```
Course-Section: PUBL 603  0101          University of Maryland                              Page 1462
Title       POLICY ANALYSIS                 Baltimore County                             AUG  6, 2008
Instructor:  MANDELL, MARVIN                  Spring 2008                                 Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:     25
Questionnaires: 25              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   1   3   5  16  4.44  751/1670  4.44 4.39  4.31 4.46  4.44
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    0   0   0   2   9   9   5  3.68 1443/1666  3.68 4.12  4.27 4.34  3.68
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   3  10   0   0   3   5   4  4.08 1009/1406  4.08 4.55  4.32 4.36  4.08
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    1   1   0   0   7  10   6  3.96 1158/1615  3.96 4.06  4.24 4.33  3.96
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0  0   5   3   6   6   5  3.12 1453/1566  3.12 4.09  4.07 4.20  3.12
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 0  0   1   4  10  10  4.16  787/1528  4.16 4.09  4.12 4.33  4.16
7. Was the grading system clearly explained            0   0   0   1   6   6  12  4.16 1008/1650  4.16 4.04  4.22 4.30  4.16
8. How many times was class cancelled                  0   0   0   0   0   0  25  5.00    1/1667  5.00 4.62  4.67 4.74  5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 0 0 0   0   2  11  12  4.40  563/1626  4.40 4.44  4.11 4.20  4.40


            Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        0   0   0   0   1   6  18  4.68  656/1559  4.68 4.56  4.46 4.49  4.68
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   0   0   0   0   0   2  23  4.92  477/1560  4.92 4.77  4.72 4.81  4.92
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0  0   0   1   4  10  10  4.16 1053/1549  4.16 4.29  4.31 4.37  4.16
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     0   0   1   4   2   6  12  3.96 1176/1546  3.96 4.16  4.32 4.40  3.96
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 1 0  1   2   5   7   9  3.88  842/1323  3.88 3.77  4.00 4.03  3.88


            Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 2  0   1   1   7  11   3  3.61 1057/1384  3.61 4.01  4.10 4.21  3.61
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 2  0   0   2   4   3  14  4.26  854/1378  4.26 4.19  4.29 4.42  4.26
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 2 0  0   1   4   6  12  4.26  861/1378  4.26 4.33  4.31 4.51  4.26
4. Were special techniques successful                  2   2   0   5   6   8   2  3.33  779/ 904  3.33 3.81  4.03 4.04  3.33


            Laboratory
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material  23   0   0   0   0   1   1  4.50 ****/ 232  **** ****  4.19 4.30  ****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information 23 0  0   0   0   0   2  5.00 ****/ 239  **** ****  4.21 4.53  ****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 23 0  0   0   0   0   2  5.00 ****/ 230  **** ****  4.44 4.69  ****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance           23   0   0   0   0   0   2  5.00 ****/ 231  **** ****  4.31 4.58  ****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified  23   0   0   0   0   0   2  5.00 ****/ 218  **** ****  4.18 4.47  ****


            Seminar
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 24   0   0   0   0   0   1  5.00 ****/  87  **** 4.00  4.65 4.61  ****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 24  0   0   0   0   0   1  5.00 ****/  79  **** 5.00  4.64 4.67  ****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 24   0   0   0   0   0   1  5.00 ****/  75  **** 4.25  4.57 4.66  ****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned    24   0   0   0   0   0   1  5.00 ****/  79  **** 4.25  4.45 4.58  ****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear                24   0   0   0   0   0   1  5.00 ****/  80  **** 4.00  3.97 4.32  ****


            Field Work
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 24   0   0   0   0   0   1  5.00 ****/  41  **** ****  4.50 4.65  ****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria  24   0   0   0   0   0   1  5.00 ****/  38  **** ****  4.19 4.58  ****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation       24   0   0   0   0   0   1  5.00 ****/  38  **** ****  4.62 4.65  ****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations   24   0   0   0   0   0   1  5.00 ****/  39  **** ****  4.27 4.59  ****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities  24   0   0   0   0   1   0  4.00 ****/  31  **** ****  4.47 4.59  ****


            Self  Paced
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 24   0   0   0   0   1   0  4.00 ****/  28  **** ****  4.64 4.82  ****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal    24   0   0   0   0   0   1  5.00 ****/  16  **** ****  4.67 4.60  ****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful      24   0   0   0   0   0   1  5.00 ****/  27  **** ****  4.54 4.67  ****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful       24   0   0   0   0   0   1  5.00 ****/  10  **** ****  4.84 4.90  ****
```

Enrollment: 25
Questionnaires: 25   Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

                                        Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	9	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	20	Major	11
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	9						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	1	Under-grad	5	Non-major	14
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	20	3.50-4.00	14	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough			
				P	0			responses to be significant			
				I	0	Other	19				
				?	1						

```
Course-Section: PUBL 604  0101                    University of Maryland                              Page 1463
Title         STATISTICAL ANALYSIS                   Baltimore County                                AUG  6, 2008
Instructor:   MARCOTTE, DAVID                         Spring 2008                                     Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:   23
Questionnaires: 19                         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   1   0   3   6   9  4.16 1105/1670  4.16  4.39  4.31  4.46  4.16
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals   0   0   0   2   1   8   8  4.16 1081/1666  4.16  4.12  4.27  4.34  4.16
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals  0   0   1   0   3   6   9  4.16  956/1406  4.16  4.55  4.32  4.36  4.16
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals   1   3   0   1   3   6   5  4.00 1083/1615  4.00  4.06  4.24  4.33  4.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0  0   1   6   3   6   3  3.21 1423/1566  3.21  4.09  4.07  4.20  3.21
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 7  0   1   1   7   3  4.00  899/1528  4.00  4.09  4.12  4.33  4.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained           0   0   1   2   1   6   9  4.05 1107/1650  4.05  4.04  4.22  4.30  4.05
8. How many times was class cancelled                 0   0   0   0   0  17   2  4.11 1472/1667  4.11  4.62  4.67  4.74  4.11
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 3 0 0  0   1   7   8  4.44  515/1626  4.44  4.44  4.11  4.20  4.44


              Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared       0   0   0   1   0   5  13  4.58  809/1559  4.58  4.56  4.46  4.49  4.58
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject  0   0   0   0   1   4  14  4.68 1066/1560  4.68  4.77  4.72  4.81  4.68
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0  0  0   1   7   6   5  3.79 1294/1549  3.79  4.29  4.31  4.37  3.79
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned    0   0   1   2   1   2  13  4.26  979/1546  4.26  4.16  4.32  4.40  4.26
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 0 1  3   3   2   5   5  3.33 1099/1323  3.33  3.77  4.00  4.03  3.33


              Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 7  0  2   0   2   4   4  3.67 1033/1384  3.67  4.01  4.10  4.21  3.67
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 7  0  1   1   1   5   4  3.83 1081/1378  3.83  4.19  4.29  4.42  3.83
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 7 0  0   0   3   3   6  4.25  867/1378  4.25  4.33  4.31  4.51  4.25
4. Were special techniques successful                 7  10   0   0   1   1   0  3.50 ****/ 904  ****  3.81  4.03  4.04  ****


              Laboratory
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material 16  0   1   0   0   1   1  3.33 ****/ 232  ****  ****  4.19  4.30  ****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information 16 0 0  1   1   0   1  3.33 ****/ 239  ****  ****  4.21  4.53  ****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 16 0 0  1   0   0   2  4.00 ****/ 230  ****  ****  4.44  4.69  ****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance          16  0   0   0   0   2   1  4.33 ****/ 231  ****  ****  4.31  4.58  ****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 16  1   0   0   0   1   1  4.50 ****/ 218  ****  ****  4.18  4.47  ****


              Seminar
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 18 0  0   0   0   0   1  5.00 ****/  87  ****  4.00  4.65  4.61  ****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 18 0 0  0   0   0   1  5.00 ****/  79  ****  5.00  4.64  4.67  ****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned   18  0   0   0   0   0   1  5.00 ****/  79  ****  4.25  4.45  4.58  ****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear               18  0   0   0   0   0   1  5.00 ****/  80  ****  4.00  3.97  4.32  ****
```

```
                                              Frequency Distribution


Credits Earned          Cum. GPA        Expected Grades        Reasons                 Type               Majors
------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
 00-27      4         0.00-0.99    0      A    7        Required for Majors   0     Graduate      9       Major       11
 28-55      1         1.00-1.99    0      B    8                                                          
 56-83      0         2.00-2.99    0      C    3        General               0     Under-grad   10       Non-major    8
 84-150     0         3.00-3.49    5      D    0
 Grad.      9         3.50-4.00    9      F    0        Electives             0     #### - Means there are not enough
                                         P    0                                     responses to be significant
                                         I    0        Other                16
                                         ?    0
```

```
Course-Section: PUBL 610C 0101          University of Maryland                              Page 1464
Title        URBAN & ENVIRON ISSUES        Baltimore County                                AUG  6, 2008
Instructor:  SHORT, JOHN R                 Spring 2008                                      Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:      9
Questionnaires:  9              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   1   0   1   0   1   2   4  4.00 1216/1670  4.00 4.39  4.31 4.46  4.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    1   0   1   1   1   3   2  3.50 1508/1666  3.50 4.12  4.27 4.34  3.50
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   1   6   0   0   0   2   0  4.00 ****/1406  **** 4.55  4.32 4.36  ****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    1   0   0   1   0   4   3  4.13 1009/1615  4.13 4.06  4.24 4.33  4.13
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 1  0   1   1   0   2   4  3.88 1039/1566  3.88 4.09  4.07 4.20  3.88
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 2 0  1   0   1   1   4  4.00  899/1528  4.00 4.09  4.12 4.33  4.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained            1   0   0   2   1   3   2  3.63 1421/1650  3.63 4.04  4.22 4.30  3.63
8. How many times was class cancelled                  1   0   0   0   1   4   3  4.25 1368/1667  4.25 4.62  4.67 4.74  4.25
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 6 0 0   0   0   1   2  4.67  278/1626  4.67 4.44  4.11 4.20  4.67


             Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        1   0   0   0   1   2   5  4.50  896/1559  4.50 4.56  4.46 4.49  4.50
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   1   0   0   1   0   1   6  4.50 1248/1560  4.50 4.77  4.72 4.81  4.50
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 1  0   0   0   1   4   3  4.25  977/1549  4.25 4.29  4.31 4.37  4.25
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     1   0   1   1   0   4   2  3.63 1345/1546  3.63 4.16  4.32 4.40  3.63
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 1 4  0   1   0   3   0  3.50 1040/1323  3.50 3.77  4.00 4.03  3.50


             Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 3  0   1   1   1   1   2  3.33 1171/1384  3.33 4.01  4.10 4.21  3.33
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 3  0   0   2   0   1   3  3.83 1081/1378  3.83 4.19  4.29 4.42  3.83
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 3 0  0   1   0   3   2  4.00  977/1378  4.00 4.33  4.31 4.51  4.00
4. Were special techniques successful                  3   2   1   0   0   1   2  3.75  629/ 904  3.75 3.81  4.03 4.04  3.75


                              Frequency Distribution

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

```
Course-Section: PUBL 610D 0101            University of Maryland                         Page 1465
Title      HEALTH POLICIES/PROGRA          Baltimore County                              AUG  6, 2008
Instructor:   SALKEVER, DAVID               Spring 2008                                  Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:     6
Questionnaires:  4              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  0  4 5.00    1/1670   5.00 4.39 4.31 4.46 5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    0  0  0  0  0  1  3 4.75  312/1666   4.75 4.12 4.27 4.34 4.75
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   0  2  0  0  0  0  2 5.00    1/1406   5.00 4.55 4.32 4.36 5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    0  0  0  0  0  1  3 4.75  290/1615   4.75 4.06 4.24 4.33 4.75
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0  0  0  0  0  0  4 5.00    1/1566   5.00 4.09 4.07 4.20 5.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0  0  1  0  0  0  3 4.00  899/1528  4.00 4.09 4.12 4.33 4.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained            0  0  0  0  0  2  2 4.50  570/1650   4.50 4.04 4.22 4.30 4.50
8. How many times was class cancelled                  0  0  0  0  0  1  3 4.75  922/1667   4.75 4.62 4.67 4.74 4.75
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 0  0  0  0  0  1  3 4.75  207/1626  4.75 4.44 4.11 4.20 4.75


                 Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        0  0  0  0  0  0  4 5.00    1/1559   5.00 4.56 4.46 4.49 5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   0  0  0  0  0  0  4 5.00    1/1560   5.00 4.77 4.72 4.81 5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0  0  0  0  0  0  4 5.00    1/1549   5.00 4.29 4.31 4.37 5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     0  0  0  0  0  1  3 4.75  407/1546   4.75 4.16 4.32 4.40 4.75
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 0  3  0  0  0  1  0 4.00  692/1323  4.00 3.77 4.00 4.03 4.00


                 Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 1  0  0  0  0  1  2 4.67  324/1384   4.67 4.01 4.10 4.21 4.67
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 1  0  0  0  0  2  1 4.33  797/1378   4.33 4.19 4.29 4.42 4.33
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 1  0  0  0  0  1  2 4.67  531/1378  4.67 4.33 4.31 4.51 4.67
4. Were special techniques successful                  1  2  0  0  0  1  0 4.00  461/ 904   4.00 3.81 4.03 4.04 4.00


                 Seminar
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 3  0  0  0  0  0  1 5.00    1/ 87   5.00 4.00 4.65 4.61 5.00
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 3  0  0  0  0  0  1 5.00   1/ 79   5.00 5.00 4.64 4.67 5.00
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 3  0  0  0  0  0  1 5.00    1/ 75   5.00 4.25 4.57 4.66 5.00
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned    3  0  0  0  0  0  1 5.00    1/ 79   5.00 4.25 4.45 4.58 5.00
5. Were criteria for grading made clear                3  0  0  0  0  0  1 5.00    1/ 80   5.00 4.00 3.97 4.32 5.00


                              Frequency Distribution

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

```
Course-Section: PUBL 610E 0101        University of Maryland                    Page 1466
Title      STRATEGIC MANAGEMENT          Baltimore County                       AUG  6, 2008
Instructor:   FLETCHER, PATRI            Spring 2008                            Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:    6
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  2  0  3  4.20 1060/1670  4.20 4.39  4.31 4.46  4.20
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals   0   0  0  0  1  2  2  4.20 1037/1666  4.20 4.12  4.27 4.34  4.20
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals  0   3  0  0  0  0  2  5.00    1/1406  5.00 4.55  4.32 4.36  5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals   0   0  1  1  0  1  2  3.40 1496/1615  3.40 4.06  4.24 4.33  3.40
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0  0  0  0  1  1  3  4.40  491/1566  4.40 4.09  4.07 4.20  4.40
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 0 0  0  2  0  3  4.20  760/1528  4.20 4.09  4.12 4.33  4.20
7. Was the grading system clearly explained           0   0  0  1  1  1  2  3.80 1330/1650  3.80 4.04  4.22 4.30  3.80
8. How many times was class cancelled                 0   0  0  0  0  3  2  4.40 1256/1667  4.40 4.62  4.67 4.74  4.40
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 1 0 0 0  1  1  2  4.25  728/1626  4.25 4.44  4.11 4.20  4.25


              Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared       1   0  0  1  0  0  3  4.25 1157/1559  4.25 4.56  4.46 4.49  4.25
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject  1   0  0  0  1  0  3  4.50 1248/1560  4.50 4.77  4.72 4.81  4.50
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 1 0 0  0  1  2  1  4.00 1146/1549  4.00 4.29  4.31 4.37  4.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned    1   0  0  0  1  2  1  4.00 1139/1546  4.00 4.16  4.32 4.40  4.00


              Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 1  0  0  0  1  1  2  4.25  670/1384  4.25 4.01  4.10 4.21  4.25
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 1  0  0  0  2  0  2  4.00  970/1378  4.00 4.19  4.29 4.42  4.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 1 0 0  0  1  0  3  4.50  653/1378  4.50 4.33  4.31 4.51  4.50
4. Were special techniques successful                 1   1  0  0  1  1  1  4.00  461/ 904  4.00 3.81  4.03 4.04  4.00


              Seminar
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 3  0  0  0  2  0  0  3.00   84/ 87  3.00 4.00  4.65 4.61  3.00
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 4 0 0  0  1  0  0  3.00 ****/ 79  **** 5.00  4.64 4.67  ****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 3  0  0  0  1  1  0  3.50   70/ 75  3.50 4.25  4.57 4.66  3.50
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned   3   0  0  0  1  1  0  3.50   72/ 79  3.50 4.25  4.45 4.58  3.50
5. Were criteria for grading made clear               3   0  0  0  2  0  0  3.00   67/ 80  3.00 4.00  3.97 4.32  3.00
```

```
                              Frequency Distribution


Credits Earned        Cum. GPA        Expected Grades        Reasons                Type                 Majors
---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
  00-27      1      0.00-0.99   0      A   3      Required for Majors  0     Graduate      2     Major        3
  28-55      0      1.00-1.99   0      B   0
  56-83      0      2.00-2.99   0      C   0      General              1     Under-grad    3     Non-major    2
  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                3
                                       ?   1
```

```
Course-Section: PUBL 613  0101              University of Maryland                           Page 1467
Title      MANAGING PUBLIC ORG                  Baltimore County                             AUG  6, 2008
Instructor:   FLETCHER, PATRI                   Spring 2008                                  Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:   20
Questionnaires:  19                 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  3  4 10  4.16 1105/1670  4.16  4.39  4.31  4.46  4.16
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    0   0  1  3  0  8  7  3.89 1324/1666  3.89  4.12  4.27  4.34  3.89
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   0  12  0  0  1  2  4  4.43  691/1406  4.43  4.55  4.32  4.36  4.43
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    0   1  2  2  1  7  6  3.72 1343/1615  3.72  4.06  4.24  4.33  3.72
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 1  0  1  1  1  5 10  4.22  675/1566  4.22  4.09  4.07  4.20  4.22
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 0 1 2 4 5 7  3.79 1134/1528  3.79  4.09  4.12  4.33  3.79
7. Was the grading system clearly explained            0   0  2  2  4  4  7  3.63 1417/1650  3.63  4.04  4.22  4.30  3.63
8. How many times was class cancelled                  0   0  0  0  0  2 17  4.89  693/1667  4.89  4.62  4.67  4.74  4.89
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 2 0 0 0 2 11 4  4.12  888/1626  4.12  4.44  4.11  4.20  4.12


                 Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        4   0  1  0  2  4  8  4.20 1199/1559  4.20  4.56  4.46  4.49  4.20
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   4   0  0  0  0  3 12  4.80  855/1560  4.80  4.77  4.72  4.81  4.80
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 4  0  1  1  1  6  6  4.00 1146/1549  4.00  4.29  4.31  4.37  4.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     4   0  2  1  2  4  6  3.73 1301/1546  3.73  4.16  4.32  4.40  3.73
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 4 12 1 0 0 2 0  3.00 ****/1323  ****  3.77  4.00  4.03  ****


                 Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 5  0  1  1  1  2  9  4.21  696/1384  4.21  4.01  4.10  4.21  4.21
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 5  0  0  0  1  1 12  4.79  368/1378  4.79  4.19  4.29  4.42  4.79
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 5 0 1 1 2 2 8  4.07  956/1378  4.07  4.33  4.31  4.51  4.07
4. Were special techniques successful                  5   0  4  1  1  2  6  3.36  774/ 904  3.36  3.81  4.03  4.04  3.36

                                       Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned          Cum. GPA         Expected Grades          Reasons                Type                   Majors
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
 00-27      4          0.00-0.99   0       A   11          Required for Majors  0     Graduate     9       Major       16
 28-55      1          1.00-1.99   0       B    2                                     Under-grad  10
 56-83      0          2.00-2.99   1       C    1          General              3     Under-grad  10       Non-major    3
 84-150     0          3.00-3.49   3       D    0
 Grad.      9          3.50-4.00   9       F    0          Electives            0     #### - Means there are not enough
                                           P    0                                     responses to be significant
                                           I    0          Other               14
                                           ?    3
```

```
Course-Section: PUBL 618  0101              University of Maryland                        Page 1468
Title        HLTH CARE FIN & SERV D          Baltimore County                             AUG  6, 2008
Instructor:  MILLER, NANCY A                 Spring 2008                                  Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:      16
Questionnaires:  13                    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   3  10  4.77  350/1670  4.77  4.39  4.31  4.46  4.77
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    0   0   0   0   0   4   9  4.69  378/1666  4.69  4.12  4.27  4.34  4.69
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   0   0   0   0   1   3   9  4.62  483/1406  4.62  4.55  4.32  4.36  4.62
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    0   0   0   0   3   1   9  4.46  606/1615  4.46  4.06  4.24  4.33  4.46
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0  0   0   0   1   1  11  4.77  218/1566  4.77  4.09  4.07  4.20  4.77
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 0  0   0   2   3   8  4.46  476/1528  4.46  4.09  4.12  4.33  4.46
7. Was the grading system clearly explained            0   0   0   0   1   4   8  4.54  527/1650  4.54  4.04  4.22  4.30  4.54
8. How many times was class cancelled                  0   0   0   0   0   1  12  4.92  540/1667  4.92  4.62  4.67  4.74  4.92
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 0 0  0   0   0   7   6  4.46  467/1626  4.46  4.44  4.11  4.20  4.46


                 Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        0   0   0   0   0   4   9  4.69  623/1559  4.69  4.56  4.46  4.49  4.69
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   0   0   0   0   0   0  13  5.00    1/1560  5.00  4.77  4.72  4.81  5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0  0   0   0   0   2  11  4.85  257/1549  4.85  4.29  4.31  4.37  4.85
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     0   0   0   0   0   3  10  4.77  395/1546  4.77  4.16  4.32  4.40  4.77
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 0 6  0   0   1   4   2  4.14  626/1323  4.14  3.77  4.00  4.03  4.14


                 Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 1  0   0   1   1   3   7  4.33  608/1384  4.33  4.01  4.10  4.21  4.33
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 1  0   0   0   4   1   7  4.25  860/1378  4.25  4.19  4.29  4.42  4.25
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 1 0  0   0   1   3   8  4.58  602/1378  4.58  4.33  4.31  4.51  4.58
4. Were special techniques successful                  1   7   0   0   1   1   3  4.40  289/ 904  4.40  3.81  4.03  4.04  4.40


                                      Frequency Distribution

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