Section: Poli 100 1

Title Amer Govt & Politics

Instructor: Miller, Nicholas

Enrollment: 47
Questionnaires: 32

#### University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2010

Page 1148 JUN 28, 2010 Job IRBR3029

Ctudant	('Ollive')	Evaluation	Ougetion	n $n$ $n$ $n$ $n$

			Fre	eque	ncie	s		Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank			Mean		Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	2	2	6	10	11		1214/1447		4.56	4.31		3.84
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	2	2	6	9	12		1161/1447	4.27	4.43	4.27	4.30	3.87
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	1	4	7	5	14		1008/1241	4.31	4.63	4.33	4.25	3.87
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	1	1	3	10	9	7		1227/1402		4.40	4.24		3.60
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	0	3	2	7	8	10		1084/1358		4.42	4.11	4.03	3.67
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	0	2	2	6	10	10	3.80	968/1316	4.08	4.41	4.14	3.99	3.80
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	1	5	7	17	4.33			4.41	4.19	4.24	4.33
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	1	11	19		1030/1447	4.61		4.69	4.68	4.58
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	3	8	13	3	3.59	1193/1434	4.26	4.24	4.10	4.10	3.59
Taskuus														
Lecture	1	0	0	0	2	-	2.4	1 71	F06/1207	1 (0	1 60	1 10	1 10	1 71
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	2	5 7	24 22		506/1387		4.68	4.46	4.46	4.71
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	-	0	-	-	3	8	13		1063/1387	4.78	4.86	4.73	4.71	4.59
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0 2	5	4				1079/1386		4.51	4.32	4.32	3.97
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	4	1	3 2	4 9	8 4	13 12	3.86	1104/1380 786/1193			4.32		3.90
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	U	4	Т	4	9	4	12	3.80	786/1193	4.12	3.92	4.02	3.99	3.86
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	12	0	4	0	6	4	6	3 40	1024/1172	3.63	4.37	4.15	3.95	3.40
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	12	0	2	5	2	6	5		1111/1182		4.60	4.35	4.18	3.35
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	12	0	1	1	4	5	9	4.00	864/1170	4.07	4.63	4.38	4.17	4.00
4. Were special techniques successful	11	12	0	2	3	1	3	3.56			4.14	4.06		3.56
1. Were special eccurrence successful	11	12	U		3	_	J	3.30	012/ 000	3.33	1.11	1.00	3.75	3.30
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	31	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 189	****	****	4.34	4.18	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	31	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 192	****	****	4.34	4.31	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	31	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	, -	****	****	4.48	4.46	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	31	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 187	****	****	4.33	4.37	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	31	0	0	0	1	0	0		****/ 168	****	****	4.20	4.29	***
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	31	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 66	****	5.00	4.58	3.95	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	31	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 62	****	4.64	4.56	4.08	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	31	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 58	****	4.57	4.41	3.88	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	31	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 65	****	4.94	4.42	3.78	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	31	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 64	****	3.96	4.09	3.75	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	31	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 38	****	4.50	4.49	3.83	***
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	31	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 36	****	3.00	4.25	4.26	***
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	31	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 28	****	4.50	4.52	3.84	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	31	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 30	****	4.50	4.30	3.64	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	31	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 27	****	4.50	4.43	3.73	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	31	0	0	0	1	0	0		****/ 31	****	****	4.72	4.50	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	31	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 21	****	****	4.57	4.38	***
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	31	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 31	****		4.64	4.65	***
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	31	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 20	****	****	4.60	4.49	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	31	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 15	****	****	4.61	4.31	****

Title Amer Govt & Politics

Instructor: Enrollment: 47

University of Maryland Baltimore County Miller,Nicholas Spring 2010

Page 1148 JUN 28, 2010 Job IRBR3029

Questionnaires: 32

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expecte	d Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors	
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	2	А	1	Required for Majors	12	Graduate	0	Major	6
28-55	7	1.00-1.99	0	В	11						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	5	C	10	General	5	Under-grad	32	Non-major	26
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	6	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	5	#### - Means	there	are not enough	ı
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	2	_		_	
				?	3						

Amer Govt & Politics

Title Miller,Nicholas

Instructor:

Enrollment: 46 Questionnaires: 39

#### University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2010

Page 1149 JUN 28, 2010 Job IRBR3029

			Fre	equer	ncie	s		Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank		_	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	1	6	13	19	4.28	839/1447	4.23	4.56	4.31	4.18	4.28
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	1	5	11	21	4.37	728/1447	4.27	4.43	4.27	4.30	4.37
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	0	1	2	3	9	22	4.32	726/1241	4.31	4.63	4.33	4.25	4.32
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	2	0	2	4	10	19	4.31	705/1402	4.07	4.40	4.24	4.15	4.31
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	5	3	9	19	4.08	756/1358	4.19	4.42	4.11	4.03	4.08
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	3	0	1	1	2	12	20	4.36	527/1316	4.08	4.41	4.14	3.99	4.36
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	3	0	0	2	3	7	24	4.47	500/1427	4.42	4.41	4.19	4.24	4.47
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	2	1	22	14	4.23	1263/1447	4.61	4.75	4.69	4.68	4.23
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	8	2	0	1	2	14	12	4.28	611/1434	4.26	4.24	4.10	4.10	4.28
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	1	7	28	4.75	429/1387	4.69	4.68	4.46	4.46	4.75
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	1	1	7	27	4.67	982/1387	4.78	4.86	4.73	4.71	4.67
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	1	0	5	5	24	4.46	677/1386	4.35	4.51	4.32	4.32	4.46
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	1	1	1	3	6	24	4.46	709/1380	4.37	4.47	4.32	4.31	4.46
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	2	2	1	7	8	16	4.03	644/1193	4.12	3.92	4.02	3.99	4.03
Discussion					_	_	_		000/4400		4 05			
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	20	0	2	2	5	3	7	3.58	970/1172	3.63	4.37	4.15	3.95	3.58
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	20	0	1	3	5	5	5		1073/1182	3.72	4.60	4.35	4.18	3.53
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	20	0	0	1	6	6	6	3.89	944/1170	4.07	4.63	4.38	4.17	3.89
4. Were special techniques successful	20	9	2	2	1	3	2	3.10	739/ 800	3.33	4.14	4.06	3.95	3.10
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	38	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 189	****	****	4.34	4.18	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	38	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 192	****	****	4.34	4.31	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	38	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 186	****	****	4.48	4.46	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	38	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 187	****	****	4.33	4.37	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	38	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 168	****	****	4.20	4.29	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	38	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 66	****	5.00	4.58	3.95	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	38	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 65	****	4.94	4.42	3.78	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	38	0	1	0	0	0	0		****/ 64	****	3.96	4.09	3.75	****
									, , ,					
Field Work		•									4 = 0			
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	38	0	1	0	0	0	0		****/ 38	****	4.50	4.49	3.83	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	38	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 36	****	3.00	4.25	4.26	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	38	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 28	****	4.50	4.52	3.84	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	38	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 30	****	4.50	4.30	3.64	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	38	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 27	****	4.50	4.43	3.73	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	38	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.72	4.50	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	38	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 21	****	****	4.57	4.38	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	38	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.64	4.65	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	38	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 20	****	****	4.60	4.49	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	38	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 15	****	****	4.61	4.31	****

Title Amer Govt & Politics

Instructor: Mille Enrollment: 46 Questionnaires: 39

Miller, Nicholas

cholas

Page 1149 JUN 28, 2010 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

University of Maryland

Baltimore County

Spring 2010

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expecte	d Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors	
00-27	9	0.00-0.99	2	A	10	Required for Majors	11	Graduate	0	Major	3
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	1	В	18						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	6	C	3	General	13	Under-grad	39	Non-major	36
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	6	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	6	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means	there	are not enough	ı
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	3	-		_	
				?	1						

Course-Section: POLI 100 3 University of Maryland Title Amer Govt & Politics

Schaller, Thomas

3.50-4.00

Baltimore County Spring 2010

Enrollment:

Questionnaires: 30

Instructor:

Grad.

Page 1150 JUN 28, 2010 Job IRBR3029

### - Means there are not enough

responses to be significant

Ctudont	Courac	Evaluation	Onogtion	$n - i \times -$
Student	COULSE	Evaluation	Ouescion	патте

	Questions	;		NR	NA	Fre	equer 2	ncie 3	s 4	5	Inst Mean	ructor Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean		Level Mean	Sect Mean
	General																
1. Did you gain n			m this course	0	0	0	0	2	12	15	4.40	723/1447	4.23	4.56	4.31	4.18	4.40
2. Did the instru	-			0	0	0	0	2	14	14	4.40	677/1447		4.43	4.27	4.30	4.40
3. Did the exam o				0	0	0	0	2	7	21	4.63	415/1241		4.63	4.33	4.25	4.63
4. Did other eval	-			0	24	0	0	1	3	2		****/1402		4.40	4.24	4.15	****
5. Did assigned r				3	0	0	0	1	9	17	4.59	286/1358		4.42	4.11	4.03	4.59
_	-		o what you learned	2	23	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	****/1316	4.08	4.41	4.14	3.99	****
7. Was the gradin	ng system clearly	expla	ined	2	0	0	1	2	8	17	4.46	513/1427	4.42	4.41	4.19	4.24	4.46
8. How many times	was class cance	lled		2	0	0	0	0	4	24	4.86	619/1447	4.61	4.75	4.69	4.68	4.86
9. How would you	grade the overal	l tead	hing effectiveness	4	2	0	0	3	10	11	4.33	540/1434	4.26	4.24	4.10	4.10	4.33
	Lecture																
1. Were the instr				1	0	0	1	0	7	21	4.66	581/1387		4.68	4.46	4.46	4.66
2. Did the instru			_	1	0	0	0	0	3	26	4.90	553/1387	4.78	4.86	4.73	4.71	4.90
3. Was lecture ma				1	0	0	2	0	8	19	4.52	597/1386		4.51	4.32	4.32	4.52
4. Did the lectur			-	1	0	0	0	2	8	19	4.59	571/1380		4.47	4.32	4.31	
5. Did audiovisua	al techniques enh	ance y	our understanding	1	1	1	2	4	6	15	4.14	574/1193	4.12	3.92	4.02	3.99	4.14
	5.1																
1 Pia -1 ai	Discuss		- dr t	1.0	0	2	0	4	8	_	2 60	958/1172	3.63	4.37	4.15	2 05	2 60
<ol> <li>Did class disc</li> <li>Were all stude</li> </ol>			_	10 9	0	3 0	0	4 5	7	5 7	3.60 3.90	941/1182		4.37	4.15	3.95 4.18	3.60 3.90
	-	_	d open discussion	10	0	0	1	2	6	11		695/1170		4.63	4.38	4.10	4.35
4. Were special t	_		d open discussion	9	15	0	1	1	1	3		****/ 800		4.14	4.06	3.95	****
i. Were special c	cciniiques succes	blui			13	O	_		_	J	1.00	, 000	3.33	1.11	1.00	3.75	
			Frequ	iency	Dist	trib	ution	n									
Credits Earned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	ason	s			Ty	pe			Majors	
00-27 4	0.00-0.99	0	A 13		Red	quir	ed fo	or M	ajor	s 1	1	Graduat	e	0	Majo	 r	5
28-55 0	1.00-1.99	0	в 4			_			-						3		
56-83 2	2.00-2.99	2	С 6		Ger	nera	1				6	Under-g	rad 3	80	Non-	major	25
84-150 2	3.00-3.49	4	D 0														

Electives

3

Other

0

0

0

1

Ρ

I ?

Amer Govt & Politics

Title

Schaller, Thomas Instructor:

Enrollment: 50 Questionnaires: 39

#### University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2010

Page 1151 JUN 28, 2010 Job IRBR3029

			Fre	equer	ncies	5		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank		Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	1	7	6	25	4.41	709/1447	4.23	4.56	4.31	4.18	4.41
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	6	9	23	4.45	619/1447	4.27	4.43	4.27	4.30	4.45
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	4	12	22	4.41	646/1241	4.31	4.63	4.33	4.25	4.41
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	26	0	2	0	3	8	4.31	715/1402	4.07	4.40	4.24	4.15	4.31
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	2	16	20	4.41	441/1358	4.19	4.42	4.11	4.03	4.41
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	31	0	0	1	1	5		****/1316	4.08	4.41	4.14	3.99	****
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	2	1	11		4.41	582/1427	4.42	4.41	4.19	4.24	4.41
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	1	1	4	32	4.76	819/1447	4.61	4.75	4.69	4.68	4.76
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	18	1	0	0	0	3	17	4.85	102/1434	4.26	4.24	4.10	4.10	4.85
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	4	5	27	4.64	611/1387	4.69	4.68	4.46	4.46	4.64
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	2	37	4.95	317/1387	4.78	4.86	4.73	4.71	4.95
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	2	16	19	4.46	677/1386	4.35	4.51	4.32	4.32	4.46
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	2	2	8	26	4.53	637/1380	4.37	4.47	4.32	4.31	4.53
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	0	4	13	21	4.45	340/1193	4.12	3.92	4.02	3.99	4.45
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	9	7	8	3.96	755/1172	3.63	4.37	4.15	3.95	3.96
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	15	0	0	2	5	6	11	4.08	836/1182	3.72	4.60	4.35	4.18	4.08
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	15	0	1	1	5	6	11	4.04	858/1170	4.07	4.63	4.38	4.17	4.04
4. Were special techniques successful	16	16	1	0	2	2	2	3.57	****/ 800	3.33	4.14	4.06	3.95	***
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	35	2	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 189	****	****	4.34	4.18	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	36	0	1	0	0	0	2	3.67	****/ 192	****	****	4.34	4.31	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	36	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 186	****	****	4.48	4.46	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	36	0	0	1	0	0	2	4.00	****/ 187	****	****	4.33	4.37	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	36	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 168	***	****	4.20	4.29	***
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	35	2	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 66	****	5.00	4.58	3.95	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	36	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 62	****	4.64	4.56	4.08	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	36	1	0	0	0	0	2		****/ 58	****	4.57	4.41	3.88	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	36	1	0	0	0	0	2		****/ 65	****	4.94	4.42	3.78	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	36	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 64	****	3.96	4.09	3.75	***
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	35	0	1	0	1	0	2	3.50	****/ 38	****	4.50	4.49	3.83	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	36	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/ 36	****	3.00	4.25	4.26	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	36	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 28	****	4.50	4.52	3.84	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	36	1	0	0	0	0	2		****/ 30	****	4.50	4.30	3.64	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	36	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 27	****	4.50	4.43	3.73	***
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	35	0	1	0	1	0	2	3.50	****/ 31	****	****	4.72	4.50	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	36	0	0	1	0	0	2	4.00	****/ 21	****	****	4.57	4.38	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	36	1	0	0	0	0	2		****/ 31	****	****	4.64	4.65	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	36	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 20	****	****	4.60	4.49	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	36	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 15	****	****	4.61	4.31	****

Title Amer Govt & Politics

Instructor: Schaller, Thomas

Enrollment: 50
Questionnaires: 39

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2010 Page 1151 JUN 28, 2010 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA	A	Expecte	d Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors	
00-27	4	0.00-0.99	1	 А	15	Required for Majors	18	Graduate	0	Major	2
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	В	14						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	3	C	5	General	7	Under-grad	39	Non-major	37
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	3	D	1						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	10	F	0	Electives	6	#### - Means	there	are not enough	n
				P	1			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	2	_			
				?	2						

Course-Section: POLI 210 1 University of Maryland Title

Political Philosophy Baltimore County Carter,John Spring 2010

Instructor: Enrollment: 53

Questionnaires: 37 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

				reque		:S			tructor	Course	-		Level	
Questions	NR	NA	A 1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this cou	irse 0	(	0 C	1	6	9	21	4.35	771/1447	4.35	4.56	4.31	4.31	4.35
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goa	ils 0	(	0 C	2	4	7	24	4.43	633/1447	4.43	4.43	4.27	4.23	4.43
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected go	oals 0	(	0 C	0	3	3	31	4.76	282/1241	4.76	4.63	4.33	4.35	4.76
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goa	ils 0	15	5 1	2	1	4	14	4.27	745/1402	4.27	4.40	4.24	4.24	4.27
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you 1	earned 0	(	0 C	3	2	14	18	4.27	590/1358	4.27	4.42	4.11	4.12	4.27
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you	learned 0	16	5 1	2	1	4	13	4.24	635/1316	4.24	4.41	4.14	4.08	4.24
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	(	0 C	0	5	5	26	4.58	361/1427	4.58	4.41	4.19	4.14	4.58
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	(	0 C	0	0	31	6	4.16	1301/1447	4.16	4.75	4.69	4.70	4.16
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effect	tiveness 4	1	1 2	0	7	16	7	3.81	1045/1434	3.81	4.24	4.10	3.97	3.81
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	(	0 0	0	4	7	26	4.59	670/1387	4.59	4.68	4.46	4.42	4.59
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the sub-	ect 0	(	0 0	0	1	4	32	4.84	707/1387	4.84	4.86	4.73	4.71	4.84
3. Was lecture material presented and explained of	learly 0	(	0 C	1	4	10	22	4.43	705/1386	4.43	4.51	4.32	4.24	4.43
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	ed 0	(	0 C	3	2	7	25	4.46	709/1380	4.46	4.47	4.32	4.30	4.46
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your unders	standing 0	8	3	0	6	8	12	3.90	764/1193	3.90	3.92	4.02	4.04	3.90
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you l	earned 11	(	) 1	2	3	2	18	4.31	546/1172	4.31	4.37	4.15	4.12	4.31
2. Were all students actively encouraged to parti		(	0 0	1	3	3	19	4.54	534/1182	4.54	4.60	4.35	4.30	4.54
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open dis	cussion 11	(	) 1	0	3	6	16	4.38	672/1170	4.38	4.63	4.38	4.32	4.38
4. Were special techniques successful	11	3	3 1	1	1	3	17	4.48	211/ 800	4.48	4.14	4.06	4.01	4.48
	Frequency	/ Di	istri	butic	n									
Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expects	ed Grades			Re	ason	ıs			Туј	ре			Majors	
00-27 2 0.00-0.99 0 7	20			rod f				7	Graduat		0	Maio	~~~~~	24

Page 1152

JUN 28, 2010

Job IRBR3029

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA	A	Expecte	d Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	 А	20	Required for Majors	27	Graduate	0	Major	24
28-55	9	1.00-1.99	0	В	10						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	4	C	3	General	2	Under-grad	37	Non-major	13
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	7	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	15	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means	there	are not enough	n
				P	0			responses to	be sig	nificant	
				I	0	Other	1	=			
				2	0						

Course-Section: POLI 230 1 University of Maryland Title Intro Constitutional L Baltimore County JUN 28, 2010

Instructor: Jones, Gary

Enrollment: 52

Grad.

1

3.50-4.00 12

Ouestionnaires: 43

# Spring 2010 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Page 1153

Job IRBR3029

General  1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course  2 0 1 2 8 15 15 4.00 1058/1447 4.05 4.56 4.31 4.31	4.00
	3.88
	3.88
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals 2 0 1 3 9 15 13 3.88 1161/1447 4.14 4.43 4.27 4.23	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals 2 0 0 3 9 10 19 4.10 882/1241 4.25 4.63 4.33 4.35	4.10
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals 2 5 2 1 10 12 11 3.81 1139/1402 4.00 4.40 4.24 4.24	3.81
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 2 0 0 1 7 10 23 4.34 518/1358 4.40 4.42 4.11 4.12	4.34
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 4 2 2 0 11 13 11 3.84 950/1316 3.93 4.41 4.14 4.08	3.84
7. Was the grading system clearly explained 3 0 0 2 7 5 26 4.38 632/1427 4.40 4.41 4.19 4.14	4.38
8. How many times was class cancelled 2 3 0 0 0 0 38 5.00 1/1447 4.97 4.75 4.69 4.70	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness $14$ 0 0 0 18 9 2 3.45 $1261/1434$ 3.42 4.24 4.10 3.97	3.45
Lecture	
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 4 0 0 2 7 11 19 4.21 1079/1387 4.36 4.68 4.46 4.42	4.21
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 4 0 1 2 10 14 12 3.87 1341/1387 4.00 4.86 4.73 4.71	3.87
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 6 0 0 3 9 15 10 3.86 1146/1386 4.04 4.51 4.32 4.24	3.86
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 4 1 3 2 12 11 10 3.61 1218/1380 3.76 4.47 4.32 4.30	3.61
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 7 28 4 2 1 1 0 1.88 ****/1193 3.29 3.92 4.02 4.04	****
Discussion	
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 22 0 6 3 7 4 1 2.57 1156/1172 2.74 4.37 4.15 4.12	2.57
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 22 0 5 3 8 3 2 2.71 1162/1182 3.10 4.60 4.35 4.30	2.71
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 22 0 2 2 7 5 5 3.43 1094/1170 3.48 4.63 4.38 4.38	3.43
4. Were special techniques successful 22 13 2 2 2 2 0 2.50 ****/ 800 **** 4.14 4.06 4.01	***
Frequency Distribution	
Flequency Discribation	
Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades Reasons Type Majors	
00-27 9 0.00-0.99 0 A 15 Required for Majors 31 Graduate 1 Major	29
28-55 5 1.00-1.99 1 B 18	-
56-83 6 2.00-2.99 5 C 3 General 2 Under-grad 42 Non-major	14
84-150 6 3.00-3.49 11 D 0	

Electives

Other

5

2

### - Means there are not enough

responses to be significant

F

Ρ

I

0

0

0

1

Intro Constitutional L

Instructor: Jones, Gary

Enrollment: 50
Questionnaires: 43

Title

#### University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2010

Page 1154 JUN 28, 2010 Job IRBR3029

			Fre	ane	ncie	S		Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	TIMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	4	0	1	1	8	12	17	4.10	1007/1447	4.05	4.56	4.31	4.31	4.10
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	3	0	0	1	4	13	22	4.40	677/1447	4.14	4.43	4.27	4.23	4.40
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	4	0	0	3	2	10	24	4.41	646/1241	4.25	4.63	4.33	4.35	4.41
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	4	2	1	1	7	9	19	4.19	836/1402	4.00	4.40	4.24	4.24	4.19
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	4	0	1	0	4	9	25	4.46	387/1358		4.42	4.11	4.12	4.46
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	3	0	1	4	4	15	16	4.03	801/1316	3.93	4.41	4.14	4.08	4.03
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	3	0	0	3	4	6	27	4.43	568/1427	4.40	4.41	4.19	4.14	4.43
8. How many times was class cancelled	4	2	0	0	0	2	35	4.95	291/1447	4.97	4.75	4.69	4.70	4.95
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	12	0	0	2	17	10	2	3.39	1281/1434	3.42	4.24	4.10	3.97	3.39
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	6	0	1	1	1	9	25	4.51	783/1387	4.36	4.68	4.46	4.42	4.51
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	6	0	1	3	4	11	18		1296/1387	4.00	4.86	4.73	4.71	4.14
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	6	0	1	1	5	12	18	4.22			4.51	4.32	4.24	4.22
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	7	1	3	0	7	12	13		1096/1380	3.76	4.47	4.32	4.30	3.91
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	7	22	3	1	4	1	5		1035/1193		3.92	4.02	4.04	3.29
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	20	0	7	2	5	4	5		1116/1172		4.37	4.15	4.12	2.91
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	20	0	4	1	7	2	9		1086/1182		4.60	4.35	4.30	3.48
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	20	0	4	1	5	5	8		1062/1170	3.48	4.63	4.38	4.32	3.52
4. Were special techniques successful	21	13	1	0	3	2	3	3.67	****/ 800	****	4.14	4.06	4.01	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	39	1	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/ 189	****	****	4.34	4.47	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	39	0	1	0	0	1	2	3.75	****/ 192	****	****	4.34	4.38	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	39	1	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/ 186	****	****	4.48	4.57	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	40	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 187	****	****	4.33	4.46	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	40	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 168	****	****	4.20	4.15	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	40	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 66	****	5.00	4.58	4.43	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	40	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 62	****	4.64	4.56	4.28	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	40	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	,	****	4.57	4.41	3.79	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	40	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33		****	4.94	4.42	4.36	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	40	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	,	****	3.96	4.09	3.70	****
mini di manda														
Field Work	4.0	0	0	_	_	-	0	4 60	***** / 20	ate ate ate ate	4 50	4 40	0 05	****
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	40	0	0	0	0	1	2		****/ 38	****	4.50	4.49	2.25	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	40	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33		****	3.00	4.25	3.25	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	40	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33		****	4.50	4.52	****	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	40	0	0	0	0	1	2		****/ 30	****	4.50	4.30	****	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	40	0	0	U	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 27	****	4.50	4.43		^^^
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	40	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 31	****	****	4.72	****	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	40	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/ 21	****	****	4.57	****	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	40	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 31	****	****	4.64	****	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	40	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 20	****	****	4.60	****	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	40	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 15	****	****	4.61	****	***

Title Intro Constitutional L

Instructor: Jones, Gary

Enrollment: 50
Questionnaires: 43

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2010 Page 1154 JUN 28, 2010 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA	A	Expecte	d Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors	
00-27	 6	0.00-0.99	1	 А	14	Required for Majors	28	Graduate	0	Major	29
28-55	8	1.00-1.99	1	В	12						
56-83	5	2.00-2.99	4	C	5	General	1	Under-grad	43	Non-major	14
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	10	D	1						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5	F	0	Electives	3	#### - Means	there	are not enough	ı
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	0	-			
				?	2						

University of Maryland Baltimore County

Title Intro To Public Admin Hussey,Laura S.

Instructor: Enrollment: 49 Questionnaires: 17

Spring 2010

Page 1155 JUN 28, 2010 Job IRBR3029

			Fre	eauer	ncies	5		Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank		Mean	Mean		Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	3	5	9	4.35	771/1447	4.35	4.56	4.31	4.31	4.35
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	4	10	4.41	662/1447	4.41	4.43	4.27	4.23	4.41
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	4	2	11	4.41	646/1241	4.41	4.63	4.33	4.35	4.41
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	4	2	10	4.24	787/1402	4.24	4.40	4.24	4.24	4.24
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	3	2	12	4.53	332/1358	4.53	4.42	4.11	4.12	4.53
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	5	3	9	4.24	635/1316	4.24	4.41	4.14	4.08	4.24
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	4	3	10	4.35	656/1427	4.35	4.41	4.19	4.14	4.35
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	1	1	15	4.82	700/1447	4.82	4.75	4.69	4.70	4.82
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	0	2	8	2	4.00	849/1434	4.00	4.24	4.10	3.97	4.00
Lecture	_		_	•	_	_			050/4005	4 00				
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	1		13	4.80	353/1387	4.80	4.68	4.46	4.42	4.80
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	1	1	13	4.80	784/1387	4.80	4.86	4.73	4.71	4.80
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	1	0	13	4.86		4.86	4.51	4.32	4.24	4.86
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	1	0	4	8	4.46	699/1380	4.46	4.47	4.32	4.30	4.46
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	0	0	0	1	5	8	4.50	288/1193	4.50	3.92	4.02	4.04	4.50
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	2	2	7	4.45	420/1172	4.45	4.37	4.15	4.12	4.45
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	0	1	0	10	4.82	292/1182	4.82	4.60	4.35	4.30	4.82
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	0	0	1	0	10	4.82	316/1170	4.82	4.63	4.38	4.32	4.82
4. Were special techniques successful	6	0	0	0	2	3	6	4.36	273/ 800		4.14	4.06		4.36
I. Here Special Committees Successful	ŭ	ŭ	ŭ	Ū	_		Ü	1.50	2737 000	1.50		1.00	1.01	1.50
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 189	****	****	4.34	4.47	***
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 192	****	****	4.34	4.38	***
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 186	****	****	4.48	4.57	***
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 187	****	****	4.33	4.46	***
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 168	****	****	4.20	4.15	****
Seminar		•	_	•			_					4 = 0		****
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	16	0	0	0	0	0	Ι	3.00	****/ 66	****	5.00	4.58	4.43	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 62	****	4.64	4.56	4.28	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 58	****	4.57	4.41	3.79	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 65	****	4.94	4.42	4.36	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 64	****	3.96	4.09	3.70	***
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 38	****	4.50	4.49	2.25	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	16	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 36	****	3.00	4.25	3.25	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 28	****	4.50	4.52	****	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	16	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 30	****	4.50	4.30	****	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	16	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 27	****	4.50	4.43	****	****
J. Did Conferences help you carry out fred activities	10	U	U	U	U	U	_	5.00	, 21		1.50	1.13		
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.72	****	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 21	****	****	4.57	****	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.64	****	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 20	****	****	4.60	****	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 15	****	****	4.61	****	****

Title Intro To Public Admin

Instructor: Hussey, Laura S.

Enrollment: 49
Questionnaires: 17

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2010 Page 1155 JUN 28, 2010 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits	its Earned Cum. GPA			Expected	Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	 А	4	Required for Majors	12	Graduate	0	Major	7
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	В	9						
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	2	C	2	General	1	Under-grad	17	Non-major	10
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	n
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	0	_			
				?	0						

Course-Section: POLI 280 1 Title

International Relation

Instructor: Hody,Cynthia A

Enrollment: 53 Questionnaires: 39

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2010

Page 1156 JUN 28, 2010 Job IRBR3029

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

	Frequencies					Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect		
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	2	5	7	25	4.41	709/1447	4.41	4.56	4.31	4.31	4.41
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	11	10	17	4.10	993/1447	4.10	4.43	4.27	4.23	4.10
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	4	10	24	4.46	587/1241	4.46	4.63	4.33	4.35	4.46
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	1	7	13	17	4.21	807/1402	4.21	4.40	4.24	4.24	4.21
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	6	7	25	4.44	419/1358	4.44	4.42	4.11	4.12	4.44
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	3	1	2	6	13	14	4.03	801/1316	4.03	4.41	4.14	4.08	4.03
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	6	8	24	4.41	582/1427	4.41	4.41	4.19	4.14	4.41
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	3	36	4.92	388/1447	4.92	4.75	4.69	4.70	4.92
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	9	1	1	0	6	12	10	4.03	833/1434	4.03	4.24	4.10	3.97	4.03
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	1	0	6	10	22	4.33	970/1387	4.33	4.68	4.46	4.42	4.33
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	4	34	4.85	681/1387	4.85	4.86	4.73	4.71	4.85
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	2	9	12	15	4.05	1026/1386	4.05	4.51	4.32	4.24	4.05
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	3	9	6	18	4.00	1030/1380	4.00	4.47	4.32	4.30	4.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	9	5	3	7	5	8	3.29	1035/1193	3.29	3.92	4.02	4.04	3.29
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	1	6	3	10	4.10	672/1172	4.10	4.37	4.15	4.12	4.10
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	19	0	0	0	4	2	14	4.50	553/1182	4.50	4.60	4.35	4.30	4.50
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	19	0	0	0	4	4	12	4.40	657/1170	4.40	4.63	4.38	4.32	4.40
4. Were special techniques successful	20	12	0	2	2	0	3	3.57	****/ 800	****	4.14	4.06	4.01	***

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA	A	Expecte	d Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	0	A	14	Required for Majors	24	Graduate	0	Major	20
28-55	10	1.00-1.99	0	В	15						
56-83	5	2.00-2.99	2	C	4	General	2	Under-grad	39	Non-major	19
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	10	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	11	F	0	Electives	6	#### - Means	there	are not enough	n
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	1	_			
				?	1						

Course-Section: POLI 301 01 University of Maryland Page 1157 JUN 28, 2010

Title Poli Research Methods Baltimore County Instructor: Forestiere,Caro Spring 2010

Enrollment: 33 Questionnaires: 26

Student	Course	Evaluation	Ouestionnaire

Frequencies

Instructor

Job IRBR3029

Course Dept UMBC Level Sect

							L T	=que	ITCTES	>		TIID	Luctor	Course	Debr	UMDC	пелет	Sect
	Questions				NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		Genera	 1															
1. Did vo	u gain ne	w insights,ski	=	m this course	0	0	0	0	1	1	24	4.88	169/1447	4.68	4.56	4.31	4.32	4.88
		tor make clear			0	0	0	1	0	5		4.69		4.47		4.27		
		estions reflec	_		0	2	0	1	0			4.83					4.33	
	_	ations reflect		-	0	2	1	0	1	1		4.71	- ,			4.24	4.24	
				what you learned	0	0	2	1	4	0	19	4.27	599/1358		4.42		4.10	4.27
				what you learned	0	0	0	1	0	1		4.85			4.41		4.13	
		system clearl		-	0	0	0	1	3	2	20	4.58	373/1427	4.24			4.15	4.58
		was class cance			0	0	0	0	1	6	19	4.69	928/1447	4.70	4.75	4.69	4.65	4.69
9. How wo	uld you g	rade the overa	ll teach	ning effectiveness	3	0	1	0	2	9	11	4.26	623/1434	4.48	4.24	4.10	4.09	4.26
	Lecture																	
1 77 1	. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared						^	0	1	0	0.1	4 01	000/1207	1 60	4 60	1 10	4 44	4 01
	. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject						0	0	1				200/1387				4.44	
	. Was lecture material presented and explained cle						0	0	0			5.00	1/1387				4.71	
	<u>-</u>						0	0	0				241/1386				4.30	
	Did the lectures contribute to what you learned Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understar					0	0	0	0			4.81						
5. Did au	.dlovisuai	tecnniques en	nance yo	our understanding	7	U	U	U	U	4	15	4.79	112/1193	3.80	3.92	4.02	4.05	4.79
		Discus	sion															
1. Did cl	ass discu			what you learned	12	0	0	0	1	2	11	4.71	247/1172	4.45	4.37	4.15	4.24	4.71
				d to participate	12	0	0	0	0			5.00					4.42	
				d open discussion	12	0	0					5.00		4.80	4.63	4.38	4.49	5.00
		chniques succe			12	4	1		0				195/ 800					
				Frequ	uency	Dis	trib	utio	n									
Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	asons	5			Туј	pe			Majors	;
00-27	A 9		Re	anir	 ed f	or Ma				Graduat		0	Maic	 or	13			
28-55	0	0.00-0.99 1.00-1.99	0	В 9		100	quii.	- L	01 110	. , 0 -	5 2		Gradace	-	· ·	1100	-	13
						Ge:	nera	1				0	Under-g	rad 2	6	Non-	-major	13
	84-150 8 3.00-3.49 3 D 0					00.		_				-	3		-		, 0 =	_5
Grad.	0						ecti	ves				0	#### - 1	Means t	here a	re not	enouc	rh
P 0												-	respons				_	•
I (						Ot:	her					0			5			
				? 1														

Course-Section: POLI 301 02 University of Maryland Title Baltimore County JUN 28, 2010

Poli Research Methods Instructor: Forestiere,Caro

Enrollment: 30 Ouestionnaires: 22

84-150

Grad.

12

0

3.00-3.49

3.50-4.00

5

D

F

Ρ

I

0

0

0

0

2

Spring 2010 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequencies

Instructor

Page 1158

Job IRBR3029

Course Dept UMBC Level Sect

#### - Means there are not enough

responses to be significant

					T. T.	-quc				TILO	LIUCCOI	COULDO	. DCPC	OLIDC	TIC A C T	DCCC		
		Questions	3		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		General	 L															
1. Did yo	ou gain n	ew insights,skil	lls fro	om this course	0	0	0	2	0	5	15	4.50	585/1447	4.68	4.56	4.31	4.32	4.50
2. Did th	ne instru	ctor make clear	the ex	spected goals	0	0	0	0	2	3	17	4.68	327/1447	4.47	4.43	4.27	4.23	4.68
3. Did th	ne exam q	uestions reflect	the e	expected goals	0	0	1	0	2	3	16	4.50	541/1241	4.87	4.63	4.33	4.33	4.50
4. Did ot	her eval	uations reflect	the ex	spected goals	0	1	0	0	1	4	16	4.71	259/1402	4.28	4.40	4.24	4.24	4.71
5. Did as	ssigned r	eadings contribu	ite to	what you learned	0	0	3	2	4	6	7	3.55	1152/1358	3.96	4.42	4.11	4.10	3.55
6. Did wr	ritten as	signments contri	ibute t	to what you learned	1	0	0	1	1	5	14	4.52	372/1316	4.27	4.41	4.14	4.13	4.52
7. Was th	ne grading	g system clearly	y expla	ained	0	0	0	1	1	3	17	4.64	310/1427	4.24	4.41	4.19	4.15	4.64
8. How ma	any times	was class cance	elled		1	0	0	0	1	2	18	4.81	754/1447	4.70	4.75	4.69	4.65	4.81
9. How wo	. How would you grade the overall teaching effective						1	0	0	11	6	4.17	733/1434	4.48	4.24	4.10	4.09	4.17
		Lecture	9															
1. Were t	the instr	uctor's lectures	s well	prepared	3	0	0	0	1	1	17	4.84	291/1387	4.69	4.68	4.46	4.44	4.84
	. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject					0	0	0	0	0	19	5.00	1/1387	5.00	4.86	4.73	4.71	5.00
3. Was le	ecture ma	terial presented	d and e	explained clearly	3	0	0	0	0	2	17	4.89	147/1386	4.43	4.51	4.32	4.30	4.89
		es contribute to			3	0	0	0	1	3	15	4.74	366/1380	4.01	4.47	4.32	4.32	4.74
5. Did au	udiovisua	l techniques enh	nance y	your understanding	3	5	0	0	2	4	8	4.43	358/1193	3.80	3.92	4.02	4.05	4.43
		Discuss	sion															
1. Did cl	lass disc	ussions contribu	ite to	what you learned	11	0	0	0	0	5	6	4.55	355/1172	4.45	4.37	4.15	4.24	4.55
2. Were a	all stude	nts actively end	courage	ed to participate	11	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1182	5.00	4.60	4.35	4.42	5.00
3. Did th	ne instru	ctor encourage f	fair ar	nd open discussion	11	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1170	4.80	4.63	4.38	4.49	5.00
4. Were s	special to	echniques succes	ssful	-	11	3	0	2	1	1	4	3.88	527/ 800	4.07	4.14	4.06	4.12	3.88
				Frequ	ıency	Dis	trib	utio	n									
Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Gra								Rea	ason	.s			Ту	pe			Majors	<b>;</b>
00-27 28-55	0	0.00-0.99 1.00-1.99	1 0	A 15 B 3	Required for Majo					ajor	rs 2	10	Graduat	е	0	Majo	r	13
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	3	C 1	General							0	Under-g	rad 2	22	Non-	major	9
	6-83 2 2.00-2.99 3 C																	

Electives

Other

0

0

Poli Research Methods

Title Instructor: Dasgupta, Sunil (Instr. A)

Enrollment: 5 Questionnaires: 3 University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2010

Page 1159 JUN 28, 2010 Job IRBR3029

	Questionnaire

	Frequencies					Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect		
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	408/1447	4.68	4.56	4.31	4.32	4.67
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	766/1447	4.47	4.43	4.27	4.23	4.33
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1241	4.87	4.63	4.33	4.33	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	976/1402	4.28	4.40	4.24	4.24	4.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	799/1358	3.96	4.42	4.11	4.10	4.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	812/1316	4.27	4.41	4.14	4.13	4.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	971/1427	4.24	4.41	4.19	4.15	4.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	958/1447	4.70	4.75	4.69	4.65	4.67
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1434	4.48	4.24	4.10	4.09	5.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1387	4.69	4.68	4.46	4.44	4.50
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1387	5.00	4.86	4.73	4.71	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	1047/1386	4.43	4.51	4.32	4.30	4.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	659/1380	4.01	4.47	4.32	4.32	3.25
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1193	3.80	3.92	4.02	4.05	3.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	521/1172	4.45	4.37	4.15	4.24	4.33
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1182	5.00	4.60	4.35	4.42	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	480/1170	4.80	4.63	4.38	4.49	4.67
4. Were special techniques successful	0	1	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	423/ 800	4.07	4.14	4.06	4.12	4.00
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	23/ 38	4.50	4.50	4.49	4.73	4.50
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	1	0	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	33/ 36	3.00	3.00	4.25	3.81	3.00
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	18/ 28	4.50	4.50	4.52	4.46	4.50
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	10/ 30	4.50	4.50	4.30	4.42	4.50
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	14/ 27	4.50	4.50	4.43	4.50	4.50
To a second	Figure 20 Picker													

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

Course-Section: POLI 301 03 University of Maryland Title Poli Research Methods Baltimore County

Baltimore County Spring 2010 Page 1160

JUN 28, 2010

Job IRBR3029

								Fr	eauei	ncies	5		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
		Question	s			NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank		Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
1 Did	anin no	Genera w insights,ski	_	m thia acurac		0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	408/1447	4.68	4.56	4.31	4.32	4.67
		w insignes,ski tor make clear			=	0	0	0	0	0	7	1	4.33	766/1447	4.47	4.43	4.27	4.23	4.33
		estions reflec			-	0	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1241	4.87	4.63	4.33	4.33	5.00
	_	ations reflect			5	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	976/1402		4.40	4.24	4.24	4.00
		adings contrib			rned	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	799/1358	3.96	4.42	4.11	4.10	4.00
-	-	ignments contr		-		0	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	812/1316	4.27	4.41	4.14	4.13	4.00
		system clearl		-	Lariica	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	971/1427	4.24	4.41	4.19	4.15	4.00
-		was class canc		iiica		0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	958/1447		4.75	4.69	4.65	4.67
o. now many	CIMCD	was class care	CIICU			J	Ü	Ü	O	Ü	-	_	1.07	J30/111/	1.70	1.75	1.05	1.05	1.07
		Lectur	е																
1. Were the	instru	ctor's lecture	s well	prepared		2	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1176/1387	4.69	4.68	4.46	4.44	4.50
3. Was lecti	ure mat	erial presente	d and e	xplained clea	arly	2	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1047/1386	4.43	4.51	4.32	4.30	4.00
4. Did the 1	lecture	s contribute t	o what	you learned		2	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	1371/1380	4.01	4.47	4.32	4.32	3.25
		Di																	
1 54 -1		Discus		b		0	0	0	0	0	2	1	4 22	E01/1170	4 45	4 27	4 1 5	1 01	4 22
		ssions contrib			0	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	521/1172		4.37	4.15	4.24	4.33	
		ts actively en				0	0 0	0	0	0	0 1	3	5.00 4.67	1/1182 480/1170	5.00 4.80	4.60	4.35	4.42 4.49	5.00 4.67
		tor encourage chniques succe		a open arscus	SSION	0	1	0	0	0 1	0	1	4.07	480/11/0		4.03	4.38	4.49	4.07
4. Were spec	ciai te	cilliques succe	SSLUI			U	1	U	U	1	U		4.00	423/ 600	4.07	4.14	4.00	4.12	4.00
		Field	Work																
1. Did field	d exper	ience contribu	te to w	hat you learr	ned	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	23/ 38	4.50	4.50	4.49	4.73	4.50
2. Did you o	clearly	understand yo	ur eval	uation criter	ria	1	0	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	33/ 36	3.00	3.00	4.25	3.81	3.00
3. Was the i	instruc	tor available	for con	sultation		1	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	18/ 28	4.50	4.50	4.52	4.46	4.50
		could you disc				1	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	10/ 30	4.50	4.50	4.30	4.42	4.50
5. Did confe	erences	help you carr	y out f	ield activiti	ies	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	14/ 27	4.50	4.50	4.43	4.50	4.50
					Frequ	ency	Dist	trib	utio	n									
					_	_													
Credits Earr	ned	Cum. GPA		Expected G	Grades				Rea	asons	5			Ту	pe			Majors	3
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A (	 )		Red	quir	ed f	or Ma	ajors	- <b></b> -	3	Graduat	 e	0	Majo	r	2
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В 2	2						-						_		
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	0	C (	)		Gei	nera	1				0	Under-g	rad	3	Non-	major	1
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	1	D (	)														

Electives

Other

0

0

#### - Means there are not enough

responses to be significant

0

0

0

1

Ρ

Ι

Grad.

3.50-4.00

Course-Section: POLI 301 03 University of Maryland Title Poli Research Methods (Instr. C)

Baltimore County Spring 2010

Enrollment: 5

Instructor:

Questionnaires: 3

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Page 1161

JUN 28, 2010

Job IRBR3029

			Fre	equer	ncies	3		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	408/1447	4.68	4.56	4.31	4.32	4.67
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	766/1447	4.47	4.43	4.27	4.23	4.33
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1241	4.87	4.63	4.33	4.33	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	976/1402	4.28	4.40	4.24	4.24	4.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	799/1358	3.96	4.42	4.11	4.10	4.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	812/1316	4.27	4.41	4.14	4.13	4.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	971/1427	4.24	4.41	4.19	4.15	4.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	958/1447	4.70	4.75	4.69	4.65	4.67
Lecture														
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	1188/1193	3.80	3.92	4.02	4.05	3.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	521/1172	4.45	4.37	4.15	4.24	4.33
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1182	5.00	4.60	4.35	4.42	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	480/1170	4.80	4.63	4.38	4.49	4.67
4. Were special techniques successful	0	1	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	423/ 800	4.07	4.14	4.06	4.12	4.00
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	23/ 38	4.50	4.50	4.49	4.73	4.50
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	1	0	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	33/ 36	3.00	3.00	4.25	3.81	3.00
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	18/ 28	4.50	4.50	4.52	4.46	4.50
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	10/ 30	4.50	4.50	4.30	4.42	4.50
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	14/ 27	4.50	4.50	4.43	4.50	4.50

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

Course-Section: POLI 309 01 Title

Selected Topics In Pol

Instructor: Sawyer, John P

Enrollment: 15 Questionnaires: 8 University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2010

Page 1162 JUN 28, 2010 Job IRBR3029

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

			Fre	eque	ncies	3		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	Ο	1	1	2	4	4.13	989/1447	4.13	4.56	4.31	4.32	4.13
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	2	3		1161/1447	3.88	4.43	4.27	4.23	3.88
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	1	1	2	2		1034/1241	3.83	4.63	4.33	4.33	3.83
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	0	1	2	4	4.00	976/1402	4.00	4.40	4.24	4.24	4.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	2	2	3	4.14	709/1358	4.14	4.42	4.11	4.10	4.14
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	3	4	4.38	519/1316	4.38	4.41	4.14	4.13	4.38
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	1	2	4	4.13	898/1427	4.13	4.41	4.19	4.15	4.13
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	565/1447	4.88	4.75	4.69	4.65	4.88
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	1	5	2	4.13	775/1434	4.13	4.24	4.10	4.09	4.13
Lecture			•	_			_		400/4000		4			
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	429/1387	4.75	4.68	4.46	4.44	4.75
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	Ι	-7	4.88	604/1387	4.88	4.86	4.73	4.71	4.88
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	2	Ι	5	4.38	775/1386	4.38	4.51	4.32	4.30	4.38
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	2	5	4.50	659/1380	4.50	4.47	4.32	4.32	4.50
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	1	3	4	4.38	395/1193	4.38	3.92	4.02	4.05	4.38
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	4	3	4.25	580/1172	4.25	4.37	4.15	4.24	4.25
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	229/1182	4.88	4.60	4.35	4.42	4.88
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	390/1170	4.75	4.63	4.38	4.49	4.75
4. Were special techniques successful	0	2	1	1	0	0	4	3.83	547/ 800	3.83	4.14	4.06	4.12	3.83

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

Amer Political Thought

Instructor: Carter, John

Enrollment: 32
Questionnaires: 18

Title

## University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2010

Page 1163 JUN 28, 2010 Job IRBR3029

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

			Fre	quer	ncie	2		Tnat	ructor	Course	Dent	UMBC	T.exre1	Sect
Ouestions	NR	NΑ	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
׫«»«»»														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	1	0	2	3	12	4.39	742/1447	4.39	4.56	4.31	4.32	4.39
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	0	2	4	11	4.33	766/1447	4.33	4.43	4.27	4.23	4.33
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	3	12	4.44	611/1241	4.44	4.63	4.33	4.33	4.44
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	2	0	3	12	4.47	530/1402	4.47	4.40	4.24	4.24	4.47
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	1	16	4.83	122/1358	4.83	4.42	4.11	4.10	4.83
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	1	2	2	12	4.28	599/1316	4.28	4.41	4.14	4.13	4.28
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	4	1	6	7	3.89	1090/1427	3.89	4.41	4.19	4.15	3.89
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	1	0	12	4	4.12	1326/1447	4.12	4.75	4.69	4.65	4.12
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	1	0	2	6	5	4.00	849/1434	4.00	4.24	4.10	4.09	4.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	1	1	2	14	4.61	641/1387	4.61	4.68	4.46	4.44	4.61
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	1	16	4.83	707/1387	4.83	4.86	4.73	4.71	4.83
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	1	0	3	14	4.67	431/1386	4.67	4.51	4.32	4.30	4.67
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	1	2	14	4.56	604/1380	4.56	4.47	4.32	4.32	4.56
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	0	4	0	1	4	7	3.63	916/1193	3.63	3.92	4.02	4.05	3.63
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	1	0	0	4	9	4.43	445/1172	4.43	4.37	4.15	4.24	4.43
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	0	0	5	9	4.64	450/1182	4.64	4.60	4.35	4.42	4.64
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	0	1	3	10	4.64	494/1170	4.64	4.63	4.38	4.49	4.64
4. Were special techniques successful	4	1	0	0	3	2	8	4.38	261/ 800	4.38	4.14	4.06	4.12	4.38
T abauat aug														
Laboratory	1.0	0	0	_	_	•	-	<b>-</b> 00	**** / 100	also also also also	ale ale ale ale	4 24	4 06	ate ate ate ate
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	17	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 189	****	****	4.34	4.26	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 192	****	****	4.34	4.20	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 186	****	****	4.48	4.36	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	17 17	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 187 ****/ 168	****	****	4.33	4.11 4.02	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	1 /	U	U	U	U	U	Т	5.00	~~~/ 108			4.20	4.02	
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 66	****	5.00	4.58	4.17	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 62	****	4.64	4.56	4.21	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 58	****	4.57	4.41	2.87	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 65	****	4.94	4.42	4.01	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 64	****		4.09	3.38	****
J. Here officera for grading made officer		Ü	ŭ	Ü	Ü	Ü	_	5.00	, 01		3.70	1.05	3.30	
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 38	****	4.50	4.49	4.73	***
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 36	****	3.00	4.25	3.81	***
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 28	****	4.50	4.52	4.46	***
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 30	****	4.50	4.30	4.42	***
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 27	****	4.50	4.43	4.50	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.72	5.00	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 21	****	****	4.57	5.00	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.64	5.00	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 20	****	****	4.60	5.00	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 15	****	****	4.61	5.00	****

Title Amer Political Thought

Instructor: Carter,John

Enrollment: 32
Questionnaires: 18

#### University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2010

Page 1163 JUN 28, 2010 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expecte	d Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	 А	11	Required for Majors	 7	Graduate	0	Major	15
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	В	3						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	4	C	2	General	1	Under-grad	18	Non-major	3
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	4	#### - Means	there	are not enough	n
				P	0			responses to	be sig	nificant	
				I	0	Other	1	-			
				?	0						

Title Policy-Making Process Hussey,Laura S.

Instructor:

Enrollment: 28 Questionnaires: 18

#### University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2010

Page 1164 JUN 28, 2010 Job IRBR3029

Central   Cent				Fre	equer	ncies	3		Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
1. Did you gain new insights, wills from this course	Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					Mean
1. Did you gain new insights wills from this course															
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals 0 0 0 0 0 1 6 11 4.50 532/1447 4.50 4.34 4.27 4.23 4.50 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals 0 0 0 0 0 1 6 11 4.56 4.63 4.73 4.33 4.33 4.34 4.56 4.51 Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0 0 0 0 0 2 7 7 94.39 474/1359 4.39 4.42 4.11 4.10 4.56 5.10 did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 0 0 0 0 2 1 15 4.73 188/1316 4.72 4.41 4.11 4.10 4.13 4.72 7 1.88 they many times was class cancelled 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 1 2 2 15 4.78 181/1427 4.78 4.17 4.19 4.15 4.72 8. How many times was class cancelled 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 1 6 6 6 4.21 679/1434 4.78 4.11 4.10 4.01 4.72 8. How many times was class cancelled 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 1 6 6 4.21 679/1434 4.78 4.11 4.10 4.09 4.21 4.72 4.72 4.72 4.72 4.72 4.72 4.72 4.72	General														
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals 5. Did dansigned readings contribute to what you learned 7. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 8. Did writen assignments contribute to what you learned 9. O 0 0 0 2 7 9 4.39 474/1358 4.39 4.42 4.11 4.10 4.39 9. How sould you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 9. How the province of the instructor seem interested in the subject 1. Were the instructor's lectures well propared 1. Were the instructor seem interested in the subject 1. Were the instructor seem interested in the subject 1. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 2. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 3. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 3. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 4. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 6. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 4. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 4. Did the lab increase understanding of the material 8. Did the lab increase understanding of the material 8. Were special techniques understand					-		3								
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 7. Was the grading system clearly explained 8. How many times was class cancelled 8. How many times was class class class cancelled 8. How the manual class class cancelled 8. How the manual class cl	• •						5								
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 6. Did written ansignments contribute to what you learned 7. Was the grading system clearly explained 8. How many times was class cancelled 9. Did written ansignments contribute to what you learned 9. Did written ansignments contribute to what you learned 9. Did to be a second or			-		-		-								
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 7. Was the grading system clearly explained 8. How many times was class cancelled 9. 0 0 0 0 1 2 1 6 6 6 4.78 181/147 4.78 4.14 4.14 4.15 4.78 8. How many times was class cancelled 9. 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 1 6 6 6 4.21 679/1434 4.78 4.75 4.69 4.65 4.78 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 4 0 0 0 0 0 1 1 7 4.94 1679/1434 4.21 4.24 4.10 4.09 4.21  Lecture 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 9. 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 17 4.94 120/1387 4.94 4.68 4.46 4.44 4.94 9. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 1 7 4.94 377/1387 4.94 4.68 4.46 4.44 4.94 9. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 1 7 4.94 377/1387 4.94 4.68 4.73 4.71 4.94 9. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 1 7 4.94 377/1387 4.94 4.68 4.34 4.74 4.94 9. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 1 4 4.94 377/1387 4.94 4.68 4.74 4.94 9. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 1 4 4.94 377/1387 4.94 4.68 4.73 4.71 4.94 9. Did the instructor observed and explained clearly 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 1 4 4.94 377/1387 4.94 4.68 4.73 4.71 4.94 9. Did the last contribute to what you learned 0 0 0 0 0 1 1 1 2 4.64 295/1172 4.64 4.37 4.71 4.32 4.32 4.67 9. Did the last sudents actively encouraged to participate 4 0 0 0 0 0 1 1 2 4.64 295/1172 4.64 4.37 4.15 4.24 4.64 9. Were special techniques successful 4 5 0 0 0 0 0 1 1 1 2 4.64 295/1172 4.64 4.37 4.15 4.24 4.64 9. Were special techniques successful 4 5 0 0 0 0 0 1 1 5 0.0 ***/189 **** 4.34 4.26 **** 1. Did the last increase understanding of the material 7 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 5 5.00 ***/189 *** 4.44 4.94 4.94 9. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 17 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 5 5.00 ***/188 *** 4.50 4.74 4.75 4.75 *** 1. Did presentations contribute to what you learned 17 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 5 5.00 ***/188 *** 4.50 4.49 4.73 *** 1. Did presentations contribute to what you learned 17 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 5 5.00 ***/188 *** 4.50 4.49 4.73 *** 1.															
7. Was the grading system clearly explained 0 0 0 0 0 1 2 1 5 6.78 181/427 4.78 4.41 4.19 4.15 8.89 How many times was class cancelled 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0	-														
8. How many times was class cancelled 9. 0 0 0 0 0 4 14 4.78 803/1447 4.78 4.75 4.69 4.65 4.78 How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 4 0 0 1 1 6 6 8 4.21 679/143 4.21 4.24 4.10 4.09 4.21 Lecture  1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 0 0 0 0 0 1 17 4.94 120/1387 4.94 4.68 4.46 4.44 4.94 1.00 4.09 4.21 4.00 4.09 4.21 4.00 4.09 4.21 4.00 4.09 4.21 4.00 4.09 4.21 4.00 4.09 4.21 4.00 4.09 4.21 4.00 4.09 4.21 4.00 4.09 4.21 4.00 4.09 4.21 4.00 4.09 4.21 4.00 4.09 4.21 4.00 4.09 4.21 4.00 4.09 4.21 4.00 4.09 4.21 4.00 4.00 4.00 4.00 4.00 4.00 4.00 4.0															
How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness			-	-	-										
New the instructor's lecture well prepared   1. Where the instructor's lectures well prepared   2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   0 0 0 0 0 1 17 4.94 120/1387 4.94 4.68 4.47 4.74 4.94 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly   0 0 0 0 0 0 5 13 4.72 353/1386 4.72 4.51 4.32 4.30 4.72 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned   0 0 0 0 0 0 5 6 5 4.00 652/1193 4.00 3.92 4.02 4.05 4.00 5 1. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding   0 2 0 0 5 6 5 4.00 652/1193 4.00 3.92 4.02 4.05 4.00 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned   4 0 1 0 0 1 12 4.64 295/1172 4.64 4.37 4.15 4.24 4.64 2. Where all students actively encouraged to participate   4 0 0 1 0 0 1 12 4.64 295/1172 4.64 4.37 4.15 4.24 4.64 2. Where special techniques successful   4 0 0 0 0 0 1 1 12 4.71 382/1182 4.71 4.60 4.35 4.42 4.71 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion   4 0 0 0 0 0 1 1 12 4.71 382/1182 4.71 4.60 4.35 4.42 4.71 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion   4 0 0 0 0 0 1 1 12 4.71 382/1182 4.71 4.60 4.35 4.42 4.71 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion   4 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 1 5.00 ***/180 4.66 4.14 4.06 4.12 4.56 ***  **Laboratory** 1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material   17 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ***/180 *** 4.24 4.26 *** 2. Were you provided with adequate background information   17 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ***/180 *** 4.34 4.26 *** 3. Where necessary materials available for lab activities   17 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ***/187 *** 4.33 4.11 *** 4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance   17 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ***/187 *** 4.33 4.11 *** 4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance   17 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ***/187 *** 4.33 4.11 *** 4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned   17 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ***/188 *** 4.50 4.20 *** 5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified   17 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ***/188 *** 4.50 4.03 4.70 *** 5. Were criteria for grading made clear   17 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ***/188 *** 4.50 4.2							_			,					
1. Nere the instructor's lectures well prepared   0 0 0 0 0 0 1 17 4.94 120/1387 4.94 4.68 4.64 4.44 4.94	9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	Τ	Τ	6	6	4.21	679/1434	4.21	4.24	4.10	4.09	4.21
1. Nere the instructor's lectures well prepared   0 0 0 0 0 0 1 17 4.94 120/1387 4.94 4.68 4.64 4.44 4.94	Logturo														
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 0 0 0 0 0 1 1 74 4.94 317/1387 4.94 4.86 4.73 4.71 4.94 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 1 4 13 4.67 463/1380 4.72 4.51 4.32 4.30 4.72 4.51 6.52 10 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1		Λ	0	Λ	Λ	Λ	1	17	1 01	120/1207	1 01	1 60	1 16	1 11	1 01
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 6. 2 0 0 5 6 5 4.00 652/193 4.00 3.92 4.02 4.05 4.00  Discussion  Discussion  Discussion  Discussion  Discussion  Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 4. 0 1 0 0 1 12 4.64 295/1172 4.64 4.37 4.15 4.24 4.64  Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 4 0 0 0 1 1 12 4.71 382/1182 4.71 4.60 4.35 4.42 4.71  Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 4 0 0 0 0 0 1 1 3 4.93 178/1170 4.93 4.63 4.38 4.49 4.93  Laboratory  Did the lab increase understanding of the material 17 0 0 0 0 0 1 1 5.00 ***/ 189 **** 4.34 4.20 ****  Were pour provided with adequate background information 17 0 0 0 0 0 1 1 5.00 ***/ 186 **** 4.34 4.20 ****  Were necessary materials available for lab activities 17 0 0 0 0 0 1 1 5.00 ***/ 186 **** 4.34 4.20 ****  Seminar  Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 17 0 0 0 0 0 1 5 5.00 ***/ 168 **** 4.34 4.10 ****  Did the easigned topics relevant to the announced theme 17 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 5 5.00 ****/ 168 **** 4.24 4.00 ****  Did presentations contribute to what you learned 17 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 5 5.00 ****/ 168 **** 4.24 4.00 ****  Did presentations contribute to what you learned 17 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 5 5.00 ****/ 168 **** 4.24 4.00 ****  Did presentations contribute to what you learned 17 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 5 5.00 ****/ 66 **** 5.00 4.58 4.17 ****  Did presentations contribute to what you learned 17 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 5 5.00 ****/ 64 **** 4.04 4.05 4.02 ****  Did gove clearly understand your evaluation criteria 17 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 5 5.00 ****/ 64 **** 4.50 4.09 3.38 ****  Field Work  Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 17 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 5 5.00 ****/ 64 **** 4.50 4.50 4.50 ****  Did study questions make clear the expected goal 17 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 5 5.00 ****/ 31 **** 4.50 4.50 4.50 ****  Self Paced  Did study questions make clear the expected goal 17 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 5 5.00 ****/ 31 **** 4.50 4.50 4.50 ***															
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 0 0 0 0 0 1 4 13 4.67 463/1380 4.67 4.47 4.32 4.32 4.67 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 0 2 0 0 0 5 6 5 5 4.00 652/193 4.00 3.92 4.02 4.05 4.00    Discussion		-	-		-	-	_								
Discussion															
Discussion  1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 4 0 1 0 0 1 12 4.64 295/1172 4.64 4.37 4.15 4.24 4.64 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 4 0 0 1 0 1 12 4.71 382/1182 4.71 4.60 4.35 4.22 4.71 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 4 0 0 0 0 1 13 4.93 178/1170 4.93 4.63 4.38 4.49 4.73 4. Were special techniques successful 4 5 0 0 0 0 4 5 4.56 177/ 800 4.56 4.14 4.06 4.12 4.55    Laboratory  1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material 17 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ***/ 189 **** 4.34 4.26 **** 4.24 4.71    2. Were you provided with adequate background information 17 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ***/ 189 **** 4.34 4.26 **** 4.34 4.															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 4 0 0 1 1 0 0 1 12 4.64 295/1172 4.64 4.37 4.15 4.24 4.64 2. Were all students actively encourage fair and open discussion 4 0 0 0 1 13 4.93 178/1170 4.93 4.63 4.38 4.49 4.93 4. Were special techniques successful 4 0 0 0 1 1 13 4.93 178/1170 4.93 4.63 4.38 4.49 4.93 4. Were special techniques successful 4 0 0 0 0 0 1 1 3 4.93 178/1170 4.93 4.63 4.38 4.49 4.93 4. Were special techniques successful 5 4 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 1 5.00 ***/ 189 **** **** 4.34 4.26 **** 2. Were you provided with adequate background information 17 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ***/ 189 **** **** 4.34 4.20 **** 2. Were you provided with adequate background information 17 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ***/ 186 **** 4.48 4.36 **** 4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance 17 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ***/ 186 **** 4.48 4.36 **** 4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance 17 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ***/ 186 **** 4.24 4.20 **** 5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 17 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ***/ 187 **** 4.34 4.20 **** 4. Did the lab instructor available for individual attention 17 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ***/ 168 **** 4.20 4.02 **** 4.20 4.02 **** 5. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 17 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ***/ 168 **** 4.50 4.51 **** 5. Were criteria for grading made clear 17 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ***/ 168 **** 4.50 4.91 4.71 **** 5. Were criteria for grading made clear 17 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ***/ 168 *** 4.57 4.49 4.42 4.71 **** 5. Were criteria for grading made clear 17 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ***/ 168 *** 4.50 4.99 3.38 **** 5. Were criteria for grading made clear 17 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ***/ 189 *** 4.50 4.99 4.73 **** 5. Did conference contribute to what you learned 17 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ***/ 189 *** 4.50 4.99 4.73 **** 5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities 17 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ***/ 27 *** 4.50 4.49 4.73 **** 5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities 17 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ***/ 27 *** 4.50 4.49 4.73 **** 5. Did conferences h	5. Did addiovisual techniques emmance your understanding	U	2	U	U	5	0	5	4.00	032/1193	4.00	3.94	4.02	4.05	4.00
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 4 0 0 1 1 0 0 1 12 4.64 295/1172 4.64 4.37 4.15 4.24 4.64 2. Were all students actively encourage fair and open discussion 4 0 0 0 1 13 4.93 178/1170 4.93 4.63 4.38 4.49 4.93 4. Were special techniques successful 4 0 0 0 1 1 13 4.93 178/1170 4.93 4.63 4.38 4.49 4.93 4. Were special techniques successful 4 0 0 0 0 0 1 1 3 4.93 178/1170 4.93 4.63 4.38 4.49 4.93 4. Were special techniques successful 5 4 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 1 5.00 ***/ 189 **** **** 4.34 4.26 **** 2. Were you provided with adequate background information 17 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ***/ 189 **** **** 4.34 4.20 **** 2. Were you provided with adequate background information 17 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ***/ 186 **** 4.48 4.36 **** 4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance 17 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ***/ 186 **** 4.48 4.36 **** 4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance 17 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ***/ 186 **** 4.24 4.20 **** 5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 17 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ***/ 187 **** 4.34 4.20 **** 4. Did the lab instructor available for individual attention 17 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ***/ 168 **** 4.20 4.02 **** 4.20 4.02 **** 5. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 17 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ***/ 168 **** 4.50 4.51 **** 5. Were criteria for grading made clear 17 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ***/ 168 **** 4.50 4.91 4.71 **** 5. Were criteria for grading made clear 17 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ***/ 168 *** 4.57 4.49 4.42 4.71 **** 5. Were criteria for grading made clear 17 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ***/ 168 *** 4.50 4.99 3.38 **** 5. Were criteria for grading made clear 17 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ***/ 189 *** 4.50 4.99 4.73 **** 5. Did conference contribute to what you learned 17 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ***/ 189 *** 4.50 4.99 4.73 **** 5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities 17 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ***/ 27 *** 4.50 4.49 4.73 **** 5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities 17 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ***/ 27 *** 4.50 4.49 4.73 **** 5. Did conferences h	Discussion														
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 4 0 0 0 1 1 0 1 12 4.71 382/1182 4.71 4.60 4.35 4.42 4.71 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 4 0 0 0 0 1 1 3 4.93 1/8/1170 4.93 4.63 4.38 4.94 4.93 4.84 Were special techniques successful 4 5 0 0 0 0 1 1 3 4.93 1/8/1170 4.93 4.63 4.38 4.94 4.95 4.56 1/7/800 4.56 4.14 4.06 4.12 4.56    Laboratory  1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material 17 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 189 **** 4.34 4.26 **** 2.0 Were you provided with adequate background information 17 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 189 **** 4.34 4.20 **** 2.0 Were necessary materials available for lab activities 17 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 180 **** 4.44 4.20 **** 2.0 Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 17 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 186 **** 4.24 4.20 4.02 **** 2.0 Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 17 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 168 **** 4.24 4.20 4.02 **** 2.0 Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 17 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 66 **** 5.00 4.58 4.17 **** 2.0 Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 17 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 66 **** 5.00 4.58 4.17 **** 2.0 Were criteria for grading made clear 17 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 66 **** 4.64 4.56 4.21 **** 2.0 Were criteria for grading made clear 17 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 64 **** 3.96 4.09 3.38 **** 2.0 Were criteria for grading made clear 17 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 64 **** 3.96 4.09 3.38 **** 2.0 Mas the instructor available for consultation 17 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 64 **** 3.90 4.09 3.38 **** 2.0 Mas the instructor available for consultation 17 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 64 **** 3.90 4.09 3.38 **** 2.0 Mas the instructor available for consultation 17 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 64 **** 3.90 4.09 3.38 **** 2.0 Mas the instructor available for consultation 17 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 64 **** 3.00 4.25 3.81 **** 3.00 4.25 3.81 **** 3.00 4.25 3.81 **** 3.00 4.25 3.81 **** 3.00 4.25 3.81 **** 3.00 4.25 3.81 **** 3.00 4.25 3.81 **** 3.00 4.25 3.81 **** 3.00 4.25 3.81 **** 3.00 4.25 3.81 **** 3.00 4.25		4	0	1	0	0	1	12	4.64	295/1172	4.64	4.37	4.15	4.24	4.64
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 4 0 0 0 0 1 1 13 4.93 178/1170 4.93 4.63 4.38 4.49 4.93 4.86 4.94 4.96 4.12 4.56    Laboratory  1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material 17 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/189 **** 4.34 4.26 *** 4.34 4.26 **** 4.34 4.26 **** 4.34 4.26 **** 4.34 4.26 **** 4.34 4.26 **** 4.34 4.26 **** 4.34 4.26 **** 4.34 4.26 **** 4.34 4															
Laboratory  1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material  2. Were you provided with adequate background information  3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities  4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance  5. Did the lab instructor provide assistance  6. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified  7. O O O O O O O O O O O O O O O O O O O				-		-	_			, -					
Laboratory  1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material 17 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 189 **** 4.34 4.26 ****  2. Were you provided with adequate background information 17 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 192 **** **** 4.34 4.20 ****  3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 17 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 186 **** **** 4.48 4.36 ****  4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance 17 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 187 **** **** 4.34 4.20 ****  5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 17 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 168 **** **** 4.33 4.11 ****  5. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 17 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 168 **** **** 4.20 4.02 ****  1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 17 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 66 **** 5.00 4.58 4.17 ****  2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 17 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 66 **** 5.00 4.58 4.17 ****  4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned 17 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 65 **** 4.64 4.56 4.21 ****  5. Were criteria for grading made clear 17 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 65 **** 4.94 4.42 4.01 ****  5. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 17 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 65 **** 4.94 4.42 4.01 ****  2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 17 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 65 **** 4.50 4.49 4.73 ****  2. Did you clearly understand your evaluations 17 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 38 **** 4.50 4.49 4.73 ****  2. Did conferences help you carry out field activities 17 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 38 **** 4.50 4.42 4.60 ****  5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities 17 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 31 **** 4.50 4.43 4.50 ****  2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal 17 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 21 **** 4.50 4.53 5.00 ****  2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal 17 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 21 **** 4.50 5.00 ****  3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful 17 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 21 **** 4.60 5.00 ****  4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful 17 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ***/ 21 **** 4.60 5.00 ****	-					-									
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material 17 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 189 **** **** 4.34 4.26 **** 2. Were you provided with adequate background information 17 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 192 **** **** 4.34 4.20 **** 4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance 17 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 186 **** **** 4.48 4.36 **** 5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 17 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 187 **** **** 4.20 4.02 ****  Seminar  1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 17 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 168 **** 5.00 4.58 4.17 **** 2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 17 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 66 **** 5.00 4.58 4.17 **** 5. Were criteria for grading made clear 17 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 64 **** 4.64 4.56 4.21 **** 5. Were criteria for grading made clear 17 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 64 **** 3.96 4.09 3.38 ****  Field Work  1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 17 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 64 **** 3.96 4.09 3.38 ****  Field Work  2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 17 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 64 **** 3.96 4.09 3.38 ****  Self Paced  1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 17 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 27 **** 4.50 4.43 4.50 ****  Self Paced  1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 17 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 27 **** 4.50 4.43 4.50 ****  Self Paced  1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 17 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 27 **** 4.50 4.43 4.50 ****  Self Paced  1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 17 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 27 **** 4.50 4.43 4.50 ****  Self Paced  1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 17 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 21 **** 4.57 5.00 ****  2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal 17 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 21 **** 4.64 5.00 ****  3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful 17 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 21 **** 4.64 5.00 ****  4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful 17 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 20 **** 4.64 5.00 *****  4. Was the feedback/tutoring by p		=	_	-	-	-	_	_		,					
2. Were you provided with adequate background information 17 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 **** 186 **** **** 4.34 4.20 **** 3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 17 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 **** 186 **** **** 4.48 4.36 **** 4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance 17 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 **** 187 **** **** 4.34 4.13 ****  5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 17 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 **** 187 **** **** 4.20 4.02 ****  Seminar  1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 17 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 **** 66 **** 5.00 4.58 4.17 ****  2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 17 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 **** 66 **** 4.64 4.56 4.21 ****  4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned 17 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 **** 65 **** 4.57 4.41 2.87 ****  5. Were criteria for grading made clear 17 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 **** 65 **** 4.94 4.42 4.01 ****  5. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 17 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 **** 65 **** 4.94 4.42 4.01 ****  2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 17 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 **** 65 **** 4.50 4.49 4.73 ****  2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation 17 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 **** 36 **** 3.00 4.25 3.81 ****  3. Was the instructor available for consultation 17 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 **** 28 **** 4.50 4.42 ****  5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities 17 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 **** 28 **** 4.50 4.42 ****  5. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 17 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 **** 27 **** 4.50 4.42 ****  5. Did study questions make clear the expected goal 17 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 **** 21 **** 4.50 4.43 4.50 *****  2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal 17 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 **** 21 **** 4.50 5.00 ****  4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful 17 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 **** 21 **** 4.60 5.00 ****  4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful 17 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 **** 20 **** 4.60 5.00 ****	Laboratory														
2. Were you provided with adequate background information 17 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 **** 186 **** **** 4.34 4.20 **** 3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 17 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 **** 186 **** **** 4.48 4.36 **** 4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance 17 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 **** 187 **** **** 4.34 4.13 ****  5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 17 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 **** 187 **** **** 4.20 4.02 ****  Seminar  1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 17 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 **** 66 **** 5.00 4.58 4.17 ****  2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 17 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 **** 66 **** 4.64 4.56 4.21 ****  4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned 17 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 **** 65 **** 4.57 4.41 2.87 ****  5. Were criteria for grading made clear 17 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 **** 65 **** 4.94 4.42 4.01 ****  5. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 17 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 **** 65 **** 4.94 4.42 4.01 ****  2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 17 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 **** 65 **** 4.50 4.49 4.73 ****  2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation 17 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 **** 36 **** 3.00 4.25 3.81 ****  3. Was the instructor available for consultation 17 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 **** 28 **** 4.50 4.42 ****  5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities 17 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 **** 28 **** 4.50 4.42 ****  5. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 17 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 **** 27 **** 4.50 4.42 ****  5. Did study questions make clear the expected goal 17 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 **** 21 **** 4.50 4.43 4.50 *****  2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal 17 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 **** 21 **** 4.50 5.00 ****  4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful 17 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 **** 21 **** 4.60 5.00 ****  4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful 17 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 **** 20 **** 4.60 5.00 ****	1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 189	****	****	4.34	4.26	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance 5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 7. 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 187 **** **** 4.33 4.11 ****  Seminar  1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned 5. Were criteria for grading made clear  Field Work  1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 7. 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 66 **** 4.64 4.56 4.21 ****  Field Work  1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 7. 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 64 **** 3.96 4.09 3.38 ****  Field Work  1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 7. 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 64 **** 3.96 4.09 3.38 ****  Field Work  1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 7. 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 64 **** 3.96 4.09 3.38 ****  Field Work  1. Did self-pace could you discuss your evaluations 7. 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 38 **** 4.50 4.49 4.73 ****  3. Was the instructor available for consultation 7. 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 28 **** 4.50 4.52 4.46 ****  5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities 7. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 8. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 9. Did study questions make clear the expected goal 9. Did study questions make clear the expected goal 9. Did study questions make clear the expected goal 9. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful 9. O 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 31 **** **** 4.57 5.00 ****  4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful 9. O 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 20 **** 4.60 5.00 ****  4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful 9. O 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 20 **** 4.60 5.00 ****  9. O 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 20 **** 4.60 5.00 ****  9. O 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 20 **** 4.60 5.00 ****  9. O 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0		17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 192	****	****	4.34	4.20	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance 5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 7. 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 187 **** **** 4.33 4.11 ****  Seminar  1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned 5. Were criteria for grading made clear  Field Work  1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 7. 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 66 **** 4.64 4.56 4.21 ****  Field Work  1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 7. 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 64 **** 3.96 4.09 3.38 ****  Field Work  1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 7. 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 64 **** 3.96 4.09 3.38 ****  Field Work  1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 7. 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 64 **** 3.96 4.09 3.38 ****  Field Work  1. Did self-pace could you discuss your evaluations 7. 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 38 **** 4.50 4.49 4.73 ****  3. Was the instructor available for consultation 7. 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 28 **** 4.50 4.52 4.46 ****  5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities 7. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 8. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 9. Did study questions make clear the expected goal 9. Did study questions make clear the expected goal 9. Did study questions make clear the expected goal 9. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful 9. O 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 31 **** **** 4.57 5.00 ****  4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful 9. O 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 20 **** 4.60 5.00 ****  4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful 9. O 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 20 **** 4.60 5.00 ****  9. O 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 20 **** 4.60 5.00 ****  9. O 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 20 **** 4.60 5.00 ****  9. O 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0	3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 186	****	****	4.48	4.36	****
Seminar  1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 17 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 66 **** 5.00 4.58 4.17 ****  2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 17 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 62 **** 4.64 4.56 4.21 ****  3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 17 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 58 **** 4.57 4.41 2.87 ****  4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned 17 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 65 **** 4.94 4.42 4.01 ****  5. Were criteria for grading made clear 17 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 64 **** 3.96 4.09 3.38 ****  Field Work  1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 17 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 38 **** 4.50 4.49 4.73 ****  2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 17 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 36 **** 3.00 4.25 3.81 ****  3. Was the instructor available for consultation 17 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 38 **** 4.50 4.52 4.46 ****  4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations 17 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 38 **** 4.50 4.52 4.46 ****  5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities 17 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 27 **** 4.50 4.43 4.50 ****  5. Did study questions make clear the expected goal 17 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 21 **** 4.50 4.43 4.50 ****  4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful 17 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 21 **** **** 4.57 5.00 ****  4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful 17 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 21 **** **** 4.60 5.00 ****  4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful 17 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 21 **** **** 4.60 5.00 ****	4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	17		0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 187	****	****	4.33	4.11	****
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 168	****	****	4.20	4.02	****
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme															
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 17 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 62 **** 4.64 4.56 4.21 **** 3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 17 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 58 **** 4.57 4.41 2.87 **** 4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned 17 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 65 **** 4.94 4.42 4.01 **** 5. Were criteria for grading made clear 17 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 64 **** 3.96 4.09 3.38 ****    Field Work  1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 17 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 38 **** 4.50 4.49 4.73 **** 2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 17 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 38 **** 4.50 4.49 4.73 **** 3. Was the instructor available for consultation 17 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 28 **** 4.50 4.52 4.46 **** 4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations 17 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 30 **** 4.50 4.30 4.42 **** 5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities 17 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 27 **** 4.50 4.33 4.42 **** 5. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 17 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 21 **** 4.50 4.43 4.50 **** 2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal 17 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 21 **** 4.50 4.43 4.50 **** 3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful 17 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 21 **** **** 4.64 5.00 **** 4.00 ***** 4.00 **** 4.00 **** 4.00 **** 4.00 **** 4.00 **** 4.00 **** 4.															
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned			-		-	-	-	_		,					
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned 17 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 **** 4.94 4.42 4.01 ****  5. Were criteria for grading made clear 17 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 **** 65 *** 4.94 4.42 4.01 ****  Field Work  1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 17 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 **** 4.50 4.49 4.73 ****  2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 17 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 **** 4.50 4.49 4.73 ****  3. Was the instructor available for consultation 17 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 **** 4.50 4.52 4.46 ****  4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations 17 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 **** 4.50 4.52 4.46 ****  5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities 17 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 **** 4.50 4.43 4.50 ****  Self Paced  1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 17 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 **** 4.50 4.43 4.50 ****  Self Paced  1. Did study questions make clear the expected goal 17 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 **** 21 **** **** 4.72 5.00 ****  3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful 17 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 **** 21 **** **** 4.64 5.00 ****  4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful 17 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 **** 20 **** **** 4.60 5.00 ****		17	0		0	0	0	1			****	4.64	4.56	4.21	
Field Work  1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 17 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 64 **** 3.96 4.09 3.38 ****  2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 17 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 38 **** 4.50 4.49 4.73 ****  3. Was the instructor available for consultation 17 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 36 **** 4.50 4.52 4.46 ****  4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations 17 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 30 **** 4.50 4.52 4.46 ****  5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities 17 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 27 **** 4.50 4.43 4.50 ****  Self Paced  1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 17 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 27 **** 4.50 4.43 4.50 ****  Self paced  1. Did study questions make clear the expected goal 17 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 21 **** 4.50 4.45 5.00 ****  3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful 17 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 20 **** 4.60 5.00 ****  4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful 17 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 20 **** 4.60 5.00 ****							-	1		,				2.87	
Field Work  1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 17 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 38 **** 4.50 4.49 4.73 ****  2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 17 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 36 **** 3.00 4.25 3.81 ****  3. Was the instructor available for consultation 17 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 28 **** 4.50 4.52 4.46 ****  4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations 17 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 28 **** 4.50 4.30 4.42 ****  5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities 17 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 27 **** 4.50 4.43 4.50 ****  Self Paced  1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 17 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 27 **** 4.50 4.43 4.50 ****  2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal 17 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 21 **** **** 4.72 5.00 ****  3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful 17 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 21 **** **** 4.64 5.00 ****  4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful 17 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 20 **** **** 4.60 5.00 ****			-	-	-	-	•	_		,					
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 17 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 38 **** 4.50 4.49 4.73 ****  2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 17 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 36 **** 3.00 4.25 3.81 ****  3. Was the instructor available for consultation 17 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 28 **** 4.50 4.52 4.46 ****  4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations 17 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 30 **** 4.50 4.30 4.42 ****  5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities 17 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 27 **** 4.50 4.43 4.50 ****  Self Paced  1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 17 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 31 **** **** 4.72 5.00 ****  2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal 17 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 21 **** **** 4.57 5.00 ****  3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful 17 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 31 **** **** 4.64 5.00 ****  4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful 17 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 20 **** **** 4.60 5.00 ****	5. Were criteria for grading made clear	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 64	****	3.96	4.09	3.38	****
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 17 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 38 **** 4.50 4.49 4.73 ****  2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 17 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 36 **** 3.00 4.25 3.81 ****  3. Was the instructor available for consultation 17 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 28 **** 4.50 4.52 4.46 ****  4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations 17 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 30 **** 4.50 4.30 4.42 ****  5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities 17 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 27 **** 4.50 4.43 4.50 ****  Self Paced  1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 17 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 31 **** **** 4.72 5.00 ****  2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal 17 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 21 **** **** 4.57 5.00 ****  3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful 17 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 31 **** **** 4.64 5.00 ****  4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful 17 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 20 **** **** 4.60 5.00 ****															
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 17 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 36 **** 3.00 4.25 3.81 ****  3. Was the instructor available for consultation 17 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 28 **** 4.50 4.52 4.46 ****  4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations 17 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 30 **** 4.50 4.30 4.42 ****  5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities 17 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 27 **** 4.50 4.43 4.50 ****  Self Paced  1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 17 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 31 **** **** 4.72 5.00 ****  2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal 17 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 21 **** **** 4.57 5.00 ****  3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful 17 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 31 **** **** 4.64 5.00 ****  4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful 17 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 20 **** **** 4.60 5.00 ****				•	•							4 50	4 40	4 50	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation 17 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 28 **** 4.50 4.52 4.46 **** 4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations 17 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 30 **** 4.50 4.30 4.42 **** 5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities 17 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 27 **** 4.50 4.43 4.50 ****  Self Paced  1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 17 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 31 **** **** 4.72 5.00 ****  2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal 17 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 21 **** **** 4.57 5.00 **** 3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful 17 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 31 **** **** 4.64 5.00 **** 4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful 17 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 20 **** **** 4.60 5.00 ****						-	-	_		,					
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations 17 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 **** 4.50 4.30 4.42 ****  5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities 17 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 **** 4.50 4.43 4.50 ****  Self Paced  1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 17 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 **** 4.72 5.00 ****  2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal 17 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 **** 4.57 5.00 ****  3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful 17 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 **** 4.64 5.00 ****  4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful 17 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 **** 4.60 5.00 ****							-			,					
Self Paced  1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 17 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 27 **** 4.50 4.43 4.50 ****  2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal 17 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 21 **** **** 4.72 5.00 ****  3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful 17 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 31 **** **** 4.64 5.00 ****  4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful 17 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 20 **** **** 4.60 5.00 ****							-			,					
Self Paced  1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 17 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 31 **** **** 4.72 5.00 ****  2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal 17 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 21 **** **** 4.57 5.00 ****  3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful 17 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 31 **** **** 4.64 5.00 ****  4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful 17 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 20 **** **** 4.60 5.00 ****			-		-	-	-	_		,					
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 17 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 31 **** **** 4.72 5.00 ****  2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal 17 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 21 **** **** 4.57 5.00 ****  3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful 17 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 31 **** **** 4.64 5.00 ****  4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful 17 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 20 **** **** 4.60 5.00 ****	5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	Τ./	0	0	0	0	U	Τ	5.00	****/ 27	****	4.50	4.43	4.50	****
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 17 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 31 **** **** 4.72 5.00 ****  2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal 17 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 21 **** **** 4.57 5.00 ****  3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful 17 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 31 **** **** 4.64 5.00 ****  4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful 17 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 20 **** **** 4.60 5.00 ****	Colf Dogod														
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal 17 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 **** 21 **** **** 4.57 5.00 **** 3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful 17 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 **** 31 **** **** 4.64 5.00 **** 4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful 17 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 **** 20 **** *** 4.60 5.00 ****		17	0	0	0	0	0	1	E 00	****/ 21	****	****	1 72	E 00	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful 17 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 31 **** **** 4.64 5.00 **** 4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful 17 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 20 **** **** 4.60 5.00 ****							-	_		,					
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful 17 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 20 **** **** 4.60 5.00 ****										,					
										, -					
3. Were energy proceeds for all the students 17 0 0 0 0 1 3.00 / 13 4.01 3.00			-	-	-	-	-	_		, =0					
	3. Here there enough proceeds for all the students	Δ/	U	U	U	U	U	_	5.00	, 15			1.01	5.00	

Title Policy-Making Process

Instructor: Hussey,Laura S.
Fnrollment: 28

Enrollment: 28
Questionnaires: 18

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2010 Page 1164 JUN 28, 2010 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits E	Earned	Cum. GPA		Expecte	d Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	Α	5 5	Required for Majors	14	Graduate	0	Major	14
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	В	10						
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	1	C	1	General	1	Under-grad	18	Non-major	4
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	5	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means	there	are not enough	n
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	0	_			
				?	0						

Course-Section: POLI 352 1

Administrative Law

Title Miller, Kerwin

Instructor:

Enrollment: 35 Questionnaires: 21

## University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2010

Page 1165 JUN 28, 2010 Job IRBR3029

Ouestions	NR	NΔ	Fre	equer 2	ncies 3	5 4	5	Inst Mean	ructor Rank	Course	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
Žucaciona														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	1	0	1	6	12	4.40	723/1447	4.40	4.56	4.31	4.32	4.40
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	7	13	4.65	364/1447	4.65	4.43	4.27	4.23	4.65
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	3	17	4.85	186/1241	4.85	4.63	4.33	4.33	4.85
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	7	0	0	0	4	9	4.69	281/1402	4.69	4.40	4.24	4.24	4.69
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	1	4	14	4.68	223/1358	4.68	4.42	4.11	4.10	4.68
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	6	0	0	0	3	10	4.77	158/1316	4.77	4.41	4.14	4.13	4.77
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	0	0	4	15	4.79	172/1427	4.79	4.41	4.19	4.15	4.79
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0 1	0 1	0	0	1 10	18 3	4.95	291/1447	4.95	4.75	4.69	4.65	4.95
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	1	Τ	U	U	10	3	4.00	849/1434	4.00	4.24	4.10	4.09	4.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	0	0	18	5.00	1/1387	5.00	4.68	4.46	4.44	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	0	1	17	4.94	317/1387	4.94	4.86	4.73	4.71	4.94
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	0	2	16	4.89	159/1386	4.89	4.51	4.32	4.30	4.89
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	2	16	4.89	181/1380	4.89	4.47	4.32	4.32	4.89
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	2	0	0	2	3	10	4.53	268/1193	4.53	3.92	4.02	4.05	4.53
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	12	0	1	0	3	2	3	3.67	925/1172	3.67	4.37	4.15	4.24	3.67
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	13	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	229/1182	4.88	4.60	4.35	4.42	4.88
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	12	0	0	0	1	0	8	4.78	364/1170	4.78	4.63	4.38	4.49	4.78
4. Were special techniques successful	12	2	0	1	3	0	3	3.71	596/ 800	3.71	4.14	4.06	4.12	3.71
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	20	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 189	****	****	4.34	4.26	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 192	***	****	4.34	4.20	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	20	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 186	****	****	4.48	4.36	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance 5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	20 20	0 0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 187 ****/ 168	****	****	4.33	4.11 4.02	****
5. Were requirements for tab reports creatry specified	20	U	U	U	U	U	_	3.00	/ 108			4.20	4.02	
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 66	****	5.00	4.58	4.17	***
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	20	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 62	****	4.64	4.56	4.21	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	20	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 58	****	4.57	4.41	2.87	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	20	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 65	****	4.94	4.42	4.01	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 64	****	3.96	4.09	3.38	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 38	****	4.50	4.49	4.73	***
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 36	****	3.00	4.25	3.81	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 28	****	4.50	4.52	4.46	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 30	****	4.50	4.30	4.42	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 27	****	4.50	4.43	4.50	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.72	5.00	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 21	****	****	4.57	5.00	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.64	5.00	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 20	****	****	4.60	5.00	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	20	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 15	****	****	4.61	5.00	****
		-	-	-	•	-	_		, _3					

Course-Section: POLI 352 1 Title

Administrative Law

Instructor: Miller, Kerwin Enrollment: 35 Questionnaires: 21

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2010

Page 1165 JUN 28, 2010 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expecte	d Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	1	A	12	Required for Majors	9	Graduate	0	Major	12
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	В	4						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	2	C	2	General	2	Under-grad	21	Non-major	9
84-150	6	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	7	F	0	Electives	4	#### - Means	there	are not enoug	h
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	1	-			
				?	1						

Comprtive Poli Analysi

Title Instructor: Grodsky, Brian

Enrollment: 29

Questionnaires: 29

#### University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2010

Page 1166 JUN 28, 2010 Job IRBR3029

			Fre	mier	ncies			Tnst	tructor	Course	Dent	TIMBC	Level	Sect
Ouestions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	5	0	0	0	0	5	19	4.79	265/1447	4.72	4.56	4.31	4.32	4.79
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	5	0	0	0	0	5	19	4.79	206/1447	4.60	4.43	4.27	4.23	4.79
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	5	14	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1241	4.80	4.63	4.33	4.33	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	5	0	0	0	1	5	18	4.71	270/1402	4.65	4.40	4.24	4.24	4.71
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	3	21	4.88	102/1358	4.82	4.42	4.11	4.10	4.88
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	2	22	4.92	68/1316	4.80	4.41	4.14	4.13	4.92
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	6	0	0	0	1	6	16	4.65	292/1427	4.41	4.41	4.19	4.15	4.65
8. How many times was class cancelled	5	0	0	0	0	1	23	4.96	243/1447	4.98	4.75	4.69	4.65	4.96
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	10	0	0	0	0	7	12	4.63	254/1434	4.39	4.24	4.10	4.09	4.63
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	5	0	0	0	0	4	20	4.83	307/1387	4.77	4.68	4.46	4.44	4.83
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	5	0	0	0	0	1	23	4.96	264/1387	4.89	4.86	4.73	4.71	4.96
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	5	0	0	0	0	5	19	4.79	265/1386	4.63	4.51	4.32	4.30	4.79
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	1	1	22	4.88	193/1380	4.75	4.47	4.32	4.32	4.88
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	7	0	1	1	4	7	9	4.00	652/1193	4.03	3.92	4.02	4.05	4.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	0	3	18	4.86	152/1172	4.86	4.37	4.15	4.24	4.86
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	0	0	0	3	18	4.86	250/1182	4.75	4.60	4.35	4.42	4.86
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	0	0	0	2	19	4.90	223/1170	4.85	4.63	4.38	4.49	4.90
4. Were special techniques successful	8	0	0	0	4	5	12	4.38	261/ 800	4.40	4.14	4.06	4.12	4.38
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	27	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 189	****	****	4.34	4.26	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	27	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 192	****	****	4.34	4.20	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	27	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 186	****	****	4.48	4.36	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	27	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 187	****	****	4.33	4.11	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	27	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 168	****	****	4.20	4.02	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	26	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 66	****	5.00	4.58	4.17	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	26	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 62	****	4.64	4.56	4.21	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	26	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 58	****	4.57	4.41	2.87	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	26	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 65	****	4.94	4.42	4.01	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	26	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 64	****	3.96	4.09	3.38	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	27	0	0	0	0	0	2		****/ 38	****	4.50	4.49	4.73	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	27	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 36	****	3.00	4.25	3.81	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	27	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 28	****	4.50	4.52	4.46	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	27 27	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 30	****	4.50	4.30	4.42	****
. Did conferences help you carry out field activities		0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 27	****	4.50	4.43	4.50	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	26	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 31	****	****	4.72	5.00	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	26	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 21	****	****	4.57	5.00	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	26	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 31	****	****	4.64	5.00	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	26	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 20	****	****	4.60	5.00	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	26	2	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 15	****	****	4.61	5.00	****

Title Comprtive Poli Analysi

Instructor: Grodsky, Brian

Enrollment: 29
Questionnaires: 29

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2010 Page 1166 JUN 28, 2010 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits	Earned	Cum. GPA		Expecte	d Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	 А	6	Required for Majors	13	Graduate	0	Major	17
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	1	В	11						
56-83	5	2.00-2.99	4	C	2	General	2	Under-grad	29	Non-major	12
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	3	#### - Means	there	are not enough	n
				P	0			responses to	be sig	nificant	
				I	0	Other	0	_	_		
				?	0						

Title Comprtive Poli Analysi

Instructor: Grodsky, Brian

Enrollment: 28
Questionnaires: 17

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2010 Page 1167 JUN 28, 2010 Job IRBR3029

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

		Question		NR	NA	Fr	equei 2	ncies 3	4	5	Inst Mean	tructor Ran		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean	
		Genera	1																
1. Did yo	ou gain ne	ew insights,ski	lls fro	m this course	0	0	0	0	0	6	11	4.65	430/1	447	4.72	4.56	4.31	4.32	4.65
2. Did th	e instruc	ctor make clear	the exp	pected goals	0	0	0	0	2	6	9	4.41	662/1	447	4.60	4.43	4.27	4.23	4.41
		estions reflec			0	12	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	451/1	241	4.80	4.63	4.33	4.33	4.60
4. Did ot	her evalu	ations reflect	the exp	pected goals	0	0	0	0	1	5	11	4.59	402/1	402	4.65	4.40	4.24	4.24	4.59
				what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	2	14	4.76	165/1	358	4.82	4.42	4.11	4.10	4.76
		-		o what you learned	0	1	0	0	0	5		4.69	221/1	316	4.80	4.41	4.14	4.13	4.69
		g system clearl		ined	0	0	0	1	2	7	7	4.18	858/1		4.41	4.41	4.19	4.15	4.18
	-	was class canc			0	0	0	0	0	0	17	5.00	1/1		4.98	4.75	4.69	4.65	5.00
9. How wo	ould you g	grade the overa	ll teac	hing effectiveness	4	0	0	0	3	5	5	4.15	744/1	434	4.39	4.24	4.10	4.09	4.15
		Lectur	е																
1. Were t	he instru	actor's lecture	s well ;	prepared	0	0	0	0	1	3	13	4.71	506/1	387	4.77	4.68	4.46	4.44	4.71
		ctor seem inter			0	0	0	0	0	3	14	4.82	732/1	387	4.89	4.86	4.73	4.71	4.82
3. Was le	cture mat	erial presente	d and e	xplained clearly	0	0	0	0	2	5	10	4.47	649/1	386	4.63	4.51	4.32	4.30	4.47
4. Did th	e lecture	es contribute t	o what	you learned	1	0	0	0	1	4	11	4.63	520/1	380	4.75	4.47	4.32	4.32	4.63
5. Did au	diovisual	l techniques en	hance y	our understanding	0	0	0	1	3	7	6	4.06	632/1	193	4.03	3.92	4.02	4.05	4.06
		Discus	sion																
1. Did cl	1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned							0	0	2	12	4.86	152/1	172	4.86	4.37	4.15	4.24	4.86
	. Were all students actively encouraged to participate							0	2	1	11	4.64	450/1		4.75	4.60	4.35	4.42	4.64
	. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion						0	0	1	1	12		352/1		4.85	4.63	4.38	4.49	4.79
	4. Were special techniques successful					0 0	1	0	1	2	10	4.43			4.40			4.12	
		Labora	toru																
2. Were y	ou provid		_	ground information	16	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/	192	****	****	4.34	4.20	****
		Semina	r																
4. Did pr	esentatio	ons contribute		you learned	16	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/	65	****	4.94	4.42	4.01	****
		Field	Work																
1. Did fi	eld exper	rience contribu	te to w	hat you learned	16	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/	38	****	4.50	4.49	4.73	****
2. Did yo	ou clearly	understand yo	ur eval	uation criteria	16	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/	36	****	3.00	4.25	3.81	****
3. Was th	e instruc	ctor available	for con	sultation	16	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/	28	****	4.50	4.52	4.46	****
4. To wha	ıt degree	could you disc	uss you	r evaluations	16	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/	30	****	4.50	4.30	4.42	****
5. Did co	nferences	s help you carr	y out f	ield activities	16	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/	27	****	4.50	4.43	4.50	****
		Self	Paced																
1. Did se	elf-paced			what you learned	16	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/	31	****	****	4.72	5.00	****
3. Were y	<ol> <li>Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned</li> <li>Were your contacts with the instructor helpful</li> </ol>					0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/	31	****	****	4.64	5.00	****
Fr						Dis	trib	utio	ı										
Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grade								Rea	asons					Тур	oe .			Majors	5
	00-27 0 0 00-0 99 0 7 7																		
00-27 0 0.00-0.99 0 A 7 28-55 0 1.00-1.99 0 B 8						Red	quir	ed fo	or Ma	jor	s 1	.2	Grad	uate	2	0	Majo	r	12
28-55 0 1.00-1.99 0 B 8 56-83 2 2.00-2.99 1 C 1						Gei	nera	1				3	Unde	r-gr	rad 1	.7	Non-	-major	5
84-150 2 3.00-3.49 1 D 0														_				_	
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5	F 0		Ele	ecti	ves				1	####	- N	Means t	here a	are not	enoug	jh
				P 0									resp	onse	es to b	e sigr	nificar	nt	
				- 0	0+h							^							

Other

0

0

0

I

Course-Section: POLI 385 01

International Security

Title Hagerty,Devin T Instructor:

Enrollment: 25 Questionnaires: 20

#### University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2010

Page 1168 JUN 28, 2010 Job IRBR3029

			Fre	equer	ncie	s		Inst	tructor	Course	Dept.	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank		_		Mean	
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	2	18	4.90	148/1447	4.90	4.56	4.31	4.32	4.90
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	7	12	4.55	479/1447	4.55	4.43	4.27	4.23	4.55
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	17	4.85	186/1241	4.85	4.63	4.33	4.33	4.85
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	9	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	93/1402	4.91	4.40	4.24	4.24	4.91
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	1	0	3	15	4.50	345/1358	4.50	4.42	4.11	4.10	4.50
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	13	1	0	0	0	6	4.43	476/1316	4.43	4.41	4.14	4.13	4.43
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	4	15	4.70	256/1427	4.70	4.41	4.19	4.15	4.70
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	1	11	8		1189/1447	4.35	4.75	4.69	4.65	4.35
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	1	4	15	4.70	206/1434			4.10	4.09	4.70
T														
Lecture	^	^	0	0	0	-1	1 77	1 0 1	100/1005	1 0 1	4 60	1 10	1 11	4 0 4
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	0		17	4.94		4.94		4.46	4.44	4.94
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	1	17	4.94	317/1387	4.94	4.86	4.73	4.71	4.94
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	0	3	15	4.83	217/1386	4.83	4.51	4.32	4.30	4.83
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	2	16	4.89	181/1380	4.89	4.47	4.32	4.32	4.89
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	3	2	1	1	5	5	3.71	867/1193	3.71	3.92	4.02	4.05	3.71
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1172	5.00	4.37	4.15	4.24	5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	13	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	250/1182	4.86	4.60	4.35	4.42	4.86
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	13	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	275/1170	4.86	4.63	4.38	4.49	4.86
4. Were special techniques successful	13	3	0	0	0	2	2		****/ 800	****	4.14	4.06	4.12	****
		_	-	-	-	_	_		,					
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 189	****	****	4.34	4.26	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 192	****	****	4.34	4.20	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 186	****	****	4.48	4.36	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 187	****	****	4.33	4.11	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 168	****	****	4.20	4.02	****
Seminar														
	1.0	0	0	0	0	0	2	г оо	++++/ ((	****	г оо	4 50	1 17	****
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	18				-	-	2		****/ 66	****	5.00	4.58	4.17	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	18	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 62	****	4.64	4.56	4.21	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	0	0	0	2		****/ 58		4.57	4.41	2.87	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	0	0	0	2		****/ 65	****	4.94	4.42	4.01	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	18	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 64	****	3.96	4.09	3.38	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 38	****	4.50	4.49	4.73	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 36	****	3.00	4.25	3.81	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	19	0	0	0	0	0	1			****	4.50	4.52	4.46	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	18	0	0	0	0	1	1		****/ 30	****	4.50	4.30	4.42	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	19	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 27	****	4.50	4.43	4.50	****
5. Did conferences help for early out field accivities		· ·	J	Ü	Ü	Ü	-	3.00	, 2,		1.50	1.15	1.30	
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.72	5.00	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 21	****	****	4.57	5.00	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.64	5.00	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 20	****	****	4.60	5.00	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	18	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 15	****	****	4.61	5.00	****

Course-Section: POLI 385 01

Title International Security

Instructor: Hagerty, Devin T

Enrollment: 25
Questionnaires: 20

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2010 Page 1168 JUN 28, 2010 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expecte	d Grades	Reasons		Type	Majors		
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	7	Required for Majors	10	Graduate	0	Major	12
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	11						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	2	C	2	General	1	Under-grad	20	Non-major	8
84-150	10	3.00-3.49	6	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	7	F	0	Electives	4	#### - Means	there	are not enough	n
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	1	-			
				?	0						

Course-Section: POLI 388 01 University of Maryland Title Internatl Confl & Coop

Baltimore County Spring 2010

Instructor: Miller, Nicholas

Enrollment:	36
Questionnaires:	22

Page 1169 JUN 28, 2010 Job IRBR3029

Student	Course	Evaluation	Questionnaire

			Fre	equer		3	-		ructor	Course	_		Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	Τ	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	0	0	0	9	12	4.57	507/1447	4.57	4.56	4.31	4.32	4.57
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	2	5	14	4.57	457/1447	4.57	4.43	4.27	4.23	4.57
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	1	1	4	15	4.57	478/1241	4.57	4.63	4.33	4.33	4.57
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	1	3	4	13	4.38	635/1402	4.38	4.40	4.24	4.24	4.38
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	2	0	1	7	11	4.19	663/1358	4.19	4.42	4.11	4.10	4.19
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	2	7	12	4.48	423/1316	4.48	4.41	4.14	4.13	4.48
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	1	3	4	13	4.38	620/1427	4.38	4.41	4.19	4.15	4.38
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	3	18	4.86	619/1447	4.86	4.75	4.69	4.65	4.86
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	1	1	0	2	6	7	4.13	775/1434	4.13	4.24	4.10	4.09	4.13
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	0	2	18	4.90	200/1387	4.90	4.68	4.46	4.44	4.90
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	2	18	4.90	528/1387	4.90	4.86	4.73	4.71	4.90
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	2	5	13	4.55	558/1386	4.55	4.51	4.32	4.30	4.55
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	3	3	13	4.53	637/1380	4.53	4.47	4.32	4.32	4.53
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	1	1	0	1	3	13	4.50	288/1193	4.50	3.92	4.02	4.05	4.50
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	12	Ω	Λ	1	1	2	6	4.30	546/1172	4.30	4.37	4.15	4.24	4.30
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	12	0	1	0	0	1	Ω	4.50	553/1182	4.50	4.60	4.35	4.42	4.50
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	12	0	0	1	0	0	9	4.70	459/1170	4.70	4.63	4.38	4.49	4.70
4. Were special techniques successful			2	0	0	0	5	3.86	537/ 800	3.86	4.14	4.06	4.12	3.86
4. Were special techniques successiui			2	0	J	U	J	3.00	3377 000	3.00	1.11	1.00	1.12	3.00
Frequ			rib	ution	ı									

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	d Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	3	Required for Majors	9	Graduate	0	Major	13
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	8						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	2	C	3	General	1	Under-grad	22	Non-major	9
84-150	9	3.00-3.49	6	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	5	#### - Means	there	are not enough	h
				P	1			responses to	be sig	nificant	
				I	0	Other	2	-	_		
				?	2						

Title American Foreign Polic

Instructor: Starkey, Brigid

Enrollment:

30 Questionnaires: 22

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2010

Page 1170 JUN 28, 2010 Job IRBR3029

			Fre	milar	ncies			Inat	ructor	Course	Dent	UMBC	Lezzel	Sect
Ouestions	NR	NΔ	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
׫«»«»»														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	0	0	0	1	20	4.95	74/1447	4.95	4.56	4.31	4.32	4.95
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	3	18	4.86	154/1447	4.86	4.43	4.27	4.23	4.86
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	2	19	4.90	141/1241	4.90	4.63	4.33	4.33	4.90
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	2	19	4.90	93/1402	4.90	4.40	4.24	4.24	4.90
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	2	19	4.90	87/1358	4.90	4.42	4.11	4.10	4.90
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	1	0	0	1	2	17	4.80	128/1316	4.80	4.41	4.14	4.13	4.80
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	1	2	1	17	4.62	328/1427	4.62	4.41	4.19	4.15	4.62
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	2	19	4.90	485/1447	4.90	4.75	4.69	4.65	4.90
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	0	4	15	4.79	133/1434	4.79	4.24	4.10	4.09	4.79
Lecture	_	•	0	•	•	-	1.0	4 05	100/1205	4 05	4 60	4 46	4 4 4	4 05
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3 4	0	0	0	0	1	18	4.95	120/1387	4.95	4.68	4.46	4.44	4.95
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject		0	0	0	0	0	18	5.00	1/1387	5.00	4.86	4.73	4.71	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	0	1		4.95	82/1386	4.95		4.32	4.30	4.95
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	1		4.95	95/1380	4.95	4.47	4.32	4.32	4.95
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	6	1	0	2	1	9	4.31	440/1193	4.31	3.92	4.02	4.05	4.31
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	124/1172	4.91	4.37	4.15	4.24	4.91
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	11	0	0	0	1	0	10	4.82	292/1182	4.82	4.60	4.35	4.42	4.82
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	11	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1170	5.00	4.63	4.38	4.49	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	11	2	0	0	0	3		4.67	133/ 800	4.67	4.14		4.12	4.67
•														
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 189	****	****	4.34	4.26	***
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 192	****	****	4.34	4.20	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 186	****	****	4.48	4.36	***
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	21	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 187	****	****	4.33	4.11	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 168	****	****	4.20	4.02	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 66	****	5.00	4.58	4.17	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	21	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 62	****	4.64	4.56	4.21	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	21	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 58	****	4.57	4.41	2.87	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	21	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 65	****	4.94	4.42	4.01	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	21	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 64	****	3.96	4.09	3.38	****
									,					
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 38	****	4.50	4.49	4.73	***
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 36	****	3.00	4.25	3.81	***
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 28	****	4.50	4.52	4.46	***
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 30	****	4.50	4.30	4.42	***
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 27	****	4.50	4.43	4.50	****
0.15 01														
Self Paced		0	0	0	0	0	1	E 00	****/ 31	****	****	1 70	E 00	****
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	21 21	0	0	0	0	0	1		,	****	****	4.72	5.00	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal		0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00 5.00	****/ 21 ****/ 31	****	****	4.57 4.64	5.00 5.00	****
. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful . Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful		0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 20	****	****	4.64	5.00	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	21 21	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 15	****	****	4.60	5.00	****
J. Were there enough proceeds for all the students	<b>4</b>	U	J	J	U	U	Т	5.00	/ 15			4.01	5.00	

Title American Foreign Polic

Instructor: Starkey, Brigid

Enrollment: 30
Questionnaires: 22

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2010 Page 1170 JUN 28, 2010 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits Ea	arned	ned Cum. GPA			d Grades	Reasons		Type	Majors		
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	10	Required for Majors	13	Graduate	0	Major	13
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	6						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	3	C	0	General	2	Under-grad	22	Non-major	9
84-150	9	3.00-3.49	5	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means	there	are not enough	n
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	0	-			
				?	0						

Course-Section: POLI 395 01

Title U.S. Nat'l Security Po

Instructor: Dasgupta, Sunil

Enrollment: 10
Questionnaires: 10

#### University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2010

Page 1171 JUN 28, 2010 Job IRBR3029

		Frequencies					Inst	ructor	Course Dept		UMBC Level		Sect	
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course			0	0	1	2	5	4.50	585/1447	4.50	4.56	4.31	4.32	4.50
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	0	2	1	1	4	3.88	1161/1447	3.88	4.43	4.27	4.23	3.88
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	4	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	282/1241	4.75	4.63	4.33	4.33	4.75
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	1	0	1	2	1	3	3.86	1107/1402	3.86	4.40	4.24	4.24	3.86
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	201/1358	4.71	4.42	4.11	4.10	4.71
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	1	2	4	4.43	476/1316	4.43	4.41	4.14	4.13	4.43
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	3	0	1	0	3	3	0	3.14	1351/1427	3.14	4.41	4.19	4.15	3.14
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	619/1447	4.86	4.75	4.69	4.65	4.86
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	1	1	4	2	3.88	1003/1434	3.88	4.24	4.10	4.09	3.88
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	2	2	4	4.25	1039/1387	4.25	4.68	4.46	4.44	4.25
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1387	5.00	4.86	4.73	4.71	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	1	4	3	4.25	879/1386	4.25	4.51	4.32	4.30	4.25
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	2	1	5	4.38	783/1380	4.38	4.47	4.32	4.32	4.38
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	6	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/1193	***	3.92	4.02	4.05	****
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	1	2	5	4.50	377/1172	4.50	4.37	4.15	4.24	4.50
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	1	1	6	4.63	470/1182	4.63	4.60	4.35	4.42	4.63
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	1	1	1	4	4.14	827/1170	4.14	4.63	4.38	4.49	4.14
4. Were special techniques successful	3	4	0	1	1	0	1	3.33	701/ 800	3.33	4.14	4.06		3.33
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	9	0	0	0	0	Λ	1	5 00	****/ 66	****	5.00	4.58	4 17	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	9	0	0	0	0	1	0	5.00	****/ 62	****	4.64	4.56	4.21	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned			0	0	0	1	0		****/ 58	****	4.57	4.41	2.87	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	9 9	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 65	****	4.94	4.42	4.01	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	9	0	0	0	0	1	0	5.00	****/ 64	****	3.96	4.09	3.38	****
o. Here driver and grading made crear	,	J	J	J	J	_	J	1.00	, 01		3.50	1.00	3.30	

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

Course-Section: POLI 401 08 University of Mary Title Individual Study In Po Baltimore Count Instructor: Lanoue, George R Spring 2010

University of Maryland Page 1172
Baltimore County JUN 28, 2010
Spring 2010 Job IRBR3029

Enrollment:	1				
Questionnaires:	1	Student	Course	Evaluation	Questionnaire

			Fr	Frequencies				Inst	ructor	Course Dept		Dept UMBC Le		Sect
Questions			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	1	5.00	1/1447	4.85	4.56	4.31	4.43	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1447	4.73	4.43	4.27	4.31	5.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1241	5.00	4.63	4.33	4.41	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1402	4.38	4.40	4.24	4.34	5.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1358	4.36	4.42	4.11	4.15	5.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1316	4.50	4.41	4.14	4.27	5.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1427	4.68	4.41	4.19	4.20	5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1447	4.96	4.75	4.69	4.72	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness			0	0	0	1	0	4.00	849/1434	4.06	4.24	4.10	4.17	4.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1176/1387	4.19	4.68	4.46	4.48	4.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1387	4.94	4.86	4.73	4.76	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1047/1386	4.38	4.51	4.32	4.34	4.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1030/1380	4.38	4.47	4.32	4.34	4.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	652/1193	4.00	3.92	4.02	4.00	4.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1172	4.71	4.37	4.15	4.25	5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1182		4.60	4.35	4.49	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1170	5.00	4.63	4.38	4.51	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful			0	0	0	1	0	4.00	423/ 800		4.14	4.06	4.19	4.00
Freq	ıency	Dis	trib	utio	n									
Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades			Reasons						ТУ	pe			Majors	ŀ

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

Course-Section: POLI 401 16

Individual Study In Po VanHoven,Jonath

Instructor:

Enrollment: 13 Questionnaires: 13

Title

#### University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2010

Page 1173 JUN 28, 2010 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Eva	luation Questionnaire
--------------------	-----------------------

Questions			Fre	equer 2	ncies 3	5 4	5	Inst Mean	ructor Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean		Sect Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	2	0	11	4.69	375/1447	4.85	4.56	4.31	4.43	4.69
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	0	10	4.46	590/1447	4.73	4.43	4.27	4.31	4.46
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	11	0	0	0	0	2		****/1241	5.00	4.63	4.33	4.41	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	5	0	1	2	3	2		1163/1402	4.38	4.40	4.24		3.75
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	6	1	1	1	0	4		1050/1358	4.36	4.42	4.11	4.15	3.71
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	4	0	0	4	1	4	4.00	812/1316	4.50	4.41	4.14	4.27	4.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	2	0	1	1	2	7	4.36	644/1427	4.68	4.41	4.19	4.20	4.36
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	12	4.92	388/1447	4.96	4.75	4.69	4.72	4.92
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	1	0	0	1	5	2	4.13	775/1434	4.06	4.24	4.10	4.17	4.13
T														
Lecture	_	•	0	1	0	_	_	4 20	001/1005	4 10	4 60	4 46	4 40	4 20
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	5	0	0	Ţ	0	2	5	4.38	931/1387	4.19	4.68	4.46	4.48	4.38
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	5	0	0	0	0	Ţ	7	4.88	604/1387	4.94	4.86	4.73	4.76	4.88
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	5	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	316/1386	4.38	4.51	4.32	4.34	4.75
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	339/1380	4.38	4.47	4.32	4.34	4.75
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	6	4	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/1193	4.00	3.92	4.02	4.00	***
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	1	2	4	4.43	445/1172	4.71	4.37	4.15	4.25	4.43
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	250/1182	4.93	4.60	4.35	4.49	4.86
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1170	5.00	4.63	4.38	4.51	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	6	2	1	0	0	2	2	3.80	562/ 800	3.90	4.14	4.06	4.19	3.80
4. Were special techniques successium	0	4	1	U	U	4	2	3.00	302/ 800	3.90	4.14	4.00	4.13	3.00
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 38	****	4.50	4.49	4.68	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	10	0	1	0	0	2	0	3.00	****/ 36	****	3.00	4.25	4.42	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	10	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 28	****	4.50	4.52	4.72	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	10	2	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 27	****	4.50	4.43	4.62	****
• • •														

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expecte	ed Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0		12	Required for Majors	5	Graduate	0	Major	8
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	0						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	1	Under-grad	13	Non-major	5
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	6	#### - Means	there	are not enough	
				P	0			responses to	be sig	nificant	
				I	0	Other	0	=	_		
					0						

Course-Section: POLI 409 01 Universititle Selected Topics Poli S Balti

Title Selected Topics Poli S
Instructor: Forestiere, Caro

Enrollment: 11
Questionnaires: 10

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2010 Page 1174 JUN 28, 2010 Job IRBR3029

#### Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

			Fre	equer	ncies	3		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	2	2	6	4.40	723/1447	4.68	4.56	4.31	4.43	4.40
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	2	6	4.40	677/1447	4.52	4.43	4.27	4.31	4.40
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	6	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1241	4.87	4.63	4.33	4.41	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	259/1402	4.82	4.40	4.24	4.34	4.71
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	1	0	4	4	4.22	635/1358	4.32	4.42	4.11	4.15	4.22
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	2	7	4.60	292/1316	4.66	4.41	4.14	4.27	4.60
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	7	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	680/1427	4.41	4.41	4.19	4.20	4.33
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	1	0	0	9	4.70	928/1447	4.63	4.75	4.69	4.72	4.70
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	3	7	4.70	206/1434	4.34	4.24	4.10	4.17	4.70
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	3	6	4.67	566/1387	4.72	4.68	4.46	4.48	4.67
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1387	4.95	4.86	4.73	4.76	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1386	4.83	4.51	4.32	4.34	5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	312/1380	4.78	4.47	4.32	4.34	4.78
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	8	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1193	3.50	3.92	4.02	4.00	****
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	377/1172	4.80	4.37	4.15	4.25	4.50
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1182	4.93	4.60	4.35	4.49	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1170	4.93	4.63	4.38	4.51	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	6	1	1	0	0	0	2	3.67	612/ 800	4.33	4.14	4.06	4.19	3.67

Credits Ea	Credits Earned			Expected	Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	9	Required for Majors	5	Graduate	0	Major	10
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	0						
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	10	Non-major	0
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	8	F	0	Electives	5	#### - Means	there	are not enough	n
				P	0			responses to	be sig	nificant	
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	1						

Course-Section: POLI 409 02 Univers
Title Selected Topics Poli S Balt

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2010

Title Selected Topics Poli S Instructor: Snyder,Quddus Z

Enrollment: 17
Questionnaires: 15

Page 1175 JUN 28, 2010 Job IRBR3029

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

					Frequencies				Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect			
		Question	3		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		Genera	 l															
1. Did you	ı qain ne	ew insights,ski	_	m this course	0	0	0	0	0	2	13	4.87	190/1447	4.68	4.56	4.31	4.43	4.87
2. Did the	e instruc	ctor make clear	the ex	pected goals	0	0	0	1	0	3	11	4.60	426/1447	4.52	4.43	4.27	4.31	4.60
3. Did the	e exam qu	uestions reflec	the e	xpected goals	0	0	0	1	1	1	12	4.60	451/1241	4.87	4.63	4.33	4.41	4.60
4. Did oth	ner evalı	uations reflect	the ex	pected goals	0	0	0	0	1	2	12	4.73	238/1402	4.82	4.40	4.24	4.34	4.73
5. Did ass	signed re	eadings contrib	ate to	what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	4	11	4.73	187/1358	4.32	4.42	4.11	4.15	4.73
6. Did wri	itten ass	signments contr	ibute t	o what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	3	12	4.80	128/1316	4.66	4.41	4.14	4.27	4.80
7. Was the	e grading	g system clearly	y expla	ined	0	0	0	1	1	4	9	4.40	596/1427	4.41	4.41	4.19	4.20	4.40
8. How mar	ny times	was class cance	elled		0	0	0	0	0	12	3	4.20	1286/1447	4.63	4.75	4.69	4.72	4.20
9. How wou	ıld you g	grade the overa	ll teac	hing effectiveness	2	1	1	0	1	5	5	4.08	807/1434	4.34	4.24	4.10	4.17	4.08
		Lectur	9															
1. Were th	ne instru	actor's lecture	s well	prepared	1	0	0	0	2	3	9	4.50	798/1387	4.72	4.68	4.46	4.48	4.50
2. Did the	e instruc	ctor seem inter	ested i	n the subject	1	0	0	0	0	2	12	4.86	656/1387	4.95	4.86	4.73	4.76	4.86
				xplained clearly	1	0	0	1	0	4	9	4.50	607/1386	4.83	4.51	4.32	4.34	4.50
4. Did the	id the lectures contribute to what you learned					0	0	1	0	3	10	4.57	582/1380	4.78	4.47	4.32	4.34	4.57
5. Did aud	. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understand						1	1	2	7	1	3.50	960/1193	3.50	3.92	4.02	4.00	3.50
	Discussion																	
1. Did cla	ass discu	ussions contrib	ite to	what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	124/1172	4.80	4.37	4.15	4.25	4.90
2. Were al	ll studer	nts actively en	courage	d to participate	5	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	303/1182	4.93	4.60	4.35	4.49	4.80
3. Did the	e instruc	ctor encourage	fair an	d open discussion	5	0	0	0	1	0	9	4.80	327/1170	4.93	4.63	4.38	4.51	4.80
4. Were sp	pecial te	echniques succe	ssful		5	7	1	0	0	0	2	3.67	****/ 800	4.33	4.14	4.06	4.19	****
		Semina:	r															
1. Were as	ssigned t	topics relevant	to the	announced theme	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 66	****	5.00	4.58	4.87	****
				Frequ	uency	Dis	trib	utio	n									
Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	ason	s			Туј	pe			Majors	
00 07		0.00.0.00																
00-27 28-55	2	0.00-0.99	0	A 9 B 5		ке	quir	ed fo	א אנ	ajor	S	6	Graduat	е	0	Majo	)r.	7
28-55 56-83	0	1.00-1.99 2.00-2.99	-	_ ~		0	0.000	1				1	IIndox	mnd 1	_	More	mo i o	0
84-150	7	2.00-2.99 3.00-3.49	1 4	C 0 D 0		Gei	nera	Т				1	Under-g	rau l	.5	non-	-major	8
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5	D 0 F 0		. וק	ecti <sup>.</sup>	a				4	#### - 1	Moona +	horo s	ro not	ono	h
Grau.	P 0						=CLI	ves				4	respons				_	11
						01	h					2	respons	es lo D	e sign	ıııcar	IL	
				5 0 I 0		Uti	her					2						
				? 0														

Course-Section: POLI 409 3

Selected Topics Poli S

Title Instructor:

Enrollment: 9 Questionnaires: 9

Hussey,Laura S.

Spring 2010

Page 1176 JUN 28, 2010 Job IRBR3029

#### Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

University of Maryland

Baltimore County

	Frequencies							Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	Λ	Ω	Λ	0	Λ	2	7	4.78	287/1447	4.68	4.56	4.31	4.43	4.78
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	0	7	4.56	479/1447	4.52	4.43	4.27	4.31	4.56
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	n	5	0	0	٥	0	4	5.00	1/1241	4.87	4.63	4.33	4.41	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1402	4.82	4.40	4.24	4.34	5.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	n	4	0	1	1	0	3	4.00	799/1358	4.32	4.42	4.11	4.15	4.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	0	1	1	5	4.57	322/1316	4.66	4.41	4.14	4.27	4.57
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	0	0	2	0	6	4.50	459/1427	4.41	4.41	4.19	4.20	4.50
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1447	4.63	4.75	4.69	4.72	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	1	0	0	n	3	1	4.25	634/1434	4.34	4.24	4.10	4.17	4.25
J. now would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	-	1	U	U	U	5		1.23	034/1434	1.51	1.21	T.10	1.1/	1.23
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	6	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1387	4.72	4.68	4.46	4.48	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	5	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1387	4.95	4.86	4.73	4.76	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	6	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1386	4.83	4.51	4.32	4.34	5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1380	4.78	4.47	4.32	4.34	5.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	6	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1193	3.50	3.92	4.02	4.00	****
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1172	4.80	4.37	4.15	4.25	5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1182	4.93	4.60	4.35	4.49	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1170	4.93	4.63	4.38	4.51	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	3	3	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/ 800	4.33	4.14	4.06	4.19	5.00

Credits Ea	Credits Earned Cum. GPA			Expected	Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	 А	7	Required for Majors	2	Graduate	0	Major	3
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	В	0						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	1	Under-grad	9	Non-major	6
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	5	#### - Means	there	are not enough	Ĺ
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	0				
				2	Λ						

Course-Section: POLI 412 01 Title

University of Maryland Ethics & Public Policy Baltimore County Spring 2010

Instructor: Ball,Calvin

Enrollment: 23 Questionnaires: 23

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Page 1177 JUN 28, 2010 Job IRBR3029

			Fre	equer	ncies	5		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	4	0	0	0	3	2	14	4.58	507/1447	4.58	4.56	4.31	4.43	4.58
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	4	0	0	0	3	1	15	4.63	389/1447	4.63	4.43	4.27	4.31	4.63
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	4	5	0	0	3	0	11	4.57	478/1241	4.57	4.63	4.33	4.41	4.57
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	4	0	0	0	2	3	14	4.63	347/1402	4.63	4.40	4.24	4.34	4.63
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	1	2	2	14	4.53	332/1358	4.53	4.42	4.11	4.15	4.53
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	1	1	2	14	4.61	283/1316	4.61	4.41	4.14	4.27	4.61
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	4	0	0	1	1	1	16	4.68	265/1427	4.68	4.41	4.19	4.20	4.68
8. How many times was class cancelled	4	0	0	0	0	1	18	4.95	291/1447	4.95	4.75	4.69	4.72	4.95
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	0	2	4	12	4.56	309/1434	4.56	4.24	4.10	4.17	4.56
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	1	Λ	1	1	16	4.63	611/1387	4.63	4.68	4.46	4.48	4.63
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	1	0	1	0	17	4.68	958/1387	4.68	4.86	4.73	4.76	4.68
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	1	0	1	1	16	4.63	470/1386	4.63	4.51	4.32	4.34	4.63
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	1	1	1	16	4.68	434/1380	4.68	4.47	4.32	4.34	4.68
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	0	2	1	0	2	14	4.32	433/1193		3.92	4.02	4.00	4.32
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	1	0	0	2	14	4.65	295/1172	4.65	4.37	4.15	4.25	4.65
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	1	0	0	1	15	4.71	391/1182	4.71	4.60	4.35	4.49	4.71
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	0	1	0	0	16	4.82	306/1170	4.82	4.63	4.38	4.51	4.82
4. Were special techniques successful	6	1	1	0	3	1	11	4.31	302/ 800	4.31	4.14	4.06	4.19	4.31
Freq	iency	Dist	rib	ation	1									

Credits E	Credits Earned			Expected	Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	11	Required for Majors	10	Graduate	0	Major	5
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	4						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	1	C	0	General	2	Under-grad	23	Non-major	18
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	4	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	2	#### - Means	there	are not enough	n
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	0						

Course-Section: POLI 419 1

Title Topics In Political Th

Instructor: Vetter, Lisa Pac

Enrollment: 18
Questionnaires: 13

#### University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2010

Page 1178 JUN 28, 2010 Job IRBR3029

#### Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

	Frequencies						Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect	
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	1	0	0	2	9	4.50	585/1447	4.50	4.56	4.31	4.43	4.50
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	1	0	0	2	9	4.50	532/1447	4.50	4.43	4.27	4.31	4.50
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	2	10	4.83	204/1241	4.83	4.63	4.33	4.41	4.83
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	1	0	1	2	8	4.33	685/1402	4.33	4.40	4.24	4.34	4.33
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	0	0	2	9	4.50	345/1358	4.50	4.42	4.11	4.15	4.50
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	0	0	2	9	4.50	392/1316	4.50	4.41	4.14	4.27	4.50
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	0	0	3	8	4.42	582/1427	4.42	4.41	4.19	4.20	4.42
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	436/1447	4.92	4.75	4.69	4.72	4.92
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	1	0	0	4	6	4.27	611/1434	4.27	4.24	4.10	4.17	4.27
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	200/1387	4.90	4.68	4.46	4.48	4.90
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1387	5.00	4.86	4.73	4.76	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	1	1	0	0	8	4.30	839/1386	4.30	4.51	4.32	4.34	4.30
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	1	1	0	1	7	4.20	940/1380	4.20	4.47	4.32	4.34	4.20
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	5	1	1	1	0	0	5	4.00	652/1193	4.00	3.92	4.02	4.00	4.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	1	0	0	0	6	4.43	445/1172	4.43	4.37	4.15	4.25	4.43
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1182	5.00	4.60	4.35	4.49	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1170	5.00	4.63	4.38	4.51	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	6	1	1	0	0	0	5	4.33	290/ 800	4.33	4.14	4.06	4.19	4.33
	-	_	_	-			_		,					

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

Course-Section: POLI 428 01 University of Maryland Title Politics Internship Instructor: Schaller, Thomas

Questions

Enrollment:

Questionnaires: 12

15

Page 1179 Baltimore County JUN 28, 2010 Spring 2010 Job IRBR3029

Instructor

Rank

Course Dept UMBC Level Sect

Mean Mean Mean Mean

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

Frequencies

NR NA 1 2 3 4 5 Mean

General																
1. Did you gain new insights, skil	=	rao.	0	0	0	0	1	2	9	4.67	408/1447	4.67	4.56	4.31	4.43	4.67
2. Did the instructor make clear			0	0	0	0	5	2	5		1053/1447	4.00	4.43	4.27	4.31	4.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect			0	3	0	0	1	5	3	4.22	806/1241	4.22	4.63	4.33	4.41	4.22
4. Did other evaluations reflect			0	0	0	0	4	1	7	4.25	766/1402	4.25	4.40	4.24	4.34	4.25
5. Did assigned readings contribu			0	0	0	0	0	3	9	4.75	173/1358	4.75	4.42	4.11	4.15	4.75
6. Did written assignments contri	_		0	0	0	0	2	3	7	4.42	486/1316	4.42	4.41	4.14	4.27	4.42
7. Was the grading system clearly		rearried	0	0	0	1	0	3	8	4.50	459/1427	4.50	4.41	4.19	4.20	4.50
8. How many times was class cance			0	1	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1447	5.00		4.69	4.72	5.00
9. How would you grade the overal		tiveness	1	2	0	0	1	3	5	4.44		4.44		4.10	4.17	4.44
T a mb																
Lecture 1. Were the instructor's lectures			0	0	0	0	0	Е	7	4.58	684/1387	4.58	4.68	4.46	4.48	4.58
2. Did the instructor seem interes		eat	0	0	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	,	4.92	4.86	4.73	4.76	4.92
3. Was lecture material presented			0	0	0	0	0	6	6	4.50	-,	4.50	4.51	4.73	4.34	4.50
	4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned									4.50		4.50	4.47	4.32	4.34	4.50
5. Did audiovisual techniques enh		0	0 1	0 1	0 1	0	6 4	6 3		,		3.92			3.64	
5. Fin dadiovibadi cocimitados cin	ianoc your anacis	Januaring	ŭ	_	_	_	_	-	J	3.01	711,1170	3.01	3.72	1102	1.00	3.01
Discuss	sion															
1. Did class discussions contribu	ite to what you l	earned	2	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	124/1172	4.90	4.37	4.15	4.25	4.90
2. Were all students actively end			2	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	,	4.80	4.60	4.35	4.49	4.80
3. Did the instructor encourage f		cussion	2	0	0	0	1	1	8	4.70	459/1170	4.70	4.63	4.38	4.51	4.70
4. Were special techniques succes	ssful		2	4	0	0	1	2	3	4.33	290/ 800	4.33	4.14	4.06	4.19	4.33
		Freque	ency	Dist	ribu	ution	ı									
Credits Earned Cum. GPA	Pour contra	J. G., . J				D					m				20-2	
Credits Earned Cum. GPA	Expecte	d Grades				Rea	ason	3 			Тур	e 			Majors	; 
00-27 0 0.00-0.99	8		Red	quire	ed fo	or Ma	ajor	s	6	Graduate	:	0	Majo	r	8	
28-55 0 1.00-1.99	2															
56-83 0 2.00-2.99	0		Ger	neral	_				1	Under-gr	ad 1	2	Non-	major	4	
84-150 7 3.00-3.49	1 D	0														
Grad. 0 3.50-4.00	0		Ele	ectiv	res				4	#### - Means there				_	jh	
	0	responses to be signifi				ifican	ıt									
	0		Oth	ıer					0							
	1															

Course-Section: POLI 432 1 University of Maryland Page 1180
Title Civil Rights Baltimore County JUN 28, 2010
Instructor: Lanoue, George R Spring 2010 Job IRBR3029

Frequencies

Instructor

Course Dept UMBC Level Sect

Enrollment:	38		
Questionnaires:	23	Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire	

? 4

Our ark i am a							P L	eque	пстег	5		Inst	ructor	Course	рерс	UMBC	телет	Sect
	Questions					NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		General	. — — — — -															
1. Did you	u gain ne	w insights,skil		this course	0	0	0	0	1	7	15	4.61	474/1447	4.61	4.56	4.31	4.43	4.61
2. Did the	e instruc	tor make clear	the exp	pected goals	0	0	0	1	3	7	12	4.30	805/1447	4.30	4.43	4.27	4.31	4.30
3. Did the	e exam qu	estions reflect	the ex	spected goals	0	1	0	0	2	5	15	4.59	460/1241	4.59	4.63	4.33	4.41	4.59
4. Did oth	her evalu	ations reflect	the exp	ected goals	0	1	1	1	2	5	13	4.27	745/1402	4.27	4.40	4.24	4.34	4.27
5. Did ass	signed re	adings contribu	ite to v	what you learned	0	0	1	0	2	2	18	4.57	306/1358	4.57	4.42	4.11	4.15	4.57
6. Did wr	itten ass	ignments contri	bute to	what you learned	0	0	2	1	3	5	12	4.04	790/1316	4.04	4.41	4.14	4.27	4.04
7. Was the	e grading	system clearly	explai	ned	0	0	1	1	1	7	13	4.30	716/1427	4.30	4.41	4.19	4.20	4.30
	-	was class cance			0	0	0	0	0	2	21	4.91	436/1447	4.91		4.69		4.91
9. How wor	uld you g	rade the overal	.l teach	ning effectiveness	4	0	0	0	3	9	7	4.21	679/1434	4.21	4.24	4.10	4.17	4.21
		Lecture	<u>:</u>															
1. Were th	he instru	ctor's lectures	well r	prepared	3	0	0	0	0	2	18	4.90	200/1387	4.90	4.68	4.46	4.48	4.90
		tor seem intere	_	_	3	0	0	0	0	2	18	4.90	528/1387	4.90	4.86	4.73	4.76	4.90
3. Was led	3. Was lecture material presented and explained clear							0	3	6	9	4.16	962/1386	4.16	4.51	4.32	4.34	4.16
4. Did the	e lecture	s contribute to	what y	ou learned	3	0	0	0	2	5	13	4.55	604/1380	4.55	4.47	4.32	4.34	4.55
5. Did aud	diovisual	techniques enh	ance yo	our understanding	4	3	0	0	2	7	7	4.31	433/1193	4.31	3.92	4.02	4.00	4.31
		Discuss	sion															
1. Did cla	ass discu			what you learned	11	0	0	2	2	4	4	3.83	841/1172	3.83	4.37	4.15	4.25	3.83
				to participate	11	0	2	0	1	4	5	3.83	- ,	3.83	4.60	4.35	4.49	3.83
		_	_	d open discussion	11	0	1	0	0	4	7	4.33	710/1170	4.33	4.63	4.38	4.51	4.33
		chniques succes			11	2	0	0	0	4	6	4.60	159/ 800			4.06	4.19	4.60
				Frequ	uency	/ Dis	trib	utio	n									
a 11. =	,	a ana		1 . 1				_					_					
Credits Ea	arnea 	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				ке 	asons	; 			Ту:	pe 			Majors 	,
00-27 0 0.00-0.99 0 A 9						Re	quir	ed f	or Ma	jor	s 1	.5	Graduat	е	1	Majo	or	13
28-55																		
56-83						Ge	nera:	1				4	Under-g	rad 2	2	Non-	-major	10
84-150 7 3.00-3.49 4 D 0																		
Grad.	Grad. 1 3.50-4.00 9 F 0					El	ecti	ves				2	#### - 1				_	ιh
	P 0					0+	her					0	respons	es to b	e sign	ııtıcar	ıt	
	I 0											U						

University of Maryland

Baltimore County Spring 2010

Course-Section: POLI 438 01 Legal Internship VanHoven,Jonath Title Instructor:

Enrollment: 14 Questionnaires: 14

Page 1181 JUN 28, 2010 Job IRBR3029

	Evaluation	

			Frequencies			3		Instructor		-		-		Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	1	1	2	0	10	4.21	909/1447	4.21	4.56	4.31	4.43	4.21
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	1	1	4	7	4.07	1011/1447	4.07	4.43	4.27	4.31	4.07
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	10	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	282/1241	4.75	4.63	4.33	4.41	4.75
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	0	2	5	6	4.07	929/1402	4.07	4.40	4.24	4.34	4.07
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	2	0	7	4	3.79	1001/1358	3.79	4.42	4.11	4.15	3.79
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	1	0	0	1	5	6	4.42	486/1316	4.42	4.41	4.14	4.27	4.42
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	5	8	4.50	459/1427	4.50	4.41	4.19	4.20	4.50
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	3	11	4.79	786/1447	4.79	4.75	4.69	4.72	4.79
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	1	1	1	5	2	3.60	1188/1434	3.60	4.24	4.10	4.17	3.60
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	2	6	5	4.23	1055/1387	4.23	4.68	4.46	4.48	4.23
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	1	12	4.92	422/1387	4.92	4.86	4.73	4.76	4.92
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	2	1	3	7	4.15	962/1386	4.15	4.51	4.32	4.34	4.15
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	2	1	3	7	4.15	965/1380	4.15	4.47	4.32	4.34	4.15
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	7	2	1	0	0	3	3.17	1060/1193	3.17	3.92	4.02	4.00	3.17
_,														
Discussion		0	_	-	0		_	4 20	F46/1180	4 20	4 25	4 1 5	4 05	4 20
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	Ţ	0	4	5	4.30	546/1172		4.37	4.15	4.25	4.30
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	303/1182	4.80	4.60	4.35	4.49	4.80
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	327/1170	4.80	4.63	4.38	4.51	4.80
4. Were special techniques successful	4	4	0	0	1	4	1	4.00	423/ 800	4.00	4.14	4.06	4.19	4.00
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 38	****	4.50	4.49	4.68	***
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 36	****	3.00	4.25	4.42	***
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	13	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 28	****	4.50	4.52	4.72	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	13	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 30	****	4.50	4.30	4.38	***
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities			0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 27	****	4.50	4.43	4.62	****
Frequ			crib	ution	ı									

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

Course-Section: POLI 440 02
Title Urban Politics

Title Urban Politic Instructor: Croatti, Mark

Enrollment: 26
Questionnaires: 21

#### University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2010

Page 1182 JUN 28, 2010 Job IRBR3029

#### Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Ouestions	NID	NA	Fre	equer 2	ncies 3	3	_		ructor	Course	Dept Mean			Sect
Questions	NR	NA				- <del>4</del> 	5 	Mean	Rank	Mean	mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	1	0	1	2	17	4.62	463/1447	4.62	4.56	4.31	4.43	4.62
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	3	4	13	4.38	702/1447	4.38	4.43	4.27	4.31	4.38
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	0	1	3	16	4.57	478/1241	4.57	4.63	4.33	4.41	4.57
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	1	0	0	4	15	4.60	380/1402	4.60	4.40	4.24	4.34	4.60
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	1	3	15	4.74	187/1358	4.74	4.42	4.11	4.15	4.74
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	1	4	1	12	4.16	710/1316	4.16	4.41	4.14	4.27	4.16
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	0	1	2	16	4.79	172/1427	4.79	4.41	4.19	4.20	4.79
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	2	17	4.89	511/1447	4.89	4.75	4.69	4.72	4.89
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	0	0	5	11	4.69	214/1434	4.69	4.24	4.10	4.17	4.69
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	3	17	4.85	276/1387	4.85	4.68	4.46	4.48	4.85
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	1	19	4.95	317/1387	4.95	4.86	4.73	4.76	4.95
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	2	3	15	4.65	444/1386	4.65	4.51	4.32	4.34	4.65
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	0	3	16	4.70	420/1380	4.70	4.47	4.32	4.34	4.70
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	2	3	5	10	4.15	564/1193	4.15	3.92	4.02	4.00	4.15
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	0	2	3	14	4.45	428/1172	4.45	4.37	4.15	4.25	4.45
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	1	0	1	2	16	4.60	490/1182	4.60	4.60	4.35	4.49	4.60
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	1	0	1	3	15	4.55	549/1170	4.55	4.63	4.38	4.51	4.55
4. Were special techniques successful	2	7	0	0	0	3	9	4.75	103/ 800	4.75	4.14		4.19	4.75
4. Were special techniques successful	4	,	U	U	U	3	9	4.75	103/ 800	4.75	4.14	4.00	4.19	4.75
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	18	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 66	****	5.00	4.58	4.87	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	18	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 62	****	4.64	4.56	4.80	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 58	****	4.57	4.41	4.59	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 65	****	4.94	4.42	4.55	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	18	0	0	1	0	0	2	4.00	****/ 64	****	3.96	4.09	4.43	****
Field Work		_												
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	0	0	2		****/ 38	****	4.50	4.49	4.68	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	19	0	0	0	0	0	2		****/ 36	****	3.00	4.25	4.42	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	19	0	0	0	0	0	2		****/ 28	****	4.50	4.52	4.72	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	19	0	0	0	0	1	1		****/ 30	****	4.50	4.30	4.38	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	19	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 27	****	4.50	4.43	4.62	****
Frequ	iency	Dist	cribu	ıtior	ı									
-	_													

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA	1	Expected	l Grades	Reasons		Type	Majors		
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	1		8	Graduate	0	Major	17		
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	8						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	1	C	2	General	5	Under-grad	21	Non-major	4
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	4	D	1						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	2	#### - Means	there	are not enough	n
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	1				
				?	1						

Course-Section: POLI 450 01

Sem Pub Admin And Poli

Title Instructor: Johnson,Arthur

Enrollment: 14 Questionnaires: 9

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2010

Page 1183 JUN 28, 2010 Job IRBR3029

#### Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

			Fr	equei	ncies	5		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	0	8	4.78	287/1447	4.82	4.56	4.31	4.43	4.78
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	5	4	4.44	619/1447	4.54	4.43	4.27	4.31	4.44
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	0	3	5	4.33	717/1241	4.56	4.63	4.33	4.41	4.33
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	0	0	1	7	4.44	567/1402	4.44	4.40	4.24	4.34	4.44
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	97/1358	4.94	4.42	4.11	4.15	4.89
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	0	4	4	4.22	644/1316	4.40	4.41	4.14	4.27	4.22
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	0	1	3	4	4.00	971/1427	4.25	4.41	4.19	4.20	4.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	6	3	4.33	1202/1447	4.54	4.75	4.69	4.72	4.33
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	1	2	4	4.43	431/1434	4.38	4.24	4.10	4.17	4.43
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	398/1387	4.85	4.68	4.46	4.48	4.78
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	579/1387	4.91	4.86	4.73	4.76	4.89
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	4	4	4.33	811/1386	4.47	4.51	4.32	4.34	4.33
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	5	4	4.44	719/1380	4.61	4.47	4.32	4.34	4.44
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	5	3	0	0	0	1	2.00	1177/1193	2.69	3.92	4.02	4.00	2.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1172	4.89	4.37	4.15	4.25	5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1182	4.93	4.60	4.35	4.49	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	1	0	7	4.75	390/1170	4.66	4.63	4.38	4.51	4.75
4. Were special techniques successful	1	3	1	0	1	0	3	3.80	562/ 800	3.60	4.14	4.06	4.19	3.80
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	4	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/ 66	5.00	5.00	4.58	4.87	5.00
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	4	0	0	0	0	3	2	4.40	48/ 62	4.64	4.64	4.56	4.80	4.40
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	37/ 58	4.57	4.57	4.41	4.59	4.40
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/ 65	4.94	4.94	4.42	4.55	5.00
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	4	0	1	0	1	0	3	3.80	43/ 64	3.96	3.96	4.09	4.43	3.80
Frequ	iency	Dist	trib	utio	n									

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

Course-Section: POLI 450 02

Title Sem Pub Admin And Poli

Instructor: Johnson, Arthur

Enrollment: 20
Questionnaires: 14

### University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2010

Page 1184 JUN 28, 2010 Job IRBR3029

Student	Course	Evaluation	on Questi	ionnai	ire
---------	--------	------------	-----------	--------	-----

			Frequencies			Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC Level		Sect		
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	2	12	4.86	201/1447	4.82	4.56	4.31	4.43	4.86
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	3	10	4.64	376/1447	4.54	4.43	4.27	4.31	4.64
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	1	12	4.79	251/1241	4.56	4.63	4.33	4.41	4.79
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	1	10	4.43	591/1402	4.44	4.40	4.24	4.34	4.43
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/1358	4.94	4.42	4.11	4.15	5.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	5	7	4.58	312/1316	4.40	4.41	4.14	4.27	4.58
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	1	1	1	9	4.50	459/1427	4.25	4.41	4.19	4.20	4.50
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	3	9	4.75	836/1447	4.54	4.75	4.69	4.72	4.75
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	0	0	6	3	4.33	540/1434	4.38	4.24	4.10	4.17	4.33
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	1	12	4.92	160/1387	4.85	4.68	4.46	4.48	4.92
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	13	4.93	422/1387	4.91	4.86	4.73	4.76	4.93
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	1	3	9	4.62	496/1386	4.47	4.51	4.32	4.34	4.62
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	3	10	4.77	326/1380	4.61	4.47	4.32	4.34	4.77
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	6	2	1	1	0	4	3.38	1008/1193	2.69	3.92	4.02	4.00	3.38
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	1	12	4.79	195/1172	4.89	4.37	4.15	4.25	4.79
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	1	0	13	4.86	250/1182	4.93	4.60	4.35	4.49	4.86
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	2	2	10	4.57	538/1170	4.66	4.63	4.38	4.51	4.57
4. Were special techniques successful	0	4	4	0	0	0	6	3.40	683/ 800	3.60	4.14	4.06	4.19	3.40
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	6	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/ 66	5.00	5.00	4.58	4.87	5.00
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	6	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	25/ 62	4.64	4.64	4.56	4.80	4.88
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	23/ 58	4.57	4.57	4.41	4.59	4.75
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	19/ 65	4.94	4.94	4.42	4.55	4.88
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	6	0	0	0	2	3	3	4.13	35/ 64		3.96	4.09	4.43	4.13
3 3 44 4 44														

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

Course-Section: POLI 486 01

Middle East Intl Relat

Title Starkey, Brigid

Instructor:

Enrollment: 22 Questionnaires: 19

#### University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2010

Page 1185 JUN 28, 2010 Job IRBR3029

#### Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

			Frequencies			Tnst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect		
Ouestions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank		Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	1	18	4.95	89/1447	4.95	4.56	4.31	4.43	4.95
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	4	15	4.79	217/1447	4.79	4.43	4.27	4.31	4.79
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	16	4.84	195/1241	4.84	4.63	4.33	4.41	4.84
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	2	16	4.79	186/1402	4.79	4.40	4.24	4.34	4.79
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	17	4.89	92/1358	4.89	4.42	4.11	4.15	4.89
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	4	14	4.68	221/1316	4.68	4.41	4.14	4.27	4.68
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	4	15	4.79	172/1427	4.79	4.41	4.19	4.20	4.79
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	18	4.95	291/1447	4.95	4.75	4.69	4.72	4.95
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	0	4	13	4.76	149/1434	4.76	4.24	4.10	4.17	4.76
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	1	17	4.84	291/1387	4.84	4.68	4.46	4.48	4.84
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	19	5.00	1/1387	5.00	4.86	4.73	4.76	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	3	15	4.74	341/1386	4.74	4.51	4.32	4.34	4.74
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	3	16	4.84	227/1380	4.84	4.47	4.32	4.34	4.84
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	3	0	1	1	1	13	4.63	211/1193	4.63	3.92	4.02	4.00	4.63
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	2	12	4.86	152/1172	4.86	4.37	4.15	4.25	4.86
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	0	0	0	14	5.00	1/1182	5.00	4.60	4.35	4.49	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	0	0	0	14	5.00	1/1170	5.00	4.63	4.38	4.51	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	5	3	0	0	0	4	7	4.64	146/ 800	4.64	4.14	4.06	4.19	4.64
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 189	****	****	4.34	4.74	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 192	****	****	4.34	4.61	***
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 186	****	****	4.48	4.72	***
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 187	****	****	4.33	4.59	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 168	***	****	4.20	4.53	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 66	****	5.00	4.58	4.87	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 62	****	4.64	4.56	4.80	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 58	****	4.57	4.41	4.59	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 65	****	4.94	4.42	4.55	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 64	***	3.96	4.09	4.43	***
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 38	****	4.50	4.49	4.68	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 36	****	3.00	4.25	4.42	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 28	****	4.50	4.52	4.72	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 30	****	4.50	4.30	4.38	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 27	****	4.50	4.43	4.62	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.72	4.80	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 21	****	****	4.57	5.00	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.64	4.60	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 20	****	****	4.60	5.00	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 15	****	****	4.61	5.00	****

Course-Section: POLI 486 01

Title Middle East Intl Relat

Instructor: Starkey, Brigid

Enrollment: 22
Questionnaires: 19

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2010 Page 1185 JUN 28, 2010 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	d Grades	Reasons		Type	Majors				
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	9	Required for Majors	9	Graduate	0	Major	14		
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	1	В	7								
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	1	C	0	General	1	Under-grad	19	Non-major	5		
84-150	6	3.00-3.49	5	D	0								
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	7	F	0	Electives	6	#### - Means	are not enoug	h			
				P	0			responses to be significant					
				I	0	Other	1	-		_			
				?	0								

Course-Section: POLI 487 01

International Poli Eco

Title Instructor: Hody,Cynthia A

Enrollment: 22 Questionnaires: 15

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2010

Page 1186 JUN 28, 2010 Job IRBR3029

#### Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

						Inst	ructor	Course Dept				Sect		
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	1	13	4.80	254/1447	4.80	4.56	4.31	4.43	4.80
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	1	13	4.80	196/1447	4.80	4.43	4.27	4.31	4.80
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	8	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	186/1241	4.86	4.63	4.33	4.41	4.86
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	1	13	4.80	165/1402	4.80	4.40	4.24	4.34	4.80
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	0	2	11	4.64	251/1358	4.64	4.42	4.11	4.15	4.64
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	2	12	4.86	102/1316	4.86	4.41	4.14	4.27	4.86
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	1	0	0	1	1	11	4.77	191/1427	4.77	4.41	4.19	4.20	4.77
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	1	5	8	4.50	1079/1447	4.50	4.75	4.69	4.72	4.50
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	5	10	4.67	230/1434	4.67	4.24	4.10	4.17	4.67
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	1	14	4.93	140/1387	4.93	4.68	4.46	4.48	4.93
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	15	5.00	1/1387	5.00	4.86	4.73	4.76	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	2	12	4.86	194/1386	4.86	4.51	4.32	4.34	4.86
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	14	4.93	111/1380	4.93	4.47	4.32	4.34	4.93
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	0	1	4	9	4.57	243/1193	4.57	3.92	4.02	4.00	4.57
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	2	10	4.83	163/1172	4.83	4.37	4.15	4.25	4.83
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/1182	5.00	4.60	4.35	4.49	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	1	1	10	4.75	390/1170	4.75	4.63	4.38	4.51	4.75
4. Were special techniques successful	3	6	0	0	1	0	5	4.67	133/ 800	4.67	4.14	4.06	4.19	4.67
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 66	****	5.00	4.58	4.87	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 65		4.94	4.42	4.55	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	14	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 64		3.96	4.09	4.43	****

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	d Grades	Reasons		Туре	Majors		
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	1	A	8	Required for Majors	11	Graduate	0	Major	9
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	6						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	1	С	0	General	1	Under-grad	15	Non-major	6
84-150	7	3.00-3.49	5	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means	are not enough		
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	0	_			
				2	Λ						