

Course-Section: SOCY 101 0101
 Title BASIC CONCEPTS IN SOCY
 Instructor: TUFEKCIOGLU, ZE
 Enrollment: 104
 Questionnaires: 44

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2008

Page 1494
 AUG 6, 2008
 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	1	0	1	2	7	19	14	4.00	1216/1670	4.01	4.36	4.31	4.23	4.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	0	1	7	18	16	4.17	1070/1666	4.15	4.40	4.27	4.30	4.17
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	3	7	17	16	4.07	1021/1406	4.19	4.42	4.32	4.31	4.07
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	3	0	3	8	13	15	4.03	1072/1615	4.04	4.27	4.24	4.17	4.03
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	2	2	8	14	17	3.98	898/1566	3.98	4.28	4.07	4.03	3.98
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	3	3	4	9	15	9	3.58	1245/1528	3.90	4.22	4.12	4.00	3.58
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	2	6	8	27	4.40	732/1650	4.44	4.37	4.22	4.28	4.40
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	2	30	10	4.19	1409/1667	4.58	4.64	4.67	4.61	4.19
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	15	0	0	2	7	12	8	3.90	1133/1626	4.02	4.22	4.11	4.07	3.90
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	0	0	5	2	33	4.70	623/1559	4.52	4.58	4.46	4.47	4.70
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	0	1	4	35	4.85	725/1560	4.81	4.86	4.72	4.68	4.85
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	0	0	2	11	27	4.63	537/1549	4.38	4.50	4.31	4.32	4.63
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	1	2	10	27	4.57	631/1546	4.36	4.49	4.32	4.32	4.57
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	5	1	1	0	3	8	26	4.53	315/1323	4.36	4.27	4.00	3.91	4.53
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	22	0	3	1	5	5	8	3.64	1045/1384	3.98	4.27	4.10	3.92	3.64
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	22	0	1	4	3	5	9	3.77	1103/1378	3.97	4.45	4.29	4.09	3.77
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	22	0	1	1	1	6	13	4.32	831/1378	4.32	4.57	4.31	4.08	4.32
4. Were special techniques successful	22	9	1	2	1	5	4	3.69	657/ 904	3.86	4.12	4.03	3.94	3.69
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	39	3	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 232	****	****	4.19	4.25	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	41	0	0	0	2	0	1	3.67	****/ 239	****	****	4.21	4.35	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	40	2	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 230	****	****	4.44	4.58	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	40	2	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 231	****	****	4.31	4.45	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	40	2	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 218	****	****	4.18	4.47	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	39	3	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 87	****	5.00	4.65	4.67	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	40	2	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 79	****	4.90	4.64	4.72	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	40	2	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 75	****	4.95	4.57	4.46	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	40	2	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 79	****	4.85	4.45	4.59	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	40	2	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 80	****	3.10	3.97	3.99	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	41	0	1	0	1	0	1	3.00	****/ 41	****	****	4.50	3.91	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	41	0	1	0	1	0	1	3.00	****/ 38	****	****	4.19	4.07	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	41	1	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 38	****	5.00	4.62	4.63	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	41	1	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 39	****	3.00	4.27	4.42	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	40	2	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.47	4.28	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	41	0	1	0	1	0	1	3.00	****/ 28	****	5.00	4.64	4.59	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	41	1	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 16	****	5.00	4.67	4.83	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	41	1	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 27	****	5.00	4.54	4.46	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	40	2	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 10	****	****	4.84	4.75	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	40	2	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 6	****	****	4.92	4.83	****

Course-Section: SOCY 101 0101
 Title BASIC CONCEPTS IN SOCY
 Instructor: TUFEKCIOGLU, ZE
 Enrollment: 104
 Questionnaires: 44

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2008

Page 1494
 AUG 6, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	5	0.00-0.99	0	A	12	Required for Majors	15	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	B	10						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	0	C	3	General	7	Under-grad	44	Non-major	44
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	5	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	8				
				?	0						

Course-Section: SOCY 101 0201
 Title BASIC CONCEPTS IN SOCY
 Instructor: SECKIN, GUL
 Enrollment: 115
 Questionnaires: 66

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2008

Page 1495
 AUG 6, 2008
 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	4	0	1	5	8	19	29	4.13	1139/1670	4.01	4.36	4.31	4.23	4.13
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	5	0	1	2	7	12	39	4.41	784/1666	4.15	4.40	4.27	4.30	4.41
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	4	0	1	3	13	44	4.58	515/1406	4.19	4.42	4.32	4.31	4.58	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	5	33	0	1	4	4	19	4.46	606/1615	4.04	4.27	4.24	4.17	4.46
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	4	4	2	2	9	19	26	4.12	771/1566	3.98	4.28	4.07	4.03	4.12
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	5	40	0	1	3	4	13	4.38	580/1528	3.90	4.22	4.12	4.00	4.38
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	7	0	0	1	3	11	44	4.66	361/1650	4.44	4.37	4.22	4.28	4.66
8. How many times was class cancelled	7	0	0	0	0	7	52	4.88	712/1667	4.58	4.64	4.67	4.61	4.88
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	13	3	0	2	10	16	22	4.16	831/1626	4.02	4.22	4.11	4.07	4.16
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	10	0	1	0	9	8	38	4.46	946/1559	4.52	4.58	4.46	4.47	4.46
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	9	0	0	1	3	6	47	4.74	985/1560	4.81	4.86	4.72	4.68	4.74
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	10	0	2	2	11	5	36	4.27	969/1549	4.38	4.50	4.31	4.32	4.27
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	9	1	1	4	6	8	37	4.36	899/1546	4.36	4.49	4.32	4.32	4.36
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	11	3	1	2	5	9	35	4.44	384/1323	4.36	4.27	4.00	3.91	4.44
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	38	0	1	0	2	3	22	4.61	372/1384	3.98	4.27	4.10	3.92	4.61
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	38	0	0	0	1	2	25	4.86	295/1378	3.97	4.45	4.29	4.09	4.86
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	38	0	0	0	1	3	24	4.82	365/1378	4.32	4.57	4.31	4.08	4.82
4. Were special techniques successful	38	10	0	0	3	3	12	4.50	243/ 904	3.86	4.12	4.03	3.94	4.50
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	63	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 232	****	****	4.19	4.25	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	65	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 239	****	****	4.21	4.35	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	64	1	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 87	****	5.00	4.65	4.67	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	65	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 41	****	****	4.50	3.91	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	65	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 38	****	****	4.19	4.07	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	65	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 28	****	5.00	4.64	4.59	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	65	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 16	****	5.00	4.67	4.83	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	65	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 27	****	5.00	4.54	4.46	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	12	0.00-0.99 0	A 37	Required for Majors	24
28-55	13	1.00-1.99 0	B 12		Graduate 0
56-83	1	2.00-2.99 8	C 0	General	12
84-150	2	3.00-3.49 4	D 0		66
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 10	F 0	Electives	4
			P 0		
			I 0		
			? 0	Other	7
### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant					

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	4	0	1	7	9	14	19	3.86	1372/1670	4.01	4.36	4.31	4.23	3.86
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	4	0	2	5	9	15	19	3.88	1331/1666	4.15	4.40	4.27	4.30	3.88
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	5	0	2	6	3	14	24	4.06	1021/1406	4.19	4.42	4.32	4.31	4.06
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	4	32	2	2	4	3	7	3.61	1411/1615	4.04	4.27	4.24	4.17	3.61
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	5	2	3	3	10	15	16	3.81	1108/1566	3.98	4.28	4.07	4.03	3.81
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	4	37	4	2	2	2	3	2.85	****/1528	3.90	4.22	4.12	4.00	****
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	4	1	0	2	5	11	31	4.45	660/1650	4.44	4.37	4.22	4.28	4.45
8. How many times was class cancelled	4	0	0	0	0	23	27	4.54	1127/1667	4.58	4.64	4.67	4.61	4.54
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	15	1	1	3	7	18	9	3.82	1210/1626	4.02	4.22	4.11	4.07	3.82
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	6	0	0	0	7	16	25	4.38	1052/1559	4.52	4.58	4.46	4.47	4.38
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	5	0	0	0	2	4	43	4.84	777/1560	4.81	4.86	4.72	4.68	4.84
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	7	0	0	4	6	16	21	4.15	1070/1549	4.38	4.50	4.31	4.32	4.15
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	5	1	2	2	7	10	27	4.21	1025/1546	4.36	4.49	4.32	4.32	4.21
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	5	0	1	3	8	15	22	4.10	656/1323	4.36	4.27	4.00	3.91	4.10
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	28	0	3	4	8	5	6	3.27	1197/1384	3.98	4.27	4.10	3.92	3.27
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	27	0	5	4	12	1	5	2.89	1326/1378	3.97	4.45	4.29	4.09	2.89
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	28	0	2	1	10	4	9	3.65	1150/1378	4.32	4.57	4.31	4.08	3.65
4. Were special techniques successful	27	23	1	0	1	0	2	3.50	****/ 904	3.86	4.12	4.03	3.94	****
Laboratory														
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	51	0	0	2	1	0	0	2.33	****/ 239	****	****	4.21	4.35	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	51	1	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/ 230	****	****	4.44	4.58	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	51	2	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 231	****	****	4.31	4.45	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	52	1	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 87	****	5.00	4.65	4.67	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	52	1	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 79	****	4.85	4.45	4.59	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	52	0	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/ 41	****	****	4.50	3.91	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	52	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 38	****	****	4.19	4.07	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	52	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 38	****	5.00	4.62	4.63	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	52	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/ 28	****	5.00	4.64	4.59	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	52	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 16	****	5.00	4.67	4.83	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	52	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 27	****	5.00	4.54	4.46	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	52	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 10	****	****	4.84	4.75	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	52	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 6	****	****	4.92	4.83	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	12	0.00-0.99	0	A 23	Required for Majors 18
28-55	9	1.00-1.99	0	B 16	Graduate 0
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	3	C 3	Major 0
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	6	D 1	General 13
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	8	F 0	Under-grad 54
					Non-major 54
					Electives 4
					#### - Means there are not enough

P	0			responses to be significant
I	0	Other	7	
?	1			

Course-Section: SOCY 101 0401
 Title BASIC CONCEPTS IN SOCY
 Instructor: TUFEKCIOGLU, ZE
 Enrollment: 150
 Questionnaires: 82

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2008

Page 1497
 AUG 6, 2008
 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	

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	3	0	2	2	14	33	28	4.05	1189/1670	4.01	4.36	4.31	4.23	4.05
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	3	0	2	2	13	28	34	4.14	1103/1666	4.15	4.40	4.27	4.30	4.14
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	3	0	2	4	16	22	35	4.06	1021/1406	4.19	4.42	4.32	4.31	4.06
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	3	9	2	5	16	12	35	4.04	1061/1615	4.04	4.27	4.24	4.17	4.04
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	4	1	4	6	14	14	39	4.01	844/1566	3.98	4.28	4.07	4.03	4.01
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	4	14	4	7	11	21	21	3.75	1152/1528	3.90	4.22	4.12	4.00	3.75
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	4	0	1	2	14	20	41	4.26	903/1650	4.44	4.37	4.22	4.28	4.26
8. How many times was class cancelled	5	2	2	0	0	15	58	4.69	992/1667	4.58	4.64	4.67	4.61	4.69
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	23	2	0	0	6	33	18	4.21	774/1626	4.02	4.22	4.11	4.07	4.21
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	7	0	0	2	4	20	49	4.55	846/1559	4.52	4.58	4.46	4.47	4.55
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	8	0	0	0	2	10	62	4.81	829/1560	4.81	4.86	4.72	4.68	4.81
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	8	0	0	2	6	20	46	4.49	709/1549	4.38	4.50	4.31	4.32	4.49
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	6	1	2	3	7	22	41	4.29	956/1546	4.36	4.49	4.32	4.32	4.29
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	11	0	2	0	8	20	41	4.38	439/1323	4.36	4.27	4.00	3.91	4.38
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	40	0	0	1	7	8	26	4.40	541/1384	3.98	4.27	4.10	3.92	4.40
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	40	0	0	1	8	8	25	4.36	774/1378	3.97	4.45	4.29	4.09	4.36
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	42	0	0	1	4	10	25	4.47	682/1378	4.32	4.57	4.31	4.08	4.47
4. Were special techniques successful	40	10	5	1	11	7	8	3.38	768/ 904	3.86	4.12	4.03	3.94	3.38
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	72	4	0	3	1	2	0	2.83	****/ 232	****	****	4.19	4.25	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	76	0	1	0	3	1	1	3.17	****/ 239	****	****	4.21	4.35	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	75	4	0	0	2	1	0	3.33	****/ 230	****	****	4.44	4.58	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	75	3	0	1	1	1	1	3.50	****/ 231	****	****	4.31	4.45	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	75	3	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	****/ 218	****	****	4.18	4.47	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	74	3	1	0	3	1	0	2.80	****/ 87	****	5.00	4.65	4.67	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	74	3	1	0	1	2	1	3.40	****/ 79	****	4.90	4.64	4.72	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	75	4	0	1	1	1	0	3.00	****/ 75	****	4.95	4.57	4.46	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	76	2	0	1	2	1	0	3.00	****/ 79	****	4.85	4.45	4.59	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	76	2	1	0	2	1	0	2.75	****/ 80	****	3.10	3.97	3.99	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	76	0	1	1	2	2	0	2.83	****/ 41	****	****	4.50	3.91	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	76	0	2	0	2	2	0	2.67	****/ 38	****	****	4.19	4.07	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	76	3	0	0	2	1	0	3.33	****/ 38	****	5.00	4.62	4.63	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	76	1	0	2	1	0	2	3.40	****/ 39	****	3.00	4.27	4.42	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	76	4	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 31	****	****	4.47	4.28	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	75	0	1	2	2	2	0	2.71	****/ 28	****	5.00	4.64	4.59	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	75	1	1	1	2	2	0	2.83	****/ 16	****	5.00	4.67	4.83	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	75	3	0	2	1	1	0	2.75	****/ 27	****	5.00	4.54	4.46	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	75	4	0	0	2	1	0	3.33	****/ 10	****	****	4.84	4.75	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	75	3	0	1	1	2	0	3.25	****/ 6	****	****	4.92	4.83	****

Course-Section: SOCY 101 0401
 Title BASIC CONCEPTS IN SOCY
 Instructor: TUFEKCIOGLU, ZE
 Enrollment: 150
 Questionnaires: 82

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2008

Page 1497
 AUG 6, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	18	0.00-0.99	0	A	17	Required for Majors	40	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	11	1.00-1.99	1	B	30						
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	12	C	8	General	9	Under-grad	82	Non-major	82
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	8	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	10	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	8				
				?	1						

Course-Section: SOCY 204 0101
 Title DIVERSITY & PLURALISM
 Instructor: PINCUS, FRED L
 Enrollment: 45
 Questionnaires: 32

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2008

Page 1498
 AUG 6, 2008
 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	1	4	13	13	4.13	1139/1670	4.13	4.36	4.31	4.32	4.13
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	1	2	6	12	10	3.90	1318/1666	3.90	4.40	4.27	4.27	3.90
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	1	2	4	11	13	4.06	1021/1406	4.06	4.42	4.32	4.39	4.06
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	1	1	3	8	18	4.32	787/1615	4.32	4.27	4.24	4.29	4.32
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	3	6	22	4.50	389/1566	4.50	4.28	4.07	4.00	4.50
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	1	2	1	7	5	15	4.00	899/1528	4.00	4.22	4.12	4.11	4.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	2	4	2	23	4.48	600/1650	4.48	4.37	4.22	4.20	4.48
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	1	0	4	7	7	12	3.90	1609/1667	3.90	4.64	4.67	4.64	3.90
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	10	1	0	3	8	10	0	3.33	1462/1626	3.33	4.22	4.11	4.06	3.33
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	1	2	2	10	16	4.23	1178/1559	4.23	4.58	4.46	4.40	4.23
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	1	4	6	20	4.45	1287/1560	4.45	4.86	4.72	4.73	4.45
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	1	0	2	19	9	4.13	1087/1549	4.13	4.50	4.31	4.25	4.13
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	2	1	13	13	4.17	1056/1546	4.17	4.49	4.32	4.30	4.17
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	1	2	1	3	10	14	4.10	656/1323	4.10	4.27	4.00	4.08	4.10
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	1	3	5	10	4.26	664/1384	4.26	4.27	4.10	4.07	4.26
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	13	0	0	1	4	3	11	4.26	854/1378	4.26	4.45	4.29	4.25	4.26
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	13	0	0	1	3	1	14	4.47	682/1378	4.47	4.57	4.31	4.26	4.47
4. Were special techniques successful	14	1	0	1	4	5	7	4.06	451/ 904	4.06	4.12	4.03	4.01	4.06

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors				
00-27	9	0.00-0.99	0	A 12	Required for Majors 14	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	8	1.00-1.99	0	B 5					
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	2	C 4	General	7	Under-grad	32	Non-major 31
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	4	D 0					
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	9	F 0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant		
				P 0					
				I 0	Other	6			
				? 0					

Course-Section: SOCY 300 0101
 Title METHODOLOGY:SOCIAL RSR
 Instructor: MACLENNAN, JAMI
 Enrollment: 43
 Questionnaires: 27

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2008

Page 1499
 AUG 6, 2008
 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	12	12	4.38	835/1670	4.40	4.36	4.31	4.24	4.38
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	6	20	4.70	366/1666	4.66	4.40	4.27	4.18	4.70
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	3	7	16	4.41	715/1406	4.43	4.42	4.32	4.22	4.41
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	13	13	4.44	633/1615	4.45	4.27	4.24	4.18	4.44
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	1	2	2	10	11	4.08	808/1566	4.18	4.28	4.07	4.04	4.08
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	1	0	1	15	9	4.19	760/1528	4.24	4.22	4.12	4.07	4.19
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	2	8	17	4.56	499/1650	4.56	4.37	4.22	4.12	4.56
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	22	4	4.15	1437/1667	4.23	4.64	4.67	4.67	4.15
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	0	1	6	15	4.64	301/1626	4.61	4.22	4.11	4.06	4.64
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	1	3	21	4.80	435/1559	4.81	4.58	4.46	4.40	4.80
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	3	22	4.88	647/1560	4.90	4.86	4.72	4.67	4.88
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	2	3	20	4.72	424/1549	4.72	4.50	4.31	4.25	4.72
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	6	19	4.76	395/1546	4.75	4.49	4.32	4.24	4.76
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	1	0	0	6	6	12	4.25	545/1323	4.37	4.27	4.00	3.99	4.25
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	1	5	10	4.56	396/1384	4.51	4.27	4.10	4.12	4.56
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	11	0	0	0	0	5	11	4.69	466/1378	4.57	4.45	4.29	4.30	4.69
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	11	0	0	0	0	6	10	4.63	570/1378	4.70	4.57	4.31	4.33	4.63
4. Were special techniques successful	11	6	0	0	2	3	5	4.30	345/ 904	3.85	4.12	4.03	4.03	4.30
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	25	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 232	****	****	4.19	4.04	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	26	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 239	****	****	4.21	3.99	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	26	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 230	****	****	4.44	4.25	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	26	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 231	****	****	4.31	4.11	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	26	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 218	****	****	4.18	3.93	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	25	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 87	****	5.00	4.65	4.30	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	25	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 79	****	4.90	4.64	4.53	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	25	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 75	****	4.95	4.57	4.50	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	25	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 79	****	4.85	4.45	3.68	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	25	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 80	****	3.10	3.97	3.76	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	26	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 41	****	****	4.50	4.44	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	26	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 38	****	****	4.19	3.96	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	26	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 38	****	5.00	4.62	4.68	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	26	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 39	****	3.00	4.27	4.38	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	26	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.47	4.51	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	26	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 28	****	5.00	4.64	3.33	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	26	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 16	****	5.00	4.67	4.00	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	26	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 27	****	5.00	4.54	2.63	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	26	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 10	****	****	4.84	****	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	26	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 6	****	****	4.92	****	****

Course-Section: SOCY 300 0101
 Title METHODOLOGY:SOCIAL RSR
 Instructor: MACLENNAN, JAMI
 Enrollment: 43
 Questionnaires: 27

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2008

Page 1499
 AUG 6, 2008
 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	9	Required for Majors	2	Graduate	0	Major	2
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	1	B	9						
56-83	7	2.00-2.99	4	C	6	General	3	Under-grad	27	Non-major	25
84-150	9	3.00-3.49	8	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	18				
				?	0						

Course-Section: SOCY 300 0201
 Title METHODOLOGY:SOCIAL RSR
 Instructor: MACLENNAN, JAMI
 Enrollment: 46
 Questionnaires: 36

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2008

Page 1500
 AUG 6, 2008
 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	3	12	20	4.42	794/1670	4.40	4.36	4.31	4.24	4.42
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	10	24	4.61	477/1666	4.66	4.40	4.27	4.18	4.61
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	1	3	7	24	4.44	667/1406	4.43	4.42	4.32	4.22	4.44
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	1	1	2	8	23	4.46	619/1615	4.45	4.27	4.24	4.18	4.46
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	4	2	5	23	4.29	610/1566	4.18	4.28	4.07	4.04	4.29
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	1	0	2	6	6	20	4.29	670/1528	4.24	4.22	4.12	4.07	4.29
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	4	7	24	4.57	471/1650	4.56	4.37	4.22	4.12	4.57
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	24	11	4.31	1326/1667	4.23	4.64	4.67	4.67	4.31
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	0	3	7	21	4.58	339/1626	4.61	4.22	4.11	4.06	4.58
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	6	29	4.83	403/1559	4.81	4.58	4.46	4.40	4.83
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	1	1	33	4.91	536/1560	4.90	4.86	4.72	4.67	4.91
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	2	6	27	4.71	424/1549	4.72	4.50	4.31	4.25	4.71
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	7	27	4.74	420/1546	4.75	4.49	4.32	4.24	4.74
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	2	0	1	4	5	21	4.48	345/1323	4.37	4.27	4.00	3.99	4.48
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	1	2	8	17	4.46	476/1384	4.51	4.27	4.10	4.12	4.46
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	9	0	0	2	2	5	18	4.44	672/1378	4.57	4.45	4.29	4.30	4.44
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	0	0	0	6	21	4.78	417/1378	4.70	4.57	4.31	4.33	4.78
4. Were special techniques successful	10	6	3	1	6	5	5	3.40	761/ 904	3.85	4.12	4.03	4.03	3.40
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	33	2	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 232	****	****	4.19	4.04	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	34	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 239	****	****	4.21	3.99	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	34	1	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 230	****	****	4.44	4.25	****

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 0	Major 3
28-55	6	1.00-1.99	0	B 11			
56-83	5	2.00-2.99	8	C 5	General 3	Under-grad 36	Non-major 33
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	3	D 0			
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F 0	Electives 0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	
				P 0			
				I 0	Other 23		
				? 0			

Course-Section: SOCY 301 0101
 Title ANALY:SOCIOLOGICAL DAT
 Instructor: COHEN, JERE M
 Enrollment: 33
 Questionnaires: 23

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2008

Page 1501
 AUG 6, 2008
 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	4	5	14	4.43	765/1670	4.43	4.36	4.31	4.24	4.43
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	4	18	4.74	333/1666	4.74	4.40	4.27	4.18	4.74
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	2	20	4.83	247/1406	4.83	4.42	4.32	4.22	4.83
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	6	0	1	2	2	12	4.47	592/1615	4.47	4.27	4.24	4.18	4.47
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	2	2	3	14	4.23	675/1566	4.23	4.28	4.07	4.04	4.23
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	6	0	0	1	3	12	4.69	285/1528	4.69	4.22	4.12	4.07	4.69
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	1	0	2	19	4.77	255/1650	4.77	4.37	4.22	4.12	4.77
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	22	5.00	1/1667	5.00	4.64	4.67	4.67	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	0	0	8	10	4.56	363/1626	4.56	4.22	4.11	4.06	4.56
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	1	2	18	4.81	435/1559	4.81	4.58	4.46	4.40	4.81
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	0	3	17	4.85	725/1560	4.85	4.86	4.72	4.67	4.85
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	2	2	17	4.71	424/1549	4.71	4.50	4.31	4.25	4.71
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	3	4	14	4.52	691/1546	4.52	4.49	4.32	4.24	4.52
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	9	2	0	0	3	6	4.00	692/1323	4.00	4.27	4.00	3.99	4.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	2	1	1	2	12	4.17	740/1384	4.17	4.27	4.10	4.12	4.17
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	1	3	0	14	4.50	603/1378	4.50	4.45	4.29	4.30	4.50
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	1	4	2	11	4.28	856/1378	4.28	4.57	4.31	4.33	4.28
4. Were special techniques successful	5	12	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	243/ 904	4.50	4.12	4.03	4.03	4.50
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	21	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 232	****	****	4.19	4.04	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	21	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 239	****	****	4.21	3.99	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	21	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 230	****	****	4.44	4.25	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	21	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 231	****	****	4.31	4.11	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	21	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 218	****	****	4.18	3.93	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	21	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 87	****	5.00	4.65	4.30	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	21	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 79	****	4.90	4.64	4.53	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	21	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 75	****	4.95	4.57	4.50	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	21	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 79	****	4.85	4.45	3.68	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	21	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 80	****	3.10	3.97	3.76	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 41	****	****	4.50	4.44	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	21	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 38	****	****	4.19	3.96	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	21	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 38	****	5.00	4.62	4.68	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	21	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/ 39	****	3.00	4.27	4.38	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	21	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.47	4.51	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	21	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 28	****	5.00	4.64	3.33	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	21	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 16	****	5.00	4.67	4.00	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	21	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 27	****	5.00	4.54	2.63	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	21	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/ 10	****	****	4.84	****	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	21	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/ 6	****	****	4.92	****	****

Course-Section: SOCY 301 0101
 Title ANALY:SOCIOLOGICAL DAT
 Instructor: COHEN, JERE M
 Enrollment: 33
 Questionnaires: 23

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2008

Page 1501
 AUG 6, 2008
 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	10	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	9
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	4						
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	4	C	7	General	0	Under-grad	23	Non-major	14
84-150	9	3.00-3.49	4	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	17				
				?	0						

Course-Section: SOCY 315 0101
 Title POPULATION & SOCIETY
 Instructor: ROTHSTEIN, WILL
 Enrollment: 44
 Questionnaires: 24

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2008

Page 1502
 AUG 6, 2008
 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	3	0	2	10	9	3.92	1331/1670	3.92	4.36	4.31	4.24	3.92
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	2	1	12	8	4.00	1199/1666	4.00	4.40	4.27	4.18	4.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	2	4	6	11	4.13	972/1406	4.13	4.42	4.32	4.22	4.13
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	3	1	1	6	7	5	3.70	1356/1615	3.70	4.27	4.24	4.18	3.70
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	3	4	5	5	2	3	2.74	1528/1566	2.74	4.28	4.07	4.04	2.74
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	4	3	2	3	7	3	3.28	1394/1528	3.28	4.22	4.12	4.07	3.28
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	1	6	9	6	3.91	1278/1650	3.91	4.37	4.22	4.12	3.91
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	16	6	4.27	1354/1667	4.27	4.64	4.67	4.67	4.27
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	7	0	1	1	2	9	4	3.82	1200/1626	3.82	4.22	4.11	4.06	3.82
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	1	2	4	14	4.48	933/1559	4.48	4.58	4.46	4.40	4.48
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	1	2	19	4.82	829/1560	4.82	4.86	4.72	4.67	4.82
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	1	2	3	5	11	4.05	1129/1549	4.05	4.50	4.31	4.25	4.05
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	2	0	6	13	4.27	971/1546	4.27	4.49	4.32	4.24	4.27
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	0	3	3	3	6	7	3.50	1040/1323	3.50	4.27	4.00	3.99	3.50
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	12	0	2	1	1	5	3	3.50	1103/1384	3.50	4.27	4.10	4.12	3.50
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	12	0	0	1	5	2	4	3.75	1110/1378	3.75	4.45	4.29	4.30	3.75
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	12	0	1	1	0	5	5	4.00	977/1378	4.00	4.57	4.31	4.33	4.00
4. Were special techniques successful	12	11	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 904	****	4.12	4.03	4.03	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors		
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A 6	Required for Majors 9	Graduate 1	Major 0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	1	B 11			
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	5	C 3	General 6	Under-grad 23	Non-major 24
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	5	D 0			
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00	0	F 0	Electives 2	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	
				P 0			
				I 0	Other 6		
				? 2			

Course-Section: SOCY 321 8620
 Title RACE & ETHNIC RELATION
 Instructor: SUFIAN, MERYL
 Enrollment: 28
 Questionnaires: 26

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2008

Page 1503
 AUG 6, 2008
 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	8	0	1	1	6	3	7	3.78	1430/1670	3.78	4.36	4.31	4.24	3.78
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	8	0	2	2	3	2	9	3.78	1398/1666	3.78	4.40	4.27	4.18	3.78
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	8	0	2	1	3	4	8	3.83	1169/1406	3.83	4.42	4.32	4.22	3.83
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	8	0	4	0	5	1	8	3.50	1448/1615	3.50	4.27	4.24	4.18	3.50
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	9	0	1	0	4	5	7	4.00	851/1566	4.00	4.28	4.07	4.04	4.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	9	1	2	1	2	4	7	3.81	1113/1528	3.81	4.22	4.12	4.07	3.81
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	10	0	2	3	1	4	6	3.56	1442/1650	3.56	4.37	4.22	4.12	3.56
8. How many times was class cancelled	9	0	0	0	0	12	5	4.29	1340/1667	4.29	4.64	4.67	4.67	4.29
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	15	2	1	0	2	4	2	3.67	1312/1626	3.67	4.22	4.11	4.06	3.67
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	8	0	3	2	1	3	9	3.72	1416/1559	3.72	4.58	4.46	4.40	3.72
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	9	0	0	0	2	3	12	4.59	1180/1560	4.59	4.86	4.72	4.67	4.59
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	10	0	1	4	1	3	7	3.69	1338/1549	3.69	4.50	4.31	4.25	3.69
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	9	0	4	0	2	1	10	3.76	1289/1546	3.76	4.49	4.32	4.24	3.76
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	11	2	2	0	4	2	5	3.62	985/1323	3.62	4.27	4.00	3.99	3.62
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	1	4	3	9	4.18	730/1384	4.18	4.27	4.10	4.12	4.18
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	9	0	3	4	2	1	7	3.29	1257/1378	3.29	4.45	4.29	4.30	3.29
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	2	3	3	2	7	3.53	1184/1378	3.53	4.57	4.31	4.33	3.53
4. Were special techniques successful	9	7	1	1	2	0	6	3.90	570/ 904	3.90	4.12	4.03	4.03	3.90
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	25	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 28	****	5.00	4.64	3.33	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	25	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 16	****	5.00	4.67	4.00	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99 0	A 6	Required for Majors 1	Graduate 1 Major 0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99 0	B 4		
56-83	2	2.00-2.99 1	C 2	General 11	Under-grad 25 Non-major 26
84-150	3	3.00-3.49 0	D 0		
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00 5	F 0	Electives 0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 2	
			? 1		

Course-Section: SOCY 333 0101
 Title HUM SEXUALITY/CROSS-CU
 Instructor: LOTTES, ILSA L.
 Enrollment: 98
 Questionnaires: 61

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2008

Page 1504
 AUG 6, 2008
 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	6	8	15	29	4.00	1216/1670	4.00	4.36	4.31	4.24	4.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	2	9	10	14	26	3.87	1344/1666	3.87	4.40	4.27	4.18	3.87
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	7	5	11	13	25	3.72	1218/1406	3.72	4.42	4.32	4.22	3.72
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	6	3	5	12	16	19	3.78	1306/1615	3.78	4.27	4.24	4.18	3.78
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	5	8	13	34	4.21	686/1566	4.21	4.28	4.07	4.04	4.21
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	6	3	12	17	22	3.77	1146/1528	3.77	4.22	4.12	4.07	3.77
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	7	3	9	17	25	3.82	1324/1650	3.82	4.37	4.22	4.12	3.82
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	1	4	55	4.90	675/1667	4.90	4.64	4.67	4.67	4.90
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	9	1	5	3	13	19	11	3.55	1369/1626	3.55	4.22	4.11	4.06	3.55
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	4	4	10	17	24	3.90	1356/1559	3.90	4.58	4.46	4.40	3.90
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	1	8	50	4.83	777/1560	4.83	4.86	4.72	4.67	4.83
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	4	5	8	22	19	3.81	1280/1549	3.81	4.50	4.31	4.25	3.81
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	4	3	9	12	30	4.05	1121/1546	4.05	4.49	4.32	4.24	4.05
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	6	16	12	2	9	7	9	2.97	1193/1323	2.97	4.27	4.00	3.99	2.97
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	22	0	3	3	10	11	12	3.67	1033/1384	3.67	4.27	4.10	4.12	3.67
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	23	0	3	3	5	11	16	3.89	1060/1378	3.89	4.45	4.29	4.30	3.89
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	23	0	1	1	6	5	25	4.37	786/1378	4.37	4.57	4.31	4.33	4.37
4. Were special techniques successful	24	26	2	2	1	4	2	3.18	****/ 904	****	4.12	4.03	4.03	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	59	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 87	****	5.00	4.65	4.30	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	60	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 28	****	5.00	4.64	3.33	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	60	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 16	****	5.00	4.67	4.00	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	5	0.00-0.99	0	A	8	Required for Majors	6	Graduate	0	Major	11
28-55	6	1.00-1.99	1	B	29						
56-83	5	2.00-2.99	7	C	14	General	25	Under-grad	61	Non-major	50
84-150	14	3.00-3.49	7	D	1						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	8	F	0	Electives	4	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	16				
				?	4						

Course-Section: SOCY 335 0101
 Title: TERRORISM & SOCIAL VIO
 Instructor: HEWITT, CHRIS J
 Enrollment: 53
 Questionnaires: 31

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2008

Page 1505
 AUG 6, 2008
 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	0	1	2	2	24	4.69	453/1670	4.69	4.36	4.31	4.24	4.69
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	1	1	3	9	15	4.24	979/1666	4.24	4.40	4.27	4.18	4.24
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	3	0	0	0	5	9	14	4.32	811/1406	4.32	4.42	4.32	4.22	4.32
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	2	1	2	4	7	13	4.07	1044/1615	4.07	4.27	4.24	4.18	4.07
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	3	0	1	5	6	14	4.27	632/1566	4.27	4.28	4.07	4.04	4.27
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	2	1	4	4	6	12	3.89	1055/1528	3.89	4.22	4.12	4.07	3.89
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	1	1	6	6	15	4.14	1043/1650	4.14	4.37	4.22	4.12	4.14
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	0	0	0	0	5	23	4.82	823/1667	4.82	4.64	4.67	4.67	4.82
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	0	2	11	13	4.42	531/1626	4.42	4.22	4.11	4.06	4.42
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	1	3	25	4.83	403/1559	4.83	4.58	4.46	4.40	4.83
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	1	28	4.97	239/1560	4.97	4.86	4.72	4.67	4.97
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	1	2	3	23	4.66	500/1549	4.66	4.50	4.31	4.25	4.66
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	1	1	2	24	4.62	570/1546	4.62	4.49	4.32	4.24	4.62
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	0	3	0	6	4	16	4.03	681/1323	4.03	4.27	4.00	3.99	4.03
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	3	2	3	7	3.93	898/1384	3.93	4.27	4.10	4.12	3.93
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	16	0	0	3	2	2	8	4.00	970/1378	4.00	4.45	4.29	4.30	4.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	16	0	1	1	2	2	9	4.13	931/1378	4.13	4.57	4.31	4.33	4.13
4. Were special techniques successful	16	11	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	****/ 904	****	4.12	4.03	4.03	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	28	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 232	****	****	4.19	4.04	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	29	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 239	****	****	4.21	3.99	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	29	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 230	****	****	4.44	4.25	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	29	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 231	****	****	4.31	4.11	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	29	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 218	****	****	4.18	3.93	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	28	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 87	****	5.00	4.65	4.30	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	29	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 79	****	4.90	4.64	4.53	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	29	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 75	****	4.95	4.57	4.50	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	29	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 79	****	4.85	4.45	3.68	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	29	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 80	****	3.10	3.97	3.76	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	29	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 41	****	****	4.50	4.44	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	29	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 38	****	****	4.19	3.96	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	29	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 38	****	5.00	4.62	4.68	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	29	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 39	****	3.00	4.27	4.38	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	29	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 31	****	****	4.47	4.51	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	29	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 28	****	5.00	4.64	3.33	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	29	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 16	****	5.00	4.67	4.00	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	29	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 27	****	5.00	4.54	2.63	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	29	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 10	****	****	4.84	****	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	30	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 6	****	****	4.92	****	****

Course-Section: SOCY 335 0101
 Title: TERRORISM & SOCIAL VIO
 Instructor: HEWITT, CHRIS J
 Enrollment: 53
 Questionnaires: 31

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2008

Page 1505
 AUG 6, 2008
 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	8	Required for Majors	2	Graduate	0	Major	3
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	B	9						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	4	C	4	General	11	Under-grad	31	Non-major	28
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	4	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	11				
				?	2						

Course-Section: SOCY 345 0101
 Title SOCIOLOGY OF EDUCATION
 Instructor: PINCUS, FRED L
 Enrollment: 50
 Questionnaires: 24

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2008

Page 1506
 AUG 6, 2008
 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	1	0	1	1	6	6	9	3.91	1331/1670	3.91	4.36	4.31	4.24	3.91
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	1	0	6	8	8	3.96	1258/1666	3.96	4.40	4.27	4.18	3.96
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	0	0	2	5	7	8	3.95	1094/1406	3.95	4.42	4.32	4.22	3.95
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	1	0	0	5	7	9	4.19	944/1615	4.19	4.27	4.24	4.18	4.19
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	5	3	13	4.38	510/1566	4.38	4.28	4.07	4.04	4.38
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	4	0	1	2	5	6	6	3.70	1182/1528	3.70	4.22	4.12	4.07	3.70
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	5	0	0	2	3	6	8	4.05	1107/1650	4.05	4.37	4.22	4.12	4.05
8. How many times was class cancelled	4	0	0	3	3	11	3	3.70	1641/1667	3.70	4.64	4.67	4.67	3.70
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	1	0	4	11	3	3.79	1233/1626	3.79	4.22	4.11	4.06	3.79
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	2	9	10	4.38	1042/1559	4.38	4.58	4.46	4.40	4.38
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	0	2	2	16	4.70	1054/1560	4.70	4.86	4.72	4.67	4.70
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	0	1	3	10	6	4.05	1125/1549	4.05	4.50	4.31	4.25	4.05
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	2	2	9	7	4.05	1121/1546	4.05	4.49	4.32	4.24	4.05
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	5	1	1	2	5	5	5	3.61	985/1323	3.61	4.27	4.00	3.99	3.61
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	2	2	5	6	4.00	820/1384	4.00	4.27	4.10	4.12	4.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	10	0	0	1	2	1	10	4.43	695/1378	4.43	4.45	4.29	4.30	4.43
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	0	1	1	4	9	4.40	751/1378	4.40	4.57	4.31	4.33	4.40
4. Were special techniques successful	9	2	1	1	6	3	2	3.31	787/ 904	3.31	4.12	4.03	4.03	3.31

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	A	9	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	4
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	7						
56-83	5	2.00-2.99	2	C	2	General	6	Under-grad	24	Non-major	20
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	8	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	11				
				?	1						

Course-Section: SOCY 352 0101
 Title ISSUES IN HEALTH CARE
 Instructor: NOLIN, MICHAEL
 Enrollment: 65
 Questionnaires: 44

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2008

Page 1507
 AUG 6, 2008
 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	3	13	27	4.56	611/1670	4.56	4.36	4.31	4.24	4.56
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	2	17	24	4.51	608/1666	4.51	4.40	4.27	4.18	4.51
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	13	29	4.65	435/1406	4.65	4.42	4.32	4.22	4.65
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	1	1	6	11	24	4.30	813/1615	4.30	4.27	4.24	4.18	4.30
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	1	1	2	2	12	25	4.38	510/1566	4.38	4.28	4.07	4.04	4.38
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	1	0	1	5	13	23	4.38	580/1528	4.38	4.22	4.12	4.07	4.38
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	2	3	4	33	4.53	527/1650	4.53	4.37	4.22	4.12	4.53
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	3	40	4.93	472/1667	4.93	4.64	4.67	4.67	4.93
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	7	1	0	0	5	22	9	4.11	888/1626	4.11	4.22	4.11	4.06	4.11
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	1	12	29	4.67	673/1559	4.67	4.58	4.46	4.40	4.67
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	4	38	4.90	596/1560	4.90	4.86	4.72	4.67	4.90
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	2	13	27	4.60	574/1549	4.60	4.50	4.31	4.25	4.60
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	1	1	8	32	4.69	482/1546	4.69	4.49	4.32	4.24	4.69
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	4	1	1	6	10	20	4.24	560/1323	4.24	4.27	4.00	3.99	4.24
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	4	7	20	4.52	427/1384	4.52	4.27	4.10	4.12	4.52
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	13	0	0	0	1	4	26	4.81	348/1378	4.81	4.45	4.29	4.30	4.81
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	13	0	0	0	0	5	26	4.84	354/1378	4.84	4.57	4.31	4.33	4.84
4. Were special techniques successful	14	12	3	0	1	5	9	3.94	526/ 904	3.94	4.12	4.03	4.03	3.94
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	43	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 87	****	5.00	4.65	4.30	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	43	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 79	****	4.90	4.64	4.53	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	43	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 75	****	4.95	4.57	4.50	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	43	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 79	****	4.85	4.45	3.68	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	43	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 80	****	3.10	3.97	3.76	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors		

00-27	3	0.00-0.99	0	A	30	Required for Majors		7	Graduate	0	Major	2
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	B	5							
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	8	C	1	General		19	Under-grad	44	Non-major	42
84-150	15	3.00-3.49	8	D	0							
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	6	F	0	Electives		2	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0							
				I	0	Other		9				
				?	1							

Course-Section: SOCY 353 0101
 Title MARRIAGE AND THE FAMIL
 Instructor: SERVATIUS, NANC
 Enrollment: 90
 Questionnaires: 41

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2008

Page 1508
 AUG 6, 2008
 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	0	3	10	8	18	4.05	1189/1670	4.05	4.36	4.31	4.24	4.05
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	3	0	0	2	9	13	14	4.03	1186/1666	4.03	4.40	4.27	4.18	4.03
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	3	0	4	3	14	5	12	3.47	1284/1406	3.47	4.42	4.32	4.22	3.47
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	0	0	1	11	13	14	4.03	1072/1615	4.03	4.27	4.24	4.18	4.03
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	1	7	11	19	4.26	632/1566	4.26	4.28	4.07	4.04	4.26
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	3	2	1	1	8	12	14	4.03	887/1528	4.03	4.22	4.12	4.07	4.03
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	3	0	1	4	7	10	16	3.95	1220/1650	3.95	4.37	4.22	4.12	3.95
8. How many times was class cancelled	4	1	0	0	1	8	27	4.72	958/1667	4.72	4.64	4.67	4.67	4.72
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	14	1	0	3	7	7	9	3.85	1181/1626	3.85	4.22	4.11	4.06	3.85
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	5	0	2	6	4	6	18	3.89	1360/1559	3.89	4.58	4.46	4.40	3.89
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	1	1	4	32	4.76	929/1560	4.76	4.86	4.72	4.67	4.76
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	4	4	9	21	4.24	994/1549	4.24	4.50	4.31	4.25	4.24
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	1	5	1	0	5	25	4.22	1009/1546	4.22	4.49	4.32	4.24	4.22
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	5	12	3	2	4	5	10	3.71	941/1323	3.71	4.27	4.00	3.99	3.71
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	2	7	18	4.59	378/1384	4.59	4.27	4.10	4.12	4.59
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	14	0	0	0	4	4	19	4.56	564/1378	4.56	4.45	4.29	4.30	4.56
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	14	0	0	0	3	2	22	4.70	492/1378	4.70	4.57	4.31	4.33	4.70
4. Were special techniques successful	15	7	2	0	3	3	11	4.11	442/ 904	4.11	4.12	4.03	4.03	4.11
Laboratory														
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	40	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 239	****	****	4.21	3.99	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	40	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 231	****	****	4.31	4.11	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	40	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 87	****	5.00	4.65	4.30	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	40	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 79	****	4.90	4.64	4.53	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	40	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 75	****	4.95	4.57	4.50	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	40	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 79	****	4.85	4.45	3.68	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	40	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 80	****	3.10	3.97	3.76	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA	Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors				

00-27	1	0.00-0.99	1	A	21	Required for Majors	10	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	11						
56-83	6	2.00-2.99	7	C	0	General	13	Under-grad	41	Non-major	41
84-150	14	3.00-3.49	7	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5	F	0	Electives	3	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	7				
				?	0						

Course-Section: SOCY 354 0101
 Title SOC BASES:PUBL/COMM HL
 Instructor: KALFOGLOU, ANDR
 Enrollment: 46
 Questionnaires: 27

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2008

Page 1509
 AUG 6, 2008
 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	0	0	2	8	15	4.52	643/1670	4.52	4.36	4.31	4.24	4.52
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	0	0	4	7	14	4.40	784/1666	4.40	4.40	4.27	4.18	4.40
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	0	0	2	1	8	14	4.36	763/1406	4.36	4.42	4.32	4.22	4.36
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	0	0	1	3	5	16	4.44	633/1615	4.44	4.27	4.24	4.18	4.44
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	1	8	16	4.60	339/1566	4.60	4.28	4.07	4.04	4.60
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	0	3	8	13	4.28	679/1528	4.28	4.22	4.12	4.07	4.28
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	1	3	4	17	4.48	600/1650	4.48	4.37	4.22	4.12	4.48
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	21	4	4.16	1430/1667	4.16	4.64	4.67	4.67	4.16
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	10	0	0	0	2	7	8	4.35	616/1626	4.35	4.22	4.11	4.06	4.35
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	4	8	12	4.33	1092/1559	4.33	4.58	4.46	4.40	4.33
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	2	1	21	4.79	873/1560	4.79	4.86	4.72	4.67	4.79
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	3	6	15	4.50	683/1549	4.50	4.50	4.31	4.25	4.50
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	1	0	4	6	13	4.25	987/1546	4.25	4.49	4.32	4.24	4.25
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	0	1	1	3	3	16	4.33	481/1323	4.33	4.27	4.00	3.99	4.33
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	11	0	1	0	3	5	7	4.06	805/1384	4.06	4.27	4.10	4.12	4.06
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	11	0	0	0	2	3	11	4.56	556/1378	4.56	4.45	4.29	4.30	4.56
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	11	0	0	0	0	2	14	4.88	312/1378	4.88	4.57	4.31	4.33	4.88
4. Were special techniques successful	11	2	0	2	2	3	7	4.07	447/ 904	4.07	4.12	4.03	4.03	4.07
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	24	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 232	****	****	4.19	4.04	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	24	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 239	****	****	4.21	3.99	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	24	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 230	****	****	4.44	4.25	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	24	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 231	****	****	4.31	4.11	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	24	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 218	****	****	4.18	3.93	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	24	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 87	****	5.00	4.65	4.30	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	24	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 79	****	4.90	4.64	4.53	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	24	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 75	****	4.95	4.57	4.50	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	24	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 79	****	4.85	4.45	3.68	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	24	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 80	****	3.10	3.97	3.76	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	24	0	1	0	0	0	2	3.67	****/ 41	****	****	4.50	4.44	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	25	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 38	****	****	4.19	3.96	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	25	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 38	****	5.00	4.62	4.68	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	25	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 39	****	3.00	4.27	4.38	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	25	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.47	4.51	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	24	0	1	0	0	0	2	3.67	****/ 28	****	5.00	4.64	3.33	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	25	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 16	****	5.00	4.67	4.00	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	25	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 27	****	5.00	4.54	2.63	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	25	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 10	****	****	4.84	****	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	25	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 6	****	****	4.92	****	****

Course-Section: SOCY 354 0101
 Title SOC BASES:PUBL/COMM HL
 Instructor: KALFOGLOU, ANDR
 Enrollment: 46
 Questionnaires: 27

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2008

Page 1509
 AUG 6, 2008
 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	2	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B	2						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	1	C	0	General	2	Under-grad	27	Non-major	27
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	11				
				?	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	2	2	8	9	13	3.85	1379/1670	3.85	4.36	4.31	4.24	3.85
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	2	4	8	6	14	3.76	1403/1666	3.76	4.40	4.27	4.18	3.76
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	4	5	9	15	4.06	1021/1406	4.06	4.42	4.32	4.22	4.06
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	1	2	1	7	7	15	4.00	1083/1615	4.00	4.27	4.24	4.18	4.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	1	2	4	4	9	13	3.84	1068/1566	3.84	4.28	4.07	4.04	3.84
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	3	4	4	2	7	13	3.70	1182/1528	3.70	4.22	4.12	4.07	3.70
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	1	0	0	5	6	20	4.48	600/1650	4.48	4.37	4.22	4.12	4.48
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	2	0	0	19	13	4.21	1402/1667	4.21	4.64	4.67	4.67	4.21
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	1	4	8	13	4	3.50	1384/1626	3.50	4.22	4.11	4.06	3.50
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	3	1	5	9	13	3.90	1352/1559	3.90	4.58	4.46	4.40	3.90
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	2	5	5	19	4.32	1383/1560	4.32	4.86	4.72	4.67	4.32
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	1	4	9	6	12	3.75	1308/1549	3.75	4.50	4.31	4.25	3.75
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	3	1	6	6	15	3.94	1204/1546	3.94	4.49	4.32	4.24	3.94
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	4	4	0	5	5	13	3.85	857/1323	3.85	4.27	4.00	3.99	3.85
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	12	0	2	2	4	3	11	3.86	949/1384	3.86	4.27	4.10	4.12	3.86
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	12	0	3	0	2	5	12	4.05	954/1378	4.05	4.45	4.29	4.30	4.05
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	12	0	1	0	2	6	13	4.36	786/1378	4.36	4.57	4.31	4.33	4.36
4. Were special techniques successful	12	8	0	1	4	3	6	4.00	461/ 904	4.00	4.12	4.03	4.03	4.00
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	32	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 232	****	****	4.19	4.04	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	32	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 239	****	****	4.21	3.99	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	32	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 230	****	****	4.44	4.25	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	32	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 231	****	****	4.31	4.11	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	32	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 218	****	****	4.18	3.93	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	32	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 87	****	5.00	4.65	4.30	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	32	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 79	****	4.90	4.64	4.53	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	32	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 75	****	4.95	4.57	4.50	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	32	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 79	****	4.85	4.45	3.68	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	32	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 80	****	3.10	3.97	3.76	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	32	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 41	****	****	4.50	4.44	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	32	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 38	****	****	4.19	3.96	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	32	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 38	****	5.00	4.62	4.68	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	32	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 39	****	3.00	4.27	4.38	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	32	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.47	4.51	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	32	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 28	****	5.00	4.64	3.33	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	32	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 16	****	5.00	4.67	4.00	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	32	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 27	****	5.00	4.54	2.63	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	32	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 10	****	****	4.84	****	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	32	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 6	****	****	4.92	****	****

Course-Section: SOCY 372 0101
 Title JUVENILE DELINQUENCY
 Instructor: KNAPP, ROLAND
 Enrollment: 54
 Questionnaires: 34

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2008

Page 1510
 AUG 6, 2008
 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	13	Required for Majors	3	Graduate	0	Major	2
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	0	B	11						
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	8	C	3	General	11	Under-grad	34	Non-major	32
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	7	F	1	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	14				
				?	0						

Course-Section: SOCY 380 0101
 Title POLITICAL SOCIOLOGY
 Instructor: SECKIN, GUL
 Enrollment: 34
 Questionnaires: 25

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2008

Page 1511
 AUG 6, 2008
 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	0	1	23	4.96	103/1670	4.96	4.36	4.31	4.24	4.96
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	3	21	4.88	198/1666	4.88	4.40	4.27	4.18	4.88
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	12	0	0	1	0	11	4.83	240/1406	4.83	4.42	4.32	4.22	4.83
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	2	0	0	2	1	19	4.77	272/1615	4.77	4.27	4.24	4.18	4.77
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	1	23	4.96	66/1566	4.96	4.28	4.07	4.04	4.96
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	1	0	0	0	1	22	4.96	61/1528	4.96	4.22	4.12	4.07	4.96
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	1	0	0	0	2	21	4.91	143/1650	4.91	4.37	4.22	4.12	4.91
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	19	5	4.21	1402/1667	4.21	4.64	4.67	4.67	4.21
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	0	6	15	4.71	239/1626	4.71	4.22	4.11	4.06	4.71
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	1	3	20	4.79	452/1559	4.79	4.58	4.46	4.40	4.79
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	1	23	4.96	298/1560	4.96	4.86	4.72	4.67	4.96
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	3	21	4.88	229/1549	4.88	4.50	4.31	4.25	4.88
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	1	22	4.88	265/1546	4.88	4.49	4.32	4.24	4.88
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	0	0	0	0	1	21	4.95	60/1323	4.95	4.27	4.00	3.99	4.95
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	1	2	14	4.76	249/1384	4.76	4.27	4.10	4.12	4.76
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	0	0	1	0	16	4.88	264/1378	4.88	4.45	4.29	4.30	4.88
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	0	0	0	0	17	5.00	1/1378	5.00	4.57	4.31	4.33	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	8	2	0	1	1	1	12	4.60	202/ 904	4.60	4.12	4.03	4.03	4.60

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	1	0.00-0.99 0	A 21	Required for Majors 6	Graduate 0 Major 2
28-55	1	1.00-1.99 0	B 0		
56-83	5	2.00-2.99 4	C 0	General 7	Under-grad 25 Non-major 23
84-150	8	3.00-3.49 4	D 0		
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 8	
			? 0		

Course-Section: SOCY 396 0101
 Title COMM SERV & LEARN INTE
 Instructor: WOLFF, MICHELE
 Enrollment: 13
 Questionnaires: 10

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2008

Page 1512
 AUG 6, 2008
 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	0	0	2	4	2	4.00	1216/1670	4.00	4.36	4.31	4.24	4.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	0	0	1	4	3	4.25	967/1666	4.25	4.40	4.27	4.18	4.25
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	3	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	924/1406	4.20	4.42	4.32	4.22	4.20
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	4	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	874/1615	4.25	4.27	4.24	4.18	4.25
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	1	4	3	4.25	643/1566	4.25	4.28	4.07	4.04	4.25
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	2	0	0	1	3	2	4.17	787/1528	4.17	4.22	4.12	4.07	4.17
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	3	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	973/1650	4.20	4.37	4.22	4.12	4.20
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	922/1667	4.75	4.64	4.67	4.67	4.75
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	0	0	0	0	3	1	4.25	728/1626	4.25	4.22	4.11	4.06	4.25
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	673/1559	4.67	4.58	4.46	4.40	4.67
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	1090/1560	4.67	4.86	4.72	4.67	4.67
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	488/1549	4.67	4.50	4.31	4.25	4.67
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	520/1546	4.67	4.49	4.32	4.24	4.67
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	6	3	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1323	****	4.27	4.00	3.99	****
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1384	5.00	4.27	4.10	4.12	5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1378	5.00	4.45	4.29	4.30	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1378	5.00	4.57	4.31	4.33	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	5	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	128/ 904	4.80	4.12	4.03	4.03	4.80

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	0
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	1	C	0
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	1	D	0
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	0	F	0
				P	3
				I	0
				?	0
					0

- Means there are not enough responses to be significant

Course-Section: SOCY 397A 0101
 Title MEDIA AND SOCIETY
 Instructor: TUFEKCIOGLU, ZE
 Enrollment: 28
 Questionnaires: 19

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2008

Page 1513
 AUG 6, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	1	0	1	6	11	4.37	862/1670	4.37	4.36	4.31	4.24	4.37
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	5	12	4.53	595/1666	4.53	4.40	4.27	4.18	4.53
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	7	9	4.32	823/1406	4.32	4.42	4.32	4.22	4.32
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	1	0	2	8	7	4.11	1018/1615	4.11	4.27	4.24	4.18	4.11
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	5	13	4.63	317/1566	4.63	4.28	4.07	4.04	4.63
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	4	6	8	4.11	842/1528	4.11	4.22	4.12	4.07	4.11
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	3	16	4.84	201/1650	4.84	4.37	4.22	4.12	4.84
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	15	3	4.17	1430/1667	4.17	4.64	4.67	4.67	4.17
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	7	0	0	0	2	5	5	4.25	728/1626	4.25	4.22	4.11	4.06	4.25
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	4	15	4.79	469/1559	4.79	4.58	4.46	4.40	4.79
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	2	17	4.89	621/1560	4.89	4.86	4.72	4.67	4.89
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	6	13	4.68	463/1549	4.68	4.50	4.31	4.25	4.68
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	2	16	4.79	370/1546	4.79	4.49	4.32	4.24	4.79
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	0	1	0	17	4.89	126/1323	4.89	4.27	4.00	3.99	4.89
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	1	1	5	6	4.23	683/1384	4.23	4.27	4.10	4.12	4.23
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	0	0	3	10	4.77	389/1378	4.77	4.45	4.29	4.30	4.77
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	0	0	0	2	11	4.85	344/1378	4.85	4.57	4.31	4.33	4.85
4. Were special techniques successful	6	3	0	1	2	0	7	4.30	345/ 904	4.30	4.12	4.03	4.03	4.30
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 232	****	****	4.19	4.04	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 239	****	****	4.21	3.99	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 230	****	****	4.44	4.25	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 231	****	****	4.31	4.11	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 218	****	****	4.18	3.93	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 87	****	5.00	4.65	4.30	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 79	****	4.90	4.64	4.53	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 75	****	4.95	4.57	4.50	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 79	****	4.85	4.45	3.68	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 80	****	3.10	3.97	3.76	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 41	****	****	4.50	4.44	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 38	****	****	4.19	3.96	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 38	****	5.00	4.62	4.68	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 39	****	3.00	4.27	4.38	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.47	4.51	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 28	****	5.00	4.64	3.33	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 16	****	5.00	4.67	4.00	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 27	****	5.00	4.54	2.63	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 10	****	****	4.84	****	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 6	****	****	4.92	****	****

Course-Section: SOCY 397A 0101
 Title MEDIA AND SOCIETY
 Instructor: TUFEKCIOGLU, ZE
 Enrollment: 28
 Questionnaires: 19

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2008

Page 1513
 AUG 6, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	7	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	2
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	5						
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	3	C	1	General	6	Under-grad	19	Non-major	17
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	5				
				?	0						

Course-Section: SOCY 397B 0101
 Title ENVIRONMENTAL SOCIOLOG
 Instructor: MACLENNAN, JAMI
 Enrollment: 41
 Questionnaires: 22

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2008

Page 1514
 AUG 6, 2008
 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	2	3	17	4.68	453/1670	4.68	4.36	4.31	4.24	4.68
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	1	2	5	13	4.27	943/1666	4.27	4.40	4.27	4.18	4.27
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	14	0	1	0	0	6	4.57	525/1406	4.57	4.42	4.32	4.22	4.57
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	5	15	4.59	456/1615	4.59	4.27	4.24	4.18	4.59
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	2	5	14	4.57	354/1566	4.57	4.28	4.07	4.04	4.57
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	4	17	4.81	173/1528	4.81	4.22	4.12	4.07	4.81
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	1	0	1	19	4.81	229/1650	4.81	4.37	4.22	4.12	4.81
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	22	5.00	1/1667	5.00	4.64	4.67	4.67	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	2	3	13	4.61	316/1626	4.61	4.22	4.11	4.06	4.61
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	3	4	13	4.50	896/1559	4.50	4.58	4.46	4.40	4.50
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	0	20	5.00	1/1560	5.00	4.86	4.72	4.67	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	1	0	5	14	4.60	562/1549	4.60	4.50	4.31	4.25	4.60
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	1	5	14	4.65	532/1546	4.65	4.49	4.32	4.24	4.65
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	0	0	0	1	2	16	4.79	167/1323	4.79	4.27	4.00	3.99	4.79
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	0	0	14	5.00	1/1384	5.00	4.27	4.10	4.12	5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	0	0	0	1	13	4.93	194/1378	4.93	4.45	4.29	4.30	4.93
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	0	0	0	1	13	4.93	225/1378	4.93	4.57	4.31	4.33	4.93
4. Were special techniques successful	9	6	0	0	1	1	5	4.57	214/ 904	4.57	4.12	4.03	4.03	4.57
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 87	****	5.00	4.65	4.30	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 79	****	4.90	4.64	4.53	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 75	****	4.95	4.57	4.50	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 79	****	4.85	4.45	3.68	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 80	****	3.10	3.97	3.76	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 16	Required for Majors	1
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	B 2		Graduate 0
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	C 0	General	8
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad 22
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	1
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	6
			? 0		

Course-Section: SOCY 409 0101
 Title SOCIOLOGICAL THEORY
 Instructor: COHEN, JERE M
 Enrollment: 44
 Questionnaires: 21

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2008

Page 1515
 AUG 6, 2008
 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	1	3	17	4.76	350/1670	4.76	4.36	4.31	4.45	4.76
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	3	16	4.67	415/1666	4.67	4.40	4.27	4.35	4.67
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	0	3	17	4.71	363/1406	4.71	4.42	4.32	4.48	4.71
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	5	1	0	4	2	9	4.13	1009/1615	4.13	4.27	4.24	4.37	4.13
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	4	15	4.62	331/1566	4.62	4.28	4.07	4.17	4.62
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	9	1	0	1	0	10	4.50	421/1528	4.50	4.22	4.12	4.26	4.50
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	2	1	2	15	4.33	806/1650	4.33	4.37	4.22	4.28	4.33
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	1	19	4.95	405/1667	4.95	4.64	4.67	4.73	4.95
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	2	0	0	1	7	8	4.44	515/1626	4.44	4.22	4.11	4.28	4.44
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	2	18	4.90	276/1559	4.90	4.58	4.46	4.58	4.90
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	1	0	19	4.90	596/1560	4.90	4.86	4.72	4.80	4.90
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	3	1	16	4.65	500/1549	4.65	4.50	4.31	4.43	4.65
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	0	0	19	4.85	288/1546	4.85	4.49	4.32	4.43	4.85
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	13	0	0	3	0	3	4.00	692/1323	4.00	4.27	4.00	4.10	4.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	5	3	8	4.19	721/1384	4.19	4.27	4.10	4.32	4.19
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	0	2	3	11	4.56	556/1378	4.56	4.45	4.29	4.55	4.56
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	0	0	2	14	4.88	312/1378	4.88	4.57	4.31	4.60	4.88
4. Were special techniques successful	6	13	1	1	0	0	0	1.50	****/ 904	****	4.12	4.03	4.22	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	5	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	12
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	12						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	2	C	2	General	0	Under-grad	21	Non-major	9
84-150	7	3.00-3.49	4	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	17				
				?	1						

Course-Section: SOCY 418 0101
 Title SAS FOR SOCIAL SCIENTI
 Instructor: MILLER, JAYNE M
 Enrollment: 25
 Questionnaires: 21

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2008

Page 1516
 AUG 6, 2008
 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	2	1	16	4.48	708/1670	4.48	4.36	4.31	4.45	4.48
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	6	12	4.43	751/1666	4.43	4.40	4.27	4.35	4.43
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	3	16	4.67	423/1406	4.67	4.42	4.32	4.48	4.67
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	1	3	4	12	4.35	750/1615	4.35	4.27	4.24	4.37	4.35
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	2	3	4	10	4.00	851/1566	4.00	4.28	4.07	4.17	4.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	3	0	0	1	4	12	4.65	315/1528	4.65	4.22	4.12	4.26	4.65
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	0	4	16	4.80	229/1650	4.80	4.37	4.22	4.28	4.80
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	12	9	4.43	1236/1667	4.43	4.64	4.67	4.73	4.43
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	1	0	0	5	9	4	3.94	1055/1626	3.94	4.22	4.11	4.28	3.94
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	5	16	4.76	503/1559	4.76	4.58	4.46	4.58	4.76
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	3	18	4.86	725/1560	4.86	4.86	4.72	4.80	4.86
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	6	4	11	4.24	994/1549	4.24	4.50	4.31	4.43	4.24
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	4	5	12	4.38	869/1546	4.38	4.49	4.32	4.43	4.38
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	2	0	0	2	3	14	4.63	254/1323	4.63	4.27	4.00	4.10	4.63
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	1	1	5	3	8	3.89	940/1384	3.89	4.27	4.10	4.32	3.89
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	1	1	17	4.84	306/1378	4.84	4.45	4.29	4.55	4.84
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	1	1	1	0	15	4.50	653/1378	4.50	4.57	4.31	4.60	4.50
4. Were special techniques successful	3	10	2	0	0	0	6	4.00	461/ 904	4.00	4.12	4.03	4.22	4.00
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	18	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 232	****	****	4.19	4.35	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	18	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 239	****	****	4.21	4.26	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	18	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 230	****	****	4.44	4.30	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	18	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 231	****	****	4.31	4.24	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	18	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 218	****	****	4.18	4.09	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	19	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 87	****	5.00	4.65	4.80	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	19	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 79	****	4.90	4.64	4.60	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 75	****	4.95	4.57	4.56	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 79	****	4.85	4.45	4.53	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	19	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 80	****	3.10	3.97	3.67	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 41	****	****	4.50	4.98	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	19	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 38	****	****	4.19	4.36	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	19	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 38	****	5.00	4.62	4.58	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	19	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 39	****	3.00	4.27	4.02	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	19	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 31	****	****	4.47	4.49	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 28	****	5.00	4.64	5.00	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	19	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 16	****	5.00	4.67	4.80	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	19	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 27	****	5.00	4.54	5.00	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	19	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 10	****	****	4.84	****	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	19	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 6	****	****	4.92	****	****

Course-Section: SOCY 418 0101
 Title SAS FOR SOCIAL SCIENTI
 Instructor: MILLER, JAYNE M
 Enrollment: 25
 Questionnaires: 21

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2008

Page 1516
 AUG 6, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	0	A	19	Required for Majors	6	Graduate	9	Major	6
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	0						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	7	Under-grad	12	Non-major	15
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	9	3.50-4.00	10	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	6				
				?	0						

Course-Section: SOCY 420 0101
 Title SOCIAL EPIDEMIOLOGY
 Instructor: TOLEA, MAGDALEN
 Enrollment: 38
 Questionnaires: 23

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2008

Page 1517
 AUG 6, 2008
 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	1	6	4	10	3.95	1280/1670	3.95	4.36	4.31	4.45	3.95
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	2	3	4	13	4.27	943/1666	4.27	4.40	4.27	4.35	4.27
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	1	2	3	16	4.55	556/1406	4.55	4.42	4.32	4.48	4.55
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	1	0	0	5	4	12	4.33	775/1615	4.33	4.27	4.24	4.37	4.33
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	5	6	10	4.24	664/1566	4.24	4.28	4.07	4.17	4.24
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	1	4	3	13	4.33	631/1528	4.33	4.22	4.12	4.26	4.33
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	1	3	2	3	12	4.05	1112/1650	4.05	4.37	4.22	4.28	4.05
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	0	21	5.00	1/1667	5.00	4.64	4.67	4.73	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	0	1	1	4	7	4	3.71	1289/1626	3.71	4.22	4.11	4.28	3.71
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	1	1	1	1	16	4.50	896/1559	4.50	4.58	4.46	4.58	4.50
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	1	1	19	4.86	725/1560	4.86	4.86	4.72	4.80	4.86
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	1	1	2	2	14	4.35	876/1549	4.35	4.50	4.31	4.43	4.35
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	2	0	4	1	13	4.15	1064/1546	4.15	4.49	4.32	4.43	4.15
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	3	1	0	0	6	10	4.41	413/1323	4.41	4.27	4.00	4.10	4.41
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	9	0	4	1	2	1	6	3.29	1191/1384	3.29	4.27	4.10	4.32	3.29
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	9	0	2	1	0	4	7	3.93	1039/1378	3.93	4.45	4.29	4.55	3.93
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	0	1	1	3	9	4.43	731/1378	4.43	4.57	4.31	4.60	4.43
4. Were special techniques successful	9	9	1	0	0	0	4	4.20	****/ 904	****	4.12	4.03	4.22	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	21	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 232	****	****	4.19	4.35	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	21	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 239	****	****	4.21	4.26	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	21	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 230	****	****	4.44	4.30	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	21	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 231	****	****	4.31	4.24	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	21	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 218	****	****	4.18	4.09	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	21	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 87	****	5.00	4.65	4.80	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	21	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 79	****	4.90	4.64	4.60	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	21	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 75	****	4.95	4.57	4.56	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	21	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 79	****	4.85	4.45	4.53	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	21	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 80	****	3.10	3.97	3.67	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	21	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 41	****	****	4.50	4.98	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	21	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 38	****	****	4.19	4.36	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	21	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 38	****	5.00	4.62	4.58	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	21	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 39	****	3.00	4.27	4.02	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	21	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.47	4.49	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	21	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 28	****	5.00	4.64	5.00	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	21	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 16	****	5.00	4.67	4.80	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	21	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 27	****	5.00	4.54	5.00	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	21	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 10	****	****	4.84	****	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	21	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 6	****	****	4.92	****	****

Course-Section: SOCY 420 0101
 Title SOCIAL EPIDEMIOLOGY
 Instructor: TOLEA, MAGDALEN
 Enrollment: 38
 Questionnaires: 23

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2008

Page 1517
 AUG 6, 2008
 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	0	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	3						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	3	C	1	General	6	Under-grad	23	Non-major	22
84-150	6	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	13				
				?	1						

Course-Section: SOCY 431 0101
 Title FAMILY/AGING IN SOCIET
 Instructor: SCHUMACHER, JOH (Instr. A)
 Enrollment: 6
 Questionnaires: 4

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2008

Page 1518
 AUG 6, 2008
 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	1	3	4.75	363/1670	4.75	4.36	4.31	4.45	4.75
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1666	5.00	4.40	4.27	4.35	5.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	318/1406	4.75	4.42	4.32	4.48	4.75
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	552/1615	4.50	4.27	4.24	4.37	4.50
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	643/1566	4.25	4.28	4.07	4.17	4.25
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	421/1528	4.50	4.22	4.12	4.26	4.50
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	570/1650	4.50	4.37	4.22	4.28	4.50
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1667	5.00	4.64	4.67	4.73	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	278/1626	4.92	4.22	4.11	4.28	4.92
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1559	5.00	4.58	4.46	4.58	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1560	5.00	4.86	4.72	4.80	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1549	5.00	4.50	4.31	4.43	5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	715/1546	4.88	4.49	4.32	4.43	4.88
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1323	5.00	4.27	4.00	4.10	5.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1384	5.00	4.27	4.10	4.32	5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	481/1378	4.67	4.45	4.29	4.55	4.67
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1378	5.00	4.57	4.31	4.60	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	1	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	328/ 904	4.33	4.12	4.03	4.22	4.33
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 87	5.00	5.00	4.65	4.80	5.00
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 79	5.00	4.90	4.64	4.60	5.00
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 75	5.00	4.95	4.57	4.56	5.00
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 79	5.00	4.85	4.45	4.53	5.00
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	3	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	67/ 80	3.00	3.10	3.97	3.67	3.00
Field Work														
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 38	5.00	5.00	4.62	4.58	5.00
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	3	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	34/ 39	3.00	3.00	4.27	4.02	3.00
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 28	5.00	5.00	4.64	5.00	5.00
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 16	5.00	5.00	4.67	4.80	5.00
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 27	5.00	5.00	4.54	5.00	5.00

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: SOCY 431 0101
 Title FAMILY/AGING IN SOCIETY
 Instructor: (Instr. B)
 Enrollment: 6
 Questionnaires: 4

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2008

Page 1519
 AUG 6, 2008
 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	1	3	4.75	363/1670	4.75	4.36	4.31	4.45	4.75
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1666	5.00	4.40	4.27	4.35	5.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	318/1406	4.75	4.42	4.32	4.48	4.75
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	552/1615	4.50	4.27	4.24	4.37	4.50
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	643/1566	4.25	4.28	4.07	4.17	4.25
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	421/1528	4.50	4.22	4.12	4.26	4.50
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	570/1650	4.50	4.37	4.22	4.28	4.50
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1667	5.00	4.64	4.67	4.73	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1626	4.92	4.22	4.11	4.28	4.92
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1559	5.00	4.58	4.46	4.58	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1560	5.00	4.86	4.72	4.80	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1549	5.00	4.50	4.31	4.43	5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1546	4.88	4.49	4.32	4.43	4.88
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1323	5.00	4.27	4.00	4.10	5.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1384	5.00	4.27	4.10	4.32	5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	481/1378	4.67	4.45	4.29	4.55	4.67
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1378	5.00	4.57	4.31	4.60	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	1	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	328/ 904	4.33	4.12	4.03	4.22	4.33
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 87	5.00	5.00	4.65	4.80	5.00
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 79	5.00	4.90	4.64	4.60	5.00
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 75	5.00	4.95	4.57	4.56	5.00
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 79	5.00	4.85	4.45	4.53	5.00
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	3	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	67/ 80	3.00	3.10	3.97	3.67	3.00
Field Work														
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 38	5.00	5.00	4.62	4.58	5.00
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	3	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	34/ 39	3.00	3.00	4.27	4.02	3.00
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 28	5.00	5.00	4.64	5.00	5.00
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 16	5.00	5.00	4.67	4.80	5.00
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 27	5.00	5.00	4.54	5.00	5.00

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: SOCY 431 0101
 Title FAMILY/AGING IN SOCIETY
 Instructor: (Instr. C)
 Enrollment: 6
 Questionnaires: 4

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2008

Page 1520
 AUG 6, 2008
 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	1	3	4.75	363/1670	4.75	4.36	4.31	4.45	4.75
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1666	5.00	4.40	4.27	4.35	5.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	318/1406	4.75	4.42	4.32	4.48	4.75
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	552/1615	4.50	4.27	4.24	4.37	4.50
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	643/1566	4.25	4.28	4.07	4.17	4.25
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	421/1528	4.50	4.22	4.12	4.26	4.50
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	570/1650	4.50	4.37	4.22	4.28	4.50
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1667	5.00	4.64	4.67	4.73	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1626	4.92	4.22	4.11	4.28	4.92
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1559	5.00	4.58	4.46	4.58	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1560	5.00	4.86	4.72	4.80	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1549	5.00	4.50	4.31	4.43	5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1546	4.88	4.49	4.32	4.43	4.88
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1323	5.00	4.27	4.00	4.10	5.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1384	5.00	4.27	4.10	4.32	5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	481/1378	4.67	4.45	4.29	4.55	4.67
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1378	5.00	4.57	4.31	4.60	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	1	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	328/ 904	4.33	4.12	4.03	4.22	4.33
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 87	5.00	5.00	4.65	4.80	5.00
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 79	5.00	4.90	4.64	4.60	5.00
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 75	5.00	4.95	4.57	4.56	5.00
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 79	5.00	4.85	4.45	4.53	5.00
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	3	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	67/ 80	3.00	3.10	3.97	3.67	3.00
Field Work														
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 38	5.00	5.00	4.62	4.58	5.00
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	3	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	34/ 39	3.00	3.00	4.27	4.02	3.00
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 28	5.00	5.00	4.64	5.00	5.00
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 16	5.00	5.00	4.67	4.80	5.00
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 27	5.00	5.00	4.54	5.00	5.00

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: SOCY 431 0101
 Title FAMILY/AGING IN SOCIET
 Instructor: (Instr. D)
 Enrollment: 6
 Questionnaires: 4

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2008

Page 1521
 AUG 6, 2008
 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	1	3	4.75	363/1670	4.75	4.36	4.31	4.45	4.75
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1666	5.00	4.40	4.27	4.35	5.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	318/1406	4.75	4.42	4.32	4.48	4.75
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	552/1615	4.50	4.27	4.24	4.37	4.50
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	643/1566	4.25	4.28	4.07	4.17	4.25
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	421/1528	4.50	4.22	4.12	4.26	4.50
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	570/1650	4.50	4.37	4.22	4.28	4.50
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1667	5.00	4.64	4.67	4.73	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1626	4.92	4.22	4.11	4.28	4.92
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1559	5.00	4.58	4.46	4.58	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1560	5.00	4.86	4.72	4.80	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1549	5.00	4.50	4.31	4.43	5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1546	4.88	4.49	4.32	4.43	4.88
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1323	5.00	4.27	4.00	4.10	5.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1384	5.00	4.27	4.10	4.32	5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	481/1378	4.67	4.45	4.29	4.55	4.67
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1378	5.00	4.57	4.31	4.60	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	1	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	328/ 904	4.33	4.12	4.03	4.22	4.33
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 87	5.00	5.00	4.65	4.80	5.00
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 79	5.00	4.90	4.64	4.60	5.00
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 75	5.00	4.95	4.57	4.56	5.00
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 79	5.00	4.85	4.45	4.53	5.00
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	3	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	67/ 80	3.00	3.10	3.97	3.67	3.00
Field Work														
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 38	5.00	5.00	4.62	4.58	5.00
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	3	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	34/ 39	3.00	3.00	4.27	4.02	3.00
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 28	5.00	5.00	4.64	5.00	5.00
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 16	5.00	5.00	4.67	4.80	5.00
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 27	5.00	5.00	4.54	5.00	5.00

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: SOCY 452 0101
 Title HEALTH CARE ORG/DEL
 Instructor: BREWER, MARY A
 Enrollment: 22
 Questionnaires: 12

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2008

Page 1522
 AUG 6, 2008
 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	3	3	5	3.92	1331/1670	3.92	4.36	4.31	4.45	3.92
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	5	5	4.25	967/1666	4.25	4.40	4.27	4.35	4.25
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	4	4	4	4.00	1057/1406	4.00	4.42	4.32	4.48	4.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	0	4	2	3	3.89	1246/1615	3.89	4.27	4.24	4.37	3.89
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	2	3	6	4.17	734/1566	4.17	4.28	4.07	4.17	4.17
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	7	0	0	4	0	1	3.40	1328/1528	3.40	4.22	4.12	4.26	3.40
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	0	3	8	4.50	570/1650	4.50	4.37	4.22	4.28	4.50
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1667	5.00	4.64	4.67	4.73	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	1	0	0	5	2	2	3.67	1312/1626	3.67	4.22	4.11	4.28	3.67
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	2	5	5	4.25	1157/1559	4.25	4.58	4.46	4.58	4.25
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	536/1560	4.92	4.86	4.72	4.80	4.92
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	2	5	5	4.25	977/1549	4.25	4.50	4.31	4.43	4.25
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	1	4	6	4.25	987/1546	4.25	4.49	4.32	4.43	4.25
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	1	0	2	4	5	4.00	692/1323	4.00	4.27	4.00	4.10	4.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	1	2	4	2	3.50	1103/1384	3.50	4.27	4.10	4.32	3.50
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	1	2	3	4	4.00	970/1378	4.00	4.45	4.29	4.55	4.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	1	1	1	4	3	3.70	1135/1378	3.70	4.57	4.31	4.60	3.70
4. Were special techniques successful	2	6	2	0	0	2	0	2.50	865/ 904	2.50	4.12	4.03	4.22	2.50
Laboratory														
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	11	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 239	****	****	4.21	4.26	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	11	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 41	****	****	4.50	4.98	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	11	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 38	****	****	4.19	4.36	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	11	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 28	****	5.00	4.64	5.00	****

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: SOCY 497B 0101
 Title HLTH & ILLNESS 21ST CE
 Instructor: ROTHSTEIN, WILL
 Enrollment: 19
 Questionnaires: 14

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2008

Page 1523
 AUG 6, 2008
 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	1	3	10	4.64	505/1670	4.64	4.36	4.31	4.45	4.64
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	5	2	6	3.93	1294/1666	3.93	4.40	4.27	4.35	3.93
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	3	9	4.50	597/1406	4.50	4.42	4.32	4.48	4.50
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	1	4	8	4.54	520/1615	4.54	4.27	4.24	4.37	4.54
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	3	11	4.79	202/1566	4.79	4.28	4.07	4.17	4.79
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	2	3	2	7	4.00	899/1528	4.00	4.22	4.12	4.26	4.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	2	0	4	1	7	3.79	1341/1650	3.79	4.37	4.22	4.28	3.79
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	14	5.00	1/1667	5.00	4.64	4.67	4.73	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	1	0	1	0	6	3	4.10	900/1626	4.10	4.22	4.11	4.28	4.10
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	1	1	1	10	4.54	858/1559	4.54	4.58	4.46	4.58	4.54
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	2	11	4.85	751/1560	4.85	4.86	4.72	4.80	4.85
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	2	3	8	4.46	736/1549	4.46	4.50	4.31	4.43	4.46
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	3	1	8	4.23	1002/1546	4.23	4.49	4.32	4.43	4.23
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	8	1	0	2	1	0	2.75	1248/1323	2.75	4.27	4.00	4.10	2.75
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	1	1	1	1	7	4.09	798/1384	4.09	4.27	4.10	4.32	4.09
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	243/1378	4.91	4.45	4.29	4.55	4.91
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	2	0	9	4.64	560/1378	4.64	4.57	4.31	4.60	4.64
4. Were special techniques successful	3	9	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 904	****	4.12	4.03	4.22	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	10	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/ 87	5.00	5.00	4.65	4.80	5.00
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	10	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	53/ 79	4.50	4.90	4.64	4.60	4.50
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	41/ 75	4.75	4.95	4.57	4.56	4.75
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	1	0	0	3	4.25	55/ 79	4.25	4.85	4.45	4.53	4.25
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	10	0	1	0	1	0	2	3.50	55/ 80	3.50	3.10	3.97	3.67	3.50
Field Work														
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.47	4.49	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors		
00-27	6	0.00-0.99	0	A 10	Required for Majors 3	Graduate 4	Major 0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B 4			
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	1	C 0	General 5	Under-grad 10	Non-major 14
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D 0			
Grad.	4	3.50-4.00	7	F 0	Electives 0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	
				P 0			
				I 0	Other 5		
				? 0			

Course-Section: SOCY 604 0101
 Title STATISTICAL ANALYSIS
 Instructor: ADLER, MARINA
 Enrollment: 20
 Questionnaires: 17

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2008

Page 1524
 AUG 6, 2008
 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	2	15	4.88	224/1670	4.58	4.36	4.31	4.46	4.88
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	1	15	4.82	241/1666	4.55	4.40	4.27	4.34	4.82
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	4	12	4.65	447/1406	4.54	4.42	4.32	4.36	4.65
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	0	0	4	12	4.53	530/1615	4.43	4.27	4.24	4.33	4.53
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	1	8	7	4.18	724/1566	4.27	4.28	4.07	4.20	4.18
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	0	1	4	10	4.60	346/1528	4.59	4.22	4.12	4.33	4.60
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	3	14	4.82	215/1650	4.73	4.37	4.22	4.30	4.82
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	17	5.00	1/1667	5.00	4.64	4.67	4.74	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	0	3	11	4.79	183/1626	4.43	4.22	4.11	4.20	4.79
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	1	16	4.94	166/1559	4.65	4.58	4.46	4.49	4.94
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	16	4.94	358/1560	4.93	4.86	4.72	4.81	4.94
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	1	16	4.94	121/1549	4.51	4.50	4.31	4.37	4.94
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	16	4.94	139/1546	4.51	4.49	4.32	4.40	4.94
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	0	2	15	4.88	126/1323	4.40	4.27	4.00	4.03	4.88
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	1	0	1	3	8	4.31	638/1384	4.08	4.27	4.10	4.21	4.31
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	0	1	3	9	4.62	517/1378	4.54	4.45	4.29	4.42	4.62
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	0	1	2	10	4.69	501/1378	4.58	4.57	4.31	4.51	4.69
4. Were special techniques successful	5	3	0	0	1	2	6	4.56	222/ 904	4.35	4.12	4.03	4.04	4.56

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors					
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	A 5	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	8	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B 10						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C 0	General	0	Under-grad	9	Non-major	17
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	1	D 0						
Grad.	8	3.50-4.00	4	F 0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P 0						
				I 0	Other	14				
				? 0						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	1	0	1	4	8	4.29	964/1670	4.58	4.36	4.31	4.46	4.29
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	4	7	4.29	931/1666	4.55	4.40	4.27	4.34	4.29
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	6	7	4.43	691/1406	4.54	4.42	4.32	4.36	4.43
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	2	4	6	4.33	775/1615	4.43	4.27	4.24	4.33	4.33
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	4	1	9	4.36	540/1566	4.27	4.28	4.07	4.20	4.36
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	4	9	4.57	368/1528	4.59	4.22	4.12	4.33	4.57
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	3	10	4.64	383/1650	4.73	4.37	4.22	4.30	4.64
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	14	5.00	1/1667	5.00	4.64	4.67	4.74	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	1	0	8	3	4.08	910/1626	4.43	4.22	4.11	4.20	4.08
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	1	1	4	8	4.36	1072/1559	4.65	4.58	4.46	4.49	4.36
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	13	4.93	477/1560	4.93	4.86	4.72	4.81	4.93
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	1	0	3	3	7	4.07	1116/1549	4.51	4.50	4.31	4.37	4.07
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	2	5	6	4.07	1113/1546	4.51	4.49	4.32	4.40	4.07
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	2	0	1	4	6	3.92	794/1323	4.40	4.27	4.00	4.03	3.92
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	1	2	4	5	3.85	957/1384	4.08	4.27	4.10	4.21	3.85
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	1	5	7	4.46	649/1378	4.54	4.45	4.29	4.42	4.46
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	2	3	8	4.46	692/1378	4.58	4.57	4.31	4.51	4.46
4. Were special techniques successful	2	5	0	0	2	2	3	4.14	425/ 904	4.35	4.12	4.03	4.04	4.14
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	11	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 232	****	****	4.19	4.30	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	12	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 239	****	****	4.21	4.53	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	12	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 230	****	****	4.44	4.69	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	12	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 231	****	****	4.31	4.58	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	12	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 218	****	****	4.18	4.47	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	11	1	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 87	****	5.00	4.65	4.61	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	12	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 79	****	4.90	4.64	4.67	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/ 75	****	4.95	4.57	4.66	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 79	****	4.85	4.45	4.58	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	12	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 80	****	3.10	3.97	4.32	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 41	****	****	4.50	4.65	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	12	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 38	****	****	4.19	4.58	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	12	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 38	****	5.00	4.62	4.65	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	12	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 39	****	3.00	4.27	4.59	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	12	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 31	****	****	4.47	4.59	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 28	****	5.00	4.64	4.82	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	12	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 16	****	5.00	4.67	4.60	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	12	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 27	****	5.00	4.54	4.67	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	12	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 10	****	****	4.84	4.90	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	12	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 6	****	****	4.92	5.00	****

Course-Section: SOCY 604 0201
 Title STATISTICAL ANALYSIS
 Instructor: FLOW-DELWICHE,
 Enrollment: 19
 Questionnaires: 14

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2008

Page 1525
 AUG 6, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	4	0.00-0.99	0	A	10	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	6	Major	3
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	3						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	8	Non-major	11
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D	0						
Grad.	6	3.50-4.00	7	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	12				
				?	0						

Course-Section: SOCY 606 0101
 Title SOC INEQUALITY/SOC POL
 Instructor: ADLER, MARINA
 Enrollment: 31
 Questionnaires: 26

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2008

Page 1526
 AUG 6, 2008
 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	3	2	5	16	4.31	943/1670	4.31	4.36	4.31	4.46	4.31
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	2	0	6	17	4.38	808/1666	4.38	4.40	4.27	4.34	4.38
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	17	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	212/1406	4.88	4.42	4.32	4.36	4.88
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	1	2	7	15	4.31	813/1615	4.31	4.27	4.24	4.33	4.31
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	2	3	20	4.62	331/1566	4.62	4.28	4.07	4.20	4.62
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	1	6	5	13	4.08	859/1528	4.08	4.22	4.12	4.33	4.08
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	4	7	3	12	3.88	1288/1650	3.88	4.37	4.22	4.30	3.88
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	3	23	4.88	712/1667	4.88	4.64	4.67	4.74	4.88
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	2	4	5	11	4.14	865/1626	4.14	4.22	4.11	4.20	4.14
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	2	1	23	4.81	435/1559	4.81	4.58	4.46	4.49	4.81
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	26	5.00	1/1560	5.00	4.86	4.72	4.81	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	1	4	20	4.76	352/1549	4.76	4.50	4.31	4.37	4.76
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	4	3	18	4.42	822/1546	4.42	4.49	4.32	4.40	4.42
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	2	2	8	14	4.31	507/1323	4.31	4.27	4.00	4.03	4.31
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	2	1	2	4	13	4.14	768/1384	4.14	4.27	4.10	4.21	4.14
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	1	0	0	1	20	4.77	379/1378	4.77	4.45	4.29	4.42	4.77
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	4	0	1	5	12	3.95	1016/1378	3.95	4.57	4.31	4.51	3.95
4. Were special techniques successful	4	10	1	0	1	2	8	4.33	328/ 904	4.33	4.12	4.03	4.04	4.33

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	6	0.00-0.99 0	A 18	Required for Majors 0	Graduate 10 Major 3
28-55	0	1.00-1.99 0	B 4		
56-83	0	2.00-2.99 0	C 0	General 4	Under-grad 16 Non-major 23
84-150	2	3.00-3.49 4	D 0		
Grad.	10	3.50-4.00 13	F 0	Electives 0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 19	
			? 1		

Course-Section: SOCY 619 0101
 Title QUALITATIVE METHODS
 Instructor: RUBINSTEIN, ROB
 Enrollment: 24
 Questionnaires: 20

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2008

Page 1527
 AUG 6, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	2	6	12	4.50	665/1670	4.50	4.36	4.31	4.46	4.50	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	0	0	5	3	10	4.28	943/1666	4.28	4.40	4.27	4.34	4.28	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	10	0	0	1	1	7	4.67	423/1406	4.67	4.42	4.32	4.36	4.67	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	6	6	7	4.05	1055/1615	4.05	4.27	4.24	4.33	4.05	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	2	1	5	11	4.32	579/1566	4.32	4.28	4.07	4.20	4.32	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	2	6	11	4.47	462/1528	4.47	4.22	4.12	4.33	4.47	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	3	1	2	2	2	9	4.00	1135/1650	4.00	4.37	4.22	4.30	4.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	1	6	12	4.58	1104/1667	4.58	4.64	4.67	4.74	4.58	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	7	1	0	0	4	6	2	3.83	1191/1626	3.83	4.22	4.11	4.20	3.83	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	0	2	4	3	7	3.94	1330/1559	3.94	4.58	4.46	4.49	3.94	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	2	16	4.89	647/1560	4.89	4.86	4.72	4.81	4.89	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	0	1	3	3	9	4.25	977/1549	4.25	4.50	4.31	4.37	4.25	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	1	2	2	11	4.44	808/1546	4.44	4.49	4.32	4.40	4.44	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	11	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	273/1323	4.60	4.27	4.00	4.03	4.60	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	1	3	3	7	4.14	758/1384	4.14	4.27	4.10	4.21	4.14	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	0	1	1	12	4.79	368/1378	4.79	4.45	4.29	4.42	4.79	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	0	1	0	1	12	4.71	481/1378	4.71	4.57	4.31	4.51	4.71	
4. Were special techniques successful	6	8	1	0	0	0	5	4.33	328/ 904	4.33	4.12	4.03	4.04	4.33	
Laboratory															
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	19	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 239	****	****	4.21	4.53	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	19	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 230	****	****	4.44	4.69	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	19	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 87	****	5.00	4.65	4.61	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	19	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 79	****	4.90	4.64	4.67	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 75	****	4.95	4.57	4.66	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	19	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 79	****	4.85	4.45	4.58	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	19	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 80	****	3.10	3.97	4.32	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/ 41	****	****	4.50	4.65	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	18	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 38	****	****	4.19	4.58	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	18	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 38	****	5.00	4.62	4.65	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	18	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 39	****	3.00	4.27	4.59	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	18	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.47	4.59	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 28	****	5.00	4.64	4.82	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	19	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 16	****	5.00	4.67	4.60	****	

Course-Section: SOCY 619 0101
 Title QUALITATIVE METHODS
 Instructor: RUBINSTEIN, ROB
 Enrollment: 24
 Questionnaires: 20

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2008

Page 1527
 AUG 6, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	12	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	5	Major	1
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	2						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	3	Under-grad	15	Non-major	19
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	5	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	8				
				?	0						

Course-Section: SOCY 620 0101
 Title SOCIAL EPIDEMIOLOGY
 Instructor: SERPI, TRACEY L
 Enrollment: 14
 Questionnaires: 9

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2008

Page 1528
 AUG 6, 2008
 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	3	6	4.67	479/1670	4.67	4.36	4.31	4.46	4.67
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	291/1666	4.78	4.40	4.27	4.34	4.78
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1406	5.00	4.42	4.32	4.36	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	189/1615	4.89	4.27	4.24	4.33	4.89
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	1	7	4.67	295/1566	4.67	4.28	4.07	4.20	4.67
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	131/1528	4.89	4.22	4.12	4.33	4.89
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1650	5.00	4.37	4.22	4.30	5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	897/1667	4.78	4.64	4.67	4.74	4.78
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	0	4	3	4.43	531/1626	4.43	4.22	4.11	4.20	4.43
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	323/1559	4.88	4.58	4.46	4.49	4.88
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1560	5.00	4.86	4.72	4.81	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	229/1549	4.88	4.50	4.31	4.37	4.88
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1546	5.00	4.49	4.32	4.40	5.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	1	0	0	0	3	3	4.50	326/1323	4.50	4.27	4.00	4.03	4.50
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	1	7	4.67	324/1384	4.67	4.27	4.10	4.21	4.67
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1378	5.00	4.45	4.29	4.42	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1378	5.00	4.57	4.31	4.51	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	1	0	1	0	0	1	6	4.38	305/ 904	4.38	4.12	4.03	4.04	4.38

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: SOCY 631 0101
 Title FAMILY/AGING IN SOCIET
 Instructor: SCHUMACHER, JOH
 Enrollment: 12
 Questionnaires: 12

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2008

Page 1529
 AUG 6, 2008
 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	5	6	4.42	794/1670	4.42	4.36	4.31	4.46	4.42
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	9	4.75	312/1666	4.75	4.40	4.27	4.34	4.75
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	4	7	4.50	597/1406	4.50	4.42	4.32	4.36	4.50
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	3	8	4.58	467/1615	4.58	4.27	4.24	4.33	4.58
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	3	9	4.75	226/1566	4.75	4.28	4.07	4.20	4.75
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	3	7	4.42	546/1528	4.42	4.22	4.12	4.33	4.42
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	0	11	4.83	208/1650	4.83	4.37	4.22	4.30	4.83
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	607/1667	4.92	4.64	4.67	4.74	4.92
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	0	5	5	4.50	403/1626	4.50	4.22	4.11	4.20	4.50
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	248/1559	4.92	4.58	4.46	4.49	4.92
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/1560	5.00	4.86	4.72	4.81	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	2	10	4.83	266/1549	4.83	4.50	4.31	4.37	4.83
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	1	9	4.58	619/1546	4.58	4.49	4.32	4.40	4.58
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/1323	5.00	4.27	4.00	4.03	5.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	1	1	1	8	4.17	740/1384	4.17	4.27	4.10	4.21	4.17
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	1	2	2	7	4.25	860/1378	4.25	4.45	4.29	4.42	4.25
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	1	2	9	4.67	531/1378	4.67	4.57	4.31	4.51	4.67
4. Were special techniques successful	0	0	0	0	2	5	5	4.25	373/ 904	4.25	4.12	4.03	4.04	4.25
Laboratory														
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	11	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 239	****	****	4.21	4.53	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	10	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 87	****	5.00	4.65	4.61	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	10	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 79	****	4.90	4.64	4.67	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 75	****	4.95	4.57	4.66	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 79	****	4.85	4.45	4.58	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	10	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 80	****	3.10	3.97	4.32	****
Field Work														
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 38	****	5.00	4.62	4.65	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	11	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 39	****	3.00	4.27	4.59	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	11	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 28	****	5.00	4.64	4.82	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 16	****	5.00	4.67	4.60	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	11	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 27	****	5.00	4.54	4.67	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	11	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 10	****	****	4.84	4.90	****

Frequency Distribution

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

I	0	Other	5
?	0		

Course-Section: SOCY 683 8020
 Title THE ORG STRUCT NONPROF
 Instructor: HALL, NANCY
 Enrollment: 6
 Questionnaires: 4

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2008

Page 1530
 AUG 6, 2008
 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	0	4	5.00	1/1670	5.00	4.36	4.31	4.46	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1666	5.00	4.40	4.27	4.34	5.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1406	5.00	4.42	4.32	4.36	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	775/1615	4.33	4.27	4.24	4.33	4.33
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	389/1566	4.50	4.28	4.07	4.20	4.50
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	3	1	4.25	706/1528	4.25	4.22	4.12	4.33	4.25
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	1	2	0	3.25	1541/1650	3.25	4.37	4.22	4.30	3.25
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	1157/1667	4.50	4.64	4.67	4.74	4.50
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	207/1626	4.75	4.22	4.11	4.20	4.75
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1559	5.00	4.58	4.46	4.49	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1560	5.00	4.86	4.72	4.81	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1549	5.00	4.50	4.31	4.37	5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1546	5.00	4.49	4.32	4.40	5.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	1	0	0	2	4.00	692/1323	4.00	4.27	4.00	4.03	4.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1384	5.00	4.27	4.10	4.21	5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1378	5.00	4.45	4.29	4.42	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1378	5.00	4.57	4.31	4.51	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	1	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	328/ 904	4.33	4.12	4.03	4.04	4.33

Frequency Distribution

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