

Course Section: SOCY 101 0101  
 Title BASIC CONCEPTS IN SOCY  
 Instructor: TUFEKCIOGLU, ZE  
 Enrollment: 144  
 Questionnaires: 92

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 1510  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	1	5	15	39	31	4.03	1152/1669	4.05	4.27	4.23	4.02	4.03	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	0	3	16	38	33	4.12	1019/1666	3.92	4.16	4.19	4.11	4.12	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	5	17	24	45	4.20	863/1421	3.98	4.28	4.24	4.11	4.20	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	3	13	3	5	21	19	28	3.84	1201/1617	3.70	4.14	4.15	3.99	3.84	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	3	2	5	10	27	44	4.20	601/1555	4.01	4.23	4.00	3.92	4.20	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	8	7	8	17	34	18	3.57	1236/1543	3.53	4.08	4.06	3.86	3.57	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	2	6	21	61	4.53	458/1647	4.25	4.12	4.12	4.06	4.53	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	2	0	0	0	33	56	4.63	1106/1668	4.74	4.76	4.67	4.62	4.63	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	27	2	0	0	9	36	18	4.14	810/1605	4.02	4.03	4.07	3.96	4.14	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	4	24	61	4.64	616/1514	4.50	4.50	4.39	4.32	4.64	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	1	13	76	4.83	705/1551	4.82	4.83	4.66	4.55	4.83	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	5	0	1	0	7	26	53	4.49	572/1503	4.29	4.37	4.24	4.17	4.49	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	5	0	3	2	6	25	51	4.37	809/1506	4.41	4.42	4.26	4.17	4.37	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	5	2	2	0	5	24	54	4.51	264/1311	3.93	4.01	3.85	3.68	4.51	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	29	0	3	2	7	23	28	4.13	793/1490	3.78	4.14	4.05	3.85	4.13	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	29	0	1	2	12	19	29	4.16	944/1502	3.79	4.37	4.26	4.06	4.16	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	30	0	0	4	8	14	36	4.32	874/1489	4.12	4.51	4.29	4.07	4.32	
4. Were special techniques successful	28	33	8	4	4	9	6	3.03	922/1006	3.21	3.86	4.00	3.81	3.03	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	78	8	1	1	0	3	1	3.33	****/ 226	****	****	4.20	3.98	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	80	0	2	0	5	2	3	3.33	****/ 233	****	****	4.19	4.09	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	81	3	0	2	0	3	3	3.88	****/ 225	****	****	4.50	4.42	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	82	4	0	1	1	3	1	3.67	****/ 223	****	****	4.35	4.19	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	82	4	2	0	2	1	1	2.83	****/ 206	****	****	4.15	4.01	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	80	5	0	0	3	1	3	4.00	****/ 112	****	4.59	4.38	4.04	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	82	2	1	0	3	2	2	3.50	****/ 97	****	4.46	4.36	4.19	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	82	4	0	0	2	1	3	4.17	****/ 92	****	4.54	4.22	3.79	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	82	5	0	1	1	1	2	3.80	****/ 105	****	4.67	4.20	3.94	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	82	3	0	2	1	2	2	3.57	****/ 98	****	3.81	3.95	3.90	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	82	0	3	2	1	2	2	2.80	****/ 58	****	4.17	4.22	4.00	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	85	0	0	1	1	3	2	3.86	****/ 52	****	4.08	4.06	3.81	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	85	2	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	****/ 39	****	4.36	4.39	4.30	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	85	2	0	1	0	2	2	4.00	****/ 40	****	4.00	3.97	4.00	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	85	3	0	1	0	2	1	3.75	****/ 30	****	4.40	4.33	4.30	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	84	0	0	1	3	2	2	3.63	****/ 55	****	****	4.34	4.17	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	84	0	1	1	1	4	1	3.38	****/ 42	****	3.00	4.31	4.08	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	84	2	0	1	2	2	1	3.50	****/ 46	****	****	4.45	4.26	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	84	2	1	0	1	3	1	3.50	****/ 33	****	****	4.25	4.25	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	84	2	0	0	3	0	3	4.00	****/ 29	****	****	4.34	4.22	****	

Course Section: SOCY 101 0101  
 Title BASIC CONCEPTS IN SOCY  
 Instructor: TUFEKCIOGLU, ZE  
 Enrollment: 144  
 Questionnaires: 92

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 1510  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	19	0.00-0.99	4	A	44	Required for Majors	42	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	12	1.00-1.99	0	B	27						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	7	C	11	General	17	Under-grad	92	Non-major	92
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	10	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	7	F	0	Electives	6	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	18				
				?	2						

Course Section: SOCY 101 0201  
 Title BASIC CONCEPTS IN SOCY  
 Instructor: HEWITT, CHRIS J  
 Enrollment: 116  
 Questionnaires: 74

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 1511  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sept
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	1	16	24	33	4.20	976/1669	4.05	4.27	4.23	4.02	4.20	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	8	15	25	26	3.93	1192/1666	3.92	4.16	4.19	4.11	3.93	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	3	0	0	10	9	28	24	3.93	1042/1421	3.98	4.28	4.24	4.11	3.93	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	3	46	1	4	2	8	10	3.88	1179/1617	3.70	4.14	4.15	3.99	3.88	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	3	0	3	5	9	30	24	3.94	872/1555	4.01	4.23	4.00	3.92	3.94	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	3	54	1	1	0	8	7	4.12	****/1543	3.53	4.08	4.06	3.86	****	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	3	2	2	5	14	24	24	3.91	1149/1647	4.25	4.12	4.12	4.06	3.91	
8. How many times was class cancelled	4	2	0	0	0	5	63	4.93	570/1668	4.74	4.76	4.67	4.62	4.93	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	14	1	0	0	15	29	15	4.00	918/1605	4.02	4.03	4.07	3.96	4.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	5	18	50	4.62	663/1514	4.50	4.50	4.39	4.32	4.62	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	2	5	67	4.88	594/1551	4.82	4.83	4.66	4.55	4.88	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	3	10	25	34	4.25	879/1503	4.29	4.37	4.24	4.17	4.25	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	6	17	50	4.60	547/1506	4.41	4.42	4.26	4.17	4.60	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	47	6	1	9	4	4	2.96	1137/1311	3.93	4.01	3.85	3.68	2.96	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	33	0	12	2	5	8	14	3.24	1269/1490	3.78	4.14	4.05	3.85	3.24	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	30	0	14	6	14	5	5	2.57	1470/1502	3.79	4.37	4.26	4.06	2.57	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	34	0	12	1	11	2	14	3.13	1388/1489	4.12	4.51	4.29	4.07	3.13	
4. Were special techniques successful	32	35	0	0	3	0	4	4.14	****/1006	3.21	3.86	4.00	3.81	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	59	10	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	****/ 226	****	****	4.20	3.98	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	62	0	4	0	2	0	6	3.33	****/ 233	****	****	4.19	4.09	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	59	11	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	****/ 225	****	****	4.50	4.42	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	61	8	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	****/ 223	****	****	4.35	4.19	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	61	8	0	1	0	0	4	4.40	****/ 206	****	****	4.15	4.01	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	59	6	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	****/ 112	****	4.59	4.38	4.04	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	61	6	0	0	3	0	4	4.14	****/ 97	****	4.46	4.36	4.19	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	61	8	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	****/ 92	****	4.54	4.22	3.79	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	61	8	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	****/ 105	****	4.67	4.20	3.94	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	61	8	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	****/ 98	****	3.81	3.95	3.90	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	63	0	4	0	2	1	4	3.09	****/ 58	****	4.17	4.22	4.00	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	62	0	3	0	2	0	7	3.67	****/ 52	****	4.08	4.06	3.81	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	61	8	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	****/ 39	****	4.36	4.39	4.30	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	61	8	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	****/ 40	****	4.00	3.97	4.00	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	61	8	1	0	0	0	4	4.20	****/ 30	****	4.40	4.33	4.30	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	65	0	2	0	2	1	4	3.56	****/ 55	****	****	4.34	4.17	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	61	8	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	****/ 42	****	3.00	4.31	4.08	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	61	8	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	****/ 46	****	****	4.45	4.26	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	61	8	0	1	0	0	4	4.40	****/ 33	****	****	4.25	4.25	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	61	8	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	****/ 29	****	****	4.34	4.22	****	

Course Section: SOCY 101 0201  
 Title BASIC CONCEPTS IN SOCY  
 Instructor: HEWITT, CHRIS J  
 Enrollment: 116  
 Questionnaires: 74

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 1511  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 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	22	Required for Majors	27	Graduate	0	Major	2
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	0	B	30						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	4	C	4	General	16	Under-grad	74	Non-major	72
84-150	6	3.00-3.49	2	D	2						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	8	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	15				
				?	0						

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	4	0	5	5	12	16	33	3.94	1242/1669	4.05	4.27	4.23	4.02	3.94	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	4	0	5	6	19	19	22	3.66	1387/1666	3.92	4.16	4.19	4.11	3.66	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	4	1	4	8	15	22	21	3.69	1159/1421	3.98	4.28	4.24	4.11	3.69	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	4	42	4	4	7	7	7	3.31	1455/1617	3.70	4.14	4.15	3.99	3.31	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	5	0	2	9	11	20	28	3.90	939/1555	4.01	4.23	4.00	3.92	3.90	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	3	57	1	3	3	3	5	3.53	****/1543	3.53	4.08	4.06	3.86	****	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	5	1	1	6	10	11	41	4.23	885/1647	4.25	4.12	4.12	4.06	4.23	
8. How many times was class cancelled	4	0	0	0	1	5	65	4.90	713/1668	4.74	4.76	4.67	4.62	4.90	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	19	3	2	2	11	26	12	3.83	1148/1605	4.02	4.03	4.07	3.96	3.83	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	8	0	0	6	12	20	29	4.07	1180/1514	4.50	4.50	4.39	4.32	4.07	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	6	0	0	1	2	8	58	4.78	825/1551	4.82	4.83	4.66	4.55	4.78	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	8	0	0	7	17	17	26	3.93	1147/1503	4.29	4.37	4.24	4.17	3.93	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	7	1	0	5	7	22	33	4.24	926/1506	4.41	4.42	4.26	4.17	4.24	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	8	0	4	6	13	16	28	3.87	725/1311	3.93	4.01	3.85	3.68	3.87	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	30	0	5	4	9	10	17	3.67	1088/1490	3.78	4.14	4.05	3.85	3.67	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	29	0	3	3	4	5	31	4.26	873/1502	3.79	4.37	4.26	4.06	4.26	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	30	0	3	0	2	5	35	4.53	657/1489	4.12	4.51	4.29	4.07	4.53	
4. Were special techniques successful	30	33	2	3	4	1	2	2.83	****/1006	3.21	3.86	4.00	3.81	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	67	6	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 226	****	****	4.20	3.98	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	68	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	****/ 233	****	****	4.19	4.09	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	66	5	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	****/ 225	****	****	4.50	4.42	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	67	5	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 223	****	****	4.35	4.19	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	67	7	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 206	****	****	4.15	4.01	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	66	6	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	****/ 112	****	4.59	4.38	4.04	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	66	6	0	0	0	3	0	4.00	****/ 97	****	4.46	4.36	4.19	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	65	9	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 92	****	4.54	4.22	3.79	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	66	5	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	****/ 105	****	4.67	4.20	3.94	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	66	5	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	****/ 98	****	3.81	3.95	3.90	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	68	0	2	1	1	1	2	3.00	****/ 58	****	4.17	4.22	4.00	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	68	0	1	0	2	1	3	3.71	****/ 52	****	4.08	4.06	3.81	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	69	3	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 39	****	4.36	4.39	4.30	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	68	4	1	0	0	0	2	3.67	****/ 40	****	4.00	3.97	4.00	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	68	5	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 30	****	4.40	4.33	4.30	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	68	0	0	0	2	2	3	4.14	****/ 55	****	****	4.34	4.17	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	68	2	0	1	1	1	2	3.80	****/ 42	****	3.00	4.31	4.08	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	68	6	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 46	****	****	4.45	4.26	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	68	4	0	1	0	0	2	4.00	****/ 33	****	****	4.25	4.25	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	68	2	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	****/ 29	****	****	4.34	4.22	****	

Course Section: SOCY 101 0301  
 Title BASIC CONCEPTS IN SOCY  
 Instructor: MACLENNAN, JAMI  
 Enrollment: 153  
 Questionnaires: 75

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 1512  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	10	0.00-0.99	5	A	18	Required for Majors	22	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	1	B	20						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	0	C	6	General	8	Under-grad	75	Non-major	75
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	6	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	1	Electives	4	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	9				
				?	0						

Course Section: SOCY 101 0401  
 Title BASIC CONCEPTS IN SOCY  
 Instructor: TUFEKCIOGLU, ZE  
 Enrollment: 147  
 Questionnaires: 172

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 1513  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sept
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	2	0	2	9	45	39	75	4.04	1152/1669	4.05	4.27	4.23	4.02	4.04	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	4	0	1	7	47	57	56	3.95	1164/1666	3.92	4.16	4.19	4.11	3.95	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	0	0	12	27	62	69	4.11	932/1421	3.98	4.28	4.24	4.11	4.11	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	21	2	17	34	57	39	3.77	1246/1617	3.70	4.14	4.15	3.99	3.77	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	1	6	15	26	51	71	3.98	806/1555	4.01	4.23	4.00	3.92	3.98	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	6	7	21	16	36	37	49	3.48	1268/1543	3.53	4.08	4.06	3.86	3.48	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	5	0	0	8	21	43	95	4.35	744/1647	4.25	4.12	4.12	4.06	4.35	
8. How many times was class cancelled	5	2	0	3	2	67	93	4.52	1183/1668	4.74	4.76	4.67	4.62	4.52	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	31	9	0	4	19	68	41	4.11	851/1605	4.02	4.03	4.07	3.96	4.11	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	5	0	0	0	12	30	125	4.68	569/1514	4.50	4.50	4.39	4.32	4.68	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	0	7	21	140	4.79	806/1551	4.82	4.83	4.66	4.55	4.79	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	1	16	52	100	4.49	588/1503	4.29	4.37	4.24	4.17	4.49	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	1	2	23	41	101	4.42	744/1506	4.41	4.42	4.26	4.17	4.42	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	9	0	3	7	10	45	98	4.40	341/1311	3.93	4.01	3.85	3.68	4.40	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	42	0	0	7	33	33	57	4.08	820/1490	3.78	4.14	4.05	3.85	4.08	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	40	0	3	5	26	32	66	4.16	944/1502	3.79	4.37	4.26	4.06	4.16	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	46	0	0	2	15	27	82	4.50	684/1489	4.12	4.51	4.29	4.07	4.50	
4. Were special techniques successful	45	56	9	10	17	15	20	3.38	819/1006	3.21	3.86	4.00	3.81	3.38	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	143	18	0	0	8	1	2	3.45	****/ 226	****	****	4.20	3.98	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	151	0	7	3	6	5	0	2.43	****/ 233	****	****	4.19	4.09	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	156	9	0	3	2	2	0	2.86	****/ 225	****	****	4.50	4.42	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	158	6	0	1	5	0	2	3.38	****/ 223	****	****	4.35	4.19	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	156	7	0	3	3	2	1	3.11	****/ 206	****	****	4.15	4.01	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	154	8	0	3	3	4	0	3.10	****/ 112	****	4.59	4.38	4.04	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	158	7	0	2	1	2	2	3.57	****/ 97	****	4.46	4.36	4.19	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	155	8	0	2	1	2	4	3.89	****/ 92	****	4.54	4.22	3.79	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	157	6	0	2	1	4	2	3.67	****/ 105	****	4.67	4.20	3.94	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	157	6	0	2	2	2	3	3.67	****/ 98	****	3.81	3.95	3.90	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	158	0	2	4	5	3	0	2.64	****/ 58	****	4.17	4.22	4.00	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	158	0	3	2	5	0	4	3.00	****/ 52	****	4.08	4.06	3.81	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	159	5	0	1	2	1	4	4.00	****/ 39	****	4.36	4.39	4.30	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	159	5	0	2	3	1	2	3.38	****/ 40	****	4.00	3.97	4.00	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	159	5	0	2	0	3	3	3.88	****/ 30	****	4.40	4.33	4.30	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	156	0	3	0	6	5	2	3.19	****/ 55	****	****	4.34	4.17	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	156	3	0	3	1	9	0	3.46	****/ 42	****	3.00	4.31	4.08	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	156	6	0	1	3	5	1	3.60	****/ 46	****	****	4.45	4.26	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	156	6	1	1	1	4	3	3.70	****/ 33	****	****	4.25	4.25	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	156	7	0	2	1	5	1	3.56	****/ 29	****	****	4.34	4.22	****	

Course Section: SOCY 101 0401  
 Title BASIC CONCEPTS IN SOCY  
 Instructor: TUFEKCIOGLU, ZE  
 Enrollment: 147  
 Questionnaires: 172

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 1513  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	34	0.00-0.99	11	A	46	Required for Majors	65	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	21	1.00-1.99	1	B	64						
56-83	6	2.00-2.99	15	C	9	General	18	Under-grad	172	Non-major	172
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	12	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	7	F	0	Electives	3	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	3	Other	39				
				?	5						



Course Section: SOCY 210 0101  
 Title CLASS/INEQUALITY IN U.  
 Instructor: HEWITT, CHRIS J  
 Enrollment: 37  
 Questionnaires: 20

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 1514  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	1	5	6	8	4.05	1138/1669	4.05	4.27	4.23	4.34	4.05	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	2	4	8	6	3.90	1235/1666	3.90	4.16	4.19	4.29	3.90	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	4	7	6	3	3.40	1279/1421	3.40	4.28	4.24	4.35	3.40	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	1	6	5	7	3.95	1112/1617	3.95	4.14	4.15	4.24	3.95	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	3	8	3	5	3.53	1217/1555	3.53	4.23	4.00	3.96	3.53	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	4	0	4	2	6	4	3.63	1215/1543	3.63	4.08	4.06	4.10	3.63	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	0	1	7	4	7	3.89	1169/1647	3.89	4.12	4.12	4.19	3.89	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	1	4	15	4.70	1039/1668	4.70	4.76	4.67	4.59	4.70	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	1	2	9	3	3.93	1039/1605	3.93	4.03	4.07	4.15	3.93	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	3	4	12	4.47	845/1514	4.47	4.50	4.39	4.39	4.47	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	1	2	16	4.79	825/1551	4.79	4.83	4.66	4.72	4.79	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	1	2	9	7	4.16	969/1503	4.16	4.37	4.24	4.29	4.16	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	2	6	11	4.47	680/1506	4.47	4.42	4.26	4.33	4.47	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	14	1	0	2	1	1	3.20	1072/1311	3.20	4.01	3.85	3.96	3.20	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	1	2	3	4	2	3.33	1233/1490	3.33	4.14	4.05	4.11	3.33	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	0	1	5	2	4	3.75	1208/1502	3.75	4.37	4.26	4.31	3.75	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	0	2	3	2	5	3.83	1155/1489	3.83	4.51	4.29	4.36	3.83	
4. Were special techniques successful	8	11	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/1006	****	3.86	4.00	3.99	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	19	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 226	****	****	4.20	4.42	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	18	0	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/ 233	****	****	4.19	4.36	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	19	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 225	****	****	4.50	4.74	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	19	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 223	****	****	4.35	4.71	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	19	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 206	****	****	4.15	4.59	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	18	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/ 112	****	4.59	4.38	4.59	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	17	1	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/ 97	****	4.46	4.36	4.60	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 92	****	4.54	4.22	4.50	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/ 105	****	4.67	4.20	4.63	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	18	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/ 98	****	3.81	3.95	4.20	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 58	****	4.17	4.22	4.20	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	19	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 52	****	4.08	4.06	5.00	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	19	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 39	****	4.36	4.39	5.00	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	19	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 40	****	4.00	3.97	5.00	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	19	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 30	****	4.40	4.33	5.00	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 55	****	****	4.34	4.67	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	19	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 42	****	3.00	4.31	5.00	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	19	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 46	****	****	4.45	5.00	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	19	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 33	****	****	4.25	5.00	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	19	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 29	****	****	4.34	5.00	****	

Course Section: SOCY 210 0101  
 Title CLASS/INEQUALITY IN U.  
 Instructor: HEWITT, CHRIS J  
 Enrollment: 37  
 Questionnaires: 20

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 1514  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 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	7	Required for Majors	2	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	B	7						
56-83	5	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	5	Under-grad	20	Non-major	20
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	5	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	3	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	1						
				I	0	Other	6				
				?	2						

Course Section: SOCY 240 0101  
 Title ELEMENTARY SOCIAL BEHA  
 Instructor: TUFEKCIOGLU, ZE  
 Enrollment: 46  
 Questionnaires: 32

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 1515  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	3	10	19	4.50	590/1669	4.50	4.27	4.23	4.34	4.50	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	3	14	14	4.35	752/1666	4.35	4.16	4.19	4.29	4.35	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	0	0	0	2	7	21	4.63	429/1421	4.63	4.28	4.24	4.35	4.63	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	3	2	0	1	6	11	9	4.04	1011/1617	4.04	4.14	4.15	4.24	4.04	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	2	1	1	1	7	18	4.43	418/1555	4.43	4.23	4.00	3.96	4.43	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	3	2	3	4	8	10	3.78	1123/1543	3.78	4.08	4.06	4.10	3.78	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	1	1	1	4	23	4.57	412/1647	4.57	4.12	4.12	4.19	4.57	
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	1	0	1	0	17	11	4.31	1345/1668	4.31	4.76	4.67	4.59	4.31	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	7	2	1	0	3	10	9	4.13	820/1605	4.13	4.03	4.07	4.15	4.13	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	1	1	4	24	4.70	537/1514	4.70	4.50	4.39	4.39	4.70	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	1	4	26	4.81	788/1551	4.81	4.83	4.66	4.72	4.81	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	1	7	22	4.70	347/1503	4.70	4.37	4.24	4.29	4.70	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	1	0	0	2	5	23	4.70	433/1506	4.70	4.42	4.26	4.33	4.70	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	1	0	1	4	7	17	4.38	357/1311	4.38	4.01	3.85	3.96	4.38	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	1	1	4	8	10	4.04	832/1490	4.04	4.14	4.05	4.11	4.04	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	0	1	4	4	15	4.38	781/1502	4.38	4.37	4.26	4.31	4.38	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	0	1	3	3	17	4.50	684/1489	4.50	4.51	4.29	4.36	4.50	
4. Were special techniques successful	8	6	1	3	6	2	6	3.50	759/1006	3.50	3.86	4.00	3.99	3.50	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	29	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 226	****	****	4.20	4.42	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	29	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 233	****	****	4.19	4.36	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	29	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 225	****	****	4.50	4.74	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	29	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 223	****	****	4.35	4.71	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	30	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 206	****	****	4.15	4.59	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	29	2	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 112	****	4.59	4.38	4.59	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	29	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 92	****	4.54	4.22	4.50	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	29	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 105	****	4.67	4.20	4.63	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	29	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 98	****	3.81	3.95	4.20	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	29	0	1	0	0	0	2	3.67	****/ 58	****	4.17	4.22	4.20	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	29	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 52	****	4.08	4.06	5.00	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	29	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 39	****	4.36	4.39	5.00	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	29	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 40	****	4.00	3.97	5.00	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	29	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 30	****	4.40	4.33	5.00	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	30	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 55	****	****	4.34	4.67	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	29	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 42	****	3.00	4.31	5.00	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	29	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 46	****	****	4.45	5.00	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	29	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 33	****	****	4.25	5.00	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	29	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 29	****	****	4.34	5.00	****	

Course Section: SOCY 240 0101  
 Title ELEMENTARY SOCIAL BEHA  
 Instructor: TUFEKCIOGLU, ZE  
 Enrollment: 46  
 Questionnaires: 32

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 1515  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 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	10	Graduate	0	Major	7
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	1	B	18						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	8	C	3	General	6	Under-grad	32	Non-major	25
84-150	6	3.00-3.49	5	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	0	F	0	Electives	2	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	7				
				?	0						

Course Section: SOCY 300 0101  
 Title METHODOLOGY:SOCIAL RSR  
 Instructor: MACLENNAN, JAMI  
 Enrollment: 44  
 Questionnaires: 28

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 1516  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	2	3	5	18	4.39	745/1669	4.39	4.27	4.23	4.28	4.39	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	2	1	3	22	4.61	439/1666	4.58	4.16	4.19	4.20	4.61	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	1	0	1	2	23	4.70	344/1421	4.61	4.28	4.24	4.25	4.70	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	2	0	1	5	19	4.44	583/1617	4.45	4.14	4.15	4.22	4.44	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	0	6	20	4.67	225/1555	4.45	4.23	4.00	4.03	4.67	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	1	1	0	1	5	19	4.58	325/1543	4.44	4.08	4.06	4.14	4.58	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	1	2	3	20	4.62	356/1647	4.60	4.12	4.12	4.14	4.62	
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	0	26	5.00	1/1668	4.94	4.76	4.67	4.68	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	10	0	0	1	1	9	7	4.22	725/1605	4.31	4.03	4.07	4.09	4.22	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	1	2	4	19	4.58	715/1514	4.64	4.50	4.39	4.46	4.58	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	1	5	20	4.73	917/1551	4.85	4.83	4.66	4.70	4.73	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	1	2	3	20	4.62	451/1503	4.69	4.37	4.24	4.28	4.62	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	1	1	3	21	4.69	433/1506	4.68	4.42	4.26	4.30	4.69	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	0	0	1	3	5	16	4.44	305/1311	4.39	4.01	3.85	3.97	4.44	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	1	1	3	10	4.47	490/1490	4.34	4.14	4.05	4.11	4.47	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	12	0	0	2	0	1	13	4.56	576/1502	4.60	4.37	4.26	4.28	4.56	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	13	0	0	0	2	2	11	4.60	596/1489	4.65	4.51	4.29	4.35	4.60	
4. Were special techniques successful	12	7	1	0	2	1	5	4.00	479/1006	3.77	3.86	4.00	4.10	4.00	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	27	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 226	****	****	4.20	4.17	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	27	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 233	****	****	4.19	4.13	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	26	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 225	****	****	4.50	4.45	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	27	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 223	****	****	4.35	4.27	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	27	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 206	****	****	4.15	4.08	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	27	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 112	****	4.59	4.38	4.53	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	26	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 97	****	4.46	4.36	4.12	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	27	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 92	****	4.54	4.22	4.47	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	27	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 105	****	4.67	4.20	4.45	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	27	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 98	****	3.81	3.95	4.15	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	27	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 58	****	4.17	4.22	4.29	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	27	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 52	****	4.08	4.06	3.59	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	27	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 39	****	4.36	4.39	3.82	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	27	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 40	****	4.00	3.97	3.34	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	27	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 30	****	4.40	4.33	3.49	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	27	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 55	****	****	4.34	4.03	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	27	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 42	****	3.00	4.31	4.13	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	26	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 46	****	****	4.45	4.13	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	27	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 33	****	****	4.25	3.00	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	27	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 29	****	****	4.34	4.13	****	

Course Section: SOCY 300 0101  
 Title METHODOLOGY:SOCIAL RSR  
 Instructor: MACLENNAN, JAMI  
 Enrollment: 44  
 Questionnaires: 28

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 1516  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 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	12	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	4
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B	4						
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	5	C	2	General	1	Under-grad	28	Non-major	24
84-150	6	3.00-3.49	4	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	16				
				?	1						

Course Section: SOCY 300 0201  
 Title: METHODOLOGY:SOCIAL RSR  
 Instructor: MACLENNAN, JAMI  
 Enrollment: 47  
 Questionnaires: 33

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 1517  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	2	16	15	4.39	745/1669	4.39	4.27	4.23	4.28	4.39	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	13	19	4.55	505/1666	4.58	4.16	4.19	4.20	4.55	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	12	19	4.52	547/1421	4.61	4.28	4.24	4.25	4.52	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	13	18	4.45	568/1617	4.45	4.14	4.15	4.22	4.45	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	2	5	9	17	4.24	567/1555	4.45	4.23	4.00	4.03	4.24	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	2	3	11	17	4.30	608/1543	4.44	4.08	4.06	4.14	4.30	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	2	9	21	4.59	378/1647	4.60	4.12	4.12	4.14	4.59	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	4	29	4.88	769/1668	4.94	4.76	4.67	4.68	4.88	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	2	0	0	0	16	11	4.41	499/1605	4.31	4.03	4.07	4.09	4.41	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	2	6	25	4.70	537/1514	4.64	4.50	4.39	4.46	4.70	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	32	4.97	205/1551	4.85	4.83	4.66	4.70	4.97	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	6	26	4.76	277/1503	4.69	4.37	4.24	4.28	4.76	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	3	5	25	4.67	471/1506	4.68	4.42	4.26	4.30	4.67	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	1	1	0	3	10	16	4.33	389/1311	4.39	4.01	3.85	3.97	4.33	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	1	6	7	14	4.21	726/1490	4.34	4.14	4.05	4.11	4.21	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	1	1	5	20	4.63	522/1502	4.60	4.37	4.26	4.28	4.63	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	0	0	2	4	21	4.70	490/1489	4.65	4.51	4.29	4.35	4.70	
4. Were special techniques successful	6	12	2	0	4	6	3	3.53	750/1006	3.77	3.86	4.00	4.10	3.53	
Laboratory															
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	32	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 233	****	****	4.19	4.13	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	31	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 112	****	4.59	4.38	4.53	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	31	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 97	****	4.46	4.36	4.12	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	32	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 92	****	4.54	4.22	4.47	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	32	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 105	****	4.67	4.20	4.45	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	32	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 98	****	3.81	3.95	4.15	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	32	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 58	****	4.17	4.22	4.29	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	32	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 52	****	4.08	4.06	3.59	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 20	Required for Majors 0
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	B 9	
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	6	C 2	General 2
84-150	11	3.00-3.49	5	D 0	Under-grad 33
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	11	F 0	Non-major 24
				P 0	
				I 0	
				? 0	Electives 0
					Other 29

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

Course Section: SOCY 301 0101  
 Title ANALY:SOCIOLOGICAL DAT  
 Instructor: LOTTES, ILSA L.  
 Enrollment: 39  
 Questionnaires: 23

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 1518  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	1	2	7	6	7	3.70	1395/1669	3.70	4.27	4.23	4.28	3.70	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	1	3	6	8	4	3.50	1466/1666	3.50	4.16	4.19	4.20	3.50	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	0	2	8	12	4.30	773/1421	4.30	4.28	4.24	4.25	4.30	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	1	0	5	8	7	3.95	1098/1617	3.95	4.14	4.15	4.22	3.95	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	5	2	6	4	6	3.17	1392/1555	3.17	4.23	4.00	4.03	3.17	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	4	1	4	4	6	4	3.42	1294/1543	3.42	4.08	4.06	4.14	3.42	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	2	2	4	5	10	3.83	1232/1647	3.83	4.12	4.12	4.14	3.83	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	1	0	1	21	4.83	863/1668	4.83	4.76	4.67	4.68	4.83	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	1	0	2	5	9	1	3.53	1348/1605	3.53	4.03	4.07	4.09	3.53	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	1	1	8	7	3	3.50	1389/1514	3.50	4.50	4.39	4.46	3.50	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	1	0	3	5	12	4.29	1326/1551	4.29	4.83	4.66	4.70	4.29	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	1	5	7	2	5	3.25	1393/1503	3.25	4.37	4.24	4.28	3.25	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	1	7	6	6	3.85	1199/1506	3.85	4.42	4.26	4.30	3.85	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	6	3	3	4	2	2	2.79	1189/1311	2.79	4.01	3.85	3.97	2.79	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	1	2	8	3	2	3.19	1293/1490	3.19	4.14	4.05	4.11	3.19	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	0	0	6	3	7	4.06	990/1502	4.06	4.37	4.26	4.28	4.06	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	1	0	4	6	5	3.88	1137/1489	3.88	4.51	4.29	4.35	3.88	
4. Were special techniques successful	8	8	1	1	4	0	1	2.86	948/1006	2.86	3.86	4.00	4.10	2.86	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	20	0	0	0	2	1	0	3.33	****/ 226	****	****	4.20	4.17	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	20	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/ 233	****	****	4.19	4.13	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	20	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/ 225	****	****	4.50	4.45	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	20	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/ 223	****	****	4.35	4.27	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	20	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/ 206	****	****	4.15	4.08	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	22	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 112	****	4.59	4.38	4.53	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	21	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 97	****	4.46	4.36	4.12	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	22	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 92	****	4.54	4.22	4.47	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	22	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 105	****	4.67	4.20	4.45	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	22	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 98	****	3.81	3.95	4.15	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	22	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 58	****	4.17	4.22	4.29	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	22	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 52	****	4.08	4.06	3.59	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	22	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 39	****	4.36	4.39	3.82	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	22	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 40	****	4.00	3.97	3.34	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	22	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 30	****	4.40	4.33	3.49	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	22	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 55	****	****	4.34	4.03	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	22	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 42	****	3.00	4.31	4.13	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	22	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 46	****	****	4.45	4.13	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	22	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 33	****	****	4.25	3.00	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	22	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 29	****	****	4.34	4.13	****	



Course Section: SOCY 301 0101  
 Title ANALY:SOCIOLOGICAL DAT  
 Instructor: LOTTES, ILSA L.  
 Enrollment: 39  
 Questionnaires: 23

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 1518  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	1	A	9	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	11
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	6						
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	1	C	6	General	0	Under-grad	23	Non-major	12
84-150	6	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	10	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	21				
				?	0						

Course Section: SOCY 321 0101  
 Title RACE & ETHNIC RELATION  
 Instructor: PINCUS, FRED L  
 Enrollment: 40  
 Questionnaires: 34

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 1519  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	3	12	19	4.47	633/1669	4.47	4.27	4.23	4.28	4.47	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	8	14	11	4.03	1082/1666	4.03	4.16	4.19	4.20	4.03	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	2	4	13	7	8	3.44	1256/1421	3.44	4.28	4.24	4.25	3.44	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	3	3	14	13	4.12	946/1617	4.12	4.14	4.15	4.22	4.12	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	4	29	4.82	132/1555	4.82	4.23	4.00	4.03	4.82	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	1	1	5	13	13	4.09	838/1543	4.09	4.08	4.06	4.14	4.09	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	2	3	6	23	4.47	532/1647	4.47	4.12	4.12	4.14	4.47	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	23	11	4.32	1337/1668	4.32	4.76	4.67	4.68	4.32	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	10	0	0	1	3	16	4	3.96	1005/1605	3.96	4.03	4.07	4.09	3.96	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	3	3	27	4.73	489/1514	4.73	4.50	4.39	4.46	4.73	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	2	31	4.88	567/1551	4.88	4.83	4.66	4.70	4.88	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	5	10	18	4.39	730/1503	4.39	4.37	4.24	4.28	4.39	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	5	10	19	4.41	757/1506	4.41	4.42	4.26	4.30	4.41	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	1	1	1	7	10	14	4.06	557/1311	4.06	4.01	3.85	3.97	4.06	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	4	10	14	4.36	604/1490	4.36	4.14	4.05	4.11	4.36	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	0	3	5	20	4.61	540/1502	4.61	4.37	4.26	4.28	4.61	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	0	0	2	4	22	4.71	478/1489	4.71	4.51	4.29	4.35	4.71	
4. Were special techniques successful	6	1	0	2	4	13	8	4.00	479/1006	4.00	3.86	4.00	4.10	4.00	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	1	0.00-0.99 0	A 8	Required for Majors 8	Graduate 0 Major 11
28-55	0	1.00-1.99 0	B 18		
56-83	4	2.00-2.99 6	C 4	General 7	Under-grad 34 Non-major 23
84-150	17	3.00-3.49 10	D 0		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 9	F 0	Electives 0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 1		
			I 0	Other 17	
			? 0		

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	2	6	12	12	26	3.93	1253/1669	3.93	4.27	4.23	4.28	3.93	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	5	7	15	18	13	3.47	1484/1666	3.47	4.16	4.19	4.20	3.47	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	4	17	13	17	7	3.10	1353/1421	3.10	4.28	4.24	4.25	3.10	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	2	0	10	9	19	18	3.80	1224/1617	3.80	4.14	4.15	4.22	3.80	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	4	11	20	22	4.00	773/1555	4.00	4.23	4.00	4.03	4.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	2	4	18	12	22	3.83	1084/1543	3.83	4.08	4.06	4.14	3.83	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	2	8	10	20	18	3.76	1275/1647	3.76	4.12	4.12	4.14	3.76	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	1	57	4.98	143/1668	4.98	4.76	4.67	4.68	4.98	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	4	7	24	10	9	3.24	1458/1605	3.24	4.03	4.07	4.09	3.24	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	10	7	9	21	8	3.18	1440/1514	3.18	4.50	4.39	4.46	3.18	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	1	12	44	4.75	880/1551	4.75	4.83	4.66	4.70	4.75	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	8	8	15	17	9	3.19	1402/1503	3.19	4.37	4.24	4.28	3.19	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	6	8	15	7	21	3.51	1319/1506	3.51	4.42	4.26	4.30	3.51	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	11	12	4	8	12	8	3.00	1115/1311	3.00	4.01	3.85	3.97	3.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	15	0	3	7	13	11	10	3.41	1215/1490	3.41	4.14	4.05	4.11	3.41	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	14	0	0	4	9	14	18	4.02	1005/1502	4.02	4.37	4.26	4.28	4.02	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	14	0	1	4	7	6	27	4.20	953/1489	4.20	4.51	4.29	4.35	4.20	
4. Were special techniques successful	14	34	3	3	3	1	1	2.45	****/1006	****	3.86	4.00	4.10	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	58	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 112	****	4.59	4.38	4.53	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	56	1	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 97	****	4.46	4.36	4.12	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	57	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 105	****	4.67	4.20	4.45	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	57	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 98	****	3.81	3.95	4.15	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	58	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 58	****	4.17	4.22	4.29	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	58	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 55	****	****	4.34	4.03	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	58	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 42	****	3.00	4.31	4.13	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	58	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 46	****	****	4.45	4.13	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors		
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	A 14	Required for Majors 11	Graduate 0	Major 6
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	B 19			
56-83	6	2.00-2.99	12	C 19	General 23	Under-grad 59	Non-major 53
84-150	20	3.00-3.49	13	D 0			
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	7	F 0	Electives 3	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	
				P 0			
				I 0	Other 19		
				? 0			

Course Section: SOCY 341 8020  
 Title SOCIAL PSYC OF SOC PRO  
 Instructor: STAFF  
 Enrollment: 15  
 Questionnaires: 14

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 1521  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	14	5.00	1/1669	5.00	4.27	4.23	4.28	5.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	12	4.86	142/1666	4.86	4.16	4.19	4.20	4.86	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	0	3	9	4.75	280/1421	4.75	4.28	4.24	4.25	4.75	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	1	12	4.92	91/1617	4.92	4.14	4.15	4.22	4.92	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	1	12	4.92	80/1555	4.92	4.23	4.00	4.03	4.92	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	0	13	4.86	123/1543	4.86	4.08	4.06	4.14	4.86	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	2	7	5	4.21	907/1647	4.21	4.12	4.12	4.14	4.21	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	14	5.00	1/1668	5.00	4.76	4.67	4.68	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	0	4	7	4.64	268/1605	4.64	4.03	4.07	4.09	4.64	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	2	12	4.86	274/1514	4.86	4.50	4.39	4.46	4.86	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	14	5.00	1/1551	5.00	4.83	4.66	4.70	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	2	12	4.86	173/1503	4.86	4.37	4.24	4.28	4.86	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	1	12	4.92	131/1506	4.92	4.42	4.26	4.30	4.92	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	3	2	9	4.43	319/1311	4.43	4.01	3.85	3.97	4.43	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	13	4.93	113/1490	4.93	4.14	4.05	4.11	4.93	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	1	13	4.93	189/1502	4.93	4.37	4.26	4.28	4.93	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	0	14	5.00	1/1489	5.00	4.51	4.29	4.35	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	0	0	1	0	1	1	11	4.50	235/1006	4.50	3.86	4.00	4.10	4.50	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	11	1	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 226	****	****	4.20	4.17	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	12	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 233	****	****	4.19	4.13	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	11	1	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 225	****	****	4.50	4.45	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	12	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 223	****	****	4.35	4.27	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	12	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 206	****	****	4.15	4.08	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	11	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 112	****	4.59	4.38	4.53	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	12	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 97	****	4.46	4.36	4.12	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 92	****	4.54	4.22	4.47	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 105	****	4.67	4.20	4.45	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	12	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 98	****	3.81	3.95	4.15	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 58	****	4.17	4.22	4.29	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	12	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 52	****	4.08	4.06	3.59	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	12	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 39	****	4.36	4.39	3.82	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	12	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 40	****	4.00	3.97	3.34	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	12	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 30	****	4.40	4.33	3.49	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 55	****	****	4.34	4.03	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	12	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 42	****	3.00	4.31	4.13	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	13	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 46	****	****	4.45	4.13	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	13	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 33	****	****	4.25	3.00	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	13	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 29	****	****	4.34	4.13	****	

Course Section: SOCY 341 8020  
 Title SOCIAL PSYC OF SOC PRO  
 Instructor: STAFF  
 Enrollment: 15  
 Questionnaires: 14

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 1521  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 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	5	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	6						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	5	Under-grad	14	Non-major	13
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	0	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	5				
				?	0						

Course Section: SOCY 349 0101  
 Title SOCIOLOGY OF RELIGION  
 Instructor: COHEN, JERE M  
 Enrollment: 60  
 Questionnaires: 35

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 1522  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	0	1	4	9	20	4.41	719/1669	4.41	4.27	4.23	4.28	4.41	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	2	4	8	20	4.35	752/1666	4.35	4.16	4.19	4.20	4.35	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	0	0	0	3	11	19	4.48	582/1421	4.48	4.28	4.24	4.25	4.48	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	22	0	0	1	4	6	4.45	568/1617	4.45	4.14	4.15	4.22	4.45	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	3	8	7	16	4.06	741/1555	4.06	4.23	4.00	4.03	4.06	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	3	22	1	0	1	2	6	4.20	723/1543	4.20	4.08	4.06	4.14	4.20	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	1	0	2	1	8	21	4.50	481/1647	4.50	4.12	4.12	4.14	4.50	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	1	2	31	4.88	750/1668	4.88	4.76	4.67	4.68	4.88	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	7	3	0	1	1	19	4	4.04	891/1605	4.04	4.03	4.07	4.09	4.04	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	2	3	27	4.78	392/1514	4.78	4.50	4.39	4.46	4.78	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	1	11	21	4.61	1111/1551	4.61	4.83	4.66	4.70	4.61	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	4	10	18	4.44	670/1503	4.44	4.37	4.24	4.28	4.44	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	2	8	21	4.61	534/1506	4.61	4.42	4.26	4.30	4.61	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	5	25	2	0	2	0	1	2.60	****/1311	****	4.01	3.85	3.97	****	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	11	0	2	2	5	3	12	3.88	970/1490	3.88	4.14	4.05	4.11	3.88	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	11	0	1	0	2	4	17	4.50	632/1502	4.50	4.37	4.26	4.28	4.50	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	11	0	1	0	1	3	19	4.63	574/1489	4.63	4.51	4.29	4.35	4.63	
4. Were special techniques successful	11	16	2	0	1	1	4	3.63	****/1006	****	3.86	4.00	4.10	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	34	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 226	****	****	4.20	4.17	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	34	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 112	****	4.59	4.38	4.53	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	14	Required for Majors	6	Graduate	0	Major	8
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	13						
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	6	C	0	General	8	Under-grad	35	Non-major	27
84-150	13	3.00-3.49	8	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	14				
				?	0						

Course Section: SOCY 351 0101  
 Title MEDICAL SOCIOLOGY  
 Instructor: SCHUMACHER, JOH  
 Enrollment: 48  
 Questionnaires: 32

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 1523  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	2	5	7	18	4.28	876/1669	4.63	4.27	4.23	4.28	4.28	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	5	25	4.72	293/1666	4.55	4.16	4.19	4.20	4.72	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	5	24	4.66	405/1421	4.91	4.28	4.24	4.25	4.66	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	2	1	7	20	4.50	496/1617	4.31	4.14	4.15	4.22	4.50	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	5	8	18	4.34	484/1555	4.84	4.23	4.00	4.03	4.34	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	1	3	5	10	12	3.94	981/1543	4.17	4.08	4.06	4.14	3.94	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	2	4	25	4.66	313/1647	3.91	4.12	4.12	4.14	4.66	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	4	27	4.87	769/1668	4.97	4.76	4.67	4.68	4.87	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	1	14	13	4.43	473/1605	4.38	4.03	4.07	4.09	4.43	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	2	4	26	4.75	441/1514	4.88	4.50	4.39	4.46	4.75	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	2	29	4.94	358/1551	4.98	4.83	4.66	4.70	4.94	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	1	7	23	4.71	335/1503	4.80	4.37	4.24	4.28	4.71	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	2	9	20	4.58	566/1506	4.83	4.42	4.26	4.30	4.58	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	0	0	6	25	4.81	116/1311	4.95	4.01	3.85	3.97	4.81	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	14	0	1	0	6	3	8	3.94	913/1490	4.55	4.14	4.05	4.11	3.94	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	13	0	1	2	0	3	13	4.32	836/1502	4.83	4.37	4.26	4.28	4.32	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	15	0	0	0	1	3	13	4.71	490/1489	4.93	4.51	4.29	4.35	4.71	
4. Were special techniques successful	15	10	1	1	1	1	3	3.57	****/1006	4.75	3.86	4.00	4.10	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	30	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 112	****	4.59	4.38	4.53	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	31	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 97	****	4.46	4.36	4.12	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	30	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 92	****	4.54	4.22	4.47	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	31	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 105	****	4.67	4.20	4.45	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	31	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 98	****	3.81	3.95	4.15	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	31	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 58	****	4.17	4.22	4.29	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	31	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 52	****	4.08	4.06	3.59	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	A 16	Required for Majors	2
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	B 15		Graduate 0
56-83	5	2.00-2.99	C 1	General	13
84-150	12	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad 32
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	1
			P 0		### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	18
			? 0		

Course Section: SOCY 351 8020  
 Title MEDICAL SOCIOLOGY  
 Instructor: SUFIAN, MERYL (Instr. A)  
 Enrollment: 4  
 Questionnaires: 4

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 1524  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	269/1669	4.63	4.27	4.23	4.28	4.75	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	549/1666	4.55	4.16	4.19	4.20	4.50	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1421	4.91	4.28	4.24	4.25	5.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	0	0	3	4.25	801/1617	4.31	4.14	4.15	4.22	4.25	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1555	4.84	4.23	4.00	4.03	5.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	659/1543	4.17	4.08	4.06	4.14	4.25	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	0	0	0	2	3.67	1321/1647	3.91	4.12	4.12	4.14	3.67	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1668	4.97	4.76	4.67	4.68	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	1	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	591/1605	4.38	4.03	4.07	4.09	4.33	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	441/1514	4.88	4.50	4.39	4.46	4.92	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1551	4.98	4.83	4.66	4.70	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	556/1503	4.80	4.37	4.24	4.28	4.83	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	353/1506	4.83	4.42	4.26	4.30	4.92	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1311	4.95	4.01	3.85	3.97	5.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	261/1490	4.55	4.14	4.05	4.11	4.75	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1502	4.83	4.37	4.26	4.28	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1489	4.93	4.51	4.29	4.35	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	143/1006	4.75	3.86	4.00	4.10	4.75	

Frequency Distribution

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



Course Section: SOCY 351 8020  
 Title MEDICAL SOCIOLOGY  
 Instructor: (Instr. B)  
 Enrollment: 4  
 Questionnaires: 4

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 1525  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	269/1669	4.63	4.27	4.23	4.28	4.75	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	549/1666	4.55	4.16	4.19	4.20	4.50	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1421	4.91	4.28	4.24	4.25	5.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	0	0	3	4.25	801/1617	4.31	4.14	4.15	4.22	4.25	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1555	4.84	4.23	4.00	4.03	5.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	659/1543	4.17	4.08	4.06	4.14	4.25	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	0	0	0	2	3.67	1321/1647	3.91	4.12	4.12	4.14	3.67	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1668	4.97	4.76	4.67	4.68	5.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1514	4.88	4.50	4.39	4.46	4.92	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1551	4.98	4.83	4.66	4.70	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1503	4.80	4.37	4.24	4.28	4.83	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1506	4.83	4.42	4.26	4.30	4.92	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1311	4.95	4.01	3.85	3.97	5.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	261/1490	4.55	4.14	4.05	4.11	4.75	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1502	4.83	4.37	4.26	4.28	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1489	4.93	4.51	4.29	4.35	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	143/1006	4.75	3.86	4.00	4.10	4.75	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course Section: SOCY 351 8020  
 Title MEDICAL SOCIOLOGY  
 Instructor: (Instr. C)  
 Enrollment: 4  
 Questionnaires: 4

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 1526  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	269/1669	4.63	4.27	4.23	4.28	4.75	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	549/1666	4.55	4.16	4.19	4.20	4.50	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1421	4.91	4.28	4.24	4.25	5.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	0	0	3	4.25	801/1617	4.31	4.14	4.15	4.22	4.25	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1555	4.84	4.23	4.00	4.03	5.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	659/1543	4.17	4.08	4.06	4.14	4.25	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	0	0	0	2	3.67	1321/1647	3.91	4.12	4.12	4.14	3.67	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1668	4.97	4.76	4.67	4.68	5.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1514	4.88	4.50	4.39	4.46	4.92	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1551	4.98	4.83	4.66	4.70	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1503	4.80	4.37	4.24	4.28	4.83	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1506	4.83	4.42	4.26	4.30	4.92	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1311	4.95	4.01	3.85	3.97	5.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	261/1490	4.55	4.14	4.05	4.11	4.75	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1502	4.83	4.37	4.26	4.28	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1489	4.93	4.51	4.29	4.35	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	143/1006	4.75	3.86	4.00	4.10	4.75	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course Section: SOCY 352 0101  
 Title ISSUES IN HEALTH CARE  
 Instructor: NOLIN, MICHAEL  
 Enrollment: 47  
 Questionnaires: 22

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 1527  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	1	3	3	6	9	3.86	1313/1669	3.86	4.27	4.23	4.28	3.86	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	1	6	6	8	3.86	1265/1666	3.86	4.16	4.19	4.20	3.86	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	3	0	5	8	6	3.64	1177/1421	3.64	4.28	4.24	4.25	3.64	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	12	7	4.18	875/1617	4.18	4.14	4.15	4.22	4.18	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	4	3	6	9	3.91	939/1555	3.91	4.23	4.00	4.03	3.91	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	1	0	1	4	8	7	4.05	863/1543	4.05	4.08	4.06	4.14	4.05	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	0	5	6	10	4.09	997/1647	4.09	4.12	4.12	4.14	4.09	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	1	14	7	4.27	1370/1668	4.27	4.76	4.67	4.68	4.27	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	3	4	7	5	3.74	1225/1605	3.74	4.03	4.07	4.09	3.74	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	1	0	4	7	10	4.14	1154/1514	4.14	4.50	4.39	4.46	4.14	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	4	17	4.73	936/1551	4.73	4.83	4.66	4.70	4.73	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	3	3	8	8	3.95	1117/1503	3.95	4.37	4.24	4.28	3.95	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	2	2	7	11	4.23	934/1506	4.23	4.42	4.26	4.30	4.23	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	1	1	1	5	2	12	4.10	542/1311	4.10	4.01	3.85	3.97	4.10	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	4	2	9	4.33	622/1490	4.33	4.14	4.05	4.11	4.33	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	0	0	1	4	10	4.60	540/1502	4.60	4.37	4.26	4.28	4.60	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	0	0	2	3	10	4.53	657/1489	4.53	4.51	4.29	4.35	4.53	
4. Were special techniques successful	7	5	1	0	3	2	4	3.80	643/1006	3.80	3.86	4.00	4.10	3.80	
Laboratory															
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 233	****	****	4.19	4.13	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	20	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 112	****	4.59	4.38	4.53	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 97	****	4.46	4.36	4.12	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 92	****	4.54	4.22	4.47	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 105	****	4.67	4.20	4.45	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 98	****	3.81	3.95	4.15	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 58	****	4.17	4.22	4.29	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 52	****	4.08	4.06	3.59	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 39	****	4.36	4.39	3.82	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 40	****	4.00	3.97	3.34	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 30	****	4.40	4.33	3.49	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 55	****	****	4.34	4.03	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 42	****	3.00	4.31	4.13	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 46	****	****	4.45	4.13	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 33	****	****	4.25	3.00	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 29	****	****	4.34	4.13	****	

Course Section: SOCY 352 0101  
 Title ISSUES IN HEALTH CARE  
 Instructor: NOLIN, MICHAEL  
 Enrollment: 47  
 Questionnaires: 22

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 1527  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 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	11	Required for Majors	6	Graduate	0	Major	5
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B	7						
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	4	C	2	General	10	Under-grad	22	Non-major	17
84-150	7	3.00-3.49	7	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	5				
				?	0						

Course Section: SOCY 353 0101  
 Title MARRIAGE AND THE FAMIL  
 Instructor: LLOYD, JENNIFER  
 Enrollment: 83  
 Questionnaires: 43

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 1528  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	2	1	3	14	23	4.28	889/1669	4.28	4.27	4.23	4.28	4.28	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	0	5	10	27	4.44	634/1666	4.44	4.16	4.19	4.20	4.44	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	0	3	10	29	4.53	529/1421	4.53	4.28	4.24	4.25	4.53	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	13	1	0	5	10	14	4.20	863/1617	4.20	4.14	4.15	4.22	4.20	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	1	4	9	27	4.43	418/1555	4.43	4.23	4.00	4.03	4.43	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	12	1	3	8	7	11	3.80	1101/1543	3.80	4.08	4.06	4.14	3.80	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	4	9	30	4.60	367/1647	4.60	4.12	4.12	4.14	4.60	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	4	34	5	4.02	1519/1668	4.02	4.76	4.67	4.68	4.02	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	9	0	1	1	8	21	3	3.71	1249/1605	3.71	4.03	4.07	4.09	3.71	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	1	2	2	9	25	4.41	939/1514	4.41	4.50	4.39	4.46	4.41	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	1	2	11	26	4.55	1152/1551	4.55	4.83	4.66	4.70	4.55	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	0	1	3	9	26	4.54	528/1503	4.54	4.37	4.24	4.28	4.54	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	2	1	4	9	25	4.32	858/1506	4.32	4.42	4.26	4.30	4.32	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	15	2	4	5	4	10	3.64	861/1311	3.64	4.01	3.85	3.97	3.64	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	9	0	2	3	7	5	17	3.94	913/1490	3.94	4.14	4.05	4.11	3.94	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	10	0	2	0	4	8	19	4.27	866/1502	4.27	4.37	4.26	4.28	4.27	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	0	2	2	3	27	4.62	585/1489	4.62	4.51	4.29	4.35	4.62	
4. Were special techniques successful	9	28	1	1	0	2	2	3.50	****/1006	****	3.86	4.00	4.10	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	41	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 112	****	4.59	4.38	4.53	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	42	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 58	****	4.17	4.22	4.29	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	A	19	Required for Majors	11	Graduate	0	Major	3
28-55	5	1.00-1.99	0	B	18						
56-83	7	2.00-2.99	13	C	3	General	14	Under-grad	43	Non-major	40
84-150	9	3.00-3.49	4	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	14				
				?	0						

Course Section: SOCY 371 0101  
 Title CRIMINOLOGY AND PENOLO  
 Instructor: KNAPP, ROLAND  
 Enrollment: 70  
 Questionnaires: 36

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 1529  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	1	7	8	20	4.31	852/1669	4.31	4.27	4.23	4.28	4.31	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	2	4	11	19	4.31	814/1666	4.31	4.16	4.19	4.20	4.31	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	3	3	7	22	4.28	797/1421	4.28	4.28	4.24	4.25	4.28	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	7	1	1	6	5	16	4.17	887/1617	4.17	4.14	4.15	4.22	4.17	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	2	1	1	10	2	19	4.12	687/1555	4.12	4.23	4.00	4.03	4.12	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	11	0	0	4	4	16	4.50	390/1543	4.50	4.08	4.06	4.14	4.50	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	3	3	7	22	4.37	697/1647	4.37	4.12	4.12	4.14	4.37	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	1	0	5	29	4.77	939/1668	4.77	4.76	4.67	4.68	4.77	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	7	0	0	2	6	12	9	3.97	987/1605	3.97	4.03	4.07	4.09	3.97	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	1	4	6	25	4.53	775/1514	4.53	4.50	4.39	4.46	4.53	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	2	8	26	4.67	1028/1551	4.67	4.83	4.66	4.70	4.67	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	1	0	3	9	23	4.47	604/1503	4.47	4.37	4.24	4.28	4.47	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	1	1	1	1	9	23	4.49	667/1506	4.49	4.42	4.26	4.30	4.49	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	3	2	4	1	9	15	4.00	587/1311	4.00	4.01	3.85	3.97	4.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	15	0	2	0	4	5	10	4.00	849/1490	4.00	4.14	4.05	4.11	4.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	15	0	2	1	7	4	7	3.62	1274/1502	3.62	4.37	4.26	4.28	3.62	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	15	0	1	2	4	3	11	4.00	1038/1489	4.00	4.51	4.29	4.35	4.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	14	15	1	2	0	0	4	3.57	****/1006	****	3.86	4.00	4.10	****	
Laboratory															
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	35	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 233	****	****	4.19	4.13	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	A 19	Required for Majors	2
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	B 13		Graduate
56-83	5	2.00-2.99	C 1	General	17
84-150	14	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	1
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	14
			? 3		

Course Section: SOCY 396 0101  
 Title COMM SERV & LEARN INTE  
 Instructor: WOLFF, MICHELE  
 Enrollment: 40  
 Questionnaires: 15

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 1530  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	0	0	0	5	9	4.64	419/1669	4.64	4.27	4.23	4.28	4.64	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	14	4.93	72/1666	4.93	4.16	4.19	4.20	4.93	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	6	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	280/1421	4.75	4.28	4.24	4.25	4.75	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	6	0	0	1	3	4	4.38	673/1617	4.38	4.14	4.15	4.22	4.38	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	5	9	4.64	237/1555	4.64	4.23	4.00	4.03	4.64	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	4	0	0	3	2	6	4.27	638/1543	4.27	4.08	4.06	4.14	4.27	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	5	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1647	5.00	4.12	4.12	4.14	5.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	3	11	4.79	926/1668	4.79	4.76	4.67	4.68	4.79	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	0	7	6	4.46	423/1605	4.46	4.03	4.07	4.09	4.46	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	0	0	13	5.00	1/1514	5.00	4.50	4.39	4.46	5.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	14	5.00	1/1551	5.00	4.83	4.66	4.70	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	0	1	12	4.92	101/1503	4.92	4.37	4.24	4.28	4.92	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	2	11	4.85	237/1506	4.85	4.42	4.26	4.30	4.85	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	11	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1311	****	4.01	3.85	3.97	****	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	141/1490	4.90	4.14	4.05	4.11	4.90	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1502	5.00	4.37	4.26	4.28	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1489	5.00	4.51	4.29	4.35	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	5	2	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	143/1006	4.75	3.86	4.00	4.10	4.75	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	A 2	Required for Majors	1
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	B 0		Graduate 0
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	C 0	General	8
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad 15
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	4
			P 11		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	0
			? 0		

Course Section: SOCY 397 0101  
 Title SELECTED TOPICS IN SOC  
 Instructor: SERVATIUS, NANC  
 Enrollment: 32  
 Questionnaires: 11

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 1531  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	4	4	3	3.91	1288/1669	3.91	4.27	4.23	4.28	3.91	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	2	4	3	1	3.09	1570/1666	3.09	4.16	4.19	4.20	3.09	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	8	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	969/1421	4.00	4.28	4.24	4.25	4.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	5	3	3.91	1168/1617	3.91	4.14	4.15	4.22	3.91	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	6	3	4.09	715/1555	4.09	4.23	4.00	4.03	4.09	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	1	2	5	2	3.80	1101/1543	3.80	4.08	4.06	4.14	3.80	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	1	4	5	0	3.18	1507/1647	3.18	4.12	4.12	4.14	3.18	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	2	9	4.82	882/1668	4.82	4.76	4.67	4.68	4.82	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	1	0	2	2	2	3.57	1325/1605	3.57	4.03	4.07	4.09	3.57	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	0	1	2	2	2	3.71	1337/1514	3.71	4.50	4.39	4.46	3.71	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	650/1551	4.86	4.83	4.66	4.70	4.86	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	0	1	3	1	2	3.57	1309/1503	3.57	4.37	4.24	4.28	3.57	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	2	2	0	3	3.57	1305/1506	3.57	4.42	4.26	4.30	3.57	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	2	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	333/1311	4.40	4.01	3.85	3.97	4.40	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	0	1	3	5	4.10	808/1490	4.10	4.14	4.05	4.11	4.10	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	1	0	1	1	7	4.30	846/1502	4.30	4.37	4.26	4.28	4.30	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	1	0	2	7	4.50	684/1489	4.50	4.51	4.29	4.35	4.50	
4. Were special techniques successful	1	3	0	0	0	6	1	4.14	436/1006	4.14	3.86	4.00	4.10	4.14	
Laboratory															
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 233	****	****	4.19	4.13	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	8	0	0	1	0	0	2	4.00	81/ 112	4.00	4.59	4.38	4.53	4.00	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	9	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 97	****	4.46	4.36	4.12	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 92	****	4.54	4.22	4.47	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 105	****	4.67	4.20	4.45	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	9	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 98	****	3.81	3.95	4.15	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 58	****	4.17	4.22	4.29	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 52	****	4.08	4.06	3.59	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 39	****	4.36	4.39	3.82	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 40	****	4.00	3.97	3.34	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 30	****	4.40	4.33	3.49	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 55	****	****	4.34	4.03	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 42	****	3.00	4.31	4.13	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 46	****	****	4.45	4.13	****	



Course Section: SOCY 397 0101  
 Title SELECTED TOPICS IN SOC  
 Instructor: SERVATIUS, NANC  
 Enrollment: 32  
 Questionnaires: 11

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 1531  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	6	Required for Majors	4	Graduate	0	Major	3
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	3						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	1	C	0	General	3	Under-grad	11	Non-major	8
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	0	D	0						
Grad.	0	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 397H 0101  
 Title APPL COMMUNITY RESEARC  
 Instructor: KELLEY-MOORE, J  
 Enrollment: 20  
 Questionnaires: 13

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 1532  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	1	5	4	3	3.69	1395/1669	3.69	4.27	4.23	4.28	3.69	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	6	4	4.00	1094/1666	4.00	4.16	4.19	4.20	4.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	7	6	4.46	554/1617	4.46	4.14	4.15	4.22	4.46	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	2	5	5	4.08	728/1555	4.08	4.23	4.00	4.03	4.08	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	1	6	5	4.15	771/1543	4.15	4.08	4.06	4.14	4.15	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	1	0	2	2	7	4.17	948/1647	4.17	4.12	4.12	4.14	4.17	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	12	4.92	570/1668	4.92	4.76	4.67	4.68	4.92	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	2	7	4	4.15	800/1605	4.15	4.03	4.07	4.09	4.15	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	6	7	4.54	763/1514	4.54	4.50	4.39	4.46	4.54	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	13	5.00	1/1551	5.00	4.83	4.66	4.70	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	3	10	4.77	266/1503	4.77	4.37	4.24	4.28	4.77	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	2	4	6	4.15	988/1506	4.15	4.42	4.26	4.30	4.15	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	7	1	0	2	2	1	3.33	1027/1311	3.33	4.01	3.85	3.97	3.33	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	1	5	2	3	3.64	1102/1490	3.64	4.14	4.05	4.11	3.64	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	1	0	1	9	4.64	513/1502	4.64	4.37	4.26	4.28	4.64	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	1	0	1	9	4.64	564/1489	4.64	4.51	4.29	4.35	4.64	
4. Were special techniques successful	2	6	1	2	1	1	0	2.40	990/1006	2.40	3.86	4.00	4.10	2.40	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	9	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/ 112	5.00	4.59	4.38	4.53	5.00	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	9	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	41/ 97	4.75	4.46	4.36	4.12	4.75	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	8	1	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	35/ 92	4.75	4.54	4.22	4.47	4.75	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	36/ 105	4.75	4.67	4.20	4.45	4.75	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	9	1	0	1	0	1	1	3.67	****/ 98	****	3.81	3.95	4.15	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	2	6	4	4.17	36/ 58	4.17	4.17	4.22	4.29	4.17	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	1	0	0	2	1	3	6	4.08	28/ 52	4.08	4.08	4.06	3.59	4.08	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	1	1	0	0	3	1	7	4.36	25/ 39	4.36	4.36	4.39	3.82	4.36	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	1	2	0	0	4	2	4	4.00	19/ 40	4.00	4.00	3.97	3.34	4.00	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	1	2	0	1	0	3	6	4.40	18/ 30	4.40	4.40	4.33	3.49	4.40	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course Section: SOCY 409 0101  
 Title SOCIOLOGICAL THEORY  
 Instructor: COHEN, JERE M  
 Enrollment: 45  
 Questionnaires: 33

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 1533  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	2	0	0	3	7	7	14	4.03	1152/1669	4.03	4.27	4.23	4.39	4.03	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	1	1	7	10	12	4.00	1094/1666	4.00	4.16	4.19	4.22	4.00	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	3	0	0	0	4	10	16	4.40	683/1421	4.40	4.28	4.24	4.38	4.40	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	19	0	1	2	5	4	4.00	1029/1617	4.00	4.14	4.15	4.22	4.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	5	6	9	10	3.71	1104/1555	3.71	4.23	4.00	4.08	3.71	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	19	0	1	2	4	5	4.08	844/1543	4.08	4.08	4.06	4.18	4.08	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	3	5	7	7	9	3.45	1416/1647	3.45	4.12	4.12	4.14	3.45	
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	0	31	5.00	1/1668	5.00	4.76	4.67	4.70	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	7	1	2	0	8	11	4	3.60	1312/1605	3.60	4.03	4.07	4.16	3.60	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	1	1	2	27	4.77	408/1514	4.77	4.50	4.39	4.45	4.77	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	0	3	27	4.90	512/1551	4.90	4.83	4.66	4.73	4.90	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	1	7	7	15	4.20	932/1503	4.20	4.37	4.24	4.27	4.20	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	0	3	7	20	4.45	706/1506	4.45	4.42	4.26	4.29	4.45	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	25	2	0	1	1	2	3.17	****/1311	****	4.01	3.85	3.88	****	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	1	3	9	6	6	3.52	1146/1490	3.52	4.14	4.05	4.26	3.52	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	0	2	2	5	17	4.42	729/1502	4.42	4.37	4.26	4.46	4.42	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	0	0	2	5	18	4.64	553/1489	4.64	4.51	4.29	4.52	4.64	
4. Were special techniques successful	7	23	0	1	0	0	2	4.00	****/1006	****	3.86	4.00	4.21	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	1	0.00-0.99 1	A 8	Required for Majors 0	Graduate 3 Major 20
28-55	1	1.00-1.99 0	B 18		
56-83	6	2.00-2.99 7	C 1	General 3	Under-grad 30 Non-major 13
84-150	11	3.00-3.49 7	D 0		
Grad.	3	3.50-4.00 10	F 0	Electives 0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 25	
			? 2		

Course Section: SOCY 420 0101  
 Title SOCIAL EPIDEMIOLOGY  
 Instructor: KELLEY-MOORE, J (Instr. A)  
 Enrollment: 28  
 Questionnaires: 17

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 1534  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	4	5	8	4.24	938/1669	4.24	4.27	4.23	4.39	4.24	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	4	2	10	4.24	908/1666	4.24	4.16	4.19	4.22	4.24	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	1	0	1	5	9	4.31	764/1421	4.31	4.28	4.24	4.38	4.31	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	1	2	2	4	7	3.88	1184/1617	3.88	4.14	4.15	4.22	3.88	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	3	12	4.59	277/1555	4.59	4.23	4.00	4.08	4.59	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	1	0	1	4	2	8	4.13	795/1543	4.13	4.08	4.06	4.18	4.13	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	3	3	3	7	3.71	1300/1647	3.71	4.12	4.12	4.14	3.71	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	1	7	9	4.47	1215/1668	4.47	4.76	4.67	4.70	4.47	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	2	6	6	4.29	654/1605	4.22	4.03	4.07	4.16	4.22	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	1	0	2	14	4.71	522/1514	4.62	4.50	4.39	4.45	4.62	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	16	4.94	307/1551	4.89	4.83	4.66	4.73	4.89	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	1	2	5	9	4.29	843/1503	4.30	4.37	4.24	4.27	4.30	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	7	10	4.59	566/1506	4.52	4.42	4.26	4.29	4.52	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	1	2	1	6	2	5	3.44	978/1311	3.55	4.01	3.85	3.88	3.55	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	2	1	2	9	4.29	667/1490	4.29	4.14	4.05	4.26	4.29	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	1	2	0	2	9	4.14	950/1502	4.14	4.37	4.26	4.46	4.14	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	2	0	2	10	4.43	776/1489	4.43	4.51	4.29	4.52	4.43	
4. Were special techniques successful	4	2	0	4	2	2	3	3.36	828/1006	3.36	3.86	4.00	4.21	3.36	
Laboratory															
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 233	****	****	4.19	4.40	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	14	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 112	****	4.59	4.38	4.74	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	15	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 97	****	4.46	4.36	4.69	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 92	****	4.54	4.22	4.48	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 105	****	4.67	4.20	4.27	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	15	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 98	****	3.81	3.95	3.86	****	
Field Work															
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 39	****	4.36	4.39	3.78	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	3	Required for Majors	2	Graduate	4	Major	1
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	8						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	1	C	0	General	5	Under-grad	13	Non-major	16
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	4	3.50-4.00	5	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	6				
				?	1						

Course Section: SOCY 420 0101  
 Title SOCIAL EPIDEMIOLOGY  
 Instructor: (Instr. B)  
 Enrollment: 28  
 Questionnaires: 17

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 1535  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	4	5	8	4.24	938/1669	4.24	4.27	4.23	4.39	4.24	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	4	2	10	4.24	908/1666	4.24	4.16	4.19	4.22	4.24	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	1	0	1	5	9	4.31	764/1421	4.31	4.28	4.24	4.38	4.31	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	1	2	2	4	7	3.88	1184/1617	3.88	4.14	4.15	4.22	3.88	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	3	12	4.59	277/1555	4.59	4.23	4.00	4.08	4.59	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	1	0	1	4	2	8	4.13	795/1543	4.13	4.08	4.06	4.18	4.13	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	3	3	3	7	3.71	1300/1647	3.71	4.12	4.12	4.14	3.71	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	1	7	9	4.47	1215/1668	4.47	4.76	4.67	4.70	4.47	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	3	5	5	4.15	800/1605	4.22	4.03	4.07	4.16	4.22	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	0	1	0	3	9	4.54	763/1514	4.62	4.50	4.39	4.45	4.62	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	0	0	2	11	4.85	677/1551	4.89	4.83	4.66	4.73	4.89	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	0	1	1	4	7	4.31	835/1503	4.30	4.37	4.24	4.27	4.30	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	1	5	7	4.46	693/1506	4.52	4.42	4.26	4.29	4.52	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	1	1	1	3	3	4	3.67	846/1311	3.55	4.01	3.85	3.88	3.55	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	2	1	2	9	4.29	667/1490	4.29	4.14	4.05	4.26	4.29	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	1	2	0	2	9	4.14	950/1502	4.14	4.37	4.26	4.46	4.14	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	2	0	2	10	4.43	776/1489	4.43	4.51	4.29	4.52	4.43	
4. Were special techniques successful	4	2	0	4	2	2	3	3.36	828/1006	3.36	3.86	4.00	4.21	3.36	
Laboratory															
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 233	****	****	4.19	4.40	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	14	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 112	****	4.59	4.38	4.74	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	15	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 97	****	4.46	4.36	4.69	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 92	****	4.54	4.22	4.48	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 105	****	4.67	4.20	4.27	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	15	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 98	****	3.81	3.95	3.86	****	
Field Work															
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 39	****	4.36	4.39	3.78	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	3	Required for Majors	2	Graduate	4	Major	1
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	8						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	1	C	0	General	5	Under-grad	13	Non-major	16
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	4	3.50-4.00	5	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	6				
				?	1						

Course Section: SOCY 430 0101  
 Title SOCIOLOGY OF AGING  
 Instructor: TRELA, JAMES E  
 Enrollment: 33  
 Questionnaires: 31

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 1536  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect		
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean		
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	2	0	0	0	2	11	16	4.48	618/1669	4.48	4.27	4.23	4.39	4.48
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	1	4	11	14	4.27	868/1666	4.27	4.16	4.19	4.22	4.27
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	0	0	0	1	11	17	4.55	511/1421	4.55	4.28	4.24	4.38	4.55
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	1	0	0	2	13	13	4.39	651/1617	4.39	4.14	4.15	4.22	4.39
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	3	1	0	4	3	10	10	3.96	839/1555	3.96	4.23	4.00	4.08	3.96
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	3	2	0	0	6	8	12	4.23	680/1543	4.23	4.08	4.06	4.18	4.23
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	3	0	0	0	4	12	12	4.29	828/1647	4.29	4.12	4.12	4.14	4.29
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	1	0	0	0	18	9	4.33	1329/1668	4.33	4.76	4.67	4.70	4.33
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	1	0	0	4	10	11	4.28	654/1605	4.28	4.03	4.07	4.16	4.28
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	1	1	0	16	11	4.21	1112/1514	4.21	4.50	4.39	4.45	4.21
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	3	26	4.90	539/1551	4.90	4.83	4.66	4.73	4.90
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	2	9	18	4.55	510/1503	4.55	4.37	4.24	4.27	4.55
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	1	0	0	1	10	17	4.57	575/1506	4.57	4.42	4.26	4.29	4.57
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	0	0	0	2	12	15	4.45	305/1311	4.45	4.01	3.85	3.88	4.45
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	1	3	7	14	4.36	594/1490	4.36	4.14	4.05	4.26	4.36
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	1	3	7	14	4.36	790/1502	4.36	4.37	4.26	4.46	4.36
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	0	0	5	5	15	4.40	800/1489	4.40	4.51	4.29	4.52	4.40
4. Were special techniques successful	6	9	1	2	4	1	8	3.81	639/1006	3.81	3.86	4.00	4.21	3.81

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	1	A	17	Required for Majors	2	Graduate	10	Major	18
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	9						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	2	C	0	General	12	Under-grad	21	Non-major	13
84-150	6	3.00-3.49	6	D	0						
Grad.	10	3.50-4.00	7	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0						
				?	0						
						Other	14				

Course Section: SOCY 452 0101  
 Title HEALTH CARE ORG/DEL  
 Instructor: STUART, MARY  
 Enrollment: 36  
 Questionnaires: 28

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 1537  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	1	2	2	5	18	4.32	828/1669	4.32	4.27	4.23	4.39	4.32	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	1	4	4	18	4.32	789/1666	4.32	4.16	4.19	4.22	4.32	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	1	0	0	2	2	22	4.77	267/1421	4.77	4.28	4.24	4.38	4.77	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	3	1	0	4	4	15	4.33	717/1617	4.33	4.14	4.15	4.22	4.33	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	1	1	1	1	5	18	4.46	379/1555	4.46	4.23	4.00	4.08	4.46	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	2	2	1	4	6	11	3.96	957/1543	3.96	4.08	4.06	4.18	3.96	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	1	0	0	4	6	16	4.46	549/1647	4.46	4.12	4.12	4.14	4.46	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	1	1	0	0	1	24	4.81	901/1668	4.81	4.76	4.67	4.70	4.81	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	1	0	5	10	8	4.00	918/1605	4.00	4.03	4.07	4.16	4.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	1	0	2	5	18	4.50	799/1514	4.50	4.50	4.39	4.45	4.50	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	0	0	25	5.00	1/1551	5.00	4.83	4.66	4.73	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	2	4	19	4.68	373/1503	4.68	4.37	4.24	4.27	4.68	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	4	4	17	4.52	623/1506	4.52	4.42	4.26	4.29	4.52	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	1	1	1	6	5	11	4.00	587/1311	4.00	4.01	3.85	3.88	4.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	2	4	12	4.56	417/1490	4.56	4.14	4.05	4.26	4.56	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	10	0	0	0	3	1	14	4.61	531/1502	4.61	4.37	4.26	4.46	4.61	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	10	0	0	0	1	0	17	4.89	299/1489	4.89	4.51	4.29	4.52	4.89	
4. Were special techniques successful	10	4	0	0	2	3	9	4.50	235/1006	4.50	3.86	4.00	4.21	4.50	
Seminar															
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	26	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 97	****	4.46	4.36	4.69	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	14	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	1	Major	2
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	10						
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	6	C	0	General	4	Under-grad	27	Non-major	26
84-150	9	3.00-3.49	4	D	0						
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00	6	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	20				
				?	1						

Course Section: SOCY 458 0101  
 Title SOC OF MENTAL HLTH & I  
 Instructor: SECKIN, GUL  
 Enrollment: 27  
 Questionnaires: 21

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 1538  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	1	3	0	2	15	4.29	876/1669	4.29	4.27	4.23	4.39	4.29	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	3	0	1	7	10	4.00	1094/1666	4.00	4.16	4.19	4.22	4.00	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	0	2	6	12	4.33	746/1421	4.33	4.28	4.24	4.38	4.33	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	2	1	5	13	4.38	662/1617	4.38	4.14	4.15	4.22	4.38	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	2	1	3	15	4.48	369/1555	4.48	4.23	4.00	4.08	4.48	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	1	1	6	12	4.29	628/1543	4.29	4.08	4.06	4.18	4.29	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	0	3	3	14	4.38	682/1647	4.38	4.12	4.12	4.14	4.38	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	3	18	4.86	807/1668	4.86	4.76	4.67	4.70	4.86	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	3	1	0	7	6	3.71	1249/1605	3.71	4.03	4.07	4.16	3.71	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	2	2	7	10	4.19	1118/1514	4.19	4.50	4.39	4.45	4.19	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	1	19	4.86	650/1551	4.86	4.83	4.66	4.73	4.86	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	1	0	3	7	10	4.19	932/1503	4.19	4.37	4.24	4.27	4.19	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	3	1	1	5	11	3.95	1121/1506	3.95	4.42	4.26	4.29	3.95	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	2	1	1	0	16	4.35	373/1311	4.35	4.01	3.85	3.88	4.35	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	2	1	2	14	4.30	650/1490	4.30	4.14	4.05	4.26	4.30	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	1	0	0	3	16	4.65	495/1502	4.65	4.37	4.26	4.46	4.65	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	1	0	2	17	4.75	434/1489	4.75	4.51	4.29	4.52	4.75	
4. Were special techniques successful	0	7	1	2	2	5	4	3.64	706/1006	3.64	3.86	4.00	4.21	3.64	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 226	****	****	4.20	4.61	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 233	****	****	4.19	4.40	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 225	****	****	4.50	4.39	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 223	****	****	4.35	4.56	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 206	****	****	4.15	4.20	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 112	****	4.59	4.38	4.74	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 97	****	4.46	4.36	4.69	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	19	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 92	****	4.54	4.22	4.48	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 105	****	4.67	4.20	4.27	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 98	****	3.81	3.95	3.86	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 58	****	4.17	4.22	3.94	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 52	****	4.08	4.06	3.80	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 39	****	4.36	4.39	3.78	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 40	****	4.00	3.97	3.81	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 30	****	4.40	4.33	4.50	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 55	****	****	4.34	5.00	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 42	****	3.00	4.31	5.00	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 46	****	****	4.45	4.92	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 33	****	****	4.25	3.00	****	



Course Section: SOCY 458 0101  
 Title SOC OF MENTAL HLTH & I  
 Instructor: SECKIN, GUL  
 Enrollment: 27  
 Questionnaires: 21

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 1538  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	2	A	17	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	8	Major	15
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	3						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	1	C	0	General	10	Under-grad	13	Non-major	6
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	8	3.50-4.00	8	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	10				
				?	1						

Course Section: SOCY 600 0101  
 Title RESEARCH METHODOLOGY  
 Instructor: ADLER, MARINA  
 Enrollment: 34  
 Questionnaires: 46

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 1539  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	2	2	18	18	6	3.52	1471/1669	3.52	4.27	4.23	4.35	3.52	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	18	10	10	8	3.17	1554/1666	3.17	4.16	4.19	4.19	3.17	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	4	18	2	2	8	10	2	3.33	1292/1421	3.33	4.28	4.24	4.33	3.33	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	2	6	10	18	8	3.55	1356/1617	3.55	4.14	4.15	4.24	3.55	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	4	14	12	14	3.70	1111/1555	3.70	4.23	4.00	4.07	3.70	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	4	0	20	10	12	3.57	1239/1543	3.57	4.08	4.06	4.27	3.57	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	4	4	12	8	16	3.64	1337/1647	3.64	4.12	4.12	4.15	3.64	
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	2	42	4.95	357/1668	4.95	4.76	4.67	4.83	4.95	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	8	0	2	6	16	12	2	3.16	1483/1605	3.16	4.03	4.07	4.13	3.16	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	4	20	20	4.36	993/1514	4.36	4.50	4.39	4.37	4.36	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	4	20	20	4.36	1289/1551	4.36	4.83	4.66	4.72	4.36	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	10	6	14	14	3.73	1250/1503	3.73	4.37	4.24	4.22	3.73	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	2	6	10	12	14	3.68	1269/1506	3.68	4.42	4.26	4.24	3.68	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	8	0	8	6	8	14	3.78	780/1311	3.78	4.01	3.85	3.89	3.78	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	10	20	2	8	3.20	1288/1490	3.20	4.14	4.05	4.18	3.20	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	2	6	8	8	16	3.75	1208/1502	3.75	4.37	4.26	4.46	3.75	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	10	0	4	4	22	3.70	1214/1489	3.70	4.51	4.29	4.44	3.70	
4. Were special techniques successful	6	22	4	2	6	2	4	3.00	923/1006	3.00	3.86	4.00	4.11	3.00	
Laboratory															
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	42	0	0	2	0	0	2	3.50	****/ 233	****	****	4.19	4.41	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	42	2	0	2	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 225	****	****	4.50	4.65	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	42	2	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 112	****	4.59	4.38	4.39	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	42	0	0	2	2	0	0	2.50	****/ 97	****	4.46	4.36	4.38	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	42	0	0	0	2	2	0	3.50	****/ 92	****	4.54	4.22	4.36	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	42	0	0	0	4	0	0	3.00	****/ 105	****	4.67	4.20	4.23	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	42	0	0	0	4	0	0	3.00	****/ 98	****	3.81	3.95	3.93	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	44	0	2	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 58	****	4.17	4.22	4.53	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	44	0	2	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 52	****	4.08	4.06	4.57	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	44	0	0	2	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 39	****	4.36	4.39	4.90	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	44	0	0	2	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 40	****	4.00	3.97	4.31	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	44	0	0	2	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 55	****	****	4.34	4.45	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	42	0	0	2	2	0	0	2.50	****/ 46	****	****	4.45	4.61	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	43	1	0	2	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 33	****	****	4.25	4.60	****	

Course Section: SOCY 600 0101  
 Title RESEARCH METHODOLOGY  
 Instructor: ADLER, MARINA  
 Enrollment: 34  
 Questionnaires: 46

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 1539  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	12	0.00-0.99	4	A	14	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	14	Major	12
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	24						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	2	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	32	Non-major	34
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	4	D	0						
Grad.	14	3.50-4.00	18	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	40				
				?	0						

Course Section: SOCY 605 0101  
 Title ADV RES & EVAL TECH  
 Instructor: ADLER, MARINA  
 Enrollment: 16  
 Questionnaires: 16

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 1540  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	2	2	5	7	4.06	1131/1669	4.06	4.27	4.23	4.35	4.06	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	2	1	4	9	4.25	881/1666	4.25	4.16	4.19	4.19	4.25	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	12	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	969/1421	4.00	4.28	4.24	4.33	4.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	5	8	4.25	801/1617	4.25	4.14	4.15	4.24	4.25	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	1	5	5	4	3.63	1163/1555	3.63	4.23	4.00	4.07	3.63	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	2	1	5	8	4.19	735/1543	4.19	4.08	4.06	4.27	4.19	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	2	0	6	8	4.25	862/1647	4.25	4.12	4.12	4.15	4.25	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	15	4.94	499/1668	4.94	4.76	4.67	4.83	4.94	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	3	4	6	4.23	713/1605	4.23	4.03	4.07	4.13	4.23	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	1	1	3	10	4.47	861/1514	4.47	4.50	4.39	4.37	4.47	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	3	12	4.80	788/1551	4.80	4.83	4.66	4.72	4.80	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	1	2	6	6	4.13	987/1503	4.13	4.37	4.24	4.22	4.13	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	1	5	8	4.33	838/1506	4.33	4.42	4.26	4.24	4.33	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	4	0	0	3	5	3	4.00	587/1311	4.00	4.01	3.85	3.89	4.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	6	7	4.54	428/1490	4.54	4.14	4.05	4.18	4.54	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	1	5	7	4.46	680/1502	4.46	4.37	4.26	4.46	4.46	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	1	2	2	8	4.31	893/1489	4.31	4.51	4.29	4.44	4.31	
4. Were special techniques successful	3	2	0	0	2	5	4	4.18	413/1006	4.18	3.86	4.00	4.11	4.18	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	A 7	Required for Majors	0
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	B 9	Graduate	7
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	C 0	General	2
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	D 0	Under-grad	9
Grad.	7	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	
			I 0	Other	12
			? 0		

Course Section: SOCY 611 0101  
 Title CONSTR RACE CLASS & GE  
 Instructor: PINCUS, FRED L  
 Enrollment: 25  
 Questionnaires: 17

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 1541  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	0	0	2	1	13	4.69	360/1669	4.69	4.27	4.23	4.35	4.69	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	1	2	5	8	4.25	881/1666	4.25	4.16	4.19	4.19	4.25	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	9	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	493/1421	4.57	4.28	4.24	4.33	4.57	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	3	2	2	9	4.06	993/1617	4.06	4.14	4.15	4.24	4.06	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	1	3	11	4.67	225/1555	4.67	4.23	4.00	4.07	4.67	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	1	4	3	7	4.07	857/1543	4.07	4.08	4.06	4.27	4.07	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	1	3	2	4	5	3.60	1353/1647	3.60	4.12	4.12	4.15	3.60	
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	0	15	5.00	1/1668	5.00	4.76	4.67	4.83	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	2	4	7	4.38	525/1605	4.38	4.03	4.07	4.13	4.38	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	7	0	0	0	2	1	7	4.50	799/1514	4.50	4.50	4.39	4.37	4.50	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	7	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	512/1551	4.90	4.83	4.66	4.72	4.90	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	8	0	0	0	1	2	6	4.56	510/1503	4.56	4.37	4.24	4.22	4.56	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	1	3	0	5	4.00	1069/1506	4.00	4.42	4.26	4.24	4.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	7	9	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/1311	****	4.01	3.85	3.89	****	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	2	12	4.86	177/1490	4.86	4.14	4.05	4.18	4.86	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	1	0	1	13	4.73	415/1502	4.73	4.37	4.26	4.46	4.73	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	0	0	0	13	5.00	1/1489	5.00	4.51	4.29	4.44	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	5	6	0	2	0	1	3	3.83	632/1006	3.83	3.86	4.00	4.11	3.83	
Laboratory															
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	16	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 233	****	****	4.19	4.41	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	9	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	43/ 112	4.88	4.59	4.38	4.39	4.88	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	9	0	0	1	0	4	3	4.13	64/ 97	4.13	4.46	4.36	4.38	4.13	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	3	3	2	3.88	71/ 92	3.88	4.54	4.22	4.36	3.88	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	36/ 105	4.75	4.67	4.20	4.23	4.75	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	9	0	0	2	2	1	3	3.63	74/ 98	3.63	3.81	3.95	3.93	3.63	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	4	0.00-0.99	1	A	9	Required for Majors	2	Graduate	5	Major	10
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	3						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	7	Under-grad	12	Non-major	7
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	5	3.50-4.00	5	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	0						

Course Section: SOCY 681 0101  
 Title NONPROFIT ORGANIZATION  
 Instructor: ROTHSTEIN, WILL  
 Enrollment: 11  
 Questionnaires: 7

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 1542  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	167/1669	4.86	4.27	4.23	4.35	4.86	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	4	3	4.43	662/1666	4.43	4.16	4.19	4.19	4.43	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	4	3	4.43	612/1617	4.43	4.14	4.15	4.24	4.43	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	2	0	3	0	3.20	1383/1555	3.20	4.23	4.00	4.07	3.20	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	210/1543	4.71	4.08	4.06	4.27	4.71	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	2	3	2	4.00	1043/1647	4.00	4.12	4.12	4.15	4.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1668	5.00	4.76	4.67	4.83	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	1	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	373/1605	4.50	4.03	4.07	4.13	4.50	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	308/1514	4.83	4.50	4.39	4.37	4.83	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1551	5.00	4.83	4.66	4.72	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	464/1503	4.60	4.37	4.24	4.22	4.60	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1506	5.00	4.42	4.26	4.24	5.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	1	1	1	0	1	1	3.00	1115/1311	3.00	4.01	3.85	3.89	3.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	298/1490	4.71	4.14	4.05	4.18	4.71	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	567/1502	4.57	4.37	4.26	4.46	4.57	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	478/1489	4.71	4.51	4.29	4.44	4.71	
4. Were special techniques successful	0	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	159/1006	4.71	3.86	4.00	4.11	4.71	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	4	1	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	65/ 112	4.50	4.59	4.38	4.39	4.50	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	5	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	50/ 97	4.50	4.46	4.36	4.38	4.50	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 92	5.00	4.54	4.22	4.36	5.00	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	51/ 105	4.50	4.67	4.20	4.23	4.50	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	5	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	46/ 98	4.00	3.81	3.95	3.93	4.00	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 58	****	4.17	4.22	4.53	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 52	****	4.08	4.06	4.57	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	6	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 39	****	4.36	4.39	4.90	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 40	****	4.00	3.97	4.31	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	6	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 30	****	4.40	4.33	4.55	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 55	****	****	4.34	4.45	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	5	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	36/ 42	3.00	3.00	4.31	4.40	3.00	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 46	****	****	4.45	4.61	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	0	A 6	Required for Majors 0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B 1	
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C 0	General 2
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	0	D 0	Under-grad 4
Grad.	3	3.50-4.00	3	F 0	Non-major 7
				P 0	
				I 0	
				? 0	Electives 0
					Other 5

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

