.47	4.31	4.32	4.03
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	12	0	0	1	7	7	15	4.20	1037/1666	4.20	4.43	4.27	4.27	4.20
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	12	0	0	3	6	4	17	4.17	948/1406	4.17	4.50	4.32	4.39	4.17
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	12	0	1	2	3	10	14	4.13	1000/1615	4.13	4.36	4.24	4.29	4.13
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	13	0	3	2	2	7	15	4.00	851/1566	4.00	4.29	4.07	4.00	4.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	14	0	2	0	8	8	10	3.86	1080/1528	3.86	4.36	4.12	4.11	3.86
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	13	0	0	0	1	10	18	4.59	457/1650	4.59	4.42	4.22	4.20	4.59
8. How many times was class cancelled	15	0	0	0	0	18	9	4.33	1310/1667	4.33	4.67	4.67	4.64	4.33
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	19	2	0	1	6	11	3	3.76	1247/1626	3.76	4.21	4.11	4.06	3.76
Lecture	1 2	0	0	0	_	_	00	4 60	640/1550	4 60	4 7 4	1 10	4 40	4 60
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	13	0	0	0	2	5	22	4.69	640/1559	4.69	4.74	4.46	4.40	4.69
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	14	0	0	0	3	7	18		1222/1560	4.54	4.83	4.72	4.73	4.54
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	13	0	0	0	6	2	21	4.52	670/1549	4.52	4.59	4.31	4.25	4.52
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	13	0	1	2	2	6	18	4.31	939/1546	4.31	4.58	4.32	4.30	4.31
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	14	0	0	1	4	5	18	4.43	403/1323	4.43	3.90	4.00	4.08	4.43
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	22	0	0	1	7	1	11	4.10	796/1384	4.10	4.37	4.10	4.07	4.10
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	22	0	0	1	1	6	12	4.45	672/1378	4.45	4.57	4.29	4.25	4.45
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	22	0	0	0	1	4	15	4.70	501/1378	4.70	4.69	4.31		4.70
4. Were special techniques successful	22	6	1	3	2	2	6	3.64	680/ 904		3.95	4.03		3.64
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	41	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 232	****	****	4.19	4.35	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	41	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 239	****	****	4.21	4.33	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	41	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 230	****	****	4.44	4.61	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	41	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 231	****	****	4.31	4.52	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	41	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 218	****	****	4.18	4.25	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	41	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 87	****	3.83	4.65	5.00	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	41	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 79	****	4.00	4.64	4.75	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	41	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 75	****	4.17	4.57	4.25	****
							_		,					****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	41	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	, ,,	****	3.67	4.45	3.95	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	41	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 80	****	3.83	3.97	4.30	****
Field Work														
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	41	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.47	4.00	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	41	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 28	****	****	4.64	****	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	41	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 16	****	****	4.67	****	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	41	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 27	****	****	4.54	****	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	41	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 10	****	****	4.84	****	****
i. has the recuback, tutoring by proceeds helpful	11	U	J	J	J	J	_	3.00	, 10			1.01		

Course-Section: POLI 250 0101 Title

INTRO TO PUBLIC ADMIN WILLIAMS-RANDAL

Enrollment: 44 Questionnaires: 42

Instructor:

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2008

Page 1327 AUG 6, 2008 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expecte	d Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	8	0.00-0.99	0	 А	10	Required for Majors	2	Graduate	0	Major	16
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	В	13						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	3	C	4	General	2	Under-grad	42	Non-major	26
84-150	6	3.00-3.49	7	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	6	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means	there	are not enough	n
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	24				
				?	0						

Course-Section: POLI 280 0101

INTERNATIONAL RELATION

Title HAGERTY, DEVIN

Instructor:

Enrollment: 48 Questionnaires: 46

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2008

Page 1328 AUG 6, 2008 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

			Fre	equer	ncie	5		Ins	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Ouestions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank		_		Mean	
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	15	0	0	0	1	5	25	4.77	338/1670	4.77	4.47	4.31	4.32	4.77
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	15	0	0	1	1	5	24	4.68	403/1666	4.68	4.43	4.27	4.27	4.68
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	15	0	0	0	0	6	25	4.81	261/1406	4.81	4.50	4.32	4.39	4.81
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	15	12	0	0	1	3	15	4.74	308/1615	4.74	4.36	4.24	4.29	4.74
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	2	5	6	17	4.27	632/1566	4.27	4.29	4.07	4.00	4.27
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	16	20	0	0	2	0	8	4.60	****/1528	****	4.36	4.12	4.11	****
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	16	0	1	1	4	5	19	4.33	806/1650	4.33	4.42	4.22	4.20	4.33
8. How many times was class cancelled	16	0	0	0	1	25	4	4.10	1472/1667	4.10	4.67	4.67	4.64	4.10
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	21	1	0	0	1	5	18	4.71	248/1626	4.71	4.21	4.11	4.06	4.71
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	16	0	0	0	0	3	27	4.90	276/1559	4.90	4.74	4.46	4.40	4.90
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	16	0	0	0	0	1	29	4.97	239/1560	4.97	4.83	4.72	4.73	4.97
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	16	0	0	1	0	5		4.73	395/1549	4.73	4.59	4.31	4.25	4.73
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	0	3	27	4.90	231/1546	4.90	4.58	4.32	4.30	4.90
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	16	20	2	0	0	2	6		****/1323	****	3.90	4.00	4.08	****
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	23	0	1	1	0	4	17	4.52	421/1384	4.52	4.37	4.10	4.07	4.52
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	23	0	1	0	3	4	15	4.39	729/1378	4.32	4.57	4.29	4.07	4.32
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	23	0	1	0	0	3	19	4.70	501/1378	4.70	4.69	4.31	4.25	4.70
4. Were special techniques successful	23	18	1	0	0	0	4		****/ 904	****	3.95	4.31	4.20	****
4. Were special techniques successiul	23	10	1	U	U	U	4	4.20	"""/ 904		3.95	4.03	4.01	
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	43	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 232	****	****	4.19	4.35	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	44	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 239	****	****	4.21	4.33	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	44	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 230	****	****	4.44	4.61	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	44	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 231	****	****	4.31	4.52	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	44	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 218	****	****	4.18	4.25	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	43	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 87	****	3.83	4.65	5.00	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	44	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 79	****	4.00	4.64	4.75	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	44	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 75	****	4.17	4.57	4.25	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	44	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 79	****	3.67	4.45	3.95	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	44	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 80	***	3.83	3.97	4.30	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	45	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 41	****	****	4.50	2.00	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	45	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 38	****	****	4.19	2.50	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	44	1	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 38	****	****	4.62	4.50	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	44	1	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 39	****	****	4.27	4.00	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	44	1	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 31	***	****	4.47	4.00	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	44	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 28	****	****	4.64	****	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	44	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	,	****	****	4.67	****	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	44	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 27	****	****	4.54	****	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	44	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	,	****	****	4.84	****	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	44	1	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 6	****	****	4.92	****	****
5. Here there charge proceeds for all the betweenes		_	J	J	0	J	_	3.00	, 0			1.72		

Course-Section: POLI 280 0101 Title

INTERNATIONAL RELATION

Instructor: HAGERTY, DEVIN

Enrollment: 48 Questionnaires: 46

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2008

Page 1328 AUG 6, 2008 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits E						Туре		Majors			
00-27	5 5	0.00-0.99	0	A	8	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	18
28-55	9	1.00-1.99	0	В	11						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	2	C	2	General	2	Under-grad	46	Non-major	28
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	8	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	10	F	0	Electives	2	#### - Means	there	are not enough	h
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	19				
				?	2						

Course-Section: POLI 301 0101 University of Maryland Title POLI RESEARCH METHODS Baltimore County Instructor: FORESTIERE, CAR Spring 2008

Enrollment:

35

University of Maryland Page 1329
Baltimore County AUG 6, 2008
Spring 2008 Job IRBR3029

Questionnaires:	35	Student Cour	se Evaluation	Questionnaire

I

0

0

								eque		s		Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
		Questio	ns		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		 Gener	 al															
1. Did yo	u gain ne	ew insights,sk		om this course	5	0	0	2	1	8	19	4.47	722/1670	4.24	4.47	4.31	4.24	4.47
		ctor make clea			5	0	0	0	4	7	19	4.50	622/1666		4.43	4.27	4.18	4.50
		uestions refle			5	6	0	0	2	9	13	4.46	656/1406	4.36	4.50	4.32	4.22	4.46
4. Did ot	her eval	uations reflec	t the ex	spected goals	5	2	0	0	2	5	21	4.68	368/1615	4.48	4.36	4.24	4.18	4.68
				what you learned	6	1	1	1	4	5	17	4.29	610/1566	3.97	4.29	4.07	4.04	4.29
	_	_		to what you learned	6	0	0	1	1	3	24	4.72	250/1528	4.51	4.36	4.12	4.07	4.72
7. Was th	e gradin	g system clear	ly expla	ained	6	0	1	2	1	6	19	4.38	757/1650	4.35	4.42	4.22	4.12	4.38
8. How ma	ny times	was class can	celled		6	0	0	0	0	11	18	4.62	1062/1667	4.72	4.67	4.67	4.67	4.62
9. How wo	uld you	grade the over	all tead	ching effectiveness	12	0	1	1	1	7	13	4.30	670/1626	3.77	4.21	4.11	4.06	4.30
		Lectu	re															
		uctor's lectur			5	0	0	0	0	5	25	4.83	387/1559		4.74	4.46	4.40	4.83
		ctor seem inte			5	0	0	0	0	3	27	4.90	596/1560	4.73	4.83	4.72	4.67	4.90
		_		explained clearly	5	0	0	0	0	7	23	4.77	352/1549		4.59	4.31	4.25	4.77
		es contribute			6 6	0	0	0	0	6	23	4.79	357/1546		4.58	4.32	4.24	4.79
5. Did au	5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding						0	2	3	3	17	4.40	423/1323	4.22	3.90	4.00	3.99	4.40
		Discu				0												
	1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learne						0	0	2	5	12	4.53	421/1384		4.37	4.10	4.12	4.53
				ed to participate	16	0	0	1	0	3	15	4.68	466/1378		4.57	4.29	4.30	4.68
		_		nd open discussion	16	0	0	0	0	5	14	4.74	460/1378		4.69	4.31	4.33	4.74
4. Were s	pecial te	echniques succ	essful		16	6	0	1	0	6	6	4.31	345/ 904	4.03	3.95	4.03	4.03	4.31
		Semin																
	-	_		announced theme	34	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 87	****	3.83	4.65	4.30	***
				dividual attention	34	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	,		4.00	4.64	4.53	***
				what you learned	34	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 75		4.17	4.57	4.50	***
_		ons contribute for grading ma		-	34 34	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 79 ****/ 80		3.67 3.83	4.45 3.97	3.68 3.76	****
J. Were C	iiteiia .	ior grading ma	de Clear			_	-	Ü	Ü	U	Τ.	5.00	/ 80		3.03	3.91	3.70	
				Frequ	lency	7 Dis	trib	utio	n									
Credits E	Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades			Expected Grades				Rea	ason	s			Ту	pe			Majors	\$
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 15	Required for Majors				 s	0	Graduat	e	0	Majo	r r	25		
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	в 10	<u>.</u>													
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	5	C 2	General						0	Under-g	rad 3	55	Non-	major	10	
84-150	17	3.00-3.49	8	D 0														
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	11	F 1		El	ecti	ves				0	#### -					ſh
				P 0		0.1					_		respons	es to b	e sign	nificar	ıt	

Other

27

Course-Section: POLI 301 0201 University of Maryland Title Baltimore County POLI RESEARCH METHODS Spring 2008

Instructor: FORESTIERE, CAR

Enrollment: 32 Questionnaires: 31

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Page 1330

AUG 6, 2008

Job IRBR3029

		Ouestion	c		MD	NA		equei 2	ncies 3	4	5	Inst Mean	ructor Rank	Course	_		Level Mean	Sect Mean
		Quescion				11/27												
		Genera	1															
1. Did yo	ou gain ne	ew insights,ski	lls fro	m this course	11	0	0	0	3	4	13	4.50	665/1670	4.24	4.47	4.31	4.24	4.50
2. Did th	ne instruc	ctor make clear	the ex	pected goals	11	0	0	0	0	3	17	4.85	216/1666	4.34	4.43	4.27	4.18	4.85
3. Did th	ne exam qu	uestions reflec	t the e	kpected goals	12	3	1	0	0	2	13	4.63	471/1406	4.36	4.50	4.32	4.22	4.63
		uations reflect			11	0	0	0	1	3	16	4.75	290/1615	4.48	4.36	4.24	4.18	4.75
5. Did as	ssigned re	eadings contrib	ute to	what you learned	12	0	3	1	2	4	9	3.79	1122/1566	3.97	4.29	4.07	4.04	3.79
6. Did wr	ritten ass	signments contr	ibute t	what you learned	12	0	0	0	1	5	13	4.63	323/1528	4.51	4.36	4.12	4.07	4.63
7. Was th	ne grading	g system clearl	y expla	ined	12	0	0	0	1	4	14	4.68	338/1650	4.35	4.42	4.22	4.12	4.68
8. How ma	any times	was class canc	elled		12	0	0	0	2	5	12	4.53	1142/1667	4.72	4.67	4.67	4.67	4.53
9. How wo	ould you	grade the overa	ll teac	ning effectiveness	15	0	1	0	1	8	6	4.13	877/1626	3.77	4.21	4.11	4.06	4.13
		Lectur	e															
1. Were t	the instru	actor's lecture	s well ;	prepared	12	0	0	0	0	2	17	4.89	291/1559	4.80	4.74	4.46	4.40	4.89
2. Did th	2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject							0	0	3	16	4.84	751/1560	4.73	4.83	4.72	4.67	4.84
3. Was le	xplained clearly	12	0	0	0	0	4	15	4.79	323/1549	4.55	4.59	4.31	4.25	4.79			
4. Did th	4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned							0	0	3	16	4.84	299/1546	4.49	4.58	4.32	4.24	4.84
5. Did av	udiovisua	l techniques en	hance y	our understanding	16	4	0	1	1	4	5	4.18	597/1323	4.22	3.90	4.00	3.99	4.18
		Discus	sion															
1. Did cl	lass disc	ussions contrib	ute to	what you learned	20	0	0	2	0	3	6	4.18	721/1384	4.27	4.37	4.10	4.12	4.18
2. Were a	all studer	nts actively en	courage	d to participate	20	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	243/1378	4.70	4.57	4.29	4.30	4.91
		_		d open discussion	20	0	0	0	0	2	9	4.82	375/1378	4.79	4.69	4.31	4.33	4.82
4. Were s	special te	echniques succe	ssful		20	2	1	0	1	3	4	4.00	461/ 904	4.03	3.95	4.03	4.03	4.00
				Frequ	iency	Dis	trib	utio	n									
Credits E	Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grad							Rea	asons	3			Ту	pe			Majors	
						Reasons												
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 13	Required for Majors 0			Graduat	е	0	Majo	or	15					
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В 4														
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	2	C 0	General 0				Under-g	rad 3	31	Non-	-major	16				
84-150	14	3.00-3.49	9	D 0							,			,				
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5	F 0		Εl	ecti	ves				0					_	n
				P 0		٥.,					-	0	respons	es to b	e sign	nificar	1T	
				I 0		Ot.	her				1	.8						

Course-Section: POLI 301 8620 University of Maryland Page 1331 Title POLI RESEARCH METHODS Baltimore County AUG 6, 2008

Instructor: STAFF
Enrollment: 15
Questionnaires: 14

Questions

Spring 2008
Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequencies

NR NA 1 2 3 4 5 Mean

Instructor

Rank

Job IRBR3029

Course Dept UMBC Level Sect

Mean Mean Mean Mean Mean

240201011							_	_		-	-							
		 Genera	 1															
1. Did you	u gain ne	ew insights,ski	lls fro	m this course	2	0	0	2	4	1	5	3.75	1442/1670	4.24	4.47	4.31	4.24	3.75
2. Did the	e instru	ctor make clear	the ex	pected goals	2	0	0	3	3	1	5	3.67	1452/1666	4.34	4.43	4.27	4.18	3.67
3. Did the	e exam q	uestions reflec	t the e	xpected goals	2	4	0	1	2	1	4	4.00	1057/1406	4.36	4.50	4.32	4.22	4.00
4. Did oth	her eval	uations reflect	the ex	pected goals	2	0	1	0	2	4	5	4.00	1083/1615	4.48	4.36	4.24	4.18	4.00
5. Did ass	signed re	eadings contrib	ute to	what you learned	2	0	1	1	2	3	5	3.83	1078/1566	3.97	4.29	4.07	4.04	3.83
6. Did wr	itten as:	signments contr	ibute t	o what you learned	d 2	1	0	0	3	3	5	4.18	769/1528	4.51	4.36	4.12	4.07	4.18
7. Was the	e grading	g system clearl	y expla	ined	2	0	1	2	0	2	7	4.00	1135/1650	4.35	4.42	4.22	4.12	4.00
8. How man	ny times	was class cand	elled		2	0	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/1667	4.72	4.67	4.67	4.67	5.00
9. How wor	uld you	grade the overa	ll teac	hing effectivenes	5	1	1	2	3	1	1	2.88	1564/1626	3.77	4.21	4.11	4.06	2.88
		Lectur	e															
1. Were th	he instr	uctor's lecture	s well	prepared	2	0	0	0	1	2	9	4.67	673/1559	4.80	4.74	4.46	4.40	4.67
2. Did the	e instru	ctor seem inter	ested i	n the subject	3	0	0	0	3	0	8	4.45	1287/1560	4.73	4.83	4.72	4.67	4.45
3. Was led	cture mat	terial presente	d and e	xplained clearly	2	0	1	0	2	3	6	4.08	1112/1549	4.55	4.59	4.31	4.25	4.08
4. Did the	e lecture	es contribute t	o what	you learned	2	0	0	3	2	1	6	3.83	1260/1546	4.49	4.58	4.32	4.24	3.83
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding						0	1	0	2	3	6	4.08	663/1323	4.22	3.90	4.00	3.99	4.08
		Discus	sion															
1. Did cla	ass disc	ussions contrib	ute to	what you learned	4	0	1	0	1	3	5	4.10	796/1384	4.27	4.37	4.10	4.12	4.10
				d to participate	4	0	0	1	1	0	8	4.50	603/1378		4.57		4.30	4.50
		-	_	d open discussion	4	0	0	0	1	0	9	4.80	386/1378	4.79	4.69	4.31	4.33	4.80
		echniques succe			4	1	1	0	2	3	3	3.78	619/ 904				4.03	3.78
				Fre	quenc	z Die	:trib	uitio	n									
				110	auciic.	y Dit	CLID	acio	11									
Credits Ea	Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grade							Re	ason	s			Тур	pe			Majors	5
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 4		Required for Major				s	0	 Graduate	:	0	Majo	· or	12	
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	в 6		Required for Major									J -			
56-83	5	2.00-2.99	3	C 1	General				0	Under-gr	rad 1	4	Non-	-major	2			
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	1	D 0		201121.01						3				-		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F 0		El	ecti	ves				0	#### - N	Means t	here a	re not	enous	уh
				P 0									response				_	
				I 0		Ot	her				1	0	-		_			

?

0

Course-Section: POLI 310 0101 Title

POLITICAL PHIL. TO 160

VAUGHAN, GEOFFR Instructor:

Enrollment: 39 Questionnaires: 39

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2008

Page 1332 AUG 6, 2008 Job IRBR3029

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

		Questions		MD	NA	Fre	equei 2	ncie	s 1	5	Inst Mean	tructor Rank	Course	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
		General															
		ew insights,skills fro		14	0	0	0	2	5	18	4.64	505/1670		4.47	4.31	4.24	4.64
		ctor make clear the ex		14	0	1	1	1	9	13	4.28	931/1666		4.43	4.27	4.18	4.28
	_	uestions reflect the ϵ		14	17	0	0	0	3	5	4.63	,		4.50	4.32	4.22	****
		uations reflect the ex		14	2	1	1	2	8	11	4.17	962/1615		4.36	4.24	4.18	4.17
	_	eadings contribute to	_	14	0	0	1	2	3	19	4.60	339/1566		4.29	4.07	4.04	4.60
		signments contribute t		14	0	1	2	0	6	16	4.36	600/1528		4.36	4.12	4.07	4.36
		g system clearly expla	iined	16	0	0	1	2	1	19	4.65	372/1650		4.42	4.22	4.12	4.65
	-	was class cancelled	1. 55	14	1	0	0	0	18	6		1368/1667		4.67	4.67	4.67	4.25
9. How wor	uld you	grade the overall tead	hing effectiveness	18	1	0	1	1	6	12	4.45	499/1626	4.45	4.21	4.11	4.06	4.45
		Lecture															
		uctor's lectures well		14	0	0	0	0	1	24	4.96	111/1559		4.74	4.46	4.40	4.96
		ctor seem interested i	-	14	0	0	0	0	0	25	5.00	1/1560		4.83	4.72	4.67	5.00
		terial presented and e		14	0	0	0	0	2	23	4.92	. ,		4.59	4.31	4.25	4.92
		es contribute to what	_	14	0	0	0	0	0	25	5.00	1/1546		4.58	4.32	4.24	5.00
5. Did au	diovisua	l techniques enhance y	our understanding	15	9	2	0	1	3	9	4.13	634/1323	4.13	3.90	4.00	3.99	4.13
		Discussion															
1. Did cla	ass disc	ussions contribute to	what you learned	22	0	0	0	1	3	13	4.71	293/1384	4.71	4.37	4.10	4.12	4.71
		nts actively encourage		22	0	0	0	2	2	13	4.65	495/1378	4.65	4.57	4.29	4.30	4.65
		ctor encourage fair ar	d open discussion	22	0	0	0	1	2	14	4.76	428/1378		4.69	4.31	4.33	4.76
4. Were s	pecial t	echniques successful		22	10	1	0	0	0	6	4.43	****/ 904	****	3.95	4.03	4.03	****
		Laboratory															
2. Were yo	ou provi	ded with adequate back	ground information	38	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 239	****	****	4.21	3.99	****
		Seminar															
1. Were as	ssigned	topics relevant to the	announced theme	37	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 87	****	3.83	4.65	4.30	****
2. Was the	e instru	ctor available for ind	lividual attention	37	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 79	****	4.00	4.64	4.53	****
		Field Work															
1. Did fie	eld expe	rience contribute to w	hat you learned	38	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 41	****	****	4.50	4.44	****
	_	y understand your eval	_	38	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 38	****	****	4.19	3.96	****
		Self Paced															
3. Were yo	our cont	acts with the instruct	or helpful	38	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 27	****	****	4.54	2.63	****
			Frequ	ency	n Digi	trib	ıtioı	n									
			11640	. CIIC Y	213			••									
Credits E	Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades						Rea	ason	S			Ту	pe			Majors	\$
00-27	0	0.00-0.99 0	A 8	Required for Majors 1					1	Graduat	 е	0	Majo	or	14		
28-55	0	1.00-1.99 0	в 12														
56-83	6	2.00-2.99 5	C 1	General 9					9	Under-g	rad 3	19	Non-	-major	25		
84-150	6	3.00-3.49 5	D 0														
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 7	F 0		Ele	ecti	ves				2	#### -				_	ſh
			P 0									respons	es to b	e sign	ificar	ıt	

Other

I 0

1

?

Baltimore County Spring 2008

Page 1333

AUG 6, 2008

Job IRBR3029

University of Maryland Course-Section: POLI 323 0101 Title THE PRESIDENCY Instructor: JIMENEZ, LUIS

Enrollment:	34			
Questionnaires:	21	Student Cours	e Evaluation	Questionnaire

			Fre	equei	ncie	S		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	0	1	2	3	14	4.50	665/1670	4.50	4.47	4.31	4.24	4.50
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	5	14	4.65	428/1666	4.65	4.43	4.27	4.18	4.65
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	2	3	15	4.65	435/1406	4.65	4.50	4.32	4.22	4.65
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	3	0	1	0	4	12	4.59	467/1615	4.59	4.36	4.24	4.18	4.59
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	0	4	5	10	4.15	743/1566	4.15	4.29	4.07	4.04	4.15
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	3	1	3	13	4.30	662/1528	4.30	4.36	4.12	4.07	4.30
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	1	0	3	16	4.70	327/1650	4.70	4.42	4.22	4.12	4.70
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	1	0	0	11	8	4.25	1368/1667	4.25	4.67	4.67	4.67	4.25
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	7	0	0	0	0	9	5	4.36	616/1626	4.36	4.21	4.11	4.06	4.36
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	1	2	17	4.80	435/1559	4.80	4.74	4.46	4.40	4.80
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	1	2	17	4.80	855/1560	4.80	4.83	4.72	4.67	4.80
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	2	3	15	4.65	500/1549	4.65	4.59	4.31	4.25	4.65
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	0	4	15	4.65	532/1546	4.65	4.58	4.32	4.24	4.65
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	6	4	2	0	2	6	3.29	1114/1323	3.29	3.90	4.00	3.99	3.29
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	1	2	2	9	4.36	589/1384	4.36	4.37	4.10	4.12	4.36
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	0	1	0	1	12	4.71	441/1378	4.71	4.57	4.29	4.30	4.71
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	0	0	1	0	13	4.86	333/1378	4.86	4.69	4.31	4.33	4.86
4. Were special techniques successful	6	10	0	1	0	0	4	4.40	****/ 904	****	3.95	4.03	4.03	****
Frequ	iency	Dist	trib	ution	n									
Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades				Rea	ason	.s			Ту	pe			Majors	

Credits E						Type		Majors			
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	 А	15	Required for Majors	2	Graduate	0	Major	13
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	5						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	6	C	0	General	5	Under-grad	21	Non-major	8
84-150	10	3.00-3.49	4	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means	there	are not enough	a
				P	0			responses to	be sig	nificant	
				I	0	Other	10				
				2	0						

Course-Section: POLI 324 0101 University of Maryland Page 1334 THE CONGRESS Baltimore County AUG 6, 2008 SCOTT, JAMES L Spring 2008 Instructor: Job IRBR3029

Student	Course	Evaluation	Questi	ionnaire
---------	--------	------------	--------	----------

Title

Enrollment:

Questionnaires: 27

27

							Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect	
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General	-	•	0	-	-	2	1 -	4 00	004/1600	4 00	4 45	4 21	4 0 4	4 05
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	5	0	2	Τ	1	3	15	4.27	974/1670		4.47	4.31	4.24	4.27
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	5	0	0	0	Τ	8	13	4.55	569/1666		4.43	4.27	4.18	4.55
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	5	0	0	Ţ	3	4	14	4.41	715/1406		4.50	4.32	4.22	4.41
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	5	0	0 1	0	5	6	11	4.27	849/1615	4.27	4.36	4.24	4.18	4.27
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	6	0	U T	Τ.	0 1	7	12	4.33	559/1566		4.29	4.07	4.04	4.33
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	6	0	•	2	_	/	11	4.29	679/1528	4.29	4.36	4.12	4.07	4.29
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	5	0	0	1	1	8	12	4.41	720/1650		4.42	4.22	4.12	4.41
8. How many times was class cancelled	5	3	0	0	0	Τ.	18	4.95	405/1667	4.95	4.67	4.67	4.67	4.95
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	9	0	U	U	4	5	9	4.28	704/1626	4.28	4.21	4.11	4.06	4.28
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	6	0	0	0	2	2	17	4.71	589/1559	4.71	4.74	4.46	4.40	4.71
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	6 6	0	0	0	2 1	2	17 18	4.71	855/1560	4.71	4.74	4.72	4.40	4.71
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	6	0	0	2	1	1	17	4.57	598/1549	4.57	4.63	4.72	4.25	4.57
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned				1	0	7	15	4.50	715/1549		4.59	4.31	4.24	4.50
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding					1	1	4		1015/1323		3.90	4.00	3.99	3.56
5. Did addiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	,	ТТ	Τ.	2	1	Т	4	3.50	1015/1323	3.50	3.90	4.00	3.99	3.50
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	Λ	1	3	11	4.67	324/1384	4.67	4.37	4.10	4.12	4.67
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	12	0	0	0	1	1	13	4.80	348/1378		4.57	4.29	4.30	4.80
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	12	0	0	0	1	2	12		460/1378		4.69	4.31	4.33	4.73
4. Were special techniques successful	13	2	0	0	3	2	7	4.33	328/ 904		3.95	4.03	4.03	4.33
1. Were special ecciniques successful	13	2	O	U	5		,	1.55	320/ 301	1.55	3.75	1.05	1.05	1.55
Freq	equency Distribution													
					-									
Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades	es Reasons							Ту	pe			Majors		
00-27 0 0.00-0.99 0 A 16	Required for Majors					0	Graduat	e	0	Majo	r or	14		
28-55 2 1.00-1.99 0 B 4	_													
56-83 4 2.00-2.99 8 C 1	General 5					5	Under-g	rad 2	7	Non-	major	13		
84-150 8 3.00-3.49 3 D 0														
Grad. 0 3.50-4.00 5 F 0	Electives							0	#### - 1	Means t		re not	enoug	h

Other

16

responses to be significant

Ρ

I

0

0

1

Baltimore County Spring 2008

Course-Section: POLI 352 0101 University of Maryland Title ADMINISTRATIVE LAW MILLER, KERWIN Instructor:

P 0

I 0

? 0

Enrollment:	32	
Questionnaires:	32	

Questions

Frequencies Instructor

16

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

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Page 1335 AUG 6, 2008

Job IRBR3029

Course Dept UMBC Level Sect

responses to be significant

		Genera	 1															
1. Did yo	ou gain ne	ew insights,ski	lls fro	m this course	8	0	0	0	3	10	11	4.33	902/1670	4.33	4.47	4.31	4.24	4.33
		ctor make clear			8	0	0	0	2	7	15	4.54	569/1666	4.54	4.43	4.27	4.18	4.54
	_	uestions reflec			8	0	0	0	3	3	18	4.63	471/1406	4.63	4.50	4.32	4.22	4.63
		uations reflect			8	5	0	0	2	7	10	4.42	660/1615	4.42	4.36	4.24	4.18	4.42
	_	_		what you learned	8	0	0	1	1	7	15	4.50	389/1566	4.50	4.29	4.07	4.04	4.50
		-		o what you learned	8	2	1	1	4	7	9	4.00	899/1528	4.00	4.36	4.12	4.07	4.00
		g system clearly		ined	8	0	0	0	3	4	17	4.58	457/1650	4.58	4.42	4.22	4.12	4.58
	-	was class cance			9	0	0	0	0	1	22	4.96	338/1667	4.96	4.67	4.67	4.67	4.96
9. How wo	ould you g	grade the overa	ll teac	ching effectiveness	10	0	0	0	5	10	7	4.09	905/1626	4.09	4.21	4.11	4.06	4.09
		Lecture	e															
1. Were t	the instru	actor's lecture	s well	prepared	9	0	0	0	2	5	16	4.61	772/1559	4.61	4.74	4.46	4.40	4.61
2. Did th	ne instruc	ctor seem inter	ested i	n the subject	9	0	0	0	3	2	18	4.65	1102/1560	4.65	4.83	4.72	4.67	4.65
3. Was le	ecture mat	terial presented	d and e	explained clearly	9	0	0	0	1	2	20	4.83	275/1549	4.83	4.59	4.31	4.25	4.83
4. Did th	ne lecture	es contribute to	o what	you learned	9	0	0	0	2	2	19	4.74	432/1546	4.74	4.58	4.32	4.24	4.74
5. Did au	udiovisual	l techniques en	hance y	our understanding	10	17	2	0	1	0	2	3.00	****/1323	****	3.90	4.00	3.99	****
		Discus	sion		9 0 1 0 5													
1. Did cl	lass discu	ussions contrib	ute to	what you learned						7	10	4.09	800/1384	4.09	4.37	4.10	4.12	4.09
2. Were a	all studer	nts actively en	courage	ed to participate	9 0 0 0 1				4	18	4.74	420/1378	4.74	4.57	4.29	4.30	4.74	
3. Did th	ne instruc	ctor encourage :	fair ar	nd open discussion					5	17	4.70	501/1378	4.70	4.69	4.31	4.33	4.70	
4. Were s	special te	echniques succe	ssful		9	5	1	0	2	5	10	4.28	361/ 904	4.28	3.95	4.03	4.03	4.28
				Frequ	equency Distribution													
Credits E	Earned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades	es Reasons				ıs			Тур	e			Majors	\$	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	 0	 A 13	Required for Maj				 Ia ior		1	 Graduate		0	Majo		13	
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B 7		17.6	quil!	cu I	J⊥ IV.	۱۵ و ۱۵ و	D	_	Graduate	•	U	Ma JC) <u>+</u>	13
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	4	Б / С 1	General						5	Under-gr	ad 3	32	Non-	-major	19	
84-150	13	3.00-3.49	3	D 0	General						5	onder gr	.uu J	, 4	14011	ilia JOI	10	
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	9	F 0	Flectives							0	#### - M	leans +	here a	re not	enous	rh
oraa.	U	3.30 1.00	7	<u>.</u>	Electives							•	пппп 1	.camb c			. ciioug	,

Other

Course-Section: POLI 360 0101 University of Maryland

Baltimore County

Page 1336

AUG 6, 2008

Job IRBR3029

Title COMPRTIVE POLI ANALYSI Instructor: GRODSKY, BRIAN Spring 2008 Enrollment: 25

Questionnaires: 24 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

		Ouestion:	-		Frequencies NR NA 1 2 3 4 5				Inst Mean	ructor Rank	Course	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean			
		Quescion	- 													Mean	Mean	Mean
		Genera																
-	_	insights,ski			13	0	0	0	1	2	8	4.64	518/1670			4.31	4.24	4.64
		or make clear	_	_	13	0	0	0	1	4	6	4.45	703/1666		4.43	4.27	4.18	4.45
		stions reflec			13	7	0	0	0	2	2		****/1406		4.50	4.32	4.22	****
		tions reflect			13	0	0	0	1	6	4	4.27	849/1615		4.36	4.24	4.18	4.27
				hat you learned	13	0	0	0	1	2	8	4.64	317/1566		4.29	4.07	4.04	4.64
				what you learned	13	0	0	0	2	2	7	4.45	490/1528		4.36	4.12	4.07	4.45
		system clearly		.nea	13	0	2	0	0	5 1	4 9		1324/1650		4.42	4.22	4.12	3.82
		as class cance		ning effectiveness	14 15	0	0	1	0	3	-	4.90	675/1667 637/1626		4.67 4.21	4.67 4.11	4.67 4.06	4.90 4.33
9. HOW WOL	iia you gr	ade the overa	li teaci	ing effectiveness	15	U	U	Τ	U	3	Э	4.33	03//1020	3.98	4.21	4.11	4.06	4.33
		Lecture		_														
		tor's lecture	_	-	13	0	0	0	1	1	9	4.73	572/1559		4.74	4.46	4.40	4.73
		or seem inter		_	13	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1560		4.83	4.72	4.67	5.00
		_		plained clearly	13	0	0	0	0	3	8	4.73	410/1549		4.59	4.31	4.25	4.73
		contribute to			13	0	0	0	0	2	9	4.82	333/1546		4.58	4.32	4.24	4.82
5. Did auc	diovisual	techniques en	nance yo	our understanding	13	0	0	0	4	4	3	3.91	820/1323	3.58	3.90	4.00	3.99	3.91
		Discus	sion															
				hat you learned	13	0	0	0	2	0	9	4.64	348/1384		4.37	4.10	4.12	4.64
				l to participate	13	0	0	0	0		10	4.91	243/1378		4.57	4.29	4.30	4.91
				l open discussion	13	0	0	0	1	2	8	4.64	560/1378		4.69	4.31	4.33	4.64
4. Were sp	pecial tec	hniques succe	ssful		13	3	1	0	4	2	1	3.25	794/ 904	3.38	3.95	4.03	4.03	3.25
		Semina	ſ															
1. Were as	ssigned to	pics relevant	to the	announced theme	23	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 87	****	3.83	4.65	4.30	***
		Field	Vork															
3. Was the	e instruct	or available		sultation	23	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 38	****	****	4.62	4.68	****
		ould you disc			23	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.27	4.38	****
	_	_	_	eld activities	23	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.47	4.51	***
		Self	Dagad															
1 Did gol	lf_paged g			hat you learned	23	0	0	0	1	0	Λ	2 00	****/ 28	****	****	4.64	3.33	****
	_	ts with the in		-	23	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 27		****	4.54	2.63	***
-				-														
				Frequ	ency	Dist	cribu	ıtior	1									
Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	sons	;			Ту	pe			Majors	\$
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 2		Rec	nuire	 ad fo	or Ma	iors		 1	 Graduat	 e	0	Majo	 r	3
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	В 6		1000	1411	- a - C	- 110	. , 0 - 1	-	_	Gradac	_	•	110000	-	3
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	2	C 0		Ger	neral	L				0	Under-g	rad 2	4	Non-	major	21
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	1	D 0									5					
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F 0		Ele	ectiv	res				0	#### -	Means t	here a	re not	enoug	ſh
				P 0									respons				_	
				I 0		Oth	ner					8	_		-			
				? 0														

Course-Section: POLI 360 0201

COMPRTIVE POLI ANALYSI

Title Instructor: GRODSKY, BRIAN

Enrollment: 14 Questionnaires: 14

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2008

Page 1337 AUG 6, 2008 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

			Fre	equen	cies			Tnet	tructor	Course	Dent	UMBC	T.exre l	Sect
Ouestions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank		Mean			Mean
x														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	0	1	2	3	7	4.23	1017/1670	4.43	4.47	4.31	4.24	4.23
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	1	0	0	7	5	4.15	1081/1666	4.30	4.43	4.27	4.18	4.15
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	10	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/1406	****	4.50	4.32	4.22	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	1	0	4	2	6	3.92	1203/1615	4.10	4.36	4.24	4.18	3.92
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	2	0	0	1	10	4.31	589/1566	4.47	4.29	4.07	4.04	4.31
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	2	4	7	4.38	580/1528	4.42	4.36	4.12	4.07	4.38
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	5	0	3	1	4	2.92	1598/1650	3.37	4.42	4.22	4.12	2.92
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	13	5.00	1/1667	4.95	4.67	4.67	4.67	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	1	0	2	7	1	3.64	1329/1626	3.98	4.21	4.11	4.06	3.64
Lecture	-	0	•	0	•	_	1.0	4 55	502/1550	4 55	4 54	1 16	4 40	4 55
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	3	10	4.77	503/1559	4.75	4.74	4.46	4.40	4.77
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	1	1	11	4.77	929/1560	4.88	4.83	4.72	4.67	4.77
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	2	3	8	4.46	736/1549	4.59	4.59	4.31	4.25	4.46
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	2	2		4.54	679/1546	4.68	4.58	4.32	4.24	4.54
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	1	1	0	7	3	1	3.25	1125/1323	3.58	3.90	4.00	3.99	3.25
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	1	0	1	10	4.67	324/1384	4.65	4.37	4.10	4.12	4.67
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	2	0	2	8	4.33	797/1378	4.62	4.57	4.29	4.30	4.33
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	1	1	1	9	4.50	653/1378	4.57	4.69	4.31	4.33	4.50
4. Were special techniques successful	2	2	1	1	2	4	-	3.50	718/ 904		3.95		4.03	3.50
1. Were special eccumiques successivi		2	_	_	2	-	2	3.30	710/ 501	3.30	3.75	1.05	1.05	3.30
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 232	****	****	4.19	4.04	***
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 239	****	****	4.21	3.99	***
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 230	****	****	4.44	4.25	***
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 231	****	****	4.31	4.11	***
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 218	****	****	4.18	3.93	****
Seminar	10	0	•	0	•	•	-	F 00		ale ale ale ale	2 02	4 65	4 20	als als als als
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	0.00	****/ 87	****	3.83	4.65	4.30	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 79	****	4.00	4.64	4.53	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 75	****	4.17	4.57	4.50	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 79	****	3.67	4.45	3.68	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 80	****	3.83	3.97	3.76	***
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5 00	****/ 41	****	****	4.50	4.44	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 38	****	****	4.19	3.96	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	13	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 38	****	****	4.62	4.68	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	13	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 39	****	****	4.27	4.38	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	13	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 31	****	****	4.47	4.51	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out fretu accivities	13	J	U	U	U	U	1	5.00	/ 31			7.4/	4.9I	
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 28	****	****	4.64	3.33	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 16	****	****	4.67	4.00	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 27	****	****	4.54	2.63	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 10	****	****	4.84	****	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 6	****	****	4.92	****	****

Course-Section: POLI 360 0201 University of Maryland
Title COMPRTIVE POLI ANALYSI Baltimore County

Baltimore County Spring 2008

Instructor: GRODSKY, BRIAN

Enrollment: 14
Questionnaires: 14

Page 1337 AUG 6, 2008 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	 А	5	Required for Majors	3	Graduate	0	Major	11
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	В	4						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	3	C	1	General	2	Under-grad	14	Non-major	3
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	a
				P	0			responses to	be sig	nificant	
				I	0	Other	7				
				?	1						

Course-Section: POLI 385 0101 University of Maryland Title INTERNATIONAL SECURITY

Baltimore County Spring 2008

Page 1338

AUG 6, 2008

Job IRBR3029

Instructor: LEBSON, MICAH Enrollment: 22

Questionnaires: 21

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

							Fre	equei	ncies	3		Inst	tructor	Cour	se Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
		Question	.s		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mea	ın Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		Genera																
		w insights,ski			3	0	0	2	5	4	7		1358/167					3.89
		tor make clear	_	_	3	0	1	1	6	5	5		1452/166				4.18	3.67
	_	estions reflec			3	1	0	1	3	6	7		988/140					4.12
		ations reflect	_	2	4	0	0	1	3	4	9	4.24	,					4.24
				hat you learned	3	0	0	2	2	8	6	4.00	, -				4.04	4.00
				what you learned	3 4	1	1	1	1 2	5	9		778/152				4.07	4.18
		system clearl		nea	3	0	0	0	0	4	8		1135/165				4.12	4.00
		was class canc			3 6	0	2	2	4	3	15 2	4.83	805/166 1509/162					4.83
9. HOW WOL	iia you g	rade the overa	.ii teaci	ing effectiveness	О	U	2	2	4	5	2	3.20	1509/102	10 3.2	10 4.21	4.11	4.06	3.20
		Lectur	- 0															
1 Were th	ne instru	ctor's lecture		repared	3	0	0	2	2	4	10	4 22	1178/159	59 4.2	2 4 74	4.46	4.40	4.22
		tor seem inter			3	0	1	0	1	4	12		1294/156				4.67	4.44
				plained clearly	3	0	0	4	2	5	7		1270/154		3 4.59			3.83
		s contribute t			3	0	1	2	2	4	9		1139/154					4.00
			_	ur understanding	4	2	1	1	5	5	3		1025/132		3.90			3.53
		1											,					
		Discus	sion															
1. Did cla	ass discu	ssions contrib	ute to w	hat you learned	9	0	0	2	3	0	7	4.00	820/138	34 4.0	0 4.37	4.10	4.12	4.00
2. Were al	ll studen	ts actively en	.couraged	to participate	9	0	0	1	1	1	9	4.50	603/13	8 4.5	0 4.57	4.29	4.30	4.50
3. Did the	e instruc	tor encourage	fair and	open discussion	9	0	0	0	2	3	7	4.42	741/137	8 4.4	2 4.69	4.31	4.33	4.42
4. Were sp	pecial te	chniques succe	ssful		9	1	0	0	3	4	4	4.09	443/ 90	4.0	9 3.95	4.03	4.03	4.09
		Labora																
2. Were yo	ou provid	ed with adequa	te backs	round information	20	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 23	9 ***	* ****	4.21	3.99	****
		Semina																
1. Were as	ssigned t	opics relevant	to the	announced theme	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/	37 ***	* 3.83	4.65	4.30	****
						- D4	d 1a .		_									
				Frequ	lency	DIS	tribi	utioi	n									
Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Re:	asons	2			-	Зуре			Majors	•
			· 							, 				.ypc				, . – – – –
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A 3		Re	auire	ed fo	or Ma	aiors	3	1	Gradua	ite	0	Majo	or	15
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В 6		_				J				-	-			-
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	4	C 4		Ge	nera:	1				3	Under-	grad	21	Non-	-major	6
84-150	8	3.00-3.49	5	D 1										-			-	
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F 0		Ele	ectiv	ves				1	#### -	Means	there	are no	enoug	ſh
				P 0									respor	ses to	be sig	nifica	nt	
				I 0		Ot1	her				1	1						
				? 2														

Course-Section: POLI 390 0101 University of Maryland Page 1339
Title AMERICAN FOREIGN POLIC Baltimore County AUG 6, 2008

Instructor: STARKEY, BRIGID

Enrollment: 35
Questionnaires: 35

Spring 2008
Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Job IRBR3029

	Frequencies							Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	5	0	0	0	0	11	19	4.63	518/1670	4.72	4.47	4.31	4.24	4.63
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	5	0	0	1	1	8	20	4.57	542/1666	4.60	4.43	4.27	4.18	4.57
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	5	0	0	0	2	8	20	4.60	495/1406	4.64	4.50	4.32	4.22	4.60
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	5	0	1	0	2	9	18	4.43	646/1615	4.40	4.36	4.24	4.18	4.43
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	1	0	8	21	4.63	317/1566	4.47	4.29	4.07	4.04	4.63
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	6	0	1	1	3	8	16	4.28	688/1528	4.34	4.36	4.12	4.07	4.28
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	5	0	0	2	3	12	13	4.20	973/1650	4.38	4.42	4.22	4.12	4.20
8. How many times was class cancelled	5	0	0	0	0	3	27	4.90	675/1667	4.89	4.67	4.67	4.67	4.90
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	12	0	0	0	3	6	14	4.48	451/1626	4.52	4.21	4.11	4.06	4.48
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	5	0	0	0	0	6	24	4.80	435/1559	4.81	4.74	4.46	4.40	4.80
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	5	0	0	0	0	2	28	4.93	417/1560	4.94	4.83	4.72	4.67	4.93
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	6	0	0	0	0	5	24	4.83	275/1549	4.78	4.59	4.31	4.25	4.83
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	1	0	7	22	4.67	520/1546	4.73	4.58	4.32	4.24	4.67
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	7	1	1	0	8	5	13	4.07	666/1323	4.08	3.90	4.00	3.99	4.07
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	13	0	Ω	0	2	6	14	4.55	409/1384	4.55	4.37	4.10	4.12	4.55
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	13	0	0	1	2	7	12	4.36	763/1378	4.62	4.57	4.29	4.30	4.36
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	13	0	0	1	1	3	17	4.64	560/1378	4.72	4.69	4.31	4.33	4.64
4. Were special techniques successful	13	4	2	0	5	8	3	3.56	708/ 904		3.95	4.03	4.03	3.56
Freq	uency	Dis	trib	utio	n									
	_													
Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades		Reasons							Ту:	pe 			Majors	

Credits E	Earned	Cum. GPA		Expecte	ed Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	А	9	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	23
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	1	В	13						
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	6	C	4	General	4	Under-grad	35	Non-major	12
84-150	10	3.00-3.49	9	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means	there	are not enough	h
				P	1			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	22	_			
				?	1						

Course-Section: POLI 390 8620 University of Maryland Page 1340 Title AMERICAN FOREIGN POLIC Baltimore County AUG 6, 2008 Spring 2008 Job IRBR3029

Instructor: MELCAVAGE, EUGE

Enrollment: 20 Questionnaires: 19

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

			Frequencies						ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	3	0	0	0	1	1	14	4.81	290/1670	4.72	4.47	4.31	4.24	4.81
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	3	0	0	0	1	4	11	4.63	465/1666	4.60	4.43	4.27	4.18	4.63
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	3	0	0	0	1	3	12	4.69	399/1406	4.64	4.50	4.32	4.22	4.69
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	3	0	1	0	1	4	10	4.38	724/1615	4.40	4.36	4.24	4.18	4.38
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	3	0	1	0	1	5	9	4.31	579/1566	4.47	4.29	4.07	4.04	4.31
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	3	1	1	0	0	5	9	4.40	560/1528	4.34	4.36	4.12	4.07	4.40
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	3	0	0	0	1	5	10	4.56	485/1650	4.38	4.42	4.22	4.12	4.56
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	0	0	0	0	2	14	4.88	730/1667	4.89	4.67	4.67	4.67	4.88
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	0	1	4	9	4.57	347/1626	4.52	4.21	4.11	4.06	4.57
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	1	1	14	4.81	419/1559	4.81	4.74	4.46	4.40	4.81
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	0	1	15	4.94	417/1560	4.94	4.83	4.72	4.67	4.94
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	0	0	1	2	12	4.73	395/1549	4.78	4.59	4.31	4.25	4.73
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	3	12	4.80	345/1546	4.73	4.58	4.32	4.24	4.80
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	5	3	1	0	1	4	5	4.09	659/1323	4.08	3.90	4.00	3.99	4.09
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	1	1	2	12	4.56	396/1384	4.55	4.37	4.10	4.12	4.56
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	0	2	14	4.88	274/1378	4.62	4.57	4.29	4.30	4.88
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	1	1	14	4.81	375/1378	4.72	4.69	4.31	4.33	4.81
4. Were special techniques successful	3	8	1	0	1	2	4	4.00	461/ 904	3.78	3.95	4.03	4.03	4.00
		Ŭ	_	ŭ	_	-	-	1.00	_01, 501	3.70	3.23	1.00	1.00	1.00

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expecte	ed Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	 А	5	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	15
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	10						
56-83	6	2.00-2.99	2	C	0	General	1	Under-grad	19	Non-major	4
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	n
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	14	_			
				?	0						

University of Maryland Course-Section: POLI 395 8620 Baltimore County Title U.S. NAT'L SECURITY PO

AUG 6, 2008 TURNER, MICHAEL Spring 2008 Job IRBR3029 Instructor:

Page 1341

responses to be significant

Enrollment:	18		-
Questionnaires:	18	Student Course	Evaluation Questionnaire

P

I

?

0

0

0

Questions						NA	Fre	equer 2	ncies 3	5 4	5	Inst Mean	ructor Rank	Course	Dept Mean		Level Mean	Sect Mean
		Questions			INK.	INA				-		Mean	Ralik	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		General																
1. Did you	ı gain ne	w insights,skil	ls fro	om this course	1	0	0	0	0	1	16	4.94	124/1670	4.94	4.47	4.31	4.24	4.94
2. Did the	e instruc	tor make clear	the ex	spected goals	1	0	0	0	0	1	16	4.94	104/1666	4.94	4.43	4.27	4.18	4.94
3. Did the	e exam qu	estions reflect	the e	expected goals	1	1	0	0	0	2	14	4.88	212/1406	4.88	4.50	4.32	4.22	4.88
4. Did oth	ner evalu	ations reflect	the ex	spected goals	1	0	0	0	0	3	14	4.82	231/1615	4.82	4.36	4.24	4.18	4.82
5. Did ass	signed re	adings contribu	te to	what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	1	15	4.82	176/1566	4.82	4.29	4.07	4.04	4.82
6. Did wri	tten ass	ignments contri	bute t	to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	1	16	4.94	73/1528	4.94	4.36	4.12	4.07	4.94
		system clearly		ained	1	0	0	0	0	1	16	4.94	95/1650	4.94	4.42	4.22	4.12	4.94
		was class cance			2	0	0	0	1	4	11		1062/1667	4.63	4.67	4.67	4.67	4.63
9. How wou	ıld you g	rade the overal	1 tead	ching effectiveness	7	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	116/1626	4.91	4.21	4.11	4.06	4.91
		Lecture																
	_			0	0													
	1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject							0	0	1	15	4.94	193/1559		4.74	4.46	4.40	4.94
				•	2	0	0	0	0	0	16	5.00	1/1560		4.83	4.72	4.67	5.00
		-		explained clearly	3	0	0	0	0		14	4.93	,	4.93	4.59	4.31	4.25	4.93
		s contribute to		•	3	0	0	0	0	2	13	4.87	276/1546		4.58	4.32	4.24	
5. Did aud	liovisual	. techniques enh	ance y	our understanding	3	1	0	0	1	0	13	4.86	137/1323	4.86	3.90	4.00	3.99	4.86
		- ·																
1 544 -1-		Discuss			1	0	0	0	0	2	10	1 00	105/1204	1 00	4 27	4 10	4 10	1 00
				what you learneded to participate	4	0	0	0	0	1	12 13	4.86	195/1384 194/1378	4.86 4.93	4.37 4.57	4.10 4.29	4.12	4.86 4.93
				ed to participate nd open discussion	4	0	0	0	0	1	13	4.93	225/1378		4.57	4.29	4.30	4.93
		chniques succes		id open discussion	4	1	0	0	0	2	11	4.85	121/ 904		3.95	4.03	4.03	4.93
4. Were sp	Deciai te	ciniiques succes	SIUI		4		U	U	U	2	TT	4.05	121/ 904	4.00	3.95	4.03	4.03	4.00
				Frequ	ency	Dist	ribu	utior	ı									
Credits Ea	Expected Grades				Rea	asons	5			Туј	pe			Majors	.			
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	A 8		Rec	quire	ed fo	or Ma	ajor	s	0	Graduat	е	1	Majo	r	10
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В 5	_													
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	4	C 0	General							3	Under-g	rad 1	.7	Non-	major	8
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	2	D 0								_			_			
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00	4	F 0		El∈	ectiv	ves				0	#### - 1	Means t	here a	re not	enoug	ŗh

Other

11

Course-Section: POLI 401 1301 University of Maryland Page 1342 Title INDIVIDUAL STUDY IN PO Baltimore County AUG 6, 2008 Spring 2008 Job IRBR3029

Instructor: FORESTIERE, CAR

Enrollment: 1 Questionnaires: 1

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

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

Course-Section: POLI 402 1301
Title HONORS RESEARCH
Instructor: FORESTIERE, CAR

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2008 Page 1343 AUG 6, 2008 Job IRBR3029

Enrollment: 1
Questionnaires: 1

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

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

Course-Section: POLI 409A 0101 University of Maryland HONRS THESIS PREP COUR Baltimore County

? 0

Title Instructor: FORESTIERE, CAR
Enrollment: 3 Spring 2008

DILL OT TIMCITE.	3			
Questionnaires:	3	Student Course	Evaluation	Questionnaire

Questions

		 Genera																
1 Did voi	u gain ne	ew insights,ski	_	m this course	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1670	5.00	4.47	4.31	4.45	5.00
		ctor make clear			2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1666	5.00	4.43	4.27	4.35	5.00
		uestions reflec			2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1406	5.00	4.50	4.32	4.48	5.00
	_	uations reflect			2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1615	5.00	4.36	4.24	4.37	5.00
				what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1566	5.00	4.29	4.07	4.17	5.00
	_	_		o what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1528	5.00	4.36	4.12	4.26	5.00
		g system clearl			2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1650	5.00	4.42	4.22	4.28	5.00
		was class canc			2	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1524/1667	4.00	4.67	4.67	4.73	4.00
9. How wor	uld you g	grade the overa	ll teac	hing effectiveness	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1626	5.00	4.21	4.11	4.28	5.00
		Lectur	e															
1. Were t	he instru	uctor's lecture	s well	prepared	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1559	5.00	4.74	4.46	4.58	5.00
2. Did the	e instruc	ctor seem inter	ested i	n the subject	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1560	5.00	4.83	4.72	4.80	5.00
3. Was le	3. Was lecture material presented and explained clear							0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1549	5.00	4.59	4.31	4.43	5.00
4. Did the	4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned							0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1546	5.00	4.58	4.32	4.43	5.00
5. Did au	5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understandi							0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1323	5.00	3.90	4.00	4.10	5.00
		Discus	sion															
1. Did cla	ass discu	ussions contrib	ute to	what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1384	5.00	4.37	4.10	4.32	5.00
				d to participate	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00		5.00	4.57	4.29	4.55	5.00
				d open discussion	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1378	5.00	4.69	4.31	4.60	5.00
4. Were s	pecial te	echniques succe	ssful		2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 904	5.00	3.95	4.03	4.22	5.00
				Frequ	ency	Dist	cribu	ıtioı	n									
Credits Ea	Expected Grades				Rea	ason	3			Тур	e			Majors	3			
00-27 0 0.00-0.99 0 A 0						Red	quire	ed f	or Ma	ajor:	 5	0	Graduate	;	0	Majo	 or	1
28-55	28-55 0 1.00-1.99 0 B 1																	
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	1	C 0		Ger	neral	L				0	Under-gr	ad	3	Non-	-major	2
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	0	D 0														
Grad.	Grad. 0 3.50-4.00 0 F 0					Ele	ectiv	<i>r</i> es				0	#### - M				_	jh
				P 0								response	s to b	e sign	ifican	ıt		
				I 0	Other							1						
						001101												

Frequencies Instructor

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

Page 1344 AUG 6, 2008

Job IRBR3029

Course Dept UMBC Level Sect

University of Maryland Baltimore County

? 0

Course-Section: POLI 409B 0101 Page 1345 Title TRANSITIONAL JUSTICE AUG 6, 2008 Instructor: GRODSKY, BRIAN Spring 2008 Job IRBR3029

Frequencies

NR NA 1 2 3 4 5 Mean

Instructor

Rank

Course Dept UMBC Level Sect

Mean Mean Mean Mean

Enrollment:	17			
Questionnaires:	17	Student Course E	Evaluation (uestionnaire

Questions

	General																	
			_		_				_		_		/4					
		ew insights,ski			7	0	0	0	0	4	6	4.60	,	4.60	4.47	4.31	4.45	4.60
		ctor make clear			-7	0	0	0	0	7	3	4.30	908/1666	4.30	4.43	4.27	4.35	4.30
	_	uestions reflec		_	7	8	0	0	1	0	1		****/1406	****	4.50	4.32	4.48	***
		uations reflect			7	1	0	0	2	2	5	4.33	775/1615	4.33	4.36	4.24	4.37	4.33
				hat you learned	7	0	0	0	0	3	7	4.70	,	4.70	4.29	4.07	4.17	4.70
		_		what you learned	7	0	0	0	0	3	7	4.70	277/1528	4.70	4.36	4.12	4.26	4.70
		g system clearl		.ned	7	0	0	0	4	2	4		1135/1650	4.00	4.42	4.22	4.28	4.00
	-	was class canc			7	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1667	5.00	4.67	4.67	4.73	5.00
9. How wor	uld you	grade the overa	ll teach	ing effectiveness	8	0	0	0	0	6	3	4.33	637/1626	4.33	4.21	4.11	4.28	4.33
		Lectur	e															
1. Were tl	he instr	uctor's lecture	s well r	repared	7	0	0	0	0	3	7	4.70	623/1559	4.70	4.74	4.46	4.58	4.70
2. Did the	e instru	ctor seem inter	ested ir	the subject	7	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	596/1560	4.90	4.83	4.72	4.80	4.90
3. Was le	3. Was lecture material presented and explained clear							0	1	3	6	4.50	683/1549	4.50	4.59	4.31	4.43	4.50
	4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned							0	0	2	8	4.80	345/1546	4.80	4.58	4.32	4.43	4.80
5. Did au	5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understandi							0	6	2	1	3.44	1065/1323	3.44	3.90	4.00	4.10	3.44
		Discus	aion															
1 124 41.				hat you learned	8	0	0	0	0	2	7	1 70	242/1384	4.78	4.37	4.10	4.32	4.78
				l to participate	8	0	0	0	1	0	8		,	4.78	4.57	4.10	4.55	4.78
		_	_	l open discussion	8	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1378	5.00	4.69	4.29	4.55	5.00
		echniques succe		open discussion	8	7	0	0	2	0	9		****/ 904			4.03	4.22	****
4. Were s	peciai t	eciniques succe	SSLUI		0	,	U	U	2	U	U	3.00	/ 904		3.95	4.03	4.22	
				Frequ	ıency	Dis	trib	utio	n									
Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	ason	3			Тур	e			Majors	\$
00-27	A 6		Red	anir	ed fo	or Ma		 S	3	 Graduate		0	Majo	r r	5			
28-55	0	0.00-0.99 1.00-1.99	0 0	В 3		1,0,	~1~++	- A I	OI 1110	-,01	~	_	Gradatt	-	Ū	1100	_	5
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	1	C 0	General							1	Under-gr	ad 1	7	Non-	-major	12
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	3	D 0	General							_	011001 91			2.021		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	0	F 0		Electives						1	#### - M	leans t	here a	re not	: enonc	rh
0144.	ŭ	3.33 1.30	•	P 0		HICCEIVED						_	response				_	,
				I 0		Other						4	_ copone					
				± 0		001						-						

University of Maryland Baltimore County

Course-Section: POLI 428 0101 Title POLITICS INTERNSHIP SCHALLER, THOMA Spring 2008 Instructor:

Enrollment: 10 Questionnaires: 9

Page 1346 AUG 6, 2008 Job IRBR3029

_			
Ctudant	COURCE	Fralustion	Ouestionnaire
bludelli	COULSE	Evaluation	Quescionnaire

	- L					Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect		
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
G]														
General	•	0	•	0	0	-	_	4 00	004/1650	4 00	4 45	4 21	4 45	4 00
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	224/1670		4.47	4.31	4.45	4.89
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	190/1666	4.89	4.43	4.27	4.35	4.89
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	Ţ	Τ	5	4.57	525/1406	4.57	4.50	4.32	4.48	4.57
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	Τ	0	0	2	0	6	4.50	552/1615	4.50	4.36	4.24	4.37	4.50
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	143/1566	4.89	4.29	4.07	4.17	4.89
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	1	6	4.44	504/1528	4.44	4.36	4.12	4.26	4.44
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	4	5	4.56	499/1650	4.56	4.42	4.22	4.28	4.56
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1667	5.00	4.67	4.67	4.73	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	141/1626	4.86	4.21	4.11	4.28	4.86
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	Λ	Λ	Λ	1	8	4.89	307/1559	4.89	4.74	4.46	4.58	4.89
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1560	5.00	4.83	4.72	4.80	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	1	7	4.67	488/1549	4.67	4.59	4.31	4.43	4.67
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	2	6	4.56	655/1546	4.56	4.58	4.32	4.43	4.56
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	1	٥	1	U	1	6	4.50	326/1323		3.90	4.00		4.50
5. Did addiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	U	т.	U	1	U	Т	0	4.50	320/1323	4.50	3.90	4.00	4.10	4.50
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	179/1384	4.89	4.37	4.10	4.32	4.89
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	264/1378	4.89	4.57	4.29	4.55	4.89
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	312/1378	4.88	4.69	4.31	4.60	4.88
4. Were special techniques successful	0	4	1	0	1	0	3	3.80	605/ 904	3.80	3.95	4.03	4.22	3.80
Frequ														

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

Course-Section: POLI 432 0101 University of Maryland Page 1347
Title CIVIL RIGHTS Baltimore County AUG 6, 2008
Instructor: LANOUE, GEORGE Spring 2008 Job IRBR3029
Enrollment: 38

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

Questionnaires: 27

			Fr	eque	ncies	3		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	1	1	4	21	4.67	479/1670	4.67	4.47	4.31	4.45	4.67
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	1	3	4		4.50	622/1666		4.43	4.27	4.35	4.50
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	3	4	19	4.52	586/1406		4.50	4.32		4.52
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	2	2	5	18	4.44	633/1615	4.44	4.36	4.24	4.37	4.44
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	2	3	21	4.73	242/1566		4.29	4.07	4.17	4.73
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	2	1	1	2	8	12	4.21	751/1528	4.21	4.36	4.12	4.26	4.21
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	2	4	20	4.69	327/1650	4.69	4.42	4.22	4.28	4.69
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	4	22	4.85	786/1667	4.85	4.67	4.67	4.73	4.85
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	1	1	0	2	7	12	4.32	659/1626	4.32	4.21	4.11	4.28	4.32
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	5	22	4.81	419/1559				4.58	4.81
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	4			911/1560		4.83	4.72	4.80	4.78
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	3	4	20	4.63	537/1549		4.59	4.31	4.43	4.63
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	1	5	20	4.63	570/1546	4.63	4.58	4.32	4.43	4.63
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	5	2	1	6	6	7	3.68	950/1323	3.68	3.90	4.00	4.10	3.68
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	Ο	1	1	2	2	16	4 41	541/1384	4.41	4.37	4.10	4.32	4.41
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	1	1	1	3	16	4.45	660/1378		4.57	4.29	4.55	4.45
	5	0	1	Δ	0	_	19	4.73	470/1378		4.69	4.31	4.60	4.73
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5 6	0	0	0	1	2	17	4.76	142/ 904		3.95			
4. Were special techniques successful	ь	U	U	U	Τ	3	Τ/	4.70	144/ 904	4./0	3.95	4.03	4.22	4.70
Frequ	ıency	Dis	rib	utio	n									
				_					_					

Credits E	Tarned	Cum. GPA	A	Expecte	d Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	1	 А	7	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	22
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	11						
56-83	7	2.00-2.99	5	C	4	General	6	Under-grad	27	Non-major	5
84-150	11	3.00-3.49	5	D	1						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	10	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means	there	are not enough	h
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	18	_			
				2	2						

University of Maryland Baltimore County

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Page 1348 AUG 6, 2008

Job IRBR3029

Course-Section: POLI 438 0101 Title LEGAL INTERNSHIP Instructor: DAVIS, JEFFREY Spring 2008

Enrollment:

Ouestionnaires: 17

17

Frequencies Instructor Course Dept UMBC Level Sect Ouestions NR NA 1 2 3 4 5 Mean Rank Mean Mean Mean Mean Mean General 1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course 4 0 0 0 2 3 8 4.46 722/1670 4.46 4.47 4.31 4.45 4.46 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals 3 0 0 1 2 2 9 4.36 846/1666 4.36 4.43 4.27 4.35 4.36 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals 3 7 0 0 1 0 6 4.71 363/1406 4.71 4.50 4.32 4.48 4.71 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals 3 0 0 1 2 3 8 4.29 837/1615 4.29 4.36 4.24 4.37 4.29 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 3 0 0 1 3 5 5 4.00 851/1566 4.00 4.29 4.07 4.17 4.00 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 3 1 0 0 3 3 7 4.31 662/1528 4.31 4.36 4.12 4.26 4.31 7. Was the grading system clearly explained 3 0 0 0 2 4 8 4.43 690/1650 4.43 4.42 4.22 4.28 4.43 8. How many times was class cancelled 4 0 0 0 0 1 12 4.92 540/1667 4.92 4.67 4.67 4.73 4.92 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 6 0 0 0 0 6 5 4.45 483/1626 4.45 4.21 4.11 4.28 4.45Lecture 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 3 0 0 0 1 3 10 4.64 706/1559 4.64 4.74 4.46 4.58 4.64 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 3 0 0 0 1 13 4.93 477/1560 4.93 4.83 4.72 4.80 4.93 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 3 0 0 1 2 3 8 4.29 952/1549 4.29 4.59 4.31 4.43 4.29 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 3 0 0 0 3 2 9 4.43 822/1546 4.43 4.58 4.32 4.43 4.43 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 4 0 0 0 4 5 4 4.00 692/1323 4.00 3.90 4.00 4.10 4.00 Discussion 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 5 0 0 0 2 3 7 4.42 530/1384 4.42 4.37 4.10 4.32 4.42 0 1 2 9 4.67 481/1378 4.67 4.57 4.29 4.55 4.67 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 5 0 0 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 5 0 0 0 1 11 4.92 253/1378 4.92 4.69 4.31 4.60 4.92 4. Were special techniques successful 5 6 0 0 1 1 4 4.50 243/904 4.50 3.95 4.03 4.22 4.50 Seminar 1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 16 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 **** 87 **** 3.83 4.65 4.80 **** Field Work 1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 15 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 ****/ 41 **** **** 4.50 4.98 **** 2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 15 0 0 0 0 1 1 4.50 ****/ 38 **** **** 4.19 4.36 **** 15 1 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 38 **** 4.62 4.58 **** 3. Was the instructor available for consultation 15 0 1 0 0 0 1 3.00 ****/ 39 **** **** 4.27 4.02 **** 4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations Frequency Distribution Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades Reasons Majors -------00-27 0 0.00-0.99 0 A 12 Required for Majors 0 Graduate 0 Major 4 28-55 0 1.00-1.99 0 56-83 3 2.00-2.99 0 84-150 6 3.00-3.49 5 Grad. 0 3.50-4.00 6 B 0 C 0 General 4 Under-grad 17 Non-major 13 D 0 F 0 Electives 1 #### - Means there are not enough P 0 responses to be significant I 0 Other 6

University of Maryland

Course-Section: POLI 438H 0101 Baltimore County Spring 2008 LEGAL INTERNSHIP DAVIS, JEFFREY Instructor: Enrollment: 1

Title

Questionnaires: 1

Page 1349 AUG 6, 2008 Job IRBR3029

Studer	t Course	Fvaluation	Questionnaire
D C uuci.	ic course	n varaacron	Queberonnarie

	Frequencies							Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	Ω	Λ	Λ	Λ	Ω	1	Λ	4 00	1216/1670	4.00	4.47	4.31	4.45	4.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	0		1199/1666	4.00	4.43	4.27	4.35	4.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1615	5.00	4.36	4.24	4.37	5.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	0	0	0		1551/1566	2.00	4.29	4.07	4.17	2.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	U	0	0	1	5.00	1/1528		4.36	4.12	4.26	5.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	0	1		1/1650		4.42	4.22	4.28	5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1667	5.00	4.67	4.67	4.73	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1626	5.00	4.21	4.11	4.28	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	U	U	U	U	U	U		5.00	1/1020	5.00	4.21	4.11	4.20	5.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1559	5.00	4.74	4.46	4.58	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1560	5.00	4.83	4.72	4.80	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1549	5.00	4.59	4.31	4.43	5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1546	5.00	4.58	4.32	4.43	5.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1323	5.00	3.90	4.00	4.10	5.00
5. 214 addrevibaar occimingado cimanoc your anacipoanaring	Ü	Ü	Ü	Ů	Ü	Ü	_	3.00	1,1323	5.00	3.70	1.00	1.10	5.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	1260/1384	3.00	4.37	4.10	4.32	3.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1378	5.00	4.57	4.29	4.55	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1378	5.00	4.69	4.31	4.60	5.00
•														
Frequ	ency	Dist	rib	ution	n									

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

Baltimore County Spring 2008

University of Maryland

Page 1350

AUG 6, 2008

Job IRBR3029

Enrollment: 20 Questionnaires: 20 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Course-Section: POLI 440 0101

URBAN POLITICS

HANLON, BERNADE

Title

Instructor:

-					-														
							Fre	eque	ncies	3		Ins	tructor	2	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
		Questions	3		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rar	nk	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
1 Did vo	u gain n	General ew insights,skil		this gourge	11	0	1	0	2	3	3	3 79	1430/1	1670	3.78	4.47	4.31	4.45	3.78
		ew insignes,ski ctor make clear			11	0	0	1	1	0	7	4.44	719/1		4.44	4.43	4.27	4.35	4.44
		uestions reflect	_	_	11	0	0	0	1	2	6	4.56	546/1		4.56	4.50	4.32	4.48	4.56
	_	uations reflect	_		11	0	0	0	1	2	6	4.56	499/1		4.56	4.36	4.24	4.37	4.56
		eadings contribu	_	_	12	0	1	0	1	1	5	4.13	771/1		4.13	4.29	4.07	4.17	4.13
	_	-		what you learned	12	0	1	1	0	1	5	4.00	899/1		4.00	4.36	4.12	4.26	4.00
		g system clearly			11	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00		1650	5.00	4.42	4.22	4.28	5.00
	_	was class cance	_	icu	11	0	0	0	0	5	4		1216/1			4.67	4.67		4.44
	_			ng effectiveness	15	0	0	1	1	3	0		1438/1			4.21	4.11	4.28	3.40
		Lecture	9																
1. Were th	he instr	uctor's lectures	well pr	epared	12	0	0	0	1	1	6	4.63	739/1	1559	4.63	4.74	4.46	4.58	4.63
		ctor seem intere	_	_	12	0	0	0	1	1	6	4.63	1138/1	1560	4.63	4.83	4.72	4.80	4.63
		terial presented		_	12	0	0	0	0	4	4	4.50	683/1	1549	4.50	4.59	4.31	4.43	4.50
		es contribute to	_	_	12	0	1	0	1	2	4		1139/1			4.58	4.32	4.43	4.00
		l techniques enh			14	0	2	1	0	0	3		1155/1			3.90	4.00	4.10	3.17
							_	_	-	-	-								
		Discuss					_	_	_										
		ussions contribu		_	15	0	0	1	1	1	2	3.80	975/1		3.80	4.37	4.10	4.32	3.80
		nts actively end			15 15	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	525/1		4.60	4.57	4.29	4.55	4.60
	id the instructor encourage fair and open discus					0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	386/1		4.80	4.69	4.31	4.60	4.80
4. Were s	Were special techniques successful					1	0	2	0	0	2	3.50	****/	904	****	3.95	4.03	4.22	****
		Laborat	-																
		crease understar	_		19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/		****	****	4.19	4.35	****
_	_	_	_	ound information	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/		****	****	4.21	4.26	****
5. Were re	equireme:	nts for lab repo	orts clea	rly specified	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/	218	****	****	4.18	4.09	****
		Seminar									_							4 00	
		topics relevant			19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/	87	****	3.83	4.65	4.80	****
_		ons contribute t	_	ou learned	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/	79	****	3.67	4.45	4.53	****
5. Were c	riteria	for grading made	e clear		19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/	80	****	3.83	3.97	3.67	****
		Field W																	
		rience contribut			19	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/		****	****	4.50	4.98	****
2. Did yo	u clearl	y understand you	ır evalua	tion criteria	19	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/	38	****	****	4.19	4.36	****
		Self E	Paced																
1. Did se	lf-paced	system contribu	ite to wh	at you learned	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/	28	****	****	4.64	5.00	***
2. Did st	udy ques	tions make clear	the exp	ected goal	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/	16	****	****	4.67	4.80	****
4. Was the	e feedba	ck/tutoring by p	proctors	helpful	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/	10	****	****	4.84	****	****
				Frequ	iency	/ Dist	trib	utio	n										
Credits Ea	redits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grad							Rea	asons	3				Туј	pe			Majors	5
00-27												0	Crac			0	 Ma∹		 8
00-27 28-55	00-27 0 0.00-0.99 0 A 8 28-55 0 1.00-1.99 0 B 0					Ked	quir(eu f	or Ma	JOES	5	U	Grad	udt	E	U	Majo) <u>r</u>	ŏ
56-83						Gei	nera:	1				0	Unde	er-g	rad 2	0	Non-	-major	12
84-150	84-150 4 3.00-3.49 2 D 0																		
Grad.	Grad. 0 3.50-4.00 1 F 0					Ele	ectiv	ves				0	####	‡ – 1	Means t	here a	are not	enoug	gh
				P 0									resp	ons	es to b	e sign	nificar	nt	
				т О		O+1	h 0 30					7							

Other

7

I 0

? 0

Course-Section: POLI 446 0101 University of Maryland Page 1351 Title THE POLITICS OF POVERT Baltimore County AUG 6, 2008 Job IRBR3029

Instructor: MILLER, CHERYL

Enrollment: 9

Questionnaires: 9

Spring 2008 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

			Fre	equer	ncies	5		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank		Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	0	Ω	Ο	1	7	4.88	234/1670	4.88	4.47	4.31	4.45	4.88
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	3	5	4.63	465/1666	4.63	4.43	4.27	4.35	4.63
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	2	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	240/1406	4.83	4.50	4.32	4.48	4.83
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	1	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	326/1615	4.71	4.36	4.24	4.37	4.71
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	148/1566	4.88	4.29	4.07	4.17	4.88
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1528	5.00	4.36	4.12	4.26	5.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	180/1650	4.88	4.42	4.22	4.28	4.88
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	5	3	4.38	1279/1667	4.38	4.67	4.67	4.73	4.38
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	1	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	347/1626	4.57	4.21	4.11	4.28	4.57
. 3														
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	521/1559	4.75	4.74	4.46	4.58	4.75
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1560	5.00	4.83	4.72	4.80	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	424/1549	4.71	4.59	4.31	4.43	4.71
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	407/1546	4.75	4.58	4.32	4.43	4.75
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	1	0	0	4	3	4.00	692/1323	4.00	3.90	4.00	4.10	4.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1384	5.00	4.37	4.10	4.32	5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1378	5.00	4.57	4.29	4.55	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1378	5.00	4.69	4.31	4.60	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	4	2	1	0	1	0	1	3.00	820/ 904	3.00	3.95	4.03	4.22	3.00
Frequ	lency	Dis	trib	ution	n									

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	d Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	 А	3	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	7
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	3						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	0	C	1	General	1	Under-grad	9	Non-major	2
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	4	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	1
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	6	-			
				2	Λ						

Course-Section: POLI 473 0101 University of Maryland Title GANDHI POL EXPMT TRUTH

Baltimore County Spring 2008

Page 1352

AUG 6, 2008

Job IRBR3029

Enrollment: 12 Questionnaires: 12 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Instructor:

LEVY, HAROLD L

							Fre	equei	ncies	;		Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
		Question	s		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		 Genera	 1															
1. Did vou	ı gain new	insights,ski		this course	4	0	1	1	2	3	1	3.25	1596/1670	3.25	4.47	4.31	4.45	3.25
_	_	or make clear			4	0	1	0	4	0	3		1508/1666		4.43	4.27	4.35	3.50
		estions reflec			4	5	0	0	2	1	0		1314/1406		4.50	4.32	4.48	3.33
		ations reflect			4	0	1	2	2	1	2		1557/1615		4.36	4.24	4.37	3.13
5. Did ass	signed rea	dings contrib	ute to w	hat you learned	5	0	1	0	4	1	1	3.14	1447/1566	3.14	4.29	4.07	4.17	3.14
6. Did wri	itten assi	gnments contr	ibute to	what you learned	4	0	1	1	3	3	0	3.00	1447/1528	3.00	4.36	4.12	4.26	3.00
7. Was the	grading	system clearl	y explai	ned	4	0	3	0	1	1	3	3.13	1565/1650	3.13	4.42	4.22	4.28	3.13
8. How man	ny times w	vas class canc	elled		4	0	0	0	0	5	3	4.38	1279/1667	4.38	4.67	4.67	4.73	4.38
9. How wou	ıld you gr	rade the overa	ll teach	ing effectiveness	7	0	1	1	1	2	0	2.80	1574/1626	2.80	4.21	4.11	4.28	2.80
		Lectur	e															
1. Were th	ne instruc	ctor's lecture	s well p	repared	4	0	0	0	1	1	6	4.63	739/1559	4.63	4.74	4.46	4.58	4.63
2. Did the	e instruct	or seem inter	ested in	the subject	4	0	0	1	0	2	5	4.38	1347/1560	4.38	4.83	4.72	4.80	4.38
3. Was led	cture mate	erial presente	d and ex	plained clearly	4	0	1	0	1	4	2	3.75	1308/1549	3.75	4.59	4.31	4.43	3.75
4. Did the	e lectures	s contribute t	o what y	ou learned	4	0	1	0	2	4	1	3.50	1379/1546	3.50	4.58	4.32	4.43	3.50
5. Did aud	diovisual	techniques en	hance yo	ur understanding	4	5	2	1	0	0	0	1.33	1316/1323	1.33	3.90	4.00	4.10	1.33
1. Did cla	Discussion Did class discussions contribute to what you learn						1	0	1	2	2	3.67	1033/1384	3.67	4.37	4.10	4.32	3.67
2. Were al	Were all students actively encouraged to participa						1	1	0	1	3	3.67	1139/1378	3.67	4.57	4.29	4.55	3.67
3. Did the	Were all students actively encouraged to participa Oid the instructor encourage fair and open discuss						1	1	1	0	3	3.50	1189/1378	3.50	4.69	4.31	4.60	3.50
4. Were sp	pecial tec	chniques succe	ssful		6	3	1	1	0	0	1	2.67	860/ 904	2.67	3.95	4.03	4.22	2.67
		Semina	r															
1. Were as	ssigned to	pics relevant	to the	announced theme	6	0	0	1	2	0	3	3.83	81/ 87	3.83	3.83	4.65	4.80	3.83
2. Was the	e instruct	or available	for indi	vidual attention	6	0	0	0	3	0	3	4.00	69/ 79	4.00	4.00	4.64	4.60	4.00
3. Did res	search pro	jects contrib	ute to w	hat you learned	6	0	0	0	2	1	3	4.17	56/ 75	4.17	4.17	4.57	4.56	4.17
4. Did pre	esentation	ns contribute	to what	you learned	6	0	0	1	2	1	2	3.67	71/ 79	3.67	3.67	4.45	4.53	3.67
5. Were cr	riteria fo	or grading mad	e clear		6	0	0	1	2	0	3	3.83	48/ 80	3.83	3.83	3.97	3.67	3.83
		Field	Work															
1. Did fie	eld experi	lence contribu	te to wh	at you learned	11	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 41	****	****	4.50	4.98	****
2. Did you	ı clearly	understand yo	ur evalu	ation criteria	11	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 38	****	****	4.19	4.36	****
3. Was the	e instruct	or available	for cons	ultation	11	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 38	****	****	4.62	4.58	****
4. To what	degree o	could you disc	uss your	evaluations	11	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.27	4.02	***
				Frequ	iency	Dist	cribu	utio	n									
Credits Ea	Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grad								asons	;			Ty	ре			Majors	
00-27 28-55	00-27 0 0.00-0.99 0 A 2 28-55 0 1.00-1.99 0 B 3							ed fo	or Ma	jors	5	2	Graduat	е	0	Majo	r	8
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	2	C 1		Ger	neral	1				0	Under-	rad 1	.2	Non-	major	4
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	1	D 0		001		-				~	OHACE S		-	11011	2	-
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F 0		Ele	ectiv	ves				0	#### -	Means t	here a	re not	enoua	rh
	-			P 0										es to b			_	•
	I 0						ner					7			5			
		? 0																

Course-Section: POLI 480 0101 University of Maryland Page 1353
Title INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZA Baltimore County AUG 6, 2008

Instructor: HODY, CYNTHIA

Enrollment: 18
Questionnaires: 14

Spring 2008
Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Job IRBR3029

			Fr	equei	ncies	3		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	3	11	4.79	325/1670	4.79	4.47	4.31	4.45	4.79
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	3	10	4.64	440/1666	4.64	4.43	4.27	4.35	4.64
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	10	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	318/1406	4.75	4.50	4.32	4.48	4.75
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	3	10	4.77	281/1615	4.77	4.36	4.24	4.37	4.77
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	3	6	4	4.08	808/1566	4.08	4.29	4.07	4.17	4.08
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	. 1	0	0	0	0	6	7	4.54	398/1528	4.54	4.36	4.12	4.26	4.54
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	1	4	8	4.54	527/1650	4.54	4.42	4.22	4.28	4.54
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	1	7	5	4.31	1334/1667	4.31	4.67	4.67	4.73	4.31
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	1	0	0	0	3	8	4.73	231/1626	4.73	4.21	4.11	4.28	4.73
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	1	2	10	4.69	623/1559	4.69	4.74	4.46	4.58	4.69
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	13	5.00	1/1560	5.00	4.83	4.72	4.80	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	1	2	9	4.67	488/1549	4.67	4.59	4.31	4.43	4.67
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	2	11	4.85	299/1546	4.85	4.58	4.32	4.43	4.85
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	10	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	****/1323	****	3.90	4.00	4.10	****
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	169/1384	4.91	4.37	4.10	4.32	4.91
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	0	0	11		1/1378		4.57	4.29	4.55	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	281/1378		4.69	4.31	4.60	4.91
4. Were special techniques successful	3	3	0	0	0	3	5	4.63	194/ 904		3.95	4.03	4.22	
Freq	uency	/ Dis	trib	utio	n									
Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades				Rea	asons	5			Ty	pe			Majors	
										- 				
00-27 0 0.00-0.99 0 A 5		Re	quir	ed f	or Ma	ajor	ŝ	2	Graduat	е	0	Majo	or	10

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

Course-Section: POLI 486 0101 University of Maryland Page 1354 Title MIDDLE EAST INTL RELAT Baltimore County AUG 6, 2008

Instructor: STARKEY, BRIGID

Enrollment: 25 Questionnaires: 24

Spring 2008 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire Job IRBR3029

		Frequencies							ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	2	0	0	0	0	4	18	4.82	290/1670	4.82	4.47	4.31	4.45	4.82
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	0	1	0	5	16	4.64	452/1666	4.64	4.43	4.27	4.35	4.64
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	0	1	0	2	2	17	4.55	556/1406	4.55	4.50	4.32	4.48	4.55
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	0	0	0	2	7	13	4.50	552/1615	4.50	4.36	4.24	4.37	4.50
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	1	5	16	4.68	280/1566	4.68	4.29	4.07	4.17	4.68
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	2	7	13	4.50	421/1528	4.50	4.36	4.12	4.26	4.50
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	1	1	4	16	4.59	443/1650	4.59	4.42	4.22	4.28	4.59
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	0	22	5.00	1/1667	5.00	4.67	4.67	4.73	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	1	2	6	12	4.38	584/1626	4.38	4.21	4.11	4.28	4.38
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	0	2	19	4.90	276/1559	4.90	4.74	4.46	4.58	4.90
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	0	1	20	4.95	298/1560	4.95	4.83	4.72	4.80	4.95
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	0	3	18	4.86	248/1549	4.86	4.59	4.31	4.43	4.86
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	2	19	4.90	231/1546	4.90	4.58	4.32	4.43	4.90
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	5	0	0	0	3	7	9	4.32	498/1323	4.32	3.90	4.00	4.10	4.32
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	0	5	8	4.62	364/1384	4.62	4.37	4.10	4.32	4.62
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	11	0	0	0	0	3	10	4.77	389/1378	4.77	4.57	4.29	4.55	4.77
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	11 11	0	0 2	0	0	2	11	4.85	344/1378	4.85	4.69	4.31	4.60	4.85
4. Were special techniques successful	4	6	3.92	548/ 904	3.92	3.95	4.03	4.22	3.92					
Frequ	ency.	Dist	ribu	ution	1									

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	d Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	Α	 6	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	16
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	10						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	6	C	3	General	8	Under-grad	24	Non-major	8
84-150	10	3.00-3.49	6	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	1	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	ı
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	13	_			
				?	0						

Course-Section: POLI 487 0101 University of Maryland Page 1355 Title INTERNATIONAL POLI ECO Baltimore County AUG 6, 2008 Spring 2008 Job IRBR3029

3.50-4.00

6

Instructor: HODY, CYNTHIA

Enrollment: 25 Questionnaires: 20

Grad.

0

_			and the second second
Student	Course	Evaluation	Questionnaire

Quebelom	iluli CD	20		beddelle coe	XI DC	DVa1	uu c i .	J11 Q.	20001	. 01111	all	•						
							Fre	equei	ncies	3		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
		Questions	5		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		General																
1. Did yo	ou gain n	ew insights,skil	ls fro	m this course	0	0	0	0	0	4	16	4.80	300/1670	4.80	4.47	4.31	4.45	4.80
2. Did th	he instru	ctor make clear	the exp	pected goals	0	0	0	0	0	4	16	4.80	259/1666	4.80	4.43	4.27	4.35	4.80
3. Did th	he exam q	uestions reflect	the e	xpected goals	0	12	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	318/1406	4.75	4.50	4.32	4.48	4.75
4. Did ot	ther eval	uations reflect	the exp	pected goals	0	1	0	0	0	4	15	4.79	263/1615	4.79	4.36	4.24	4.37	4.79
5. Did as	ssigned r	eadings contribu	ite to	what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	18	4.90	132/1566	4.90	4.29	4.07	4.17	4.90
6. Did w	ritten as	signments contri	bute to	o what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	5	15	4.75	221/1528	4.75	4.36	4.12	4.26	4.75
		g system clearly		ined	0	0	0	0	1	4	15	4.70	327/1650	4.70	4.42	4.22	4.28	4.70
		was class cance			0	0	0	0	0	9	11	4.55	1119/1667	4.55	4.67	4.67	4.73	4.55
9. How wo	ould you	grade the overal	l teac	hing effectiveness	3	0	0	0	0	3	14	4.82	156/1626	4.82	4.21	4.11	4.28	4.82
		Lecture	2															
1. Were t	the instr	uctor's lectures	well	prepared	1	0	0	1	0	4	14	4.63	722/1559	4.63	4.74	4.46	4.58	4.63
2. Did th	he instru	ctor seem intere	sted i	n the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	19	5.00	1/1560	5.00	4.83	4.72	4.80	5.00
3. Was le	ecture ma	terial presented	l and e	xplained clearly	1	0	0	1	1	4	13	4.53	658/1549	4.53	4.59	4.31	4.43	4.53
4. Did th	he lectur	es contribute to	what	you learned	1	0	1	0	1	3	14	4.53	691/1546	4.53	4.58	4.32	4.43	4.53
5. Did au	udiovisua	l techniques enh	nance y	our understanding	2	8	1	0	2	1	6	4.10	656/1323	4.10	3.90	4.00	4.10	4.10
		Discuss	sion															
1. Did cl	lass disc	ussions contribu	ite to	what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	4	14	4.78	242/1384	4.78	4.37	4.10	4.32	4.78
2. Were a	all stude	nts actively end	courage	d to participate	2	0	0	0	0	2	16	4.89	264/1378	4.89	4.57	4.29	4.55	4.89
3. Did th	he instru	ctor encourage f	air an	d open discussion	2	0	0	0	1	1	16	4.83	354/1378	4.83	4.69	4.31	4.60	4.83
4. Were s	special t	echniques succes	sful		2	15	0	0	2	0	1	3.67	****/ 904	****	3.95	4.03	4.22	****
		Laborat	orv															
3. Were r	necessary	materials avail	able f	or lab activities	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 230	****	***	4.44	4.30	****
				Frequ	iency	/ Dist	trib	ution	ı									
Credits I	Earned 	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	asons	; 			Ту	pe 			Majors	;
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 10		Red	quir	ed fo	or Ma	jor	s	0	Graduat	е	0	Majo	or	10
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	В 6														
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	2	C 1		Gei	nera	1				2	Under-g	rad 2	20	Non-	-major	10
84-150	8	3.00-3.49	6	D 0														

Electives

Other

0

15

- Means there are not enough

responses to be significant

0

0

0

1

F

Р

I

Course-Section: POLI 489 0101 University of Maryland SEL TOPICS: INTERNATL R Baltimore County

Questionnaires: 5

Page 1356 Title AUG 6, 2008 Instructor: HAGERTY, DEVIN Spring 2008 Job IRBR3029 Enrollment: 7

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

		NR	NA	Fre	equei 2	ncies 3	4	5	Inst Mean	ructor Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean		Level Mean	Sect Mean			
		Genera	 l															
1. Did you	u gain ne	ew insights,ski	lls fro	om this course	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	300/1670	4.80	4.47	4.31	4.45	4.80
2. Did the	e instru	ctor make clear	the ex	spected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	490/1666	4.57	4.43	4.27	4.35	4.60
3. Did the	e exam qı	uestions reflect	t the e	expected goals	0	3	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1406	4.80	4.50	4.32	4.48	5.00
4. Did oth	her evalı	uations reflect	the ex	spected goals	0	0	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	944/1615	4.30	4.36	4.24	4.37	4.20
5. Did ass	signed re	eadings contrib	ute to	what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	491/1566	4.32	4.29	4.07	4.17	4.40
6. Did wr	itten ass	signments contr	ibute t	o what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	173/1528	4.65	4.36	4.12	4.26	4.80
7. Was the	e grading	g system clearly	y expla	ined	0	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	720/1650	4.50	4.42	4.22	4.28	4.40
8. How mar	ny times	was class cance	elled		1	0	0	0	0	3	1	4.25	1368/1667	4.57	4.67	4.67	4.73	4.25
9. How wor	uld you	grade the overa	ll tead	ching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1626	4.60	4.21	4.11	4.28	****
		Lecture	e															
1. Were th	he instr	uctor's lectures	s well	prepared	1	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	896/1559	4.68	4.74	4.46	4.58	4.50
2. Did the	Were the instructor's lectures well prepared oid the instructor seem interested in the subjutes lecture material presented and explained of the lectures contribute to what you learned id audiovisual techniques enhance your undersubjutes. Discussion Oid class discussions contribute to what you learned it.					0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1560	4.93	4.83	4.72	4.80	5.00
3. Was led	cture mat	explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1549	4.74	4.59	4.31	4.43	5.00		
4. Did the	e lecture	es contribute to	you learned	1	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	715/1546	4.57	4.58	4.32	4.43	4.50	
Did aud	diovisua	our understanding	1	3	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1323	3.50	3.90	4.00	4.10	****		
		Discus	sion															
1. Did cla	ass disc	ussions contrib	ute to	what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1384	4.78	4.37	4.10	4.32	5.00
2. Were al	ll studer	nts actively end	courage	ed to participate	3	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	970/1378	4.31	4.57	4.29	4.55	4.00
				nd open discussion	3	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1378	4.84	4.69	4.31	4.60	5.00
l. Were sp	pecial te	echniques succes	ssful		3	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	243/ 904	4.30	3.95	4.03	4.22	4.50
1. Were as	ssigned t	topics relevant	to the	announced theme	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 87	****	3.83	4.65	4.80	****
2. Was the	e instru	ctor available :	for ind	lividual attention	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 79	****	4.00	4.64	4.60	***
3. Did res	search pi	e instructor available for individual attent search projects contribute to what you learn			4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 75	****	4.17	4.57	4.56	***
. Did pre	esentatio	sentations contribute to what you learned			4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 79	****	3.67	4.45	4.53	***
. Were ci	riteria 1	for grading made	e clear		4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 80	****	3.83	3.97	3.67	****
				Frequ	iency	Dist	rib	ution	n									
Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	asons	:			Тъ	ре			Majors	ı.
00-27 28-55						Red	quir	ed fo	or Ma	jors	3	0	Graduat	e	0	Majo	or	4
56-83				_ *		Gei	nera:	1				2	Under-9	rad	5	Non-	-major	1
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	2	D 0														
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F 0		Ele	ecti	ves				0	#### -				_	rh
				P 0		0.1						2	respons	es to b	e sigr	nificar	1t	
I 0					Otl	ner					3							

Course-Section: POLI 489 8620 University of Maryland Page 1357 Title SEL TOPICS: INTERNATL R Baltimore County AUG 6, 2008 Job IRBR3029

Instructor: MELCAVAGE, EUGE

Enrollment: 22 Questionnaires: 22

Spring 2008 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

	ncies	3		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect				
Questions	NR	NA	1	_		4	5	Mean	Rank		Mean	Mean		Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	2	0	0	0	1	2	17	4.80	300/1670	4.80	4.47	4.31	4.45	4.80
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	0	0	2	5	13	4.55	556/1666		4.43	4.27	4.35	4.55
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	0	0	0	2	4	14	4.60	495/1406	4.80	4.50	4.32	4.48	4.60
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	0	0	0	3	6	11	4.40	687/1615	4.30	4.36	4.24	4.37	4.40
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	1	4	4	11	4.25	643/1566	4.32	4.29	4.07	4.17	4.25
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	2	6	12	4.50	421/1528	4.65	4.36	4.12	4.26	4.50
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	1	0	5	14	4.60	429/1650	4.50	4.42	4.22	4.28	4.60
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	2	18	4.90	675/1667	4.57	4.67	4.67	4.73	4.90
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	7	0	0	0	1	4	10	4.60	324/1626	4.60	4.21	4.11	4.28	4.60
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	1	0	0	19	4.85	355/1559	4.68	4.74	4.46	4.58	4.85
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	1	1	18	4.85	725/1560	4.93	4.83	4.72	4.80	4.85
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	1	0	1	4	13	4.47	722/1549	4.74	4.59	4.31	4.43	4.47
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	1	0	4	14	4.63	557/1546	4.57	4.58	4.32	4.43	4.63
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	7	2	1	3	1	5	3.50	1040/1323	3.50	3.90	4.00	4.10	3.50
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	2	3	11	4.56	396/1384	4.78	4.37	4.10	4.32	4.56
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	1	1	1	13	4.63	510/1378	4.31	4.57	4.29	4.55	4.63
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	0	0	2	1	13	4.69	511/1378	4.84	4.69	4.31	4.60	4.69
4. Were special techniques successful	6	6	1	0	1	3	5	4.10	442/ 904	4.30	3.95	4.03	4.22	4.10
Frequ	ency	Dis	trib	ution	n									
Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades			Reasons				Ty	Type 			Majors			

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expecte	d Grades	Reasons		Туре	Majors		
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	 А	5	Required for Majors	3	Graduate	0	Major	17
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	12						
56-83	7	2.00-2.99	3	C	2	General	0	Under-grad	22	Non-major	5
84-150	6	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	6	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	n
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	18	_			
				2	1						

Course-Section: POLI 646 0101 University of Maryland Page 1358 Title THE POLITICS OF POVERT Baltimore County AUG 6, 2008 Job IRBR3029

Instructor: MILLER, CHERYL

Enrollment: 5 Questionnaires: 5

Grad.

3.50-4.00

F

Ρ

I

?

0

0

0

0

Spring 2008 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

		NR	NA	Fre	_	ncies 3	4	5	Inst Mean	tructor Rank		Dept Mean		Level Mean	Sect Mean			
		Genera																
-	_	J ,			0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1670		4.47	4.31	4.46	5.00
					0	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	,	4.60	4.43	4.27	4.34	4.60
	Did you gain new insights, skills from this course oid the instructor make clear the expected goals oid the exam questions reflect the expected goals oid other evaluations reflect the expected goals oid assigned readings contribute to what you lear oid written assignments contr				0	2	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	799/1406		4.50	4.32	4.36	4.33
					0	0	0	0	2	1	2		1083/1615	4.00	4.36	4.24	4.33	4.00
	_	_		-	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	187/1566	4.80	4.29	4.07	4.20	4.80
		-		_	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	-,	4.80	4.36	4.12	4.33	4.80
				ined	0	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	,		4.42	4.22	4.30	4.60
	-				0	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	1082/1667	4.60	4.67	4.67	4.74	4.60
9. How wou	ıld you g	grade the overa	ll teac	hing effectiveness	2	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	278/1626	4.67	4.21	4.11	4.20	4.67
		Lectur	e															
1. Were th	. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared					0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	435/1559	4.80	4.74	4.46	4.49	4.80
	Did the instructor seem interested in the subject				0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1560	5.00	4.83	4.72	4.81	5.00
	. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject . Was lecture material presented and explained clearly				0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	294/1549	4.80	4.59	4.31	4.37	4.80
		-			0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1546	5.00	4.58	4.32	4.40	5.00
				-	1	0	1	0	0	0	3	4.00	692/1323		3.90	4.00	4.03	4.00
		Diagua	aion															
1 Did ala	aa diaa			what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	257/1384	4.75	4.37	4.10	4.21	4.75
				d to participate	1	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1378	5.00	4.57	4.29	4.42	5.00
		_	_		1	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1378	5.00	4.69	4.31	4.51	5.00
	e instructor encourage fair and open discussion pecial techniques successful		d open discussion	2	0	0	0	2	0	1	3.67	671/ 904	3.67	3.95	4.03	4.04	3.67	
				Frequ	lency	Dist	cribu	ution	n									
Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	asons	3			Ту	pe			Majors	
00-27						Red	 guire	ed fo	or Ma	iors	 5	0	Graduat	 e	2	Majo	 or	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В 2		1101	1			.,	-	-	22 34440	-	_	- 101) 0	-	,
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C 0		Ger	nera:	1				1	Under-g	rad	3	Non-	major	5
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	1	D 0		001		_				_	2201 3		-	-7011	, 0 -	-
01 100		3.00 3.19	-	2 0														

Electives

Other

0

4

- Means there are not enough

responses to be significant

Course-Section: POLI 652 0101 POLITICS OF HEALTH MILLER, NANCY A Instructor:

Questions

Title

Enrollment:

Questionnaires: 15

17

University of Maryland Page 1359 AUG 6, 2008 Baltimore County Spring 2008 Job IRBR3029

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

Course Dept UMBC Level Sect

Frequencies Instructor

11

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

	3	3.50-4.00	9	F 0		F.7.	acti	7PS				0	#### - N	leans t	here a	re not	enour	ſh		
Grad.	_	3.00-3.49		- *	Electives							•				are not enough				
84-150	1	3.00-2.99	2	D 0	General							٥	onder-gr	au I	. 4	NOI1-	ına Jor	13		
28-55 56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	B 1 C 0		Cor	noro.	1				3	Under-gr	-ad 1	2	Non	major	15		
00-27 28-55	3	0.00-0.99 1.00-1.99	0	A 8		Red	quir	ed fo	or Ma	ajor	S	1	Graduate	:	3	Majo	r	0		
Credits Ear	ned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades	ciicy	DIS	CT ID		asons	5			Тур	e			Majors	3		
				Frequ	encv	Dist	trib	ıt i oı	า											
4. Were spe	cial ted	chniques succes	ssful		4	6	2	0	1	0	2	3.00	820/ 904	3.00	3.95	4.03	4.04	3.00		
		_		open discussion	4	0	0	0	1	0	10	4.82	375/1378	4.82	4.69	4.31	4.51	4.82		
	2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate							0	2	2	5	4.00	970/1378	4.00	4.57	4.29	4.42	4.00		
1. Did clas	Discussion 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned							1	0	3	7	4.45	487/1384	4.45	4.37	4.10	4.21	4.45		
	•												, , ,							
	Did the lectures contribute to what you learned Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understandi:							1	0	1	4	3.86	857/1323	3.86	3.90	4.00	4.03	3.86		
			0	0	0	0	0	5	10	4.67	520/1546	4.67	4.58	4.32	4.40	4.67				
				plained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	5	10	4.93	488/1549	4.67	4.63	4.72	4.37	4.67		
		ctor's lecture: tor seem inter	_	-	0	0	0	0	U T	2 1	12 14	4.73	555/1559 417/1560	4.73	4.74	4.46 4.72	4.49 4.81	4.73 4.93		
1 Mana bha		Lecture	_		0	0	0	0	1	2	10	4 72	FFF /1FF0	4 72	4 74	1 10	4 40	4 72		
9. How would	d you gi	rade the overa	ll teach	ing effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	6	8	4.57	347/1626	4.57	4.21	4.11	4.20	4.57		
8. How many	times v	was class cance	elled		0	0	0	0	0	0	15	5.00	1/1667	5.00	4.67	4.67	4.74	5.00		
7. Was the	grading	system clearly	y explai:	ned	0	0	0	0	0	4	11	4.73	289/1650	4.73	4.42	4.22	4.30	4.73		
	_	_		what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	4	11	4.73	240/1528	4.73	4.36	4.12	4.33	4.73		
			_	hat you learned	0	0	0	0	0	6	9	4.60	339/1566	4.60	4.29	4.07	4.20	4.60		
	_	ations reflect		_	0	1	0	0	0	5	9	4.64	401/1615	4.64	4.36	4.24	4.33	4.64		
		estions reflect	_	_	0	12	0	0	0	0	ە 3		****/1406	****	4.43	4.32	4.34	****		
	_	w insights,skil tor make clear			0	0	0	0	0 1	5 6	10	4.67 4.47	479/1670 686/1666	4.67 4.47	4.47	4.31	4.46	4.67 4.47		
1 541		General	_	6.16. d. m.	0	0	0	0	0	_	1.0	4 60	450 /1650	4 67	4 47	4 21	1 16	4 67		

Other

I 0

? 4