Course-Section: SOCY 101 0101

University of Maryland SOCY Baltimore County

Title BASIC CONCEPTS IN SOCY

Instructor: TUFEKCIOGLU, ZE

Enrollment: 104
Questionnaires: 44

Spring 2008

Page 1494 AUG 6, 2008 Job IRBR3029

			Fre	equer	ncie	g		Ingi	tructor	Course	Dent	UMBC	Level	Sect
Ouestions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank		Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
x														
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														
<ol> <li>Were the instructor's lectures well prepared</li> </ol>	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			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	0.0	•	2	-	_	_	0	2 64	1045/1204	2 00	4 05	4 10	2 00	2 64
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	22	0	3	1	5	5	8		1045/1384		4.27	4.10	3.92	3.64
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	22	0	1	4	3	5	9		1103/1378		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	,	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	, -	****	****	4.19	4.35	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	40	2	0	0	1	0	1	4.00		****	****	4.44	4.58	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	40	2	0	0	1	0	1		****/ 231	****	****	4.31	4.45	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	40	2	0	0	1	0	1		, -	****	****	4.18	4.45	****
J. Were requirements for lab reports crearry specified	10	2	U	U		U	1	1.00	/ 210			1.10	1.1/	
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		****	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		****	5.00	4.64	4.59	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	41	1	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	,	****	5.00	4.67	4.83	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	41	1	0	0	1	0	1	4.00		****	5.00	4.54	4.46	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	40	2	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	,	****	****	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

Credits E	Carned	Cum. GPA		Expecte	d Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	5	0.00-0.99	0	 А	12	Required for Majors	15	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	В	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	n
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				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

									_	ncie				tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
		Question	ıs			NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		 Genera	1																
1. Did vo	ou gain n	ew insights,ski		om this cou	ırse	4	0	1	5	8	19	29	4.13	1139/1670	4.01	4.36	4.31	4.23	4.13
_	-	ctor make clear				5	0	1	2	7	12	39	4.41	784/1666		4.40	4.27	4.30	4.41
		uestions reflec		_		4	0	1	1	3	13	44	4.58			4.42	4.32	4.31	4.58
		uations reflect				5	33	0	1	4	4	19	4.46	606/1615	4.04	4.27	4.24	4.17	4.46
5. Did as	signed r	eadings contrib	ute to	what you 1	learned	4	4	2	2	9	19	26	4.12	771/1566	3.98	4.28	4.07	4.03	4.12
6. Did wr	ritten as	signments contr	ibute t	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 th	ne gradin	g system clearl	y expla	ained		7	0	0	1	3	11	44	4.66	361/1650	4.44	4.37	4.22	4.28	4.66
8. How ma	any times	was class canc	elled			7	0	0	0	0	7	52	4.88	712/1667	4.58	4.64	4.67	4.61	4.88
9. How wo	ould you	grade the overa	ll tead	ching effec	ctiveness	13	3	0	2	10	16	22	4.16	831/1626	4.02	4.22	4.11	4.07	4.16
		Lectur	·e																
1. Were t	he instr	uctor's lecture		prepared		10	0	1	0	9	8	38	4.46	946/1559	4.52	4.58	4.46	4.47	4.46
		ctor seem inter			iect.	9	0	0	1	3	6	47	4.74			4.86	4.72	4.68	4.74
		terial presente				10	0	2	2	11	5	36	4.27			4.50	4.31		4.27
		es contribute t				9	1	1	4	6	8	37	4.36			4.49	4.32	4.32	
		l techniques en		_		11	3	1	2	5	9	35	4.44			4.27	4.00		4.44
	Discussion																		
1 Did al							0	1	0	2	3	22	4.61	372/1384	3.98	4.27	4.10	3.92	4.61
	Did class discussions contribute to what you learn Were all students actively encouraged to participa					38 38	0	0	0	1	2	25	4.86			4.45	4.10	4.09	4.86
		ctor encourage				38	0	0	0	1	3	24	4.82			4.57	4.31	4.08	4.82
		echniques succe		ia open are	ocubbion .	38	10	0	0	3	3	12	4.50	,		4.12		3.94	
	-	-																	
		Labora	-																
		crease understa	_			63	2	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 232		****	4.19	4.25	****
2. Were y	ou provi	ded with adequa	te back	kground inf	ormation	65	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 239	****	****	4.21	4.35	****
		Semina	r																
1. Were a	ssigned	topics relevant	to the	e announced	l theme	64	1	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 87	****	5.00	4.65	4.67	****
		Field	Work																
1. Did fi	eld expe	rience contribu	ite to v	what you le	earned	65	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 41	****	****	4.50	3.91	****
2. Did yo	ou clearly	y understand yo	ur eval	luation cri	lteria	65	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 38	****	****	4.19	4.07	***
		Self	Daced																
1 Did se	Self Paced . Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned						0	0	0	1	0	Ο	3 00	****/ 28	****	5.00	4.64	4.59	****
	_	-		_		65 65	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 16		5.00	4.67	4.83	****
	Did study questions make clear the expected goal Were your contacts with the instructor helpful					65	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 27		5.00		4.46	****
								,											
	rred					ıency	7 Dis	trib	utio	n									
Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades								Re	ason	.s			Ty	pe			Majors	;	
00-27 12 0.00-0.99 0 A 37					Re	 guir	 ed f	or M	 ajor	s 2	24	 Graduat	 e	0	Majo	 or	2		
28-55	13	1.00-1.99	0	В	12			-			-						5		
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	8	C	0		Ge:	nera	1			1	2	Under-g	rad 6	6	Non-	-major	64
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	4	D	0														

Credits E	Earned	Cum. GP	A	Expecte	d Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	12	0.00-0.99	0	 А	37	Required for Majors	24	Graduate	0	Major	2
28-55	13	1.00-1.99	0	В	12						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	8	C	0	General	12	Under-grad	66	Non-major	64
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	4	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	10	F	0	Electives	4	#### - Means	there	are not enough	h
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	7				
				2	0						

Course-Section: SOCY 101 0301

BASIC CONCEPTS IN SOCY

Title TRELA, JAMES E Instructor:

Enrollment: 151

Questionnaires: 54

# University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2008

Page 1496 AUG 6, 2008 Job IRBR3029

	_			
Ctudant	('Ollred	Evaluation	Ougetion	n $n$ $n$ $n$ $n$

		Fre	eque	ncie	s		Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect	
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General	1	0	1	7	9	1.4	1.0	2 06	1272/1670	4.01	1 26	1 21	1 22	2 06
<ol> <li>Did you gain new insights, skills from this course</li> <li>Did the instructor make clear the expected goals</li> </ol>	4 4	0	2	5	9	14 15	19 19		1372/1670 1331/1666		4.36 4.40	4.31 4.27	4.23	3.86 3.88
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	5	0	2	6	3	14	24		1021/1406		4.42	4.27	4.30	4.06
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	4	32	2	2	4	3	7		1411/1615		4.27	4.24	4.17	3.61
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	5	2	3	3	10	15	16		1108/1566		4.28	4.24	4.17	3.81
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	4	37	4	2	2	2	3		****/1528	3.90	4.22	4.12	4.00	****
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	4	1	0	2	5	11	31		660/1650		4.37	4.12	4.28	4.45
8. How many times was class cancelled	4	0	0	0	0	23			1127/1667		4.64	4.67	4.61	4.54
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	15	1	1	3	7	18			1210/1626					3.82
J. now would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	13	1		5	,	10	,	3.02	1210/1020	1.02	1.22	7,11	1.07	3.02
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 08	4.27	4.10	3.92	3.27
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	27	0	5	4	12	1	5		1326/1378		4.45	4.29	4.09	2.89
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	28	0	2	1	10	4	9		1150/1378		4.57	4.31	4.08	3.65
4. Were special techniques successful	27	23	1	0	1	0	2		****/ 904		4.12	4.03	3.94	****
1. Note special recomingues successful	27	23	-	Ü	_	Ü	-	3.30	, 501	3.00	1.12	1.05	3.71	
Laboratory														
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	51	0	0	2	1	0	0	2.33	,	****	****	4.21	4.35	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	51	1	0	1	1	0	0		****/ 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	5∠ 52	0	1	0	0	0	1		****/ 38	****	****	4.19	4.07	****
	5∠ 52	1	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 38	****				****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	52	1	U	U	U	U	Τ	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		****/ 28	****	5.00	4.64	4.59	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	52	1	0	0	1	0	0		****/ 16		5.00	4.67	4.83	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	52	1	0	0	1	0	0		****/ 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	****

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

P 0 responses to be significant I 0 Other 7

Course-Section: SOCY 101 0401

University of Maryland

BASIC CONCEPTS IN SOCY

Instructor: TUFEKCIOGLU, ZE

Enrollment: 150
Questionnaires: 82

Title

Baltimore County
Spring 2008

Page 1497 AUG 6, 2008 Job IRBR3029

Student	Course	Evaluation	Questionnaire
---------	--------	------------	---------------

	_			Frequencies			Instructor		Course Dept		t UMBC Level		Sect	
Questions	NR	NA	1	_	3	4	5	Mean	Rank		_		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		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		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		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
<ol> <li>Was the grading system clearly explained</li> </ol>	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	_	0	0	•		0.0	4.0	4 55	046/1550	4 50	4 50	1 16	4 45	4 55
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	4.40
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			4.03	3.94	
4. Were special techniques successful	40	10	5	Τ	TT	/	0	3.30	700/ 904	3.00	4.12	4.03	3.94	3.30
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		****/ 231	****	****	4.31	4.45	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	75	3	0	0	1	2	1		****/ 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		0	-	•	•	0	0	0 55		als als als 1	F 0.0	4	4 50	****
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

Credits E	Earned	Cum. GPA	A	Expecte	ed Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	18	0.00-0.99	0	 А	17	Required for Majors	40	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	11	1.00-1.99	1	В	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	n
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	8				
				?	1						

Course-Section: SOCY 204 0101 University of Maryland Page 1498 Title DIVERSITY & PLURALISM Baltimore County AUG 6, 2008 Spring 2008 Job IRBR3029

Instructor: PINCUS, FRED L

Enrollment: 45 Questionnaires: 32

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequencies Instructor Course Dept UMBC Leve Questions NR NA 1 2 3 4 5 Mean Rank Mean Mean Mea	
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 4.3	
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 4.2	
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 4.3	
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 4.2	
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 4.0	
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 4.1	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained 1 0 0 2 4 2 23 4.48 600/1650 4.48 4.37 4.22 4.2	
8. How many times was class cancelled 1 1 0 4 7 7 12 3.90 1609/1667 3.90 4.64 4.67 4.6	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 10 $$ 1 $$ 0 $$ 3 $$ 8 $$ 10 $$ 0 $$ 3.33 $$ 1462/1626 $$ 3.33 $$ 4.22 $$ 4.11 $$ 4.0	6 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 4.4	
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.	
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 4.7	
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 4.3	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding $1$ $1$ $2$ $1$ $3$ $10$ $14$ $4.10$ $656/1323$ $4.10$ $4.27$ $4.00$ $4.00$	8 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 4.0	
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 4.2	
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 4.2	
4. Were special techniques successful 14 1 0 1 4 5 7 4.06 451/904 4.06 4.12 4.03 4.0	1 4.06
Frequency Distribution	
Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades Reasons Type Majo	cs
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-majo	r 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 end	ıgh

Other

6

responses to be significant

Ρ

I

0

0

0

Course-Section: SOCY 300 0101

METHODOLOGY:SOCIAL RSR

Title

Instructor: MACLENNAN, JAMI

Enrollment: 43 Questionnaires: 27

## University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2008

Page 1499 AUG 6, 2008 Job IRBR3029

Questions	NR	NA	Fre	equer 2	ncie:	s 4	5	Inst Mean	ructor Rank	Course Mean	_	UMBC Mean		Sect Mean
General	1	0	0	0	2	10	10	4 20	025/1670	4 40	1 20	1 21	1 01	4 20
<ol> <li>Did you gain new insights, skills from this course</li> <li>Did the instructor make clear the expected goals</li> </ol>	1 0	0	0	0	2 1	12 6	12 20	4.38	835/1670 366/1666	4.40 4.66	4.36 4.40	4.31 4.27	4.24 4.18	4.38 4.70
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	3	7	16	4.70	715/1406	4.43	4.40	4.27	4.10	4.70
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	13	13	4.41	633/1615	4.45	4.42	4.32	4.22	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	4.24	4.16	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		1437/1667		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		4.11		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			4.10	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		****/ 230	****	****	4.44	4.25	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	26	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 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		****/ 87	****	5.00	4.65	4.30	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	25	0	0	0	0	1	1		****/ 79	***	4.90	4.64	4.53	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	25	0	0	0	1	0	1		****/ 75 ****/ 79	****	4.95	4.57	4.50	****
<ol> <li>Did presentations contribute to what you learned</li> <li>Were criteria for grading made clear</li> </ol>	25 25	0	0	0	1 1	0	1		****/ 79 ****/ 80	****	4.85 3.10	4.45 3.97	3.68 3.76	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	25	U	U	U	Τ	U	1	4.00	***/ 80		3.10	3.97	3.70	
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	26	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 41	****	****	4.50	4.44	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	26	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 38	****	****	4.19	3.96	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	26	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 38	****	5.00	4.62	4.68	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	26	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 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		****/ 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

Credits E	arned	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	В	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	ı
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				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

		3			Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect			
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	1	3	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	4.03	536/1560		4.86	4.72	4.40	4.03
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	2	6	27	4.71	,		4.50	4.72	4.25	4.71
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	7	27	4.74	424/1549		4.49	4.31		4.71
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	2	0	1	4	5	21	4.48	345/1323		4.49	4.00	3.99	4.48
3. Did addiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	4	U	_	4	5	21	4.40	343/1323	4.37	4.2/	4.00	3.99	4.40
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														
Laboratory  1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material		2	0	0	1	0	Λ	2 00	****/ 232	****	****	4.19	4.04	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	33 34	0	0	0	1	0	1		****/ 232		****	4.19	3.99	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	34	1	0	1	0	0	U T		****/ 230		****	4.44	4.25	****
J. WELE NECESSALY MALELIAIS AVAILABLE TOT TAB ACCIVILLES	J <del>1</del>	Т	U		U	U	U	2.00	/ 230			4.44	1.43	
_														

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expecte	d Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	 А	12	Required for Majors	2	Graduate	0	Major	3
28-55	6	1.00-1.99	0	В	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	n
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	23				
				2	Λ						

Course-Section: SOCY 301 0101

ANALY:SOCIOLOGICAL DAT

Title

Instructor: COHEN, JERE M

Enrollment: 33 Questionnaires: 23

## University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2008

Page 1501 AUG 6, 2008 Job IRBR3029

			Fre	mier	ncies			Inst	ructor	Course	Dent	UMBC	I.eve l	Sect
Ouestions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank		Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
x														
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		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		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
5. Did addiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	9	2	U	U	3	O	4.00	092/1323	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		****/ 79	****	4.85	4.45	3.68	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	21	0	0	0	1	0	1		****/ 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	E 00	****/ 41	****	****	4.50	4.44	****
-		0		0	0	0	1		****/ 38	****	****	4.19		****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	21	0	1 0							****			3.96	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	21	0		0	1	0	1		****/ 38	****	5.00	4.62	4.68	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	21	0	0	1	0 1	0	1		****/ 39 ****/ 31	****	3.00	4.27	4.38	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	21	U	U	U	Τ	U	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		****/ 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:

Enrollment: 33 Questionnaires: 23

COHEN, JERE M Spring 2008

Page 1501 AUG 6, 2008 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

University of Maryland

Baltimore County

Credits Ea	arned	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	В	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	า
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	17				
				?	0						

Course-Section: SOCY 315 0101 University of Maryland Title POPULATION & SOCIETY Baltimore County Instructor: ROTHSTEIN, WILL Spring 2008

Enrollment:

Questionnaires: 24

44

University of Maryland Page 1502
Baltimore County AUG 6, 2008
Spring 2008 Job IRBR3029

_			
Ctudent	Course	Fralustion	Ouestionnaire
bludent	COULDE	E varuation	Ouescionnarie

					tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect						
	Questions		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
	General															
1. Did you gain new	insights,skills f	rom 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	r 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 quest	tions 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 evaluat:	ions 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 read:	ings contribute t	o 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 assign	nments 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 sy	Was the grading system clearly explained How many times was class cancelled				0	1	6	9	6	3.91	1278/1650	3.91	4.37	4.22	4.12	3.91
8. How many times was	s 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 grad	How would you grade the overall teaching effective			0	1	1	2	9	4	3.82	1200/1626	3.82	4.22	4.11	4.06	3.82
	Lecture															
1. Were the instructo	. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared			0	0	1	2	4	14	4.48	933/1559	4.48	4.58	4.46	4.40	4.48
2. Did the instructor	r 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 mater:	ial 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 wha	t 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 to	echniques 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 discuss:	ions contribute t	o 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 encoura	ged 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	-		12	0	1	1	0	5	5	4.00	977/1378	4.00	4.57	4.31	4.33	4.00
4. Were special techn	_	12	11	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 904	****	4.12	4.03	4.03	****	
		Frequ	iency	Dist	crib	utio	n									
Credits Earned	edits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades						ason	ıs			Ту	pe			Majors	3

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	d Grades	Reasons		Туре		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	В	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	n
				P	0			responses to	be sig	nificant	
				I	0	Other	6				
				2	2						

Course-Section: SOCY 321 8620 University of Maryland Title RACE & ETHNIC RELATION Baltimore County

Instructor: SUFIAN, MERYL

Enrollment: 28 Questionnaires: 26

# Spring 2008 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Page 1503

AUG 6, 2008

Job IRBR3029

	Questions				NR	NA	Fre	equei 2	ncies 3	s 4	5	Ins Mean	tructor Ranl	k	Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
		 Genera	 1																
1 Did vo	u gain ne	Genera w insights,ski	_	m this course	8	0	1	1	6	3	7	3 78	1430/1	670	3.78	4.36	4.31	4.24	3.78
		tor make clear			8	0	2	2	3	2	9		1398/1		3.78	4.40	4.27	4.18	3.78
		estions reflec			8	0	2	1	3	4	8		1169/14		3.83	4.42	4.32	4.22	3.83
	_	ations reflect		_	8	0	4	0	5	1	8		1448/1		3.50	4.27	4.24	4.18	3.50
				what you learned	9	0	1	0	4	5	7	4.00			4.00	4.28	4.07	4.04	4.00
6. Did wr	itten ass	ignments contr	ibute t	o what you learned	9	1	2	1	2	4	7	3.81	1113/1	528	3.81	4.22	4.12	4.07	3.81
7. Was the	e grading	system clearly	y expla	ined	10	0	2	3	1	4	6	3.56	1442/1	650	3.56	4.37	4.22	4.12	3.56
		was class canc			9	0	0	0	0	12	5	4.29	1340/1	667	4.29	4.64	4.67	4.67	4.29
9. How wo	uld you g	rade the overa	ll teac	hing effectiveness	15	2	1	0	2	4	2	3.67	1312/1	626	3.67	4.22	4.11	4.06	3.67
	Lecture																		
1. Were t	he instru	ctor's lecture	s well	prepared	8	0	3	2	1	3	9	3.72	1416/1	559	3.72	4.58	4.46	4.40	3.72
2. Did th	e instruc	nstructor seem interested in the subject				0	0	0	2	3	12	4.59	1180/1	560	4.59	4.86	4.72	4.67	4.59
	as lecture material presented and explained clearl					0	1	4	1	3	7	3.69	1338/1	549	3.69	4.50	4.31	4.25	3.69
	the lectures contribute to what you learned					0	4	0	2	1	10		1289/1		3.76	4.49	4.32	4.24	3.76
5. Did au	. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding					2	2	0	4	2	5	3.62	985/13	323	3.62	4.27	4.00	3.99	3.62
		Discus	sion																
1. Did cla	ass discu	ssions contrib	ute to	what you learned	9	0	0	1	4	3	9	4.18	730/13	384	4.18	4.27	4.10	4.12	4.18
		_	_	d to participate	9	0	3	4	2	1	7		1257/13		3.29	4.45	4.29	4.30	3.29
				d open discussion	9	0	2	3	3	2	7		1184/13		3.53	4.57	4.31	4.33	3.53
4. Were s	pecial te	chniques succe	ssful		9	7	1	1	2	0	6	3.90	570/ 9	904	3.90	4.12	4.03	4.03	3.90
		Self																	
	-	-		what you learned	25	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/	28	****	5.00	4.64	3.33	****
2. Did st	udy quest	ions make clea	r the e	xpected goal	25	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/	16	****	5.00	4.67	4.00	***
				Frequ	lency	Dis	tribu	ution	n										
Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	asons	3				Тур	pe			Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	А б		Red	 quire	ed fo	or Ma	ajor	 s	1	 Gradı	uate	 e	 1	Majo	 or	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В 4						J							3 -		-
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	1	C 2	General						1	1	Unde	r-gi	rad 2	5	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 t			_	h
				P 0									respo	onse	es to b	e sign	ificar	ıt	
				I 0		Other						2							

Course-Section: SOCY 333 0101 University of Maryland Title HUM SEXUALITY/CROSS-CU

Baltimore County Spring 2008

Page 1504

AUG 6, 2008

Job IRBR3029

Instructor:	LOTTES, ILSA L.	Spring 2008
Enrollment:	98	
Questionnaires:	61	Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequencies NR NA 1 2 3 4 5						_		tructor		Dept			Sect
NR	NA		2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
0	0	3	6	8	15	29	4.00	1216/1670	4.00	4.36	4.31	4.24	4.00
0	0	2	9	10	14	26	3.87	1344/1666	3.87	4.40	4.27	4.18	3.87
0	0	7	5	11	13	25	3.72	1218/1406	3.72	4.42	4.32	4.22	3.72
0	6	3	5	12	16	19	3.78	1306/1615	3.78	4.27	4.24	4.18	3.78
l 0	0	1	5	8	13	34	4.21	686/1566	4.21	4.28	4.07	4.04	4.21
ied 0	1	6	3	12	17	22	3.77	1146/1528	3.77	4.22	4.12	4.07	3.77
0	0	7	3	9	17	25	3.82	1324/1650	3.82	4.37	4.22	4.12	3.82
1	0	0	0	1	4	55	4.90	675/1667	7 4.90	4.64	4.67	4.67	4.90
ess 9	1	5	3	13	19	11	3.55	1369/1626	3.55	4.22	4.11	4.06	3.55
2	0	4	4	10	17	24		1356/1559	3.90	4.58	4.46	4.40	3.90
2	0	0	0	1	8	50	4.83	777/1560	4.83	4.86	4.72	4.67	4.83
3	0	4	5	8	22	19	3.81	1280/1549	3.81	4.50	4.31	4.25	3.81
	0	4	3	9	12	30	4.05	1121/1546	4.05	4.49	4.32	4.24	4.05
ıg 6	16	12	2	9	7	9	2.97	1193/1323	3 2.97	4.27	4.00	3.99	2.97
1 22	0	3	3	10	11	12	3.67	1033/1384	3.67	4.27	4.10	4.12	3.67
23	0	3	3	5	11	16	3.89	1060/1378	3.89	4.45	4.29	4.30	3.89
n 23	0	1	1	6	5	25	4.37	786/1378	3 4.37	4.57	4.31	4.33	4.37
24	26	2	2	1	4	2	3.18	****/ 904	1 ****	4.12	4.03	4.03	****
: 59	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 87	7 ****	5.00	4.65	4.30	****
l 60	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 28	****	5.00	4.64	3.33	****
60	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 16	****	5.00	4.67	4.00	****
equenc	y Dis	strib	outio	on									
les			Re	easor	ıs			Τζ	/pe			Majors	5
					 Ia ior		 6	Gradua+			 oreM		11
	1/6	-darr	.cu i	. J. I	בטן בי		5	Gradual		5	ra J	-	T.T
	Ge	nera	1			2	25	Under-d	arad 6	51	Non-	-maior	50
	36	-11C1 G				2		OHACI -S	,	, <u>.</u>	14011	a JOI	50
	F:1	lect i	ves				4	#### -	Means t	here a	re not	enouc	rh
							-					_	,
	Ot	her				1	6	1005011		91			
	0.0					_							
	0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0	0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0	0 0 3 0 0 2 0 0 7 0 6 3 1 0 0 1 1 ed 0 1 6 0 0 7 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 7 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 7 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 7 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 0	0 0 3 6 0 0 2 9 0 0 7 5 0 6 3 5 1 0 0 1 5 1 0 0 7 3 1 0 0 0 7 3 1 0 0 0 7 3 1 0 0 0 7 3 1 0 0 0 7 3 1 0 0 0 7 3 1 0 0 0 7 3 1 0 0 0 0 1 5 3 0 4 5 3 0 4 5 3 0 4 5 3 0 4 5 3 0 4 3 10 22 0 3 3 10 23 0 1 1 24 26 2 2 10 59 1 0 0 10 60 0 0	0 0 3 6 8 0 0 2 9 10 0 0 7 5 11 0 6 3 5 12 0 0 0 1 5 8 10 0 0 1 6 3 12 0 0 7 3 9 1 0 0 0 1 1 0 0 0 1 2 0 0 0 1 3 0 4 5 8 3 0 4 3 9 1 3 0 4 5 8 3 0 4 3 9 1 6 16 12 2 9 1 22 0 3 3 10 2 3 0 3 3 5 2 3 0 1 1 6 2 4 2 6 2 2 1 2 59 1 0 0 0 1 60 0 0 0 0 0 1 60 0 0 0 0 0 1 7 7 3 9 1 7 8 7 8 8 8 8 8 8 8 8 8 8 8 8 8 8 8 8	0 0 3 6 8 15 0 0 2 9 10 14 0 0 7 5 11 13 0 6 3 5 12 16 1 0 0 1 5 8 13 1 1 0 0 7 3 9 17 0 0 7 3 9 17 1 0 0 0 1 4 1 0 0 0 1 4 1 0 0 0 1 4 1 0 0 0 1 4 1 0 0 0 1 4 1 0 0 0 1 4 1 0 0 0 1 8 1 0 0 0 1 8 1 0 0 0 1 8 1 0 0 0 1 8 1 0 0 0 0 1 8 1 0 0 0 0 1 8 1 0 0 0 0 1 8 1 0 0 0 0 1 8 1 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 0	0 0 3 6 8 15 29 0 0 0 2 9 10 14 26 0 0 7 5 11 13 25 0 6 3 5 12 16 19 1 0 0 1 5 8 13 34 1 0 0 1 6 3 12 17 22 0 0 7 3 9 17 25 1 0 0 0 1 4 55 2 1 0 0 0 1 4 55 2 1 0 0 0 1 4 55 2 1 0 0 0 1 8 50 2 2 0 4 4 10 17 24 2 0 0 0 1 8 50 3 0 4 5 8 22 19 3 0 4 3 9 12 30 1 1 2 2 9 7 9 2 2 2 0 3 3 10 11 12 2 2 3 0 3 3 5 11 16 2 3 0 1 1 6 5 25 2 4 26 2 2 1 4 2 2 5 9 1 0 0 0 0 1 2 5 9 1 0 0 0 0 1 2 6 5 9 1 0 0 0 0 1 2 7 8 8 8 8 8 8 8 8 8 8 8 8 8 8 8 8 8 8	0 0 3 6 8 15 29 4.00 0 0 2 9 10 14 26 3.87 0 0 7 5 11 13 25 3.72 0 6 3 5 12 16 19 3.78 1 0 0 1 5 8 13 34 4.21 1 0 0 0 7 3 9 17 25 3.82 1 0 0 0 1 4 55 4.90 1 0 0 0 1 4 55 4.90 1 0 0 0 1 8 50 4.83 1 0 0 1 1 12 3.67 1 0 0 0 1 1 12 3.67 1 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 1 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 1 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 1 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 1 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 1 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 1 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 1 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 1 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 1 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 1 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 1 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 1 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 1 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 1 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 1 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 1 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 1 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 1 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 1 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 1 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 1 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 1 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 1 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 1 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 1 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 1 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 1 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00	0 0 3 6 8 15 29 4.00 1216/1670 0 0 2 9 10 14 26 3.87 1344/1666 0 0 7 5 11 13 25 3.72 1218/1406 0 6 3 5 12 16 19 3.78 1306/1618 0 0 1 5 8 13 34 4.21 686/1566 0 0 7 3 9 17 22 3.77 1146/1528 0 0 7 3 9 17 25 3.82 1324/1656 1 0 0 0 1 4 55 4.90 675/1667 1 0 0 0 1 4 55 4.90 675/1667 1 0 0 0 1 8 50 4.83 777/1566 2 0 0 0 1 8 50 4.83 777/1566 2 0 0 0 1 8 50 4.83 777/1566 3 0 4 5 8 22 19 3.81 1280/1548 3 0 4 5 8 22 19 3.81 1280/1548 3 0 4 3 9 12 30 4.05 1121/1548 1 22 0 3 3 10 11 12 3.67 1033/1382 1 22 0 3 3 10 11 12 3.67 1033/1382 1 22 0 3 3 5 11 16 3.89 1060/1378 2 2 0 0 0 0 1 5 25 4.37 786/1378 2 2 0 0 0 0 1 5 25 4.37 786/1378 2 2 3 0 3 3 5 11 16 3.89 1060/1378 2 2 5 2 1 4 2 3.18 ****/ 904 2 5 9 1 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 85 2 6 6 7 3 1 1 1 6 5 25 4.37 786/1378 2 6 7 3 1 1 1 6 5 25 4.37 786/1378 2 7 3 0 4 5 8 25 1 4.37 786/1378 3 0 4 5 8 25 1 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5	0 0 3 6 8 15 29 4.00 1216/1670 4.00 0 0 2 9 10 14 26 3.87 1344/1666 3.87 0 0 7 5 11 13 25 3.72 1218/1406 3.72 0 6 3 5 12 16 19 3.78 1306/1615 3.78 1 0 0 1 5 8 13 34 4.21 686/1566 4.21 1 0 0 7 3 9 17 25 3.82 1324/1650 3.82 1 0 0 0 1 4 55 4.90 675/1667 4.90 1 0 0 7 3 19 11 3.55 1369/1626 3.55  2 0 4 4 10 17 24 3.90 1356/1559 3.90 2 0 0 0 1 8 50 4.83 777/1560 4.83 7 3 0 4 5 8 22 19 3.81 1280/1549 3.81 3 0 4 3 9 12 30 4.05 1121/1546 4.05 1 3 0 4 3 9 12 30 4.05 1121/1546 4.05 1 6 23 0 3 3 5 11 16 3.89 1060/1378 3.89 1 23 0 1 1 6 5 25 4.37 786/1378 4.37 2 4 26 2 2 1 4 2 3.18 ****/ 904 ****  1 60 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 87 ****  1 60 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 87 ****  1 60 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 16 ****  1 6 6 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 16 ****  1 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7	0 0 3 6 8 15 29 4.00 1216/1670 4.00 4.36 0 0 2 9 10 14 26 3.87 1344/1666 3.87 4.40 0 0 7 5 11 13 25 3.72 1218/1406 3.72 4.42 0 6 3 5 12 16 19 3.78 1306/1615 3.78 4.27 1 0 0 1 5 8 13 34 4.21 686/1566 4.21 4.28 1 1 0 0 7 3 9 17 22 3.77 1146/1528 3.77 4.22 0 0 7 3 9 17 25 3.82 1324/1650 3.82 4.37 1 0 0 0 1 4 55 4.90 675/1667 4.90 4.64 1 0 0 0 1 8 50 4.83 777/1560 4.83 4.86 1 3 0 4 5 8 22 19 3.81 1280/1549 3.81 4.50 2 0 0 0 1 8 50 4.83 777/1560 4.83 4.86 2 0 0 0 1 8 50 4.83 777/1560 4.83 4.86 2 0 0 0 1 8 50 4.83 777/1560 4.83 4.86 2 0 0 0 1 8 50 4.83 777/1560 4.83 4.86 2 0 0 0 1 8 50 4.83 777/1560 4.83 4.86 2 0 0 0 1 8 50 4.83 777/1560 4.83 4.86 2 0 0 0 1 8 50 4.83 777/1560 4.83 4.86 2 0 0 0 1 8 50 4.83 777/1560 4.83 4.86 2 0 0 0 0 1 8 50 4.83 778/1560 4.83 4.86 2 0 0 0 0 1 8 50 4.83 778/1560 4.83 4.86 2 0 0 0 0 1 8 50 4.83 778/1560 4.83 4.86 2 0 0 0 0 1 8 50 4.83 778/1560 4.83 4.86 2 0 0 0 0 1 8 50 4.83 778/1560 4.83 4.86 2 0 0 0 0 1 8 50 4.83 778/1560 4.83 4.86 2 0 0 0 0 1 8 50 4.83 778/1560 4.83 4.86 2 0 0 0 0 1 8 50 4.83 778/1560 4.83 4.86 2 0 0 0 0 1 8 50 4.83 778/1560 4.83 4.86 2 0 0 0 0 1 8 50 4.83 778/1560 4.83 4.86 2 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0	0 0 3 6 8 15 29 4.00 1216/1670 4.00 4.36 4.31 0 0 2 9 10 14 26 3.87 1344/1666 3.87 4.40 4.27 0 0 0 7 5 11 13 25 3.72 1218/1406 3.72 4.42 4.32 0 6 6 3 5 12 16 19 3.78 1306/1615 3.78 4.27 4.24 1 0 0 1 5 8 13 34 4.21 686/1566 4.21 4.28 4.07 1 0 0 7 7 3 9 17 25 3.82 1324/1650 3.82 4.37 4.22 1 0 0 0 1 4 55 4.90 675/1667 4.90 4.64 4.67 1 0 0 0 1 4 55 4.90 675/1667 4.90 4.64 4.67 1 0 0 0 1 8 50 4.83 777/1560 4.83 4.86 4.72 1 0 0 0 1 8 50 4.83 777/1560 4.83 4.86 4.72 1 0 0 0 1 8 50 4.83 777/1560 4.83 4.86 4.72 1 3 0 4 5 8 22 19 3.81 1280/1549 3.81 4.50 4.31 3 0 4 3 9 12 30 4.05 1121/1546 4.05 4.49 4.32 1 0 0 0 1 1 8 50 4.83 777/1560 4.83 4.86 4.72 1 3 0 3 3 5 11 16 3.89 1060/1378 3.89 4.45 4.29 1 0 2 0 3 3 10 11 12 3.67 1033/1384 3.67 4.27 4.10 2 2 0 4 4 10 6 5 25 4.37 786/1378 4.37 4.57 4.31 2 4 26 2 2 1 4 2 3.18 ****/ 904 **** 4.12 4.03  1 2 2 0 3 3 6 1 1 6 5 25 4.37 786/1378 4.37 4.57 4.31 2 4 26 2 2 1 4 2 3.18 ****/ 904 **** 4.12 4.03  2 5 9 1 0 0 0 1 5 5.00 ****/ 87 **** 5.00 4.65  3 6 6 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 87 **** 5.00 4.67  1 2 2 8 8 8 8 8 8 8 8 8 8 8 8 8 8 8 8 8	0 0 3 6 8 15 29 4.00 1216/1670 4.00 4.36 4.31 4.24 0 0 0 2 9 10 14 26 3.87 1344/1666 3.87 4.40 4.27 4.18 0 0 7 5 11 13 25 3.72 1218/1406 3.72 4.42 4.32 4.22 0 6 6 3 5 12 16 19 3.78 1306/1615 3.78 4.27 4.24 4.18 0 0 0 1 5 8 13 34 4.21 686/1566 4.21 4.28 4.07 4.04 1ed 0 1 6 3 12 17 22 3.77 1146/1528 3.77 4.22 4.12 4.07 0 0 7 3 9 17 25 3.82 1324/1650 3.82 4.37 4.22 4.12 1 0 0 0 1 4 55 4.90 675/1667 4.90 4.64 4.67 4.67 1 0 0 0 1 8 50 4.83 777/1560 4.83 4.86 4.72 4.67 1 3 0 4 5 8 22 19 3.81 1280/1549 3.81 4.50 4.31 4.25 3 0 4 3 9 12 30 4.05 1121/1546 4.05 4.49 4.32 4.24 1 1 0 0 0 0 1 8 50 4.83 777/1560 4.83 4.86 4.72 4.67 1 3 0 4 5 8 22 19 3.81 1280/1549 3.81 4.50 4.31 4.25 3 0 4 3 9 12 30 4.05 1121/1546 4.05 4.49 4.32 4.24 1 0 0 0 0 1 8 50 4.83 777/1560 4.83 4.86 4.72 4.67 2 0 0 0 0 1 8 50 4.83 777/1560 4.83 4.86 4.72 4.67 3 0 4 5 8 22 19 3.81 1280/1549 3.81 4.50 4.31 4.25 3 0 4 3 9 12 30 4.05 1121/1546 4.05 4.49 4.32 4.24 1 0 0 0 0 0 1 8 5 0 4.83 777/1560 4.83 4.86 4.72 4.67 2 0 0 0 0 1 8 50 4.83 777/1560 4.83 4.86 4.72 4.67 3 0 4 5 8 22 19 3.81 1280/1549 3.81 4.50 4.31 4.25 3 0 4 3 9 12 30 4.05 1121/1546 4.05 4.49 4.32 4.24 1 0 0 0 0 0 1 5 5.00 ****/ 8 4.84 4.45 4.29 4.30 1 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0

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

			Fre	equer	ncies	2		Tngi	tructor	Course	Dent	UMBC	I.evel	Sect
Ouestions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank		Mean	Mean		Mean
*******														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	2	0	0	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	_	0	0	0	1	2	0.5	4 02	402/1550	4 00	4 50	1 16	4 40	4 00
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	1	3	25	4.83	,	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		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		4.62		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	,	****	4.90	4.64	4.53	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	29	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	,	****	4.95	4.57	4.50	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	29	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00		****	4.85	4.45	3.68	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	29 29	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	, -	****	3.10	3.97	3.68	****
5. Were criteria for grading made crear	29	U	U	U	U	U	۷	5.00	/ 80		3.10	3.97	3.70	
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	, -	****	5.00	4.64	3.33	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	29	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	,	****	5.00	4.67	4.00	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	29	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	,	****	5.00	4.54	2.63	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	29	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	,	****	****	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

Credits Ea	arned	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	В	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	1
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	11				
				?	2						

Course-Section: SOCY 345 0101 University of Maryland Page 1506 Baltimore County Spring 2008 AUG 6, 2008 Title SOCIOLOGY OF EDUCATION Job IRBR3029

PINCUS, FRED L Instructor:

Enrollment: 50 Questionnaires: 24

Student	Course	Evaluation	Questionnaire

			Fre	equer	ncie	s		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	1	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		4.57	4.31	4.33	4.40
4. Were special techniques successful	9	2	1	1	6	3	2	3.31	787/ 904		4.12	4.03	4.03	3.31
Frequ	iency	Dis	trib	ution	1									
Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades				Rea	ason	.s 			Ту:	pe 			Majors	

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	В	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	ı
				P	0			responses to	be sig	nificant	
				I	0	Other	11	_			
				?	1						

Course-Section: SOCY 352 0101 University of Maryland Title ISSUES IN HEALTH CARE Baltimore County

Instructor: NOLIN, MICHAEL Enrollment: 65

Ouestionnaires: 44

Ρ

I

0

0

1

Spring 2008 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequencies

Instructor

Page 1507

AUG 6, 2008

Job IRBR3029

Course Dept UMBC Level Sect

responses to be significant

							т.т.	cquci				1115	LUCCOL	COULDO	DCPC	OLIDC	пс∨ст	DCCC
	Questions					NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		Genera	1															
1. Did vo	ou gain n	ew insights,ski	-	m this course	1	0	0	0	3	13	27	4.56	611/1670	4.56	4.36	4.31	4.24	4.56
		ctor make clear			1	0	0	0	2		24	4.51			4.40	4.27	4.18	4.51
		uestions reflec			1	0	0	0	1	13	29	4.65	435/1406		4.42	4.32		4.65
		uations reflect			1	0	1	1	6	11	24	4.30	813/1615	4.30	4.27	4.24	4.18	4.30
5. Did as	ssigned r	eadings contrib	ute 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 wr	ritten as	signments contr	ibute t	o 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 th	ne gradin	g system clearl	y expla	ined	1	0	1	2	3	4	33	4.53	527/1650	4.53	4.37	4.22	4.12	4.53
3. How ma	any times	was class cand	elled		1	0	0	0	0	3	40	4.93	472/1667	4.93	4.64	4.67	4.67	4.93
9. How wo	ould you	grade the overa	ll teac	hing effectiveness	7	1	0	0	5	22	9	4.11	888/1626	4.11	4.22	4.11	4.06	4.11
		Lectur	·e															
l. Were t	he instr	uctor's lecture	s 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 th	ne instru	ctor seem inter	ested i	n the subject	2	0	0	0	0	4	38	4.90	596/1560	4.90	4.86	4.72	4.67	4.90
. Was le	e lecture material presented and explained cles					0	0	0	2	13	27	4.60	574/1549	4.60	4.50	4.31	4.25	4.60
. Did th	d the lectures contribute to what you learned					0	0	1	1	8	32	4.69	482/1546	4.69	4.49	4.32	4.24	4.69
. Did au	id audiovisual techniques enhance your understan				2	4	1	1	6	10	20	4.24	560/1323	4.24	4.27	4.00	3.99	4.24
	Discussion																	
l. Did cl	ass disc	ussions contrib	ute 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
. Were a	all stude	nts actively en	courage	d to participate	13	0	0	0	1	4	26	4.81	348/1378	4.81	4.45	4.29	4.30	4.81
. Did th	ne instru	ctor encourage	fair an	d open discussion	13	0	0	0	0	5	26	4.84	354/1378	4.84	4.57	4.31	4.33	4.84
1. Were s	special t	echniques succe	ssful		14	12	3	0	1	5	9	3.94	526/ 904	3.94	4.12	4.03	4.03	3.94
		Semina	ır															
l. Were a	assigned	topics relevant	to the	announced theme	43	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 87	****	5.00	4.65	4.30	****
. Was th	ne instru	ctor available	for ind	lividual attention	43	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 79	****	4.90	4.64	4.53	****
. Did re	esearch p	rojects contrib	ute to	what you learned	43	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 75	****	4.95	4.57	4.50	****
. Did pr	resentati	ons contribute	to what	you learned	43	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 79	****	4.85	4.45	3.68	****
. Were o	criteria	for grading mad	le clear		43	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 80	****	3.10	3.97	3.76	****
				Frequ	ıency	Dis	trib	utio	n									
redits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Gra								Rea	ason	ıs			Ty	pe			Majors	5
														- 				
00-27 28-55	3 3	0.00-0.99 1.00-1.99	0	A 30 B 5		Re	quir	ed f	or M	lajor	S	7	Graduat	е	0	Majo	or	2
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	8	C 1		Ge	nera:	1			1	.9	Under-q	rad 4	14	Non-	-major	42
84-150	15	3.00-3.49	8	D 0				_			_	-	0.1.0.0.1			2.011		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	6	F 0		El	ecti	ves				2	#### -	Means t	here a	re not	t enoug	<sub>j</sub> h
																	•	

9

Other

Course-Section: SOCY 353 0101

MARRIAGE AND THE FAMIL

Title Instructor: SERVATIUS, NANC

Enrollment: 90 Questionnaires: 41

## University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2008

Page 1508 AUG 6, 2008 Job IRBR3029

				_	ncie	s		Ins	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	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		1220/1650		4.37	4.22	4.12	3.95
8. How many times was class cancelled	4	1	0	0	1	8	27		958/1667		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			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		****/ 231	****	****	4.31		***
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	40	0	0	0	0	1	Λ	4 00	****/ 87	****	5.00	4.65	4.30	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	40	0	0	0	1	0	0		****/ 79		4.90	4.64	4.53	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	40	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 75		4.95	4.57	4.50	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	40	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 79		4.85	4.45	3.68	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	40	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 80		3.10	3.97	3.76	***
Freq	iency	Dis	trib	utic	n									
_	1													
Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades				Re	ason	.s			Ту	pe 			Majors	: 
00-27 1 0.00-0.99 1 A 21		Re	quir	ed f	or M	lajor	s 1	.0	Graduat	е	0	Majo	r	0

Credits	Earned	Cum. GPA		Expecte	d Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	1	Α	21	Required for Majors	10	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	В	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	ı
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	7	_			
				?	0						

Course-Section: SOCY 354 0101

SOC BASES: PUBL/COMM HL

Title Instructor: KALFOGLOU, ANDR

Enrollment: 46 Questionnaires: 27

University of Maryland Spring 2008

Baltimore County

Page 1509 AUG 6, 2008 Job IRBR3029

			Fre	equer	ncies	2		Inst	ructor	Course	Dent	UMBC	I.evel	Sect
Ouestions	NR	NΑ	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank		Mean		Mean	Mean
x														
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	2	0	•	•		0	1.0	4 22	1000/1550	4 22	4 50	1 16	4 40	4 22
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	4	8	12		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		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		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		447/ 904	4.07		4.03	4.03	4.07
1. Wele special ecciniques successivi		2	Ü	2	2	5	,	1.07	1177 301	1.07	1.12	1.05	1.05	1.07
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	0.4		•	•	0	0	•	F 00	****	ale ale ale ale	F 00	4 65	4 20	als als als als
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	24	1	0	0	0	0	2	3.00	****/ 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		****/ 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		****/ 38	****	5.00	4.62	4.68	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	25	0	0	0	0	0	2		****/ 39	****	3.00	4.27	4.38	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	25	0	0	0	0	0	2		****/ 31	****	****	4.47	4.51	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out fretu accivities	20	U	U	U	U	J	۷	5.00	/ 31			7.4/	4.9I	
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

Credits Ea	arned	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	В	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	n
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	11				
				?	0						

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

			Fre	equer	ncies	=		Tnst	tructor	Course	Dent	UMBC	I.evel	Sect
Ouestions	NR	NΑ	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	_	Mean	Mean	Mean
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		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		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
- 1														
Laboratory		_												
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	32	1	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 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		,		****	4.44	4.25	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	32	1	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 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		,	****	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	,	****	3.10	3.97	3.76	****
J. Were criteria for grading made crear	22	U	U	U	O	U		3.00	, 00		3.10	3.77	3.70	
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		****/ 38	****	5.00	4.62	4.68	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	32	1	0	0	0	0	1			****	3.00	4.27	4.38	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	32	1	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 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

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	d Grades	Reasons		Туре		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	В	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	n
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	14				
				?	0						

Course-Section: SOCY 380 0101 University of Maryland Page 1511 Title POLITICAL SOCIOLOGY Baltimore County AUG 6, 2008 Spring 2008 Job IRBR3029

Instructor: SECKIN, GUL

Enrollment: 34 Questionnaires: 25

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

			Fre	equer	ncie	s		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank		Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
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		4.40	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
▼ a whoma														
Lecture	1	_	^	^	1	2	0.0	4 70	450/1550	4 70	4 50	1 10	4 40	4 70
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	U T	3	20	4.79	452/1559 298/1560		4.58	4.46 4.72	4.40 4.67	4.79
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	7	23 21	4.96 4.88	298/1560		4.86 4.50	4.72	4.07	4.96 4.88
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	1	1	22	4.88	265/1549		4.49	4.31	4.25	4.88
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	U T	1								
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	U	U	U	U	Т	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
Frequ	on ar	. Diat	- n i bı	.+	_									

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	d 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	В	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	ives 1		there	are not enough	n
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	8				
				?	0						

Course-Section: SOCY 396 0101 University of Maryland Page 1512 Title COMM SERV & LEARN INTE Baltimore County AUG 6, 2008 Spring 2008

WOLFF, MICHELE Instructor:

Enrollment: 13 Questionnaires: 10

Ctudont	Courac	Erraluation	Questionnaire
Student	Course	Evaluation	Questionnaire

Job IRBR3029

			Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Dept.	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General	2	0	0	0	2	4	2	4 00	1016/1670	4 00	1 20	4.31	4.24	4 00
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	2	0	0	0	1	4	3	4.00	1216/1670 967/1666		4.36	4.31	4.24	4.00 4.25
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	3	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	924/1406		4.40	4.32	4.22	4.25
Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals		3 4	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	924/1406 874/1615	4.25	4.42	4.24	4.18	4.25
Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals  Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned		0	0	0	1	4	3	4.25	643/1566		4.27	4.24	4.10	4.25
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 5. Did written assignments contribute to what you learne		2	0	0	1	2	2	4.17	787/1528		4.22	4.12	4.07	4.17
5. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 7. Was the grading system clearly explained		3	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	973/1650	4.20	4.37	4.12	4.12	4.20
8. How many times was class cancelled 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness		0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	922/1667	4.75	4.64	4.67	4.67	4.75
		0	0	0	0	3	1	4.25	728/1626		4.22	4.11	4.06	
J. now would you grade the overall teaching circultaness	6	J	Ü	Ü	0	5	_	1.23	72071020	1.23	1.22		1.00	1.25
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		0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1384		4.27	4.10	4.12	5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate		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		0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1378		4.57	4.31	4.33	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	5	U	U	U	0	Τ	4	4.80	128/ 904	4.80	4.12	4.03	4.03	4.80

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

Course-Section: SOCY 397A 0101

MEDIA AND SOCIETY

Title Instructor: TUFEKCIOGLU, ZE

Enrollment: 28 Questionnaires: 19

Spring 2008

Page 1513 AUG 6, 2008 Job IRBR3029

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

University of Maryland

Baltimore County

			Fre	equei	ncie	s		Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank		Mean	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		4.40	4.27	4.18	4.53
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	7	9	4.32			4.42	4.32	4.22	4.32
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	1	0	2	8	<i>5</i> 7		1018/1615		4.27		4.18	4.11
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	5	13	4.63	317/1566		4.27	4.24	4.10	4.63
	0	0	0	1	4	5 6	8	4.11			4.20	4.12	4.04	4.03
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	3	16	4.11	- ,		4.22	4.12	4.12	4.11
	1	0	0	0	0	15	3						4.12	4.17
8. How many times was class cancelled	7	0	0	0	2	15 5		4.17	1430/1667 728/1626		4.64	4.67 4.11	4.07	4.17
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	/	U	U	U	2	5	5	4.25	/28/1626	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		4.45	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		4.57	4.31	4.33	4.85
4. Were special techniques successful	6	3	0	1	2	0	7	4.30	345/ 904		4.12	4.03	4.03	4.30
4. Were special techniques successful	0	3	U	Τ.	4	U	,	4.30	343/ 304	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		****/ 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		****/ 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		****/ 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			****	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

Credits E	arned	d Cum. GPA Expected Grades Reasons						Type		Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	 А	7	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	2
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	В	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	n
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	5				
				?	0						

Course-Section: SOCY 397B 0101 University of Maryland ENVIRONMENTAL SOCIOLOG Baltimore County

Ρ

I

0

0

0

Title Spring 2008 Instructor: MACLENNAN, JAMI

Page 1514

AUG 6, 2008

Job IRBR3029

responses to be significant

Enrollment:	41				
Questionnaires:	22	Student	Course	Evaluation	Questionnaire

Questions				MP	NA	Fre	_	ncies 3	5 4	5	Ins Mean	tructor Rank		Dept Mean			Sect Mean	
		Quescion																
		Genera	1															
1. Did you	u gain ne	ew insights,ski	lls fro	m this course	0	0	0	0	2	3	17	4.68	453/1670	4.68	4.36	4.31	4.24	4.68
		ctor make clear			0	0	1	1	2	5	13	4.27	943/1666	4.27	4.40	4.27	4.18	4.27
	_	uestions reflec		_	1	14	0	1	0	0	6	4.57	525/1406		4.42	4.32	4.22	4.57
		uations reflect			0	0	0	0	2	5	15	4.59	456/1615		4.27	4.24	4.18	4.59
				what you learned	1	0	0	0	2	5	14	4.57	354/1566		4.28	4.07	4.04	4.57
		-		o what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	4	17	4.81	-,		4.22	4.12	4.07	4.81
		g system clearl		ined	1	0	0	1	0	1	19	4.81	229/1650		4.37	4.22	4.12	4.81
	-	was class canc			0	0	0	0	0	0	22	5.00	1/1667		4.64	4.67	4.67	5.00
9. How wor	uld you	grade the overa	II teac	hing effectiveness	4	0	0	0	2	3	13	4.61	316/1626	4.61	4.22	4.11	4.06	4.61
		Lectur	e															
1. Were th	he instr	uctor's lecture	s 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	e instru	ctor seem inter	ested i	n 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 led	cture mat	terial presente	d and e	xplained clearly	2	0	0	1	0	5	14	4.60	562/1549	4.60	4.50	4.31	4.25	4.60
	. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned					0	0	0	1	5	14	4.65	532/1546	4.65	4.49	4.32	4.24	4.65
5. Did aud	5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding					0	0	0	1	2	16	4.79	167/1323	4.79	4.27	4.00	3.99	4.79
	Discussion																	
1. Did cla	ass disc	ussions contrib	ute 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 al	ll stude	nts actively en	courage	d 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	e instru	ctor encourage	fair an	d 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 sp	pecial te	echniques succe	ssful		9	6	0	0	1	1	5	4.57	214/ 904	4.57	4.12	4.03	4.03	4.57
		Semina	r															
1. Were as	ssigned t			announced theme	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 87	****	5.00	4.65	4.30	****
	_	-		ividual attention	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	, -	****	4.90	4.64	4.53	****
				what you learned	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 75	****	4.95	4.57	4.50	***
	_	ons contribute		-	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 79	****	4.85	4.45	3.68	***
_		for grading mad		•	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 80	****	3.10	3.97	3.76	****
	•					Dist	cribu	ution	n									
Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grade																		
Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grade									asons				Ту	pe 			Majors 	
00-27 0 0.00-0.99 0 A 16						Red	quire	ed fo	or Ma	jor	s	1	Graduat	е	0	Majo	or	1
28-55	0 1.00-1.99 0 B 2					-						_	_					
56-83 4 2.00-2.99 1 C 0					General				8 Under-grad 22 Non-major 21									
84-150 5 3.00-3.49 6 D 0									_									
Grad. 0 3.50-4.00 3 F 0						Ele	ectiv	ves				1	#### -	Means t	here a		enoug	n

Other

6

University of Maryland Baltimore County SOCIOLOGICAL THEORY COHEN, JERE M Spring 2008

Course-Section: SOCY 409 0101 Page 1515 Title AUG 6, 2008 Instructor: Job IRBR3029

Frequencies

Instructor

Course Dept UMBC Level Sect

responses to be significant

Ouestionnaires:	21	Student	Course	Evaluation	Ouestionnaire
Quescionnaires.	21	beauciic	COULSE	Evaluation	Quescronnarie

Ρ

I

? 1

0

0

Enrollment:

44

O combine							T. T.	Eque	ITCTE	•		TIID	LIUCCOL	COULSE	: Debr	UNDC	пелет	מפכנ
Questions				NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
		 General																
1. Did you	u gain ne	ew insights,skil	ls fro	om 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	e instru	ctor make clear	the ex	spected 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	e exam qu	uestions reflect	the e	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 oth	her evalı	uations reflect	the ex	spected goals	0	5	1	0	4	2	9	4.13	1009/1615	4.13	4.27	4.24	4.37	4.13
5. Did ass	signed re	eadings contribu	ite 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 wri	itten ass	signments contri	bute t	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	e grading	g system clearly	expla	ined	0	0	1	2	1	2	15	4.33	806/1650	4.33	4.37	4.22	4.28	4.33
8. How mar	ny times	was class cance	elled		1	0	0	0	0	1	19	4.95	405/1667	4.95	4.64	4.67	4.73	4.95
9. How wor	9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectivene					2	0	0	1	7	8	4.44	515/1626	4.44	4.22	4.11	4.28	4.44
		Lecture	<u>:</u>															
1. Were th	1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared						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 led	cture mat	terial presented	l and e	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	e lecture	es 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 aud	diovisual	l techniques enh	ance y	our understanding	2	13	0	0	3	0	3	4.00	692/1323	4.00	4.27	4.00	4.10	4.00
		Discuss	sion															
1. Did cla	ass discu	ussions contribu	ite 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
				ed to participate	5	0	0	0	2	3	11	4.56	556/1378	4.56	4.45	4.29	4.55	4.56
		_	_	nd open discussion	5	0	0	0	0	2	14	4.88	312/1378	4.88	4.57	4.31	4.60	4.88
		echniques succes		-	6	13	1	1	0	0	0	1.50	****/ 904	****	4.12	4.03	4.22	****
				Frequ	ency	/ Dist	trib	utio	n									
Credits Ea	arnod	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades	Doggong				,			Ty	20			Majors	,	
		Cuiii. GPA		Expected Grades	Reasons									 pe			Majors 	, 
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 5	Required for Majors					jors 0 Gradu			e	0	Majo	or	12	
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В 12														
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	2	C 2	General					0 Unde			Under-g	rad 2	21	Non-	-major	9
84-150	7	3.00-3.49	4	D 0	=1													
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F 0	Electives							0	#### - 1	Means there are not enough				ιh

Other

17

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
---------	--------	------------	---------------

			Fre	equer	ncie	s		Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank		_		Mean	
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		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		4.24		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		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		4.00	461/ 904	4.00	4.12			4.00
1. Wele special econniques successful	3		_	O	Ü	O	Ü	1.00	101, 501	1.00	1.12	1.05	1.22	1.00
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		****/ 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		, -	****	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		,	****	****	4.19	4.36	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	19	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00		****	5.00	4.19	4.58	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	19	0	0	0	0	0	2		,	****	3.00	4.02	4.02	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	19	0	0	0	0	1	1		****/ 31	****	****	4.47	4.49	****
J. Dia conferences help you carry out freta activities	10	U	J	J	0	_	_	1.50	/ 31			1.1/	1.12	
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

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA	A	Expecte	d Grades	Reasons		Type	Majors		
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	0	 А	19	Required for Majors	6	Graduate	9	Major	6
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	В	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	a
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	6				
				?	0						

Course-Section: SOCY 420 0101

Title SOCIAL EPIDEMIOLOGY

TOLEA, MAGDALEN 38 Instructor:

Enrollment: Questionnaires: 23

## University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2008

Page 1517 AUG 6, 2008 Job IRBR3029

Ctudant	('Ollred	Evaluation	Ougetion	naira

Questions	NR	NA	Fre	equer 2	ncies 3	4	5	Inst Mean	tructor Rank	Course Mean	_		Level Mean	Sect Mean
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		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		4.64		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		4.58	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		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		1191/1384		4.27	4.10	4.32	3.29
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	9	0	2	1	0	4	7		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		****/ 230	****	****	4.44	4.30	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	21	1	0	0	1	0	0		****/ 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		****/ 87	****	5.00	4.65	4.80	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	21	1	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 79	****	4.90	4.64	4.60	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	21	1	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 75	****	4.95	4.57	4.56	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	21 21	1 1	0	0	0	0	1 1		****/ 79 ****/ 80	****	4.85	4.45	4.53	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	21	1	U	U	U	U	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		****/ 41	****	****	4.50	4.98	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	21	0	1	0	0	0	1		****/ 38	****	****	4.19	4.36	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	21	1	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 38	****	5.00	4.62	4.58	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	21	1	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 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		****/ 28	****	5.00	4.64	5.00	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	21	1	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 16	****	5.00	4.67	4.80	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	21	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	,	****	5.00	4.54	5.00	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	21 21	1 1	0	0	0	0	1 1	5.00	****/ 10 ****/ 6	****		4.84	****	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	ZΙ	Т	U	U	U	U	Т	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

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expecte	d 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	В	3						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	3	С	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	n
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	13				
				?	1						

Course-Section: SOCY 431 0101
Title FAMILY/AGING IN SOCIET

FAMILY/AGING IN SOCIET SCHUMACHER, JOH (Instr. A)

Instructor: SCHUMEnrollment: 6
Questionnaires: 4

Spring 2008

Page 1518 AUG 6, 2008 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

University of Maryland

Baltimore County

		Questions	3		NR	NA	Fro	eque:	ncies 3	4	5	Inst Mean	ructor Rani		Course	_		Level Mean	Sect Mean
1 Did wo	u gain ne	General w insights,skil		m this sourse	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	363/1	670	4.75	4.36	4.31	4.45	4.75
_		tor make clear			0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1		5.00	4.40	4.27	4.45	5.00
		estions reflect			0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	318/1		4.75	4.42	4.32	4.48	4.75
		ations reflect			0	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	552/1		4.50	4.27	4.24	4.37	4.50
				what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	643/1		4.25	4.28	4.07	4.17	4.25
				o what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	421/1		4.50	4.22	4.12	4.26	4.50
		system clearly			0	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	570/1		4.50	4.37		4.28	4.50
		was class cance	-		0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1		5.00	4.64	4.67	4.73	5.00
	-			hing effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	278/1			4.22		4.28	4.92
		Lecture																	
		ctor's lectures			0	0	0	0	0	0	4		1/1		5.00	4.58	4.46	4.58	5.00
		tor seem intere		_	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1		5.00	4.86	4.72	4.80	5.00
				xplained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1		5.00	4.50	4.31	4.43	5.00
	4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned						0	0	1	0	3	4.50	715/1		4.88	4.49	4.32	4.43	4.88
5. Did au	diovisual	techniques enh	nance y	our understanding	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1	323	5.00	4.27	4.00	4.10	5.00
1 Did al	agg digg:	Discuss		what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1	384	5.00	4.27	4.10	4.32	5.00
				d to participate	1	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	481/1		4.67	4.45	4.29	4.55	4.67
		_	_	d open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1		5.00	4.57	4.31	4.60	5.00
		chniques succes		a open arboubbion	1	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	328/		4.33	4.12	4.03	4.22	4.33
		Seminar	r																
1. Were as	ssigned t	opics 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	e instruc	tor available f	for ind	ividual attention	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/	79	5.00	4.90	4.64	4.60	5.00
				what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	0	1		1/	75	5.00	4.95	4.57	4.56	5.00
_		ons contribute to for grading made		-	3	0	0	0	0 1	0	1	5.00	1/ 67/	79 80	5.00	4.85	4.45	4.53 3.67	5.00
o. were c.	ilceria i				3	U	U	U	Τ.	U	U	3.00	077	80	3.00	3.10	3.91	3.07	3.00
		Field V			_		_			_	_								
		tor available f			3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/	38	5.00	5.00	4.62	4.58	5.00
4. To what	t degree	could you discu	uss you	r evaluations	3	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	34/	39	3.00	3.00	4.27	4.02	3.00
		Self I									_				= 00				
	_	-		what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	0	1		1/	28	5.00	5.00	4.64	5.00	5.00
		ions make clear			3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/	16	5.00	5.00	4.67	4.80	5.00
3. were yo	our conta	acts with the in	nstruct	or neipiul	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/	21	5.00	5.00	4.54	5.00	5.00
				Frequ	iency	Dist	trib	utio	n										
Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Re	asons					Тур	oe .			Majors	
00-27 1 0.00-0.99 0 A 2						Red	quir	ed f	or Ma	jors	3	0	Grad	uate	2	0	Majo	or	1
28-55 0 1.00-1.99 0 B 1 56-83 0 2.00-2.99 0 C 1						Ger	nera	1				2	Unde:	r-ar	rad	4	Non-	-major	3
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	0	D 0			-							5-				3	-
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F 0 P 0		Ele	ecti	ves				0			Means t es to b			t enoug nt	h
				I 0		Otl	her					2	_ 55P			. 2131		-	
				3 0															

Course-Section: SOCY 431 0101
Title FAMILY/AGING IN SOCIET University of Maryland

Baltimore County Spring 2008

Instructor: (Instr. B)

Enrollment: Ouestionnaires: 4 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Page 1519 AUG 6, 2008

Job IRBR3029

Frequencies Instructor Course Dept UMBC Level Sect Ouestions NR NA 1 2 3 4 5 Mean Rank Mean Mean Mean Mean General 1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course 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 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 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 8. How many times was class cancelled 0 0 0 0 1 0 3 4.50 570/1650 4.50 4.37 4.22 4.28 4.50 0 0 0 0 0 0 4 5.00 1/1667 5.00 4.64 4.67 4.73 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 0 0 0 1 5.00 1/1560 5.00 4.86 4.72 4.80 5.00 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 3 0 0 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 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  $1 \quad 0 \quad 0 \quad 0 \quad 0 \quad 3 \quad 5.00$ 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 0 0 00 0 0 1 5.00 1/ 87 5.00 5.00 4.65 4.80 5.00 0 0 0 1 5.00 1/ 79 5.00 4.90 4.64 4.60 5.00 2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 3 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 1/ 75 5.00 4.95 4.57 4.56 5.00 3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 3 0 0 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 4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations 3 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 1/ 38 5.00 5.00 4.62 4.58 5.00 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 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 Cum. GPA Expected Grades Credits Earned Majors \_\_\_\_\_\_ 00-27 1 0.00-0.99 0 A 2
28-55 0 1.00-1.99 0 B 1
56-83 0 2.00-2.99 0 C 1
84-150 1 3.00-3.49 0 D 0
Grad. 0 3.50-4.00 2 F 0 Required for Majors 0 Graduate 0 Major 1 General 2 Under-grad 4 Non-major 3 Electives 0 #### - Means there are not enough P 0 responses to be significant

Other

2

I 0

Course-Section: SOCY 431 0101 University of Maryland

Baltimore County Spring 2008

Title FAMILY/AGING IN SOCIET Instructor: (Instr. C)

Enrollment: 6 Questionnaires: 4

Page 1520 AUG 6, 2008 Job IRBR3029

Student	Course	Evaluation	Questionnaire
---------	--------	------------	---------------

			Fr	eque:	ncies	3		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	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		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		4.28	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		4.37	4.22	4.28	4.50
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1667		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		4.22	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		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		1/ 75		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		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	4.64	5.00	5.00
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal			0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 16		5.00	4.67	4.80	5.00
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful			0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 27	5.00	5.00	4.54	5.00	5.00
Frequ	ency	Dis	trib	utio	n									

Credits E	redits 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	В	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	L
				P	0			responses to	be sig	nificant	
				I	0	Other	2				
				2	Ο						

Course-Section: SOCY 431 0101 University of Maryland

FAMILY/AGING IN SOCIET Baltimore County

Title FAMILY/AGING IN SOCIET
Instructor: (Instr. D)

Enrollment: 6
Ouestionnaires: 4

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Spring 2008

Page 1521

AUG 6, 2008

Job IRBR3029

Frequencies Instructor Course Dept UMBC Level Sect Ouestions NR NA 1 2 3 4 5 Mean Rank Mean Mean Mean Mean General 0 0 0 1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course 0 1 3 4.75 363/1670 4.75 4.36 4.31 4.45 4.75 0 0 0 0 4 5.00 1/1666 5.00 4.40 4.27 4.35 5.00 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals 0 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals 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 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 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 0 0 0 4 5.00 8. How many times was class cancelled 0 0 0 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 0 0 0 1 5.00 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 3 0 0 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 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 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 1/1378 5.00 4.57 4.31 4.60 5.00 4. Were special techniques successful 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 1 5.00 1/ 87 5.00 5.00 4.65 4.80 5.00 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 3 0 0 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 00 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

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected	d Grades	Reasons		Type	Majors		
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	 А	2	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	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	ı
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	2				
				2	Λ						

Course-Section: SOCY 452 0101 Title HEALTH CARE ORG/DEL

Baltimore County Spring 2008

University of Maryland BREWER, MARY A

Enrollment: 22 Ouestionnaires: 12

Instructor:

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Page 1522 AUG 6, 2008

Job IRBR3029

Frequencies Instructor Course Dept UMBC Level Sect Ouestions NR NA 1 2 3 4 5 Mean Rank Mean Mean Mean Mean Mean General 1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course 0 0 1 0 3 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 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 1 11 4.92 536/1560 4.92 4.86 4.72 4.80 4.92 0 2 5 5 4.25 977/1549 4.25 4.50 4.31 4.43 4.25 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0 0 0 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 1.00 \*\*\*\*/ 239 \*\*\*\* \*\*\*\* 4.21 4.26 \*\*\*\* Field Work 1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 11 0 1 0 0 0 1.00 \*\*\*\*/ 41 \*\*\*\* \*\*\*\* 4.50 4.98 \*\*\*\* 2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 11 0 1 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 1.00 \*\*\*\*/ 28 \*\*\*\* 5.00 4.64 5.00 \*\*\*\* Frequency Distribution Reasons Type Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades Majors 

 00-27
 1
 0.00-0.99
 0
 A
 8

 28-55
 0
 1.00-1.99
 0
 B
 2

 56-83
 1
 2.00-2.99
 1
 C
 0

 84-150
 4
 3.00-3.49
 1
 D
 0

 Grad.
 0
 3.50-4.00
 3
 F
 0

 Required for Majors 0 Graduate 0 Major 0 General 1 Under-grad 12 Non-major 12 Electives 0 #### - Means there are not enough P Ω responses to be significant I 0 Other 10

Course-Section: SOCY 497B 0101 Universititle HLTH & ILLNESS 21ST CE Balti

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2008

Instructor: ROTHSTEIN, WILL

Enrollment: 19
Questionnaires: 14

Page 1523 AUG 6, 2008 Job IRBR3029

Ctudant	COLLEGE	Evaluation	Ougetion	22122

	Questions			NR	NA	Fr 1	eque:	ncies 3	4	5	Inst Mean	tructor Ran		Course Mean	Dept Mean		Level Mean	Sect Mean	
1 544		General		<b>-</b> bd	^	0	0	0	1	2	1.0	1 (1	E O E /1	C70	1 (1	1 20	1 21	4 45	1 (1
		w insights,ski] tor make clear			0	0	0	0 1	1 5	3 2	10 6		505/1 1294/1		3.93	4.36	4.31	4.45 4.35	4.64 3.93
		estions reflect			0	0	0	0	2	3	9	4.50			4.50	4.40	4.27	4.48	4.50
	_	ations reflect	_		0	1	0	0	1	4	8	4.54			4.54	4.42	4.24	4.37	4.54
		adings contribu	_	_	0	0	0	0	0	3	11	4.79	202/1		4.79	4.28	4.07	4.17	4.79
	_	-		what you learned	0	0	0	2	3	2	7	4.00	899/1		4.00	4.22	4.12	4.26	4.00
		system clearly			0	0	2	0	4	1	7		1341/1		3.79	4.37	4.22	4.28	3.79
		was class cance	_	cu	0	0	0	0	0	0	14	5.00		667	5.00	4.64	4.67	4.73	5.00
	_			ng effectiveness	3	1	0	1	0	6	3	4.10				4.22			4.10
J. 110	114 704 J	rado ono overas	0000111	115 01100017011000		_		_	ŭ	Ü		1.10	,,,,		1110			1.20	1.10
		Lecture	2																
1. Were th	ne instru	ctor's lectures	s well pr	epared	1	0	0	1	1	1	10	4.54	858/1	559	4.54	4.58	4.46	4.58	4.54
2. Did the	e instruc	tor seem intere	ested in	the subject	1	0	0	0	0	2	11	4.85	751/1	560	4.85	4.86	4.72	4.80	4.85
3. Was led	cture mat	erial presented	d and exp	lained clearly	1	0	0	0	2	3	8	4.46	736/1	549	4.46	4.50	4.31	4.43	4.46
4. Did the	e lecture	s contribute to	what yo	u learned	1	0	0	1	3	1	8	4.23	1002/1	546	4.23	4.49	4.32	4.43	4.23
5. Did aud	diovisual	techniques enh	nance you	r understanding	2	8	1	0	2	1	0	2.75	1248/1	323	2.75	4.27	4.00	4.10	2.75
		Discuss																	
		ssions contribu		-	3	0	1	1	1	1	7	4.09	798/1		4.09	4.27	4.10	4.32	4.09
		ts actively end	_		3	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91			4.91	4.45	4.29	4.55	4.91
		_		open discussion	3	0	0	0	2	0	9	4.64			4.64	4.57	4.31	4.60	4.64
4. Were sp	pecial te	chniques succes	sstul		3	9	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/	904	****	4.12	4.03	4.22	***
		Seminar	^																
1. Were as	ssigned t	opics relevant	=	nnounced theme	10	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/	87	5.00	5.00	4.65	4.80	5.00
	_	-		idual attention	10	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	53/	79	4.50	4.90	4.64	4.60	4.50
		ojects contribu			10	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	41/	75	4.75	4.95	4.57	4.56	4.75
	_	ns contribute t		_	10	0	0	1	0	0	3	4.25	55/	79	4.25	4.85	4.45	4.53	4.25
_		or grading made	-		10	0	1	0	1	0	2	3.50	55/	80	3.50	3.10	3.97	3.67	
		Field V																	
5. Did cor	nferences	help you carry	out fie	ld activities	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/	31	***	****	4.47	4.49	****
				Frequ	iencv	Dis	trib	utio	n										
				11040	101107	210	0112	u010.	-										
Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Re	asons					Тур	pe			Majors	
00 07		0 00 0 00	0	a 10								2				4			
00-27 28-55	6 0	0.00-0.99 1.00-1.99	0	A 10 B 4		ке	quir	eu f	or Ma	Jor	Ö	3	Grad	udle	=	4	Majo	)T	0
	0		1	<del>-</del> -		0-	20 0 20 -	1				5	IIn d -		- A 1	0	Mon	mo do	1.4
56-83 84-150	0	2.00-2.99 3.00-3.49	0			Ge	nera					5	Unde	тд1	Lau I	.0	non-	-major	14
84-150 Grad.	4	3.00-3.49	7	D 0 F 0		רים	ecti	TTO G				0	####	1	Means t	horo	ro not	onous	h
Grau.	4	3.50-4.00	1	Р 0		БŢ	CCLI	ves				U			means t es to b			_	11
I 0				O+	her					5	resp	OIIS	a LU L	e sigi	itttcal	10			
				5 0		UL	TICT					J							
				. 0															

Course-Section: SOCY 604 0101 University of Maryland Page 1524 Baltimore County AUG 6, 2008 Title STATISTICAL ANALYSIS Job IRBR3029

Instructor: ADLER, MARINA Spring 2008 Enrollment:

FIII OT THEILC:	20		
Questionnaires:	17	Student Course Evaluation	Questionnaire

				eque.		_				00 41 00	DOPO	01120		200
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	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 learne	d 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 effectivenes	s 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			4.94	,		4.86		4.81	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	1	16	4.94				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			4.00	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			,			4.29	4.42	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	0	1	2	10	4.69	501/1378			4.31	4.51	
4. Were special techniques successful	5	3	0	0	1	2	6	4.56	222/ 904			4.03	4.04	
Fire		- 54	4 d To											
fre	quenc	/ DIS	LT 1D	uc10	11									
Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grade	s			Re	ason	s			Туј	pe			Majors	i
00_27 2 0.00_0.00 0 λ 5					 or M			Λ	Craduat		ο	Maio		0

Frequencies

Instructor

Course Dept UMBC Level Sect

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expecte	d Grades	Reasons	Туре			Majors	
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	 А	5	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	8	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	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	n
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	14	_			
				2	Λ						

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

Questions	NR	NA	Fre	equer 2	cies 3	4	5	Inst Mean	ructor Rank	Course Mean	_	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
General	0	0	-	•	-		0	4 00	064/1650	4 50	4 26	4 21	1 16	4 00
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		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 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	0	2 4	4 1	6 9	4.33	775/1615 540/1566	4.43	4.27 4.28	4.24	4.33	4.33 4.36
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	4	-	4.57	368/1528	4.27	4.28	4.07	4.20	4.57
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1			4.64	383/1650	4.73	4.22	4.12	4.33	4.64
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0		5.00	1/1667	5.00	4.64		4.74	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	1	0	8		4.08	910/1626			4.11		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		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			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			794/1323		4.27			3.92
Discussion 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	1	2	4	-	3.85	057/1204	4 00	4 27	1 10	4.21	3.85
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1 1	0	0	1 0	2 1	4 5	5 7	3.85 4.46	957/1384 649/1378	4.08 4.54	4.27 4.45	4.10 4.29		3.85 4.46
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	2	3	8	4.46	692/1378	4.54	4.45		4.42 4.51	4.46
4. Were special techniques successful	2	5	0	0	2	2	3		425/ 904				4.04	
4. Were special techniques successiul	2	5	U	U	۷	4	3	4.14	423/ 904	4.33	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		****/ 230	****	****	4.44	4.69	***
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	12	0	0	0	1	0	1		****/ 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		****/ 75	****	4.95	4.57	4.66	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	0	1	1		****/ 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		****/ 41	****	****	4.50	4.65	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	12	0	0	0	0	1	1		****/ 38	****	****	4.19	4.58	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	12	0	0	0	0	0	2		****/ 38	****	5.00	4.62	4.65	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	12	0	0	0	0	0	2		****/ 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		****/ 28	****	5.00	4.64	4.82	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	12	0	0	0	0	1	1		****/ 16	****	5.00	4.67	4.60	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	12	0	0	0	0	1	1		****/ 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

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expecte	d Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors		
00-27	4	0.00-0.99	0	 А	10	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	6	Major	3	
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	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		
				P	0			responses to	be sig	nificant		
				I	0	Other	12					
				?	0							

Course-Section: SOCY 606 0101 University of Maryland Page 1526 Title SOC INEQUALITY/SOC POL Baltimore County AUG 6, 2008 Job IRBR3029

Instructor: ADLER, MARINA

Enrollment: 31 Questionnaires: 26

Spring 2008 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

			Frequencies			Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect		
Questions	NR	NA		_		4	5	Mean	Rank		Mean		Mean	Mean
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		4.40	4.27		4.38
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	17	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	212/1406		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		4.28	4.07	4.20	4.62
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0 E	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 effectivenes	s 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
Fre	quency	y Dis	strib	utio	n									
Credits Farned Cum CDA Expected Crade	-			D.	agone				Тът	00			Majorg	4

Credits Earned 00-27 6 28-55 0 56-83 0 84-150 2 Grad. 10	Cum. GPA	A	Expecte	d Grades	Reasons		Type	Majors			
00-27	6	0.00-0.99	0	А	18	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	10	Major	3
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	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	n
				P	0			responses to	be sig	nificant	
				I	0	Other	19	_			
				?	1						

Course-Section: SOCY 619 0101

QUALITATIVE METHODS

Title Instructor:

Enrollment:

RUBINSTEIN, ROB

24 Questionnaires: 20

# Spring 2008

Page 1527 AUG 6, 2008 Job IRBR3029

# Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

University of Maryland

Baltimore County

			Fre	eauei	ncies	3		Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Ouestions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank		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			4.49	4.32	4.40	4.44
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	11	0	0	1	0		4.60	273/1323		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		4.57	4.31	4.51	4.71
4. Were special techniques successful	6	8	1	0	0	0	5	4.33	328/ 904			4.03	4.04	
	-	-	_	-	•	-	-		,					
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		****/ 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	****
The state of the s														
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		****/ 31	****	****	4.47	4.59	****
1. 11. 1111		J	_	ŭ	Ü	J	_	3.00	, 31			/	1.00	
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		****/ 16	****	5.00		4.60	****
* * · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·									,					

Course-Section: SOCY 619 0101
Title QUALITATIVE METHO

QUALITATIVE METHODS RUBINSTEIN, ROB

Enrollment: 24
Questionnaires: 20

Instructor:

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2008 Page 1527 AUG 6, 2008 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expecte	d 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	В	2						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	0	С	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	n
				P	0			responses to	be sig	nificant	
				I	0	Other	8				
				?	0						

Course-Section: SOCY 620 0101 University of Maryland Title SOCIAL EPIDEMIOLOGY Baltimore County Instructor: SERPI, TRACEY L Spring 2008 Enrollment: 14

Questions

Questionnaires: 9

Page 1528 AUG 6, 2008 Job IRBR3029

Frequencies Instructor Course Dept UMBC Level Sect

NR NA 1 2 3 4 5 Mean Rank Mean Mean Mean Mean Mean

O L L	a	Ti 1 +	Ouestionnaire

General  1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course  2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals  3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals  4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals  5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned  6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned  7. Was the grading system clearly explained  8. How many times was class cancelled  9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness						0 0 0 0 0 0 0	0 0 0 0 0 0 0	0 0 0 0 0 0	0 0 0 0 0 0 0	0 0 0 0 1 0 0 0	3 2 0 1 1 1 0 2 4	6 7 9 8 7 8 9 7 3	4.67 4.78 5.00 4.89 4.67 4.89 5.00 4.78 4.43	479/1670 291/1666 1/1406 189/1615 295/1566 131/1528 1/1650 897/1667 531/1626	4.67 4.78 5.00 4.89 4.67 4.89 5.00 4.78 4.43	4.36 4.40 4.42 4.27 4.28 4.22 4.37 4.64 4.22	4.31 4.27 4.32 4.24 4.07 4.12 4.22 4.67 4.11	4.46 4.34 4.36 4.33 4.20 4.33 4.30 4.74 4.20	4.67 4.78 5.00 4.89 4.67 4.89 5.00 4.78 4.43
Lecture  1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding  Discussion 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 4. Were special techniques successful					ing ed te	1 1 1 1 2 0 0 0	0 0 0 0 1	0 0 0 0 0	0 0 0 0 0	0 0 0 0 0	1 0 1 0 3	7 8 7 8 3 7 9 9	4.88 5.00 4.88 5.00 4.50 4.67 5.00 5.00 4.38	323/1559 1/1560 229/1549 1/1546 326/1323 324/1384 1/1378 1/1378 305/ 904	4.88 5.00 4.88 5.00 4.50 4.67 5.00 5.00 4.38	4.58 4.86 4.50 4.49 4.27 4.27 4.45 4.57 4.12	4.46 4.72 4.31 4.32 4.00 4.10 4.29 4.31 4.03	4.49 4.81 4.37 4.40 4.03 4.21 4.42 4.51 4.04	4.88 5.00 4.88 5.00 4.50 4.67 5.00 5.00 4.38
					Freque	ency	Dist	ribu	ıtior	n									
Credits Ea	rned	Cum. GPA		Expected Gr	ades				Rea	asons	5			Тур	e			Majors	
00-27 28-55 56-83 84-150 Grad.	1 0 0 1 5	0.00-0.99 1.00-1.99 2.00-2.99 3.00-3.49 3.50-4.00	1 0 0 1 5	A 7 B 2 C 0 D 0 F 0 P 0 I 0 ? 0			Ger	- neral	L	or Ma	ajors		0 7 0	Graduate Under-gr #### - M response	ad Jeans t		re not	major enoug	7 2 h

Course-Section: SOCY 631 0101

FAMILY/AGING IN SOCIET

Title Instructor: SCHUMACHER, JOH

Enrollment: 12 Questionnaires: 12 Baltimore County Spring 2008

Page 1529 AUG 6, 2008 Job IRBR3029

# Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

University of Maryland

			Fre	equei	ncie	s		Inst	tructor	Course	e Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General	^	^	^	0	1	_	_	4 40	704/1670	4 40	1 26	4 21	1 16	4 40
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	U T	5 3	6	4.42	794/1670		4.36	4.31	4.46	4.42
<ol> <li>Did the instructor make clear the expected goals</li> <li>Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals</li> </ol>	0	0	0	0	1	4	9 7	4.75 4.50	312/1666 597/1406	4.75 4.50	4.40	4.27 4.32	4.34	4.75 4.50
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	3	8	4.58	467/1615	4.58	4.42	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	4.27	4.24	4.33	4.75
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	3	<i>9</i> 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		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		4.22	4.11	4.20	4.50
7. Now would fou grade the overall codening circultumess	-	0	J	O	O	J	3	1.50	103/1020	1.50	1.22		1.20	1.50
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		4.12	4.03	4.04	
									,					
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		****/ 79	****	4.90	4.64	4.67	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	0	0	2		****/ 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	11	0	^	0	0	0	1	F 00	**** / 20		г оо	4 60	4 65	
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	U	U	U	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	****
Freq	iency	n Die	trib	utio	n									
r r edr	.c.icy	210	UL 130											

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	В	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	ı
Grad.			P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant		

I 0 Other 5 ?

Course-Section: SOCY 683 8020 University of Maryland Page 1530 Title THE ORG STRUCT NONPROF Baltimore County AUG 6, 2008

Instructor: HALL, NANCY Enrollment: 6

Questionnaires: 4

Spring 2008 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire Job IRBR3029

responses to be significant

							Fre	equer	ncies			Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
		Questions	5		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		General																
1. Did voi	u gain ne	w insights,skil	_	m this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1670	5.00	4.36	4.31	4.46	5.00
		tor make clear			0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1666		4.40	4.27	4.34	5.00
		estions reflect			0	2	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1406		4.42	4.32	4.36	5.00
	_	ations reflect		_	0	1	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	775/1615	4.33	4.27	4.24	4.33	4.33
5. Did ass	signed rea	adings contribu	ite 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
				o 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	e grading	system clearly	expla	ined	0	0	0	1	1	2	0	3.25	1541/1650	3.25	4.37	4.22	4.30	3.25
8. How man	ny times v	was class cance	elled		0	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	1157/1667	4.50	4.64	4.67	4.74	4.50
9. How wor	uld you g	rade the overal	ll teac	hing effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	207/1626	4.75	4.22	4.11	4.20	4.75
		Lecture	2															
1. Were th	he instru	ctor's lectures	-	prepared	1	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1559	5.00	4.58	4.46	4.49	5.00
		tor seem intere			1	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1560		4.86	4.72	4.81	5.00
				xplained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1549		4.50	4.31	4.37	5.00
		s contribute to			1	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1546		4.49	4.32	4.40	5.00
				our understanding	1	0	0	1	0	0	2	4.00	692/1323	4.00	4.27	4.00	4.03	4.00
		Discuss	ni on															
1 Did ala	acc dican			what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1384	5.00	4.27	4.10	4.21	5.00
				d to participate	2	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1378		4.45	4.29	4.42	5.00
		-	_	d open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1378		4.57	4.31		5.00
		chniques succes		a open arscassion	1	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	328/ 904		4.12		4.04	4.33
				Frequ	enas	Dia:	+rih	ution	,									
				rrequ	terrey	DIS	CIID	ucioi	1									
Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	asons				Ty	pe			Majors	:
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A 2		Re	guir	ed fo	or Ma	jors	- – – – 3	0	Graduat	 e	1	Majo	 or	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	в 1			-			_						J -		
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C 0		Ge	nera	1				0	Under-g	rad	3	Non-	-major	4
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	1	D 0									3				-	
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00	1	F 0		El	ecti	ves				0	#### - 1	Means t	here a	re not	enoug	rh

Other

Ρ

I

?

0

0

0