

Course-Section: SOCY 101 1
 Title Basic Concepts In Socy
 Instructor: Cousin-Gossett,
 Enrollment: 148
 Questionnaires: 14

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2009

Page 1357
 MAR 22, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	0	1	2	5	5	4.08	1065/1509	4.24	4.33	4.31	4.18	4.08
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	0	1	2	5	4	4.00	1086/1509	4.19	4.26	4.26	4.25	4.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	0	1	1	1	4	5	3.92	1010/1287	4.12	4.26	4.30	4.24	3.92
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	2	1	0	0	4	5	4.20	834/1459	4.06	4.23	4.22	4.11	4.20
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	2	3	6	4.36	478/1406	4.30	4.33	4.09	4.02	4.36
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	1	2	3	4	4.00	807/1384	3.97	4.22	4.11	3.98	4.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	4	0	1	0	2	1	6	4.10	917/1489	4.20	4.27	4.17	4.20	4.10
8. How many times was class cancelled	5	0	0	0	0	5	4	4.44	1127/1506	4.60	4.76	4.67	4.66	4.44
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	0	0	0	1	5	2	4.13	774/1463	4.11	4.13	4.09	4.02	4.13
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	1	1	2	8	4.42	917/1438	4.41	4.47	4.46	4.44	4.42
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	1	2	9	4.67	1014/1421	4.76	4.83	4.73	4.66	4.67
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	1	5	6	4.42	725/1411	4.42	4.40	4.31	4.27	4.42
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	1	1	1	9	4.50	634/1405	4.56	4.46	4.32	4.27	4.50
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	0	0	0	1	6	5	4.33	421/1236	4.17	4.09	4.00	3.87	4.33
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	244/1260	4.42	4.26	4.14	3.95	4.75
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	0	1	4	3	4.25	783/1255	4.28	4.47	4.33	4.15	4.25
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	421/1258	4.53	4.56	4.38	4.18	4.75
4. Were special techniques successful	6	3	0	0	3	1	1	3.60	671/ 873	3.67	3.89	4.03	3.89	3.60
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 184	****	****	4.16	4.06	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 198	****	****	4.22	4.14	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 184	****	****	4.48	4.48	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 165	****	****	4.18	4.15	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 89	****	4.60	4.49	4.31	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 92	****	4.80	4.54	4.16	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 90	****	5.00	4.50	4.21	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 93	****	4.40	4.06	3.92	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.39	3.75	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.41	4.29	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 47	****	****	4.51	4.53	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 44	****	****	4.32	4.12	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 49	****	****	4.26	4.28	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 41	****	****	4.14	4.13	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 46	****	****	4.31	4.52	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 37	****	****	4.05	4.47	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.27	4.21	****

Course-Section: SOCY 101 1
 Title Basic Concepts In Socy
 Instructor: Cousin-Gossett,
 Enrollment: 148
 Questionnaires: 14

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2009

Page 1357
 MAR 22, 2010
 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	3	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	3						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	0	C	3	General	6	Under-grad	14	Non-major	14
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	0						

Course-Section: SOCY 101 2
 Title Basic Concepts In Socy
 Instructor: Cousin-Gossett,
 Enrollment: 120
 Questionnaires: 45

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2009

Page 1358
 MAR 22, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	1	0	8	13	23	4.27	872/1509	4.24	4.33	4.31	4.18	4.27
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	1	1	5	19	18	4.18	932/1509	4.19	4.26	4.26	4.25	4.18
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	2	5	8	29	4.38	668/1287	4.12	4.26	4.30	4.24	4.38
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	6	0	2	4	14	18	4.26	759/1459	4.06	4.23	4.22	4.11	4.26
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	6	1	0	5	7	26	4.46	377/1406	4.30	4.33	4.09	4.02	4.46
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	10	0	1	9	10	14	4.09	762/1384	3.97	4.22	4.11	3.98	4.09
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	6	7	32	4.58	376/1489	4.20	4.27	4.17	4.20	4.58
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	2	37	5	4.07	1360/1506	4.60	4.76	4.67	4.66	4.07
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	9	3	0	1	1	18	13	4.30	579/1463	4.11	4.13	4.09	4.02	4.30
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	1	3	15	26	4.47	852/1438	4.41	4.47	4.46	4.44	4.47
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	2	5	36	4.79	811/1421	4.76	4.83	4.73	4.66	4.79
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	5	10	29	4.55	568/1411	4.42	4.40	4.31	4.27	4.55
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	2	7	35	4.75	345/1405	4.56	4.46	4.32	4.27	4.75
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	0	0	2	2	12	27	4.49	290/1236	4.17	4.09	4.00	3.87	4.49
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	9	0	1	1	3	14	17	4.25	621/1260	4.42	4.26	4.14	3.95	4.25
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	11	0	0	0	9	8	17	4.24	796/1255	4.28	4.47	4.33	4.15	4.24
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	11	0	0	1	3	7	23	4.53	605/1258	4.53	4.56	4.38	4.18	4.53
4. Were special techniques successful	11	21	2	0	2	1	8	4.00	442/ 873	3.67	3.89	4.03	3.89	4.00
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	39	5	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 184	****	****	4.16	4.06	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	41	0	1	0	0	2	1	3.50	****/ 198	****	****	4.22	4.14	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	41	2	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 184	****	****	4.48	4.48	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	41	2	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 177	****	****	4.36	4.29	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	42	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 165	****	****	4.18	4.15	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	40	3	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 89	****	4.60	4.49	4.31	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	42	2	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 92	****	4.80	4.54	4.16	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	42	2	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 90	****	5.00	4.50	4.21	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	42	1	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 92	****	4.40	4.38	4.21	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	42	1	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 93	****	4.40	4.06	3.92	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	42	0	0	2	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.39	3.75	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	43	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/ 48	****	****	4.41	4.29	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	43	0	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	****/ 47	****	****	4.51	4.53	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	43	0	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/ 47	****	****	4.18	4.26	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	44	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 44	****	****	4.32	4.12	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	43	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 49	****	****	4.26	4.28	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	44	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 41	****	****	4.14	4.13	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	44	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 46	****	****	4.31	4.52	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	44	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 37	****	****	4.05	4.47	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	44	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.27	4.21	****

Course-Section: SOCY 101 2
 Title Basic Concepts In Socy
 Instructor: Cousin-Gossett,
 Enrollment: 120
 Questionnaires: 45

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2009

Page 1358
 MAR 22, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	10	0.00-0.99	0	A	12	Required for Majors	6	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	B	13						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	2	C	4	General	13	Under-grad	45	Non-major	44
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	4	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	4				
				?	0						

Course-Section: SOCY 101 3
 Title Basic Concepts In Socy
 Instructor: Cousin-Gossett,
 Enrollment: 156
 Questionnaires: 78

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2009

Page 1359
 MAR 22, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	1	1	8	22	46	4.42	698/1509	4.24	4.33	4.31	4.18	4.42
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	0	0	5	30	41	4.47	589/1509	4.19	4.26	4.26	4.25	4.47
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	2	8	28	37	4.33	708/1287	4.12	4.26	4.30	4.24	4.33
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	8	1	3	19	22	23	3.93	1066/1459	4.06	4.23	4.22	4.11	3.93
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	6	3	1	8	21	38	4.27	575/1406	4.30	4.33	4.09	4.02	4.27
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	15	3	1	21	12	24	3.87	970/1384	3.97	4.22	4.11	3.98	3.87
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	1	0	1	6	21	48	4.53	434/1489	4.20	4.27	4.17	4.20	4.53
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	0	0	0	0	5	70	4.93	408/1506	4.60	4.76	4.67	4.66	4.93
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	20	2	0	0	6	31	19	4.23	648/1463	4.11	4.13	4.09	4.02	4.23
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	6	0	0	0	5	14	53	4.67	588/1438	4.41	4.47	4.46	4.44	4.67
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	5	0	0	0	0	10	63	4.86	639/1421	4.76	4.83	4.73	4.66	4.86
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	0	0	3	18	53	4.68	402/1411	4.42	4.40	4.31	4.27	4.68
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	1	0	1	2	17	53	4.67	446/1405	4.56	4.46	4.32	4.27	4.67
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	5	0	0	0	7	8	58	4.70	158/1236	4.17	4.09	4.00	3.87	4.70
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	24	0	1	0	7	15	31	4.39	520/1260	4.42	4.26	4.14	3.95	4.39
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	25	0	0	2	5	18	28	4.36	707/1255	4.28	4.47	4.33	4.15	4.36
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	25	0	0	0	3	8	42	4.74	444/1258	4.53	4.56	4.38	4.18	4.74
4. Were special techniques successful	25	28	4	3	7	2	9	3.36	747/ 873	3.67	3.89	4.03	3.89	3.36
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	67	9	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/ 184	****	****	4.16	4.06	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	71	0	2	0	1	0	4	3.57	****/ 198	****	****	4.22	4.14	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	71	5	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 184	****	****	4.48	4.48	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	71	5	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	****/ 177	****	****	4.36	4.29	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	71	5	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 165	****	****	4.18	4.15	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	69	4	0	1	0	2	2	4.00	****/ 89	****	4.60	4.49	4.31	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	71	3	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	****/ 92	****	4.80	4.54	4.16	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	71	3	0	1	0	0	3	4.25	****/ 90	****	5.00	4.50	4.21	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	71	2	1	0	0	0	4	4.20	****/ 92	****	4.40	4.38	4.21	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	72	2	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	****/ 93	****	4.40	4.06	3.92	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	71	0	1	0	1	1	4	4.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.39	3.75	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	71	0	1	0	1	2	3	3.86	****/ 48	****	****	4.41	4.29	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	71	3	1	0	0	0	3	4.00	****/ 47	****	****	4.51	4.53	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	71	4	0	1	1	0	1	3.33	****/ 47	****	****	4.18	4.26	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	71	4	0	1	1	1	0	3.00	****/ 44	****	****	4.32	4.12	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	70	0	1	0	1	2	4	4.00	****/ 49	****	****	4.26	4.28	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	70	3	1	0	1	1	2	3.60	****/ 41	****	****	4.14	4.13	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	70	3	0	1	1	1	2	3.80	****/ 46	****	****	4.31	4.52	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	70	5	1	0	1	0	1	3.00	****/ 37	****	****	4.05	4.47	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	70	4	0	1	0	1	2	4.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.27	4.21	****

Course-Section: SOCY 101 3
 Title Basic Concepts In Socy
 Instructor: Cousin-Gossett,
 Enrollment: 156
 Questionnaires: 78

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2009

Page 1359
 MAR 22, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	14	0.00-0.99	5	A	26	Required for Majors	9	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	0	B	21						
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	1	C	3	General	31	Under-grad	78	Non-major	78
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	4	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	7	F	0	Electives	8	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	2				
				?	1						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	3	0	2	1	14	29	39	4.20	942/1509	4.24	4.33	4.31	4.18	4.20
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	3	0	1	5	16	24	39	4.12	1002/1509	4.19	4.26	4.26	4.25	4.12
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	3	0	1	7	23	27	27	3.85	1053/1287	4.12	4.26	4.30	4.24	3.85
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	3	8	2	2	26	22	25	3.86	1127/1459	4.06	4.23	4.22	4.11	3.86
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	4	1	2	4	12	30	35	4.11	739/1406	4.30	4.33	4.09	4.02	4.11
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	5	0	4	4	19	25	31	3.90	939/1384	3.97	4.22	4.11	3.98	3.90
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	4	1	4	11	25	16	27	3.61	1258/1489	4.20	4.27	4.17	4.20	3.61
8. How many times was class cancelled	4	0	0	0	0	4	80	4.95	292/1506	4.60	4.76	4.67	4.66	4.95
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	16	3	4	3	17	26	19	3.77	1092/1463	4.11	4.13	4.09	4.02	3.77
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	6	0	1	4	16	26	35	4.10	1176/1438	4.41	4.47	4.46	4.44	4.10
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	7	0	0	0	4	15	62	4.72	950/1421	4.76	4.83	4.73	4.66	4.72
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	8	0	1	6	14	27	32	4.04	1035/1411	4.42	4.40	4.31	4.27	4.04
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	9	0	2	1	11	20	45	4.33	838/1405	4.56	4.46	4.32	4.27	4.33
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	9	50	8	0	8	5	8	3.17	1096/1236	4.17	4.09	4.00	3.87	3.17
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	40	0	1	1	8	11	27	4.29	589/1260	4.42	4.26	4.14	3.95	4.29
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	40	0	2	2	6	8	30	4.29	755/1255	4.28	4.47	4.33	4.15	4.29
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	40	0	3	6	2	9	28	4.10	901/1258	4.53	4.56	4.38	4.18	4.10
4. Were special techniques successful	40	26	2	1	6	5	8	3.73	625/ 873	3.67	3.89	4.03	3.89	3.73
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	85	1	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 184	****	****	4.16	4.06	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	86	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 198	****	****	4.22	4.14	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	86	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 184	****	****	4.48	4.48	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	86	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 177	****	****	4.36	4.29	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	86	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 165	****	****	4.18	4.15	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	85	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/ 89	****	4.60	4.49	4.31	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	85	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/ 92	****	4.80	4.54	4.16	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	85	1	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 90	****	5.00	4.50	4.21	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	85	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 92	****	4.40	4.38	4.21	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	85	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/ 93	****	4.40	4.06	3.92	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	85	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/ 48	****	****	4.39	3.75	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	85	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 48	****	****	4.41	4.29	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	85	0	0	1	0	0	2	4.00	****/ 47	****	****	4.51	4.53	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	86	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 47	****	****	4.18	4.26	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	86	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 44	****	****	4.32	4.12	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	85	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/ 49	****	****	4.26	4.28	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	85	1	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 41	****	****	4.14	4.13	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	85	1	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 46	****	****	4.31	4.52	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	85	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/ 37	****	****	4.05	4.47	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	85	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	****/ 30	****	****	4.27	4.21	****

Course-Section: SOCY 101 4
 Title Basic Concepts In Socy
 Instructor: Damasiewicz,Mer
 Enrollment: 147
 Questionnaires: 88

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2009

Page 1360
 MAR 22, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	16	0.00-0.99	0	A	10	Required for Majors	11	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	5	1.00-1.99	0	B	37						
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	2	C	18	General	36	Under-grad	88	Non-major	88
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	6	D	1						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	14	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	1				
				?	4						

Course-Section: SOCY 201 1
 Title Social Prob: Amer Socie
 Instructor: Morgan, Leslie A
 Enrollment: 65
 Questionnaires: 36

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2009

Page 1361
 MAR 22, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	1	4	7	11	12	3.83	1273/1509	3.83	4.33	4.31	4.34	3.83
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	1	2	2	12	17	4.24	880/1509	4.24	4.26	4.26	4.32	4.24
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	0	3	2	6	9	14	3.85	1047/1287	3.85	4.26	4.30	4.35	3.85
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	14	0	0	6	3	11	4.25	770/1459	4.25	4.23	4.22	4.30	4.25
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	0	6	11	16	4.21	647/1406	4.21	4.33	4.09	4.09	4.21
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	15	3	0	5	5	6	3.58	1159/1384	3.58	4.22	4.11	4.09	3.58
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	1	3	8	22	4.40	597/1489	4.40	4.27	4.17	4.19	4.40
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	4	28	3	3.97	1402/1506	3.97	4.76	4.67	4.61	3.97
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	8	0	0	0	8	12	8	4.00	853/1463	4.00	4.13	4.09	4.08	4.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	1	0	1	6	27	4.66	603/1438	4.66	4.47	4.46	4.48	4.66
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	1	8	26	4.71	950/1421	4.71	4.83	4.73	4.76	4.71
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	1	1	2	9	21	4.41	725/1411	4.41	4.40	4.31	4.37	4.41
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	3	0	3	9	19	4.21	934/1405	4.21	4.46	4.32	4.39	4.21
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	4	3	1	3	10	13	3.97	708/1236	3.97	4.09	4.00	4.11	3.97
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	14	0	3	0	4	6	9	3.82	904/1260	3.82	4.26	4.14	4.19	3.82
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	14	0	0	2	3	5	12	4.23	803/1255	4.23	4.47	4.33	4.37	4.23
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	14	0	0	1	3	6	12	4.32	784/1258	4.32	4.56	4.38	4.44	4.32
4. Were special techniques successful	14	16	1	1	0	3	1	3.33	****/ 873	****	3.89	4.03	4.04	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	33	2	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 184	****	****	4.16	4.54	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	34	0	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/ 198	****	****	4.22	4.51	****
Seminar														
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	35	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 92	****	4.80	4.54	****	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	35	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 90	****	5.00	4.50	****	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	35	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 92	****	4.40	4.38	4.00	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors		
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	1	A 6	Required for Majors 12	Graduate 0	Major 2
28-55	6	1.00-1.99	0	B 16			
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	2	C 11	General 12	Under-grad 36	Non-major 34
84-150	7	3.00-3.49	8	D 0			
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F 0	Electives 7	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	
				P 0			
				I 0	Other 3		
				? 0			

Course-Section: SOCY 210 1
 Title Class/Inequality In U.
 Instructor: Cousin-Gossett,
 Enrollment: 45
 Questionnaires: 20

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2009

Page 1362
 MAR 22, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	6	13	4.60	482/1509	4.60	4.33	4.31	4.34	4.60
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	4	14	4.68	333/1509	4.68	4.26	4.26	4.32	4.68
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	6	13	4.60	426/1287	4.60	4.26	4.30	4.35	4.60
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	0	3	5	9	4.35	667/1459	4.35	4.23	4.22	4.30	4.35
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	3	4	12	4.35	486/1406	4.35	4.33	4.09	4.09	4.35
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	5	0	1	3	2	9	4.27	609/1384	4.27	4.22	4.11	4.09	4.27
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	4	15	4.70	243/1489	4.70	4.27	4.17	4.19	4.70
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	20	5.00	1/1506	5.00	4.76	4.67	4.61	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	0	4	12	4.75	151/1463	4.75	4.13	4.09	4.08	4.75
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	3	2	13	4.56	737/1438	4.56	4.47	4.46	4.48	4.56
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	1	1	16	4.83	716/1421	4.83	4.83	4.73	4.76	4.83
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	2	3	13	4.61	482/1411	4.61	4.40	4.31	4.37	4.61
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	1	3	14	4.72	381/1405	4.72	4.46	4.32	4.39	4.72
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	0	0	0	4	1	13	4.50	274/1236	4.50	4.09	4.00	4.11	4.50
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	2	2	5	4.33	558/1260	4.33	4.26	4.14	4.19	4.33
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	11	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	321/1255	4.78	4.47	4.33	4.37	4.78
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	11	0	0	0	0	3	6	4.67	507/1258	4.67	4.56	4.38	4.44	4.67
4. Were special techniques successful	11	3	0	0	1	2	3	4.33	292/ 873	4.33	3.89	4.03	4.04	4.33

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: SOCY 300 1
 Title Methodology:Social Rsr
 Instructor: Adler,Marina A
 Enrollment: 43
 Questionnaires: 33

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2009

Page 1363
 MAR 22, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies		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	3	7	8	13	3.91	1214/1509	4.10	4.33	4.31	4.32	3.91
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	1	3	11	17	4.38	731/1509	4.37	4.26	4.26	4.25	4.38
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	1	2	4	8	17	4.19	832/1287	4.28	4.26	4.30	4.33	4.19
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	2	0	4	5	21	4.34	676/1459	4.36	4.23	4.22	4.26	4.34
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	3	2	4	6	17	4.00	813/1406	4.18	4.33	4.09	4.12	4.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	1	1	1	5	6	18	4.26	619/1384	4.30	4.22	4.11	4.15	4.26
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	2	3	8	18	4.25	760/1489	4.46	4.27	4.17	4.14	4.25
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	1	31	4.97	233/1506	4.67	4.76	4.67	4.67	4.97
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	1	7	14	6	3.89	990/1463	4.08	4.13	4.09	4.08	3.89
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	1	1	29	4.90	219/1438	4.85	4.47	4.46	4.43	4.90
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	1	3	28	4.84	691/1421	4.86	4.83	4.73	4.73	4.84
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	1	2	9	18	4.47	665/1411	4.46	4.40	4.31	4.29	4.47
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	2	0	6	22	4.48	658/1405	4.47	4.46	4.32	4.32	4.48
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	4	1	1	3	4	17	4.35	412/1236	3.78	4.09	4.00	4.07	4.35
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	3	1	4	6	11	3.84	892/1260	3.92	4.26	4.14	4.22	3.84
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	1	0	5	9	10	4.08	880/1255	4.33	4.47	4.33	4.37	4.08
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	1	3	6	2	14	3.96	964/1258	4.29	4.56	4.38	4.42	3.96
4. Were special techniques successful	8	9	0	2	2	6	6	4.00	442/ 873	3.96	3.89	4.03	4.08	4.00
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	26	0	0	1	0	2	4	4.29	****/ 184	****	****	4.16	4.07	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	26	0	0	0	1	3	3	4.29	****/ 198	****	****	4.22	4.17	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	26	0	0	0	1	3	3	4.29	****/ 184	****	****	4.48	4.52	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	26	1	0	1	0	1	4	4.33	****/ 177	****	****	4.36	4.30	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	26	0	0	1	1	2	3	4.00	****/ 165	****	****	4.18	4.11	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	28	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	****/ 89	****	4.60	4.49	4.86	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	27	0	0	0	0	3	3	4.50	****/ 92	****	4.80	4.54	4.67	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	28	0	0	1	0	1	3	4.20	****/ 90	****	5.00	4.50	4.63	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	28	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	****/ 92	****	4.40	4.38	4.73	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	26	1	0	0	2	0	4	4.33	****/ 93	****	4.40	4.06	3.94	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	31	0	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.39	4.61	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	31	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.41	4.34	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	31	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 47	****	****	4.51	4.62	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	31	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 47	****	****	4.18	4.47	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	31	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 44	****	****	4.32	4.40	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	31	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 49	****	****	4.26	5.00	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	31	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 41	****	****	4.14	5.00	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	31	0	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	****/ 46	****	****	4.31	5.00	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	31	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 37	****	****	4.05	5.00	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	31	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.27	5.00	****

Course-Section: SOCY 300 1
 Title Methodology:Social Rsr
 Instructor: Adler,Marina A
 Enrollment: 43
 Questionnaires: 33

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2009

Page 1363
 MAR 22, 2010
 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	4	Required for Majors	29	Graduate	0	Major	9
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	12						
56-83	10	2.00-2.99	5	C	12	General	0	Under-grad	33	Non-major	24
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	4	D	2						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	8	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	0						

Course-Section: SOCY 300 2
 Title Methodology:Social Rsr
 Instructor: Seckin,Gul
 Enrollment: 45
 Questionnaires: 30

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2009

Page 1364
 MAR 22, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	1	5	8	16	4.30	833/1509	4.10	4.33	4.31	4.32	4.30
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	1	1	10	17	4.37	742/1509	4.37	4.26	4.26	4.25	4.37
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	10	1	0	2	4	12	4.37	678/1287	4.28	4.26	4.30	4.33	4.37
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	2	2	8	17	4.38	647/1459	4.36	4.23	4.22	4.26	4.38
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	3	1	8	18	4.37	478/1406	4.18	4.33	4.09	4.12	4.37
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	1	4	4	19	4.34	518/1384	4.30	4.22	4.11	4.15	4.34
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	8	21	4.67	276/1489	4.46	4.27	4.17	4.14	4.67
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	18	11	4.38	1182/1506	4.67	4.76	4.67	4.67	4.38
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	7	0	0	0	3	11	9	4.26	618/1463	4.08	4.13	4.09	4.08	4.26
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	4	25	4.80	363/1438	4.85	4.47	4.46	4.43	4.80
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	2	27	4.87	639/1421	4.86	4.83	4.73	4.73	4.87
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	1	2	9	17	4.45	689/1411	4.46	4.40	4.31	4.29	4.45
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	0	3	6	19	4.45	708/1405	4.47	4.46	4.32	4.32	4.45
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	2	8	1	4	5	9	3.22	1084/1236	3.78	4.09	4.00	4.07	3.22
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	9	0	1	2	3	5	10	4.00	746/1260	3.92	4.26	4.14	4.22	4.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	9	0	0	1	2	2	16	4.57	526/1255	4.33	4.47	4.33	4.37	4.57
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	1	1	0	1	18	4.62	542/1258	4.29	4.56	4.38	4.42	4.62
4. Were special techniques successful	10	7	0	1	3	5	4	3.92	517/ 873	3.96	3.89	4.03	4.08	3.92
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	28	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 184	****	****	4.16	4.07	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	29	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 198	****	****	4.22	4.17	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	29	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 184	****	****	4.48	4.52	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	29	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 177	****	****	4.36	4.30	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	29	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 165	****	****	4.18	4.11	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors		
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A 23	Required for Majors 24	Graduate 0	Major 10
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	B 1			
56-83	7	2.00-2.99	5	C 2	General 0	Under-grad 30	Non-major 20
84-150	7	3.00-3.49	4	D 1			
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	7	F 0	Electives 2	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	
				P 0			
				I 0	Other 0		
				? 0			

Course-Section: SOCY 301 1
 Title Analy:Sociological Dat
 Instructor: Lottes,Ilsa L
 Enrollment: 20
 Questionnaires: 15

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2009

Page 1365
 MAR 22, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	1	13	4.80	244/1509	4.80	4.33	4.31	4.32	4.80
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	12	4.80	201/1509	4.80	4.26	4.26	4.25	4.80
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	13	4.87	159/1287	4.87	4.26	4.30	4.33	4.87
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	1	11	4.53	421/1459	4.53	4.23	4.22	4.26	4.53
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	1	2	2	9	4.13	711/1406	4.13	4.33	4.09	4.12	4.13
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	6	1	0	1	1	6	4.22	649/1384	4.22	4.22	4.11	4.15	4.22
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	2	2	11	4.60	341/1489	4.60	4.27	4.17	4.14	4.60
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	14	4.93	408/1506	4.93	4.76	4.67	4.67	4.93
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	0	2	9	4.82	114/1463	4.82	4.13	4.09	4.08	4.82
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	3	12	4.80	363/1438	4.80	4.47	4.46	4.43	4.80
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	0	14	4.87	639/1421	4.87	4.83	4.73	4.73	4.87
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	2	13	4.87	180/1411	4.87	4.40	4.31	4.29	4.87
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	14	4.93	120/1405	4.93	4.46	4.32	4.32	4.93
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	6	1	0	1	0	7	4.33	421/1236	4.33	4.09	4.00	4.07	4.33
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	136/1260	4.90	4.26	4.14	4.22	4.90
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1255	5.00	4.47	4.33	4.37	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1258	5.00	4.56	4.38	4.42	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	5	4	0	0	2	0	4	4.33	292/ 873	4.33	3.89	4.03	4.08	4.33

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors		
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 13	Required for Majors 11	Graduate 0	Major 10
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B 2			
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	4	C 0	General 0	Under-grad 15	Non-major 5
84-150	6	3.00-3.49	3	D 0			
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F 0	Electives 2	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	
				P 0			
				I 0	Other 0		
				? 0			

Course-Section: SOCY 321 1
 Title Race & Ethnic Relation
 Instructor: Pincus, Fred L
 Enrollment: 40
 Questionnaires: 25

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2009

Page 1366
 MAR 22, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	3	1	9	12	4.20	942/1509	4.32	4.33	4.31	4.32	4.20
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	2	1	3	10	8	3.88	1183/1509	4.33	4.26	4.26	4.25	3.88
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	2	5	7	11	4.08	890/1287	4.37	4.26	4.30	4.33	4.08
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	2	2	3	4	13	4.00	979/1459	4.50	4.23	4.22	4.26	4.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	7	17	4.64	238/1406	4.71	4.33	4.09	4.12	4.64
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	3	2	8	12	4.16	701/1384	4.47	4.22	4.11	4.15	4.16
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	1	5	4	14	4.16	854/1489	4.47	4.27	4.17	4.14	4.16
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	24	4.96	233/1506	4.76	4.76	4.67	4.67	4.96
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	1	4	10	5	3.95	918/1463	4.39	4.13	4.09	4.08	3.95
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	2	0	6	17	4.52	775/1438	4.70	4.47	4.46	4.43	4.52
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	2	1	21	4.79	811/1421	4.90	4.83	4.73	4.73	4.79
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	5	8	12	4.28	858/1411	4.53	4.40	4.31	4.29	4.28
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	2	0	8	15	4.44	708/1405	4.66	4.46	4.32	4.32	4.44
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	3	2	2	4	5	9	3.77	841/1236	3.81	4.09	4.00	4.07	3.77
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	3	0	8	11	4.23	645/1260	4.43	4.26	4.14	4.22	4.23
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	2	1	7	12	4.32	740/1255	4.66	4.47	4.33	4.37	4.32
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	1	0	3	1	17	4.50	620/1258	4.69	4.56	4.38	4.42	4.50
4. Were special techniques successful	3	1	0	3	3	6	9	4.00	442/ 873	4.00	3.89	4.03	4.08	4.00
Laboratory														
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	24	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 198	****	****	4.22	4.17	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	24	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 49	****	****	4.26	5.00	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	24	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 41	****	****	4.14	5.00	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	24	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 46	****	****	4.31	5.00	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	24	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 37	****	****	4.05	5.00	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	24	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.27	5.00	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors		
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A 6	Required for Majors 7	Graduate 0	Major 5
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B 12			
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	3	C 3	General 4	Under-grad 25	Non-major 20
84-150	6	3.00-3.49	3	D 1			
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F 0	Electives 9	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	
				P 0			
				I 0	Other 2		
				? 2			

Course-Section: SOCY 321 2
 Title Race & Ethnic Relation
 Instructor: Hylton, Kevin
 Enrollment: 9
 Questionnaires: 9

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2009

Page 1367
 MAR 22, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	2	1	6	4.44	673/1509	4.32	4.33	4.31	4.32	4.44	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	234/1509	4.33	4.26	4.26	4.25	4.78	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	6	4.67	359/1287	4.37	4.26	4.30	4.33	4.67	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1459	4.50	4.23	4.22	4.26	5.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	0	8	4.78	152/1406	4.71	4.33	4.09	4.12	4.78	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	132/1384	4.47	4.22	4.11	4.15	4.78	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	175/1489	4.47	4.27	4.17	4.14	4.78	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	4	5	4.56	1030/1506	4.76	4.76	4.67	4.67	4.56	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	106/1463	4.39	4.13	4.09	4.08	4.83	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	247/1438	4.70	4.47	4.46	4.43	4.89	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1421	4.90	4.83	4.73	4.73	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	279/1411	4.53	4.40	4.31	4.29	4.78	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	205/1405	4.66	4.46	4.32	4.32	4.88	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	1	1	0	1	2	3	3.86	799/1236	3.81	4.09	4.00	4.07	3.86	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	1	6	4.63	337/1260	4.43	4.26	4.14	4.22	4.63	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1255	4.66	4.47	4.33	4.37	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	274/1258	4.69	4.56	4.38	4.42	4.88	
4. Were special techniques successful	1	1	1	1	0	0	5	4.00	442/ 873	4.00	3.89	4.03	4.08	4.00	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 49	****	****	4.26	5.00	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	8	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 41	****	****	4.14	5.00	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 46	****	****	4.31	5.00	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 37	****	****	4.05	5.00	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.27	5.00	****	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: SOCY 332 1
 Title Hum Sexuality/Socio Pe
 Instructor: Lottes,Ilsa L
 Enrollment: 80
 Questionnaires: 45

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2009

Page 1368
 MAR 22, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	2	0	5	3	7	9	19	3.79	1291/1509	3.79	4.33	4.31	4.32	3.79
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	3	5	6	8	21	3.91	1164/1509	3.91	4.26	4.26	4.25	3.91
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	0	5	6	6	9	17	3.63	1128/1287	3.63	4.26	4.30	4.33	3.63
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	4	4	4	9	8	14	3.62	1265/1459	3.62	4.23	4.22	4.26	3.62
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	3	7	8	24	4.19	665/1406	4.19	4.33	4.09	4.12	4.19
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	0	3	3	6	9	22	4.02	795/1384	4.02	4.22	4.11	4.15	4.02
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	1	4	5	11	22	4.14	885/1489	4.14	4.27	4.17	4.14	4.14
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	8	35	4.81	762/1506	4.81	4.76	4.67	4.67	4.81
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	11	0	1	3	10	10	10	3.74	1117/1463	3.74	4.13	4.09	4.08	3.74
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	3	5	9	6	18	3.76	1315/1438	3.76	4.47	4.46	4.43	3.76
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	7	0	0	0	1	7	30	4.76	863/1421	4.76	4.83	4.73	4.73	4.76
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	5	0	3	3	7	12	15	3.83	1178/1411	3.83	4.40	4.31	4.29	3.83
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	5	0	5	2	4	4	25	4.05	1024/1405	4.05	4.46	4.32	4.32	4.05
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	6	0	7	2	6	7	17	3.64	914/1236	3.64	4.09	4.00	4.07	3.64
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	11	0	5	4	4	6	15	3.65	992/1260	3.65	4.26	4.14	4.22	3.65
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	11	0	1	1	5	8	19	4.26	776/1255	4.26	4.47	4.33	4.37	4.26
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	11	0	0	1	2	8	23	4.56	584/1258	4.56	4.56	4.38	4.42	4.56
4. Were special techniques successful	11	21	5	0	0	2	6	3.31	762/ 873	3.31	3.89	4.03	4.08	3.31
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	42	1	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 184	****	****	4.16	4.07	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	43	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 198	****	****	4.22	4.17	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	43	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 184	****	****	4.48	4.52	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	43	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 177	****	****	4.36	4.30	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	43	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/ 165	****	****	4.18	4.11	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	41	1	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/ 89	****	4.60	4.49	4.86	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	41	1	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/ 92	****	4.80	4.54	4.67	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	43	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 90	****	5.00	4.50	4.63	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	43	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 92	****	4.40	4.38	4.73	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	43	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 93	****	4.40	4.06	3.94	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	42	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.39	4.61	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	43	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 48	****	****	4.41	4.34	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	42	1	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 47	****	****	4.51	4.62	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	42	1	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 47	****	****	4.18	4.47	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	43	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 44	****	****	4.32	4.40	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	44	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 49	****	****	4.26	5.00	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	44	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 41	****	****	4.14	5.00	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	43	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 46	****	****	4.31	5.00	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	43	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 37	****	****	4.05	5.00	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	43	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.27	5.00	****

Course-Section: SOCY 332 1
 Title Hum Sexuality/Socio Pe
 Instructor: Lottes,Ilsa L
 Enrollment: 80
 Questionnaires: 45

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2009

Page 1368
 MAR 22, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	4	0.00-0.99	1	A	14	Required for Majors	9	Graduate	0	Major	10
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B	11						
56-83	5	2.00-2.99	6	C	8	General	5	Under-grad	45	Non-major	35
84-150	6	3.00-3.49	4	D	1						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5	F	0	Electives	18	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	2				
				?	1						

Course-Section: SOCY 333 2
 Title Hum Sexuality/Cross-Cu
 Instructor: Kerrigan,Dylan
 Enrollment: 17
 Questionnaires: 15

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2009

Page 1369
 MAR 22, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	3	12	4.80	244/1509	4.80	4.33	4.31	4.32	4.80
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	3	0	3	9	4.20	922/1509	4.20	4.26	4.26	4.25	4.20
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	4	0	0	1	1	9	4.73	293/1287	4.73	4.26	4.30	4.33	4.73
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	1	2	3	8	4.29	737/1459	4.29	4.23	4.22	4.26	4.29
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	14	4.93	63/1406	4.93	4.33	4.09	4.12	4.93
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	2	12	4.73	165/1384	4.73	4.22	4.11	4.15	4.73
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	4	1	3	5	2	3.00	1403/1489	3.00	4.27	4.17	4.14	3.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	6	9	4.60	990/1506	4.60	4.76	4.67	4.67	4.60
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	1	0	1	6	6	4.14	750/1463	4.14	4.13	4.09	4.08	4.14
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	2	13	4.87	276/1438	4.87	4.47	4.46	4.43	4.87
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	14	4.93	376/1421	4.93	4.83	4.73	4.73	4.93
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	3	12	4.80	243/1411	4.80	4.40	4.31	4.29	4.80
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	13	4.87	217/1405	4.87	4.46	4.32	4.32	4.87
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	0	4	11	4.73	137/1236	4.73	4.09	4.00	4.07	4.73
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	3	11	4.79	223/1260	4.79	4.26	4.14	4.22	4.79
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	0	1	13	4.93	164/1255	4.93	4.47	4.33	4.37	4.93
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	1	1	4	8	4.36	756/1258	4.36	4.56	4.38	4.42	4.36
4. Were special techniques successful	1	4	0	1	1	6	2	3.90	536/ 873	3.90	3.89	4.03	4.08	3.90

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: SOCY 351 1
 Title Medical Sociology
 Instructor: Schumacher, John
 Enrollment: 49
 Questionnaires: 31

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2009

Page 1370
 MAR 22, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	0	0	4	3	23	4.63	446/1509	4.63	4.33	4.31	4.32	4.63
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	2	4	24	4.73	278/1509	4.73	4.26	4.26	4.25	4.73
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	1	1	4	24	4.70	326/1287	4.70	4.26	4.30	4.33	4.70
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	1	1	2	5	21	4.47	520/1459	4.47	4.23	4.22	4.26	4.47
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	6	3	21	4.50	332/1406	4.50	4.33	4.09	4.12	4.50
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	1	6	6	16	4.17	701/1384	4.17	4.22	4.11	4.15	4.17
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	0	5	25	4.83	133/1489	4.83	4.27	4.17	4.14	4.83
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	3	27	4.90	583/1506	4.90	4.76	4.67	4.67	4.90
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	0	18	9	4.33	545/1463	4.33	4.13	4.09	4.08	4.33
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	1	2	5	22	4.60	675/1438	4.60	4.47	4.46	4.43	4.60
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	1	29	4.97	215/1421	4.97	4.83	4.73	4.73	4.97
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	1	2	5	22	4.60	496/1411	4.60	4.40	4.31	4.29	4.60
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	4	3	22	4.53	605/1405	4.53	4.46	4.32	4.32	4.53
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	0	2	4	24	4.73	137/1236	4.73	4.09	4.00	4.07	4.73
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	10	0	2	0	3	7	9	4.00	746/1260	4.00	4.26	4.14	4.22	4.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	10	0	0	1	2	7	11	4.33	723/1255	4.33	4.47	4.33	4.37	4.33
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	10	0	0	0	1	3	17	4.76	409/1258	4.76	4.56	4.38	4.42	4.76
4. Were special techniques successful	10	6	1	1	4	4	5	3.73	620/ 873	3.73	3.89	4.03	4.08	3.73
Laboratory														
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	27	0	1	0	0	1	2	3.75	****/ 198	****	****	4.22	4.17	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	27	2	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 184	****	****	4.48	4.52	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	26	2	1	1	0	0	1	2.67	****/ 89	****	4.60	4.49	4.86	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	26	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	****/ 92	****	4.80	4.54	4.67	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	26	0	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	****/ 90	****	5.00	4.50	4.63	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	26	0	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	****/ 92	****	4.40	4.38	4.73	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	26	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	****/ 93	****	4.40	4.06	3.94	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	26	0	2	0	0	3	0	2.80	****/ 48	****	****	4.39	4.61	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	26	0	1	0	1	1	2	3.60	****/ 48	****	****	4.41	4.34	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	26	2	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 47	****	****	4.51	4.62	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	26	3	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 47	****	****	4.18	4.47	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	26	3	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/ 44	****	****	4.32	4.40	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	26	0	1	0	1	1	2	3.60	****/ 49	****	****	4.26	5.00	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	26	1	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	****/ 41	****	****	4.14	5.00	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	26	2	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/ 46	****	****	4.31	5.00	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	26	3	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 37	****	****	4.05	5.00	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	26	4	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.27	5.00	****

Course-Section: SOCY 351 1
 Title Medical Sociology
 Instructor: Schumacher, John
 Enrollment: 49
 Questionnaires: 31

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2009

Page 1370
 MAR 22, 2010
 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	15	Required for Majors	13	Graduate	0	Major	7
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	B	10						
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	4	C	4	General	1	Under-grad	31	Non-major	24
84-150	8	3.00-3.49	4	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	6	F	0	Electives	10	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	4				
				?	0						

Course-Section: SOCY 352 1
 Title Issues In Health Care
 Instructor: Chard,Sarah E
 Enrollment: 42
 Questionnaires: 34

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2009

Page 1371
 MAR 22, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	0	1	1	6	25	4.67	410/1509	4.70	4.33	4.31	4.32	4.67
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	5	12	16	4.33	774/1509	4.39	4.26	4.26	4.25	4.33
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	1	1	13	18	4.45	578/1287	4.45	4.26	4.30	4.33	4.45
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	2	2	7	22	4.48	487/1459	4.49	4.23	4.22	4.26	4.48
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	8	25	4.76	164/1406	4.78	4.33	4.09	4.12	4.76
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	1	1	0	0	9	22	4.59	285/1384	4.80	4.22	4.11	4.15	4.59
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	2	4	5	22	4.42	569/1489	4.26	4.27	4.17	4.14	4.42
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	1	0	2	30	4.85	702/1506	4.72	4.76	4.67	4.67	4.85
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	2	14	14	4.40	467/1463	4.35	4.13	4.09	4.08	4.40
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	0	2	29	4.94	153/1438	4.60	4.47	4.46	4.43	4.94
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	0	1	30	4.97	215/1421	4.98	4.83	4.73	4.73	4.97
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	1	0	5	7	17	4.30	841/1411	4.40	4.40	4.31	4.29	4.30
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	1	1	5	24	4.68	446/1405	4.70	4.46	4.32	4.32	4.68
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	6	0	1	4	7	12	4.25	489/1236	4.13	4.09	4.00	4.07	4.25
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	18	0	1	0	3	1	11	4.31	574/1260	4.52	4.26	4.14	4.22	4.31
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	18	0	0	1	1	5	9	4.38	690/1255	4.64	4.47	4.33	4.37	4.38
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	18	0	0	0	2	2	12	4.63	535/1258	4.77	4.56	4.38	4.42	4.63
4. Were special techniques successful	18	10	0	2	0	1	3	3.83	****/ 873	4.56	3.89	4.03	4.08	****
Seminar														
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	33	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 92	****	4.80	4.54	4.67	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	33	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 49	****	****	4.26	5.00	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	33	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 41	****	****	4.14	5.00	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	33	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 46	****	****	4.31	5.00	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	33	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 37	****	****	4.05	5.00	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	33	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.27	5.00	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	17	Required for Majors	15	Graduate	0	Major	5
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	1	B	9						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	2	C	2	General	3	Under-grad	34	Non-major	29
84-150	9	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	10	F	0	Electives	7	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	0						

Course-Section: SOCY 352 2
 Title Issues In Health Care
 Instructor: Sufian, Meryl
 Enrollment: 12
 Questionnaires: 11

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2009

Page 1372
 MAR 22, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	1	9	4.73	339/1509	4.70	4.33	4.31	4.32	4.73
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	2	7	4.45	621/1509	4.39	4.26	4.26	4.25	4.45
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	9	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1287	4.45	4.26	4.30	4.33	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	1	0	0	1	8	4.50	454/1459	4.49	4.23	4.22	4.26	4.50
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	0	9	4.80	135/1406	4.78	4.33	4.09	4.12	4.80
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1384	4.80	4.22	4.11	4.15	5.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	3	3	4	4.10	917/1489	4.26	4.27	4.17	4.14	4.10
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	4	6	4.60	990/1506	4.72	4.76	4.67	4.67	4.60
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	1	5	4	4.30	579/1463	4.35	4.13	4.09	4.08	4.30
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	1	1	3	6	4.27	1055/1438	4.60	4.47	4.46	4.43	4.27
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1421	4.98	4.83	4.73	4.73	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	1	3	6	4.50	617/1411	4.40	4.40	4.31	4.29	4.50
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	3	8	4.73	381/1405	4.70	4.46	4.32	4.32	4.73
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	3	0	1	1	3	3	4.00	664/1236	4.13	4.09	4.00	4.07	4.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	3	8	4.73	265/1260	4.52	4.26	4.14	4.22	4.73
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	205/1255	4.64	4.47	4.33	4.37	4.91
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	236/1258	4.77	4.56	4.38	4.42	4.91
4. Were special techniques successful	0	2	0	0	1	2	6	4.56	193/ 873	4.56	3.89	4.03	4.08	4.56
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 49	****	****	4.26	5.00	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 41	****	****	4.14	5.00	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	10	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 46	****	****	4.31	5.00	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	10	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 37	****	****	4.05	5.00	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.27	5.00	****

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: SOCY 353 1
 Title Marriage And The Famil
 Instructor: Damasiewicz,Mer
 Enrollment: 87
 Questionnaires: 57

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2009

Page 1373
 MAR 22, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	2	0	7	4	6	16	22	3.76	1301/1509	3.76	4.33	4.31	4.32	3.76
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	10	9	14	13	10	3.07	1458/1509	3.07	4.26	4.26	4.25	3.07
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	8	12	13	8	15	3.18	1234/1287	3.18	4.26	4.30	4.33	3.18
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	9	1	7	13	14	12	3.62	1265/1459	3.62	4.23	4.22	4.26	3.62
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	3	4	7	4	12	7	20	3.58	1147/1406	3.58	4.33	4.09	4.12	3.58
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	3	2	7	6	10	13	16	3.48	1200/1384	3.48	4.22	4.11	4.15	3.48
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	3	2	13	11	12	7	9	2.77	1437/1489	2.77	4.27	4.17	4.14	2.77
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	0	0	0	0	1	53	4.98	117/1506	4.98	4.76	4.67	4.67	4.98
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	19	2	2	3	14	9	8	3.50	1241/1463	3.50	4.13	4.09	4.08	3.50
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	7	0	6	3	7	13	21	3.80	1297/1438	3.80	4.47	4.46	4.43	3.80
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	6	0	0	0	2	6	43	4.80	794/1421	4.80	4.83	4.73	4.73	4.80
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	7	0	7	4	6	16	17	3.64	1242/1411	3.64	4.40	4.31	4.29	3.64
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	6	0	6	5	9	7	24	3.75	1194/1405	3.75	4.46	4.32	4.32	3.75
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	7	33	11	0	1	1	4	2.24	1213/1236	2.24	4.09	4.00	4.07	2.24
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	11	0	6	1	14	9	16	3.61	1011/1260	3.61	4.26	4.14	4.22	3.61
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	11	0	3	3	5	6	29	4.20	822/1255	4.20	4.47	4.33	4.37	4.20
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	12	0	1	4	12	6	22	3.98	956/1258	3.98	4.56	4.38	4.42	3.98
4. Were special techniques successful	12	24	9	2	6	2	2	2.33	861/ 873	2.33	3.89	4.03	4.08	2.33
Laboratory														
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	56	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 198	****	****	4.22	4.17	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	56	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 177	****	****	4.36	4.30	****
Seminar														
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	56	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 92	****	4.40	4.38	4.73	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	56	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.39	4.61	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	56	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 49	****	****	4.26	5.00	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	56	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 41	****	****	4.14	5.00	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	56	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 46	****	****	4.31	5.00	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors		

00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	A	11	Required for Majors		13	Graduate	0	Major	5
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B	18							
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	4	C	4	General		7	Under-grad	57	Non-major	52
84-150	6	3.00-3.49	10	D	1							
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives		12	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	1							
				I	0	Other		2				
				?	3							

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	0	0	1	10	24	4.66	422/1509	4.66	4.33	4.31	4.32	4.66
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	0	0	2	8	24	4.65	378/1509	4.65	4.26	4.26	4.25	4.65
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	4	0	0	2	6	22	4.67	359/1287	4.67	4.26	4.30	4.33	4.67
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	1	2	9	23	4.54	410/1459	4.54	4.23	4.22	4.26	4.54
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	1	2	4	26	4.56	300/1406	4.56	4.33	4.09	4.12	4.56
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	2	3	6	23	4.47	376/1384	4.47	4.22	4.11	4.15	4.47
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	0	3	5	26	4.68	265/1489	4.68	4.27	4.17	4.14	4.68
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	0	0	0	0	12	21	4.64	965/1506	4.64	4.76	4.67	4.67	4.64
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	8	0	1	0	5	9	13	4.18	714/1463	4.18	4.13	4.09	4.08	4.18
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	1	4	28	4.82	348/1438	4.82	4.47	4.46	4.43	4.82
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	0	3	30	4.91	537/1421	4.91	4.83	4.73	4.73	4.91
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	1	6	26	4.76	303/1411	4.76	4.40	4.31	4.29	4.76
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	3	30	4.91	172/1405	4.91	4.46	4.32	4.32	4.91
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	0	0	0	0	6	27	4.82	96/1236	4.82	4.09	4.00	4.07	4.82
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	15	0	1	0	2	2	16	4.52	402/1260	4.52	4.26	4.14	4.22	4.52
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	15	0	0	0	1	3	17	4.76	333/1255	4.76	4.47	4.33	4.37	4.76
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	15	0	0	0	0	2	19	4.90	236/1258	4.90	4.56	4.38	4.42	4.90
4. Were special techniques successful	15	4	3	0	3	0	11	3.94	498/ 873	3.94	3.89	4.03	4.08	3.94
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	33	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 89	****	4.60	4.49	4.86	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	34	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 92	****	4.80	4.54	4.67	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	34	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 90	****	5.00	4.50	4.63	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	34	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 92	****	4.40	4.38	4.73	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	34	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 93	****	4.40	4.06	3.94	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	34	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.39	4.61	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	34	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.41	4.34	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	34	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 47	****	****	4.51	4.62	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	34	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 47	****	****	4.18	4.47	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	34	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 44	****	****	4.32	4.40	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	35	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 49	****	****	4.26	5.00	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	35	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 41	****	****	4.14	5.00	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	35	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 46	****	****	4.31	5.00	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	22	Required for Majors	19	Graduate	0	Major	5
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B	8						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	4	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	36	Non-major	31
84-150	10	3.00-3.49	4	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5	F	0	Electives	6	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				

Course-Section: SOCY 371 1
 Title Criminology And Penolo
 Instructor: Knapp,William R
 Enrollment: 80
 Questionnaires: 26

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2009

Page 1375
 MAR 22, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	2	0	0	1	3	8	12	4.29	842/1509	4.29	4.33	4.31	4.32	4.29
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	4	11	10	4.24	880/1509	4.24	4.26	4.26	4.25	4.24
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	1	0	2	9	13	4.32	718/1287	4.32	4.26	4.30	4.33	4.32
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	5	0	1	5	7	7	4.00	979/1459	4.00	4.23	4.22	4.26	4.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	1	1	1	3	10	9	4.04	783/1406	4.04	4.33	4.09	4.12	4.04
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	5	0	1	4	9	6	4.00	807/1384	4.00	4.22	4.11	4.15	4.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	1	4	8	11	4.08	930/1489	4.08	4.27	4.17	4.14	4.08
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	2	23	4.92	466/1506	4.92	4.76	4.67	4.67	4.92
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	8	0	0	1	6	10	1	3.61	1200/1463	3.61	4.13	4.09	4.08	3.61
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	2	9	12	4.43	891/1438	4.43	4.47	4.46	4.43	4.43
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	0	2	21	4.91	483/1421	4.91	4.83	4.73	4.73	4.91
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	0	1	3	6	12	4.32	830/1411	4.32	4.40	4.31	4.29	4.32
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	2	6	15	4.57	577/1405	4.57	4.46	4.32	4.32	4.57
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	4	2	1	4	5	6	3.67	904/1236	3.67	4.09	4.00	4.07	3.67
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	2	0	4	5	7	3.83	896/1260	3.83	4.26	4.14	4.22	3.83
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	1	1	0	9	7	4.11	868/1255	4.11	4.47	4.33	4.37	4.11
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	2	0	2	4	10	4.11	895/1258	4.11	4.56	4.38	4.42	4.11
4. Were special techniques successful	8	12	2	0	1	0	3	3.33	****/ 873	****	3.89	4.03	4.08	****
Laboratory														
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	25	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 198	****	****	4.22	4.17	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	25	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.39	4.61	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	25	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.41	4.34	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	25	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 49	****	****	4.26	5.00	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	25	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 41	****	****	4.14	5.00	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	12	Required for Majors	11	Graduate	0	Major	4
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B	6						
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	4	C	3	General	2	Under-grad	26	Non-major	22
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	4	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	8	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	1				
				?	1						

Course-Section: SOCY 374 1
 Title Drugs And Alcohol
 Instructor: Hosler, Colleen
 Enrollment: 54
 Questionnaires: 43

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2009

Page 1376
 MAR 22, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	8	34	4.77	291/1509	4.77	4.33	4.31	4.32	4.77
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	41	4.95	58/1509	4.95	4.26	4.26	4.25	4.95
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	5	38	4.88	143/1287	4.88	4.26	4.30	4.33	4.88
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	2	9	31	4.69	247/1459	4.69	4.23	4.22	4.26	4.69
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	4	18	20	4.30	527/1406	4.30	4.33	4.09	4.12	4.30
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	6	11	25	4.45	394/1384	4.45	4.22	4.11	4.15	4.45
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	5	10	28	4.53	422/1489	4.53	4.27	4.17	4.14	4.53
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	14	29	4.67	933/1506	4.67	4.76	4.67	4.67	4.67
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	1	0	1	2	11	23	4.51	317/1463	4.51	4.13	4.09	4.08	4.51
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	0	4	36	4.90	219/1438	4.90	4.47	4.46	4.43	4.90
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	1	0	0	38	4.92	429/1421	4.92	4.83	4.73	4.73	4.92
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	1	5	34	4.82	222/1411	4.82	4.40	4.31	4.29	4.82
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	1	1	38	4.93	137/1405	4.93	4.46	4.32	4.32	4.93
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	0	0	0	1	9	30	4.72	142/1236	4.73	4.09	4.00	4.07	4.72
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	1	0	3	22	4.77	237/1260	4.77	4.26	4.14	4.22	4.77
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	17	0	1	0	0	2	23	4.77	333/1255	4.77	4.47	4.33	4.37	4.77
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	17	0	0	0	1	1	24	4.88	261/1258	4.88	4.56	4.38	4.42	4.88
4. Were special techniques successful	17	3	3	0	5	9	6	3.65	653/ 873	3.65	3.89	4.03	4.08	3.65

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99 0	A 32	Required for Majors 14	Graduate 0 Major 4
28-55	4	1.00-1.99 1	B 8		
56-83	4	2.00-2.99 2	C 0	General 5	Under-grad 43 Non-major 39
84-150	8	3.00-3.49 10	D 0		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 9	F 0	Electives 19	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 0	
			? 1		

Course-Section: SOCY 396 1
 Title Comm Serv & Learn Inte
 Instructor: Wolff,Michele K
 Enrollment: 10
 Questionnaires: 16

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2009

Page 1377
 MAR 22, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean		
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5						Mean	Rank
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	7	9	4.56	528/1509	4.56	4.33	4.31	4.32	4.56
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	0	4	11	4.56	471/1509	4.56	4.26	4.26	4.25	4.56
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	11	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1287	5.00	4.26	4.30	4.33	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	5	0	0	2	1	8	4.55	410/1459	4.55	4.23	4.22	4.26	4.55
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	1	0	0	1	3	10	4.64	238/1406	4.64	4.33	4.09	4.12	4.64
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	1	5	8	4.50	349/1384	4.50	4.22	4.11	4.15	4.50
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	7	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1489	5.00	4.27	4.17	4.14	5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	1	0	0	0	2	12	4.86	682/1506	4.86	4.76	4.67	4.67	4.86
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	8	0	0	0	0	6	2	4.25	628/1463	4.25	4.13	4.09	4.08	4.25
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	1	0	1	13	4.73	480/1438	4.73	4.47	4.46	4.43	4.73
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	1	14	4.93	376/1421	4.93	4.83	4.73	4.73	4.93
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	1	14	4.93	96/1411	4.93	4.40	4.31	4.29	4.93
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	2	1	12	4.67	459/1405	4.67	4.46	4.32	4.32	4.67
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	9	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	354/1236	4.40	4.09	4.00	4.07	4.40
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	2	12	4.86	172/1260	4.86	4.26	4.14	4.22	4.86
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	1	1	12	4.79	310/1255	4.79	4.47	4.33	4.37	4.79
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	0	0	14	5.00	1/1258	5.00	4.56	4.38	4.42	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	2	0	0	0	0	3	11	4.79	101/ 873	4.79	3.89	4.03	4.08	4.79
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 184	****	****	4.16	4.07	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 89	****	4.60	4.49	4.86	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 92	****	4.80	4.54	4.67	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.39	4.61	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	14	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.41	4.34	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 47	****	****	4.51	4.62	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 49	****	****	4.26	5.00	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 41	****	****	4.14	5.00	****

Frequency Distribution

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

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	2	13	4.75	303/1509	4.75	4.33	4.31	4.39	4.75
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	2	12	4.63	401/1509	4.63	4.26	4.26	4.26	4.63
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	4	12	4.75	261/1287	4.75	4.26	4.30	4.38	4.75
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	3	11	4.56	389/1459	4.56	4.23	4.22	4.32	4.56
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	2	13	4.75	164/1406	4.75	4.33	4.09	4.11	4.75
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	2	13	4.75	149/1384	4.75	4.22	4.11	4.23	4.75
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	2	1	13	4.69	254/1489	4.69	4.27	4.17	4.18	4.69
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	15	4.94	408/1506	4.94	4.76	4.67	4.67	4.94
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	0	0	0	0	9	1	4.10	799/1463	4.10	4.13	4.09	4.18	4.10
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	4	11	4.63	646/1438	4.63	4.47	4.46	4.50	4.63
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	2	14	4.88	614/1421	4.88	4.83	4.73	4.76	4.88
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	3	3	10	4.44	701/1411	4.44	4.40	4.31	4.35	4.44
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	0	1	14	4.69	432/1405	4.69	4.46	4.32	4.34	4.69
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	0	1	0	4	1	8	4.07	630/1236	4.07	4.09	4.00	4.03	4.07
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	2	1	11	4.64	323/1260	4.64	4.26	4.14	4.25	4.64
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	1	1	1	11	4.57	526/1255	4.57	4.47	4.33	4.46	4.57
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	1	1	12	4.79	386/1258	4.79	4.56	4.38	4.51	4.79
4. Were special techniques successful	2	0	0	1	4	4	5	3.93	517/ 873	3.93	3.89	4.03	4.26	3.93
Laboratory														
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	15	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 198	****	****	4.22	4.37	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	14	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 89	****	4.60	4.49	4.71	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	13	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 92	****	4.80	4.54	4.83	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	14	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 90	****	5.00	4.50	4.69	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	14	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 92	****	4.40	4.38	4.64	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	13	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 93	****	4.40	4.06	4.32	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	15	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.39	4.75	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	15	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.41	4.54	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	15	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 47	****	****	4.51	4.51	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	15	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 47	****	****	4.18	4.19	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	15	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 44	****	****	4.32	4.07	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 49	****	****	4.26	4.67	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	15	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 46	****	****	4.31	4.67	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 7	Required for Majors 12
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B 5	
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	2	C 2	General 0
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	1	D 0	Under-grad 16
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F 0	Non-major 9
Electives 1					
#### - Means there are not enough					

P	0			responses to be significant
I	0	Other	1	
?	0			

Course-Section: SOCY 420 1
 Title Social Epidemiology
 Instructor: Damasiewicz,Mer
 Enrollment: 31
 Questionnaires: 9

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2009

Page 1379
 MAR 22, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	2	0	2	2	2	3.25	1447/1509	3.25	4.33	4.31	4.39	3.25
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	2	0	3	2	1	3.00	1463/1509	3.00	4.26	4.26	4.26	3.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	3	0	1	3	1	2.88	1275/1287	2.88	4.26	4.30	4.38	2.88
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	1	2	1	0	2	2	3.14	1405/1459	3.14	4.23	4.22	4.32	3.14
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	2	2	0	1	1	2	3.17	1307/1406	3.17	4.33	4.09	4.11	3.17
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	2	2	1	2	3.13	1309/1384	3.13	4.22	4.11	4.23	3.13
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	1	2	1	1	1	2	3.00	1403/1489	3.00	4.27	4.17	4.18	3.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1506	5.00	4.76	4.67	4.67	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	1	0	0	3	0	3.25	1338/1463	3.25	4.13	4.09	4.18	3.25
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	1	2	0	2	2	3.29	1391/1438	3.29	4.47	4.46	4.50	3.29
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	950/1421	4.71	4.83	4.73	4.76	4.71
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	1	1	0	2	2	3.50	1277/1411	3.50	4.40	4.31	4.35	3.50
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	0	0	3	3	4.00	1047/1405	4.00	4.46	4.32	4.34	4.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	4	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	176/1236	4.67	4.09	4.00	4.03	4.67
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	0	0	3	4	4.13	701/1260	4.13	4.26	4.14	4.25	4.13
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	1	0	0	0	7	4.50	575/1255	4.50	4.47	4.33	4.46	4.50
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	1	0	0	1	6	4.38	742/1258	4.38	4.56	4.38	4.51	4.38
4. Were special techniques successful	1	4	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/ 873	5.00	3.89	4.03	4.26	5.00

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: SOCY 430 1
 Title Sociology Of Aging
 Instructor: Canham, Sarah L.
 Enrollment: 20
 Questionnaires: 13

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2009

Page 1380
 MAR 22, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	0	0	2	3	7	4.42	711/1509	4.42	4.33	4.31	4.39	4.42
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	1	2	2	7	4.25	859/1509	4.25	4.26	4.26	4.26	4.25
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	2	1	1	8	4.25	779/1287	4.25	4.26	4.30	4.38	4.25
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	3	2	7	4.33	686/1459	4.33	4.23	4.22	4.32	4.33
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	1	2	8	4.42	434/1406	4.42	4.33	4.09	4.11	4.42
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	3	2	6	4.27	599/1384	4.27	4.22	4.11	4.23	4.27
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	1	2	9	4.67	276/1489	4.67	4.27	4.17	4.18	4.67
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/1506	5.00	4.76	4.67	4.67	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	5	2	3	3.80	1060/1463	3.80	4.13	4.09	4.18	3.80
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	1	3	2	6	4.08	1179/1438	4.08	4.47	4.46	4.50	4.08
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	1	1	10	4.75	881/1421	4.75	4.83	4.73	4.76	4.75
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	1	2	2	7	4.25	885/1411	4.25	4.40	4.31	4.35	4.25
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	2	2	7	4.25	896/1405	4.25	4.46	4.32	4.34	4.25
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	1	2	3	6	4.17	563/1236	4.17	4.09	4.00	4.03	4.17
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	3	1	6	4.30	582/1260	4.30	4.26	4.14	4.25	4.30
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1255	5.00	4.47	4.33	4.46	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1258	5.00	4.56	4.38	4.51	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	3	1	0	1	3	2	3	3.78	600/ 873	3.78	3.89	4.03	4.26	3.78

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors		
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A 9	Required for Majors 4	Graduate 0	Major 5
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	1	B 3			
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	1	C 0	General 1	Under-grad 13	Non-major 8
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	1	D 0			
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F 0	Electives 7	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	
				P 0			
				I 0	Other 0		
				? 0			

Course-Section: SOCY 452 1
 Title Health Care Org/Del
 Instructor: Brewer, Mary A
 Enrollment: 43
 Questionnaires: 12

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2009

Page 1381
 MAR 22, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	2	3	7	4.42	711/1509	4.42	4.33	4.31	4.39	4.42
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	4	6	4.25	859/1509	4.25	4.26	4.26	4.26	4.25
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	2	7	4.25	779/1287	4.25	4.26	4.30	4.38	4.25
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	4	0	0	1	2	5	4.50	454/1459	4.50	4.23	4.22	4.32	4.50
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	2	8	4.50	332/1406	4.50	4.33	4.09	4.11	4.50
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	4	0	0	2	1	4	4.29	589/1384	4.29	4.22	4.11	4.23	4.29
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	3	8	4.58	364/1489	4.58	4.27	4.17	4.18	4.58
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	1	0	0	2	9	4.50	1070/1506	4.50	4.76	4.67	4.67	4.50
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	5	3	2	3.70	1142/1463	3.70	4.13	4.09	4.18	3.70
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	1	3	7	4.55	750/1438	4.55	4.47	4.46	4.50	4.55
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	1	0	10	4.82	768/1421	4.82	4.83	4.73	4.76	4.82
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	1	1	4	5	4.18	943/1411	4.18	4.40	4.31	4.35	4.18
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	1	0	4	5	4.00	1047/1405	4.00	4.46	4.32	4.34	4.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	1	0	3	7	4.45	314/1236	4.45	4.09	4.00	4.03	4.45
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	1	2	6	4.56	383/1260	4.56	4.26	4.14	4.25	4.56
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	1	2	0	6	4.22	803/1255	4.22	4.47	4.33	4.46	4.22
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	1	2	6	4.56	584/1258	4.56	4.56	4.38	4.51	4.56
4. Were special techniques successful	3	4	1	0	3	0	1	3.00	801/ 873	3.00	3.89	4.03	4.26	3.00

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A 5	Required for Majors 8	Graduate 0	Major 0	
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B 2				
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C 0	General	0	Under-grad 12	Non-major 12
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	3	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	0		
				? 0				

Course-Section: SOCY 457 1
 Title Social Hist Of Medicin
 Instructor: Rothstein,Willi
 Enrollment: 36
 Questionnaires: 25

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2009

Page 1382
 MAR 22, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	1	0	2	4	18	4.52	574/1509	4.52	4.33	4.31	4.39	4.52
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	1	2	8	13	4.24	880/1509	4.24	4.26	4.26	4.26	4.24
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	5	4	15	4.42	626/1287	4.42	4.26	4.30	4.38	4.42
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	1	3	3	6	10	3.91	1077/1459	3.91	4.23	4.22	4.32	3.91
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	0	3	7	13	4.29	539/1406	4.29	4.33	4.09	4.11	4.29
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	3	1	2	5	6	8	3.82	1009/1384	3.82	4.22	4.11	4.23	3.82
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	3	3	9	9	3.88	1120/1489	3.88	4.27	4.17	4.18	3.88
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	4	20	4.83	722/1506	4.83	4.76	4.67	4.67	4.83
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	1	0	0	2	7	10	4.42	438/1463	4.42	4.13	4.09	4.18	4.42
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	1	4	19	4.75	447/1438	4.75	4.47	4.46	4.50	4.75
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	1	2	2	19	4.63	1060/1421	4.63	4.83	4.73	4.76	4.63
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	3	5	16	4.54	568/1411	4.54	4.40	4.31	4.35	4.54
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	2	1	2	19	4.58	558/1405	4.58	4.46	4.32	4.34	4.58
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	6	4	1	4	2	5	3.19	1093/1236	3.19	4.09	4.00	4.03	3.19
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	1	1	4	2	10	4.06	729/1260	4.06	4.26	4.14	4.25	4.06
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	0	2	2	4	10	4.22	803/1255	4.22	4.47	4.33	4.46	4.22
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	0	0	4	7	7	4.17	867/1258	4.17	4.56	4.38	4.51	4.17
4. Were special techniques successful	7	10	1	1	2	1	3	3.50	705/ 873	3.50	3.89	4.03	4.26	3.50
Laboratory														
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	24	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 198	****	****	4.22	4.37	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	22	1	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 89	****	4.60	4.49	4.71	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	22	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 92	****	4.80	4.54	4.83	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	22	1	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 90	****	5.00	4.50	4.69	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	22	1	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 92	****	4.40	4.38	4.64	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	22	1	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 93	****	4.40	4.06	4.32	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	1	A	9	Required for Majors	11	Graduate	5	Major	5
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	8						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	2	C	1	General	1	Under-grad	20	Non-major	20
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	5	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	6	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	1						
				I	0	Other	2				
				?	2						

Course-Section: SOCY 458 1
 Title Soc Of Mental Hlth & I
 Instructor: Seckin,Gul
 Enrollment: 31
 Questionnaires: 23

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2009

Page 1383
 MAR 22, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	3	2	2	6	10	3.78	1294/1509	3.78	4.33	4.31	4.39	3.78
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	3	0	6	3	11	3.83	1215/1509	3.83	4.26	4.26	4.26	3.83
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	3	1	1	3	4	11	4.15	851/1287	4.15	4.26	4.30	4.38	4.15
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	1	1	4	3	4	8	3.70	1217/1459	3.70	4.23	4.22	4.32	3.70
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	2	3	3	13	4.14	711/1406	4.14	4.33	4.09	4.11	4.14
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	2	1	6	4	9	3.77	1036/1384	3.77	4.22	4.11	4.23	3.77
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	1	2	1	10	7	3.95	1046/1489	3.95	4.27	4.17	4.18	3.95
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	11	11	4.50	1070/1506	4.50	4.76	4.67	4.67	4.50
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	7	1	1	0	7	6	1	3.40	1295/1463	3.40	4.13	4.09	4.18	3.40
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	2	5	0	5	9	3.67	1343/1438	3.67	4.47	4.46	4.50	3.67
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	1	4	16	4.71	950/1421	4.71	4.83	4.73	4.76	4.71
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	3	2	2	3	11	3.81	1187/1411	3.81	4.40	4.31	4.35	3.81
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	3	1	4	3	10	3.76	1188/1405	3.76	4.46	4.32	4.34	3.76
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	1	1	0	1	3	14	4.53	261/1236	4.53	4.09	4.00	4.03	4.53
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	9	0	5	2	3	1	3	2.64	1230/1260	2.64	4.26	4.14	4.25	2.64
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	10	0	2	2	1	4	4	3.46	1137/1255	3.46	4.47	4.33	4.46	3.46
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	2	3	2	2	5	3.36	1180/1258	3.36	4.56	4.38	4.51	3.36
4. Were special techniques successful	10	7	0	1	2	2	1	3.50	705/ 873	3.50	3.89	4.03	4.26	3.50
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	21	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/ 89	****	4.60	4.49	4.71	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	21	0	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	****/ 92	****	4.80	4.54	4.83	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	21	0	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/ 93	****	4.40	4.06	4.32	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	2	0.00-0.99 2	A 15	Required for Majors 7	Graduate 5 Major 4
28-55	2	1.00-1.99 0	B 1		
56-83	1	2.00-2.99 0	C 0	General 0	Under-grad 18 Non-major 19
84-150	2	3.00-3.49 1	D 0		
Grad.	5	3.50-4.00 10	F 0	Electives 9	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 2	
			? 1		

Course-Section: SOCY 600 1
 Title Research Methodology
 Instructor: Adler, Marina A
 Enrollment: 12
 Questionnaires: 12

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2009

Page 1384
 MAR 22, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	0	1	1	2	7	4.36	767/1509	3.98	4.33	4.31	4.39	4.36
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	2	3	6	4.36	742/1509	3.93	4.26	4.26	4.25	4.36
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	6	0	0	3	0	1	3.50	1168/1287	3.60	4.26	4.30	4.22	3.50
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	1	1	5	4	4.09	917/1459	4.05	4.23	4.22	4.16	4.09
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	1	5	4	4.09	746/1406	4.21	4.33	4.09	4.12	4.09
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	2	3	6	4.36	492/1384	4.03	4.22	4.11	4.16	4.36
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	1	4	6	4.45	527/1489	4.23	4.27	4.17	4.14	4.45
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1506	4.94	4.76	4.67	4.71	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	151/1463	3.94	4.13	4.09	4.15	4.75
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	2	9	4.82	348/1438	4.01	4.47	4.46	4.49	4.82
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	537/1421	4.40	4.83	4.73	4.78	4.91
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	3	8	4.73	339/1411	3.91	4.40	4.31	4.33	4.73
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	3	8	4.73	381/1405	3.91	4.46	4.32	4.33	4.73
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	0	0	0	2	3	5	4.30	451/1236	3.53	4.09	4.00	3.98	4.30
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	244/1260	4.15	4.26	4.14	4.21	4.75
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	0	0	3	5	4.63	484/1255	4.16	4.47	4.33	4.43	4.63
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	274/1258	4.39	4.56	4.38	4.50	4.88
4. Were special techniques successful	4	3	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	93/ 873	4.40	3.89	4.03	4.01	4.80

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	4	0.00-0.99	1	A	1	Required for Majors	11	Graduate	2	Major	11
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	6						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	10	Non-major	1
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D	0						
Grad.	2	3.50-4.00	1	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	3						

Course-Section: SOCY 600 2
 Title Research Methodology
 Instructor: Schumacher, John
 Enrollment: 20
 Questionnaires: 10

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2009

Page 1385
 MAR 22, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	2	3	2	3	3.60	1369/1509	3.98	4.33	4.31	4.39	3.60
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	3	2	2	3	3.50	1372/1509	3.93	4.26	4.26	4.25	3.50
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	0	4	1	4	3.70	1108/1287	3.60	4.26	4.30	4.22	3.70
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	6	2	4.00	979/1459	4.05	4.23	4.22	4.16	4.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	2	2	5	4.33	502/1406	4.21	4.33	4.09	4.12	4.33
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	3	7	0	3.70	1083/1384	4.03	4.22	4.11	4.16	3.70
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	0	0	6	3	4.00	986/1489	4.23	4.27	4.17	4.14	4.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	622/1506	4.94	4.76	4.67	4.71	4.89
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	1	5	2	0	3.13	1375/1463	3.94	4.13	4.09	4.15	3.13
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	1	2	3	2	2	3.20	1395/1438	4.01	4.47	4.46	4.49	3.20
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	1	2	4	3	3.90	1368/1421	4.40	4.83	4.73	4.78	3.90
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	1	2	2	5	0	3.10	1354/1411	3.91	4.40	4.31	4.33	3.10
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	4	1	5	0	3.10	1341/1405	3.91	4.46	4.32	4.33	3.10
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	0	1	3	2	1	1	2.75	1179/1236	3.53	4.09	4.00	3.98	2.75
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	3	4	1	3.56	1028/1260	4.15	4.26	4.14	4.21	3.56
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	1	3	4	2	3.70	1071/1255	4.16	4.47	4.33	4.43	3.70
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	3	5	2	3.90	1013/1258	4.39	4.56	4.38	4.50	3.90
4. Were special techniques successful	1	2	0	0	3	1	3	4.00	442/ 873	4.40	3.89	4.03	4.01	4.00
Self Paced														
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 46	****	****	4.31	4.11	****

Frequency Distribution

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

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies		Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean					
	NR	NA	1	2						3	4	5	Mean	Rank
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	4	7	4.64	446/1509	4.64	4.33	4.31	4.39	4.64
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	5	5	4.36	742/1509	4.36	4.26	4.26	4.25	4.36
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	8	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	708/1287	4.33	4.26	4.30	4.22	4.33
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	5	6	4.55	410/1459	4.55	4.23	4.22	4.16	4.55
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	135/1406	4.80	4.33	4.09	4.12	4.80
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	3	7	4.70	199/1384	4.70	4.22	4.11	4.16	4.70
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	1	5	4	4.30	707/1489	4.30	4.27	4.17	4.14	4.30
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1506	5.00	4.76	4.67	4.71	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	4	7	4.64	228/1463	4.64	4.13	4.09	4.15	4.64
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	0	3	5	4.63	646/1438	4.63	4.47	4.46	4.49	4.63
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	588/1421	4.89	4.83	4.73	4.78	4.89
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	303/1411	4.75	4.40	4.31	4.33	4.75
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	1	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	345/1405	4.75	4.46	4.32	4.33	4.75
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	7	1	1	0	0	0	1.50	****/1236	****	4.09	4.00	3.98	****
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	4	7	4.64	330/1260	4.64	4.26	4.14	4.21	4.64
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	1	0	2	8	4.55	547/1255	4.55	4.47	4.33	4.43	4.55
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	236/1258	4.91	4.56	4.38	4.50	4.91
4. Were special techniques successful	1	5	0	1	1	0	3	4.00	442/ 873	4.00	3.89	4.03	4.01	4.00
Laboratory														
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	10	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 198	****	****	4.22	4.31	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	6	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	56/ 89	4.60	4.60	4.49	4.39	4.60
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	6	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	36/ 92	4.80	4.80	4.54	4.52	4.80
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/ 90	5.00	5.00	4.50	4.48	5.00
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	58/ 92	4.40	4.40	4.38	4.30	4.40
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	6	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	40/ 93	4.40	4.40	4.06	4.04	4.40
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	10	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.39	4.36	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	10	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.41	4.40	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 49	****	****	4.26	4.16	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 41	****	****	4.14	4.08	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 46	****	****	4.31	4.11	****

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: SOCY 620 1
 Title Social Epidemiology
 Instructor: Alley,Dawn E
 Enrollment: 15
 Questionnaires: 14

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2009

Page 1387
 MAR 22, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean		
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5						Mean	Rank
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	1	0	4	9	4.50	598/1509	4.50	4.33	4.31	4.39	4.50
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	11	4.79	223/1509	4.79	4.26	4.26	4.25	4.79
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	1	1	10	4.75	261/1287	4.75	4.26	4.30	4.22	4.75
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	12	4.86	121/1459	4.86	4.23	4.22	4.16	4.86
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	4	8	4.43	423/1406	4.43	4.33	4.09	4.12	4.43
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	1	1	11	4.57	299/1384	4.57	4.22	4.11	4.16	4.57
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	2	11	4.71	224/1489	4.71	4.27	4.17	4.14	4.71
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	6	8	4.57	1014/1506	4.57	4.76	4.67	4.71	4.57
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	0	0	6	3	4.33	545/1463	4.33	4.13	4.09	4.15	4.33
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	14	5.00	1/1438	5.00	4.47	4.46	4.49	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	14	5.00	1/1421	5.00	4.83	4.73	4.78	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	1	13	4.93	110/1411	4.93	4.40	4.31	4.33	4.93
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	0	2	11	4.57	568/1405	4.57	4.46	4.32	4.33	4.57
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	1	0	0	1	2	10	4.69	158/1236	4.69	4.09	4.00	3.98	4.69
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	0	4	8	4.46	451/1260	4.46	4.26	4.14	4.21	4.46
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	0	1	12	4.92	164/1255	4.92	4.47	4.33	4.43	4.92
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	0	13	5.00	1/1258	5.00	4.56	4.38	4.50	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	1	1	1	0	3	1	7	4.08	422/ 873	4.08	3.89	4.03	4.01	4.08
Laboratory														
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	13	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 198	****	****	4.22	4.31	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	12	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 89	****	4.60	4.49	4.39	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	12	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 92	****	4.80	4.54	4.52	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 90	****	5.00	4.50	4.48	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 92	****	4.40	4.38	4.30	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	12	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 93	****	4.40	4.06	4.04	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors					
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 12	Required for Majors	2	Graduate	8	Major	7
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B 1						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C 0	General	1	Under-grad	6	Non-major	7
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	2	D 0						
Grad.	8	3.50-4.00	4	F 0	Electives	8	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P 0						
				I 0	Other	0				
				? 0						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	0	0	2	7	4	4.15	987/1509	4.15	4.33	4.31	4.39	4.15
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	2	2	5	4	3.85	1202/1509	3.85	4.26	4.26	4.25	3.85
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	1	2	4	6	4.15	851/1287	4.15	4.26	4.30	4.22	4.15
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	1	2	9	1	3.77	1187/1459	3.77	4.23	4.22	4.16	3.77
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	2	7	4	4.15	693/1406	4.15	4.33	4.09	4.12	4.15
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	1	0	0	3	3	6	4.25	619/1384	4.25	4.22	4.11	4.16	4.25
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	1	0	2	9	4.31	707/1489	4.31	4.27	4.17	4.14	4.31
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	13	5.00	1/1506	5.00	4.76	4.67	4.71	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	4	4	5	4.08	815/1463	4.08	4.13	4.09	4.15	4.08
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	1	2	4	6	4.15	1141/1438	4.15	4.47	4.46	4.49	4.15
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	13	5.00	1/1421	5.00	4.83	4.73	4.78	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	4	3	6	4.15	964/1411	4.15	4.40	4.31	4.33	4.15
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	2	3	3	5	3.85	1159/1405	3.85	4.46	4.32	4.33	3.85
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	0	5	6	2	3.77	847/1236	3.77	4.09	4.00	3.98	3.77
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	4	2	3	3.89	876/1260	3.89	4.26	4.14	4.21	3.89
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	1	1	1	6	4.33	723/1255	4.33	4.47	4.33	4.43	4.33
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	0	1	1	7	4.67	507/1258	4.67	4.56	4.38	4.50	4.67
4. Were special techniques successful	5	6	1	0	0	1	1	3.33	****/ 873	****	3.89	4.03	4.01	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 89	****	4.60	4.49	4.39	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 92	****	4.80	4.54	4.52	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 90	****	5.00	4.50	4.48	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 92	****	4.40	4.38	4.30	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 93	****	4.40	4.06	4.04	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors				
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	A 11	Required for Majors	3	Graduate	8	Major	9
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	B 0						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	C 0	General	3	Under-grad	6	Non-major	5
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	D 0						
Grad.	8	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	7	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
			P 0						
			I 0	Other	0				
			? 2						

Course-Section: SOCY 681 1
 Title Nonprofit Organization
 Instructor: Hall,Nancy F
 Enrollment: 15
 Questionnaires: 13

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2009

Page 1389
 MAR 22, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	0	0	1	2	9	4.67	410/1509	4.67	4.33	4.31	4.39	4.67
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	2	1	9	4.58	447/1509	4.58	4.26	4.26	4.25	4.58
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	6	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	359/1287	4.67	4.26	4.30	4.22	4.67
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	1	0	0	1	4	6	4.45	536/1459	4.45	4.23	4.22	4.16	4.45
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	0	3	3	5	3.92	921/1406	3.92	4.33	4.09	4.12	3.92
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	3	9	4.75	149/1384	4.75	4.22	4.11	4.16	4.75
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	2	4	6	4.33	674/1489	4.33	4.27	4.17	4.14	4.33
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1506	5.00	4.76	4.67	4.71	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	88/1463	4.89	4.13	4.09	4.15	4.89
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	3	9	4.75	447/1438	4.75	4.47	4.46	4.49	4.75
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/1421	5.00	4.83	4.73	4.78	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	0	2	9	4.82	232/1411	4.82	4.40	4.31	4.33	4.82
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	2	10	4.83	251/1405	4.83	4.46	4.32	4.33	4.83
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	2	0	0	1	3	6	4.50	274/1236	4.50	4.09	4.00	3.98	4.50
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	2	2	7	4.45	460/1260	4.45	4.26	4.14	4.21	4.45
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	0	3	8	4.73	379/1255	4.73	4.47	4.33	4.43	4.73
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	1	0	10	4.82	350/1258	4.82	4.56	4.38	4.50	4.82
4. Were special techniques successful	2	0	0	0	4	5	2	3.82	580/ 873	3.82	3.89	4.03	4.01	3.82
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	11	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 89	****	4.60	4.49	4.39	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	11	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 92	****	4.80	4.54	4.52	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 90	****	5.00	4.50	4.48	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 92	****	4.40	4.38	4.30	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	11	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 93	****	4.40	4.06	4.04	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 49	****	****	4.26	4.16	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	12	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 41	****	****	4.14	4.08	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	12	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 46	****	****	4.31	4.11	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	12	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 37	****	****	4.05	3.69	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	12	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.27	4.26	****

Frequency Distribution

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