```
Course-Section: PUBL 600  0101            University of Maryland                              Page 1488
Title      RESEARCH METHODOLOGY            Baltimore County                                   JAN 21, 2006
Instructor:   DAVIDOFF, AMY J              Fall   2005                                        Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:    25
Questionnaires: 24                   Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire


                                        Frequencies        Instructor   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   6  3  3  5  7  3.17 1603/1674  3.17  4.23  4.27  4.44  3.17
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals     0   0   2  4  9  6  3  3.17 1590/1674  3.17  4.26  4.23  4.34  3.17
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals    0   0   3  5  9  5  2  2.92 1383/1423  2.92  4.36  4.27  4.28  2.92
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals     0   0   3  5  5  7  4  3.17 1536/1609  3.17  4.23  4.22  4.34  3.17
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0   0   4  4  3  7  6  3.29 1348/1585  3.29  4.04  3.96  4.23  3.29
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 0   3  3  2  7  9  3.67 1207/1535  3.67  4.08  4.08  4.27  3.67
7. Was the grading system clearly explained             0   0   6  1  4  5  8  3.33 1504/1651  3.33  4.20  4.18  4.32  3.33
8. How many times was class cancelled                   0   0   0  1  0  9  14 4.50 1203/1673  4.50  4.65  4.69  4.78  4.50
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 7 1   3  3  9  1  0  2.50 1620/1656  2.50  4.06  4.07  4.15  2.50


              Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared         0   0   0  2  9  5  8  3.79 1403/1586  3.79  4.43  4.43  4.50  3.79
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject    0   0   1  1  4  5  13 4.17 1434/1585  4.17  4.72  4.69  4.79  4.17
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0   0   3  5 10  5  1  2.83 1539/1582  2.83  4.30  4.26  4.33  2.83
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned      0   0   5  4  8  3  4  2.88 1520/1575  2.88  4.32  4.27  4.30  2.88
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 1  1   2  1 12  4  3  3.23 1170/1380  3.23  3.94  3.94  3.85  3.23


              Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 2   0   3  4  8  7  0  2.86 1418/1520  2.86  4.14  4.01  4.19  2.86
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 2   0   2  5  2  8  5  3.41 1341/1515  3.41  4.37  4.24  4.47  3.41
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 2  0   2  4  4  6  6  3.45 1320/1511  3.45  4.37  4.27  4.49  3.45
4. Were special techniques successful                   2   9   5  1  4  2  1  2.46  968/ 994  2.46  3.97  3.94  4.07  2.46


              Laboratory
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material   23  0   0  0  1  0  0  3.00 ****/ 265  ****  4.06  4.23  4.51  ****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information 22 0   0  0  2  0  0  3.00 ****/ 278  ****  4.21  4.19  4.42  ****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 22 1   0  0  1  0  0  3.00 ****/ 260  ****  4.43  4.46  4.67  ****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance            22  0   0  0  2  0  0  3.00 ****/ 259  ****  4.21  4.33  4.66  ****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified  23  0   0  0  1  0  0  3.00 ****/ 233  ****  4.36  4.20  4.53  ****


              Seminar
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 20  0   0  0  2  2  0  3.50 ****/ 103  ****  4.39  4.41  4.56  ****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 20 0   0  1  0  2  1  3.75 ****/ 101  ****  4.33  4.48  4.62  ****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 20  0   0  2  1  1  0  2.75 ****/  95  ****  4.15  4.31  4.43  ****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned     20  0   0  1  3  0  0  2.75 ****/  99  ****  4.36  4.39  4.54  ****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear                 20  0   0  1  0  3  0  3.50 ****/  97  ****  3.76  4.14  4.26  ****


              Field Work
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned  22  0   1  0  1  0  0  2.00 ****/  76  ****  3.36  3.98  4.20  ****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria  22  0   0  0  1  1  0  3.50 ****/  77  ****  3.65  3.93  4.31  ****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation        22  0   0  0  2  0  0  3.00 ****/  53  ****  4.19  4.45  4.64  ****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations    23  0   0  0  1  0  0  3.00 ****/  48  ****  3.86  4.12  4.35  ****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities  22  0   0  0  1  1  0  3.50 ****/  49  ****  3.74  4.27  4.46  ****


              Self  Paced
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 23  0   0  0  1  0  0  3.00 ****/  61  ****  4.03  4.09  4.46  ****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal     22  0   0  0  2  0  0  3.00 ****/  52  ****  4.21  4.26  4.59  ****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful       21  0   0  0  3  0  0  3.00 ****/  50  ****  4.23  4.44  4.64  ****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful        22  0   0  1  1  0  0  2.50 ****/  35  ****  4.22  4.36  4.84  ****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students      23  0   0  0  1  0  0  3.00 ****/  31  ****  4.25  4.34  4.64  ****
```

Title   RESEARCH METHODOLOGY   Baltimore County   JAN 21, 2006
Instructor: DAVIDOFF, AMY J   Fall   2005   Job IRBR3029
Enrollment: 25
Questionnaires: 24   Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

                                      Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	7	0.00-0.99	5	A	8	Required for Majors	2	Graduate	11	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	10						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	13	Non-major	4
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	11	3.50-4.00	5	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough			
				P	0			responses to be significant			
				I	0	Other	20				
				?	3						

```
Course-Section: PUBL 601  0101           University of Maryland                        Page 1489
Title       POLITICAL/SOCIAL CONTE        Baltimore County                             JAN 21, 2006
Instructor:  MILLER, CHERYL                    Fall  2005                               Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:     19
Questionnaires: 18               Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire
```

```
                                            Frequencies       Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
          Questions                   NR  NA  1  2  3  4  5  Mean    Rank   Mean  Mean  Mean Mean  Mean
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
          General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course   2   0  0  0  1  2 13  4.75   298/1674  4.75  4.23  4.27  4.44  4.75
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    2   0  0  0  2  5  9  4.44   689/1674  4.44  4.26  4.23  4.34  4.44
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   2   0  0  0  0  5 11  4.69   349/1423  4.69  4.36  4.27  4.28  4.69
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    2   0  0  0  2  2 12  4.63   353/1609  4.63  4.23  4.22  4.34  4.63
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 2  0  0  0  2  2 12  4.63   251/1585  4.63  4.04  3.96  4.23  4.63
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 2 0 0 2  2  4  8  4.13   807/1535  4.13  4.08  4.08  4.27  4.13
7. Was the grading system clearly explained            2   0  0  0  1  5 10  4.56   445/1651  4.56  4.20  4.18  4.32  4.56
8. How many times was class cancelled                  2   0  0  0  0  0 16  5.00     1/1673  5.00  4.65  4.69  4.78  5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 3 0 0 0  2  6  7  4.33   615/1656  4.33  4.06  4.07  4.15  4.33

          Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        1   0  0  0  3  3 11  4.47   901/1586  4.47  4.43  4.43  4.50  4.47
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   1   0  0  0  0  1 16  4.94   340/1585  4.94  4.72  4.69  4.79  4.94
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 1  0  0  1  2  5  9  4.29   892/1582  4.29  4.30  4.26  4.33  4.29
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     1   0  0  0  1  3 13  4.71   440/1575  4.71  4.32  4.27  4.30  4.71
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 1 10 3 0  3  0  1  2.43  1335/1380  2.43  3.94  3.94  3.85  2.43

          Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 4  0  0  1  0  4  9  4.50   397/1520  4.50  4.14  4.01  4.19  4.50
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 4  0  1  0  0  1 12  4.64   503/1515  4.64  4.37  4.24  4.47  4.64
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 4 0 0  0  0  4 10  4.71   458/1511  4.71  4.37  4.27  4.49  4.71
4. Were special techniques successful                  5   5  0  0  4  2  2  3.75   638/ 994  3.75  3.97  3.94  4.07  3.75

          Seminar
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 17 0 0 0  0  0  1  5.00  ****/ 101  ****  4.33  4.48  4.62  ****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 17 0 0 0  0  1  0  4.00  ****/  95  ****  4.15  4.31  4.43  ****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned    17  0  0  0  0  1  0  4.00  ****/  99  ****  4.36  4.39  4.54  ****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear                17  0  0  0  0  1  0  4.00  ****/  97  ****  3.76  4.14  4.26  ****

                           Frequency Distribution
```

```
Credits Earned        Cum. GPA        Expected Grades        Reasons              Type                Majors
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
00-27     1        0.00-0.99   6       A    5        Required for Majors  0    Graduate      14    Major         0
28-55     0        1.00-1.99   0       B   10
56-83     0        2.00-2.99   0       C    0        General              0    Under-grad     4    Non-major     1
84-150    0        3.00-3.49   2       D    0
Grad.    14        3.50-4.00   2       F    0        Electives            0    #### - Means there are not enough
                                       P    0                                  responses to be significant
                                       I    0        Other               15
                                       ?    1
```

```
Course-Section: PUBL 603  0101           University of Maryland                        Page 1490
Title       POLICY ANALYSIS              Baltimore County                              JAN 21, 2006
Instructor:  MILLER, NANCY A             Fall  2005                                    Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:     19
Questionnaires: 18                  Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

                                          Frequencies       Instructor   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  2  7  7 4.06 1155/1674  4.06  4.23  4.27 4.44 4.06
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals     0   0  0  0  2  9  7 4.28  906/1674  4.28  4.26  4.23 4.34 4.28
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals    0  13  0  0  3  1  1 3.60 1249/1423  3.60  4.36  4.27 4.28 3.60
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals     0   0  0  0  2 10  6 4.22  892/1609  4.22  4.23  4.22 4.34 4.22
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 1   0  1  0  3  7  6 4.00  769/1585  4.00  4.04  3.96 4.23 4.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 1 1  0  0  0  8  8 4.50  373/1535  4.50  4.08  4.08 4.27 4.50
7. Was the grading system clearly explained             1   0  0  0  2  5 10 4.47  568/1651  4.47  4.20  4.18 4.32 4.47
8. How many times was class cancelled                   1   0  0  0  0  2 15 4.88  742/1673  4.88  4.65  4.69 4.78 4.88
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 0 0  0  0  2  8  8 4.33  615/1656  4.33  4.06  4.07 4.15 4.33

           Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared         1   0  0  0  1  7  9 4.47  901/1586  4.47  4.43  4.43 4.50 4.47
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject    0   0  0  0  0  4 14 4.78  874/1585  4.78  4.72  4.69 4.79 4.78
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0   0  0  1  5  4  8 4.06 1104/1582  4.06  4.30  4.26 4.33 4.06
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned      1   0  0  0  4  6  7 4.18 1030/1575  4.18  4.32  4.27 4.30 4.18
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 0  7  2  1  2  5  1 3.18 1184/1380  3.18  3.94  3.94 3.85 3.18

           Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 3   0  0  0  2  5  8 4.40  512/1520  4.40  4.14  4.01 4.19 4.40
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 3   0  0  0  0  2 13 4.87  254/1515  4.87  4.37  4.24 4.47 4.87
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 3  0  0  1  0  1 13 4.73  436/1511  4.73  4.37  4.27 4.49 4.73
4. Were special techniques successful                   3   5  0  0  4  2  4 4.00  474/ 994  4.00  3.97  3.94 4.07 4.00

           Seminar
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 15  0  0  0  0  1  2 4.67 ****/ 103  ****  4.39  4.41 4.56 ****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 15 0  0  0  0  1  2 4.67 ****/ 101  ****  4.33  4.48 4.62 ****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 15  0  0  0  0  1  2 4.67 ****/  95  ****  4.15  4.31 4.43 ****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned     15  0  0  0  0  1  2 4.67 ****/  99  ****  4.36  4.39 4.54 ****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear                 15  0  0  0  0  2  1 4.33 ****/  97  ****  3.76  4.14 4.26 ****

           Field Work
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned  10  0  0  0  0  3  5 4.63   30/  76  4.63  3.36  3.98 4.20 4.63
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria  10  0  0  0  1  4  3 4.25   30/  77  4.25  3.65  3.93 4.31 4.25
3. Was the instructor available for consultation        10  2  0  0  0  0  6 5.00    1/  53  5.00  4.19  4.45 4.64 5.00
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations    10  1  0  0  0  3  4 4.57   16/  48  4.57  3.86  4.12 4.35 4.57
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities  10  2  0  0  0  0  6 5.00    1/  49  5.00  3.74  4.27 4.46 5.00

                                   Frequency Distribution

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

```
Course-Section: PUBL 605  0101            University of Maryland                         Page 1491
Title        ADV RES & EVAL TECH           Baltimore County                             JAN 21, 2006
Instructor:  ADLER, MARINA                     Fall  2005                               Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:      12
Questionnaires: 10                    Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire
```

			Frequencies					Instructor		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	2	7	4.60	485/1674	4.60	4.23	4.27	4.44	4.60
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	4	6	4.60	460/1674	4.60	4.26	4.23	4.34	4.60
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	7	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	1016/1423	4.00	4.36	4.27	4.28	4.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	7	3	4.30	786/1609	4.30	4.23	4.22	4.34	4.30
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	3	5	4.44	378/1585	4.44	4.04	3.96	4.23	4.44
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	5	4	4.44	454/1535	4.44	4.08	4.08	4.27	4.44
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	2	3	4	4.22	901/1651	4.22	4.20	4.18	4.32	4.22
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	3	5	4.63	1114/1673	4.63	4.65	4.69	4.78	4.63
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	0	4	2	4.33	615/1656	4.33	4.06	4.07	4.15	4.33
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	4	6	4.60	753/1586	4.60	4.43	4.43	4.50	4.60
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	1	8	4.70	1035/1585	4.70	4.72	4.69	4.79	4.70
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	5	5	4.50	632/1582	4.50	4.30	4.26	4.33	4.50
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	4	6	4.60	579/1575	4.60	4.32	4.27	4.30	4.60
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	1	1	0	2	4	2	3.67	962/1380	3.67	3.94	3.94	3.85	3.67
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	4	4	4.50	397/1520	4.50	4.14	4.01	4.19	4.50
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	1	4	3	4.25	898/1515	4.25	4.37	4.24	4.47	4.25
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	0	6	2	4.25	896/1511	4.25	4.37	4.27	4.49	4.25
4. Were special techniques successful	2	4	0	0	1	3	0	3.75	638/ 994	3.75	3.97	3.94	4.07	3.75
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 103	****	4.39	4.41	4.56	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 101	****	4.33	4.48	4.62	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 95	****	4.15	4.31	4.43	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 99	****	4.36	4.39	4.54	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 97	****	3.76	4.14	4.26	****

Frequency Distribution

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

```
Course-Section: PUBL 610D 0101            University of Maryland                              Page 1492
Title          ECON EVAL OF HEALTH PR     Baltimore County                                   JAN 21, 2006
Instructor:    Salkever, David            Fall   2005                                         Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:    5
Questionnaires: 5                         Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire
```

```
                                                    Frequencies          Instructor    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  4  4.80  243/1674   4.80 4.23   4.27 4.44  4.80
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals     0   0  0  0  0  2  3  4.60  460/1674   4.60 4.26   4.23 4.34  4.60
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals    2   2  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/1423   **** 4.36   4.27 4.28  ****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals     0   1  0  0  0  0  4  5.00    1/1609   5.00 4.23   4.22 4.34  5.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0   0  0  0  0  0  5  5.00    1/1585   5.00 4.04   3.96 4.23  5.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 2  0  0  0  1  2  4.67  238/1535   4.67 4.08   4.08 4.27  4.67
7. Was the grading system clearly explained             0   1  0  0  0  1  3  4.75  231/1651   4.75 4.20   4.18 4.32  4.75
8. How many times was class cancelled                   0   0  0  0  0  2  3  4.60 1135/1673   4.60 4.65   4.69 4.78  4.60
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 1 0  0  0  0  0  4  5.00    1/1656   5.00 4.06   4.07 4.15  5.00

              Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared         0   0  0  0  0  0  5  5.00    1/1586   5.00 4.43   4.43 4.50  5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject    0   0  0  0  0  0  5  5.00    1/1585   5.00 4.72   4.69 4.79  5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0   0  0  0  0  1  4  4.80  246/1582   4.80 4.30   4.26 4.33  4.80
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned      0   0  0  0  0  0  5  5.00    1/1575   5.00 4.32   4.27 4.30  5.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 1  2  0  0  0  1  1  4.50  303/1380   4.50 3.94   3.94 3.85  4.50

              Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 0   0  0  0  0  1  4  4.80  191/1520   4.80 4.14   4.01 4.19  4.80
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 0   0  0  0  0  0  5  5.00    1/1515   5.00 4.37   4.24 4.47  5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 0  0  0  0  0  0  5  5.00    1/1511   5.00 4.37   4.27 4.49  5.00
4. Were special techniques successful                   2   1  0  0  0  0  2  5.00    1/ 994   5.00 3.97   3.94 4.07  5.00
```

```
                                    Frequency Distribution

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

```
Enrollment:      8
Questionnaires:  7                            Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire


                                            Frequencies        Instructor    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  3  3  4.29  916/1674  4.29  4.23  4.27  4.44  4.29
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals   0   0  0  1  2  3  1  3.57 1465/1674  3.57  4.26  4.23  4.34  3.57
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals  0   5  0  1  0  0  1  3.50 1268/1423  3.50  4.36  4.27  4.28  3.50
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals   0   1  0  2  1  2  1  3.33 1500/1609  3.33  4.23  4.22  4.34  3.33
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0  0  0  1  1  2  3  4.00  769/1585  4.00  4.04  3.96  4.23  4.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 0 0 0  0  6  1  4.14  787/1535  4.14  4.08  4.08  4.27  4.14
7. Was the grading system clearly explained           0   0  0  1  1  3  2  3.86 1258/1651  3.86  4.20  4.18  4.32  3.86
8. How many times was class cancelled                 0   0  0  0  0  3  4  4.57 1155/1673  4.57  4.65  4.69  4.78  4.57
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 0 0 0 0 0 3 4  4.57  331/1656  4.57  4.06  4.07  4.15  4.57


            Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared       1   0  0  0  1  1  4  4.50  858/1586  4.50  4.43  4.43  4.50  4.50
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject  1   0  0  0  0  0  6  5.00    1/1585  5.00  4.72  4.69  4.79  5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 1  0  0  0  0  2  4  4.67  438/1582  4.67  4.30  4.26  4.33  4.67
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned    1   0  0  0  0  1  5  4.83  246/1575  4.83  4.32  4.27  4.30  4.83


            Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 1  0  0  0  0  2  4  4.67  295/1520  4.67  4.14  4.01  4.19  4.67
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 1  0  0  0  0  1  5  4.83  289/1515  4.83  4.37  4.24  4.47  4.83
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 1 0 0 0  0  1  5  4.83  323/1511  4.83  4.37  4.27  4.49  4.83


                                          Frequency Distribution


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

```
Course-Section: PUBL 698 0101 (8013)              University of Maryland                        Page   10
Title                                              Baltimore County                              JAN 21, 2006
Instructor:                    (Instr. A)          Fall   2005                                   Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:      0
Questionnaires:  12                      Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire
```

```
                                                        Frequencies      Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
             Questions                          NR  NA   1  2  3  4  5  Mean    Rank    Mean  Mean  Mean Mean  Mean
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
             General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course  3   0   0  0  4  4  1  3.67 1449/1674  ****  3.99  4.27 4.07  3.67
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals   3   0   1  3  1  3  1  3.00 1608/1674  ****  4.11  4.23 4.16  3.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals  3   6   0  0  0  2  1  4.33  771/1423  ****  4.51  4.27 4.16  4.33
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals   3   2   3  0  0  3  1  2.86 1583/1609  ****  3.97  4.22 4.05  2.86
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 3 3   2  1  1  1  1  2.67 1532/1585  ****  3.78  3.96 3.88  2.67
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 3 1 0  1  1  3  3  4.00  870/1535  ****  4.03  4.08 3.89  4.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained           3   2   3  2  1  1  0  2.00 1636/1651  ****  3.77  4.18 4.10  2.00
8. How many times was class cancelled                 4   1   0  0  0  1  6  4.86  796/1673  ****  4.58  4.69 4.67  4.86
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 6 0 0  1  3  2  0  3.17 1506/1656  ****  4.07  4.07 3.96  2.88

             Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared       3   0   2  0  1  2  4  3.67 1442/1586  ****  4.34  4.43 4.37  3.92
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject  3   0   0  0  3  1  5  4.22 1410/1585  ****  4.73  4.69 4.60  4.33
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 3 0   2  1  0  2  4  3.56 1388/1582  ****  4.17  4.26 4.17  3.85
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned    3   0   3  1  0  3  2  3.00 1487/1575  ****  4.09  4.27 4.17  3.07
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 4 4  0  0  1  1  2  4.25  489/1380  ****  4.17  3.94 3.78  4.25

             Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 4 0  2  0  2  2  2  3.25 1284/1520  ****  3.57  4.01 3.76  3.25
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 4 0  2  0  1  1  4  3.63 1267/1515  ****  3.72  4.24 3.97  3.63
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 4 0 1  0  2  1  4  3.88 1155/1511  ****  3.92  4.27 4.00  3.88
4. Were special techniques successful                 4   3   0  0  1  1  3  4.40  287/ 994  ****  3.96  3.94 3.73  4.40
```

                            Frequency Distribution

```
Credits Earned        Cum. GPA        Expected Grades        Reasons                Type                  Majors
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
 00-27      3      0.00-0.99   0        A   8       Required for Majors  0    Graduate     2     Major        0
 28-55      1      1.00-1.99   0        B   0
 56-83      0      2.00-2.99   0        C   0       General              0    Under-grad  10     Non-major   12
 84-150     0      3.00-3.49   4        D   0
 Grad.      2      3.50-4.00   2        F   0       Electives            0    #### - Means there are not enough
                                        P   0                                responses to be significant
                                        I   0       Other                7
                                        ?   0
```

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies 1	2	3	4	5	Instructor Mean	Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	3	0	0	0	4	4	1	3.67	1449/1674	****	3.99	4.27	4.07	3.67
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	3	0	1	3	1	3	1	3.00	1608/1674	****	4.11	4.23	4.16	3.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	3	6	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	771/1423	****	4.51	4.27	4.16	4.33
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	3	2	3	0	0	3	1	2.86	1583/1609	****	3.97	4.22	4.05	2.86
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	3	3	2	1	1	1	1	2.67	1532/1585	****	3.78	3.96	3.88	2.67
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	3	1	0	1	1	3	3	4.00	870/1535	****	4.03	4.08	3.89	4.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	3	2	3	2	1	1	0	2.00	1636/1651	****	3.77	4.18	4.10	2.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	4	1	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	796/1673	****	4.58	4.69	4.67	4.86
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	7	0	1	1	2	1	0	2.60	1616/1656	****	4.07	4.07	3.96	2.88
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	6	0	0	0	2	1	3	4.17	1211/1586	****	4.34	4.43	4.37	3.92
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	5	0	0	0	2	0	5	4.43	1292/1585	****	4.73	4.69	4.60	4.33
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	5	0	0	1	0	3	3	4.14	1043/1582	****	4.17	4.26	4.17	3.85
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	5	0	2	1	0	2	2	3.14	1467/1575	****	4.09	4.27	4.17	3.07
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	5	3	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	489/1380	****	4.17	3.94	3.78	4.25
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	2	0	2	2	2	3.25	1284/1520	****	3.57	4.01	3.76	3.25
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	2	0	1	1	4	3.63	1267/1515	****	3.72	4.24	3.97	3.63
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	1	0	2	1	4	3.88	1155/1511	****	3.92	4.27	4.00	3.88
4. Were special techniques successful	4	3	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	287/ 994	****	3.96	3.94	3.73	4.40

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	0	A	8	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	2	Major	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	0						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	10	Non-major	12
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	4	D	0						
Grad.	2	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough			
				P	0			responses to be significant			
				I	0	Other	7				
				?	0						