Course-Section: PUBL 600 0101 University of Maryland Title RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

Baltimore County Spring 2007

Instructor: MARCOTTE, DAVID Enrollment: 15

Questionnaires: 13

	Page	1315
JUN	1 26,	2007
Job	IRBE	3029

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

			Fre	equei	ncies	3		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	6	7	4.54	571/1522	4.54	4.44	4.30	4.45	4.54
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	5	7	4.46	607/1522		4.13	4.26	4.29	4.46
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	4	9	4.69	337/1285	4.69	4.35	4.30	4.31	4.69
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	5	8	4.62	367/1476	4.62	4.10	4.22	4.31	4.62
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	5	7	4.46	375/1412	4.46	3.93	4.06	4.25	4.46
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	4	9	4.69	187/1381	4.69	4.26	4.08	4.25	4.69
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	3	10	4.77	201/1500	4.77	4.01	4.18	4.22	4.77
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	5	8	4.62	983/1517	4.62	4.70	4.65	4.73	4.62
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	0	6	5	4.45	445/1497	4.45	4.04	4.11	4.21	4.45
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	6	6	4.38	946/1440	4.38	4.51	4.45	4.48	4.38
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	2	11	4.85	656/1448	4.85	4.82	4.71	4.80	4.85
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	7	6	4.46	648/1436	4.46	4.15	4.29	4.37	4.46
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	3	9	4.75	350/1432	4.75	4.24	4.29	4.33	4.75
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	4	0	1	5	1	1	3.25	1011/1221	3.25	3.26	3.93	3.83	3.25
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	3	8	4.58	337/1280	4.58	4.17	4.10	4.24	4.58
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	0	2	10	4.83	290/1277	4.83	4.58	4.34	4.52	4.83
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	200/1269	4.92	4.45	4.31	4.51	4.92
4. Were special techniques successful	1	6	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	141/ 854	4.67	3.60	4.02	4.08	4.67
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	11	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 79	****	4.75	4.58	4.76	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	10	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 77	****	4.75	4.52	4.70	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/ 65	****	5.00	4.49	4.71	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	1	2	0	3.67	****/ 78	****	4.75	4.45	4.66	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	10	0	0	0	2	1	0	3.33	****/ 80	****	4.25	4.11	4.38	****
P		<u> </u>	.,											

## Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: PUBL 601 0101 University of Maryland Title POLITICAL/SOCIAL CONTE Baltimore County Instructor: CHRIQUI, JAMIE Spring 2007

Questions

University of Maryland Page 1316
Baltimore County JUN 26, 2007
Spring 2007 Job IRBR3029

Instructor

Rank

Course Dept UMBC Level Sect

Mean Mean Mean Mean

Enrollment:	23			
Questionnaires:	22	Student Cou	urse Evaluation	Questionnaire

		Genera	al															
				om this course	2	0		1	5	4	10	4.15	1001/1522	4.15	4.44	4.30	4.45	4.15
2. Did th	ne instru	ctor make clear	r the ex	xpected goals	2	0	0	1	1	6	12	4.45	639/1522	4.45	4.13	4.26	4.29	4.45
3. Did th	ne exam q	uestions reflec	ct the e	expected goals	2	0	0	0	3	5	12	4.45	602/1285	4.45	4.35	4.30	4.31	4.45
4. Did ot	her evalu	uations reflect	t the ex	xpected goals	2	0	1	0	4				903/1476			4.22	4.31	4.15
				what you learned	2	0	0	1	1	6	12	4.45	393/1412	4.45	3.93	4.06	4.25	4.45
6. Did wr	ritten as	signments conti	ribute 1	to what you learned	2	0	0	0	3	9	8	4.25	604/1381	4.25	4.26	4.08	4.25	4.25
		g system clear:				0		1	1	7	11	4.40	630/1500	4.40	4.01	4.18	4.22	4.40
		was class cand				0		0	0	2	18	4.90	487/1517	4.90	4.70	4.65	4.73	4.90
9. How wo	ould you	grade the overa	all tead	ching effectiveness	7	0	0	1	4	5	5	3.93	993/1497	3.93	4.04	4.11	4.21	3.93
		Lectu	re															
		uctor's lecture			2	0	0	0					565/1440			4.45	4.48	4.70
2. Did th	ne instru	ctor seem inter	rested :	in the subject	2	0	0	0	1	3	16	4.75	859/1448	4.75	4.82	4.71	4.80	4.75
3. Was le	ecture mat	terial presente	ed and	explained clearly	2	0	0	0	2	9	9	4.35	772/1436	4.35	4.15	4.29	4.37	4.35
4. Did th	ne lecture	es contribute t	to what	explained clearly you learned	2	0	0	0	4	6	10	4.30	847/1432	4.30	4.24	4.29	4.33	4.30
5. Did au	Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understand						4	2	4	2	1	2.54	1161/1221	2.54	3.26	3.93	3.83	2.54
1. Did cl	ass disc	ussions contrib	bute to	what you learned	2	0	0	2	4	7	7	3.95	771/1280	3.95	4.17	4.10	4.24	3.95
2. Were a	all stude	nts actively e	ncourage	ed to participate nd open discussion	2	0	0	0	0	2	18	4.90	228/1277	4.90	4.58	4.34	4.52	4.90
3. Did th	ne instru	ctor encourage	fair a	nd open discussion	2	0	0	0	0	5	15	4.75	381/1269	4.75	4.45		4.51	
4. Were s	special to	echniques succe	essful		2	17	1	0	0	0	2	3.67	****/ 854	****	3.60	4.02	4.08	****
				Freque	ency	/ Dis	trib	utio	n									
Credits E	Carned	Cum. GPA	A	Expected Grades				Rea	ason	S			Typ	e			Majors	3
				Expected Grades														
00-27	4	0.00-0.99		A 15		Re	quir	ed f	or Ma	ajor	s	1	Graduate	<u>:</u>	9	Majo	or	16
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B 5 C 0 D 0	Required for Majo													
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C 0	General							0	Under-gr	ad 1	.3	Non-	-major	6
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	2	D 0	GCIICI a I													
Grad.	9	3.50-4.00	12	F 0		Ele	ecti	ves				0	#### - M	leans t	here a	re not	enoug	јh
				P 0									response	s to k	e sign	nifican	ıt	
				I 0	Other						1	.9	-					
				- 0														

Frequencies

NR NA 1 2 3 4 5 Mean

Baltimore County Spring 2007

University of Maryland

Page 1317

JUN 26, 2007

Job IRBR3029

Enrollment: 20 Questionnaires: 16 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Ι

?

0

2

Course-Section: PUBL 603 0101

POLICY ANALYSIS

MANDELL, MARVIN

Title

Instructor:

Overstions						_	ncies		_		ructor	Course	_			Sec		
		Question	.s		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mea
		Genera	1															
1. Did you g	gain ne	w insights,ski	lls fro	om this course	1	0	0	0	1	7	7	4.40	733/1522	4.40	4.44	4.30	4.45	4.4
2. Did the i	instruc	ctor make clear	the ex	spected goals	0	0	0	0	3	5	8	4.31	811/1522	4.31	4.13	4.26	4.29	4.3
3. Did the e	exam qu	estions reflec	t the e	expected goals	0	9	0	0	2	1	4	4.29	745/1285	4.29	4.35	4.30	4.31	4.2
4. Did other	evalu	ations reflect	the ex	spected goals	0	0	0	1	4	4	7	4.06	977/1476	4.06	4.10	4.22	4.31	4.0
5. Did assig	gned re	eadings contrib	ute to	what you learned	0	0	1	1	6	5	3	3.50	1165/1412	3.50	3.93	4.06	4.25	3.5
5. Did writt	en ass	signments contr	ibute t	to what you learned	0	0	0	0	3	2	11	4.50	331/1381	4.50	4.26	4.08	4.25	4.5
. Was the g	grading	system clearl	y expla	ained	0	0	1	2	1	4	8	4.00	988/1500	4.00	4.01	4.18	4.22	4.0
3. How many	times	was class canc	elled		0	0	0	0	0	1	15	4.94	341/1517	4.94	4.70	4.65	4.73	4.9
9. How would	d you g	grade the overa	ll tead	ching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	9	7	4.44	469/1497	4.44	4.04	4.11	4.21	4.4
		Lectur	_															
		actor's lecture			0	0	0	0	0	5	11	4.69	578/1440		4.51	4.45	4.48	4.6
		ctor seem inter			0	0	0	0	0	2	14	4.88	575/1448	4.88	4.82	4.71	4.80	4.8
B. Was lectu	ıre mat	erial presente	d and e	explained clearly	0	0	0	1	1	5	9	4.38	751/1436	4.38	4.15	4.29	4.37	4.3
. Did the l	lecture	es contribute t	o what	you learned	0	0	0	1	0	4	11	4.56	569/1432	4.56	4.24	4.29	4.33	4.5
. Did audio	ovisual	techniques en	hance y	our understanding	0	0	0	0	2	5	9	4.44	335/1221	4.44	3.26	3.93	3.83	4.4
				what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	7		4.40			4.17	4.10		4.4
				ed to participate	1	0	0	0	2	2		4.60			4.58		4.52	
				nd open discussion	1	0	0	0	1	5			562/1269				4.51	
1. Were spec	cial te	echniques succe	ssful		1	2	1	2	2	4	4	3.62	647/ 854	3.62	3.60	4.02	4.08	3.6
		Labora																
2. Were you	provid	led with adequa	te back	ground information	15	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 228	***	****	4.35	4.39	***
0 13 '		Semina			1.4	-	•	•	0	0	1	F 00	****		4 55	4 50	4 50	
2. Was the 1	ınstruc	ctor available	ior inc	dividual attention	14	T	U	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 77	****	4.75	4.52	4.70	***
				Frequ	iency	Dist	rib	utio	n									
Credits Earn	ned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades	s Reasons					5			Ту	pe			Majors	3
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	1	A 7	Required for Major					 s	4	Graduat	e 1	.0	Majo	 or	 5	
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	в 7												_		
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C 0	General					0	Under-g	rad	6	Non-	-major	11		
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	2	D 0														
Grad. 1	LO	3.50-4.00	4	F 0		Ele	ecti	ves				1	#### - 1	Means t	here a	re not	enoug	jh
				P 0									respons	es to b	e sign	ificar	nt	
	P 0										1	0	-					

Other

10

University of Maryland Baltimore County

Spring 2007

Page 1318 JUN 26, 2007 Job IRBR3029

Questionnaires:	18	Student	Course	Evaluation	Questionnaire

Course-Section: PUBL 604 0101

25

STATISTICAL ANALYSIS

MARCOTTE, DAVID

Title

Instructor:

Enrollment:

			Fre	eque	ncie	3		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect		
	Questions		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
	1															
1 Pidi	General		^	0	0	1	0	_	11	4 50	605/1500	4 50	1 11	4 20	4 45	4 50
1. Did you gain new			0	0	0	1	0	б	ΤŢ	4.50	605/1522		4.44	4.30	4.45	4.50
2. Did the instruct			0	0	0	1	4	7	6		1080/1522	4.00	4.13	4.26	4.29	4.00
3. Did the exam que			0	0	Τ	1	1	4	11	4.28	752/1285	4.28	4.35	4.30	4.31	4.28
4. Did other evalua		1 3	0	0	1	0	2	8	7	4.11	945/1476		4.10	4.22	4.31	4.11
5. Did assigned rea	_	_	0	3	6	2	1	2	4		1369/1412		3.93	4.06	4.25	2.73
	9	to what you learned	0	7	1	0	0	4	6	4.27	585/1381	4.27	4.26	4.08	4.25	4.27
<ol> <li>Was the grading</li> </ol>	system clearly exp	lained	1	0	0	1	0	6	10	4.47	527/1500	4.47	4.01	4.18	4.22	4.47
8. How many times w	as class cancelled		0	0	0	0	0	1	17	4.94	292/1517	4.94	4.70	4.65	4.73	4.94
9. How would you gr	ade the overall tea	aching effectiveness	4	0	1	0	1	5	7	4.21	695/1497	4.21	4.04	4.11	4.21	4.21
	Lecture															
1 Were the instruc	l prepared	0	0	1	Ο	1	5	11	4.39	946/1440	4.39	4.51	4.45	4.48	4.39	
	1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject						0	4	13		1060/1448		4.82	4.71	4.80	4.61
3. Was lecture mate		3	0	0	0	0	6	6	5		1206/1436		4.15	4.29	4.37	3.78
4. Did the lectures	_	-	0	0	0	1	2	2	12	4.44	707/1432		4.24	4.29	4.33	4.44
5. Did audiovisual		-	1	-	0	Τ	1	2	5	4.33	408/1221		3.26	3.93	3.83	4.33
5. Did audiovisual	techniques enhance	your understanding	Т	5	U	U	1	О	5	4.33	408/1221	4.33	3.20	3.93	3.83	4.33
	Discussion															
1. Did class discus	sions contribute to	o what you learned	3	0	3	0	1	5	6	3.73	920/1280	3.73	4.17	4.10	4.24	3.73
2. Were all student	s actively encourag	ged to participate	4	0	0	3	2	4	5	3.79	1056/1277	3.79	4.58	4.34	4.52	3.79
3. Did the instruct	or encourage fair a	and open discussion	5	0	0	0	2	4	7	4.38	685/1269	4.38	4.45	4.31	4.51	4.38
4. Were special tec	4. Were special techniques successful				0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/ 854	****	3.60	4.02	4.08	****
	iency	7 Dist	trib	utio	n											
Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	les Reasons								Ty	pe			Majors	

Credits E	Carned	Cum. GP	A	Expected	d Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors	
00-27	5	0.00-0.99	0	A	10	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	8	Major	2
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	5						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	С	0	General	0	Under-grad	10	Non-major	16
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	4	D	0						
Grad.	8	3.50-4.00	10	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	n
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	14				
				?	0						

University of Maryland Page 1319
Baltimore County JUN 26, 2007
Spring 2007 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Course-Section: PUBL 610B 0101

3

URBAN THEORY

SHORT, JOHN R

Title

Instructor:

Enrollment:

Questionnaires: 2

Lecture  1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 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. Discussion  1. Discussion  1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 7. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 7. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 7. Discussion  1. Frequency Distribution  1. Distribution  1. Were all techniques understand effectiveness 8. Did audiovisual techniques understand of the subject 9. Discussion 9. Discuss							Frequencies				Inst	cructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect		
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 1/1522 5.00 4.44 4.30 4.45 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals 0 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 1/1522 5.00 4.13 4.26 4.29 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 938/1285 4.00 4.35 4.30 4.31 4.Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 1 4.00 1009/1476 4.00 4.10 4.22 4.31 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0 0 0 0 0 1 1 0 1 4.00 1009/1476 4.00 4.10 4.22 4.31 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 0 0 0 0 1 1 0 1 4.00 806/1381 4.00 4.26 4.08 4.25 7. Was the grading system clearly explained 0 0 0 0 0 1 1 0 1 4.00 806/1381 4.00 4.26 4.08 4.25 7. Was the grading system clearly explained 0 0 0 0 0 1 1 0 1 4.00 806/1381 4.00 4.26 4.08 4.25 7. Was the grading system clearly explained 0 0 0 0 0 1 1 0 1 4.00 806/1381 4.00 4.26 4.08 4.25 7. Was the grading system clearly explained 0 0 0 0 0 1 1 0 1 4.00 806/1381 4.00 4.26 4.08 4.25 7. Was the grading system clearly explained 0 0 0 0 0 1 1 0 1 4.00 808/1497 4.00 4.01 4.18 4.22 8. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 0 0 0 0 0 1 1 4.00 808/1497 4.00 4.04 4.11 4.21 8.00 8.00 8.00 8.00 8.00 8.00 8.00 8.0			Questions	3		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 1/1522 5.00 4.13 4.26 4.29 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals 0 1 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 938/1285 4.00 4.35 4.30 4.31 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals 0 0 0 0 1 0 1 4.00 1009/1476 4.00 4.10 4.22 4.31 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0 0 0 0 0 1 1 1 4.50 339/1412 4.50 3.93 4.06 4.25 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 0 0 0 0 1 1 0 1 4.00 806/1381 4.00 4.26 4.08 4.25 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 0 0 0 0 1 1 0 1 4.00 806/1381 4.00 4.26 4.08 4.25 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 0 0 0 0 1 1 0 1 4.00 806/1381 4.00 4.26 4.08 4.25 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 0 0 0 0 1 1 0 1 4.00 806/1381 4.00 4.26 4.08 4.25 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 0 0 0 0 1 1 0 1 4.00 806/1381 4.00 4.26 4.08 4.25 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 0 0 0 0 1 1 0 1 4.00 898/1497 4.00 4.04 4.11 4.21 8.00 8.00 8.00 8.00 8.00 8.00 8.00 8.0			General	 l															
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 938/1285 4.00 4.35 4.30 4.31 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals 0 0 0 0 1 0 1 4.00 1009/1476 4.00 4.00 4.22 4.31 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0 0 0 0 0 1 1 4.50 339/1412 4.50 3.93 4.06 4.25 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 0 0 0 1 1 0 1 4.00 806/1381 4.00 4.26 4.08 4.25 7. Was the grading system clearly explained 0 0 0 0 0 1 1 0 3.50 1298/1500 3.50 4.01 4.18 4.22 8. How many times was class cancelled 0 0 0 0 0 1 1 1 4.50 1080/1517 4.50 4.03 4.05 4.73 4.65 4.73 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 0 0 0 0 0 1 0 1 4.00 898/1497 4.00 4.04 4.11 4.21    Lecture 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 0 0 0 0 0 1 0 1 4.00 1186/1440 4.00 4.51 4.45 4.48 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 0 0 0 0 0 1 0 1 4.00 1186/1440 4.00 4.51 4.45 4.48 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 0 0 0 0 0 1 0 1 4.00 1056/1436 4.00 4.15 4.29 4.37 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 0 0 0 0 1 0 1 3.50 1270/1432 3.50 4.24 4.29 4.33 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 0 1 1 0 0 0 0 1.00 1216/1221 1.00 3.26 3.93 3.83    Discussion 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 0 0 0 0 1 0 1 4.00 930/1277 4.00 4.58 4.34 4.52 4. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 0 0 0 0 1 0 1 4.00 930/1277 4.00 4.58 4.34 4.52 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 0 0 0 1 0 0 1 3.50 1171/1269 3.50 4.45 4.31 4.51 4.54 4.55 4.55 4.55 4.55 4.55 4.5	1. Did yo	ou gain ne	ew insights,ski	lls from	this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1522	5.00	4.44	4.30	4.45	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals 0 0 0 0 1 0 1 4.00 1009/1476 4.00 4.10 4.22 4.31 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0 0 0 0 0 1 1 4.50 339/1412 4.50 3.93 4.06 4.25 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 0 0 0 0 1 1 4.00 806/1381 4.00 4.26 4.08 4.25 7. Was the grading system clearly explained 0 0 0 0 0 1 1 0 3.50 1298/1500 3.50 4.01 4.18 4.22 8. How many times was class cancelled 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 1 4.50 1080/1517 4.50 4.70 4.65 4.73 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 0 0 0 0 0 1 0 1 4.00 898/1497 4.00 4.04 4.11 4.21    Lecture  Lecture  Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 0 0 0 0 0 1 0 1 4.00 1186/1440 4.00 4.51 4.45 4.48 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 0 0 0 0 0 1 0 1 4.00 1056/1436 4.00 4.15 4.29 4.37 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 0 0 0 0 1 0 1 4.00 1056/1436 4.00 4.15 4.29 4.37 4. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 0 1 1 0 0 0 0 1.20 1216/1221 1.00 3.26 3.93 3.83    Discussion  1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 0 0 0 0 1 0 1 4.00 718/1280 4.00 4.17 4.10 4.24 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 0 0 0 0 1 0 1 4.00 930/1277 4.00 4.58 4.34 4.52 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 0 0 0 1 0 1 0 0 1 3.50 1117/1269 3.50 4.45 4.31 4.51 4. Were special techniques successful    Frequency Distribution	2. Did th	ne instruc	ctor make clear	the expe	cted goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1522	5.00	4.13	4.26	4.29	5.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0 0 0 0 0 1 1 4.50 339/1412 4.50 3.93 4.06 4.25 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 0 0 0 1 1 0 1 4.00 806/1381 4.00 4.26 4.08 4.25 7. Was the grading system clearly explained 0 0 0 0 1 1 0 3.50 1298/1500 3.50 4.01 4.18 4.22 8. How many times was class cancelled 0 0 0 0 0 1 1 4.50 1080/1517 4.50 4.70 4.65 4.73 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 0 0 0 0 0 1 0 1 4.00 898/1497 4.00 4.04 4.11 4.21    Lecture  1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 0 0 0 0 0 1 0 1 4.00 1186/1440 4.00 4.51 4.45 4.48 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 0 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 1/1448 5.00 4.82 4.71 4.80 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0 0 0 0 0 1 0 1 4.00 1056/1436 4.00 4.15 4.29 4.37 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 0 0 0 1 0 1 4.00 1056/1436 4.00 4.15 4.29 4.37 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 0 1 1 0 0 1 3.50 1270/1432 3.50 4.24 4.29 4.33 5. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 0 0 0 0 1 0 0 1 0 1 4.00 718/1280 4.00 4.17 4.10 4.24 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 0 0 0 0 1 0 1 4.00 930/1277 4.00 4.58 4.34 4.52 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 0 0 0 1 0 0 1 3.50 1117/1269 3.50 4.45 4.31 4.51 4. Were special techniques successful 0 1 0 0 1 0 0 1 3.50 1117/1269 3.50 4.45 4.31 4.51 4. Were special techniques successful 0 1 0 0 1 0 0 3.00 779/854 3.00 3.60 4.02 4.08	3. Did th	ne exam qu	uestions reflect	t the exp	ected goals	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	938/1285	4.00	4.35	4.30	4.31	4.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 0 0 0 1 0 1 4.00 806/1381 4.00 4.26 4.08 4.25 7. Was the grading system clearly explained 0 0 0 0 0 1 1 0 3.50 1298/1500 3.50 4.01 4.18 4.22 8. How many times was class cancelled 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 1 4.50 1080/1517 4.50 4.70 4.65 4.73 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 0 0 0 0 1 0 1 4.00 898/1497 4.00 4.04 4.11 4.21 Lecture  1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 0 0 0 0 0 1 0 1 4.00 1186/1440 4.00 4.51 4.45 4.48 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 0 0 0 0 0 1 0 1 4.00 1186/1440 4.00 4.51 4.45 4.48 2. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 0 0 0 0 1 0 1 4.00 1056/1436 4.00 4.15 4.29 4.37 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 0 0 0 0 1 0 1 3.50 1270/1432 3.50 4.24 4.29 4.33 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 0 1 1 0 0 0 1 1.00 1216/1221 1.00 3.26 3.93 3.83 Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 0 0 0 0 1 0 1 4.00 718/1280 4.00 4.17 4.10 4.24 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 0 0 0 0 1 0 1 4.00 930/1277 4.00 4.58 4.34 4.52 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 0 0 0 1 0 1 3.50 1117/1269 3.50 4.45 4.31 4.51 4. Were special techniques successful 0 1 0 0 1 0 0 1 3.50 1117/1269 3.50 4.45 4.31 4.51 4. Were special techniques successful 0 1 0 0 1 0 0 1 0 0 3.00 779/854 3.00 3.60 4.02 4.08	4. Did ot	ther evalu	uations reflect	the expe	cted goals	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	1009/1476	4.00	4.10	4.22	4.31	4.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained 0 0 0 0 1 1 0 3.50 1298/1500 3.50 4.01 4.18 4.22 8. How many times was class cancelled 0 0 0 0 0 1 1 4.50 1080/1517 4.50 4.70 4.65 4.73 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 0 0 0 0 1 0 1 4.00 898/1497 4.00 4.04 4.11 4.21    Lecture  1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 0 0 0 0 0 1 0 1 4.00 1186/1440 4.00 4.51 4.45 4.48 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 0 1 4.00 1056/1436 5.00 4.82 4.71 4.80 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0 0 0 0 1 0 1 4.00 1056/1436 4.00 4.15 4.29 4.37 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 0 0 0 0 1 0 1 3.50 1270/1432 3.50 4.24 4.29 4.33 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 0 1 1 0 0 0 1 0 1 4.00 718/1280 4.00 4.17 4.10 4.24 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 0 0 0 0 1 0 1 4.00 930/1277 4.00 4.58 4.34 4.52 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 0 0 0 1 0 1 0 1 3.50 1117/1269 3.50 4.45 4.31 4.51 4. Were special techniques successful 0 1 0 0 1 0 1 0 0 3.00 779/854 3.00 3.60 4.02 4.08	5. Did as	ssigned re	eadings contribu	ate to wh	at you learned	0	0	0	0	-	1	1	4.50	339/1412	4.50	3.93	4.06	4.25	4.50
8. How many times was class cancelled 0 0 0 0 0 1 1 4.50 1080/1517 4.50 4.70 4.65 4.73 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 0 0 0 0 0 1 0 1 4.00 898/1497 4.00 4.04 4.11 4.21   Lecture  1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 0 0 0 0 0 1 0 1 4.00 1186/1440 4.00 4.51 4.45 4.48 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 1/1448 5.00 4.82 4.71 4.80 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0 0 0 0 1 0 1 4.00 1056/1436 4.00 4.15 4.29 4.37 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 0 0 0 1 0 1 3.50 1270/1432 3.50 4.24 4.29 4.33 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 0 1 1 0 0 0 1.00 1216/1221 1.00 3.26 3.93 3.83   Discussion  Discussion   Discussions contribute to what you learned 0 0 0 0 1 0 1 4.00 718/1280 4.00 4.17 4.10 4.24 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 0 0 0 0 1 0 1 4.00 930/1277 4.00 4.58 4.34 4.52 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 0 0 0 1 0 1 0 0 1 3.50 1117/1269 3.50 4.45 4.31 4.51 4. Were special techniques successful 0 1 0 0 1 0 0 3.00 779/854 3.00 3.60 4.02 4.08	6. Did wr	ritten ass	signments contr	ibute to	what you learned	0	0				0	1	4.00	806/1381	4.00	4.26	4.08	4.25	4.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 0 0 0 0 1 0 1 4.00 898/1497 4.00 4.04 4.11 4.21  Lecture  1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 0 0 0 0 0 1 0 1 4.00 1186/1440 4.00 4.51 4.45 4.48 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 0 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 1/1448 5.00 4.82 4.71 4.80 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0 0 0 0 0 1 0 1 4.00 1056/1436 4.00 4.15 4.29 4.37 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 0 0 0 1 0 1 3.50 1270/1432 3.50 4.24 4.29 4.33 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 0 1 1 0 0 0 0 1.00 1216/1221 1.00 3.26 3.93 3.83  Discussion  1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 0 0 0 0 1 0 1 4.00 718/1280 4.00 4.17 4.10 4.24 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 0 0 0 0 1 0 1 4.00 930/1277 4.00 4.58 4.34 4.52 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 0 0 0 1 0 1 0 0 3.00 779/854 3.00 3.60 4.02 4.08  Frequency Distribution	7. Was th	ne grading	g system clearly	y explair	ied	0	0		0	1	1	0	3.50	1298/1500	3.50	4.01	4.18	4.22	3.50
Lecture  1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared  2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject  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. Discussion  1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned  7. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned  8. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject  8. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding  9. Discussion  1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned  9. Discussion  1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned  9. Discussion  1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned  9. Discussion  1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned  1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned  1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned  1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned  1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned  1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned  1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned  1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned  1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned  1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned  1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned  1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned  1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned  1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned  1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned  1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned  1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned  1. Did class discussions  1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned  1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned  1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned  1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned  1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned  1. Did class di	8. How ma	any times	was class cance	elled		0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	1080/1517	4.50	4.70	4.65	4.73	4.50
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 0 0 0 0 1 0 1 4.00 1186/1440 4.00 4.51 4.45 4.48 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 1/1448 5.00 4.82 4.71 4.80 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0 0 0 0 1 0 1 4.00 1056/1436 4.00 4.15 4.29 4.37 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 0 0 0 1 0 1 3.50 1270/1432 3.50 4.24 4.29 4.33 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 0 1 1 0 0 0 1.00 1216/1221 1.00 3.26 3.93 3.83 Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 0 0 0 0 1 0 1 4.00 718/1280 4.00 4.17 4.10 4.24 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 0 0 0 0 1 0 1 4.00 930/1277 4.00 4.58 4.34 4.52 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 0 0 0 1 0 1 3.50 1117/1269 3.50 4.45 4.31 4.51 4. Were special techniques successful 0 1 0 0 1 0 0 3.00 779/854 3.00 3.60 4.02 4.08	9. How wo	ould you g	grade the overa	ll teachi	ng effectiveness	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	898/1497	4.00	4.04	4.11	4.21	4.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 1/1448 5.00 4.82 4.71 4.80 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0 0 0 0 1 0 1 4.00 1056/1436 4.00 4.15 4.29 4.37 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 0 0 0 1 0 1 3.50 1270/1432 3.50 4.24 4.29 4.33 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 0 1 1 0 0 0 0 1.00 1216/1221 1.00 3.26 3.93 3.83  Discussion  1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 0 0 0 0 1 0 1 4.00 718/1280 4.00 4.17 4.10 4.24 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 0 0 0 0 1 0 1 4.00 930/1277 4.00 4.58 4.34 4.52 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 0 0 0 1 0 1 3.50 1117/1269 3.50 4.45 4.31 4.51 4. Were special techniques successful  Frequency Distribution			Lecture	Э															
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 1/1448 5.00 4.82 4.71 4.80 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0 0 0 0 1 0 1 4.00 1056/1436 4.00 4.15 4.29 4.37 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 0 0 0 1 0 1 3.50 1270/1432 3.50 4.24 4.29 4.33 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 0 1 1 0 0 0 0 1.00 1216/1221 1.00 3.26 3.93 3.83  Discussion  1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 0 0 0 0 1 0 1 4.00 718/1280 4.00 4.17 4.10 4.24 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 0 0 0 0 1 0 1 4.00 930/1277 4.00 4.58 4.34 4.52 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 0 0 0 1 0 1 3.50 1117/1269 3.50 4.45 4.31 4.51 4. Were special techniques successful	1. Were t	the instru	actor's lectures	s well pr	repared	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	1186/1440	4.00	4.51	4.45	4.48	4.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 0 0 0 1 0 0 1 3.50 1270/1432 3.50 4.24 4.29 4.33 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 0 1 1 0 0 0 0 1.00 1216/1221 1.00 3.26 3.93 3.83 Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 0 0 0 0 1 0 1 4.00 718/1280 4.00 4.17 4.10 4.24 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 0 0 0 0 1 0 1 4.00 930/1277 4.00 4.58 4.34 4.52 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 0 0 0 1 0 0 1 3.50 1117/1269 3.50 4.45 4.31 4.51 4. Were special techniques successful 0 1 0 0 1 0 0 3.00 779/854 3.00 3.60 4.02 4.08						0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1448	5.00	4.82	4.71	4.80	5.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 0 1 1 0 0 0 0 1.00 1216/1221 1.00 3.26 3.93 3.83  Discussion  1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 0 0 0 0 1 0 1 4.00 718/1280 4.00 4.17 4.10 4.24  2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 0 0 0 0 1 0 1 4.00 930/1277 4.00 4.58 4.34 4.52  3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 0 0 0 1 0 0 1 3.50 1117/1269 3.50 4.45 4.31 4.51  4. Were special techniques successful 0 1 0 0 1 0 0 3.00 779/854 3.00 3.60 4.02 4.08  Frequency Distribution						0	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	1056/1436	4.00	4.15	4.29	4.37	4.00
Discussion  1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 0 0 0 0 1 0 1 4.00 718/1280 4.00 4.17 4.10 4.24  2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 0 0 0 0 1 0 1 4.00 930/1277 4.00 4.58 4.34 4.52  3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 0 0 0 1 0 0 1 3.50 1117/1269 3.50 4.45 4.31 4.51  4. Were special techniques successful 0 1 0 0 1 0 0 3.00 779/854 3.00 3.60 4.02 4.08  Frequency Distribution	4. Did th	-						0	1	0	0	1	3.50	1270/1432	3.50	4.24	4.29	4.33	3.50
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 0 0 0 0 1 0 1 4.00 718/1280 4.00 4.17 4.10 4.24 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 0 0 0 0 1 0 1 4.00 930/1277 4.00 4.58 4.34 4.52 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 0 0 0 1 0 0 1 3.50 1117/1269 3.50 4.45 4.31 4.51 4. Were special techniques successful 0 1 0 0 1 0 0 3.00 779/854 3.00 3.60 4.02 4.08 Frequency Distribution	5. Did au							1	0	0	0	0	1.00	1216/1221	1.00	3.26	3.93	3.83	1.00
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 0 0 0 0 1 0 1 4.00 718/1280 4.00 4.17 4.10 4.24 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 0 0 0 0 1 0 1 4.00 930/1277 4.00 4.58 4.34 4.52 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 0 0 0 1 0 0 1 3.50 1117/1269 3.50 4.45 4.31 4.51 4. Were special techniques successful 0 1 0 0 1 0 0 3.00 779/854 3.00 3.60 4.02 4.08 Frequency Distribution			Discus	sion															
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 0 0 0 0 1 0 1 4.00 930/1277 4.00 4.58 4.34 4.52 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 0 0 0 1 0 0 1 3.50 1117/1269 3.50 4.45 4.31 4.51 4. Were special techniques successful 0 1 0 0 1 0 0 3.00 779/854 3.00 3.60 4.02 4.08 Frequency Distribution	1. Did cl	lass discu			nat vou learned	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	718/1280	4.00	4.17	4.10	4.24	4.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 0 0 0 1 0 0 1 3.50 1117/1269 3.50 4.45 4.31 4.51 4. Were special techniques successful 0 1 0 0 1 0 0 3.00 779/854 3.00 3.60 4.02 4.08  Frequency Distribution					-				0		0	1		-,					4.00
4. Were special techniques successful 0 1 0 0 1 0 0 3.00 779/854 3.00 3.60 4.02 4.08  Frequency Distribution						0	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	1117/1269	3.50	4.45	4.31	4.51	3.50
			_				1	0	0	1	0	0							3.00
					Fred	uencs	, Die	tri bi	ıtioı	1									
					1109	acricy	DIS	CIID	10101										
Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades Reasons Type Majors	Credits E	Earned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	asons	3			Ту	pe			Majors	;
00-27 1 0.00-0.99 0 A 2 Required for Majors 0 Graduate 0 Major	00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A 2		Re	quir	ed f	or Ma	jors	3	0	Graduat	 e	0	Majo	r r	0
28-55 0 1.00-1.99 0 B 0	28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	в 0			-			-								
56-83 0 2.00-2.99 0 C 0 General 0 Under-grad 2 Non-major	56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C 0	General						0	Under-g	rad	2	Non-	major	2	
84-150 0 3.00-3.49 1 D 0	84-150	0	3.00-3.49	1	D 0	GCIICIAI							_				-		
Grad. 0 $3.50-4.00$ 0 F 0 Electives 0 $\#\#\#$ - Means there are not enough	Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	0	F 0		Ele	ecti	<i>r</i> es				0	#### - 1	Means t	here a	re not	enoug	ıh
P 0 responses to be significant					P 0									respons	es to b	e sign	ifican	ıt	
I 0 Other 1					I 0		Ot1	her					1						
? 0					? 0														

Course-Section: PUBL 610C 0101

Title HURRICANE KATRINA

Instructor: SHORT, JOHN R

Enrollment: 5
Questionnaires: 5

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2007 Page 1320 JUN 26, 2007 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	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1522	5.00	4.44	4.30	4.45	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	4	1	4.20	935/1522	4.20	4.13	4.26	4.29	4.20
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	378/1476	4.60	4.10	4.22	4.31	4.60
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	430/1412	4.40	3.93	4.06	4.25	4.40
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1381	5.00	4.26	4.08	4.25	5.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	2	0	3	4.20	839/1500	4.20	4.01	4.18	4.22	4.20
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	3	2	4.40	1161/1517	4.40	4.70	4.65	4.73	4.40
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	189/1497	4.75	4.04	4.11	4.21	4.75
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1440	5.00	4.51	4.45	4.48	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1448	5.00	4.82	4.71	4.80	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	478/1436	4.60	4.15	4.29	4.37	4.60
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	294/1432	4.80	4.24	4.29	4.33	4.80
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	3	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	606/1221	4.00	3.26	3.93	3.83	4.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	477/1280	4.40	4.17	4.10	4.24	4.40
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1277	5.00	4.58	4.34	4.52	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1269	5.00	4.45	4.31	4.51	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	0	4	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 854	****	3.60	4.02	4.08	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	1	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	44/ 79	4.75	4.75	4.58	4.76	4.75
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	1	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	45/ 77	4.75	4.75	4.52	4.70	4.75
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/ 65	5.00	5.00	4.49	4.71	5.00
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	35/ 78	4.75	4.75	4.45	4.66	4.75
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	1	0	0	0	0	3	1	4.25	43/ 80	4.25	4.25	4.11	4.38	4.25

## Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: PUBL 610D 0101 University of Maryland Title Baltimore County APPL MULT REGRESS ANAL

Instructor: SALKEVER, DAVID Spring 2007

Enrollment: 9 Questionnaires: 9

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Page 1321

JUN 26, 2007

Job IRBR3029

		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	1	1	1	6	4.33	814/1522	4.33	4.44	4.30	4.45	4.33
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals			0	1	2	3	3	3.89	1200/1522	3.89	4.13	4.26	4.29	3.89
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	6	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1285	5.00	4.35	4.30	4.31	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	0	6	4.33	703/1476	4.33	4.10	4.22	4.31	4.33
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	2	0	6	4.22	594/1412	4.22	3.93	4.06	4.25	4.22
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	0	4	4	4.22	633/1381	4.22	4.26	4.08	4.25	4.22
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	2	1	0	2	4	3.56	1280/1500	3.56	4.01	4.18	4.22	3.56
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1517	5.00	4.70	4.65	4.73	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	2	5	1	3.88	1057/1497	3.88	4.04	4.11	4.21	3.88
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	3	6	4.67	604/1440	4.67	4.51	4.45	4.48	4.67
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1448	5.00	4.82	4.71	4.80	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	1	1	3	3	4.00	1056/1436	4.00	4.15	4.29	4.37	4.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	2	2	4	4.25	884/1432	4.25	4.24	4.29	4.33	4.25
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	6	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/1221	****	3.26	3.93	3.83	****
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	2	2	3	0	2.88	1228/1280	2.88	4.17	4.10	4.24	2.88
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	1	0	0	0	7	4.50	594/1277	4.50	4.58	4.34	4.52	4.50
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	1	1	2	4	4.13	844/1269	4.13	4.45	4.31	4.51	4.13
4. Were special techniques successful	1	7	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 854	****	3.60	4.02	4.08	****

## Frequency Distribution

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

University of Maryland Baltimore County

Page 1322

JUN 26, 2007

Job IRBR3029

Course-Section: PUBL 610F 0101 Title STRATEGIC MANAGEMENT Instructor: FLETCHER, PATRI Spring 2007

Enrollment: 9 Questionnaires: 7

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

						-	ncie	S		Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect		
		Question	s		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		 Genera	 1															
1. Did yo	u gain ne	ew insights,ski	_	m this course	0	0	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	525/1522	4.57	4.44	4.30	4.45	4.57
_	_	ctor make clear			1	0	0	2	2	0	2	3.33	1419/1522		4.13	4.26	4.29	3.33
		uestions reflec			1	4	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	1160/1285	3.50	4.35	4.30	4.31	3.50
4. Did ot	her eval	uations reflect	the ex	pected goals	1	0	0	1	0	2	3	4.17		4.17	4.10	4.22	4.31	4.17
5. Did as	signed re	eadings contrib	ute to	what you learned	0	0	1	2	0	2	2	3.29	1278/1412	3.29	3.93	4.06	4.25	3.29
6. Did wr	6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned						1	0	1	2	3	3.86	977/1381	3.86	4.26	4.08	4.25	3.86
7. Was the	e grading	g system clearl	y expla	ined	0	0	0	1	0	1	5	4.43	600/1500	4.43	4.01	4.18	4.22	4.43
8. How man	ny times	was class canc	elled		0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1517	5.00	4.70	4.65	4.73	5.00
	9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectivenes						0	0	1	3	2	4.17	756/1497	4.17	4.04	4.11	4.21	4.17
		Lectur	<b>e</b>															
1. Were ti	he instr		-	prepared	0	0	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	716/1440	4.57	4.51	4.45	4.48	4.57
	<ol> <li>Were the instructor's lectures well prepared</li> <li>Did the instructor seem interested in the subject</li> </ol>							0	0	1			629/1448		4.82	4.71	4.80	4.86
				xplained clearly	0	0	0	0	2	2			1056/1436		4.15	4.29	4.37	4.00
		es contribute t		1	0	0	2	0	0	2			1251/1432			4.29	4.33	3.57
				our understanding	0	5	1	0	0	1			1165/1221		3.26	3.93	3.83	2.50
		Discus	gion															
1 Did al:	ace diec			what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	161/1280	4.86	4.17	4.10	4.24	4.86
				d to participate	0	0	0	0	0	1	6		. ,	4.86	4.58	4.34	4.52	4.86
				d open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	277/1269	4.86	4.45	4.31	4.51	4.86
		echniques succe		a open arroadren	0	0	0	0	1	3	3	4.29	314/ 854		3.60	4.02	4.08	4.29
				Frequ	onat	. Dia	+ r i h	t i o	n									
				1.1640	terrey	DIS	CIID	ucio.	.1									
Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Re	ason	S			Ty	pe			Majors	3
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	A 1		Red	guir	ed f	or Ma	ajors		0	Graduat	 e	2	Majo	 or	4
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	в 4			-			-						3		
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C 0		Ger	nera	1				2	Under-g	rad	5	Non-	-major	3
84-150																-		
Grad.					Ele	ecti <sup>.</sup>	ves				2	#### - 1	Means t	here a	re not	enoug	jh	
P 0										respons				_				
I 0			Otl	her					2	_								

Course-Section: PUBL 613 0101 University of Maryland Title MANAGING PUBLIC ORG NORRIS, DONALD

Baltimore County Spring 2007

Page 1323

JUN 26, 2007

Job IRBR3029

Instructor:	NORRIS,	DONALD	Spring 2007
Enrollment:	15		
Questionnaires:	11		Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

						Fr	eque	ncies	3		Ins	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sec
		Questions		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mea
		General															
. Did you	gain ne	ew insights, skills	from this course	0	0	0	1	4	3	3	3.73	1310/1522	3.73	4.44	4.30	4.45	3.7
. Did the	instruc	ctor make clear the	expected goals	0	0	0	0	5	4	2	3.73	1280/1522	3.73	4.13	4.26	4.29	3.
. Did the	exam qu	uestions reflect th	e expected goals	0	4	0	0	1	4	2	4.14	849/1285	4.14	4.35	4.30	4.31	4.
. Did oth	er evalı	ations reflect the	expected goals	0	0	2	0	4	3	2	3.27	1376/1476	3.27	4.10	4.22	4.31	3.
. Did ass	igned re	eadings contribute	to what you learned	0	0	0	1	4	3	3	3.73	1037/1412	3.73	3.93	4.06	4.25	3.
. Did wri	tten ass	signments contribut	e to what you learned	0	0	1	1	4	2	3	3.45	1175/1383	3.45	4.26	4.08	4.25	3.
. Was the	grading	g system clearly ex	plained	0	0	1	3	1	3	3	3.36	1369/1500	3.36	4.01	4.18	4.22	3.
. How man	y times	was class cancelle	i i	0	0	0	0	0	9	2	4.18	1307/1517	4.18	4.70	4.65	4.73	4.
. How wou	ld you g	grade the overall t	eaching effectiveness	2	0	2	3	1	1	2	2.78	1454/1497	2.78	4.04	4.11	4.21	2.
		Lecture															
. Were th	e instru	uctor's lectures we	ll prepared	0	0	0	1	2	0	8	4.36	961/1440	4.36	4.51	4.45	4.48	4.
. Did the	d in the subject	0	0	0	1	1	1	8	4.45	1199/1448	4.45	4.82	4.71	4.80	4.		
. Was lec	d explained clearly	1	0	1	0	3	3	3	3.70	1228/1436	3.70	4.15	4.29	4.37	3.		
. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned					0	1	0	4	3	3	3.64	1233/1432	3.64	4.24	4.29	4.33	3.
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding					9	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/1222	****	3.26	3.93	3.83	* *
		Discussion															
. Did cla	ss discu	ussions contribute	to what you learned	2	0	0	0	4	3	2	3.78	894/1280	3.78	4.17	4.10	4.24	3.
. Were al	l studer	nts actively encour	aged to participate	2	0	0	0	1	3	5	4.44	652/1277	4.44	4.58	4.34	4.52	4.
. Did the	instruc	ctor encourage fair	and open discussion	2	0	0	2	2	3	2	3.56	1107/1269	3.56	4.45	4.31	4.51	3.
. Were sp	ecial te	echniques successfu	1	2	6	2	1	0	0	0	1.33	853/ 854	1.33	3.60	4.02	4.08	1.
		Seminar															
. Were as	signed t	topics relevant to	the announced theme	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 79	****	4.75	4.58	4.76	* *
. Was the	instruc	ctor available for	individual attention	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 77	****	4.75	4.52	4.70	* *
. Did res	earch pr	rojects contribute	to what you learned	10	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 65	****	5.00	4.49	4.71	* *
. Did pre	sentatio	ons contribute to w	nat you learned	10	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 78	****	4.75	4.45	4.66	* *
. Were cr	iteria f	for grading made cl	ear	10	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 80	****	4.25	4.11	4.38	* *
			Frequ	iency	/ Dist	trib	utio	n									
redits Ea	rned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades				Re	asons	5			T	тре			Majors	3
 00-27	2	0.00-0.99 0	A 3		Dec	 รถเร็ <i>ร</i>	 ed f	or Ma	ior		2	Graduat	·	 6	Majo		
28-55	1	1.00-1.99 0	А 3 В 6		Ked	4urr	eu I	OT INC	וייטני	o	4	Gradual	. =	U	Ma JC	) <u>T</u>	
26-33 56-83	0	2.00-2.99 0	C 0		Cox	nera	1				1	Under-	mad	5	Mo∽	-major	
34-150	0	3.00-3.49 2	D 0		Ger	ier a	т				Т	onder-6	jı au	5	NOI1-	-ıııa Jor	
	6		Б 0 F 0		. רים	ecti					0	####	Moana	horo -		ono	~h
Grad.	O	3.50-4.00 6	P 0		ъ⊥€	ECLI	ves				U		Means t			_	ATT
			- · ·		04-1	ner					8	respons	ses to b	e sign	ııııcar	16	
			I 0		()† h	IPY											

Baltimore County

University of Maryland Spring 2007

Page 1324

JUN 26, 2007

Job IRBR3029

Enrollment:	35				
Questionnaires:	21	Student	Course	Evaluation	Questionnaire

Course-Section: PUBL 617 0101

ECONOMICS OF LAW

BRENNAN, TIMOTH

Title

Instructor:

Questions NR NA 1 2 3 4 5 Mean Rank Mean Mean Mean Mean Mean Mean Mean Mean
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course 0 0 0 0 0 9 12 4.57 525/1522 4.57 4.44 4.30 4.45 4.57 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals 0 0 0 3 3 9 6 3.86 1217/1522 3.86 4.13 4.26 4.29 3.86 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals 0 0 0 0 4 5 12 4.38 666/1285 4.38 4.35 4.30 4.31 4.38 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals 0 1 0 0 0 6 14 4.70 285/1476 4.70 4.10 4.22 4.31 4.70 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0 1 1 2 2 7 8 3.95 826/1412 3.95 3.93 4.06 4.25 3.95
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course 0 0 0 0 0 9 12 4.57 525/1522 4.57 4.44 4.30 4.45 4.57 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals 0 0 0 3 3 9 6 3.86 1217/1522 3.86 4.13 4.26 4.29 3.86 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals 0 0 0 0 4 5 12 4.38 666/1285 4.38 4.35 4.30 4.31 4.38 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals 0 1 0 0 0 6 14 4.70 285/1476 4.70 4.10 4.22 4.31 4.70 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0 1 1 2 2 7 8 3.95 826/1412 3.95 3.93 4.06 4.25 3.95
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals 0 0 0 3 3 9 6 3.86 1217/1522 3.86 4.13 4.26 4.29 3.86 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals 0 0 0 0 4 5 12 4.38 666/1285 4.38 4.35 4.30 4.31 4.38 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals 0 1 0 0 0 6 14 4.70 285/1476 4.70 4.10 4.22 4.31 4.70 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0 1 1 2 2 7 8 3.95 826/1412 3.95 3.93 4.06 4.25 3.95
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals 0 1 0 0 0 6 14 4.70 285/1476 4.70 4.10 4.22 4.31 4.70 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0 1 1 2 2 7 8 3.95 826/1412 3.95 3.93 4.06 4.25 3.95
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0 1 1 2 2 7 8 3.95 826/1412 3.95 3.93 4.06 4.25 3.95
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 0 0 0 1 8 12 4.52 314/1381 4.52 4.26 4.08 4.25 4.52
7. Was the grading system clearly explained 0 0 0 0 4 4 13 4.43 600/1500 4.43 4.01 4.18 4.22 4.43
8. How many times was class cancelled 0 0 0 0 1 12 8 4.33 1217/1517 4.33 4.70 4.65 4.73 4.33
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 0 0 0 0 6 8 7 4.05 872/1497 4.05 4.04 4.11 4.21 4.05
Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 0 0 0 0 2 6 13 4.52 774/1440 4.52 4.51 4.45 4.48 4.52
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject $0  0  0  1  1  19  4.86  629/1448  4.86  4.82  4.71  4.80  4.86$
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0 0 0 2 5 5 9 $4.00\ 1056/1436$ $4.00\ 4.15$ $4.29$ $4.37$ $4.00$
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 0 0 0 1 3 5 12 4.33 820/1432 4.33 4.24 4.29 4.33 4.33
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 0 15 0 1 1 2 2 3.83 739/1221 3.83 3.26 3.93 3.83 3.83
Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 9 0 0 1 2 5 4 4.00 718/1280 4.00 4.17 4.10 4.24 4.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 9 0 0 1 1 0 10 4.58 540/1277 4.58 4.58 4.34 4.52 4.58 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 9 0 0 0 2 0 10 4.67 461/1269 4.67 4.45 4.31 4.51 4.67
4. Were special techniques successful 9 11 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 854 **** 3.60 4.02 4.08 ****
Frequency Distribution
Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades Reasons Type Majors
00-27 0 0.00-0.99 0 A 9 Required for Majors 0 Graduate 2 Major 1
28-55 0 1.00-1.99 0 B 9
56-83 4 2.00-2.99 4 C 1 General 7 Under-grad 19 Non-major 20
84-150 10 3.00-3.49 7 D 0
Grad. 2 3.50-4.00 5 F 0 Electives 0 #### - Means there are not enough
P 0 responses to be significant
I 0 Other 14
? 1

Course-Section: PUBL 618 0101 Title

HLTH CARE FIN & SERV D

Instructor: MILLER, NANCY A

Enrollment: 13

Questionnaires: 13

Spring 2007

Page 1325 JUN 26, 2007 Job IRBR3029

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

University of Maryland

Baltimore County

			Fre	equei	ncies	3		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	1	Λ	3	9	4.54	571/1522	4.54	4.44	4.30	4.45	4.54
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	1	11	4.77	244/1522	4.77	4.13	4.26	4.29	4.77
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	3	9	4.75	278/1285	4.75	4.35	4.30	4.31	4.75
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	0	5	7	4.38	650/1476	4.38	4.10	4.22	4.31	4.38
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	2	10	4.69	205/1412	4.69	3.93	4.06	4.25	4.69
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	4	7	4.38	458/1381	4.38	4.26	4.08	4.25	4.38
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	3	9	4.62	374/1500	4.62	4.01	4.18	4.22	4.62
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	2	11	4.85	623/1517	4.85	4.70	4.65	4.73	4.85
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	0	5	5	4.50	385/1497	4.50	4.04	4.11	4.21	4.50
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	0	12	4.85	288/1440	4.85	4.51	4.45	4.48	4.85
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	13	5.00	1/1448	5.00	4.82	4.71	4.80	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	4	9	4.69	383/1436	4.69	4.15	4.29	4.37	4.69
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	4	9	4.69	418/1432	4.69	4.24	4.29	4.33	4.69
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	2	1	0	1	3	6	4.18	508/1221	4.18	3.26	3.93	3.83	4.18
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	2	9	4.67	286/1280		4.17	4.10	4.24	4.67
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	1	1	10	4.75	375/1277	4.75	4.58	4.34	4.52	4.75
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	2	10	4.83	299/1269	4.83	4.45	4.31	4.51	4.83
4. Were special techniques successful	1	3	0	1	1	1	6	4.33	287/ 854	4.33	3.60	4.02	4.08	4.33
- ,														
Laboratory	1.0	^	_	^	^	0	1	F 00	****/ 228		****	4 25	4 20	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	^^^^/ 228		^ ^ ^ ^	4.35	4.39	* * * * *
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	11	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 79	****	4.75	4.58	4.76	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	11	0	0	0	0	0	2	1.00	****/ 77	****	4.75	4.52	4.70	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	0	1	1		****/ 65	****	5.00	4.49	4.71	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	0	0	2	1.00	****/ 78	****	4.75	4.45	4.66	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	11	0	0	0	0	0	2	3.00	****/ 80	****	4.25	4.11	4.38	****
5. Hold directia for grading made often		J	J	J	J	J		3.00	, 00		1.23		1.55	
Frequ	encv	Dist	tribu	ation	n									
1	- 2													

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expecte	d Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors		
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	A	 6	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	8	Major	9	
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	5							
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	1	С	0	General	4	Under-grad	5	Non-major	4	
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	1	D	0							
Grad.	8	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	2	#### - Means	there	are not enough	ı	
				P	0			responses to	be sig	mificant		
				I	0	Other	7					
				2	1							

Course-Section: PUBL 642 0101 University of Maryland Title GOVT. INFORMATION POLI Baltimore County Instructor: FLETCHER, PATRI Spring 2007

I

0

Enrollment:

Questionnaires: 5

7

niversity of Maryland Page 1326
Baltimore County JUN 26, 2007
Spring 2007 Job IRBR3029

1

St.udent.	Course	Evaluation	Questionnaire

							Frequencies					Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions					NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		 Genera	 1															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course					0	0	0	0	1	3	1	4.00	1122/1522	4.00	4.44	4.30	4.45	4.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals					0	0	0	1	1	2	1	3.60	1323/1522	3.60	4.13	4.26	4.29	3.60
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals						3	0	0	1	0	0		****/1285		4.35	4.30	4.31	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals						0	1	1	2	0	1	2.80	1443/1476	2.80	4.10	4.22	4.31	2.80
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned					0	0	1	0	2	1	1	3.20	1302/1412	3.20	3.93	4.06	4.25	3.20
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned					0	0	0	0	2	1	2	4.00	806/1381	4.00	4.26	4.08	4.25	4.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained						0	1	1	3	0	0	2.40	1475/1500	2.40	4.01	4.18	4.22	2.40
8. How many times was class cancelled					1	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	802/1517	4.75	4.70	4.65	4.73	4.75
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness					2	0	0	0	2	1	0	3.33	1346/1497	3.33	4.04	4.11	4.21	3.33
		Lectur	e															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared						0	0	0	2	1	2	4.00	1186/1440	4.00	4.51	4.45	4.48	4.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject						0	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	1072/1448	4.60	4.82	4.71	4.80	4.60
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly						0	0	0	2	2	1	3.80	1197/1436	3.80	4.15	4.29	4.37	3.80
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned						0	0	0	1	3	1	4.00	1036/1432	4.00	4.24	4.29	4.33	4.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding					0	3	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	1165/1221	2.50	3.26	3.93	3.83	2.50
		Discus	sion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned						0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	222/1280	4.75	4.17	4.10	4.24	4.75
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate					1	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	375/1277	4.75	4.58	4.34	4.52	4.75
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion						0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	777/1269	4.25	4.45	4.31	4.51	4.25
4. Were special techniques successful					1	2	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	426/ 854	4.00	3.60	4.02	4.08	4.00
				Frequ	iency	/ Dist	trib	utio	n									
Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades							Reasons						Ty	me		Majors		
													·					
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A 2		Required for Major					3	0	Graduat	е	1	Majo	or	3
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	в 3														
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C 0		General						3 Under-		grad 4		Non-major		2
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D 0														
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00	F 0		Ele	Electives					1	#### - Means there are not enough					gh	
				Р 0									respons	es to b	e sign	nificar	nt	
				- 0		0.1						-						

Other