

Course Section: PUBL 600 0101
 Title RESEARCH METHODOLOGY
 Instructor: MANDELL, MARVIN
 Enrollment: 25
 Questionnaires: 19

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2006

Page 1472
 JAN 18, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	2	11	6	4.21	963/1669	4.21	4.19	4.23	4.35	4.21	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	1	2	7	8	4.05	1065/1666	4.05	3.81	4.19	4.19	4.05	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	15	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/1421	****	4.28	4.24	4.33	****	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	8	9	4.37	684/1617	4.37	3.81	4.15	4.24	4.37	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	2	1	11	4	3.79	1037/1555	3.79	3.94	4.00	4.07	3.79	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	1	9	7	4.22	690/1543	4.22	4.28	4.06	4.27	4.22	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	2	1	2	8	5	3.72	1290/1647	3.72	3.58	4.12	4.15	3.72	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	19	5.00	1/1668	5.00	4.82	4.67	4.83	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	2	0	0	1	8	8	4.41	486/1605	4.41	3.99	4.07	4.13	4.41	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	3	5	11	4.42	923/1514	4.42	3.96	4.39	4.37	4.42	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	18	4.95	307/1551	4.95	4.49	4.66	4.72	4.95	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	1	4	3	10	4.22	905/1503	4.22	3.76	4.24	4.22	4.22	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	2	1	6	10	4.26	901/1506	4.26	3.81	4.26	4.24	4.26	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	3	0	0	5	7	4	3.94	665/1311	3.94	3.52	3.85	3.89	3.94	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	6	12	4.67	340/1490	4.67	4.28	4.05	4.18	4.67	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	0	3	15	4.83	306/1502	4.83	4.31	4.26	4.46	4.83	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	1	2	15	4.78	411/1489	4.78	4.22	4.29	4.44	4.78	
4. Were special techniques successful	1	3	0	0	2	3	10	4.53	224/1006	4.53	4.24	4.00	4.11	4.53	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	18	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 226	****	****	4.20	4.47	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	18	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 233	****	****	4.19	4.41	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	18	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 225	****	****	4.50	4.65	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	18	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 223	****	****	4.35	4.48	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	18	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 206	****	****	4.15	4.39	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	17	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 112	****	4.46	4.38	4.39	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	17	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 97	****	4.20	4.36	4.38	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 92	****	4.47	4.22	4.36	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 105	****	4.47	4.20	4.23	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	17	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 98	****	2.67	3.95	3.93	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 58	****	****	4.22	4.53	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	18	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.06	4.57	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	18	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.39	4.90	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	18	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 40	****	****	3.97	4.31	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	18	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.33	4.55	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 55	****	****	4.34	4.45	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	18	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 42	****	****	4.31	4.40	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	18	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 46	****	****	4.45	4.61	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	18	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 33	****	****	4.25	4.60	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	18	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 29	****	****	4.34	5.00	****	

Course Section: PUBL 600 0101
 Title RESEARCH METHODOLOGY
 Instructor: MANDELL, MARVIN
 Enrollment: 25
 Questionnaires: 19

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2006

Page 1472
 JAN 18, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	2	A	6	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	18	Major	15
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	7						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	1	Under-grad	1	Non-major	4
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	18	3.50-4.00	1	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	15				
				?	2						

Course Section: PUBL 601 0101
 Title: POLITICAL/SOCIAL CONTE
 Instructor: MILLER, CHERYL
 Enrollment: 24
 Questionnaires: 24

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2006

Page 1473
 JAN 18, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sept
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	3	0	0	0	1	7	13	4.57	511/1669	4.57	4.19	4.23	4.35	4.57	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	4	0	0	0	3	8	9	4.30	814/1666	4.30	3.81	4.19	4.19	4.30	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	4	0	0	0	2	5	13	4.55	511/1421	4.55	4.28	4.24	4.33	4.55	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	4	0	1	1	0	6	12	4.35	695/1617	4.35	3.81	4.15	4.24	4.35	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	8	13	4.62	255/1555	4.62	3.94	4.00	4.07	4.62	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	2	8	11	4.43	490/1543	4.43	4.28	4.06	4.27	4.43	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	3	0	0	0	2	5	14	4.57	401/1647	4.57	3.58	4.12	4.15	4.57	
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	0	0	0	0	12	9	4.43	1257/1668	4.43	4.82	4.67	4.83	4.43	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	1	0	0	2	12	5	4.16	800/1605	4.16	3.99	4.07	4.13	4.16	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	1	4	16	4.71	505/1514	4.71	3.96	4.39	4.37	4.71	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	0	1	20	4.95	256/1551	4.95	4.49	4.66	4.72	4.95	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	1	5	9	6	3.95	1117/1503	3.95	3.76	4.24	4.22	3.95	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	1	2	8	10	4.29	884/1506	4.29	3.81	4.26	4.24	4.29	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	16	1	0	2	1	1	3.20	****/1311	****	3.52	3.85	3.89	****	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	7	13	4.65	348/1490	4.65	4.28	4.05	4.18	4.65	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	1	1	2	16	4.65	495/1502	4.65	4.31	4.26	4.46	4.65	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	2	3	1	14	4.35	846/1489	4.35	4.22	4.29	4.44	4.35	
4. Were special techniques successful	4	11	0	1	3	2	3	3.78	651/1006	3.78	4.24	4.00	4.11	3.78	
Laboratory															
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	22	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 233	****	****	4.19	4.41	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	22	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 112	****	4.46	4.38	4.39	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	22	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 97	****	4.20	4.36	4.38	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	22	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/ 92	****	4.47	4.22	4.36	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	22	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/ 105	****	4.47	4.20	4.23	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	23	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 98	****	2.67	3.95	3.93	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	23	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 58	****	****	4.22	4.53	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	23	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.06	4.57	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	23	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.39	4.90	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	23	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 40	****	****	3.97	4.31	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	23	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.33	4.55	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	23	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 55	****	****	4.34	4.45	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	23	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 42	****	****	4.31	4.40	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	2	A	6	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	15	Major	14
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	8						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	1	Under-grad	9	Non-major	10
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	15	3.50-4.00	5	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough			

P	0			responses to be significant
I	0	Other	18	
?	3			

Course Section: PUBL 603 0101
 Title POLICY ANALYSIS
 Instructor: MILLER, NANCY A
 Enrollment: 33
 Questionnaires: 27

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2006

Page 1474
 JAN 18, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	1	4	12	10	4.15	1052/1669	4.15	4.19	4.23	4.35	4.15	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	5	6	15	4.30	827/1666	4.30	3.81	4.19	4.19	4.30	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	20	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	184/1421	4.86	4.28	4.24	4.33	4.86	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	1	4	8	13	4.27	790/1617	4.27	3.81	4.15	4.24	4.27	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	3	2	2	8	12	3.89	955/1555	3.89	3.94	4.00	4.07	3.89	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	1	1	3	6	15	4.27	649/1543	4.27	4.28	4.06	4.27	4.27	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	4	6	17	4.48	515/1647	4.48	3.58	4.12	4.15	4.48	
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	1	24	4.96	285/1668	4.96	4.82	4.67	4.83	4.96	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	8	1	0	0	2	13	3	4.06	884/1605	4.06	3.99	4.07	4.13	4.06	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	3	4	20	4.63	647/1514	4.63	3.96	4.39	4.37	4.63	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	2	4	21	4.70	973/1551	4.70	4.49	4.66	4.72	4.70	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	6	7	14	4.30	843/1503	4.30	3.76	4.24	4.22	4.30	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	4	8	14	4.30	876/1506	4.30	3.81	4.26	4.24	4.30	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	7	1	1	4	7	7	3.90	699/1311	3.90	3.52	3.85	3.89	3.90	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	1	4	9	10	4.17	764/1490	4.17	4.28	4.05	4.18	4.17	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	4	5	15	4.46	693/1502	4.46	4.31	4.26	4.46	4.46	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	1	3	20	4.79	389/1489	4.79	4.22	4.29	4.44	4.79	
4. Were special techniques successful	4	9	0	1	2	6	5	4.07	465/1006	4.07	4.24	4.00	4.11	4.07	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	23	3	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 226	****	****	4.20	4.47	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	25	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 233	****	****	4.19	4.41	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	26	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 225	****	****	4.50	4.65	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	25	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 223	****	****	4.35	4.48	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	25	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 206	****	****	4.15	4.39	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	20	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	44/ 112	4.86	4.46	4.38	4.39	4.86	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	21	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	****/ 97	****	4.20	4.36	4.38	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	21	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	****/ 92	****	4.47	4.22	4.36	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	21	0	0	0	0	3	3	4.50	****/ 105	****	4.47	4.20	4.23	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	21	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	****/ 98	****	2.67	3.95	3.93	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	23	0	0	1	0	0	3	4.25	****/ 58	****	****	4.22	4.53	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	24	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	****/ 52	****	****	4.06	4.57	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	24	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.39	4.90	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	24	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 40	****	****	3.97	4.31	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	24	1	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 30	****	****	4.33	4.55	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	24	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/ 55	****	****	4.34	4.45	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	25	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 42	****	****	4.31	4.40	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	24	1	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 46	****	****	4.45	4.61	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	25	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/ 33	****	****	4.25	4.60	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	25	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 29	****	****	4.34	5.00	****	

Course Section: PUBL 603 0101
 Title POLICY ANALYSIS
 Instructor: MILLER, NANCY A
 Enrollment: 33
 Questionnaires: 27

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2006

Page 1474
 JAN 18, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	7	0.00-0.99	5	A	18	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	13	Major	22
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	4						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	14	Non-major	5
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	13	3.50-4.00	7	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	23				
				?	1						

Course Section: PUBL 610B 0101
 Title MLTIVRTE RGSSN ANALYSI
 Instructor: SALKEVER, DAVID
 Enrollment: 15
 Questionnaires: 15

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2006

Page 1475
 JAN 18, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	1	2	8	4	4.00	1173/1669	4.00	4.19	4.23	4.35	4.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	3	3	5	4	3.67	1387/1666	3.67	3.81	4.19	4.19	3.67	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	12	0	0	2	0	1	3.67	****/1421	****	4.28	4.24	4.33	****	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	6	6	4.20	863/1617	4.20	3.81	4.15	4.24	4.20	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	1	9	4	4.07	734/1555	4.07	3.94	4.00	4.07	4.07	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	1	1	7	5	4.14	783/1543	4.14	4.28	4.06	4.27	4.14	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	0	4	1	6	3	3.57	1365/1647	3.57	3.58	4.12	4.15	3.57	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	15	5.00	1/1668	5.00	4.82	4.67	4.83	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	1	0	4	6	2	3.62	1305/1605	3.62	3.99	4.07	4.13	3.62	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	5	3	6	4.07	1180/1514	4.07	3.96	4.39	4.37	4.07	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	6	8	4.57	1135/1551	4.57	4.49	4.66	4.72	4.57	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	1	1	6	4	2	3.36	1376/1503	3.36	3.76	4.24	4.22	3.36	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	1	4	5	3	3.57	1305/1506	3.57	3.81	4.26	4.24	3.57	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	9	0	0	1	3	1	4.00	587/1311	4.00	3.52	3.85	3.89	4.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	2	0	2	4	2	3.40	1215/1490	3.40	4.28	4.05	4.18	3.40	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	1	2	3	3	3.89	1129/1502	3.89	4.31	4.26	4.46	3.89	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	0	1	2	3	3	3.89	1133/1489	3.89	4.22	4.29	4.44	3.89	
4. Were special techniques successful	6	7	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	****/1006	****	4.24	4.00	4.11	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	5	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	7	Major	12
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	0	B	7						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	7	Under-grad	8	Non-major	3
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	7	3.50-4.00	9	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	6				
				?	0						

Course Section: PUBL 610E 0101
 Title GLOBALIZATION & THE CI
 Instructor: SHORT, JOHN R
 Enrollment: 4
 Questionnaires: 4

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2006

Page 1476
 JAN 18, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	590/1669	4.50	4.19	4.23	4.35	4.50	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	0	2	4.00	1094/1666	4.00	3.81	4.19	4.19	4.00	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	1357/1421	3.00	4.28	4.24	4.33	3.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	219/1617	4.75	3.81	4.15	4.24	4.75	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	340/1555	4.50	3.94	4.00	4.07	4.50	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	180/1543	4.75	4.28	4.06	4.27	4.75	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	481/1647	4.50	3.58	4.12	4.15	4.50	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	4	0	4.00	1530/1668	4.00	4.82	4.67	4.83	4.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	918/1605	4.00	3.99	4.07	4.13	4.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	1082/1514	4.25	3.96	4.39	4.37	4.25	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1551	5.00	4.49	4.66	4.72	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	3	1	4.25	879/1503	4.25	3.76	4.24	4.22	4.25	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	642/1506	4.50	3.81	4.26	4.24	4.50	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	2	0	1	1	0	2.25	1260/1311	2.25	3.52	3.85	3.89	2.25	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	261/1490	4.75	4.28	4.05	4.18	4.75	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	393/1502	4.75	4.31	4.26	4.46	4.75	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	434/1489	4.75	4.22	4.29	4.44	4.75	
4. Were special techniques successful	0	1	0	0	0	3	0	4.00	479/1006	4.00	4.24	4.00	4.11	4.00	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 112	5.00	4.46	4.38	4.39	5.00	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 97	5.00	4.20	4.36	4.38	5.00	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 92	5.00	4.47	4.22	4.36	5.00	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 105	5.00	4.47	4.20	4.23	5.00	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	3	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	46/ 98	4.00	2.67	3.95	3.93	4.00	

Frequency Distribution

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

- Means there are not enough responses to be significant

Course Section: PUBL 698 0101
 Title CAPSTONE
 Instructor: FLETCHER, PATTE (Instr. A)
 Enrollment: 9
 Questionnaires: 8

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2006

Page 1477
 JAN 18, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	2	1	1	4	3.88	1307/1669	4.06	4.19	4.23	4.35	3.88	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	2	4	1	1	3.13	1565/1666	3.50	3.81	4.19	4.19	3.13	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	6	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	557/1421	4.50	4.28	4.24	4.33	4.50	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	3	3	0	1	1	0	2.00	1610/1617	3.08	3.81	4.15	4.24	2.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	2	0	2	3	3.86	980/1555	3.64	3.94	4.00	4.07	3.86	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	1	3	2	3.86	1060/1543	4.18	4.28	4.06	4.27	3.86	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	2	1	1	0	2	1	3.20	1504/1647	2.85	3.58	4.12	4.15	3.20	
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1668	5.00	4.82	4.67	4.83	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	2	4	0	3.67	1274/1605	3.93	3.99	4.07	4.13	3.67	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	0	2	0	2	0	3.00	1457/1514	3.39	3.96	4.39	4.37	3.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	1	1	1	1	3.50	1489/1551	4.05	4.49	4.66	4.72	3.50	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	0	1	1	2	0	3.25	1393/1503	3.45	3.76	4.24	4.22	3.25	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	1	1	0	2	0	2.75	1436/1506	3.33	3.81	4.26	4.24	2.75	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	3	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1311	****	3.52	3.85	3.89	****	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	1	3	3	3.88	970/1490	4.22	4.28	4.05	4.18	3.88	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	3	1	4	4.13	962/1502	4.06	4.31	4.26	4.46	4.13	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	2	3	3	4.13	999/1489	3.85	4.22	4.29	4.44	4.13	
4. Were special techniques successful	0	3	0	0	2	1	2	4.00	479/1006	4.38	4.24	4.00	4.11	4.00	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	3	0	0	1	0	2	2	4.00	81/ 112	4.00	4.46	4.38	4.39	4.00	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	3	0	0	2	0	0	3	3.80	82/ 97	3.80	4.20	4.36	4.38	3.80	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	1	0	1	3	4.20	57/ 92	4.20	4.47	4.22	4.36	4.20	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	1	0	1	3	4.20	61/ 105	4.20	4.47	4.20	4.23	4.20	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	3	0	2	1	2	0	0	2.00	93/ 98	2.00	2.67	3.95	3.93	2.00	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course Section: PUBL 698 0101
 Title CAPSTONE
 Instructor: MANDELL, MARVIN (Instr. B)
 Enrollment: 9
 Questionnaires: 8

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2006

Page 1478
 JAN 18, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	2	1	1	4	3.88	1307/1669	4.06	4.19	4.23	4.35	3.88	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	2	4	1	1	3.13	1565/1666	3.50	3.81	4.19	4.19	3.13	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	6	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	557/1421	4.50	4.28	4.24	4.33	4.50	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	3	3	0	1	1	0	2.00	1610/1617	3.08	3.81	4.15	4.24	2.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	2	0	2	3	3.86	980/1555	3.64	3.94	4.00	4.07	3.86	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	1	3	2	3.86	1060/1543	4.18	4.28	4.06	4.27	3.86	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	2	1	1	0	2	1	3.20	1504/1647	2.85	3.58	4.12	4.15	3.20	
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1668	5.00	4.82	4.67	4.83	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	1	1	3	1	3.67	1274/1605	3.93	3.99	4.07	4.13	3.67	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	0	2	0	2	0	3.00	1457/1514	3.39	3.96	4.39	4.37	3.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	1	1	1	1	3.50	1489/1551	4.05	4.49	4.66	4.72	3.50	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	0	1	1	2	0	3.25	1393/1503	3.45	3.76	4.24	4.22	3.25	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	1	1	0	2	0	2.75	1436/1506	3.33	3.81	4.26	4.24	2.75	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	3	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1311	****	3.52	3.85	3.89	****	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	1	3	3	3.88	970/1490	4.22	4.28	4.05	4.18	3.88	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	3	1	4	4.13	962/1502	4.06	4.31	4.26	4.46	4.13	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	2	3	3	4.13	999/1489	3.85	4.22	4.29	4.44	4.13	
4. Were special techniques successful	0	3	0	0	2	1	2	4.00	479/1006	4.38	4.24	4.00	4.11	4.00	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	3	0	0	1	0	2	2	4.00	81/ 112	4.00	4.46	4.38	4.39	4.00	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	3	0	0	2	0	0	3	3.80	82/ 97	3.80	4.20	4.36	4.38	3.80	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	1	0	1	3	4.20	57/ 92	4.20	4.47	4.22	4.36	4.20	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	1	0	1	3	4.20	61/ 105	4.20	4.47	4.20	4.23	4.20	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	3	0	2	1	2	0	0	2.00	93/ 98	2.00	2.67	3.95	3.93	2.00	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course Section: PUBL 698 0102
 Title CAPSTONE
 Instructor: SHORT, JOHN (Instr. A)
 Enrollment: 8
 Questionnaires: 8

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2006

Page 1479
 JAN 18, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	1	0	3	4	4.25	914/1669	4.06	4.19	4.23	4.35	4.25	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	5	1	3.88	1257/1666	3.50	3.81	4.19	4.19	3.88	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	7	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1421	4.50	4.28	4.24	4.33	****	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	1	3	2	4.17	899/1617	3.08	3.81	4.15	4.24	4.17	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	1	0	2	3	1	3.43	1287/1555	3.64	3.94	4.00	4.07	3.43	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	2	5	4.50	390/1543	4.18	4.28	4.06	4.27	4.50	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	4	1	0	1	2	2.50	1586/1647	2.85	3.58	4.12	4.15	2.50	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1668	5.00	4.82	4.67	4.83	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	6	2	4.25	690/1605	3.93	3.99	4.07	4.13	4.19	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	1	0	5	2	4.00	1199/1514	3.39	3.96	4.39	4.37	3.79	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	1	6	4.63	1083/1551	4.05	4.49	4.66	4.72	4.60	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	2	4	2	4.00	1066/1503	3.45	3.76	4.24	4.22	3.64	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	3	1	3	4.00	1069/1506	3.33	3.81	4.26	4.24	3.92	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	7	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/1311	****	3.52	3.85	3.89	****	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	405/1490	4.22	4.28	4.05	4.18	4.57	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	1	1	2	3	4.00	1013/1502	4.06	4.31	4.26	4.46	4.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	3	0	1	3	3.57	1249/1489	3.85	4.22	4.29	4.44	3.57	
4. Were special techniques successful	1	3	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	143/1006	4.38	4.24	4.00	4.11	4.75	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	7	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 112	4.00	4.46	4.38	4.39	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 97	3.80	4.20	4.36	4.38	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 92	4.20	4.47	4.22	4.36	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 105	4.20	4.47	4.20	4.23	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	7	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 98	2.00	2.67	3.95	3.93	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	8
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	0
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	1	D	0
Grad.	6	3.50-4.00	3	F	0
				P	0
				I	0
				?	0
			Required for Majors	0	Graduate
			General	0	Under-grad
			Electives	0	Non-major
			Other	8	

- Means there are not enough responses to be significant

Course Section: PUBL 698 0102
 Title CAPSTONE
 Instructor: NORRIS, DONALD (Instr. B)
 Enrollment: 8
 Questionnaires: 8

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2006

Page 1480
 JAN 18, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	1	0	3	4	4.25	914/1669	4.06	4.19	4.23	4.35	4.25	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	5	1	3.88	1257/1666	3.50	3.81	4.19	4.19	3.88	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	7	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1421	4.50	4.28	4.24	4.33	****	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	1	3	2	4.17	899/1617	3.08	3.81	4.15	4.24	4.17	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	1	0	2	3	1	3.43	1287/1555	3.64	3.94	4.00	4.07	3.43	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	2	5	4.50	390/1543	4.18	4.28	4.06	4.27	4.50	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	4	1	0	1	2	2.50	1586/1647	2.85	3.58	4.12	4.15	2.50	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1668	5.00	4.82	4.67	4.83	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	1	5	2	4.13	830/1605	3.93	3.99	4.07	4.13	4.19	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	1	2	3	1	3.57	1375/1514	3.39	3.96	4.39	4.37	3.79	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	1	1	5	4.57	1135/1551	4.05	4.49	4.66	4.72	4.60	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	1	0	3	2	1	3.29	1389/1503	3.45	3.76	4.24	4.22	3.64	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	1	0	0	3	1	2	3.83	1209/1506	3.33	3.81	4.26	4.24	3.92	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	7	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/1311	****	3.52	3.85	3.89	****	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	405/1490	4.22	4.28	4.05	4.18	4.57	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	1	1	2	3	4.00	1013/1502	4.06	4.31	4.26	4.46	4.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	3	0	1	3	3.57	1249/1489	3.85	4.22	4.29	4.44	3.57	
4. Were special techniques successful	1	3	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	143/1006	4.38	4.24	4.00	4.11	4.75	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	7	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 112	4.00	4.46	4.38	4.39	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 97	3.80	4.20	4.36	4.38	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 92	4.20	4.47	4.22	4.36	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 105	4.20	4.47	4.20	4.23	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	7	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 98	2.00	2.67	3.95	3.93	****	

Frequency Distribution

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