

Course-Section: SOCY 101 0101  
 Title BASIC CONCEPTS IN SOCY  
 Instructor: Tufekcioglu, Ze  
 Enrollment: 145  
 Questionnaires: 86

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2005

Page 1516  
 JAN 21, 2006  
 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	2	0	6	4	17	26	31	3.86	1353/1674	3.98	4.27	4.27	4.07	3.86	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	3	0	3	6	17	26	31	3.92	1258/1674	3.95	4.18	4.23	4.16	3.92	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	4	0	2	5	11	29	35	4.10	962/1423	4.15	4.19	4.27	4.16	4.10	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	15	4	7	14	22	22	3.74	1334/1609	3.90	4.14	4.22	4.05	3.74	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	5	1	1	6	12	24	37	4.13	682/1585	4.11	4.18	3.96	3.88	4.13	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	6	5	8	13	17	23	14	3.29	1370/1535	3.56	4.05	4.08	3.89	3.29	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	7	0	0	5	7	25	42	4.32	795/1651	4.19	4.26	4.18	4.10	4.32	
8. How many times was class cancelled	8	0	0	0	1	28	49	4.62	1124/1673	4.70	4.69	4.69	4.67	4.62	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	22	3	1	2	13	27	18	3.97	1022/1656	4.00	4.07	4.07	3.96	3.97	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	9	0	0	2	8	33	34	4.29	1120/1586	4.31	4.55	4.43	4.37	4.29	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	9	0	0	1	2	13	61	4.74	938/1585	4.80	4.79	4.69	4.60	4.74	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	11	0	1	2	9	30	33	4.23	967/1582	4.29	4.33	4.26	4.17	4.23	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	11	0	1	4	9	23	38	4.24	975/1575	4.29	4.40	4.27	4.17	4.24	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	12	1	3	5	15	16	34	4.00	666/1380	4.20	3.98	3.94	3.78	4.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	21	0	3	6	17	20	19	3.71	1068/1520	4.08	4.19	4.01	3.76	3.71	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	21	0	1	2	15	23	24	4.03	1014/1515	4.31	4.45	4.24	3.97	4.03	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	21	0	0	1	10	16	38	4.40	751/1511	4.53	4.46	4.27	4.00	4.40	
4. Were special techniques successful	21	19	8	5	13	12	8	3.15	860/ 994	3.35	3.93	3.94	3.73	3.15	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	76	5	0	0	2	2	1	3.80	****/ 265	****	****	4.23	3.97	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	80	0	1	0	2	2	1	3.33	****/ 278	****	****	4.19	3.97	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	80	2	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	****/ 260	****	****	4.46	4.41	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	81	2	0	0	1	2	0	3.67	****/ 259	****	****	4.33	4.19	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	81	2	0	0	1	2	0	3.67	****/ 233	****	****	4.20	4.00	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	79	1	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	****/ 103	****	5.00	4.41	4.33	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	80	1	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	****/ 101	****	5.00	4.48	4.18	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	79	2	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	****/ 95	****	5.00	4.31	3.99	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	80	1	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	****/ 99	****	5.00	4.39	4.10	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	80	1	0	1	1	2	1	3.60	****/ 97	****	5.00	4.14	3.69	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	80	0	1	0	0	2	3	4.00	****/ 76	****	****	3.98	3.32	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	80	0	1	0	0	3	2	3.83	****/ 77	****	****	3.93	3.42	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	80	1	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	****/ 53	****	****	4.45	4.34	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	81	1	0	1	0	2	1	3.75	****/ 48	****	****	4.12	4.00	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	81	1	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	****/ 49	****	****	4.27	4.30	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	81	0	0	0	1	3	1	4.00	****/ 61	****	****	4.09	3.87	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	81	1	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	****/ 52	****	****	4.26	3.91	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	82	1	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 50	****	****	4.44	4.39	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	83	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 35	****	****	4.36	3.92	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	83	1	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.34	3.88	****	

Course-Section: SOCY 101 0101  
 Title BASIC CONCEPTS IN SOCY  
 Instructor: Tufekcioglu, Ze  
 Enrollment: 145  
 Questionnaires: 86

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2005

Page 1516  
 JAN 21, 2006  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	10	0.00-0.99	2	A	29	Required for Majors	40	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	10	1.00-1.99	0	B	28						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	7	C	8	General	7	Under-grad	86	Non-major	86
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	6	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	4	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	18				
				?	4						

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	5	0	1	8	15	23	32	3.97	1233/1674	3.98	4.27	4.27	4.07	3.97	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	4	0	3	4	22	27	24	3.81	1333/1674	3.95	4.18	4.23	4.16	3.81	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	5	0	2	6	18	20	33	3.96	1052/1423	4.15	4.19	4.27	4.16	3.96	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	5	12	4	6	16	17	24	3.76	1313/1609	3.90	4.14	4.22	4.05	3.76	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	4	0	6	2	19	18	35	3.92	879/1585	4.11	4.18	3.96	3.88	3.92	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	5	10	7	7	23	17	15	3.38	1342/1535	3.56	4.05	4.08	3.89	3.38	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	5	0	1	1	12	16	49	4.41	673/1651	4.19	4.26	4.18	4.10	4.41	
8. How many times was class cancelled	5	2	0	1	0	6	70	4.88	742/1673	4.70	4.69	4.69	4.67	4.88	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	30	1	0	1	10	29	13	4.02	948/1656	4.00	4.07	4.07	3.96	4.02	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	6	0	1	1	12	29	35	4.23	1160/1586	4.31	4.55	4.43	4.37	4.23	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	7	0	0	0	4	8	65	4.79	832/1585	4.80	4.79	4.69	4.60	4.79	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	6	0	2	2	15	25	34	4.12	1070/1582	4.29	4.33	4.26	4.17	4.12	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	7	0	3	3	9	19	43	4.25	966/1575	4.29	4.40	4.27	4.17	4.25	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	7	0	0	2	17	22	36	4.19	540/1380	4.20	3.98	3.94	3.78	4.19	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	19	0	3	3	6	22	31	4.15	734/1520	4.08	4.19	4.01	3.76	4.15	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	17	0	4	2	10	15	36	4.15	971/1515	4.31	4.45	4.24	3.97	4.15	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	18	0	0	0	6	13	47	4.62	544/1511	4.53	4.46	4.27	4.00	4.62	
4. Were special techniques successful	18	13	3	4	7	25	14	3.81	609/ 994	3.35	3.93	3.94	3.73	3.81	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	62	12	0	1	3	2	4	3.90	****/ 265	****	****	4.23	3.97	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	69	0	3	0	2	5	5	3.60	****/ 278	****	****	4.19	3.97	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	70	9	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	****/ 260	****	****	4.46	4.41	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	70	9	0	0	2	1	2	4.00	****/ 259	****	****	4.33	4.19	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	70	10	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	****/ 233	****	****	4.20	4.00	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	66	8	0	0	1	2	7	4.60	****/ 103	****	5.00	4.41	4.33	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	68	9	0	0	1	2	4	4.43	****/ 101	****	5.00	4.48	4.18	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	69	10	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	****/ 95	****	5.00	4.31	3.99	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	69	6	0	0	2	3	4	4.22	****/ 99	****	5.00	4.39	4.10	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	69	8	0	0	1	1	5	4.57	****/ 97	****	5.00	4.14	3.69	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	68	0	4	1	2	4	5	3.31	****/ 76	****	****	3.98	3.32	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	70	0	1	0	6	2	5	3.71	****/ 77	****	****	3.93	3.42	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	69	5	0	0	3	1	6	4.30	****/ 53	****	****	4.45	4.34	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	70	6	0	0	2	2	4	4.25	****/ 48	****	****	4.12	4.00	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	71	8	0	0	2	1	2	4.00	****/ 49	****	****	4.27	4.30	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	68	0	0	0	4	5	7	4.19	****/ 61	****	****	4.09	3.87	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	69	3	0	0	3	2	7	4.33	****/ 52	****	****	4.26	3.91	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	69	5	0	0	1	3	6	4.50	****/ 50	****	****	4.44	4.39	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	70	7	0	0	1	1	5	4.57	****/ 35	****	****	4.36	3.92	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	70	6	0	1	2	1	4	4.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.34	3.88	****	

Course-Section: SOCY 101 0201  
 Title BASIC CONCEPTS IN SOCY  
 Instructor: Tufekcioglu, Ze  
 Enrollment: 141  
 Questionnaires: 84

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2005

Page 1517  
 JAN 21, 2006  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	18	0.00-0.99	4	A	25	Required for Majors	39	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	6	1.00-1.99	0	B	31						
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	3	C	5	General	16	Under-grad	84	Non-major	84
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	4	D	1						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	8	F	0	Electives	3	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	9				
				?	4						

Course-Section: SOCY 101 0301  
 Title BASIC CONCEPTS IN SOCY  
 Instructor: KELLEY-MOORE, J  
 Enrollment: 140  
 Questionnaires: 100

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2005

Page 1518  
 JAN 21, 2006  
 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	0	0	2	1	13	29	55	4.34	841/1674	3.98	4.27	4.27	4.07	4.34	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	11	26	62	4.49	609/1674	3.95	4.18	4.23	4.16	4.49	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	10	26	63	4.51	563/1423	4.15	4.19	4.27	4.16	4.51	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	5	1	5	7	28	54	4.36	715/1609	3.90	4.14	4.22	4.05	4.36	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	4	3	16	25	51	4.17	632/1585	4.11	4.18	3.96	3.88	4.17	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	0	2	2	21	31	42	4.11	817/1535	3.56	4.05	4.08	3.89	4.11	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	2	13	32	51	4.31	795/1651	4.19	4.26	4.18	4.10	4.31	
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	0	0	0	2	23	72	4.72	1001/1673	4.70	4.69	4.69	4.67	4.72	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	14	0	2	3	4	36	41	4.29	667/1656	4.00	4.07	4.07	3.96	4.29	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	1	8	89	4.90	231/1586	4.31	4.55	4.43	4.37	4.90	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	3	95	4.97	227/1585	4.80	4.79	4.69	4.60	4.97	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	2	12	85	4.84	217/1582	4.29	4.33	4.26	4.17	4.84	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	2	0	1	14	82	4.76	359/1575	4.29	4.40	4.27	4.17	4.76	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	12	3	2	8	17	55	4.40	379/1380	4.20	3.98	3.94	3.78	4.40	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	40	0	3	1	4	15	37	4.37	546/1520	4.08	4.19	4.01	3.76	4.37	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	40	0	0	2	4	8	46	4.63	513/1515	4.31	4.45	4.24	3.97	4.63	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	40	0	1	0	3	8	48	4.70	479/1511	4.53	4.46	4.27	4.00	4.70	
4. Were special techniques successful	41	22	6	2	6	10	13	3.59	702/ 994	3.35	3.93	3.94	3.73	3.59	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	94	4	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 265	****	****	4.23	3.97	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	96	0	2	0	0	0	2	3.00	****/ 278	****	****	4.19	3.97	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	97	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 260	****	****	4.46	4.41	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	97	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 259	****	****	4.33	4.19	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	97	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 233	****	****	4.20	4.00	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	95	2	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 103	****	5.00	4.41	4.33	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	96	1	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 101	****	5.00	4.48	4.18	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	97	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 95	****	5.00	4.31	3.99	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	97	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 99	****	5.00	4.39	4.10	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	97	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 97	****	5.00	4.14	3.69	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	96	0	1	0	0	1	2	3.75	****/ 76	****	****	3.98	3.32	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	97	0	1	0	0	0	2	3.67	****/ 77	****	****	3.93	3.42	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	97	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 53	****	****	4.45	4.34	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	97	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.12	4.00	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	97	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 49	****	****	4.27	4.30	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	96	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	****/ 61	****	****	4.09	3.87	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	97	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 52	****	****	4.26	3.91	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	97	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/ 50	****	****	4.44	4.39	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	97	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 35	****	****	4.36	3.92	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	97	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.34	3.88	****	

Course-Section: SOCY 101 0301  
 Title BASIC CONCEPTS IN SOCY  
 Instructor: KELLEY-MOORE, J  
 Enrollment: 140  
 Questionnaires: 100

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2005

Page 1518  
 JAN 21, 2006  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	21	0.00-0.99	4	A	36	Required for Majors	38	Graduate	0	Major	3
28-55	20	1.00-1.99	1	B	47						
56-83	5	2.00-2.99	7	C	11	General	24	Under-grad	100	Non-major	97
84-150	9	3.00-3.49	16	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	14	F	0	Electives	3	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	27				
				?	0						

Course-Section: SOCY 101 0401  
 Title BASIC CONCEPTS IN SOCY  
 Instructor: MACLENNAN, JAMI  
 Enrollment: 137  
 Questionnaires: 82

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2005

Page 1519  
 JAN 21, 2006  
 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	3	7	22	26	24	3.74	1411/1674	3.98	4.27	4.27	4.07	3.74	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	3	10	23	27	19	3.60	1455/1674	3.95	4.18	4.23	4.16	3.60	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	2	1	6	14	27	31	4.03	1004/1423	4.15	4.19	4.27	4.16	4.03	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	9	1	9	21	19	22	3.72	1341/1609	3.90	4.14	4.22	4.05	3.72	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	3	2	11	22	43	4.23	575/1585	4.11	4.18	3.96	3.88	4.23	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	2	7	8	23	26	16	3.45	1313/1535	3.56	4.05	4.08	3.89	3.45	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	2	11	17	29	22	3.72	1352/1651	4.19	4.26	4.18	4.10	3.72	
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	0	1	1	0	25	52	4.59	1141/1673	4.70	4.69	4.69	4.67	4.59	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	18	0	1	5	18	26	14	3.73	1252/1656	4.00	4.07	4.07	3.96	3.73	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	2	5	21	27	24	3.84	1391/1586	4.31	4.55	4.43	4.37	3.84	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	3	1	14	63	4.69	1035/1585	4.80	4.79	4.69	4.60	4.69	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	2	4	12	39	23	3.96	1164/1582	4.29	4.33	4.26	4.17	3.96	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	1	3	4	19	23	28	3.90	1220/1575	4.29	4.40	4.27	4.17	3.90	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	5	2	4	2	8	22	39	4.20	540/1380	4.20	3.98	3.94	3.78	4.20	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	27	0	2	2	9	18	24	4.09	780/1520	4.08	4.19	4.01	3.76	4.09	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	27	0	0	2	10	6	37	4.42	746/1515	4.31	4.45	4.24	3.97	4.42	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	28	0	2	3	3	9	37	4.41	751/1511	4.53	4.46	4.27	4.00	4.41	
4. Were special techniques successful	28	26	6	7	5	5	5	2.86	930/ 994	3.35	3.93	3.94	3.73	2.86	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	77	3	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	****/ 265	****	****	4.23	3.97	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	79	0	0	1	0	2	0	3.33	****/ 278	****	****	4.19	3.97	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	79	2	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 260	****	****	4.46	4.41	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	79	2	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 259	****	****	4.33	4.19	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	79	2	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 233	****	****	4.20	4.00	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	77	2	0	2	0	1	0	2.67	****/ 103	****	5.00	4.41	4.33	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	78	1	0	2	0	1	0	2.67	****/ 101	****	5.00	4.48	4.18	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	78	2	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/ 95	****	5.00	4.31	3.99	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	78	2	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 99	****	5.00	4.39	4.10	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	78	1	0	1	0	1	1	3.67	****/ 97	****	5.00	4.14	3.69	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	79	0	2	0	0	0	1	2.33	****/ 76	****	****	3.98	3.32	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	80	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 77	****	****	3.93	3.42	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	79	1	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/ 53	****	****	4.45	4.34	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	79	2	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.12	4.00	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	78	0	1	0	1	1	1	3.25	****/ 61	****	****	4.09	3.87	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	78	2	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 52	****	****	4.26	3.91	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	78	2	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 50	****	****	4.44	4.39	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	78	2	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 35	****	****	4.36	3.92	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	78	2	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.34	3.88	****	

Course-Section: SOCY 101 0401  
 Title BASIC CONCEPTS IN SOCY  
 Instructor: MACLENNAN, JAMI  
 Enrollment: 137  
 Questionnaires: 82

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2005

Page 1519  
 JAN 21, 2006  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	11	0.00-0.99	3	A	12	Required for Majors	29	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	6	1.00-1.99	0	B	26						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	4	C	19	General	12	Under-grad	82	Non-major	82
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	4	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	2	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	13				
				?	1						



Course-Section: SOCY 210 0101  
 Title CLASS/INEQUALITY IN U.  
 Instructor: HEWITT, CHRIS J  
 Enrollment: 40  
 Questionnaires: 22

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2005

Page 1520  
 JAN 21, 2006  
 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	7	14	4.59	497/1674	4.59	4.27	4.27	4.32	4.59	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	9	11	4.36	790/1674	4.36	4.18	4.23	4.26	4.36	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	2	1	6	12	4.18	901/1423	4.18	4.19	4.27	4.36	4.18	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	1	3	3	6	7	3.75	1320/1609	3.75	4.14	4.22	4.23	3.75	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	1	5	4	10	4.00	769/1585	4.00	4.18	3.96	3.91	4.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	2	2	2	2	6	7	3.74	1162/1535	3.74	4.05	4.08	4.03	3.74	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	1	6	4	9	3.90	1228/1651	3.90	4.26	4.18	4.20	3.90	
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	19	1	4.05	1545/1673	4.05	4.69	4.69	4.67	4.05	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	2	0	0	1	7	8	4.44	479/1656	4.44	4.07	4.07	4.10	4.44	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	1	0	3	18	4.73	560/1586	4.73	4.55	4.43	4.48	4.73	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	2	20	4.91	567/1585	4.91	4.79	4.69	4.76	4.91	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	1	1	5	15	4.55	589/1582	4.55	4.33	4.26	4.35	4.55	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	0	3	18	4.73	407/1575	4.73	4.40	4.27	4.39	4.73	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	17	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	****/1380	****	3.98	3.94	4.03	****	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	10	0	1	1	2	4	4	3.75	1027/1520	3.75	4.19	4.01	4.03	3.75	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	10	0	1	2	2	4	3	3.50	1303/1515	3.50	4.45	4.24	4.28	3.50	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	10	0	1	0	0	5	6	4.25	896/1511	4.25	4.46	4.27	4.28	4.25	
4. Were special techniques successful	9	9	1	0	0	2	1	3.50	****/ 994	****	3.93	3.94	3.98	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	19	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 265	****	****	4.23	4.34	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	20	0	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/ 278	****	****	4.19	4.36	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	19	2	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 260	****	****	4.46	4.51	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	19	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 259	****	****	4.33	4.42	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	19	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 233	****	****	4.20	4.48	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	20	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 103	****	5.00	4.41	4.07	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	20	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 101	****	5.00	4.48	4.45	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	20	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 95	****	5.00	4.31	4.33	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	20	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 99	****	5.00	4.39	4.22	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	21	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 76	****	****	3.98	3.97	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	21	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 77	****	****	3.93	4.20	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 53	****	****	4.45	4.50	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.12	4.50	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 49	****	****	4.27	4.82	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	20	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 61	****	****	4.09	4.23	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	20	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 52	****	****	4.26	4.53	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	20	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 50	****	****	4.44	4.42	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	20	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 35	****	****	4.36	4.63	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	20	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.34	4.50	****	

Course-Section: SOCY 210 0101  
 Title CLASS/INEQUALITY IN U.  
 Instructor: HEWITT, CHRIS J  
 Enrollment: 40  
 Questionnaires: 22

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2005

Page 1520  
 JAN 21, 2006  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	8	Required for Majors	2	Graduate	0	Major	3
28-55	6	1.00-1.99	0	B	7						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	3	C	5	General	6	Under-grad	22	Non-major	19
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	5	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	11				
				?	0						

Course-Section: SOCY 240 0101  
 Title ELEMENTARY SOCIAL BEHA  
 Instructor: Tufekcioglu, Ze  
 Enrollment: 48  
 Questionnaires: 29

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2005

Page 1521  
 JAN 21, 2006  
 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	8	16	4.34	841/1674	4.34	4.27	4.27	4.32	4.34	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	2	2	9	16	4.34	816/1674	4.34	4.18	4.23	4.26	4.34	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	3	9	16	4.38	728/1423	4.38	4.19	4.27	4.36	4.38	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	5	2	1	5	2	14	4.04	1068/1609	4.04	4.14	4.22	4.23	4.04	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	0	5	5	17	4.44	378/1585	4.44	4.18	3.96	3.91	4.44	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	2	1	1	6	7	12	4.04	857/1535	4.04	4.05	4.08	4.03	4.04	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	2	3	3	21	4.48	553/1651	4.48	4.26	4.18	4.20	4.48	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	1	8	19	4.64	1093/1673	4.64	4.69	4.69	4.67	4.64	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	2	1	10	12	4.28	680/1656	4.28	4.07	4.07	4.10	4.28	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	1	0	5	22	4.71	581/1586	4.71	4.55	4.43	4.48	4.71	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	4	24	4.86	689/1585	4.86	4.79	4.69	4.76	4.86	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	1	0	2	6	18	4.48	661/1582	4.48	4.33	4.26	4.35	4.48	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	2	0	1	4	21	4.50	692/1575	4.50	4.40	4.27	4.39	4.50	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	1	1	4	6	16	4.25	489/1380	4.25	3.98	3.94	4.03	4.25	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	4	5	16	4.48	420/1520	4.48	4.19	4.01	4.03	4.48	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	0	1	2	22	4.84	277/1515	4.84	4.45	4.24	4.28	4.84	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	1	0	2	3	19	4.56	594/1511	4.56	4.46	4.27	4.28	4.56	
4. Were special techniques successful	5	12	0	0	3	2	7	4.33	322/ 994	4.33	3.93	3.94	3.98	4.33	
Laboratory															
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	28	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 278	****	****	4.19	4.36	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	27	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 103	****	5.00	4.41	4.07	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	28	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 101	****	5.00	4.48	4.45	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	28	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 76	****	****	3.98	3.97	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	28	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 77	****	****	3.93	4.20	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	28	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 53	****	****	4.45	4.50	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	28	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.12	4.50	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	28	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 61	****	****	4.09	4.23	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	28	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.26	4.53	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors		
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	A 10	Required for Majors 4	Graduate 0	Major 0
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	1	B 12			
56-83	8	2.00-2.99	3	C 2	General 9	Under-grad 29	Non-major 29
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	10	D 0			
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	6	F 0	Electives 2	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	
				P 0			
				I 0	Other 14		
				? 2			

Course-Section: SOCY 300 0101  
 Title METHODOLOGY:SOCIAL RSR  
 Instructor: SCHUMACHER, JOH  
 Enrollment: 45  
 Questionnaires: 24

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2005

Page 1522  
 JAN 21, 2006  
 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	6	17	4.67	406/1674	4.56	4.27	4.27	4.26	4.67	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	2	19	4.67	379/1674	4.51	4.18	4.23	4.21	4.67	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	5	17	4.70	335/1423	4.61	4.19	4.27	4.27	4.70	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	2	6	15	4.57	420/1609	4.47	4.14	4.22	4.27	4.57	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	6	17	4.67	224/1585	4.54	4.18	3.96	3.95	4.67	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	9	13	4.46	440/1535	4.32	4.05	4.08	4.15	4.46	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	4	19	4.75	231/1651	4.55	4.26	4.18	4.16	4.75	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	19	5	4.21	1457/1673	4.43	4.69	4.69	4.68	4.21	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	7	0	0	0	1	8	8	4.41	507/1656	4.41	4.07	4.07	4.07	4.41	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	1	3	18	4.77	453/1586	4.68	4.55	4.43	4.42	4.77	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	1	2	19	4.82	786/1585	4.81	4.79	4.69	4.66	4.82	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	0	5	16	4.76	299/1582	4.61	4.33	4.26	4.26	4.76	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	1	4	17	4.73	407/1575	4.65	4.40	4.27	4.25	4.73	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	1	0	0	2	8	11	4.43	363/1380	4.27	3.98	3.94	4.01	4.43	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	1	0	2	11	4.64	309/1520	4.40	4.19	4.01	4.09	4.64	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	10	0	0	0	0	2	12	4.86	266/1515	4.68	4.45	4.24	4.32	4.86	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	10	0	0	0	0	2	12	4.86	301/1511	4.70	4.46	4.27	4.34	4.86	
4. Were special techniques successful	10	2	0	0	1	4	7	4.50	205/ 994	4.08	3.93	3.94	3.96	4.50	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	21	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/ 265	****	****	4.23	4.26	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	21	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/ 278	****	****	4.19	4.24	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	21	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/ 260	****	****	4.46	4.49	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	21	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 259	****	****	4.33	4.33	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	21	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 233	****	****	4.20	4.18	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	23	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 76	****	****	3.98	4.03	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	23	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 77	****	****	3.93	3.70	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	23	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 53	****	****	4.45	3.87	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	23	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.12	3.67	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	23	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 49	****	****	4.27	3.27	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 5	Required for Majors 0
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	0	B 13	
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	5	C 2	General 0
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	4	D 0	Under-grad 24
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F 0	Non-major 12
				P 0	
				I 0	
				? 0	Electives 0
					Other 20

#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant

Course-Section: SOCY 300 0201  
 Title METHODOLOGY:SOCIAL RSR  
 Instructor: MACLENNAN, JAMI  
 Enrollment: 44  
 Questionnaires: 31

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2005

Page 1523  
 JAN 21, 2006  
 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	2	0	0	0	3	10	16	4.45	703/1674	4.56	4.27	4.27	4.26	4.45	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	0	2	2	9	16	4.34	816/1674	4.51	4.18	4.23	4.21	4.34	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	0	0	0	5	4	20	4.52	563/1423	4.61	4.19	4.27	4.27	4.52	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	0	0	1	3	9	16	4.38	687/1609	4.47	4.14	4.22	4.27	4.38	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	1	2	6	19	4.41	404/1585	4.54	4.18	3.96	3.95	4.41	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	1	7	7	14	4.17	757/1535	4.32	4.05	4.08	4.15	4.17	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	3	2	6	18	4.34	754/1651	4.55	4.26	4.18	4.16	4.34	
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	1	8	20	4.66	1082/1673	4.43	4.69	4.69	4.68	4.66	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	10	1	0	1	0	9	10	4.40	522/1656	4.41	4.07	4.07	4.07	4.40	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	3	6	20	4.59	774/1586	4.68	4.55	4.43	4.42	4.59	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	1	4	24	4.79	832/1585	4.81	4.79	4.69	4.66	4.79	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	1	1	11	16	4.45	719/1582	4.61	4.33	4.26	4.26	4.45	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	1	0	2	4	21	4.57	612/1575	4.65	4.40	4.27	4.25	4.57	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	1	0	2	5	9	12	4.11	622/1380	4.27	3.98	3.94	4.01	4.11	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	7	6	11	4.17	726/1520	4.40	4.19	4.01	4.09	4.17	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	0	1	1	7	15	4.50	629/1515	4.68	4.45	4.24	4.32	4.50	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	0	0	3	5	16	4.54	610/1511	4.70	4.46	4.27	4.34	4.54	
4. Were special techniques successful	7	12	1	1	3	3	4	3.67	676/ 994	4.08	3.93	3.94	3.96	3.67	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	29	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 265	****	****	4.23	4.26	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	30	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 278	****	****	4.19	4.24	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	30	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 260	****	****	4.46	4.49	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	30	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 259	****	****	4.33	4.33	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	30	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 233	****	****	4.20	4.18	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	29	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 103	****	5.00	4.41	4.10	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	30	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 101	****	5.00	4.48	4.30	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	30	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 95	****	5.00	4.31	3.91	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	30	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 99	****	5.00	4.39	4.29	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	30	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 97	****	5.00	4.14	3.48	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	29	0	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/ 76	****	****	3.98	4.03	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	30	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 77	****	****	3.93	3.70	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	30	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 53	****	****	4.45	3.87	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	30	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.12	3.67	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	30	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 49	****	****	4.27	3.27	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	29	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 61	****	****	4.09	3.20	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	30	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.26	3.50	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	30	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 50	****	****	4.44	3.82	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	30	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 35	****	****	4.36	3.29	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	30	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.34	4.29	****	

Course-Section: SOCY 300 0201  
 Title METHODOLOGY:SOCIAL RSR  
 Instructor: MACLENNAN, JAMI  
 Enrollment: 44  
 Questionnaires: 31

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2005

Page 1523  
 JAN 21, 2006  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	14	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	8
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	10						
56-83	6	2.00-2.99	2	C	2	General	1	Under-grad	31	Non-major	23
84-150	7	3.00-3.49	6	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	6	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	24				
				?	0						

Course-Section: SOCY 301 0101  
 Title ANALY:SOCIOLOGICAL DAT  
 Instructor: MACLENNAN, JAMI  
 Enrollment: 39  
 Questionnaires: 29

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2005

Page 1524  
 JAN 21, 2006  
 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	3	0	0	0	1	13	12	4.42	735/1674	4.42	4.27	4.27	4.26	4.42	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	3	0	0	0	2	5	19	4.65	392/1674	4.65	4.18	4.23	4.21	4.65	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	4	0	0	0	1	1	23	4.88	146/1423	4.88	4.19	4.27	4.27	4.88	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	4	4	1	0	1	5	14	4.48	536/1609	4.48	4.14	4.22	4.27	4.48	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	3	0	3	2	6	5	10	3.65	1128/1585	3.65	4.18	3.96	3.95	3.65	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	3	7	0	1	4	4	10	4.21	715/1535	4.21	4.05	4.08	4.15	4.21	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	3	1	0	0	1	4	20	4.76	220/1651	4.76	4.26	4.18	4.16	4.76	
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	0	0	0	0	9	17	4.65	1082/1673	4.65	4.69	4.69	4.68	4.65	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	9	0	0	0	1	11	8	4.35	588/1656	4.35	4.07	4.07	4.07	4.35	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	2	6	18	4.62	738/1586	4.62	4.55	4.43	4.42	4.62	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	1	6	19	4.69	1035/1585	4.69	4.79	4.69	4.66	4.69	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	3	7	16	4.50	632/1582	4.50	4.33	4.26	4.26	4.50	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	1	0	1	23	4.84	235/1575	4.84	4.40	4.27	4.25	4.84	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	3	0	0	4	8	10	4.27	472/1380	4.27	3.98	3.94	4.01	4.27	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	3	1	1	2	15	4.14	751/1520	4.14	4.19	4.01	4.09	4.14	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	1	0	1	3	17	4.59	551/1515	4.59	4.45	4.24	4.32	4.59	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	0	0	3	5	13	4.48	674/1511	4.48	4.46	4.27	4.34	4.48	
4. Were special techniques successful	9	10	0	2	0	4	4	4.00	474/ 994	4.00	3.93	3.94	3.96	4.00	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	24	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	****/ 265	****	****	4.23	4.26	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	24	0	0	0	0	3	2	4.40	****/ 278	****	****	4.19	4.24	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	24	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	****/ 260	****	****	4.46	4.49	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	24	0	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	****/ 259	****	****	4.33	4.33	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	24	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	****/ 233	****	****	4.20	4.18	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	26	1	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 103	****	5.00	4.41	4.10	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	27	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 101	****	5.00	4.48	4.30	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	26	1	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 95	****	5.00	4.31	3.91	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	27	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 99	****	5.00	4.39	4.29	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	27	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 97	****	5.00	4.14	3.48	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	27	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 76	****	****	3.98	4.03	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	27	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 77	****	****	3.93	3.70	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	27	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 53	****	****	4.45	3.87	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	27	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 48	****	****	4.12	3.67	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	27	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 49	****	****	4.27	3.27	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	27	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 61	****	****	4.09	3.20	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	27	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.26	3.50	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	27	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 50	****	****	4.44	3.82	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	27	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 35	****	****	4.36	3.29	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	27	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 31	****	****	4.34	4.29	****	

Course-Section: SOCY 301 0101  
 Title ANALY:SOCIOLOGICAL DAT  
 Instructor: MACLENNAN, JAMI  
 Enrollment: 39  
 Questionnaires: 29

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2005

Page 1524  
 JAN 21, 2006  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	A	19	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	16
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	3						
56-83	5	2.00-2.99	3	C	2	General	1	Under-grad	29	Non-major	13
84-150	6	3.00-3.49	5	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	19				
				?	0						



Course-Section: SOCY 321 0101  
 Title RACE & ETHNIC RELATION  
 Instructor: PINCUS, FRED L  
 Enrollment: 40  
 Questionnaires: 26

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2005

Page 1525  
 JAN 21, 2006  
 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	1	0	0	3	0	6	16	4.40	768/1674	4.40	4.27	4.27	4.26	4.40	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	2	3	8	12	4.20	1001/1674	4.20	4.18	4.23	4.21	4.20	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	3	6	5	11	3.96	1052/1423	3.96	4.19	4.27	4.27	3.96	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	1	0	2	2	5	15	4.38	687/1609	4.38	4.14	4.22	4.27	4.38	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	3	3	19	4.64	238/1585	4.64	4.18	3.96	3.95	4.64	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	1	0	1	2	10	10	4.26	655/1535	4.26	4.05	4.08	4.15	4.26	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	5	7	13	4.32	781/1651	4.32	4.26	4.18	4.16	4.32	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	25	5.00	1/1673	5.00	4.69	4.69	4.68	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	1	1	1	4	9	7	3.91	1124/1656	3.91	4.07	4.07	4.07	3.91	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	1	4	20	4.76	474/1586	4.76	4.55	4.43	4.42	4.76	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	3	22	4.88	615/1585	4.88	4.79	4.69	4.66	4.88	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	1	3	5	16	4.44	719/1582	4.44	4.33	4.26	4.26	4.44	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	1	5	18	4.60	579/1575	4.60	4.40	4.27	4.25	4.60	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	5	1	0	6	7	6	3.85	831/1380	3.85	3.98	3.94	4.01	3.85	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	1	1	2	10	4.50	397/1520	4.50	4.19	4.01	4.09	4.50	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	12	0	0	2	0	0	12	4.57	568/1515	4.57	4.45	4.24	4.32	4.57	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	12	0	0	2	0	2	10	4.43	729/1511	4.43	4.46	4.27	4.34	4.43	
4. Were special techniques successful	13	2	0	1	2	4	4	4.00	474/ 994	4.00	3.93	3.94	3.96	4.00	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	25	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 103	****	5.00	4.41	4.10	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	25	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 76	****	****	3.98	4.03	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	25	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 61	****	****	4.09	3.20	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	25	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.26	3.50	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	25	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 50	****	****	4.44	3.82	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	7	Required for Majors	5	Graduate	0	Major	4
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	9						
56-83	7	2.00-2.99	5	C	6	General	8	Under-grad	26	Non-major	22
84-150	8	3.00-3.49	6	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5	F	0	Electives	2	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	4				
				?	0						

Course-Section: SOCY 321H 0101  
 Title  
 Instructor: PINCUS, FRED L (Instr. A)  
 Enrollment: 5  
 Questionnaires: 5

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2005

Page 1526  
 JAN 21, 2006  
 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	0	2	3	4.60	485/1674	4.60	4.27	4.27	4.26	4.60	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	460/1674	4.60	4.18	4.23	4.21	4.60	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	2	4.40	697/1423	4.40	4.19	4.27	4.27	4.40	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	2	4.40	645/1609	4.40	4.14	4.22	4.27	4.40	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1585	5.00	4.18	3.96	3.95	5.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	4	1	4.20	737/1535	4.20	4.05	4.08	4.15	4.20	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1651	5.00	4.26	4.18	4.16	5.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1673	5.00	4.69	4.69	4.68	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	310/1656	4.80	4.07	4.07	4.07	4.80	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	389/1586	4.80	4.55	4.43	4.42	4.80	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1585	5.00	4.79	4.69	4.66	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	246/1582	4.80	4.33	4.26	4.26	4.80	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	279/1575	4.80	4.40	4.27	4.25	4.80	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	1	0	0	2	2	3.80	866/1380	3.80	3.98	3.94	4.01	3.80	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	338/1520	4.60	4.19	4.01	4.09	4.60	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1515	5.00	4.45	4.24	4.32	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	358/1511	4.80	4.46	4.27	4.34	4.80	
4. Were special techniques successful	0	1	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	205/ 994	4.50	3.93	3.94	3.96	4.50	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 103	****	5.00	4.41	4.10	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 99	****	5.00	4.39	4.29	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	4	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 97	****	5.00	4.14	3.48	****	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: SOCY 321H 0101  
 Title  
 Instructor: PINCUS, FRED L (Instr. B)  
 Enrollment: 5  
 Questionnaires: 5

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2005

Page 1527  
 JAN 21, 2006  
 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	0	2	3	4.60	485/1674	4.60	4.27	4.27	4.26	4.60	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	460/1674	4.60	4.18	4.23	4.21	4.60	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	2	4.40	697/1423	4.40	4.19	4.27	4.27	4.40	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	2	4.40	645/1609	4.40	4.14	4.22	4.27	4.40	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1585	5.00	4.18	3.96	3.95	5.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	4	1	4.20	737/1535	4.20	4.05	4.08	4.15	4.20	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1651	5.00	4.26	4.18	4.16	5.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1673	5.00	4.69	4.69	4.68	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1656	4.80	4.07	4.07	4.07	4.80	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1586	4.80	4.55	4.43	4.42	4.80	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1585	5.00	4.79	4.69	4.66	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1582	4.80	4.33	4.26	4.26	4.80	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1575	4.80	4.40	4.27	4.25	4.80	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1380	3.80	3.98	3.94	4.01	3.80	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	338/1520	4.60	4.19	4.01	4.09	4.60	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1515	5.00	4.45	4.24	4.32	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	358/1511	4.80	4.46	4.27	4.34	4.80	
4. Were special techniques successful	0	1	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	205/ 994	4.50	3.93	3.94	3.96	4.50	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 103	****	5.00	4.41	4.10	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 99	****	5.00	4.39	4.29	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	4	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 97	****	5.00	4.14	3.48	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 4	Required for Majors	1
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	B 1		
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	C 0	General	2
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	D 0	Under-grad	5
Grad.	0	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: SOCY 351 8020  
 Title MEDICAL SOCIOLOGY  
 Instructor: Sufian, Meryl  
 Enrollment: 11  
 Questionnaires: 9

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2005

Page 1528  
 JAN 21, 2006  
 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	2	5	4.33	854/1674	4.33	4.27	4.27	4.26	4.33	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	0	0	3	5	4.22	968/1674	4.22	4.18	4.23	4.21	4.22	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	0	0	2	6	4.33	771/1423	4.33	4.19	4.27	4.27	4.33	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	0	0	3	5	4.22	892/1609	4.22	4.14	4.22	4.27	4.22	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	0	3	5	4.22	584/1585	4.22	4.18	3.96	3.95	4.22	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	0	7	4.56	328/1535	4.56	4.05	4.08	4.15	4.56	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	0	1	2	5	4.11	1020/1651	4.11	4.26	4.18	4.16	4.11	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	929/1673	4.78	4.69	4.69	4.68	4.78	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	1	0	1	4	0	3.33	1444/1656	3.33	4.07	4.07	4.07	3.33	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	249/1586	4.89	4.55	4.43	4.42	4.89	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	615/1585	4.89	4.79	4.69	4.66	4.89	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	3	6	4.67	438/1582	4.67	4.33	4.26	4.26	4.67	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	3	5	4.44	768/1575	4.44	4.40	4.27	4.25	4.44	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	5	1	0	3	0	0	2.50	1324/1380	2.50	3.98	3.94	4.01	2.50	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	1	7	4.67	295/1520	4.67	4.19	4.01	4.09	4.67	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	3	6	4.67	483/1515	4.67	4.45	4.24	4.32	4.67	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	1	1	1	4	2	3.56	1299/1511	3.56	4.46	4.27	4.34	3.56	
4. Were special techniques successful	0	0	1	1	0	3	4	3.89	577/ 994	3.89	3.93	3.94	3.96	3.89	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: SOCY 352 0101  
 Title ISSUES IN HEALTH CARE  
 Instructor: STUART, MARY  
 Enrollment: 53  
 Questionnaires: 32

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2005

Page 1529  
 JAN 21, 2006  
 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	1	0	6	2	4	8	11	3.52	1507/1674	3.52	4.27	4.27	4.26	3.52	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	5	3	4	10	9	3.48	1507/1674	3.48	4.18	4.23	4.21	3.48	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	5	1	4	10	11	3.68	1209/1423	3.68	4.19	4.27	4.27	3.68	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	1	6	3	2	11	8	3.40	1484/1609	3.40	4.14	4.22	4.27	3.40	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	11	1	1	8	10	3.16	1400/1585	3.16	4.18	3.96	3.95	3.16	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	7	1	4	10	9	3.42	1328/1535	3.42	4.05	4.08	4.15	3.42	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	3	1	7	12	8	3.68	1372/1651	3.68	4.26	4.18	4.16	3.68	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	1	0	0	2	15	13	4.37	1339/1673	4.37	4.69	4.69	4.68	4.37	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	3	2	7	12	3	3.37	1431/1656	3.37	4.07	4.07	4.07	3.37	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	4	5	2	11	7	3.41	1497/1586	3.41	4.55	4.43	4.42	3.41	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	1	2	5	22	4.60	1142/1585	4.60	4.79	4.69	4.66	4.60	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	6	2	6	10	5	3.21	1480/1582	3.21	4.33	4.26	4.26	3.21	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	6	3	2	9	9	3.41	1398/1575	3.41	4.40	4.27	4.25	3.41	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	1	4	3	3	5	13	3.71	930/1380	3.71	3.98	3.94	4.01	3.71	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	17	0	3	1	2	4	5	3.47	1189/1520	3.47	4.19	4.01	4.09	3.47	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	17	0	3	1	0	4	7	3.73	1221/1515	3.73	4.45	4.24	4.32	3.73	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	17	0	2	2	0	3	8	3.87	1161/1511	3.87	4.46	4.27	4.34	3.87	
4. Were special techniques successful	17	5	4	1	0	3	2	2.80	937/ 994	2.80	3.93	3.94	3.96	2.80	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	30	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 103	****	5.00	4.41	4.10	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	30	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 101	****	5.00	4.48	4.30	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	30	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 95	****	5.00	4.31	3.91	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	30	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 99	****	5.00	4.39	4.29	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	30	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 97	****	5.00	4.14	3.48	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	31	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 61	****	****	4.09	3.20	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	31	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.26	3.50	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	31	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 50	****	****	4.44	3.82	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	31	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 35	****	****	4.36	3.29	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	31	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.34	4.29	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors		
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A 12	Required for Majors 5	Graduate 0	Major 3
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B 14			
56-83	5	2.00-2.99	5	C 0	General 10	Under-grad 32	Non-major 29
84-150	6	3.00-3.49	9	D 0			
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	6	F 0	Electives 0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	
				P 1			
				I 0	Other 12		
				? 0			

Course-Section: SOCY 353 0101  
 Title MARRIAGE AND THE FAMIL  
 Instructor: Tufekcioglu, Ze  
 Enrollment: 98  
 Questionnaires: 51

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2005

Page 1530  
 JAN 21, 2006  
 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	2	5	14	16	14	3.69	1439/1674	3.69	4.27	4.27	4.26	3.69	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	4	1	17	18	11	3.61	1451/1674	3.61	4.18	4.23	4.21	3.61	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	7	6	14	12	12	3.31	1320/1423	3.31	4.19	4.27	4.27	3.31	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	3	9	14	11	13	3.44	1471/1609	3.44	4.14	4.22	4.27	3.44	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	7	10	14	18	3.76	1040/1585	3.76	4.18	3.96	3.95	3.76	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	2	3	5	10	16	14	3.69	1196/1535	3.69	4.05	4.08	4.15	3.69	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	2	8	9	31	4.31	795/1651	4.31	4.26	4.18	4.16	4.31	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	1	1	1	13	35	4.57	1162/1673	4.57	4.69	4.69	4.68	4.57	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	14	0	2	2	12	16	5	3.54	1358/1656	3.54	4.07	4.07	4.07	3.54	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	2	9	11	26	4.27	1128/1586	4.27	4.55	4.43	4.42	4.27	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	5	0	0	1	2	9	34	4.65	1083/1585	4.65	4.79	4.69	4.66	4.65	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	5	0	0	5	9	14	18	3.98	1155/1582	3.98	4.33	4.26	4.26	3.98	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	3	2	8	14	20	3.98	1161/1575	3.98	4.40	4.27	4.25	3.98	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	5	1	3	3	8	9	22	3.98	705/1380	3.98	3.98	3.94	4.01	3.98	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	10	0	1	3	11	10	16	3.90	924/1520	3.90	4.19	4.01	4.09	3.90	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	10	0	1	0	5	14	21	4.32	847/1515	4.32	4.45	4.24	4.32	4.32	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	10	0	0	1	5	11	24	4.41	740/1511	4.41	4.46	4.27	4.34	4.41	
4. Were special techniques successful	11	11	0	4	9	4	12	3.83	604/ 994	3.83	3.93	3.94	3.96	3.83	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	46	3	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/ 265	****	****	4.23	4.26	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	48	0	1	1	1	0	0	2.00	****/ 278	****	****	4.19	4.24	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	49	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 260	****	****	4.46	4.49	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	49	1	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 259	****	****	4.33	4.33	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	49	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 233	****	****	4.20	4.18	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	48	1	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 103	****	5.00	4.41	4.10	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	48	1	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/ 101	****	5.00	4.48	4.30	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	48	2	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 95	****	5.00	4.31	3.91	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	48	1	0	2	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 99	****	5.00	4.39	4.29	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	48	2	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 97	****	5.00	4.14	3.48	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	49	0	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/ 76	****	****	3.98	4.03	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	49	0	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/ 77	****	****	3.93	3.70	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	49	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 53	****	****	4.45	3.87	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	49	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.12	3.67	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	49	1	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 49	****	****	4.27	3.27	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	48	0	1	0	2	0	0	2.33	****/ 61	****	****	4.09	3.20	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	48	1	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.26	3.50	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	49	1	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 50	****	****	4.44	3.82	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	48	1	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/ 35	****	****	4.36	3.29	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	48	1	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.34	4.29	****	

Course-Section: SOCY 353 0101  
 Title MARRIAGE AND THE FAMIL  
 Instructor: Tufekcioglu, Ze  
 Enrollment: 98  
 Questionnaires: 51

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2005

Page 1530  
 JAN 21, 2006  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	A	7	Required for Majors	16	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	1	B	22						
56-83	8	2.00-2.99	5	C	7	General	13	Under-grad	51	Non-major	50
84-150	11	3.00-3.49	13	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	1	Electives	3	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	2						
				I	0	Other	12				
				?	2						

Course-Section: SOCY 371 0101  
 Title CRIMINOLOGY AND PENOLO  
 Instructor: Knapp, Roland  
 Enrollment: 72  
 Questionnaires: 31

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2005

Page 1531  
 JAN 21, 2006  
 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	1	0	0	1	7	9	13	4.13	1085/1674	4.13	4.27	4.27	4.26	4.13	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	3	6	11	10	3.93	1233/1674	3.93	4.18	4.23	4.21	3.93	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	3	2	14	11	4.10	957/1423	4.10	4.19	4.27	4.27	4.10	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	16	1	1	2	3	6	3.92	1198/1609	3.92	4.14	4.22	4.27	3.92	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	3	1	4	7	8	7	3.59	1169/1585	3.59	4.18	3.96	3.95	3.59	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	16	1	2	4	3	3	3.38	1338/1535	3.38	4.05	4.08	4.15	3.38	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	1	2	5	22	4.60	393/1651	4.60	4.26	4.18	4.16	4.60	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	8	22	4.73	987/1673	4.73	4.69	4.69	4.68	4.73	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	1	0	3	10	8	4	3.52	1367/1656	3.52	4.07	4.07	4.07	3.52	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	4	11	15	4.37	1044/1586	4.37	4.55	4.43	4.42	4.37	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	6	6	18	4.40	1309/1585	4.40	4.79	4.69	4.66	4.40	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	2	5	8	14	4.17	1016/1582	4.17	4.33	4.26	4.26	4.17	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	1	5	6	17	4.23	975/1575	4.23	4.40	4.27	4.25	4.23	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	1	2	0	4	10	11	4.04	652/1380	4.04	3.98	3.94	4.01	4.04	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	17	0	2	3	2	3	4	3.29	1273/1520	3.29	4.19	4.01	4.09	3.29	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	17	0	1	1	4	3	5	3.71	1233/1515	3.71	4.45	4.24	4.32	3.71	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	17	0	1	3	0	4	6	3.79	1205/1511	3.79	4.46	4.27	4.34	3.79	
4. Were special techniques successful	17	13	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 994	****	3.93	3.94	3.96	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	30	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 265	****	****	4.23	4.26	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	30	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 278	****	****	4.19	4.24	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	30	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 260	****	****	4.46	4.49	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	30	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 259	****	****	4.33	4.33	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	30	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 233	****	****	4.20	4.18	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	30	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 103	****	5.00	4.41	4.10	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	30	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 101	****	5.00	4.48	4.30	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	30	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 95	****	5.00	4.31	3.91	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	30	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 99	****	5.00	4.39	4.29	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	30	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 97	****	5.00	4.14	3.48	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	30	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 76	****	****	3.98	4.03	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	30	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 53	****	****	4.45	3.87	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	30	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.12	3.67	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	30	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 49	****	****	4.27	3.27	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	30	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 61	****	****	4.09	3.20	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	30	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 50	****	****	4.44	3.82	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	30	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 35	****	****	4.36	3.29	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	30	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.34	4.29	****	



Course-Section: SOCY 371 0101  
 Title CRIMINOLOGY AND PENOLO  
 Instructor: Knapp, Roland  
 Enrollment: 72  
 Questionnaires: 31

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2005

Page 1531  
 JAN 21, 2006  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	A	12	Required for Majors	3	Graduate	0	Major	4
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	0	B	13						
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	1	C	3	General	13	Under-grad	31	Non-major	27
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	9	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	6	F	0	Electives	2	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	12				
				?	1						

Course-Section: SOCY 380 0101  
 Title POLITICAL SOCIOLOGY  
 Instructor: HEWITT, CHRIS J  
 Enrollment: 47  
 Questionnaires: 23

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2005

Page 1532  
 JAN 21, 2006  
 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	3	4	15	4.43	719/1674	4.43	4.27	4.27	4.26	4.43	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	2	5	5	11	4.09	1090/1674	4.09	4.18	4.23	4.21	4.09	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	3	7	12	4.30	803/1423	4.30	4.19	4.27	4.27	4.30	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	4	0	1	3	5	10	4.26	839/1609	4.26	4.14	4.22	4.27	4.26	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	3	2	3	8	6	3.55	1199/1585	3.55	4.18	3.96	3.95	3.55	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	2	10	9	4.23	703/1535	4.23	4.05	4.08	4.15	4.23	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	4	4	6	8	3.82	1282/1651	3.82	4.26	4.18	4.16	3.82	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	18	4	4.18	1470/1673	4.18	4.69	4.69	4.68	4.18	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	0	0	0	3	8	6	4.18	816/1656	4.18	4.07	4.07	4.07	4.18	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	3	7	13	4.43	960/1586	4.43	4.55	4.43	4.42	4.43	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	3	20	4.87	664/1585	4.87	4.79	4.69	4.66	4.87	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	4	6	12	4.36	819/1582	4.36	4.33	4.26	4.26	4.36	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	3	18	4.77	327/1575	4.77	4.40	4.27	4.25	4.77	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	18	1	0	1	0	2	3.50	****/1380	****	3.98	3.94	4.01	****	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	2	3	5	5	3.87	948/1520	3.87	4.19	4.01	4.09	3.87	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	0	1	3	3	8	4.20	944/1515	4.20	4.45	4.24	4.32	4.20	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	0	1	2	4	8	4.27	886/1511	4.27	4.46	4.27	4.34	4.27	
4. Were special techniques successful	8	12	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/ 994	****	3.93	3.94	3.96	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	21	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 265	****	****	4.23	4.26	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	22	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 278	****	****	4.19	4.24	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	22	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 260	****	****	4.46	4.49	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	22	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 259	****	****	4.33	4.33	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	22	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 233	****	****	4.20	4.18	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	21	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 103	****	5.00	4.41	4.10	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	22	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 101	****	5.00	4.48	4.30	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 95	****	5.00	4.31	3.91	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	22	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 99	****	5.00	4.39	4.29	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	22	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 97	****	5.00	4.14	3.48	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	22	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 76	****	****	3.98	4.03	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors		
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	A 4	Required for Majors 3	Graduate 1	Major 10
28-55	6	1.00-1.99	0	B 16			
56-83	6	2.00-2.99	2	C 1	General 9	Under-grad 22	Non-major 13
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	5	D 0			
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00	6	F 0	Electives 1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	
				P 0			
				I 0	Other 9		
				? 0			

Course-Section: SOCY 396 0101  
 Title COMM SERV & LEARN INTE  
 Instructor: WOLFF, MICHELE  
 Enrollment: 14  
 Questionnaires: 15

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2005

Page 1533  
 JAN 21, 2006  
 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	0	6	9	4.60	485/1674	4.60	4.27	4.27	4.26	4.60	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	3	11	4.79	237/1674	4.79	4.18	4.23	4.21	4.79	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	6	0	0	0	3	6	4.67	376/1423	4.67	4.19	4.27	4.27	4.67	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	3	0	0	0	4	7	4.64	343/1609	4.64	4.14	4.22	4.27	4.64	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	1	2	3	8	4.07	728/1585	4.07	4.18	3.96	3.95	4.07	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	1	0	0	4	9	4.43	481/1535	4.43	4.05	4.08	4.15	4.43	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	3	0	0	1	2	9	4.67	330/1651	4.67	4.26	4.18	4.16	4.67	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	5	10	4.67	1072/1673	4.67	4.69	4.69	4.68	4.67	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	0	0	5	5	4.50	381/1656	4.50	4.07	4.07	4.07	4.50	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	1	1	12	4.79	431/1586	4.79	4.55	4.43	4.42	4.79	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	1	12	4.92	453/1585	4.92	4.79	4.69	4.66	4.92	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	1	0	13	4.86	199/1582	4.86	4.33	4.26	4.26	4.86	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	0	0	0	13	4.71	423/1575	4.71	4.40	4.27	4.25	4.71	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	7	0	0	1	2	3	4.33	426/1380	4.33	3.98	3.94	4.01	4.33	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	0	13	5.00	1/1520	5.00	4.19	4.01	4.09	5.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	1	1	11	4.77	372/1515	4.77	4.45	4.24	4.32	4.77	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	0	0	13	5.00	1/1511	5.00	4.46	4.27	4.34	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	2	1	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/ 994	5.00	3.93	3.94	3.96	5.00	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 1	Required for Majors	1
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	B 0		Graduate 0
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	C 0	General	11
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad 15
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	1
			P 13		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	1
			? 0		

Course-Section: SOCY 397 0101  
 Title SELECTED TOPICS IN SOC  
 Instructor: SERVATIUS, NANC  
 Enrollment: 33  
 Questionnaires: 2

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2005

Page 1534  
 JAN 21, 2006  
 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	0	0	3.00	1628/1674	3.00	4.27	4.27	4.26	3.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	1608/1674	3.00	4.18	4.23	4.21	3.00	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	1363/1423	3.00	4.19	4.27	4.27	3.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	1557/1609	3.00	4.14	4.22	4.27	3.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	1543/1585	2.50	4.18	3.96	3.95	2.50	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	1509/1535	2.50	4.05	4.08	4.15	2.50	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	1610/1651	2.50	4.26	4.18	4.16	2.50	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1673	5.00	4.69	4.69	4.68	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	1377/1656	3.50	4.07	4.07	4.07	3.50	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	858/1586	4.50	4.55	4.43	4.42	4.50	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	1225/1585	4.50	4.79	4.69	4.66	4.50	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	1406/1582	3.50	4.33	4.26	4.26	3.50	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	1367/1575	3.50	4.40	4.27	4.25	3.50	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	303/1380	4.50	3.98	3.94	4.01	4.50	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	1470/1520	2.50	4.19	4.01	4.09	2.50	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	629/1515	4.50	4.45	4.24	4.32	4.50	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	1050/1511	4.00	4.46	4.27	4.34	4.00	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: SOCY 409 0101  
 Title SOCIOLOGICAL THEORY  
 Instructor: COHEN, JERE M  
 Enrollment: 50  
 Questionnaires: 24

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2005

Page 1535  
 JAN 21, 2006  
 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	3	10	11	4.33	854/1674	4.33	4.27	4.27	4.42	4.33	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	9	12	4.38	776/1674	4.38	4.18	4.23	4.31	4.38	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	2	20	4.75	262/1423	4.75	4.19	4.27	4.34	4.75	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	15	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	131/1609	4.89	4.14	4.22	4.30	4.89	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	4	8	12	4.33	482/1585	4.33	4.18	3.96	4.01	4.33	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	14	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	131/1535	4.80	4.05	4.08	4.18	4.80	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	4	8	11	4.21	924/1651	4.21	4.26	4.18	4.23	4.21	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	20	4	4.17	1484/1673	4.17	4.69	4.69	4.67	4.17	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	1	1	1	2	8	5	3.88	1139/1656	3.88	4.07	4.07	4.19	3.88	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	4	19	4.75	496/1586	4.75	4.55	4.43	4.46	4.75	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	2	2	19	4.74	960/1585	4.74	4.79	4.69	4.76	4.74	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	2	10	12	4.42	762/1582	4.42	4.33	4.26	4.31	4.42	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	0	4	19	4.67	495/1575	4.67	4.40	4.27	4.35	4.67	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	17	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	****/1380	****	3.98	3.94	4.04	****	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	1	1	1	8	8	4.11	777/1520	4.11	4.19	4.01	4.18	4.11	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	1	1	1	16	4.68	463/1515	4.68	4.45	4.24	4.40	4.68	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	0	0	3	16	4.84	312/1511	4.84	4.46	4.27	4.45	4.84	
4. Were special techniques successful	6	14	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	****/ 994	****	3.93	3.94	4.19	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	23	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 265	****	****	4.23	4.53	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	23	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 278	****	****	4.19	4.21	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	23	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 260	****	****	4.46	4.24	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	23	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 103	****	5.00	4.41	4.42	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	23	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 101	****	5.00	4.48	4.65	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	23	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 95	****	5.00	4.31	4.60	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	23	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 99	****	5.00	4.39	4.57	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	23	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 97	****	5.00	4.14	4.46	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	23	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 76	****	****	3.98	4.86	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	23	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 77	****	****	3.93	4.24	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	23	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 53	****	****	4.45	4.86	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	23	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.12	4.13	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	23	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 49	****	****	4.27	4.48	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	23	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 61	****	****	4.09	5.00	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	23	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.26	5.00	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	23	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 50	****	****	4.44	5.00	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	23	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 35	****	****	4.36	5.00	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	23	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.34	5.00	****	

Course-Section: SOCY 409 0101  
 Title: SOCIOLOGICAL THEORY  
 Instructor: COHEN, JERE M  
 Enrollment: 50  
 Questionnaires: 24

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2005

Page 1535  
 JAN 21, 2006  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	7	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	2	Major	18
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	14						
56-83	6	2.00-2.99	1	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	22	Non-major	6
84-150	7	3.00-3.49	5	D	0						
Grad.	2	3.50-4.00	6	F	0	Electives	2	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	1						
				I	0	Other	17				
				?	0						

Course-Section: SOCY 414 0101  
 Title EVALUATION:EDUC POLICY  
 Instructor: COHEN, JERE M  
 Enrollment: 26  
 Questionnaires: 14

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2005

Page 1536  
 JAN 21, 2006  
 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	3	3	8	4.36	829/1674	4.36	4.27	4.27	4.42	4.36	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	3	10	4.64	406/1674	4.64	4.18	4.23	4.31	4.64	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	12	4.86	167/1423	4.86	4.19	4.27	4.34	4.86	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	4	10	4.71	262/1609	4.71	4.14	4.22	4.30	4.71	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	3	11	4.79	148/1585	4.79	4.18	3.96	4.01	4.79	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	5	0	0	1	1	7	4.67	238/1535	4.67	4.05	4.08	4.18	4.67	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	0	2	2	9	4.29	832/1651	4.29	4.26	4.18	4.23	4.29	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	4	10	4.71	1015/1673	4.71	4.69	4.69	4.67	4.71	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	2	5	4	4.18	805/1656	4.18	4.07	4.07	4.19	4.18	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	2	12	4.86	301/1586	4.86	4.55	4.43	4.46	4.86	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	3	11	4.79	853/1585	4.79	4.79	4.69	4.76	4.79	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	1	12	4.79	272/1582	4.79	4.33	4.26	4.31	4.79	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	1	12	4.79	311/1575	4.79	4.40	4.27	4.35	4.79	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	4	2	1	1	1	5	3.60	998/1380	3.60	3.98	3.94	4.04	3.60	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	1	1	3	7	4.08	786/1520	4.08	4.19	4.01	4.18	4.08	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	1	0	0	2	10	4.54	603/1515	4.54	4.45	4.24	4.40	4.54	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	2	1	10	4.62	553/1511	4.62	4.46	4.27	4.45	4.62	
4. Were special techniques successful	1	9	0	0	2	0	2	4.00	474/ 994	4.00	3.93	3.94	4.19	4.00	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: SOCY 420 0101  
 Title SOCIAL EPIDEMIOLOGY  
 Instructor: KELLEY-MOORE, J  
 Enrollment: 33  
 Questionnaires: 28

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2005

Page 1537  
 JAN 21, 2006  
 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	1	0	0	0	1	3	23	4.81	233/1674	4.81	4.27	4.27	4.42	4.81	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	5	21	4.74	281/1674	4.74	4.18	4.23	4.31	4.74	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	1	0	1	0	6	19	4.65	390/1423	4.65	4.19	4.27	4.34	4.65	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	3	4	20	4.63	353/1609	4.63	4.14	4.22	4.30	4.63	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	5	22	4.81	131/1585	4.81	4.18	3.96	4.01	4.81	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	2	0	8	17	4.48	400/1535	4.48	4.05	4.08	4.18	4.48	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	1	1	5	20	4.63	372/1651	4.63	4.26	4.18	4.23	4.63	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	14	13	4.48	1224/1673	4.48	4.69	4.69	4.67	4.48	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	0	5	21	4.81	149/1656	4.81	4.07	4.07	4.19	4.81	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	0	1	25	4.96	86/1586	4.96	4.55	4.43	4.46	4.96	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	1	25	4.96	227/1585	4.96	4.79	4.69	4.76	4.96	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	0	6	20	4.77	299/1582	4.77	4.33	4.26	4.31	4.77	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	2	3	21	4.73	391/1575	4.73	4.40	4.27	4.35	4.73	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	2	0	0	1	9	14	4.54	278/1380	4.54	3.98	3.94	4.04	4.54	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	2	0	4	17	4.57	361/1520	4.57	4.19	4.01	4.18	4.57	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	0	1	2	20	4.83	301/1515	4.83	4.45	4.24	4.40	4.83	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	0	0	0	23	5.00	1/1511	5.00	4.46	4.27	4.45	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	6	2	0	0	3	6	11	4.40	287/ 994	4.40	3.93	3.94	4.19	4.40	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	26	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 103	****	5.00	4.41	4.42	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	26	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 101	****	5.00	4.48	4.65	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	26	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 95	****	5.00	4.31	4.60	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	26	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 99	****	5.00	4.39	4.57	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	26	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 97	****	5.00	4.14	4.46	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	A 15	Required for Majors	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	B 9		Graduate 9
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	C 1	General	17
84-150	9	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad 19
Grad.	9	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	1
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	9
			? 1		



Course-Section: SOCY 430 0101  
 Title SOCIOLOGY OF AGING  
 Instructor: TRELA, JAMES E  
 Enrollment: 26  
 Questionnaires: 15

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2005

Page 1538  
 JAN 21, 2006  
 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	1	1	1	4	8	4.13	1085/1674	4.13	4.27	4.27	4.42	4.13	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	1	2	6	5	3.87	1298/1674	3.87	4.18	4.23	4.31	3.87	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	1	1	4	3	5	3.71	1188/1423	3.71	4.19	4.27	4.34	3.71	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	2	2	8	3	3.80	1285/1609	3.80	4.14	4.22	4.30	3.80	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	2	2	3	7	3.87	946/1585	3.87	4.18	3.96	4.01	3.87	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	4	0	0	1	6	4	4.27	643/1535	4.27	4.05	4.08	4.18	4.27	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	0	2	2	10	4.33	768/1651	4.33	4.26	4.18	4.23	4.33	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	9	6	4.40	1311/1673	4.40	4.69	4.69	4.67	4.40	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	1	1	1	7	2	3.67	1297/1656	3.67	4.07	4.07	4.19	3.67	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	2	12	4.73	538/1586	4.73	4.55	4.43	4.46	4.73	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	0	14	4.87	664/1585	4.87	4.79	4.69	4.76	4.87	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	5	2	8	4.20	998/1582	4.20	4.33	4.26	4.31	4.20	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	1	0	4	9	4.27	949/1575	4.27	4.40	4.27	4.35	4.27	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	1	1	13	4.80	114/1380	4.80	3.98	3.94	4.04	4.80	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	1	1	0	9	4.55	373/1520	4.55	4.19	4.01	4.18	4.55	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	1	0	1	1	8	4.36	798/1515	4.36	4.45	4.24	4.40	4.36	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	1	1	0	0	9	4.36	788/1511	4.36	4.46	4.27	4.45	4.36	
4. Were special techniques successful	4	5	2	0	2	0	2	3.00	881/ 994	3.00	3.93	3.94	4.19	3.00	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	3	0.00-0.99 2	A 6	Required for Majors	1
28-55	0	1.00-1.99 0	B 7		Graduate 4
56-83	0	2.00-2.99 1	C 1	General	6
84-150	3	3.00-3.49 1	D 0		Under-grad 11
Grad.	4	3.50-4.00 4	F 0	Electives	0
			P 1		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	7
			? 0		

Course-Section: SOCY 452 0101  
 Title HEALTH CARE ORG/DEL  
 Instructor: NOLIN, MICHAEL  
 Enrollment: 43  
 Questionnaires: 27

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2005

Page 1539  
 JAN 21, 2006  
 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	1	3	5	8	10	3.85	1353/1674	3.85	4.27	4.27	4.42	3.85	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	5	4	10	1	7	3.04	1605/1674	3.04	4.18	4.23	4.31	3.04	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	3	10	7	7	3.67	1214/1423	3.67	4.19	4.27	4.34	3.67	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	2	3	12	9	3.96	1146/1609	3.96	4.14	4.22	4.30	3.96	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	3	6	7	9	3.67	1121/1585	3.67	4.18	3.96	4.01	3.67	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	2	1	1	4	9	9	4.00	870/1535	4.00	4.05	4.08	4.18	4.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	1	2	4	3	15	4.16	966/1651	4.16	4.26	4.18	4.23	4.16	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	1	25	4.96	283/1673	4.96	4.69	4.69	4.67	4.96	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	3	9	8	3	3.48	1390/1656	3.48	4.07	4.07	4.19	3.48	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	1	2	7	9	7	3.73	1421/1586	3.73	4.55	4.43	4.46	3.73	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	1	3	3	19	4.54	1200/1585	4.54	4.79	4.69	4.76	4.54	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	4	10	8	4	3.46	1420/1582	3.46	4.33	4.26	4.31	3.46	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	3	5	9	8	3.77	1284/1575	3.77	4.40	4.27	4.35	3.77	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	5	2	5	3	5	6	3.38	1103/1380	3.38	3.98	3.94	4.04	3.38	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	11	0	1	1	1	5	8	4.13	760/1520	4.13	4.19	4.01	4.18	4.13	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	11	0	0	1	2	4	9	4.31	847/1515	4.31	4.45	4.24	4.40	4.31	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	11	0	0	1	1	4	10	4.44	718/1511	4.44	4.46	4.27	4.45	4.44	
4. Were special techniques successful	11	5	2	0	2	3	4	3.64	687/ 994	3.64	3.93	3.94	4.19	3.64	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	1	0.00-0.99 0	A 15	Required for Majors 1	Graduate 3 Major 0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99 0	B 6		
56-83	7	2.00-2.99 1	C 4	General 3	Under-grad 24 Non-major 27
84-150	9	3.00-3.49 8	D 0		
Grad.	3	3.50-4.00 9	F 0	Electives 0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 21	
			? 0		

Course-Section: SOCY 457 0101  
 Title SOCIAL HIST OF MEDICIN  
 Instructor: ROTHSTEIN, WILL  
 Enrollment: 43  
 Questionnaires: 34

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2005

Page 1540  
 JAN 21, 2006  
 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	1	0	0	0	5	13	15	4.30	891/1674	4.30	4.27	4.27	4.42	4.30	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	0	6	10	17	4.24	956/1674	4.24	4.18	4.23	4.31	4.24	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	2	6	12	14	4.12	950/1423	4.12	4.19	4.27	4.34	4.12	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	4	1	3	4	13	8	3.83	1272/1609	3.83	4.14	4.22	4.30	3.83	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	1	5	5	20	4.31	502/1585	4.31	4.18	3.96	4.01	4.31	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	5	4	3	3	8	10	3.61	1240/1535	3.61	4.05	4.08	4.18	3.61	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	3	8	8	13	3.97	1149/1651	3.97	4.26	4.18	4.23	3.97	
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	1	31	4.97	283/1673	4.97	4.69	4.69	4.67	4.97	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	1	1	8	12	8	3.83	1177/1656	3.83	4.07	4.07	4.19	3.83	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	1	0	1	7	24	4.61	753/1586	4.61	4.55	4.43	4.46	4.61	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	1	0	0	5	28	4.74	960/1585	4.74	4.79	4.69	4.76	4.74	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	1	2	2	13	15	4.18	1007/1582	4.18	4.33	4.26	4.31	4.18	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	4	6	22	4.48	717/1575	4.48	4.40	4.27	4.35	4.48	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	6	6	2	7	8	4	3.07	1210/1380	3.07	3.98	3.94	4.04	3.07	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	10	0	2	2	3	8	9	3.83	967/1520	3.83	4.19	4.01	4.18	3.83	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	10	0	1	1	5	8	9	3.96	1080/1515	3.96	4.45	4.24	4.40	3.96	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	10	0	1	1	6	7	9	3.92	1130/1511	3.92	4.46	4.27	4.45	3.92	
4. Were special techniques successful	10	19	1	3	0	0	1	2.40	****/ 994	****	3.93	3.94	4.19	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	29	3	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 265	****	****	4.23	4.53	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	33	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 278	****	****	4.19	4.21	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	33	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 260	****	****	4.46	4.24	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	33	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 259	****	****	4.33	4.31	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	33	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 233	****	****	4.20	4.10	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	31	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 103	****	5.00	4.41	4.42	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	32	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 76	****	****	3.98	4.86	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	33	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 77	****	****	3.93	4.24	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	33	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 61	****	****	4.09	5.00	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	33	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.26	5.00	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	33	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 50	****	****	4.44	5.00	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors		
00-27	4	0.00-0.99	0	A 13	Required for Majors 2	Graduate 9	Major 8
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B 14			
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	3	C 2	General 17	Under-grad 25	Non-major 26
84-150	9	3.00-3.49	9	D 0			
Grad.	9	3.50-4.00	6	F 0	Electives 1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	
				P 0			
				I 0	Other 10		



Course-Section: SOCY 600 0101  
 Title RESEARCH METHODOLOGY  
 Instructor: ADLER, MARINA  
 Enrollment: 22  
 Questionnaires: 15

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2005

Page 1541  
 JAN 21, 2006  
 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	3	3	2	7	3.87	1347/1674	3.87	4.27	4.27	4.44	3.87	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	2	4	4	5	3.80	1340/1674	3.80	4.18	4.23	4.34	3.80	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	9	0	2	1	0	3	3.67	1214/1423	3.67	4.19	4.27	4.28	3.67	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	5	0	7	3	3.53	1439/1609	3.53	4.14	4.22	4.34	3.53	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	2	5	7	4.20	612/1585	4.20	4.18	3.96	4.23	4.20	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	1	3	4	6	4.07	840/1535	4.07	4.05	4.08	4.27	4.07	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	3	0	1	5	5	3.64	1385/1651	3.64	4.26	4.18	4.32	3.64	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	14	5.00	1/1673	5.00	4.69	4.69	4.78	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	3	4	4	2	3.38	1427/1656	3.38	4.07	4.07	4.15	3.38	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	1	1	2	11	4.53	826/1586	4.53	4.55	4.43	4.50	4.53	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	3	11	4.67	1071/1585	4.67	4.79	4.69	4.79	4.67	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	4	1	7	3	3.60	1371/1582	3.60	4.33	4.26	4.33	3.60	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	4	3	4	4	3.53	1361/1575	3.53	4.40	4.27	4.30	3.53	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	2	1	3	2	6	1	3.23	1167/1380	3.23	3.98	3.94	3.85	3.23	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	2	1	6	4	3.53	1157/1520	3.53	4.19	4.01	4.19	3.53	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	1	0	4	6	4	3.80	1180/1515	3.80	4.45	4.24	4.47	3.80	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	2	5	8	4.40	751/1511	4.40	4.46	4.27	4.49	4.40	
4. Were special techniques successful	0	5	0	0	4	4	2	3.80	614/ 994	3.80	3.93	3.94	4.07	3.80	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	12	2	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 265	****	****	4.23	4.51	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	14	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 278	****	****	4.19	4.42	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 260	****	****	4.46	4.67	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 259	****	****	4.33	4.66	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	14	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 233	****	****	4.20	4.53	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	13	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 103	****	5.00	4.41	4.56	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	14	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 101	****	5.00	4.48	4.62	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 95	****	5.00	4.31	4.43	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 99	****	5.00	4.39	4.54	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 97	****	5.00	4.14	4.26	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 76	****	****	3.98	4.20	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	14	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 77	****	****	3.93	4.31	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 61	****	****	4.09	4.46	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	2	A	6	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	9	Major	12
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	6						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	6	Non-major	3
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D	0						
Grad.	9	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough			

P	0			responses to be significant
I	0	Other	13	
?	0			

Course-Section: SOCY 605 0101  
 Title ADV RES & EVAL TECH  
 Instructor: ADLER, MARINA  
 Enrollment: 5  
 Questionnaires: 5

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2005

Page 1542  
 JAN 21, 2006  
 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	4	4.60	485/1674	4.60	4.27	4.27	4.44	4.60	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	1001/1674	4.20	4.18	4.23	4.34	4.20	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	4	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1423	****	4.19	4.27	4.28	****	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	3	1	4.00	1094/1609	4.00	4.14	4.22	4.34	4.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	612/1585	4.20	4.18	3.96	4.23	4.20	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	283/1535	4.60	4.05	4.08	4.27	4.60	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	3	2	4.40	673/1651	4.40	4.26	4.18	4.32	4.40	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1673	5.00	4.69	4.69	4.78	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	4	1	4.20	794/1656	4.20	4.07	4.07	4.15	4.20	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	389/1586	4.80	4.55	4.43	4.50	4.80	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	811/1585	4.80	4.79	4.69	4.79	4.80	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	3	2	4.40	777/1582	4.40	4.33	4.26	4.33	4.40	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	819/1575	4.40	4.40	4.27	4.30	4.40	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	3	0	2	3.80	866/1380	3.80	3.98	3.94	3.85	3.80	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	191/1520	4.80	4.19	4.01	4.19	4.80	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	543/1515	4.60	4.45	4.24	4.47	4.60	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	1	0	1	3	4.20	955/1511	4.20	4.46	4.27	4.49	4.20	
4. Were special techniques successful	0	3	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	205/ 994	4.50	3.93	3.94	4.07	4.50	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	4	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 103	****	5.00	4.41	4.56	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	4	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 101	****	5.00	4.48	4.62	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 95	****	5.00	4.31	4.43	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 99	****	5.00	4.39	4.54	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	4	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 97	****	5.00	4.14	4.26	****	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: SOCY 611 0101  
 Title CONSTR RACE CLASS & GE  
 Instructor: PINCUS, FRED L  
 Enrollment: 24  
 Questionnaires: 22

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2005

Page 1543  
 JAN 21, 2006  
 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	21	4.91	148/1674	4.91	4.27	4.27	4.44	4.91	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	8	14	4.64	419/1674	4.64	4.18	4.23	4.34	4.64	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	16	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	****/1423	****	4.19	4.27	4.28	****	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	1	3	17	4.76	212/1609	4.76	4.14	4.22	4.34	4.76	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	1	20	4.95	43/1585	4.95	4.18	3.96	4.23	4.95	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	7	13	4.57	310/1535	4.57	4.05	4.08	4.27	4.57	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	0	2	4	14	4.43	643/1651	4.43	4.26	4.18	4.32	4.43	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	21	5.00	1/1673	5.00	4.69	4.69	4.78	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	2	10	7	4.26	706/1656	4.26	4.07	4.07	4.15	4.26	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	2	6	13	4.52	837/1586	4.52	4.55	4.43	4.50	4.52	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	21	4.95	284/1585	4.95	4.79	4.69	4.79	4.95	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	1	6	14	4.62	510/1582	4.62	4.33	4.26	4.33	4.62	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	3	5	13	4.48	730/1575	4.48	4.40	4.27	4.30	4.48	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	16	0	2	1	0	1	3.00	****/1380	****	3.98	3.94	3.85	****	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	1	20	4.95	67/1520	4.95	4.19	4.01	4.19	4.95	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	0	1	20	4.95	104/1515	4.95	4.45	4.24	4.47	4.95	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	1	20	4.95	122/1511	4.95	4.46	4.27	4.49	4.95	
4. Were special techniques successful	1	11	0	0	3	3	4	4.10	445/ 994	4.10	3.93	3.94	4.07	4.10	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	18	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	****/ 103	****	5.00	4.41	4.56	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	18	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	****/ 101	****	5.00	4.48	4.62	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	****/ 95	****	5.00	4.31	4.43	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	****/ 99	****	5.00	4.39	4.54	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	18	0	0	1	1	1	1	3.50	****/ 97	****	5.00	4.14	4.26	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	5	0.00-0.99	1	A	12
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	6
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	4	D	0
Grad.	12	3.50-4.00	5	F	0
				P	0
				I	0
				?	1
-----					
			Required for Majors	1	Graduate
			General	8	Under-grad
			Electives	1	Non-major
			Other	10	
					### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant



Course-Section: SOCY 681 0101  
 Title NONPROFIT ORGANIZATION  
 Instructor: ROTHSTEIN, WILL  
 Enrollment: 6  
 Questionnaires: 6

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2005

Page 1544  
 JAN 21, 2006  
 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	0	0	6	5.00	1/1674	5.00	4.27	4.27	4.44	5.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1674	5.00	4.18	4.23	4.34	5.00	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	5	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1423	****	4.19	4.27	4.28	****	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1609	5.00	4.14	4.22	4.34	5.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1585	5.00	4.18	3.96	4.23	5.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	238/1535	4.67	4.05	4.08	4.27	4.67	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	524/1651	4.50	4.26	4.18	4.32	4.50	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1673	5.00	4.69	4.69	4.78	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1656	5.00	4.07	4.07	4.15	5.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1586	5.00	4.55	4.43	4.50	5.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1585	5.00	4.79	4.69	4.79	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1582	5.00	4.33	4.26	4.33	5.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1575	5.00	4.40	4.27	4.30	5.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	303/1380	4.50	3.98	3.94	3.85	4.50	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1520	5.00	4.19	4.01	4.19	5.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1515	5.00	4.45	4.24	4.47	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1511	5.00	4.46	4.27	4.49	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	0	0	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	205/ 994	4.50	3.93	3.94	4.07	4.50	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 265	****	****	4.23	4.51	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 278	****	****	4.19	4.42	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 260	****	****	4.46	4.67	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 259	****	****	4.33	4.66	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	4	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 103	5.00	5.00	4.41	4.56	5.00	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	4	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 101	5.00	5.00	4.48	4.62	5.00	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 95	5.00	5.00	4.31	4.43	5.00	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 99	5.00	5.00	4.39	4.54	5.00	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	4	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 97	5.00	5.00	4.14	4.26	5.00	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 76	****	****	3.98	4.20	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 77	****	****	3.93	4.31	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 53	****	****	4.45	4.64	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.12	4.35	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 49	****	****	4.27	4.46	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 61	****	****	4.09	4.46	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.26	4.59	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 50	****	****	4.44	4.64	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 35	****	****	4.36	4.84	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.34	4.64	****	

Course-Section: SOCY 681 0101  
 Title NONPROFIT ORGANIZATION  
 Instructor: ROTHSTEIN, WILL  
 Enrollment: 6  
 Questionnaires: 6

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2005

Page 1544  
 JAN 21, 2006  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	6	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	3	Under-grad	2	Non-major	4
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D	0						
Grad.	4	3.50-4.00	1	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	2				
				?	0						