

Course-Section: POLI 100 0101
 Title AMER GOVT & POLITICS
 Instructor: MILLER, NICHOLA
 Enrollment: 45
 Questionnaires: 43

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 1268
 JUL 2, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	14	0	0	2	6	7	14	4.14	1065/1576	4.41	4.52	4.30	4.11	4.14	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	14	0	2	4	3	6	14	3.90	1242/1576	4.30	4.45	4.27	4.18	3.90	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	14	0	2	1	4	7	15	4.10	938/1342	4.41	4.61	4.32	4.19	4.10	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	14	3	3	2	3	9	9	3.73	1266/1520	4.14	4.42	4.25	4.09	3.73	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	15	0	1	2	7	9	9	3.82	1051/1465	4.13	4.36	4.12	4.02	3.82	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	15	0	3	3	2	8	12	3.82	1051/1434	3.91	4.39	4.14	3.94	3.82	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	15	0	1	2	5	5	15	4.11	971/1547	4.46	4.51	4.19	4.10	4.11	
8. How many times was class cancelled	16	0	0	0	2	16	9	4.26	1324/1574	4.62	4.63	4.64	4.59	4.26	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	25	0	0	2	3	8	5	3.89	1074/1554	4.25	4.36	4.10	4.01	3.89	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	17	0	0	0	0	3	23	4.88	278/1488	4.70	4.73	4.47	4.41	4.88	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	17	0	0	1	2	4	19	4.58	1150/1493	4.75	4.85	4.73	4.65	4.58	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	17	0	0	3	2	4	17	4.35	881/1486	4.55	4.58	4.32	4.26	4.35	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	1	3	6	16	4.42	789/1489	4.64	4.68	4.32	4.22	4.42	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	19	3	3	2	4	4	8	3.57	987/1277	4.10	4.08	4.03	3.91	3.57	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	28	0	1	1	3	5	5	3.80	938/1279	3.92	4.33	4.17	3.96	3.80	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	28	0	2	4	4	3	2	2.93	1224/1270	3.88	4.47	4.35	4.09	2.93	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	28	0	1	2	4	3	5	3.60	1086/1269	4.09	4.62	4.35	4.09	3.60	
4. Were special techniques successful	28	12	1	1	1	0	0	2.00	****/ 878	****	4.13	4.05	3.91	****	
Laboratory															
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	42	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 240	****	****	4.35	4.29	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	42	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 85	****	****	4.72	4.52	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	42	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 375	****	****	4.01	3.78	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	42	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.48	4.20	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	42	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.40	4.11	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	42	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 40	****	****	4.60	4.44	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	42	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 24	****	****	4.83	4.71	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	42	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 35	****	****	4.67	4.68	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	1	A	11	Required for Majors	9	Graduate	0	Major	2
28-55	5	1.00-1.99	0	B	3						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	2	C	5	General	3	Under-grad	43	Non-major	41
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	2	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	8				
				?	0						

Course-Section: POLI 100 0201
 Title AMER GOVT & POLITICS
 Instructor: MILLER, NICHOLA
 Enrollment: 36
 Questionnaires: 36

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 1269
 JUL 2, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	2	0	0	2	4	18	10	4.06	1118/1576	4.41	4.52	4.30	4.11	4.06	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	1	1	6	10	16	4.15	1040/1576	4.30	4.45	4.27	4.18	4.15	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	0	1	1	3	11	18	4.29	804/1342	4.41	4.61	4.32	4.19	4.29	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	1	0	4	7	13	9	3.82	1225/1520	4.14	4.42	4.25	4.09	3.82	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	3	1	1	3	5	12	11	3.91	989/1465	4.13	4.36	4.12	4.02	3.91	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	4	0	1	2	5	12	12	4.00	878/1434	3.91	4.39	4.14	3.94	4.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	4	0	0	2	6	4	20	4.31	774/1547	4.46	4.51	4.19	4.10	4.31	
8. How many times was class cancelled	4	0	0	1	0	16	15	4.41	1202/1574	4.62	4.63	4.64	4.59	4.41	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	11	0	0	1	3	18	3	3.92	1032/1554	4.25	4.36	4.10	4.01	3.92	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	1	0	1	6	24	4.63	722/1488	4.70	4.73	4.47	4.41	4.63	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	6	0	0	0	2	8	20	4.60	1125/1493	4.75	4.85	4.73	4.65	4.60	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	7	0	0	1	1	10	17	4.48	706/1486	4.55	4.58	4.32	4.26	4.48	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	5	1	0	1	3	8	18	4.43	777/1489	4.64	4.68	4.32	4.22	4.43	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	6	7	2	1	4	3	13	4.04	676/1277	4.10	4.08	4.03	3.91	4.04	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	15	0	3	0	5	7	6	3.62	1018/1279	3.92	4.33	4.17	3.96	3.62	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	15	0	1	0	9	5	6	3.71	1070/1270	3.88	4.47	4.35	4.09	3.71	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	15	0	1	2	6	3	9	3.81	1018/1269	4.09	4.62	4.35	4.09	3.81	
4. Were special techniques successful	15	17	1	0	2	0	1	3.00	****/ 878	****	4.13	4.05	3.91	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	5	0.00-0.99 0	A 4	Required for Majors 9	Graduate 0 Major 6
28-55	1	1.00-1.99 0	B 11		
56-83	3	2.00-2.99 3	C 10	General 8	Under-grad 36 Non-major 30
84-150	1	3.00-3.49 5	D 0		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 1	F 0	Electives 2	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 7	
			? 0		

Course-Section: POLI 100 0301
 Title AMER GOVT & POLITICS
 Instructor: SCHALLER, THOMA
 Enrollment: 47
 Questionnaires: 47

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 1270
 JUL 2, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	15	0	1	0	1	4	26	4.69	387/1576	4.41	4.52	4.30	4.11	4.69	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	15	0	0	2	1	8	21	4.50	608/1576	4.30	4.45	4.27	4.18	4.50	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	15	0	1	0	1	6	24	4.63	455/1342	4.41	4.61	4.32	4.19	4.63	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	16	20	1	0	0	3	7	4.36	****/1520	4.14	4.42	4.25	4.09	****	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	3	12	16	4.42	498/1465	4.13	4.36	4.12	4.02	4.42	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	15	27	0	0	2	1	2	4.00	****/1434	3.91	4.39	4.14	3.94	****	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	15	0	0	0	2	4	26	4.75	238/1547	4.46	4.51	4.19	4.10	4.75	
8. How many times was class cancelled	15	1	0	0	0	3	28	4.90	469/1574	4.62	4.63	4.64	4.59	4.90	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	25	0	0	0	0	8	14	4.64	289/1554	4.25	4.36	4.10	4.01	4.64	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	15	0	1	0	1	10	20	4.50	870/1488	4.70	4.73	4.47	4.41	4.50	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	16	0	0	0	0	1	30	4.97	223/1493	4.75	4.85	4.73	4.65	4.97	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	15	0	1	0	2	4	25	4.63	530/1486	4.55	4.58	4.32	4.26	4.63	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	1	1	3	27	4.75	378/1489	4.64	4.68	4.32	4.22	4.75	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	16	0	1	0	3	11	16	4.32	472/1277	4.10	4.08	4.03	3.91	4.32	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	33	0	1	2	1	2	8	4.00	802/1279	3.92	4.33	4.17	3.96	4.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	33	0	1	0	1	1	11	4.50	636/1270	3.88	4.47	4.35	4.09	4.50	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	33	0	1	0	2	0	11	4.43	711/1269	4.09	4.62	4.35	4.09	4.43	
4. Were special techniques successful	33	10	0	1	0	1	2	4.00	****/ 878	****	4.13	4.05	3.91	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	6	0.00-0.99 0	A 8	Required for Majors 8	Graduate 0 Major 0
28-55	9	1.00-1.99 0	B 12		
56-83	3	2.00-2.99 4	C 4	General 7	Under-grad 47 Non-major 47
84-150	3	3.00-3.49 6	D 0		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 10	F 0	Electives 2	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 7	
			? 0		

Course-Section: POLI 100 0401
 Title AMER GOVT & POLITICS
 Instructor: SCHALLER, THOMA
 Enrollment: 43
 Questionnaires: 43

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 1271
 JUL 2, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	14	0	0	0	2	3	24	4.76	301/1576	4.41	4.52	4.30	4.11	4.76	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	14	0	0	1	1	5	22	4.66	406/1576	4.30	4.45	4.27	4.18	4.66	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	14	0	0	0	2	7	20	4.62	455/1342	4.41	4.61	4.32	4.19	4.62	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	14	15	0	0	1	0	13	4.86	167/1520	4.14	4.42	4.25	4.09	4.86	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	14	0	1	0	4	6	18	4.38	537/1465	4.13	4.36	4.12	4.02	4.38	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	15	19	0	0	1	0	8	4.78	****/1434	3.91	4.39	4.14	3.94	****	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	14	0	1	1	0	2	25	4.69	315/1547	4.46	4.51	4.19	4.10	4.69	
8. How many times was class cancelled	14	0	0	0	1	0	28	4.93	328/1574	4.62	4.63	4.64	4.59	4.93	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	18	0	0	1	0	8	16	4.56	347/1554	4.25	4.36	4.10	4.01	4.56	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	15	0	0	0	0	6	22	4.79	442/1488	4.70	4.73	4.47	4.41	4.79	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	14	0	0	1	0	1	27	4.86	658/1493	4.75	4.85	4.73	4.65	4.86	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	16	0	0	0	1	5	21	4.74	352/1486	4.55	4.58	4.32	4.26	4.74	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	0	1	27	4.96	78/1489	4.64	4.68	4.32	4.22	4.96	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	17	5	0	1	1	6	13	4.48	337/1277	4.10	4.08	4.03	3.91	4.48	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	24	0	1	0	3	4	11	4.26	657/1279	3.92	4.33	4.17	3.96	4.26	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	24	0	1	1	0	5	12	4.37	763/1270	3.88	4.47	4.35	4.09	4.37	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	24	0	0	0	2	5	12	4.53	632/1269	4.09	4.62	4.35	4.09	4.53	
4. Were special techniques successful	24	12	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	****/ 878	****	4.13	4.05	3.91	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	41	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 234	****	****	4.23	4.08	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	42	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 240	****	****	4.35	4.29	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	42	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 229	****	****	4.51	4.43	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	42	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 232	****	2.00	4.29	4.27	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	42	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 379	****	****	4.20	4.15	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	41	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 85	****	****	4.72	4.52	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	42	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 79	****	****	4.69	4.52	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	42	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 72	****	****	4.64	4.43	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	42	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 80	****	****	4.61	4.55	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	42	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 375	****	****	4.01	3.78	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	42	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.48	4.20	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	42	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.40	4.11	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	42	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 44	****	****	4.73	4.71	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	42	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 45	****	****	4.57	4.72	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	42	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 326	****	****	4.03	3.64	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	42	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 40	****	****	4.60	4.44	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	42	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 24	****	****	4.83	4.71	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	42	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 35	****	****	4.67	4.68	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	42	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 28	****	****	4.78	4.65	****	

Course-Section: POLI 100 0401
 Title AMER GOVT & POLITICS
 Instructor: SCHALLER, THOMA
 Enrollment: 43
 Questionnaires: 43

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 1271
 JUL 2, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	7	0.00-0.99	1	A	7	Required for Majors	10	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	8	1.00-1.99	0	B	17						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	2	C	1	General	1	Under-grad	43	Non-major	42
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	9	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	10	F	0	Electives	3	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	11				
				?	1						

Course-Section: POLI 100Y 0101
 Title AMER GOVT & POLITICS
 Instructor: MILLER, NICHOLA
 Enrollment: 17
 Questionnaires: 15

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 1272
 JUL 2, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	8	0	0	0	1	5	1	4.00	1148/1576	4.00	4.52	4.30	4.11	4.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	8	0	0	0	3	2	2	3.86	1264/1576	3.86	4.45	4.27	4.18	3.86
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	8	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	345/1342	4.71	4.61	4.32	4.19	4.71
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	8	0	0	0	2	1	4	4.29	826/1520	4.29	4.42	4.25	4.09	4.29
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	1	1	2	3	4.00	850/1465	4.00	4.36	4.12	4.02	4.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	1	0	1	5	4.43	498/1434	4.43	4.39	4.14	3.94	4.43
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	8	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	280/1547	4.71	4.51	4.19	4.10	4.71
8. How many times was class cancelled	8	0	0	0	0	6	1	4.14	1398/1574	4.14	4.63	4.64	4.59	4.14
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	8	1	0	0	4	2	0	3.33	1367/1554	3.33	4.36	4.10	4.01	3.33
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	9	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	355/1488	4.83	4.73	4.47	4.41	4.83
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	8	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	986/1493	4.71	4.85	4.73	4.65	4.71
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	8	0	0	0	1	2	4	4.43	792/1486	4.43	4.58	4.32	4.26	4.43
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	2	1	4	4.29	934/1489	4.29	4.68	4.32	4.22	4.29
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	8	1	1	0	1	1	3	3.83	839/1277	3.83	4.08	4.03	3.91	3.83
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	3	1	1	3.60	1022/1279	3.60	4.33	4.17	3.96	3.60
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	10	0	3	1	0	0	1	2.00	1261/1270	2.00	4.47	4.35	4.09	2.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	10	0	0	0	4	0	1	3.40	1142/1269	3.40	4.62	4.35	4.09	3.40
4. Were special techniques successful	9	5	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 878	****	4.13	4.05	3.91	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	2	0.00-0.99 0	A 0	Required for Majors 0	Graduate 0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99 0	B 5		Major 1
56-83	1	2.00-2.99 1	C 2	General 2	Under-grad 15
84-150	0	3.00-3.49 1	D 0		Non-major 14
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 0	F 0	Electives 2	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 3	
			? 0		

Course-Section: POLI 210 0101
 Title POLITICAL PHILOSOPHY
 Instructor: CARTER, JOHN W.
 Enrollment: 43
 Questionnaires: 32

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 1273
 JUL 2, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	2	5	7	18	4.28	916/1576	4.28	4.52	4.30	4.35	4.28	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	8	6	17	4.22	978/1576	4.22	4.45	4.27	4.32	4.22	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	1	2	2	4	22	4.42	696/1342	4.42	4.61	4.32	4.41	4.42	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	3	8	3	17	4.10	998/1520	4.10	4.42	4.25	4.26	4.10	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	1	1	1	5	6	16	4.21	699/1465	4.21	4.36	4.12	4.09	4.21	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	1	2	2	6	8	12	3.87	1027/1434	3.87	4.39	4.14	4.06	3.87	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	0	5	7	18	4.32	765/1547	4.32	4.51	4.19	4.22	4.32	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	31	5.00	1/1574	5.00	4.63	4.64	4.62	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	1	2	0	4	13	8	3.93	1032/1554	3.93	4.36	4.10	4.05	3.93	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	1	0	0	5	25	4.71	610/1488	4.71	4.73	4.47	4.44	4.71	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	1	1	0	4	25	4.65	1077/1493	4.65	4.85	4.73	4.75	4.65	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	1	0	3	8	19	4.42	806/1486	4.42	4.58	4.32	4.29	4.42	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	5	3	22	4.48	719/1489	4.48	4.68	4.32	4.31	4.48	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	8	1	2	4	4	11	4.00	692/1277	4.00	4.08	4.03	4.01	4.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	2	0	4	8	11	4.04	789/1279	4.04	4.33	4.17	4.14	4.04	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	0	0	4	2	19	4.60	559/1270	4.60	4.47	4.35	4.30	4.60	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	0	0	3	2	20	4.68	527/1269	4.68	4.62	4.35	4.29	4.68	
4. Were special techniques successful	6	9	3	0	4	5	5	3.53	704/ 878	3.53	4.13	4.05	3.92	3.53	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	31	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.48	4.74	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	31	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 40	****	****	4.60	5.00	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	A	8	Required for Majors	5	Graduate	0	Major	14
28-55	7	1.00-1.99	0	B	12						
56-83	7	2.00-2.99	1	C	5	General	5	Under-grad	32	Non-major	18
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	5	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	10	F	0	Electives	2	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	18				
				?	2						

Course-Section: POLI 230 0101
 Title INTRO CONSTITUTIONAL L
 Instructor: DAVIS, JEFFREY
 Enrollment: 50
 Questionnaires: 50

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 1274
 JUL 2, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	16	0	0	0	2	9	23	4.62	485/1576	4.51	4.52	4.30	4.35	4.62	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	17	0	0	0	2	17	14	4.36	811/1576	4.38	4.45	4.27	4.32	4.36	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	17	0	1	0	1	11	20	4.48	608/1342	4.49	4.61	4.32	4.41	4.48	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	17	8	1	0	4	7	13	4.24	880/1520	4.29	4.42	4.25	4.26	4.24	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	1	2	8	22	4.55	341/1465	4.49	4.36	4.12	4.09	4.55	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	17	0	1	0	7	12	13	4.09	840/1434	4.14	4.39	4.14	4.06	4.09	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	17	0	0	2	4	6	21	4.39	699/1547	4.35	4.51	4.19	4.22	4.39	
8. How many times was class cancelled	19	1	0	0	0	8	22	4.73	795/1574	4.67	4.63	4.64	4.62	4.73	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	26	0	0	0	3	16	5	4.08	881/1554	4.26	4.36	4.10	4.05	4.08	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	22	0	0	0	0	6	22	4.79	442/1488	4.75	4.73	4.47	4.44	4.79	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	22	0	0	0	1	4	23	4.79	849/1493	4.76	4.85	4.73	4.75	4.79	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	22	0	0	1	2	12	13	4.32	901/1486	4.43	4.58	4.32	4.29	4.32	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	22	0	1	0	0	6	21	4.64	526/1489	4.68	4.68	4.32	4.31	4.64	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	25	3	3	2	7	4	6	3.36	1077/1277	3.75	4.08	4.03	4.01	3.36	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	28	0	2	0	6	5	9	3.86	914/1279	3.90	4.33	4.17	4.14	3.86	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	28	0	1	0	5	3	13	4.23	841/1270	4.18	4.47	4.35	4.30	4.23	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	28	0	0	1	1	4	16	4.59	590/1269	4.48	4.62	4.35	4.29	4.59	
4. Were special techniques successful	28	18	1	0	0	1	2	3.75	****/ 878	****	4.13	4.05	3.92	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	2	0.00-0.99 0	A 7	Required for Majors	3
28-55	5	1.00-1.99 0	B 14		Graduate 0
56-83	8	2.00-2.99 4	C 3	General	3
84-150	5	3.00-3.49 7	D 0		Under-grad 50
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 9	F 0	Electives	3
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	17
			? 2		

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

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 1275
 JUL 2, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	13	0	0	1	5	10	22	4.39	797/1576	4.51	4.52	4.30	4.35	4.39	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	14	0	0	0	6	10	21	4.41	759/1576	4.38	4.45	4.27	4.32	4.41	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	14	0	0	1	3	10	23	4.49	608/1342	4.49	4.61	4.32	4.41	4.49	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	14	8	1	1	2	8	17	4.34	756/1520	4.29	4.42	4.25	4.26	4.34	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	15	0	2	0	3	6	25	4.44	454/1465	4.49	4.36	4.12	4.09	4.44	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	14	1	0	2	6	11	17	4.19	748/1434	4.14	4.39	4.14	4.06	4.19	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	14	0	1	3	2	9	22	4.30	794/1547	4.35	4.51	4.19	4.22	4.30	
8. How many times was class cancelled	14	1	0	0	1	12	23	4.61	987/1574	4.67	4.63	4.64	4.62	4.61	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	21	0	0	0	3	11	16	4.43	490/1554	4.26	4.36	4.10	4.05	4.43	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	17	0	1	0	2	2	29	4.71	610/1488	4.75	4.73	4.47	4.44	4.71	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	17	0	1	0	2	1	30	4.74	947/1493	4.76	4.85	4.73	4.75	4.74	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	18	0	1	0	2	7	23	4.55	631/1486	4.43	4.58	4.32	4.29	4.55	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	18	1	0	0	4	1	27	4.72	434/1489	4.68	4.68	4.32	4.31	4.72	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	18	2	1	2	4	9	15	4.13	638/1277	3.75	4.08	4.03	4.01	4.13	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	21	0	1	0	12	4	13	3.93	869/1279	3.90	4.33	4.17	4.14	3.93	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	21	0	0	2	9	2	17	4.13	887/1270	4.18	4.47	4.35	4.30	4.13	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	21	0	0	0	6	7	17	4.37	754/1269	4.48	4.62	4.35	4.29	4.37	
4. Were special techniques successful	21	20	0	1	3	0	6	4.10	****/ 878	****	4.13	4.05	3.92	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	4	0.00-0.99 0	A 6	Required for Majors	5
28-55	1	1.00-1.99 0	B 11		Graduate 0
56-83	6	2.00-2.99 6	C 11	General	2
84-150	2	3.00-3.49 0	D 0		Under-grad 51
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 9	F 0	Electives	3
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	17
			? 0		

Course-Section: POLI 250 0101
 Title INTRO TO PUBLIC ADMIN
 Instructor: HUSSEY, LAURA
 Enrollment: 50
 Questionnaires: 46

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 1276
 JUL 2, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	17	0	1	2	5	8	13	4.03	1130/1576	4.03	4.52	4.30	4.35	4.03
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	17	0	0	0	5	6	18	4.45	698/1576	4.45	4.45	4.27	4.32	4.45
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	17	0	0	1	2	4	22	4.62	455/1342	4.62	4.61	4.32	4.41	4.62
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	18	0	0	1	3	9	15	4.36	744/1520	4.36	4.42	4.25	4.26	4.36
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	18	0	1	1	2	4	20	4.46	424/1465	4.46	4.36	4.12	4.09	4.46
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	18	0	1	1	3	8	15	4.25	682/1434	4.25	4.39	4.14	4.06	4.25
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	17	0	0	2	0	4	23	4.66	351/1547	4.66	4.51	4.19	4.22	4.66
8. How many times was class cancelled	19	0	0	0	0	3	24	4.89	508/1574	4.89	4.63	4.64	4.62	4.89
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	29	2	0	0	4	8	3	3.93	1019/1554	3.93	4.36	4.10	4.05	3.93
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	17	0	0	0	2	1	26	4.83	370/1488	4.83	4.73	4.47	4.44	4.83
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	17	0	0	0	2	1	26	4.83	759/1493	4.83	4.85	4.73	4.75	4.83
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	17	0	0	0	5	4	20	4.52	666/1486	4.52	4.58	4.32	4.29	4.52
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	18	1	0	1	0	6	20	4.67	500/1489	4.67	4.68	4.32	4.31	4.67
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	18	0	1	1	2	8	16	4.32	472/1277	4.32	4.08	4.03	4.01	4.32
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	20	0	0	0	1	10	15	4.54	425/1279	4.54	4.33	4.17	4.14	4.54
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	19	0	0	0	3	4	20	4.63	541/1270	4.63	4.47	4.35	4.30	4.63
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	19	0	0	1	3	3	20	4.56	614/1269	4.56	4.62	4.35	4.29	4.56
4. Were special techniques successful	19	0	0	1	6	4	16	4.30	344/ 878	4.30	4.13	4.05	3.92	4.30

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	3	0.00-0.99 0	A 9	Required for Majors 3	Graduate 0 Major 18
28-55	2	1.00-1.99 0	B 14		
56-83	5	2.00-2.99 7	C 5	General 1	Under-grad 46 Non-major 28
84-150	5	3.00-3.49 4	D 0		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 4	F 0	Electives 0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 21	
			? 1		

Course-Section: POLI 280 0101
 Title INTERNATIONAL RELATION
 Instructor: HAGERTY, DEVIN
 Enrollment: 54
 Questionnaires: 53

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 1277
 JUL 2, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	14	0	1	0	4	6	28	4.54	595/1576	4.54	4.52	4.30	4.35	4.54	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	14	0	0	1	7	12	19	4.26	939/1576	4.26	4.45	4.27	4.32	4.26	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	14	0	0	2	2	12	23	4.44	671/1342	4.44	4.61	4.32	4.41	4.44	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	15	24	0	1	1	4	8	4.36	744/1520	4.36	4.42	4.25	4.26	4.36	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	3	3	14	19	4.26	647/1465	4.26	4.36	4.12	4.09	4.26	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	14	26	0	1	2	2	8	4.31	****/1434	****	4.39	4.14	4.06	****	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	14	0	1	3	5	8	22	4.21	893/1547	4.21	4.51	4.19	4.22	4.21	
8. How many times was class cancelled	14	0	0	0	0	8	31	4.79	683/1574	4.79	4.63	4.64	4.62	4.79	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	24	2	0	0	3	8	16	4.48	422/1554	4.48	4.36	4.10	4.05	4.48	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	18	0	0	0	2	4	29	4.77	463/1488	4.77	4.73	4.47	4.44	4.77	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	18	0	0	0	0	1	34	4.97	167/1493	4.97	4.85	4.73	4.75	4.97	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	19	0	0	0	6	4	24	4.53	654/1486	4.53	4.58	4.32	4.29	4.53	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	0	1	3	31	4.86	251/1489	4.86	4.68	4.32	4.31	4.86	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	23	20	2	0	1	1	6	3.90	****/1277	****	4.08	4.03	4.01	****	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	32	0	2	3	4	5	7	3.57	1034/1279	3.57	4.33	4.17	4.14	3.57	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	32	0	0	0	5	4	12	4.33	784/1270	4.33	4.47	4.35	4.30	4.33	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	32	0	0	0	1	4	16	4.71	491/1269	4.71	4.62	4.35	4.29	4.71	
4. Were special techniques successful	32	15	0	1	1	0	4	4.17	****/ 878	****	4.13	4.05	3.92	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	4	0.00-0.99 0	A 7	Required for Majors	1 Graduate 0 Major 24
28-55	7	1.00-1.99 0	B 17		
56-83	8	2.00-2.99 4	C 9	General	4 Under-grad 53 Non-major 29
84-150	2	3.00-3.49 4	D 0		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 14	F 0	Electives	1
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	26
			? 0		

Course-Section: POLI 300 0101
 Title QUANT POLI SCI
 Instructor: MILLER, NICHOLA
 Enrollment: 34
 Questionnaires: 34

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 1278
 JUL 2, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	20	0	0	0	5	4	5	4.00	1148/1576	4.00	4.52	4.30	4.30	4.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	20	0	0	0	1	5	8	4.50	608/1576	4.50	4.45	4.27	4.28	4.50	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	20	0	0	0	3	3	8	4.36	753/1342	4.36	4.61	4.32	4.30	4.36	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	20	1	0	0	4	4	5	4.08	1008/1520	4.08	4.42	4.25	4.25	4.08	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	21	1	0	4	4	1	3	3.25	1337/1465	3.25	4.36	4.12	4.09	3.25	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	20	3	0	1	3	2	5	4.00	878/1434	4.00	4.39	4.14	4.15	4.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	20	0	0	0	3	5	6	4.21	882/1547	4.21	4.51	4.19	4.21	4.21	
8. How many times was class cancelled	20	1	0	0	0	6	7	4.54	1056/1574	4.54	4.63	4.64	4.61	4.54	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	23	0	0	0	4	5	2	3.82	1124/1554	3.82	4.36	4.10	4.09	3.82	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	21	0	0	0	2	2	9	4.54	834/1488	4.54	4.73	4.47	4.47	4.54	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	21	0	0	0	3	0	10	4.54	1184/1493	4.54	4.85	4.73	4.70	4.54	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	21	0	0	1	2	2	8	4.31	922/1486	4.31	4.58	4.32	4.32	4.31	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	21	0	1	0	1	2	9	4.38	834/1489	4.38	4.68	4.32	4.34	4.38	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	21	3	1	0	2	1	6	4.10	653/1277	4.10	4.08	4.03	4.11	4.10	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	26	0	1	0	1	3	3	3.88	****/1279	****	4.33	4.17	4.20	****	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	27	0	0	0	2	2	3	4.14	****/1270	****	4.47	4.35	4.42	****	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	27	0	0	0	1	2	4	4.43	****/1269	****	4.62	4.35	4.41	****	
4. Were special techniques successful	27	5	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 878	****	4.13	4.05	4.09	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	33	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 234	****	****	4.23	4.24	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	33	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 240	****	****	4.35	4.32	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	33	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 229	****	****	4.51	4.48	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	33	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 232	****	2.00	4.29	4.16	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	33	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 379	****	****	4.20	4.17	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	33	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 85	****	****	4.72	4.67	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	33	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 79	****	****	4.69	4.69	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	33	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 72	****	****	4.64	4.53	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	33	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 80	****	****	4.61	4.22	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	33	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 375	****	****	4.01	4.12	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	33	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.48	4.37	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	33	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.40	3.92	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	33	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 44	****	****	4.73	4.63	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	33	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 45	****	****	4.57	4.50	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	33	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 326	****	****	4.03	4.23	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	33	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 40	****	****	4.60	4.83	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	33	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 24	****	****	4.83	4.89	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	33	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 35	****	****	4.67	5.00	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	33	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 28	****	****	4.78	5.00	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	33	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 382	****	****	4.08	4.24	****	

Course-Section: POLI 300 0101
 Title QUANT POLI SCI
 Instructor: MILLER, NICHOLA
 Enrollment: 34
 Questionnaires: 34

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 1278
 JUL 2, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	3	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	12
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B	4						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	5	C	3	General	1	Under-grad	34	Non-major	22
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	0	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	12				
				?	3						

Course-Section: POLI 301 0101
 Title POLI RESEARCH METHODS
 Instructor: FORESTIERE, CAR
 Enrollment: 33
 Questionnaires: 33

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 1279
 JUL 2, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	5	0	0	0	2	4	22	4.71	347/1576	4.54	4.52	4.30	4.30	4.71	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	5	0	0	0	2	3	23	4.75	279/1576	4.67	4.45	4.27	4.28	4.75	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	5	0	0	1	0	4	23	4.75	298/1342	4.68	4.61	4.32	4.30	4.75	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	5	1	0	0	1	3	23	4.81	191/1520	4.67	4.42	4.25	4.25	4.81	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	5	0	5	2	3	5	13	3.68	1159/1465	3.82	4.36	4.12	4.09	3.68	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	1	3	4	20	4.54	375/1434	4.51	4.39	4.14	4.15	4.54	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	5	0	0	0	0	3	25	4.89	129/1547	4.81	4.51	4.19	4.21	4.89	
8. How many times was class cancelled	5	0	1	0	1	5	21	4.61	1003/1574	4.56	4.63	4.64	4.61	4.61	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	8	0	1	0	1	6	17	4.52	379/1554	4.51	4.36	4.10	4.09	4.52	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	7	0	0	0	1	1	24	4.88	278/1488	4.82	4.73	4.47	4.47	4.88	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	7	0	0	0	0	1	25	4.96	223/1493	4.92	4.85	4.73	4.70	4.96	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	7	0	0	0	1	2	23	4.85	231/1486	4.81	4.58	4.32	4.32	4.85	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	1	4	21	4.77	364/1489	4.78	4.68	4.32	4.34	4.77	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	8	2	1	0	3	6	13	4.30	489/1277	4.17	4.08	4.03	4.11	4.30	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	10	0	1	0	3	6	13	4.30	625/1279	4.19	4.33	4.17	4.20	4.30	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	10	0	0	0	3	3	17	4.61	559/1270	4.60	4.47	4.35	4.42	4.61	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	10	0	0	0	2	3	18	4.70	511/1269	4.67	4.62	4.35	4.41	4.70	
4. Were special techniques successful	10	4	2	1	0	3	13	4.26	361/ 878	3.78	4.13	4.05	4.09	4.26	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99 0	A 16	Required for Majors 1	Graduate 0 Major 12
28-55	0	1.00-1.99 0	B 9		
56-83	8	2.00-2.99 4	C 2	General 0	Under-grad 33 Non-major 21
84-150	9	3.00-3.49 5	D 0		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 10	F 0	Electives 0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 27	
			? 1		

Course-Section: POLI 301 0201
 Title POLI RESEARCH METHODS
 Instructor: FORESTIERE, CAR
 Enrollment: 38
 Questionnaires: 37

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 1280
 JUL 2, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor Mean	Instructor Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5								
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	6	0	0	2	3	4	22	4.48	667/1576	4.54	4.52	4.30	4.30	4.48	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	6	0	0	1	1	7	22	4.61	462/1576	4.67	4.45	4.27	4.28	4.61	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	6	2	1	0	1	6	21	4.59	500/1342	4.68	4.61	4.32	4.30	4.59	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	6	1	1	0	2	5	22	4.57	441/1520	4.67	4.42	4.25	4.25	4.57	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	7	0	6	4	5	3	12	3.37	1306/1465	3.82	4.36	4.12	4.09	3.37	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	3	5	22	4.63	296/1434	4.51	4.39	4.14	4.15	4.63	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	7	0	0	1	3	3	23	4.60	411/1547	4.81	4.51	4.19	4.21	4.60	
8. How many times was class cancelled	7	0	0	2	4	3	21	4.43	1165/1574	4.56	4.63	4.64	4.61	4.43	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	10	0	1	0	5	7	14	4.22	742/1554	4.51	4.36	4.10	4.09	4.22	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	9	0	0	0	3	4	21	4.64	694/1488	4.82	4.73	4.47	4.47	4.64	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	9	0	0	0	1	2	25	4.86	683/1493	4.92	4.85	4.73	4.70	4.86	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	9	0	0	1	0	7	20	4.64	499/1486	4.81	4.58	4.32	4.32	4.64	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	1	0	5	22	4.71	434/1489	4.78	4.68	4.32	4.34	4.71	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	10	3	0	0	2	7	15	4.54	288/1277	4.17	4.08	4.03	4.11	4.54	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	20	0	2	0	4	5	6	3.76	957/1279	4.19	4.33	4.17	4.20	3.76	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	20	0	0	1	1	4	11	4.47	666/1270	4.60	4.47	4.35	4.42	4.47	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	20	0	0	0	2	5	10	4.47	669/1269	4.67	4.62	4.35	4.41	4.47	
4. Were special techniques successful	21	2	1	0	2	5	6	4.07	451/ 878	3.78	4.13	4.05	4.09	4.07	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99 0	A 19	Required for Majors 0	Graduate 0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99 0	B 6		Major 20
56-83	6	2.00-2.99 0	C 2	General 1	Under-grad 37
84-150	9	3.00-3.49 6	D 0		Non-major 17
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 13	F 0	Electives 0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 27	
			? 0		

Course-Section: POLI 301 8620
 Title POLI RESEARCH METHODS
 Instructor: GOLDBERG, MARNI
 Enrollment: 16
 Questionnaires: 17

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 1281
 JUL 2, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	3	0	0	0	2	4	8	4.43	757/1576	4.54	4.52	4.30	4.30	4.43	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	3	0	0	0	2	1	11	4.64	420/1576	4.67	4.45	4.27	4.28	4.64	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	3	0	0	0	1	2	11	4.71	345/1342	4.68	4.61	4.32	4.30	4.71	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	3	1	0	0	1	3	9	4.62	385/1520	4.67	4.42	4.25	4.25	4.62	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	1	6	7	4.43	483/1465	3.82	4.36	4.12	4.09	4.43	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	1	1	4	8	4.36	574/1434	4.51	4.39	4.14	4.15	4.36	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	3	0	0	0	0	1	13	4.93	98/1547	4.81	4.51	4.19	4.21	4.93	
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	0	0	0	0	5	9	4.64	942/1574	4.56	4.63	4.64	4.61	4.64	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	8	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	180/1554	4.51	4.36	4.10	4.09	4.78	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	0	1	13	4.93	198/1488	4.82	4.73	4.47	4.47	4.93	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	0	1	13	4.93	445/1493	4.92	4.85	4.73	4.70	4.93	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	0	1	13	4.93	137/1486	4.81	4.58	4.32	4.32	4.93	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	2	12	4.86	251/1489	4.78	4.68	4.32	4.34	4.86	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	2	1	1	2	5	3	3.67	943/1277	4.17	4.08	4.03	4.11	3.67	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	2	3	9	4.50	445/1279	4.19	4.33	4.17	4.20	4.50	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	0	4	10	4.71	458/1270	4.60	4.47	4.35	4.42	4.71	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	0	2	12	4.86	332/1269	4.67	4.62	4.35	4.41	4.86	
4. Were special techniques successful	3	5	2	1	3	1	2	3.00	799/ 878	3.78	4.13	4.05	4.09	3.00	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	14	2	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 234	****	****	4.23	4.24	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	15	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 240	****	****	4.35	4.32	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	15	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 229	****	****	4.51	4.48	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	14	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 232	****	2.00	4.29	4.16	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	14	2	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 379	****	****	4.20	4.17	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	14	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 85	****	****	4.72	4.67	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	14	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 79	****	****	4.69	4.69	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	14	1	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 72	****	****	4.64	4.53	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	14	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 80	****	****	4.61	4.22	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	14	2	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 375	****	****	4.01	4.12	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 52	****	****	4.48	4.37	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.40	3.92	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	15	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 326	****	****	4.03	4.23	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 40	****	****	4.60	4.83	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	15	0	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	****/ 24	****	****	4.83	4.89	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	15	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 35	****	****	4.67	5.00	****	

Course-Section: POLI 301 8620
 Title POLI RESEARCH METHODS
 Instructor: GOLDBERG, MARNI
 Enrollment: 16
 Questionnaires: 17

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 1281
 JUL 2, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	1	A	6	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	10
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	4						
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	3	C	2	General	1	Under-grad	17	Non-major	7
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	0	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	11				
				?	0						

Course-Section: POLI 309 0101
 Title SELECTED TOPICS IN POL
 Instructor: KING-MEADOWS, T
 Enrollment: 29
 Questionnaires: 29

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 1282
 JUL 2, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	7	0	0	1	1	4	16	4.59	513/1576	4.42	4.52	4.30	4.30	4.59	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	7	0	0	2	2	1	17	4.50	608/1576	4.25	4.45	4.27	4.28	4.50	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	7	1	0	2	3	1	15	4.38	726/1342	4.47	4.61	4.32	4.30	4.38	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	7	0	1	0	1	3	17	4.59	406/1520	4.36	4.42	4.25	4.25	4.59	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	2	3	15	4.65	271/1465	4.36	4.36	4.12	4.09	4.65	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	8	0	1	1	1	6	12	4.29	647/1434	4.24	4.39	4.14	4.15	4.29	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	9	0	2	0	4	4	10	4.00	1041/1547	4.28	4.51	4.19	4.21	4.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	10	0	0	0	0	13	6	4.32	1279/1574	4.19	4.63	4.64	4.61	4.32	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	11	0	0	0	1	5	12	4.61	307/1554	4.12	4.36	4.10	4.09	4.61	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	9	0	0	0	0	4	16	4.80	401/1488	4.62	4.73	4.47	4.47	4.80	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	9	0	0	0	0	0	20	5.00	1/1493	4.78	4.85	4.73	4.70	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	9	0	0	0	3	3	14	4.55	619/1486	4.18	4.58	4.32	4.32	4.55	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	2	2	16	4.70	461/1489	4.35	4.68	4.32	4.34	4.70	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	9	16	2	0	2	0	0	2.00	****/1277	3.50	4.08	4.03	4.11	****	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	11	0	1	1	2	2	12	4.28	649/1279	4.28	4.33	4.17	4.20	4.28	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	11	0	0	1	2	3	12	4.44	696/1270	4.58	4.47	4.35	4.42	4.44	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	11	0	0	0	0	3	15	4.83	353/1269	4.81	4.62	4.35	4.41	4.83	
4. Were special techniques successful	11	8	2	1	2	1	4	3.40	742/ 878	3.70	4.13	4.05	4.09	3.40	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	28	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 85	****	****	4.72	4.67	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	28	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 79	****	****	4.69	4.69	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	28	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 72	****	****	4.64	4.53	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	28	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 80	****	****	4.61	4.22	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	28	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 375	****	****	4.01	4.12	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	25	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.48	4.37	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	25	0	1	0	0	0	3	4.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.40	3.92	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	25	1	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 44	****	****	4.73	4.63	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	25	1	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 45	****	****	4.57	4.50	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	25	1	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 326	****	****	4.03	4.23	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	28	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 40	****	****	4.60	4.83	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	28	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 24	****	****	4.83	4.89	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	28	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 35	****	****	4.67	5.00	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	28	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 28	****	****	4.78	5.00	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	28	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 382	****	****	4.08	4.24	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors		
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A 6	Required for Majors 2	Graduate 0	Major 17
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	0	B 10			
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	3	C 1	General 5	Under-grad 29	Non-major 12
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	3	D 0			
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	7	F 0	Electives 2	#### - Means there are not enough	

P	0			responses to be significant
I	0	Other	10	
?	1			

Course-Section: POLI 309 8620
 Title SELECTED TOPICS IN POL
 Instructor: JANOW, JEREMY
 Enrollment: 17
 Questionnaires: 17

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 1283
 JUL 2, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	0	0	3	6	7	4.25	952/1576	4.42	4.52	4.30	4.30	4.25	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	1	0	3	5	6	4.00	1138/1576	4.25	4.45	4.27	4.28	4.00	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	1	0	4	11	4.56	521/1342	4.47	4.61	4.32	4.30	4.56	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	4	6	6	4.13	977/1520	4.36	4.42	4.25	4.25	4.13	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	2	2	5	7	4.06	818/1465	4.36	4.36	4.12	4.09	4.06	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	2	1	5	8	4.19	758/1434	4.24	4.39	4.14	4.15	4.19	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	2	3	11	4.56	457/1547	4.28	4.51	4.19	4.21	4.56	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	1	13	2	4.06	1438/1574	4.19	4.63	4.64	4.61	4.06	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	0	0	0	5	5	1	3.64	1247/1554	4.12	4.36	4.10	4.09	3.64	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	2	5	9	4.44	957/1488	4.62	4.73	4.47	4.47	4.44	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	2	3	11	4.56	1159/1493	4.78	4.85	4.73	4.70	4.56	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	2	6	1	7	3.81	1229/1486	4.18	4.58	4.32	4.32	3.81	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	5	3	7	4.00	1118/1489	4.35	4.68	4.32	4.34	4.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	2	2	1	4	2	5	3.50	1020/1277	3.50	4.08	4.03	4.11	3.50	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	4	2	8	4.29	641/1279	4.28	4.33	4.17	4.20	4.29	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	1	2	11	4.71	458/1270	4.58	4.47	4.35	4.42	4.71	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	0	3	11	4.79	409/1269	4.81	4.62	4.35	4.41	4.79	
4. Were special techniques successful	3	5	0	1	2	2	4	4.00	464/ 878	3.70	4.13	4.05	4.09	4.00	
Laboratory															
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	16	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 240	****	****	4.35	4.32	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	16	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 85	****	****	4.72	4.67	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 80	****	****	4.61	4.22	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 375	****	****	4.01	4.12	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	16	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.48	4.37	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	16	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.40	3.92	****	
Self Paced															
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 24	****	****	4.83	4.89	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	6	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	6
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	6						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	1	C	0	General	2	Under-grad	17	Non-major	11
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	9				
				?	1						

Course-Section: POLI 324 0101
 Title THE CONGRESS
 Instructor: KING-MEADOWS, T
 Enrollment: 25
 Questionnaires: 25

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 1284
 JUL 2, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	8	0	2	1	0	5	9	4.06	1118/1576	4.06	4.52	4.30	4.30	4.06	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	8	0	2	1	5	4	5	3.53	1387/1576	3.53	4.45	4.27	4.28	3.53	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	8	1	1	1	2	7	5	3.88	1080/1342	3.88	4.61	4.32	4.30	3.88	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	8	1	1	5	3	3	4	3.25	1438/1520	3.25	4.42	4.25	4.25	3.25	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	8	0	1	1	2	5	8	4.06	824/1465	4.06	4.36	4.12	4.09	4.06	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	8	0	2	2	3	4	6	3.59	1178/1434	3.59	4.39	4.14	4.15	3.59	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	8	0	3	3	5	3	3	3.00	1459/1547	3.00	4.51	4.19	4.21	3.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	8	0	0	0	1	8	8	4.41	1189/1574	4.41	4.63	4.64	4.61	4.41	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	12	0	0	2	1	7	3	3.85	1103/1554	3.85	4.36	4.10	4.09	3.85	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	8	0	0	2	3	4	8	4.06	1218/1488	4.06	4.73	4.47	4.47	4.06	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	8	0	0	0	1	4	12	4.65	1077/1493	4.65	4.85	4.73	4.70	4.65	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	8	0	1	1	3	10	2	3.65	1293/1486	3.65	4.58	4.32	4.32	3.65	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	5	7	5	4.00	1118/1489	4.00	4.68	4.32	4.34	4.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	9	13	1	0	2	0	0	2.33	****/1277	****	4.08	4.03	4.11	****	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	12	0	1	2	2	4	4	3.62	1018/1279	3.62	4.33	4.17	4.20	3.62	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	12	0	2	1	1	3	6	3.77	1049/1270	3.77	4.47	4.35	4.42	3.77	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	12	0	0	2	3	4	4	3.77	1032/1269	3.77	4.62	4.35	4.41	3.77	
4. Were special techniques successful	13	5	2	0	1	2	2	3.29	764/ 878	3.29	4.13	4.05	4.09	3.29	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	6	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	12
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	5						
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	2	C	3	General	6	Under-grad	25	Non-major	13
84-150	6	3.00-3.49	4	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	6	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	8				
				?	1						

Course-Section: POLI 350 0101
 Title POLICY-MAKING PROCESS
 Instructor: HUSSEY, LAURA
 Enrollment: 33
 Questionnaires: 30

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 1285
 JUL 2, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	8	0	0	0	0	8	14	4.64	457/1576	4.64	4.52	4.30	4.30	4.64	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	8	0	1	0	1	6	14	4.45	683/1576	4.45	4.45	4.27	4.28	4.45	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	8	0	2	0	1	5	14	4.32	788/1342	4.32	4.61	4.32	4.30	4.32	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	8	0	1	0	1	6	14	4.45	597/1520	4.45	4.42	4.25	4.25	4.45	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	8	0	1	1	2	5	13	4.27	626/1465	4.27	4.36	4.12	4.09	4.27	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	8	0	1	0	2	6	13	4.36	564/1434	4.36	4.39	4.14	4.15	4.36	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	9	0	0	1	2	5	13	4.43	657/1547	4.43	4.51	4.19	4.21	4.43	
8. How many times was class cancelled	9	0	1	0	0	4	16	4.62	987/1574	4.62	4.63	4.64	4.61	4.62	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	12	1	1	0	1	8	7	4.18	794/1554	4.18	4.36	4.10	4.09	4.18	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	10	0	0	0	0	3	17	4.85	324/1488	4.85	4.73	4.47	4.47	4.85	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	11	0	0	0	0	1	18	4.95	334/1493	4.95	4.85	4.73	4.70	4.95	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	11	0	0	0	0	1	18	4.95	103/1486	4.95	4.58	4.32	4.32	4.95	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	0	1	18	4.95	116/1489	4.95	4.68	4.32	4.34	4.95	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	11	0	0	0	4	2	13	4.47	337/1277	4.47	4.08	4.03	4.11	4.47	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	0	0	2	10	4.83	204/1279	4.83	4.33	4.17	4.20	4.83	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	18	0	0	0	1	0	11	4.83	326/1270	4.83	4.47	4.35	4.42	4.83	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	18	0	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/1269	5.00	4.62	4.35	4.41	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	18	3	0	0	4	0	5	4.11	440/ 878	4.11	4.13	4.05	4.09	4.11	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 6	Required for Majors	12
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	B 6		
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	C 2	General	18
84-150	6	3.00-3.49	D 0		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	1
			P 1		
			I 0	Other	10
			? 1		

- Means there are not enough responses to be significant

Course-Section: POLI 352 0101
 Title ADMINISTRATIVE LAW
 Instructor: MILLER, KERWIN
 Enrollment: 26
 Questionnaires: 22

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 1286
 JUL 2, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	0	1	1	5	14	4.52	609/1576	4.52	4.52	4.30	4.30	4.52	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	1	1	5	14	4.52	581/1576	4.52	4.45	4.27	4.28	4.52	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	1	5	15	15	4.67	406/1342	4.67	4.61	4.32	4.30	4.67	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	5	0	0	1	4	11	4.63	376/1520	4.63	4.42	4.25	4.25	4.63	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	1	1	18	4.85	148/1465	4.85	4.36	4.12	4.09	4.85	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	2	0	1	2	7	9	4.26	670/1434	4.26	4.39	4.14	4.15	4.26	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	0	2	19	4.90	123/1547	4.90	4.51	4.19	4.21	4.90	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	16	5	4.24	1339/1574	4.24	4.63	4.64	4.61	4.24	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	9	0	0	0	1	4	8	4.54	371/1554	4.54	4.36	4.10	4.09	4.54	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	2	1	18	4.76	484/1488	4.76	4.73	4.47	4.47	4.76	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	1	0	4	16	4.67	1053/1493	4.67	4.85	4.73	4.70	4.67	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	2	4	15	4.62	545/1486	4.62	4.58	4.32	4.32	4.62	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	4	16	4.71	434/1489	4.71	4.68	4.32	4.34	4.71	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	17	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/1277	****	4.08	4.03	4.11	****	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	2	2	10	4.57	400/1279	4.57	4.33	4.17	4.20	4.57	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	0	1	0	0	13	4.79	378/1270	4.79	4.47	4.35	4.42	4.79	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	0	0	1	0	13	4.86	332/1269	4.86	4.62	4.35	4.41	4.86	
4. Were special techniques successful	8	6	1	1	2	2	2	3.38	747/ 878	3.38	4.13	4.05	4.09	3.38	
Self Paced															
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	21	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 382	****	****	4.08	4.24	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 10	Required for Majors	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	B 8		Graduate 0
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	C 0	General	2
84-150	12	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad 22
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	1
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	15
			? 0		

Course-Section: POLI 360 0101
 Title COMPRTIVE POLI ANALYSI
 Instructor: GRODSKY, BRIAN
 Enrollment: 32
 Questionnaires: 32

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 1287
 JUL 2, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	10	0	1	0	0	2	19	4.73	335/1576	4.60	4.52	4.30	4.30	4.73
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	10	0	0	0	1	6	15	4.64	434/1576	4.55	4.45	4.27	4.28	4.64
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	10	14	0	1	0	0	7	4.63	455/1342	4.81	4.61	4.32	4.30	4.63
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	10	0	0	1	0	5	16	4.64	367/1520	4.55	4.42	4.25	4.25	4.64
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	1	0	1	19	4.81	175/1465	4.77	4.36	4.12	4.09	4.81
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	1	1	1	18	4.71	226/1434	4.72	4.39	4.14	4.15	4.71
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	11	0	0	1	1	5	14	4.52	503/1547	4.62	4.51	4.19	4.21	4.52
8. How many times was class cancelled	11	0	0	1	0	1	19	4.81	665/1574	4.87	4.63	4.64	4.61	4.81
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	17	0	0	1	0	3	11	4.60	316/1554	4.55	4.36	4.10	4.09	4.60
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	11	0	0	1	0	4	16	4.67	666/1488	4.67	4.73	4.47	4.47	4.67
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	11	0	0	0	1	1	19	4.86	683/1493	4.93	4.85	4.73	4.70	4.86
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	11	0	0	0	2	4	15	4.62	545/1486	4.64	4.58	4.32	4.32	4.62
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	1	0	2	18	4.76	364/1489	4.77	4.68	4.32	4.34	4.76
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	11	3	0	3	3	4	8	3.94	758/1277	4.20	4.08	4.03	4.11	3.94
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	1	0	2	13	4.69	320/1279	4.59	4.33	4.17	4.20	4.69
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	16	0	0	0	2	3	11	4.56	589/1270	4.57	4.47	4.35	4.42	4.56
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	16	0	0	1	0	4	11	4.56	608/1269	4.66	4.62	4.35	4.41	4.56
4. Were special techniques successful	17	3	1	0	2	6	3	3.83	589/ 878	4.21	4.13	4.05	4.09	3.83

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99 0	A 12	Required for Majors 0	Graduate 0 Major 15
28-55	0	1.00-1.99 0	B 3		
56-83	5	2.00-2.99 0	C 2	General 0	Under-grad 32 Non-major 17
84-150	2	3.00-3.49 3	D 0		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 8	F 0	Electives 0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 15	
			? 0		

Course-Section: POLI 360 0201
 Title COMPRTIVE POLI ANALYSI
 Instructor: GRODSKY, BRIAN
 Enrollment: 23
 Questionnaires: 23

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 1288
 JUL 2, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	8	0	0	2	0	2	11	4.47	697/1576	4.60	4.52	4.30	4.30	4.47	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	8	0	0	0	2	4	9	4.47	668/1576	4.55	4.45	4.27	4.28	4.47	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	8	8	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1342	4.81	4.61	4.32	4.30	5.00		
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	8	0	0	0	2	4	9	4.47	579/1520	4.55	4.42	4.25	4.25	4.47	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	0	4	11	4.73	219/1465	4.77	4.36	4.12	4.09	4.73	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	0	4	11	4.73	209/1434	4.72	4.39	4.14	4.15	4.73	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	8	1	0	0	0	4	10	4.71	280/1547	4.62	4.51	4.19	4.21	4.71	
8. How many times was class cancelled	8	0	0	0	0	1	14	4.93	328/1574	4.87	4.63	4.64	4.61	4.93	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	13	0	0	0	0	5	5	4.50	395/1554	4.55	4.36	4.10	4.09	4.50	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	8	0	0	0	1	3	11	4.67	666/1488	4.67	4.73	4.47	4.47	4.67	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	8	0	0	0	0	0	15	5.00	1/1493	4.93	4.85	4.73	4.70	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	8	0	0	0	1	3	11	4.67	468/1486	4.64	4.58	4.32	4.32	4.67	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	1	1	12	4.79	336/1489	4.77	4.68	4.32	4.34	4.79	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	9	1	0	1	0	4	8	4.46	347/1277	4.20	4.08	4.03	4.11	4.46	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	2	2	8	4.50	445/1279	4.59	4.33	4.17	4.20	4.50	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	11	0	0	0	1	3	8	4.58	574/1270	4.57	4.47	4.35	4.42	4.58	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	11	0	0	0	1	1	10	4.75	444/1269	4.66	4.62	4.35	4.41	4.75	
4. Were special techniques successful	11	0	0	1	0	2	9	4.58	193/ 878	4.21	4.13	4.05	4.09	4.58	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors				
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 9	Required for Majors	2	Graduate	0	Major	14
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	B 2						
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	C 0	General	2	Under-grad	23	Non-major	9
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	D 0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
			P 0						
			I 0	Other	8				
			? 1						

Course-Section: POLI 380 8620
 Title INTERNATIONAL RELATION
 Instructor: MCDONALD, MICHA
 Enrollment: 11
 Questionnaires: 11

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 1289
 JUL 2, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	3	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1576	5.00	4.52	4.30	4.30	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	3	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	173/1576	4.88	4.45	4.27	4.28	4.88
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	3	3	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1342	5.00	4.61	4.32	4.30	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	3	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	155/1520	4.88	4.42	4.25	4.25	4.88
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	137/1465	4.88	4.36	4.12	4.09	4.88
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	122/1434	4.88	4.39	4.14	4.15	4.88
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	3	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	141/1547	4.88	4.51	4.19	4.21	4.88
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1574	5.00	4.63	4.64	4.61	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	263/1554	4.67	4.36	4.10	4.09	4.67
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1488	5.00	4.73	4.47	4.47	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	632/1493	4.88	4.85	4.73	4.70	4.88
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	221/1486	4.86	4.58	4.32	4.32	4.86
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1489	5.00	4.68	4.32	4.34	5.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	5	0	0	0	1	2	3	4.33	463/1277	4.33	4.08	4.03	4.11	4.33
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1279	5.00	4.33	4.17	4.20	5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1270	5.00	4.47	4.35	4.42	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1269	5.00	4.62	4.35	4.41	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	4	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	122/ 878	4.86	4.13	4.05	4.09	4.86

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: POLI 390 0101
 Title AMERICAN FOREIGN POLIC
 Instructor: STARKEY, BRIGID
 Enrollment: 29
 Questionnaires: 29

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 1290
 JUL 2, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	7	0	0	0	0	3	19	4.86	195/1576	4.83	4.52	4.30	4.30	4.86
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	7	0	0	0	1	2	19	4.82	215/1576	4.56	4.45	4.27	4.28	4.82
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	7	0	0	0	0	3	19	4.86	203/1342	4.71	4.61	4.32	4.30	4.86
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	7	1	0	0	0	2	19	4.90	138/1520	4.40	4.42	4.25	4.25	4.90
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	0	2	20	4.91	122/1465	4.34	4.36	4.12	4.09	4.91
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	7	1	0	0	0	5	16	4.76	184/1434	4.51	4.39	4.14	4.15	4.76
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	7	0	0	0	2	4	16	4.64	375/1547	4.67	4.51	4.19	4.21	4.64
8. How many times was class cancelled	7	0	0	0	0	0	22	5.00	1/1574	5.00	4.63	4.64	4.61	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	10	0	0	0	0	6	13	4.68	246/1554	4.65	4.36	4.10	4.09	4.68
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	7	0	0	0	0	1	21	4.95	124/1488	4.83	4.73	4.47	4.47	4.95
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	8	0	0	0	0	0	21	5.00	1/1493	5.00	4.85	4.73	4.70	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	8	0	0	0	0	5	16	4.76	325/1486	4.63	4.58	4.32	4.32	4.76
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	0	4	18	4.82	297/1489	4.80	4.68	4.32	4.34	4.82
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	7	6	1	2	2	3	8	3.94	769/1277	4.07	4.08	4.03	4.11	3.94
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	0	5	12	4.71	305/1279	4.54	4.33	4.17	4.20	4.71
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	12	0	0	0	0	1	16	4.94	156/1270	4.85	4.47	4.35	4.42	4.94
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	12	0	0	0	0	0	17	5.00	1/1269	5.00	4.62	4.35	4.41	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	12	2	0	0	2	7	6	4.27	361/ 878	3.80	4.13	4.05	4.09	4.27

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99 0	A 8	Required for Majors	1
28-55	1	1.00-1.99 0	B 11		Graduate 0
56-83	6	2.00-2.99 1	C 0	General	4
84-150	5	3.00-3.49 6	D 0		Under-grad 29
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 6	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	15
			? 1		

Course-Section: POLI 390 8620
 Title AMERICAN FOREIGN POLIC
 Instructor: MELCAVAGE, EUGE
 Enrollment: 12
 Questionnaires: 12

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 1291
 JUL 2, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor Mean	Instructor Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5								
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	2	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	243/1576	4.83	4.52	4.30	4.30	4.80	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	0	0	2	3	5	4.30	891/1576	4.56	4.45	4.27	4.28	4.30	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	3	0	0	0	1	2	6	4.56	531/1342	4.71	4.61	4.32	4.30	4.56	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	1	1	0	2	2	4	3.89	1179/1520	4.40	4.42	4.25	4.25	3.89	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	1	2	4	2	3.78	1088/1465	4.34	4.36	4.12	4.09	3.78	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	2	0	0	2	2	4	4.25	682/1434	4.51	4.39	4.14	4.15	4.25	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	0	1	1	8	4.70	303/1547	4.67	4.51	4.19	4.21	4.70	
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1574	5.00	4.63	4.64	4.61	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	1	1	6	4.63	298/1554	4.65	4.36	4.10	4.09	4.63	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	1	1	8	4.70	624/1488	4.83	4.73	4.47	4.47	4.70	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1493	5.00	4.85	4.73	4.70	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	1	0	2	7	4.50	678/1486	4.63	4.58	4.32	4.32	4.50	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	1	0	8	4.78	350/1489	4.80	4.68	4.32	4.34	4.78	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	4	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	585/1277	4.07	4.08	4.03	4.11	4.20	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	1	3	4	4.38	575/1279	4.54	4.33	4.17	4.20	4.38	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	0	1	0	7	4.75	412/1270	4.85	4.47	4.35	4.42	4.75	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1269	5.00	4.62	4.35	4.41	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	4	5	0	1	1	0	1	3.33	755/ 878	3.80	4.13	4.05	4.09	3.33	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 85	****	****	4.72	4.67	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 79	****	****	4.69	4.69	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 72	****	****	4.64	4.53	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.48	4.37	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.40	3.92	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 44	****	****	4.73	4.63	****	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: POLI 403 1501
 Title RESEARCH INTERNSHIP
 Instructor: KING-MEADOWS, T
 Enrollment: 4
 Questionnaires: 4

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 1292
 JUL 2, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1576	5.00	4.52	4.30	4.46	5.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1576	5.00	4.45	4.27	4.35	5.00	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1342	5.00	4.61	4.32	4.46	5.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1520	5.00	4.42	4.25	4.38	5.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1465	5.00	4.36	4.12	4.22	5.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1434	5.00	4.39	4.14	4.30	5.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1547	5.00	4.51	4.19	4.24	5.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	758/1574	4.75	4.63	4.64	4.69	4.75	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1554	5.00	4.36	4.10	4.24	5.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1488	5.00	4.73	4.47	4.55	5.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1493	5.00	4.85	4.73	4.80	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1486	5.00	4.58	4.32	4.41	5.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1489	5.00	4.68	4.32	4.38	5.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	1	0	1	0	0	2	4.00	692/1277	4.00	4.08	4.03	4.04	4.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1279	5.00	4.33	4.17	4.31	5.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1270	5.00	4.47	4.35	4.53	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1269	5.00	4.62	4.35	4.55	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	2	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 878	5.00	4.13	4.05	4.33	5.00	
Laboratory															
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	3	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	229/ 232	2.00	2.00	4.29	4.56	2.00	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: POLI 409 0101
 Title SELECTED TOPICS POLI S
 Instructor: FORESTIERE, CAR
 Enrollment: 17
 Questionnaires: 17

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 1293
 JUL 2, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	0	0	3	4	9	4.38	818/1576	4.38	4.52	4.30	4.46	4.38	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	3	2	11	4.50	608/1576	4.50	4.45	4.27	4.35	4.50	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	8	0	0	1	0	6	4.71	345/1342	4.71	4.61	4.32	4.46	4.71	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	5	1	0	0	1	9	4.55	464/1520	4.55	4.42	4.25	4.38	4.55	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	8	0	2	0	0	6	4.25	647/1465	4.25	4.36	4.12	4.22	4.25	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	1	0	0	1	5	9	4.53	375/1434	4.53	4.39	4.14	4.30	4.53	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	1	2	0	1	5	7	4.00	1041/1547	4.00	4.51	4.19	4.24	4.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	1	1	2	2	10	4.19	1373/1574	4.19	4.63	4.64	4.69	4.19	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	1	5	8	4.50	395/1554	4.50	4.36	4.10	4.24	4.50	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	0	0	1	3	9	4.62	736/1488	4.62	4.73	4.47	4.55	4.62	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	1	0	13	4.86	683/1493	4.86	4.85	4.73	4.80	4.86	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	5	0	0	0	0	2	10	4.83	241/1486	4.83	4.58	4.32	4.41	4.83	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	3	10	4.77	364/1489	4.77	4.68	4.32	4.38	4.77	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	11	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/1277	****	4.08	4.03	4.04	****	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	1	0	0	5	6	4.25	665/1279	4.25	4.33	4.17	4.31	4.25	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	1	0	0	1	10	4.58	574/1270	4.58	4.47	4.35	4.53	4.58	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	1	0	0	2	9	4.50	644/1269	4.50	4.62	4.35	4.55	4.50	
4. Were special techniques successful	5	3	1	0	1	2	5	4.11	440/ 878	4.11	4.13	4.05	4.33	4.11	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 85	****	****	4.72	4.77	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 79	****	****	4.69	4.69	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 72	****	****	4.64	4.64	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99 0	A 13	Required for Majors	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99 0	B 0		
56-83	5	2.00-2.99 0	C 0	General	6
84-150	4	3.00-3.49 2	D 0	Under-grad	17
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 11	F 0	Electives	2
			P 0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	
			I 1	Other	8
			? 0		

Course-Section: POLI 412 0101
 Title ETHICS & PUBLIC POLICY
 Instructor: BALL, CALVIN
 Enrollment: 27
 Questionnaires: 26

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 1294
 JUL 2, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	3	0	1	1	1	4	16	4.43	742/1576	4.43	4.52	4.30	4.46	4.43
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	3	0	0	1	3	2	17	4.52	581/1576	4.52	4.45	4.27	4.35	4.52
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	3	16	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1342	5.00	4.61	4.32	4.46	5.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	3	0	0	0	3	3	17	4.61	395/1520	4.61	4.42	4.25	4.38	4.61
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	4	0	2	0	2	3	15	4.32	587/1465	4.32	4.36	4.12	4.22	4.32
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	3	0	1	0	3	2	17	4.48	435/1434	4.48	4.39	4.14	4.30	4.48
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	3	0	0	1	1	2	19	4.70	303/1547	4.70	4.51	4.19	4.24	4.70
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	0	0	0	0	6	17	4.74	795/1574	4.74	4.63	4.64	4.69	4.74
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	10	0	0	0	1	3	12	4.69	246/1554	4.69	4.36	4.10	4.24	4.69
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	4	4	15	4.48	907/1488	4.48	4.73	4.47	4.55	4.48
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	1	1	21	4.87	658/1493	4.87	4.85	4.73	4.80	4.87
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	1	4	18	4.74	366/1486	4.74	4.58	4.32	4.41	4.74
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	1	0	1	5	16	4.52	672/1489	4.52	4.68	4.32	4.38	4.52
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	5	2	0	0	2	3	14	4.63	236/1277	4.63	4.08	4.03	4.04	4.63
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	1	0	3	15	4.68	320/1279	4.68	4.33	4.17	4.31	4.68
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	0	0	1	2	16	4.79	378/1270	4.79	4.47	4.35	4.53	4.79
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	0	0	1	1	17	4.84	342/1269	4.84	4.62	4.35	4.55	4.84
4. Were special techniques successful	8	2	0	0	3	2	11	4.50	221/ 878	4.50	4.13	4.05	4.33	4.50

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 12	Required for Majors	1	
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	B 7		Graduate 0	
56-83	6	2.00-2.99	C 2	General	8	
84-150	11	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad 26	
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	0	
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	
			I 0	Other		13
			? 1			

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

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 1295
 JUL 2, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	243/1576	4.80	4.52	4.30	4.46	4.80	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	476/1576	4.60	4.45	4.27	4.35	4.60	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1342	5.00	4.61	4.32	4.46	5.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	197/1520	4.80	4.42	4.25	4.38	4.80	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1465	5.00	4.36	4.12	4.22	5.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	151/1434	4.80	4.39	4.14	4.30	4.80	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	186/1547	4.80	4.51	4.19	4.24	4.80	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	665/1574	4.80	4.63	4.64	4.69	4.80	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	1	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	194/1554	4.75	4.36	4.10	4.24	4.75	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1488	5.00	4.73	4.47	4.55	5.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	810/1493	4.80	4.85	4.73	4.80	4.80	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	271/1486	4.80	4.58	4.32	4.41	4.80	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	309/1489	4.80	4.68	4.32	4.38	4.80	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	585/1277	4.20	4.08	4.03	4.04	4.20	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1279	5.00	4.33	4.17	4.31	5.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1270	5.00	4.47	4.35	4.53	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	444/1269	4.75	4.62	4.35	4.55	4.75	
4. Were special techniques successful	1	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/ 878	5.00	4.13	4.05	4.33	5.00	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: POLI 432 0101
 Title CIVIL RIGHTS
 Instructor: L'ANOUE, GEORGE
 Enrollment: 34
 Questionnaires: 34

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 1296
 JUL 2, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	14	0	0	0	1	3	16	4.75	301/1576	4.75	4.52	4.30	4.46	4.75
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	15	0	0	0	1	3	15	4.74	301/1576	4.74	4.45	4.27	4.35	4.74
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	14	0	0	0	2	3	15	4.65	418/1342	4.65	4.61	4.32	4.46	4.65
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	14	2	0	0	1	7	10	4.50	511/1520	4.50	4.42	4.25	4.38	4.50
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	2	3	15	4.65	271/1465	4.65	4.36	4.12	4.22	4.65
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	14	1	0	0	3	4	12	4.47	435/1434	4.47	4.39	4.14	4.30	4.47
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	14	0	0	0	2	2	16	4.70	303/1547	4.70	4.51	4.19	4.24	4.70
8. How many times was class cancelled	14	0	0	0	0	2	18	4.90	469/1574	4.90	4.63	4.64	4.69	4.90
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	20	0	0	0	0	3	11	4.79	173/1554	4.79	4.36	4.10	4.24	4.79
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	14	0	0	0	0	1	19	4.95	149/1488	4.95	4.73	4.47	4.55	4.95
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	14	0	0	0	0	2	18	4.90	557/1493	4.90	4.85	4.73	4.80	4.90
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	14	0	0	0	1	3	16	4.75	339/1486	4.75	4.58	4.32	4.41	4.75
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	2	3	15	4.65	513/1489	4.65	4.68	4.32	4.38	4.65
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	15	3	0	2	3	4	7	4.00	692/1277	4.00	4.08	4.03	4.04	4.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	20	0	0	2	1	3	8	4.21	697/1279	4.21	4.33	4.17	4.31	4.21
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	20	0	0	0	1	1	12	4.79	378/1270	4.79	4.47	4.35	4.53	4.79
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	20	0	0	1	1	0	12	4.64	551/1269	4.64	4.62	4.35	4.55	4.64
4. Were special techniques successful	20	2	0	0	1	2	9	4.67	164/ 878	4.67	4.13	4.05	4.33	4.67
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	33	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.48	4.70	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	33	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.40	4.30	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	33	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 44	****	****	4.73	4.60	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	33	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 45	****	****	4.57	4.34	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	33	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 326	****	****	4.03	3.97	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	33	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 40	****	****	4.60	5.00	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	33	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 24	****	****	4.83	5.00	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	33	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 35	****	****	4.67	5.00	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	33	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 28	****	****	4.78	5.00	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	33	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 382	****	****	4.08	3.88	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors		
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 9	Required for Majors 1	Graduate 0	Major 7
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B 5			
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	1	C 1	General 3	Under-grad 34	Non-major 27
84-150	9	3.00-3.49	6	D 0			
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	6	F 0	Electives 0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	
				P 0			
				I 0	Other 14		
				? 3			

Course-Section: POLI 438 0101
 Title LEGAL INTERNSHIP
 Instructor: DAVIS, JEFFREY
 Enrollment: 9
 Questionnaires: 9

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 1297
 JUL 2, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor Mean	Instructor Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5								
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1576	5.00	4.52	4.30	4.46	5.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	173/1576	4.88	4.45	4.27	4.35	4.88	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	5	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	406/1342	4.67	4.61	4.32	4.46	4.67	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	249/1520	4.75	4.42	4.25	4.38	4.75	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	206/1465	4.75	4.36	4.12	4.22	4.75	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	122/1434	4.88	4.39	4.14	4.30	4.88	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	1	1	6	4.63	387/1547	4.63	4.51	4.19	4.24	4.63	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	758/1574	4.75	4.63	4.64	4.69	4.75	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	138/1554	4.86	4.36	4.10	4.24	4.86	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	293/1488	4.88	4.73	4.47	4.55	4.88	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1493	5.00	4.85	4.73	4.80	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	201/1486	4.88	4.58	4.32	4.41	4.88	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	228/1489	4.88	4.68	4.32	4.38	4.88	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	2	1	0	1	0	3	3.80	856/1277	3.80	4.08	4.03	4.04	3.80	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1279	5.00	4.33	4.17	4.31	5.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1270	5.00	4.47	4.35	4.53	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1269	5.00	4.62	4.35	4.55	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	4	2	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/ 878	5.00	4.13	4.05	4.33	5.00	

Frequency Distribution

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

- Means there are not enough responses to be significant

Course-Section: POLI 458 0101
 Title ADMIN INTERNSHIP
 Instructor: SCHALLER, THOMA
 Enrollment: 1
 Questionnaires: 1

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 1298
 JUL 2, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99 0	A 0	Required for Majors 0	Graduate 0 Major 0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99 0	B 0		
56-83	0	2.00-2.99 0	C 0	General 0	Under-grad 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 responses to be significant
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 0	
			? 0		

Course-Section: POLI 480 0101
 Title INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZA
 Instructor: SNYDER, QUDDUS
 Enrollment: 18
 Questionnaires: 17

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 1299
 JUL 2, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	7	0	0	0	1	2	7	4.60	500/1576	4.60	4.52	4.30	4.46	4.60	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	7	0	0	0	1	4	5	4.40	759/1576	4.40	4.45	4.27	4.35	4.40	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	7	0	0	0	1	0	9	4.80	240/1342	4.80	4.61	4.32	4.46	4.80	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	7	0	0	0	1	3	6	4.50	511/1520	4.50	4.42	4.25	4.38	4.50	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	2	3	5	4.30	596/1465	4.30	4.36	4.12	4.22	4.30	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	2	3	5	4.30	625/1434	4.30	4.39	4.14	4.30	4.30	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	7	0	0	0	1	2	7	4.60	411/1547	4.60	4.51	4.19	4.24	4.60	
8. How many times was class cancelled	7	0	0	0	0	7	3	4.30	1288/1574	4.30	4.63	4.64	4.69	4.30	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	9	0	0	0	2	4	2	4.00	924/1554	4.00	4.36	4.10	4.24	4.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	8	0	0	0	0	6	3	4.33	1048/1488	4.33	4.73	4.47	4.55	4.33	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	7	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1493	5.00	4.85	4.73	4.80	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	8	0	0	0	2	2	5	4.33	891/1486	4.33	4.58	4.32	4.41	4.33	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	350/1489	4.78	4.68	4.32	4.38	4.78	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	8	5	1	0	0	1	2	3.75	****/1277	****	4.08	4.03	4.04	****	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	1	2	4	4.43	532/1279	4.43	4.33	4.17	4.31	4.43	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	10	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	307/1270	4.86	4.47	4.35	4.53	4.86	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	10	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1269	5.00	4.62	4.35	4.55	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	10	1	1	0	0	3	2	3.83	589/ 878	3.83	4.13	4.05	4.33	3.83	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 85	****	****	4.72	4.77	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 79	****	****	4.69	4.69	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 72	****	****	4.64	4.64	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 80	****	****	4.61	4.52	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 375	****	****	4.01	3.90	****	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: POLI 486 0101
 Title MIDDLE EAST INTL RELAT
 Instructor: STARKEY, BRIGID
 Enrollment: 19
 Questionnaires: 19

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 1300
 JUL 2, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	3	0	0	0	3	1	12	4.56	554/1576	4.56	4.52	4.30	4.46	4.56
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	3	0	0	0	1	3	12	4.69	364/1576	4.69	4.45	4.27	4.35	4.69
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	3	0	0	0	0	3	13	4.81	233/1342	4.81	4.61	4.32	4.46	4.81
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	3	0	0	0	1	4	11	4.63	376/1520	4.63	4.42	4.25	4.38	4.63
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	2	14	4.88	137/1465	4.88	4.36	4.12	4.22	4.88
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	1	6	9	4.50	398/1434	4.50	4.39	4.14	4.30	4.50
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	3	0	0	0	1	6	9	4.50	527/1547	4.50	4.51	4.19	4.24	4.50
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	0	0	0	0	3	13	4.81	645/1574	4.81	4.63	4.64	4.69	4.81
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	7	0	0	0	1	3	8	4.58	331/1554	4.58	4.36	4.10	4.24	4.58
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	0	0	0	2	13	4.87	309/1488	4.87	4.73	4.47	4.55	4.87
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	0	0	0	15	5.00	1/1493	5.00	4.85	4.73	4.80	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	0	0	0	1	14	4.93	120/1486	4.93	4.58	4.32	4.41	4.93
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	2	13	4.87	240/1489	4.87	4.68	4.32	4.38	4.87
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	5	3	1	1	2	2	5	3.82	850/1277	3.82	4.08	4.03	4.04	3.82
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	0	2	10	4.83	204/1279	4.83	4.33	4.17	4.31	4.83
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	0	1	1	0	10	4.58	574/1270	4.58	4.47	4.35	4.53	4.58
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	0	0	1	0	11	4.83	353/1269	4.83	4.62	4.35	4.55	4.83
4. Were special techniques successful	7	2	0	1	1	1	7	4.40	283/ 878	4.40	4.13	4.05	4.33	4.40

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: POLI 487 0101
 Title INTERNATIONAL POLI ECO
 Instructor: HODY, CYNTHIA
 Enrollment: 23
 Questionnaires: 23

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 1301
 JUL 2, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	7	0	0	0	1	1	14	4.81	235/1576	4.81	4.52	4.30	4.46	4.81	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	7	0	0	0	1	4	11	4.63	448/1576	4.63	4.45	4.27	4.35	4.63	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	7	11	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	****/1342	****	4.61	4.32	4.46	****	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	7	1	0	1	0	4	10	4.53	476/1520	4.53	4.42	4.25	4.38	4.53	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	1	1	13	4.80	175/1465	4.80	4.36	4.12	4.22	4.80	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	1	0	2	12	4.67	270/1434	4.67	4.39	4.14	4.30	4.67	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	8	0	0	0	1	2	12	4.73	259/1547	4.73	4.51	4.19	4.24	4.73	
8. How many times was class cancelled	8	0	0	0	0	15	0	4.00	1459/1574	4.00	4.63	4.64	4.69	4.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	10	0	0	0	0	5	8	4.62	307/1554	4.62	4.36	4.10	4.24	4.62	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	8	0	0	0	1	4	10	4.60	750/1488	4.60	4.73	4.47	4.55	4.60	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	8	0	0	0	0	1	14	4.93	390/1493	4.93	4.85	4.73	4.80	4.93	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	8	0	0	0	2	4	9	4.47	735/1486	4.47	4.58	4.32	4.41	4.47	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	1	3	11	4.67	500/1489	4.67	4.68	4.32	4.38	4.67	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	8	4	3	0	0	2	6	3.73	909/1277	3.73	4.08	4.03	4.04	3.73	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	2	5	7	4.36	589/1279	4.36	4.33	4.17	4.31	4.36	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	9	0	0	0	1	3	10	4.64	523/1270	4.64	4.47	4.35	4.53	4.64	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	0	0	1	2	11	4.71	491/1269	4.71	4.62	4.35	4.55	4.71	
4. Were special techniques successful	9	9	2	0	2	1	0	2.40	****/ 878	****	4.13	4.05	4.33	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 85	****	****	4.72	4.77	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 79	****	****	4.69	4.69	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 72	****	****	4.64	4.64	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 80	****	****	4.61	4.52	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 375	****	****	4.01	3.90	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 8	Required for Majors	2
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	B 4		Graduate 0
56-83	5	2.00-2.99	C 1	General	1
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad 23
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	9
			? 0		

Course-Section: POLI 489 8620
 Title SEL TOPICS:INTERNATL R
 Instructor: MELCAVAGE, EUGE
 Enrollment: 14
 Questionnaires: 14

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 1302
 JUL 2, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	0	1	1	3	8	4.38	808/1576	4.38	4.52	4.30	4.46	4.38	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	1	1	1	3	6	4.00	1138/1576	4.00	4.45	4.27	4.35	4.00	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	3	2	8	4.38	726/1342	4.38	4.61	4.32	4.46	4.38	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	0	0	0	3	4	5	4.17	945/1520	4.17	4.42	4.25	4.38	4.17	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	0	2	3	7	4.15	748/1465	4.15	4.36	4.12	4.22	4.15	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	0	0	4	8	4.38	544/1434	4.38	4.39	4.14	4.30	4.38	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	0	2	3	7	4.15	932/1547	4.15	4.51	4.19	4.24	4.15	
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/1574	5.00	4.63	4.64	4.69	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	3	3	5	4.18	783/1554	4.18	4.36	4.10	4.24	4.18	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	1	0	11	4.83	355/1488	4.83	4.73	4.47	4.55	4.83	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	501/1493	4.92	4.85	4.73	4.80	4.92	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	1	0	0	3	8	4.42	806/1486	4.42	4.58	4.32	4.41	4.42	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	1	0	1	10	4.67	500/1489	4.67	4.68	4.32	4.38	4.67	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	7	0	0	0	3	2	4.40	404/1277	4.40	4.08	4.03	4.04	4.40	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	2	2	8	4.50	445/1279	4.50	4.33	4.17	4.31	4.50	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	1	3	8	4.58	574/1270	4.58	4.47	4.35	4.53	4.58	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	0	2	10	4.83	353/1269	4.83	4.62	4.35	4.55	4.83	
4. Were special techniques successful	2	8	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	221/ 878	4.50	4.13	4.05	4.33	4.50	
Laboratory															
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	13	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 240	****	****	4.35	4.45	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	12	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 85	****	****	4.72	4.77	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	12	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 79	****	****	4.69	4.69	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	12	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 72	****	****	4.64	4.64	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 80	****	****	4.61	4.52	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	12	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 375	****	****	4.01	3.90	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/ 52	****	****	4.48	4.70	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	12	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.40	4.30	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	12	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 44	****	****	4.73	4.60	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	12	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 45	****	****	4.57	4.34	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 40	****	****	4.60	5.00	****	

Frequency Distribution

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

