

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	3	9	19	31	4.26	952/1576	3.94	4.33	4.30	4.11	4.26	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	3	8	20	31	4.27	920/1576	4.04	4.29	4.27	4.18	4.27	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	1	1	0	9	15	36	4.39	717/1342	4.11	4.31	4.32	4.19	4.39	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	12	2	1	10	16	21	4.06	1012/1520	3.83	4.22	4.25	4.09	4.06	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	5	2	0	8	24	23	4.16	748/1465	3.83	4.21	4.12	4.02	4.16	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	16	1	7	13	13	11	3.58	1181/1434	3.51	4.16	4.14	3.94	3.58	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	2	4	17	39	4.50	527/1547	4.30	4.37	4.19	4.10	4.50	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	51	10	4.16	1386/1574	4.52	4.59	4.64	4.59	4.16	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	20	1	0	2	6	24	9	3.98	964/1554	3.94	4.07	4.10	4.01	3.98	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	3	18	39	4.60	750/1488	4.49	4.52	4.47	4.41	4.60	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	1	4	54	4.90	582/1493	4.77	4.80	4.73	4.65	4.90	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	2	2	18	37	4.53	654/1486	4.34	4.38	4.32	4.26	4.53	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	1	2	5	14	37	4.42	789/1489	4.29	4.43	4.32	4.22	4.42	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	0	0	2	12	16	29	4.22	560/1277	4.21	4.20	4.03	3.91	4.22	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	20	0	1	2	9	13	17	4.02	795/1279	3.95	4.26	4.17	3.96	4.02	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	20	0	2	3	3	8	26	4.26	823/1270	3.99	4.44	4.35	4.09	4.26	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	20	0	0	1	3	8	30	4.60	590/1269	4.38	4.50	4.35	4.09	4.60	
4. Were special techniques successful	20	13	2	6	10	4	7	3.28	766/ 878	3.61	3.89	4.05	3.91	3.28	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	60	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 234	****	****	4.23	4.08	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	60	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 240	****	****	4.35	4.29	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	60	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 229	****	****	4.51	4.43	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	60	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 232	****	****	4.29	4.27	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	58	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	****/ 379	****	4.33	4.20	4.15	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	60	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 85	****	4.67	4.72	4.52	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	60	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 79	****	4.67	4.69	4.52	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	60	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 72	****	4.67	4.64	4.43	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	60	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 80	****	4.67	4.61	4.55	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	59	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/ 375	****	4.21	4.01	3.78	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	60	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.48	4.20	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	60	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.40	4.11	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	60	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 44	****	****	4.73	4.71	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	60	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 45	****	****	4.57	4.72	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	59	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 326	****	****	4.03	3.64	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	60	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 40	****	****	4.60	4.44	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	60	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 24	****	****	4.83	4.71	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	60	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 35	****	****	4.67	4.68	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	60	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 28	****	****	4.78	4.65	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	59	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/ 382	****	****	4.08	3.86	****	

Course-Section: SOCY 101 0101  
 Title BASIC CONCEPTS IN SOCY  
 Instructor: COUSINGOSSETT,  
 Enrollment: 107  
 Questionnaires: 62

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2009

Page 1426  
 JUL 2, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	18	0.00-0.99	1	A	17	Required for Majors	28	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	0	B	18						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	9	C	9	General	6	Under-grad	62	Non-major	62
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	7	D	1						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	7	F	0	Electives	4	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	12				
				?	2						

Course-Section: SOCY 101 0201  
 Title BASIC CONCEPTS IN SOCY  
 Instructor: SECKIN, GUL  
 Enrollment: 153  
 Questionnaires: 69

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2009

Page 1427  
 JUL 2, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sept
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	3	0	1	4	7	23	31	4.20	1019/1576	3.94	4.33	4.30	4.11	4.20	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	0	2	8	17	40	4.42	743/1576	4.04	4.29	4.27	4.18	4.42	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	0	0	2	6	13	46	4.54	552/1342	4.11	4.31	4.32	4.19	4.54	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	29	0	2	4	9	23	4.39	695/1520	3.83	4.22	4.25	4.09	4.39	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	4	3	3	7	13	13	26	3.84	1043/1465	3.83	4.21	4.12	4.02	3.84	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	5	31	2	1	5	9	16	4.09	840/1434	3.51	4.16	4.14	3.94	4.09	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	4	1	2	1	6	12	43	4.45	608/1547	4.30	4.37	4.19	4.10	4.45	
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	0	0	0	3	39	24	4.32	1279/1574	4.52	4.59	4.64	4.59	4.32	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	13	2	1	1	9	28	15	4.02	918/1554	3.94	4.07	4.10	4.01	4.02	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	7	0	0	0	9	14	39	4.48	895/1488	4.49	4.52	4.47	4.41	4.48	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	0	4	7	54	4.77	888/1493	4.77	4.80	4.73	4.65	4.77	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	0	1	10	20	34	4.34	891/1486	4.34	4.38	4.32	4.26	4.34	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	1	4	7	11	42	4.37	856/1489	4.29	4.43	4.32	4.22	4.37	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	5	0	1	2	7	14	40	4.41	404/1277	4.21	4.20	4.03	3.91	4.41	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	35	0	0	2	5	6	21	4.35	589/1279	3.95	4.26	4.17	3.96	4.35	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	35	0	0	2	5	9	18	4.26	823/1270	3.99	4.44	4.35	4.09	4.26	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	35	0	0	1	3	5	25	4.59	596/1269	4.38	4.50	4.35	4.09	4.59	
4. Were special techniques successful	35	16	1	3	4	4	6	3.61	685/ 878	3.61	3.89	4.05	3.91	3.61	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	67	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 234	****	****	4.23	4.08	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	68	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 240	****	****	4.35	4.29	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	68	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 229	****	****	4.51	4.43	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	68	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 232	****	****	4.29	4.27	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	67	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 379	****	4.33	4.20	4.15	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	67	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 85	****	4.67	4.72	4.52	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	68	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 79	****	4.67	4.69	4.52	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	68	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 72	****	4.67	4.64	4.43	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	68	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 80	****	4.67	4.61	4.55	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	68	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 375	****	4.21	4.01	3.78	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	68	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.48	4.20	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	68	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.40	4.11	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	68	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 44	****	****	4.73	4.71	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	68	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 45	****	****	4.57	4.72	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	67	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 326	****	****	4.03	3.64	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	68	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 40	****	****	4.60	4.44	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	68	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 24	****	****	4.83	4.71	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	68	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 35	****	****	4.67	4.68	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	68	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 28	****	****	4.78	4.65	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	68	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 382	****	****	4.08	3.86	****	

Course-Section: SOCY 101 0201  
 Title BASIC CONCEPTS IN SOCY  
 Instructor: SECKIN, GUL  
 Enrollment: 153  
 Questionnaires: 69

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2009

Page 1427  
 JUL 2, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	16	0.00-0.99	0	A	36	Required for Majors	34	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	8	1.00-1.99	1	B	16						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	9	C	3	General	12	Under-grad	69	Non-major	69
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	10	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	8	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	8				
				?	1						

Course-Section: SOCY 101 0301  
 Title BASIC CONCEPTS IN SOCY  
 Instructor: TRELA, JAMES E  
 Enrollment: 193  
 Questionnaires: 80

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2009

Page 1428  
 JUL 2, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	5	0	4	10	25	24	12	3.40	1482/1576	3.94	4.33	4.30	4.11	3.40	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	5	0	7	8	22	25	13	3.39	1445/1576	4.04	4.29	4.27	4.18	3.39	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	5	2	6	9	10	30	18	3.62	1181/1342	4.11	4.31	4.32	4.19	3.62	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	6	42	9	2	8	7	6	2.97	1475/1520	3.83	4.22	4.25	4.09	2.97	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	6	6	7	5	14	20	22	3.66	1166/1465	3.83	4.21	4.12	4.02	3.66	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	5	37	5	6	9	10	8	3.26	1310/1434	3.51	4.16	4.14	3.94	3.26	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	5	1	5	6	9	23	31	3.93	1113/1547	4.30	4.37	4.19	4.10	3.93	
8. How many times was class cancelled	5	1	0	0	0	3	71	4.96	235/1574	4.52	4.59	4.64	4.59	4.96	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	20	1	2	5	16	25	11	3.64	1240/1554	3.94	4.07	4.10	4.01	3.64	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	8	0	3	3	3	22	41	4.32	1064/1488	4.49	4.52	4.47	4.41	4.32	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	8	0	1	2	2	6	61	4.72	966/1493	4.77	4.80	4.73	4.65	4.72	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	11	0	4	5	8	24	28	3.97	1129/1486	4.34	4.38	4.32	4.26	3.97	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	11	1	7	3	9	22	27	3.87	1209/1489	4.29	4.43	4.32	4.22	3.87	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	11	6	5	8	10	16	24	3.73	902/1277	4.21	4.20	4.03	3.91	3.73	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	39	0	8	6	10	7	10	3.12	1169/1279	3.95	4.26	4.17	3.96	3.12	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	40	0	5	7	7	11	10	3.35	1165/1270	3.99	4.44	4.35	4.09	3.35	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	40	0	2	5	7	10	16	3.83	1012/1269	4.38	4.50	4.35	4.09	3.83	
4. Were special techniques successful	41	28	2	3	0	1	5	3.36	****/ 878	3.61	3.89	4.05	3.91	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	73	5	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 234	****	****	4.23	4.08	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	76	0	1	0	0	0	3	4.00	****/ 240	****	****	4.35	4.29	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	76	2	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 229	****	****	4.51	4.43	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	76	1	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 232	****	****	4.29	4.27	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	66	2	0	0	0	5	7	4.58	****/ 379	****	4.33	4.20	4.15	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	77	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 85	****	4.67	4.72	4.52	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	77	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 79	****	4.67	4.69	4.52	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	77	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 72	****	4.67	4.64	4.43	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	77	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 80	****	4.67	4.61	4.55	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	76	1	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 375	****	4.21	4.01	3.78	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	77	0	1	0	0	0	2	3.67	****/ 52	****	****	4.48	4.20	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	77	0	1	0	0	0	2	3.67	****/ 48	****	****	4.40	4.11	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	77	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 44	****	****	4.73	4.71	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	76	1	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 45	****	****	4.57	4.72	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	77	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 326	****	****	4.03	3.64	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	77	0	1	0	0	0	2	3.67	****/ 40	****	****	4.60	4.44	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	77	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 24	****	****	4.83	4.71	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	77	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 35	****	****	4.67	4.68	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	77	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 28	****	****	4.78	4.65	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	76	1	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 382	****	****	4.08	3.86	****	

Course-Section: SOCY 101 0301  
 Title BASIC CONCEPTS IN SOCY  
 Instructor: TRELA, JAMES E  
 Enrollment: 193  
 Questionnaires: 80

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2009

Page 1428  
 JUL 2, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	20	0.00-0.99	0	A	12	Required for Majors	33	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	11	1.00-1.99	0	B	26						
56-83	6	2.00-2.99	10	C	20	General	18	Under-grad	80	Non-major	80
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	10	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	15	F	2	Electives	3	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	10				
				?	2						

Course-Section: SOCY 101 0401  
 Title BASIC CONCEPTS IN SOCY  
 Instructor: COUSINGOSSETT,  
 Enrollment: 143  
 Questionnaires: 74

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2009

Page 1429  
 JUL 2, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sept
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	2	0	2	3	17	29	21	3.89	1257/1576	3.94	4.33	4.30	4.11	3.89	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	3	0	1	5	8	31	26	4.07	1094/1576	4.04	4.29	4.27	4.18	4.07	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	1	1	6	15	28	21	3.87	1080/1342	4.11	4.31	4.32	4.19	3.87	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	4	16	1	3	14	19	17	3.89	1179/1520	3.83	4.22	4.25	4.09	3.89	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	3	6	3	6	19	20	17	3.65	1180/1465	3.83	4.21	4.12	4.02	3.65	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	3	16	6	9	19	14	7	3.13	1353/1434	3.51	4.16	4.14	3.94	3.13	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	3	0	0	1	13	20	37	4.31	784/1547	4.30	4.37	4.19	4.10	4.31	
8. How many times was class cancelled	4	3	1	1	0	18	47	4.63	972/1574	4.52	4.59	4.64	4.59	4.63	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	29	5	0	0	5	25	10	4.13	849/1554	3.94	4.07	4.10	4.01	4.13	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	9	0	0	1	4	19	41	4.54	834/1488	4.49	4.52	4.47	4.41	4.54	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	8	0	0	1	3	12	50	4.68	1029/1493	4.77	4.80	4.73	4.65	4.68	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	9	0	0	0	5	21	39	4.52	654/1486	4.34	4.38	4.32	4.26	4.52	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	8	2	0	1	6	17	40	4.50	696/1489	4.29	4.43	4.32	4.22	4.50	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	16	1	0	1	8	11	37	4.47	337/1277	4.21	4.20	4.03	3.91	4.47	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	33	0	0	2	5	13	21	4.29	633/1279	3.95	4.26	4.17	3.96	4.29	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	33	0	0	1	12	10	18	4.10	905/1270	3.99	4.44	4.35	4.09	4.10	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	34	0	1	0	3	9	27	4.53	632/1269	4.38	4.50	4.35	4.09	4.53	
4. Were special techniques successful	35	10	1	2	6	9	11	3.93	529/ 878	3.61	3.89	4.05	3.91	3.93	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	70	2	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 234	****	****	4.23	4.08	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	72	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 240	****	****	4.35	4.29	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	72	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 229	****	****	4.51	4.43	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	73	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 232	****	****	4.29	4.27	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	73	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 379	****	4.33	4.20	4.15	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	71	0	0	0	2	0	1	3.67	****/ 85	****	4.67	4.72	4.52	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	73	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 79	****	4.67	4.69	4.52	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	73	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 72	****	4.67	4.64	4.43	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	73	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 80	****	4.67	4.61	4.55	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	73	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 375	****	4.21	4.01	3.78	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	72	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.48	4.20	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	72	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.40	4.11	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	72	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 44	****	****	4.73	4.71	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	72	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 45	****	****	4.57	4.72	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	72	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 326	****	****	4.03	3.64	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	73	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 40	****	****	4.60	4.44	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	73	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 24	****	****	4.83	4.71	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	73	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 35	****	****	4.67	4.68	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	73	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 28	****	****	4.78	4.65	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	73	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 382	****	****	4.08	3.86	****	

Course-Section: SOCY 101 0401  
 Title BASIC CONCEPTS IN SOCY  
 Instructor: COUSINGOSSETT,  
 Enrollment: 143  
 Questionnaires: 74

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2009

Page 1429  
 JUL 2, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	13	0.00-0.99	2	A	20	Required for Majors	38	Graduate	0	Major	2
28-55	5	1.00-1.99	2	B	25						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	1	C	5	General	11	Under-grad	74	Non-major	72
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	10	D	2						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	8				
				?	3						



Course-Section: SOCY 204 0101  
 Title DIVERSITY & PLURALISM  
 Instructor: PINCUS, FRED L  
 Enrollment: 43  
 Questionnaires: 31

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2009

Page 1430  
 JUL 2, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	1	1	4	15	10	4.03	1130/1576	4.03	4.33	4.30	4.35	4.03
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	2	1	3	14	11	4.00	1138/1576	4.00	4.29	4.27	4.32	4.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	6	10	14	4.19	879/1342	4.19	4.31	4.32	4.41	4.19
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	1	3	0	6	9	11	3.86	1192/1520	3.86	4.22	4.25	4.26	3.86
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	3	9	18	4.39	529/1465	4.39	4.21	4.12	4.09	4.39
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	5	13	12	4.23	704/1434	4.23	4.16	4.14	4.06	4.23
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	0	7	6	17	4.23	871/1547	4.23	4.37	4.19	4.22	4.23
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	16	12	3	3.58	1551/1574	3.58	4.59	4.64	4.62	3.58
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	0	0	1	13	7	4	3.56	1281/1554	3.56	4.07	4.10	4.05	3.56
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	0	0	4	8	15	4.41	995/1488	4.41	4.52	4.47	4.44	4.41
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	0	3	6	18	4.56	1167/1493	4.56	4.80	4.73	4.75	4.56
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	1	7	7	13	4.14	1039/1486	4.14	4.38	4.32	4.29	4.14
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	2	1	5	9	10	3.89	1200/1489	3.89	4.43	4.32	4.31	3.89
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	0	1	1	8	8	10	3.89	807/1277	3.89	4.20	4.03	4.01	3.89
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	9	0	1	1	1	5	14	4.36	582/1279	4.36	4.26	4.17	4.14	4.36
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	9	0	1	1	1	3	16	4.45	686/1270	4.45	4.44	4.35	4.30	4.45
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	0	0	3	6	13	4.45	686/1269	4.45	4.50	4.35	4.29	4.45
4. Were special techniques successful	9	1	0	2	4	8	7	3.95	510/ 878	3.95	3.89	4.05	3.92	3.95

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	1	0.00-0.99 0	A 15	Required for Majors 17	Graduate 1 Major 2
28-55	6	1.00-1.99 0	B 9		
56-83	5	2.00-2.99 3	C 5	General 3	Under-grad 30 Non-major 29
84-150	2	3.00-3.49 7	D 0		
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00 7	F 0	Electives 1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 8	
			? 0		

Course-Section: SOCY 300 0101  
 Title METHODOLOGY:SOCIAL RSR  
 Instructor: ANDERSON, DANIE  
 Enrollment: 41  
 Questionnaires: 27

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2009

Page 1431  
 JUL 2, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	6	7	14	4.30	904/1576	4.15	4.33	4.30	4.30	4.30	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	9	16	4.48	638/1576	4.34	4.29	4.27	4.28	4.48	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	1	0	2	10	13	4.31	797/1342	4.21	4.31	4.32	4.30	4.31	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	1	3	6	16	4.42	648/1520	4.19	4.22	4.25	4.25	4.42	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	2	4	7	14	4.22	678/1465	4.34	4.21	4.12	4.09	4.22	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	2	0	3	9	12	4.12	826/1434	3.93	4.16	4.14	4.15	4.12	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	9	17	4.59	422/1547	4.47	4.37	4.19	4.21	4.59	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	6	17	4	3.93	1509/1574	4.41	4.59	4.64	4.61	3.93	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	1	0	1	2	12	5	4.05	897/1554	3.96	4.07	4.10	4.09	4.05	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	5	21	4.81	401/1488	4.82	4.52	4.47	4.47	4.81	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	3	2	21	4.69	1017/1493	4.69	4.80	4.73	4.70	4.69	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	3	8	14	4.44	763/1486	4.48	4.38	4.32	4.32	4.44	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	1	2	7	15	4.44	766/1489	4.30	4.43	4.32	4.34	4.44	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	4	0	1	2	4	14	4.48	337/1277	4.47	4.20	4.03	4.11	4.48	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	1	2	6	9	4.28	649/1279	4.26	4.26	4.17	4.20	4.28	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	9	0	1	2	1	3	11	4.17	871/1270	4.13	4.44	4.35	4.42	4.17	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	0	0	0	2	16	4.89	299/1269	4.65	4.50	4.35	4.41	4.89	
4. Were special techniques successful	9	2	1	1	3	5	6	3.88	570/ 878	3.55	3.89	4.05	4.09	3.88	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	26	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 85	****	4.67	4.72	4.67	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	26	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 79	****	4.67	4.69	4.69	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	26	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 72	****	4.67	4.64	4.53	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	26	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 80	****	4.67	4.61	4.22	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	26	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 375	****	4.21	4.01	4.12	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	26	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.48	4.37	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	26	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.40	3.92	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	26	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 44	****	****	4.73	4.63	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	26	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 45	****	****	4.57	4.50	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors		
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A 12	Required for Majors 0	Graduate 0	Major 4
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	B 8			
56-83	5	2.00-2.99	4	C 1	General 3	Under-grad 27	Non-major 23
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	7	D 0			
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F 0	Electives 0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	
				P 0			
				I 0	Other 17		
				? 0			

Course-Section: SOCY 300 0201  
 Title: METHODOLOGY:SOCIAL RSR  
 Instructor: TUFEKIOGLU, ZE  
 Enrollment: 36  
 Questionnaires: 21

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2009

Page 1432  
 JUL 2, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sept
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	0	1	4	9	6	4.00	1148/1576	4.15	4.33	4.30	4.30	4.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	4	8	8	4.20	996/1576	4.34	4.29	4.27	4.28	4.20	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	0	0	0	7	3	9	4.11	938/1342	4.21	4.31	4.32	4.30	4.11	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	7	7	6	3.95	1103/1520	4.19	4.22	4.25	4.25	3.95	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	2	7	11	4.45	454/1465	4.34	4.21	4.12	4.09	4.45	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	3	4	8	5	3.75	1093/1434	3.93	4.16	4.14	4.15	3.75	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	4	5	11	4.35	737/1547	4.47	4.37	4.19	4.21	4.35	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	2	18	4.90	469/1574	4.41	4.59	4.64	4.61	4.90	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	0	0	0	3	11	1	3.87	1088/1554	3.96	4.07	4.10	4.09	3.87	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	1	1	17	4.84	339/1488	4.82	4.52	4.47	4.47	4.84	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	1	4	14	4.68	1029/1493	4.69	4.80	4.73	4.70	4.68	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	2	5	12	4.53	654/1486	4.48	4.38	4.32	4.32	4.53	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	1	0	0	5	5	8	4.17	1020/1489	4.30	4.43	4.32	4.34	4.17	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	0	0	0	2	6	11	4.47	337/1277	4.47	4.20	4.03	4.11	4.47	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	2	5	5	4.25	665/1279	4.26	4.26	4.17	4.20	4.25	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	9	0	0	0	2	7	3	4.08	908/1270	4.13	4.44	4.35	4.42	4.08	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	0	0	2	3	7	4.42	719/1269	4.65	4.50	4.35	4.41	4.42	
4. Were special techniques successful	9	3	1	1	3	3	1	3.22	776/ 878	3.55	3.89	4.05	4.09	3.22	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	18	1	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 234	****	****	4.23	4.24	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	19	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 240	****	****	4.35	4.32	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	19	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 229	****	****	4.51	4.48	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	19	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 232	****	****	4.29	4.16	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	18	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/ 379	****	4.33	4.20	4.17	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	19	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 85	****	4.67	4.72	4.67	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	19	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 79	****	4.67	4.69	4.69	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 72	****	4.67	4.64	4.53	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 80	****	4.67	4.61	4.22	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	18	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/ 375	****	4.21	4.01	4.12	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	19	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.48	4.37	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	19	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.40	3.92	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	19	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 44	****	****	4.73	4.63	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	19	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 45	****	****	4.57	4.50	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	19	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 326	****	****	4.03	4.23	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 40	****	****	4.60	4.83	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	19	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 24	****	****	4.83	4.89	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	19	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/ 35	****	****	4.67	5.00	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	19	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 28	****	****	4.78	5.00	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	19	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 382	****	****	4.08	4.24	****	

Course-Section: SOCY 300 0201  
 Title METHODOLOGY:SOCIAL RSR  
 Instructor: TUFEKCIOGLU, ZE  
 Enrollment: 36  
 Questionnaires: 21

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2009

Page 1432  
 JUL 2, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	5	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	9
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	12						
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	4	C	3	General	0	Under-grad	21	Non-major	12
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	5	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	19				
				?	0						

Course-Section: SOCY 301 0101  
 Title ANALY:SOCIOLOGICAL DAT  
 Instructor: COHEN, JERE M  
 Enrollment: 41  
 Questionnaires: 30

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2009

Page 1433  
 JUL 2, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor Mean	Instructor Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5								
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	3	0	0	0	3	8	16	4.48	667/1576	4.48	4.33	4.30	4.30	4.48	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	3	0	0	1	3	4	19	4.52	594/1576	4.52	4.29	4.27	4.28	4.52	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	3	0	0	0	0	6	21	4.78	275/1342	4.78	4.31	4.32	4.30	4.78	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	6	0	0	1	4	17	4.73	281/1520	4.73	4.22	4.25	4.25	4.73	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	4	3	4	1	3	7	8	3.61	1208/1465	3.61	4.21	4.12	4.09	3.61	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	4	10	1	0	1	3	11	4.44	486/1434	4.44	4.16	4.14	4.15	4.44	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	4	0	0	0	1	5	20	4.73	259/1547	4.73	4.37	4.19	4.21	4.73	
8. How many times was class cancelled	4	0	0	0	0	2	24	4.92	375/1574	4.92	4.59	4.64	4.61	4.92	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	12	1	0	0	0	6	11	4.65	281/1554	4.65	4.07	4.10	4.09	4.65	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	0	0	0	5	21	4.81	401/1488	4.81	4.52	4.47	4.47	4.81	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	5	0	0	0	1	1	23	4.88	607/1493	4.88	4.80	4.73	4.70	4.88	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	5	0	0	1	2	5	17	4.52	654/1486	4.52	4.38	4.32	4.32	4.52	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	2	4	20	4.69	461/1489	4.69	4.43	4.32	4.34	4.69	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	21	0	1	0	1	3	4.20	****/1277	****	4.20	4.03	4.11	****	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	13	0	2	1	2	2	10	4.00	802/1279	4.00	4.26	4.17	4.20	4.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	13	0	0	1	2	3	11	4.41	726/1270	4.41	4.44	4.35	4.42	4.41	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	14	0	1	0	4	2	9	4.13	894/1269	4.13	4.50	4.35	4.41	4.13	
4. Were special techniques successful	13	14	1	0	0	1	1	3.33	****/ 878	****	3.89	4.05	4.09	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	26	2	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/ 234	****	****	4.23	4.24	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	28	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 240	****	****	4.35	4.32	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	27	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 229	****	****	4.51	4.48	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	28	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 232	****	****	4.29	4.16	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	A	9	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	15
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	7						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	5	C	8	General	0	Under-grad	30	Non-major	15
84-150	9	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	22				
				?	1						

Course-Section: SOCY 315 0101  
 Title POPULATION & SOCIETY  
 Instructor: ROTHSTEIN, WILL  
 Enrollment: 41  
 Questionnaires: 21

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2009

Page 1434  
 JUL 2, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor Mean	Instructor Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5								
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	0	0	4	2	14	4.50	637/1576	4.50	4.33	4.30	4.30	4.50	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	8	11	4.38	785/1576	4.38	4.29	4.27	4.28	4.38	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	4	15	4.57	510/1342	4.57	4.31	4.32	4.30	4.57	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	1	3	5	10	4.26	848/1520	4.26	4.22	4.25	4.25	4.26	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	6	2	2	1	5	4	3.50	1242/1465	3.50	4.21	4.12	4.09	3.50	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	3	0	1	4	4	7	4.06	852/1434	4.06	4.16	4.14	4.15	4.06	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	0	2	5	12	4.35	737/1547	4.35	4.37	4.19	4.21	4.35	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	1	0	13	7	4.24	1339/1574	4.24	4.59	4.64	4.61	4.24	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	3	6	8	4.29	672/1554	4.29	4.07	4.10	4.09	4.29	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	2	2	14	4.67	666/1488	4.67	4.52	4.47	4.47	4.67	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	1	4	14	4.68	1029/1493	4.68	4.80	4.73	4.70	4.68	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	2	3	13	4.61	545/1486	4.61	4.38	4.32	4.32	4.61	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	1	3	13	4.71	448/1489	4.71	4.43	4.32	4.34	4.71	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	2	1	0	4	4	6	3.93	769/1277	3.93	4.20	4.03	4.11	3.93	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	4	5	7	4.19	719/1279	4.19	4.26	4.17	4.20	4.19	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	0	4	1	10	4.40	736/1270	4.40	4.44	4.35	4.42	4.40	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	0	3	5	8	4.31	786/1269	4.31	4.50	4.35	4.41	4.31	
4. Were special techniques successful	6	9	1	1	0	2	2	3.50	709/ 878	3.50	3.89	4.05	4.09	3.50	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	1	0.00-0.99 0	A 8	Required for Majors 5	Graduate 0 Major 1
28-55	2	1.00-1.99 0	B 4		
56-83	1	2.00-2.99 1	C 2	General 6	Under-grad 21 Non-major 20
84-150	1	3.00-3.49 1	D 0		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 3	F 0	Electives 0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 4	
			? 0		

Course-Section: SOCY 321 0101  
 Title RACE & ETHNIC RELATION  
 Instructor: COUSINGOSSETT,  
 Enrollment: 32  
 Questionnaires: 22

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2009

Page 1435  
 JUL 2, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	1	2	0	6	13	4.27	928/1576	4.45	4.33	4.30	4.30	4.27	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	7	12	4.36	811/1576	4.41	4.29	4.27	4.28	4.36	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	2	1	4	15	4.45	646/1342	4.50	4.31	4.32	4.30	4.45	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	3	1	5	12	4.24	880/1520	4.31	4.22	4.25	4.25	4.24	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	3	1	4	14	4.32	587/1465	4.57	4.21	4.12	4.09	4.32	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	5	5	11	4.14	806/1434	4.34	4.16	4.14	4.15	4.14	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	1	2	0	18	4.50	527/1547	4.50	4.37	4.19	4.21	4.50	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	22	5.00	1/1574	4.87	4.59	4.64	4.61	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	3	10	8	4.24	732/1554	4.51	4.07	4.10	4.09	4.24	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	2	5	14	4.57	786/1488	4.70	4.52	4.47	4.47	4.57	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	3	18	4.86	683/1493	4.91	4.80	4.73	4.70	4.86	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	1	0	4	16	4.67	468/1486	4.72	4.38	4.32	4.32	4.67	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	1	1	1	17	4.52	672/1489	4.70	4.43	4.32	4.34	4.52	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	1	0	3	3	14	4.38	421/1277	4.41	4.20	4.03	4.11	4.38	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	1	1	1	1	11	4.33	603/1279	4.63	4.26	4.17	4.20	4.33	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	0	2	1	3	9	4.27	823/1270	4.59	4.44	4.35	4.42	4.27	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	0	0	1	2	12	4.73	467/1269	4.82	4.50	4.35	4.41	4.73	
4. Were special techniques successful	7	8	1	0	3	0	3	3.57	694/ 878	4.07	3.89	4.05	4.09	3.57	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: SOCY 321 8620  
 Title RACE & ETHNIC RELATION  
 Instructor: COUSINGASSETT, Hylton, Kevin  
 Enrollment: 30  
 Questionnaires: 27

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2009

Page 1436  
 JUL 2, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	3	0	0	1	0	6	17	4.63	471/1576	4.45	4.33	4.30	4.30	4.63	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	3	0	0	1	1	8	14	4.46	683/1576	4.41	4.29	4.27	4.28	4.46	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	3	0	0	1	9	14	14	4.54	541/1342	4.50	4.31	4.32	4.30	4.54	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	3	0	1	0	3	5	15	4.38	719/1520	4.31	4.22	4.25	4.25	4.38	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	2	0	21	4.83	164/1465	4.57	4.21	4.12	4.09	4.83	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	4	1	0	2	0	4	16	4.55	368/1434	4.34	4.16	4.14	4.15	4.55	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	5	0	0	0	1	9	12	4.50	527/1547	4.50	4.37	4.19	4.21	4.50	
8. How many times was class cancelled	4	0	0	0	0	6	17	4.74	795/1574	4.87	4.59	4.64	4.61	4.74	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	9	0	0	0	1	2	15	4.78	180/1554	4.51	4.07	4.10	4.09	4.78	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	0	4	20	4.83	355/1488	4.70	4.52	4.47	4.47	4.83	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	0	1	23	4.96	279/1493	4.91	4.80	4.73	4.70	4.96	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	0	0	0	5	18	4.78	298/1486	4.72	4.38	4.32	4.32	4.78	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	3	21	4.88	228/1489	4.70	4.43	4.32	4.34	4.88	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	1	1	1	1	4	16	4.43	375/1277	4.41	4.20	4.03	4.11	4.43	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	2	22	4.92	152/1279	4.63	4.26	4.17	4.20	4.92	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	0	2	22	4.92	234/1270	4.59	4.44	4.35	4.42	4.92	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	0	2	22	4.92	250/1269	4.82	4.50	4.35	4.41	4.92	
4. Were special techniques successful	3	10	0	0	1	4	9	4.57	197/ 878	4.07	3.89	4.05	4.09	4.57	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	2	0.00-0.99 0	A 12	Required for Majors 4	Graduate 0 Major 0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99 0	B 7		
56-83	3	2.00-2.99 4	C 1	General 16	Under-grad 27 Non-major 27
84-150	8	3.00-3.49 5	D 0		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 7	F 0	Electives 1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 4	
			? 1		



Course-Section: SOCY 333 0101  
 Title HUM SEXUALITY/CROSS-CU  
 Instructor: LOTTES, ILSA L.  
 Enrollment: 83  
 Questionnaires: 47

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2009

Page 1437  
 JUL 2, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	3	0	2	1	8	9	24	4.18	1027/1576	4.18	4.33	4.30	4.30	4.18	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	4	0	3	4	8	10	18	3.84	1275/1576	3.84	4.29	4.27	4.28	3.84	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	3	1	4	8	7	11	13	3.49	1217/1342	3.49	4.31	4.32	4.30	3.49	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	3	3	0	5	7	13	16	3.98	1078/1520	3.98	4.22	4.25	4.25	3.98	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	3	7	7	25	4.29	616/1465	4.29	4.21	4.12	4.09	4.29	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	6	0	1	2	9	11	18	4.05	861/1434	4.05	4.16	4.14	4.15	4.05	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	6	0	1	5	7	8	20	4.00	1041/1547	4.00	4.37	4.19	4.21	4.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	7	0	0	0	1	0	39	4.95	281/1574	4.95	4.59	4.64	4.61	4.95	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	8	1	4	1	7	10	16	3.87	1088/1554	3.87	4.07	4.10	4.09	3.87	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	3	3	8	7	22	3.98	1257/1488	3.98	4.52	4.47	4.47	3.98	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	0	3	2	38	4.81	784/1493	4.81	4.80	4.73	4.70	4.81	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	4	3	8	7	21	3.88	1204/1486	3.88	4.38	4.32	4.32	3.88	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	2	5	2	10	24	4.14	1042/1489	4.14	4.43	4.32	4.34	4.14	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	6	4	4	9	9	11	3.51	1015/1277	3.51	4.20	4.03	4.11	3.51	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	10	0	2	3	3	9	20	4.14	751/1279	4.14	4.26	4.17	4.20	4.14	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	10	0	1	0	3	5	28	4.59	566/1270	4.59	4.44	4.35	4.42	4.59	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	10	0	2	1	3	3	28	4.46	686/1269	4.46	4.50	4.35	4.41	4.46	
4. Were special techniques successful	10	23	0	1	4	4	5	3.93	538/ 878	3.93	3.89	4.05	4.09	3.93	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	46	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 234	****	****	4.23	4.24	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	46	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 240	****	****	4.35	4.32	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	46	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 229	****	****	4.51	4.48	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	46	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 232	****	****	4.29	4.16	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	44	0	0	1	0	1	1	3.67	****/ 379	****	4.33	4.20	4.17	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	46	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 85	****	4.67	4.72	4.67	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	46	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 79	****	4.67	4.69	4.69	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	46	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 72	****	4.67	4.64	4.53	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	46	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 80	****	4.67	4.61	4.22	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	45	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/ 375	****	4.21	4.01	4.12	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	46	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.48	4.37	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	46	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.40	3.92	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	46	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 44	****	****	4.73	4.63	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	46	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 45	****	****	4.57	4.50	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	46	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 326	****	****	4.03	4.23	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	46	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 40	****	****	4.60	4.83	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	46	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 24	****	****	4.83	4.89	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	46	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 35	****	****	4.67	5.00	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	46	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 28	****	****	4.78	5.00	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	46	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 382	****	****	4.08	4.24	****	

Course-Section: SOCY 333 0101  
 Title HUM SEXUALITY/CROSS-CU  
 Instructor: LOTTES, ILSA L.  
 Enrollment: 83  
 Questionnaires: 47

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2009

Page 1437  
 JUL 2, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	15	Required for Majors	4	Graduate	0	Major	10
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	1	B	16						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	3	C	5	General	22	Under-grad	47	Non-major	37
84-150	10	3.00-3.49	11	D	1						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	3	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	1						
				I	0	Other	9				
				?	0						

Course-Section: SOCY 351 0101  
 Title MEDICAL SOCIOLOGY  
 Instructor: COZART, MERYL S  
 Enrollment: 37  
 Questionnaires: 26

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2009

Page 1438  
 JUL 2, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	2	1	4	7	11	3.96	1185/1576	4.06	4.33	4.30	4.30	3.96	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	2	1	8	4	11	3.81	1292/1576	3.94	4.29	4.27	4.28	3.81	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	3	3	3	6	11	3.73	1141/1342	3.90	4.31	4.32	4.30	3.73	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	4	1	2	5	3	11	3.95	1103/1520	3.79	4.22	4.25	4.25	3.95	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	7	4	13	4.16	738/1465	4.27	4.21	4.12	4.09	4.16	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	1	0	1	8	5	10	4.00	878/1434	4.14	4.16	4.14	4.15	4.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	3	7	3	11	3.80	1219/1547	3.78	4.37	4.19	4.21	3.80	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	6	19	4.76	739/1574	4.67	4.59	4.64	4.61	4.76	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	8	0	1	0	6	6	5	3.78	1152/1554	3.81	4.07	4.10	4.09	3.78	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	2	1	8	6	8	3.68	1365/1488	4.22	4.52	4.47	4.47	3.68	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	1	0	1	7	16	4.48	1225/1493	4.70	4.80	4.73	4.70	4.48	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	2	1	6	7	9	3.80	1233/1486	4.15	4.38	4.32	4.32	3.80	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	2	0	5	5	13	4.08	1075/1489	4.25	4.43	4.32	4.34	4.08	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	6	1	0	5	4	9	4.05	672/1277	3.98	4.20	4.03	4.11	4.05	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	5	1	7	4.15	738/1279	4.44	4.26	4.17	4.20	4.15	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	13	0	0	0	3	1	9	4.46	676/1270	4.59	4.44	4.35	4.42	4.46	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	13	0	0	0	3	1	9	4.46	677/1269	4.73	4.50	4.35	4.41	4.46	
4. Were special techniques successful	13	6	0	1	2	0	4	4.00	464/ 878	4.23	3.89	4.05	4.09	4.00	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	1	0.00-0.99 0	A 5	Required for Majors 1	Graduate 0 Major 3
28-55	2	1.00-1.99 0	B 9		
56-83	3	2.00-2.99 5	C 6	General 6	Under-grad 26 Non-major 23
84-150	7	3.00-3.49 4	D 0		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 5	F 0	Electives 1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 13	
			? 0		

Course-Section: SOCY 351 8620  
 Title MEDICAL SOCIOLOGY  
 Instructor: SUFIAN, MERYL  
 Enrollment: 19  
 Questionnaires: 19

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2009

Page 1439  
 JUL 2, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	6	0	1	0	2	3	7	4.15	1050/1576	4.06	4.33	4.30	4.30	4.15	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	6	0	0	0	3	6	4	4.08	1094/1576	3.94	4.29	4.27	4.28	4.08	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	6	0	0	1	3	3	6	4.08	948/1342	3.90	4.31	4.32	4.30	4.08	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	7	4	0	1	3	2	2	3.63	1320/1520	3.79	4.22	4.25	4.25	3.63	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	1	6	6	4.38	529/1465	4.27	4.21	4.12	4.09	4.38	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	7	5	0	0	1	3	3	4.29	647/1434	4.14	4.16	4.14	4.15	4.29	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	6	1	1	0	4	3	4	3.75	1239/1547	3.78	4.37	4.19	4.21	3.75	
8. How many times was class cancelled	7	0	0	0	0	5	7	4.58	1018/1574	4.67	4.59	4.64	4.61	4.58	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	7	0	0	1	2	7	2	3.83	1110/1554	3.81	4.07	4.10	4.09	3.83	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	7	0	0	0	0	3	9	4.75	505/1488	4.22	4.52	4.47	4.47	4.75	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	7	0	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	501/1493	4.70	4.80	4.73	4.70	4.92	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	7	0	0	0	1	4	7	4.50	678/1486	4.15	4.38	4.32	4.32	4.50	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	2	3	7	4.42	801/1489	4.25	4.43	4.32	4.34	4.42	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	7	1	1	1	1	3	5	3.91	802/1277	3.98	4.20	4.03	4.11	3.91	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	0	3	8	4.73	287/1279	4.44	4.26	4.17	4.20	4.73	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	0	0	1	1	9	4.73	447/1270	4.59	4.44	4.35	4.42	4.73	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1269	4.73	4.50	4.35	4.41	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	8	0	0	1	0	3	7	4.45	252/ 878	4.23	3.89	4.05	4.09	4.45	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: SOCY 352 0101  
 Title ISSUES IN HEALTH CARE  
 Instructor: NOLIN, MICHAEL  
 Enrollment: 69  
 Questionnaires: 32

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2009

Page 1440  
 JUL 2, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	2	0	2	6	22	4.44	742/1576	4.44	4.33	4.30	4.30	4.44	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	8	21	4.56	528/1576	4.56	4.29	4.27	4.28	4.56	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	5	24	4.63	455/1342	4.63	4.31	4.32	4.30	4.63	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	1	1	1	9	18	4.40	683/1520	4.40	4.22	4.25	4.25	4.40	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	4	7	20	4.44	468/1465	4.44	4.21	4.12	4.09	4.44	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	15	0	2	3	4	8	4.06	857/1434	4.06	4.16	4.14	4.15	4.06	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	3	4	24	4.59	422/1547	4.59	4.37	4.19	4.21	4.59	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	3	29	4.91	469/1574	4.91	4.59	4.64	4.61	4.91	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	7	2	1	0	2	10	10	4.22	752/1554	4.22	4.07	4.10	4.09	4.22	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	12	19	4.56	798/1488	4.56	4.52	4.47	4.47	4.56	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	2	30	4.94	390/1493	4.94	4.80	4.73	4.70	4.94	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	1	1	11	19	4.50	678/1486	4.50	4.38	4.32	4.32	4.50	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	2	5	24	4.63	552/1489	4.63	4.43	4.32	4.34	4.63	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	4	1	1	4	12	10	4.04	680/1277	4.04	4.20	4.03	4.11	4.04	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	13	0	1	1	2	5	10	4.16	738/1279	4.16	4.26	4.17	4.20	4.16	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	13	0	0	0	1	3	15	4.74	435/1270	4.74	4.44	4.35	4.42	4.74	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	13	0	0	0	1	2	16	4.79	409/1269	4.79	4.50	4.35	4.41	4.79	
4. Were special techniques successful	13	13	3	0	0	1	2	2.83	****/ 878	****	3.89	4.05	4.09	****	
Laboratory															
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	30	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 240	****	****	4.35	4.32	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	28	2	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 379	****	4.33	4.20	4.17	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	29	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 85	****	4.67	4.72	4.67	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	30	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 79	****	4.67	4.69	4.69	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	30	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 72	****	4.67	4.64	4.53	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	30	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 80	****	4.67	4.61	4.22	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	30	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 375	****	4.21	4.01	4.12	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	30	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.48	4.37	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	30	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.40	3.92	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	30	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 44	****	****	4.73	4.63	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	30	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 45	****	****	4.57	4.50	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	31	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 40	****	****	4.60	4.83	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	31	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 24	****	****	4.83	4.89	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	31	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 35	****	****	4.67	5.00	****	

Course-Section: SOCY 352 0101  
 Title ISSUES IN HEALTH CARE  
 Instructor: NOLIN, MICHAEL  
 Enrollment: 69  
 Questionnaires: 32

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2009

Page 1440  
 JUL 2, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	21	Required for Majors	4	Graduate	0	Major	4
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	9						
56-83	7	2.00-2.99	6	C	1	General	15	Under-grad	32	Non-major	28
84-150	8	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	9	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	13				
				?	0						

Course-Section: SOCY 353 0101  
 Title MARRIAGE AND THE FAMIL  
 Instructor: CARTER, WENDY  
 Enrollment: 83  
 Questionnaires: 62

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2009

Page 1441  
 JUL 2, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	1	1	17	24	19	3.95	1194/1576	3.95	4.33	4.30	4.30	4.30	3.95
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	1	2	20	16	22	3.92	1227/1576	3.92	4.29	4.27	4.28	4.28	3.92
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	16	3	3	11	16	13	3.72	1150/1342	3.72	4.31	4.32	4.30	4.30	3.72
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	3	5	13	21	20	3.81	1232/1520	3.81	4.22	4.25	4.25	4.25	3.81
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	2	3	26	30	4.38	537/1465	4.38	4.21	4.12	4.09	4.38	4.38
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	2	2	5	12	24	15	3.78	1081/1434	3.78	4.16	4.14	4.15	3.78	3.78
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	4	11	23	23	4.07	999/1547	4.07	4.37	4.19	4.21	4.07	4.07
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	1	0	0	0	8	50	4.86	547/1574	4.86	4.59	4.64	4.61	4.86	4.86
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	17	2	1	5	17	13	7	3.47	1321/1554	3.47	4.07	4.10	4.09	3.47	3.47
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	1	3	12	22	22	4.02	1230/1488	4.02	4.52	4.47	4.47	4.02	4.02
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	4	15	42	4.62	1101/1493	4.62	4.80	4.73	4.70	4.62	4.62
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	2	15	21	23	4.07	1081/1486	4.07	4.38	4.32	4.32	4.07	4.07
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	3	15	16	26	4.03	1102/1489	4.03	4.43	4.32	4.34	4.03	4.03
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	4	3	2	11	19	22	3.96	736/1277	3.96	4.20	4.03	4.11	3.96	3.96
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	2	5	17	24	4.31	617/1279	4.31	4.26	4.17	4.20	4.31	4.31
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	14	0	0	2	3	12	31	4.50	636/1270	4.50	4.44	4.35	4.42	4.50	4.50
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	14	0	1	4	5	14	24	4.17	870/1269	4.17	4.50	4.35	4.41	4.17	4.17
4. Were special techniques successful	15	0	0	6	6	18	17	3.98	491/ 878	3.98	3.89	4.05	4.09	3.98	3.98
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	58	1	0	1	0	2	0	3.33	****/ 234	****	****	4.23	4.24	****	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	59	0	0	1	0	2	0	3.33	****/ 240	****	****	4.35	4.32	****	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	60	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 229	****	****	4.51	4.48	****	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	61	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 232	****	****	4.29	4.16	****	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	56	1	0	0	0	4	1	4.20	****/ 379	****	4.33	4.20	4.17	****	****
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	59	1	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 85	****	4.67	4.72	4.67	****	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	60	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 79	****	4.67	4.69	4.69	****	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	60	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 72	****	4.67	4.64	4.53	****	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	60	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 80	****	4.67	4.61	4.22	****	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	59	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/ 375	****	4.21	4.01	4.12	****	****
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	60	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.48	4.37	****	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	60	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.40	3.92	****	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	60	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 44	****	****	4.73	4.63	****	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	60	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 45	****	****	4.57	4.50	****	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	57	0	0	0	1	3	1	4.00	****/ 326	****	****	4.03	4.23	****	****
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	60	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 40	****	****	4.60	4.83	****	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	61	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 24	****	****	4.83	4.89	****	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	60	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 35	****	****	4.67	5.00	****	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	60	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 28	****	****	4.78	5.00	****	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	60	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 382	****	****	4.08	4.24	****	****

Course-Section: SOCY 353 0101  
 Title MARRIAGE AND THE FAMIL  
 Instructor: CARTER, WENDY  
 Enrollment: 83  
 Questionnaires: 62

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2009

Page 1441  
 JUL 2, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	0	A	22	Required for Majors	17	Graduate	0	Major	4
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	0	B	27						
56-83	15	2.00-2.99	8	C	4	General	14	Under-grad	62	Non-major	58
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	14	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	3	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	19				
				?	1						



Course-Section: SOCY 354 0101  
 Title SOC BASES:PUBL/COMM HL  
 Instructor: KALFOGLOU, ANDR  
 Enrollment: 47  
 Questionnaires: 31

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2009

Page 1442  
 JUL 2, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	5	25	4.77	277/1576	4.77	4.33	4.30	4.30	4.77	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	5	23	4.65	420/1576	4.65	4.29	4.27	4.28	4.65	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	5	24	4.68	393/1342	4.68	4.31	4.32	4.30	4.68	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	9	21	4.65	357/1520	4.65	4.22	4.25	4.25	4.65	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	0	7	23	4.68	257/1465	4.68	4.21	4.12	4.09	4.68	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	0	1	5	23	4.76	193/1434	4.76	4.16	4.14	4.15	4.76	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	2	4	24	4.73	259/1547	4.73	4.37	4.19	4.21	4.73	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	9	22	4.71	851/1574	4.71	4.59	4.64	4.61	4.71	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	8	0	0	0	1	12	10	4.39	545/1554	4.39	4.07	4.10	4.09	4.39	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	1	1	2	27	4.77	463/1488	4.77	4.52	4.47	4.47	4.77	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	30	4.97	223/1493	4.97	4.80	4.73	4.70	4.97	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	1	1	3	26	4.74	352/1486	4.74	4.38	4.32	4.32	4.74	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	0	3	27	4.81	309/1489	4.81	4.43	4.32	4.34	4.81	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	1	2	28	4.87	113/1277	4.87	4.20	4.03	4.11	4.87	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	1	6	16	4.65	343/1279	4.65	4.26	4.17	4.20	4.65	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	0	0	1	4	18	4.74	435/1270	4.74	4.44	4.35	4.42	4.74	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	0	0	2	1	20	4.78	409/1269	4.78	4.50	4.35	4.41	4.78	
4. Were special techniques successful	9	7	0	1	1	4	9	4.40	283/ 878	4.40	3.89	4.05	4.09	4.40	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	28	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 234	****	****	4.23	4.24	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	30	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 240	****	****	4.35	4.32	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	29	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 229	****	****	4.51	4.48	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	29	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 232	****	****	4.29	4.16	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	29	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 379	****	4.33	4.20	4.17	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	29	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 85	****	4.67	4.72	4.67	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	30	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 79	****	4.67	4.69	4.69	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	30	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 72	****	4.67	4.64	4.53	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	30	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 80	****	4.67	4.61	4.22	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	29	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 375	****	4.21	4.01	4.12	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	29	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.48	4.37	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	29	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.40	3.92	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	29	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 44	****	****	4.73	4.63	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	29	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 45	****	****	4.57	4.50	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	29	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 326	****	****	4.03	4.23	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	29	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 40	****	****	4.60	4.83	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	29	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 24	****	****	4.83	4.89	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	29	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 35	****	****	4.67	5.00	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	29	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 28	****	****	4.78	5.00	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	29	1	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 382	****	****	4.08	4.24	****	

Course-Section: SOCY 354 0101  
 Title SOC BASES:PUBL/COMM HL  
 Instructor: KALFOGLOU, ANDR  
 Enrollment: 47  
 Questionnaires: 31

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2009

Page 1442  
 JUL 2, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	25	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	B	3						
56-83	5	2.00-2.99	1	C	0	General	7	Under-grad	31	Non-major	31
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	6	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	6	F	0	Electives	3	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	18				
				?	0						

Course-Section: SOCY 372 0101  
 Title JUVENILE DELINQUENCY  
 Instructor: KNAPP, ROLAND  
 Enrollment: 62  
 Questionnaires: 28

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2009

Page 1443  
 JUL 2, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	1	8	4	7	7	3.41	1482/1576	3.41	4.33	4.30	4.30	3.41
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	1	4	11	3	8	3.48	1401/1576	3.48	4.29	4.27	4.28	3.48
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	2	3	7	5	10	3.67	1166/1342	3.67	4.31	4.32	4.30	3.67
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	2	3	2	5	7	8	3.60	1330/1520	3.60	4.22	4.25	4.25	3.60
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	1	5	2	5	6	8	3.38	1299/1465	3.38	4.21	4.12	4.09	3.38
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	6	4	1	4	5	7	3.48	1221/1434	3.48	4.16	4.14	4.15	3.48
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	2	2	5	5	13	3.93	1124/1547	3.93	4.37	4.19	4.21	3.93
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	24	3	4.11	1417/1574	4.11	4.59	4.64	4.61	4.11
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	1	3	3	11	4	2	2.96	1466/1554	2.96	4.07	4.10	4.09	2.96
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	1	1	9	5	11	3.89	1321/1488	3.89	4.52	4.47	4.47	3.89
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	4	8	15	4.41	1286/1493	4.41	4.80	4.73	4.70	4.41
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	3	8	7	9	3.81	1229/1486	3.81	4.38	4.32	4.32	3.81
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	1	1	4	4	6	11	3.85	1218/1489	3.85	4.43	4.32	4.34	3.85
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	7	3	1	6	5	5	3.40	1066/1277	3.40	4.20	4.03	4.11	3.40
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	17	0	4	3	3	1	0	2.09	1269/1279	2.09	4.26	4.17	4.20	2.09
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	17	0	1	3	3	1	3	3.18	1189/1270	3.18	4.44	4.35	4.42	3.18
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	17	0	0	4	2	1	4	3.45	1129/1269	3.45	4.50	4.35	4.41	3.45
4. Were special techniques successful	17	9	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 878	****	3.89	4.05	4.09	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99 0	A 14	Required for Majors 3	Graduate 0 Major 2
28-55	3	1.00-1.99 0	B 10		
56-83	7	2.00-2.99 3	C 1	General 13	Under-grad 28 Non-major 26
84-150	8	3.00-3.49 6	D 0		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 11	F 0	Electives 3	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 5	
			? 0		

Course-Section: SOCY 374 0101  
 Title DRUGS AND ALCOHOL  
 Instructor: ROZENBROEK, KAT  
 Enrollment: 34  
 Questionnaires: 22

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2009

Page 1444  
 JUL 2, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor Mean	Instructor Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5								
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	2	20	4.91	163/1576	4.91	4.33	4.30	4.30	4.91	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	1	20	4.95	76/1576	4.95	4.29	4.27	4.28	4.95	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	21	4.95	90/1342	4.95	4.31	4.32	4.30	4.95	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	2	18	4.73	281/1520	4.73	4.22	4.25	4.25	4.73	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	5	16	4.76	200/1465	4.76	4.21	4.12	4.09	4.76	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	4	16	4.71	226/1434	4.71	4.16	4.14	4.15	4.71	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	0	1	20	4.95	62/1547	4.95	4.37	4.19	4.21	4.95	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	14	7	4.33	1262/1574	4.33	4.59	4.64	4.61	4.33	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	0	1	5	11	4.59	331/1554	4.59	4.07	4.10	4.09	4.59	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	4	18	4.82	385/1488	4.82	4.52	4.47	4.47	4.82	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	21	4.95	279/1493	4.95	4.80	4.73	4.70	4.95	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	3	19	4.86	211/1486	4.86	4.38	4.32	4.32	4.86	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	4	18	4.82	297/1489	4.82	4.43	4.32	4.34	4.82	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	0	0	0	2	2	16	4.70	194/1277	4.70	4.20	4.03	4.11	4.70	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	3	13	4.81	214/1279	4.81	4.26	4.17	4.20	4.81	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	0	0	0	16	5.00	1/1270	5.00	4.44	4.35	4.42	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	0	0	0	0	16	5.00	1/1269	5.00	4.50	4.35	4.41	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	6	2	0	0	0	5	9	4.64	171/ 878	4.64	3.89	4.05	4.09	4.64	
Laboratory															
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	16	0	0	0	0	4	2	4.33	128/ 379	4.33	4.33	4.20	4.17	4.33	
Seminar															
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	20	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 375	****	4.21	4.01	4.12	****	
Field Work															
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	20	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 326	****	****	4.03	4.23	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	15	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	5
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	3						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	6	C	1	General	12	Under-grad	22	Non-major	17
84-150	6	3.00-3.49	6	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	6				
				?	1						

Course-Section: SOCY 380 0101  
 Title POLITICAL SOCIOLOGY  
 Instructor: SECKIN, GUL  
 Enrollment: 33  
 Questionnaires: 21

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2009

Page 1445  
 JUL 2, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	2	0	0	1	1	0	17	4.74	324/1576	4.74	4.33	4.30	4.30	4.74	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	0	1	1	2	15	4.63	434/1576	4.63	4.29	4.27	4.28	4.63	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	16	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/1342	****	4.31	4.32	4.30	****	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	0	0	0	1	2	16	4.79	218/1520	4.79	4.22	4.25	4.25	4.79	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	2	17	4.89	127/1465	4.89	4.21	4.12	4.09	4.89	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	1	0	0	1	1	16	4.83	138/1434	4.83	4.16	4.14	4.15	4.83	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	0	0	0	19	5.00	1/1547	5.00	4.37	4.19	4.21	5.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	1	0	1	14	3	3.95	1496/1574	3.95	4.59	4.64	4.61	3.95	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	1	1	0	1	6	8	4.25	712/1554	4.25	4.07	4.10	4.09	4.25	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	0	0	0	3	14	4.82	370/1488	4.82	4.52	4.47	4.47	4.82	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	0	0	1	16	4.94	334/1493	4.94	4.80	4.73	4.70	4.94	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	0	0	0	3	14	4.82	251/1486	4.82	4.38	4.32	4.32	4.82	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	1	0	16	4.88	217/1489	4.88	4.43	4.32	4.34	4.88	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	1	0	0	0	1	15	4.94	73/1277	4.94	4.20	4.03	4.11	4.94	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	2	1	10	4.62	373/1279	4.62	4.26	4.17	4.20	4.62	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	0	1	1	0	11	4.62	550/1270	4.62	4.44	4.35	4.42	4.62	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	0	0	0	0	13	5.00	1/1269	5.00	4.50	4.35	4.41	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	9	5	1	0	2	1	3	3.71	654/ 878	3.71	3.89	4.05	4.09	3.71	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99 0	A 17	Required for Majors 3	Graduate 0 Major 1
28-55	1	1.00-1.99 0	B 0		
56-83	3	2.00-2.99 2	C 0	General 6	Under-grad 21 Non-major 20
84-150	5	3.00-3.49 5	D 0		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 5	F 0	Electives 1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 7	
			? 0		

Course-Section: SOCY 396 0101  
 Title COMM SERV & LEARN INTE  
 Instructor: WOLFF, MICHELE  
 Enrollment: 18  
 Questionnaires: 18

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2009

Page 1446  
 JUL 2, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor Mean	Instructor Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5								
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	3	4	11	4.44	727/1576	4.44	4.33	4.30	4.30	4.44	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	4	4	10	4.33	851/1576	4.33	4.29	4.27	4.28	4.33	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	6	0	0	3	2	7	4.33	770/1342	4.33	4.31	4.32	4.30	4.33	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	5	0	0	3	4	6	4.23	880/1520	4.23	4.22	4.25	4.25	4.23	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	3	4	9	4.24	668/1465	4.24	4.21	4.12	4.09	4.24	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	3	1	0	3	6	4	3.86	1033/1434	3.86	4.16	4.14	4.15	3.86	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	3	0	0	2	3	9	4.50	527/1547	4.50	4.37	4.19	4.21	4.50	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	4	13	4.76	739/1574	4.76	4.59	4.64	4.61	4.76	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	0	0	6	7	4.54	371/1554	4.54	4.07	4.10	4.09	4.54	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	5	0	0	0	0	1	12	4.92	198/1488	4.92	4.52	4.47	4.47	4.92	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	5	0	0	0	1	0	12	4.85	708/1493	4.85	4.80	4.73	4.70	4.85	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	5	0	0	0	1	4	8	4.54	642/1486	4.54	4.38	4.32	4.32	4.54	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	1	5	7	4.46	742/1489	4.46	4.43	4.32	4.34	4.46	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	5	4	0	1	4	2	2	3.56	997/1277	3.56	4.20	4.03	4.11	3.56	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	1	3	7	4.55	419/1279	4.55	4.26	4.17	4.20	4.55	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	260/1270	4.91	4.44	4.35	4.42	4.91	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	0	0	0	3	8	4.73	479/1269	4.73	4.50	4.35	4.41	4.73	
4. Were special techniques successful	7	1	0	0	0	3	7	4.70	152/ 878	4.70	3.89	4.05	4.09	4.70	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 234	****	****	4.23	4.24	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 240	****	****	4.35	4.32	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 229	****	****	4.51	4.48	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 232	****	****	4.29	4.16	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 379	****	4.33	4.20	4.17	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 85	****	4.67	4.72	4.67	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 79	****	4.67	4.69	4.69	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 72	****	4.67	4.64	4.53	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 80	****	4.67	4.61	4.22	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 375	****	4.21	4.01	4.12	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.48	4.37	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.40	3.92	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 44	****	****	4.73	4.63	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 45	****	****	4.57	4.50	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 326	****	****	4.03	4.23	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 40	****	****	4.60	4.83	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 24	****	****	4.83	4.89	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 35	****	****	4.67	5.00	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 28	****	****	4.78	5.00	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 382	****	****	4.08	4.24	****	

Course-Section: SOCY 396 0101  
 Title: COMM SERV & LEARN INTE  
 Instructor: WOLFF, MICHELE  
 Enrollment: 18  
 Questionnaires: 18

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2009

Page 1446  
 JUL 2, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: SOCY 397B 0101  
 Title THE SOCIOLOGY OF MONEY  
 Instructor: COUSINGOSSETT,  
 Enrollment: 34  
 Questionnaires: 22

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2009

Page 1447  
 JUL 2, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	7	14	4.59	513/1576	4.59	4.33	4.30	4.30	4.59	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	5	14	4.50	608/1576	4.50	4.29	4.27	4.28	4.50	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	4	16	4.64	443/1342	4.64	4.31	4.32	4.30	4.64	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	4	0	0	1	6	11	4.56	453/1520	4.56	4.22	4.25	4.25	4.56	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	2	19	4.82	169/1465	4.82	4.21	4.12	4.09	4.82	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	5	5	12	4.32	614/1434	4.32	4.16	4.14	4.15	4.32	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	5	2	15	4.45	608/1547	4.45	4.37	4.19	4.21	4.45	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	13	9	4.41	1202/1574	4.41	4.59	4.64	4.61	4.41	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	0	2	7	8	4.35	597/1554	4.35	4.07	4.10	4.09	4.35	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	8	13	4.62	736/1488	4.62	4.52	4.47	4.47	4.62	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	2	19	4.90	557/1493	4.90	4.80	4.73	4.70	4.90	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	1	2	18	4.81	271/1486	4.81	4.38	4.32	4.32	4.81	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	1	19	4.86	251/1489	4.86	4.43	4.32	4.34	4.86	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	1	4	6	10	4.19	585/1277	4.19	4.20	4.03	4.11	4.19	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	1	1	12	4.79	236/1279	4.79	4.26	4.17	4.20	4.79	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	0	0	0	2	12	4.86	307/1270	4.86	4.44	4.35	4.42	4.86	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	0	0	0	1	13	4.93	222/1269	4.93	4.50	4.35	4.41	4.93	
4. Were special techniques successful	8	12	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 878	****	3.89	4.05	4.09	****	
Laboratory															
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	21	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 240	****	****	4.35	4.32	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	21	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.48	4.37	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	21	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.40	3.92	****	

Frequency Distribution

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



**SCEQ Data for Spring 2009- SOCY 403 0101 Intro to Intl Field Res - Stuart, Mary (A) and Riley, Joyce (B)**

	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean
<b>General</b>								
Did you gain new insights, skills from this course				1	1		5	4.29
Did the instructor make clear the expected goals				1	1	3	2	3.86
Did exam questions reflect expected goals						2	5	4.71
Did other evaluations reflect expected goals						5	2	4.29
Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned					2	1	4	4.29
Did written assignments contribute to what you learned					2	1	4	4.29
Was the grading system clearly explained						2	5	4.71
How many times was class canceled							7	5.00
How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness_INSTRUC A	2	1			1	2	1	3.20
How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness_INSTRUC B	3	1			2		1	2.75
<b>Lecture - INSTRUC A</b>								
Were the instructor's lectures well prepared						4	3	4.43
Did the instructor seem interested in the subject						1	6	4.86
Was lecture material presented and explained clearly					1	2	4	4.43
Did the lectures contribute to what you learned				3	1		3	3.43
Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	3				1	2	2.33
<b>Lecture - INSTRUC B</b>								
Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3				1	1	2	4.25
Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3					1	3	4.75
Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3				1		3	4.50
Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4		1				2	3.67
Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	1				1	1	3.00
<b>Discussion</b>								
Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1			1	2		3	3.83
Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1					1	5	4.83
Encourage diverse points of view?	1				1	1	4	4.50
Were special techniques successful in producing relevant discussion	1	3			1	1	1	2.00
<b>Field</b>								
Field experience contribute to what learned						2	5	4.71
Understand clearly, at beginning, criteria to be evaluated				1		1	5	4.43
Instructor available for consultation		1					6	4.29
Opportunity to discuss evaluations		1					6	4.29
Did conferences with instructor help carry out field activities					1	2	4	4.43

<b>Credits Earned</b>	<b>N</b>
56-83	1
84 and over	2
Don't Recall/Missing	4

<b>Cum GPA</b>	
2.00-2.99	1
3.50-4.00	3
Don't Recall	3
<b>Expected Grades</b>	
A	4
B	1
?	2
<b>Reasons</b>	
Elective	6
Missing	1
<b>Student Type</b>	
Undergraduate	7
Graduate	0
<b>Majors</b>	
BIOL	1
INDS	1
SOCY	2
none listed	3

Course-Section: SOCY 409 0101  
 Title SOCIOLOGICAL THEORY  
 Instructor: COHEN, JERE M  
 Enrollment: 54  
 Questionnaires: 34

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2009

Page 1448  
 JUL 2, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	0	0	4	10	19	4.45	712/1576	4.45	4.33	4.30	4.46	4.45	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	3	10	20	4.52	594/1576	4.52	4.29	4.27	4.35	4.52	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	7	25	4.73	333/1342	4.73	4.31	4.32	4.46	4.73	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	7	0	2	2	4	17	4.44	614/1520	4.44	4.22	4.25	4.38	4.44	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	3	6	8	14	3.97	905/1465	3.97	4.21	4.12	4.22	3.97	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	10	0	0	2	4	17	4.65	279/1434	4.65	4.16	4.14	4.30	4.65	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	1	0	0	2	7	22	4.65	363/1547	4.65	4.37	4.19	4.24	4.65	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	2	0	0	0	2	29	4.94	328/1574	4.94	4.59	4.64	4.69	4.94	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	8	0	1	0	2	13	10	4.19	772/1554	4.19	4.07	4.10	4.24	4.19	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	0	0	1	4	25	4.80	401/1488	4.80	4.52	4.47	4.55	4.80	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	0	0	3	27	4.90	557/1493	4.90	4.80	4.73	4.80	4.90	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	0	1	3	7	19	4.47	735/1486	4.47	4.38	4.32	4.41	4.47	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	2	4	24	4.73	406/1489	4.73	4.43	4.32	4.38	4.73	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	24	1	1	0	1	3	3.67	****/1277	****	4.20	4.03	4.04	****	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	16	0	1	0	2	5	10	4.28	649/1279	4.28	4.26	4.17	4.31	4.28	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	16	0	0	0	3	3	12	4.50	636/1270	4.50	4.44	4.35	4.53	4.50	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	16	0	0	0	1	2	15	4.78	421/1269	4.78	4.50	4.35	4.55	4.78	
4. Were special techniques successful	15	14	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	****/ 878	****	3.89	4.05	4.33	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	1	A	12	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	16
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	14						
56-83	5	2.00-2.99	5	C	1	General	0	Under-grad	34	Non-major	18
84-150	16	3.00-3.49	8	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	6	F	0	Electives	2	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0						
				?	0						
						Other	25				

Course-Section: SOCY 415 0101  
 Title HIGHER ED AND SOC INEQ  
 Instructor: PINCUS, FRED L  
 Enrollment: 16  
 Questionnaires: 11

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2009

Page 1449  
 JUL 2, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	3	7	4.55	582/1576	4.55	4.33	4.30	4.46	4.55
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	2	8	4.64	434/1576	4.64	4.29	4.27	4.35	4.64
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	8	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1342	5.00	4.31	4.32	4.46	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	4	6	4.60	395/1520	4.60	4.22	4.25	4.38	4.60
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	1	9	4.73	225/1465	4.73	4.21	4.12	4.22	4.73
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	4	7	4.64	296/1434	4.64	4.16	4.14	4.30	4.64
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	1	1	1	7	4.09	978/1547	4.09	4.37	4.19	4.24	4.09
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	4	7	0	3.64	1547/1574	3.64	4.59	4.64	4.69	3.64
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	1	0	0	2	4	3	4.11	860/1554	4.11	4.07	4.10	4.24	4.11
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	1	3	4	4.38	1018/1488	4.38	4.52	4.47	4.55	4.38
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	632/1493	4.88	4.80	4.73	4.80	4.88
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	1	3	4	4.38	851/1486	4.38	4.38	4.32	4.41	4.38
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	1	1	1	5	4.25	955/1489	4.25	4.43	4.32	4.38	4.25
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	4	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	215/1277	4.67	4.20	4.03	4.04	4.67
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	2	1	6	4.44	510/1279	4.44	4.26	4.17	4.31	4.44
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	1	2	6	4.56	597/1270	4.56	4.44	4.35	4.53	4.56
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	1	2	6	4.56	614/1269	4.56	4.50	4.35	4.55	4.56
4. Were special techniques successful	2	4	1	0	1	0	3	3.80	603/ 878	3.80	3.89	4.05	4.33	3.80
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	8	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	58/ 85	4.67	4.67	4.72	4.77	4.67
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	8	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	52/ 79	4.67	4.67	4.69	4.69	4.67
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	44/ 72	4.67	4.67	4.64	4.64	4.67
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	40/ 80	4.67	4.67	4.61	4.52	4.67
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	8	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	146/ 375	4.67	4.21	4.01	3.90	4.67

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: SOCY 418 0101  
 Title SAS FOR SOCIAL SCIENTI  
 Instructor: MILLER, JAYNE M  
 Enrollment: 22  
 Questionnaires: 19

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2009

Page 1450  
 JUL 2, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	2	4	13	4.58	541/1576	4.58	4.33	4.30	4.46	4.58	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	4	13	4.58	515/1576	4.58	4.29	4.27	4.35	4.58	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	3	14	4.63	443/1342	4.63	4.31	4.32	4.46	4.63	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	3	14	4.63	367/1520	4.63	4.22	4.25	4.38	4.63	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	1	4	1	2	5	5	3.35	1310/1465	3.35	4.21	4.12	4.22	3.35	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	1	0	1	1	5	9	4.38	554/1434	4.38	4.16	4.14	4.30	4.38	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	2	0	2	13	4.53	503/1547	4.53	4.37	4.19	4.24	4.53	
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	14	3	4.18	1379/1574	4.18	4.59	4.64	4.69	4.18	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	0	1	9	4	4.21	752/1554	4.21	4.07	4.10	4.24	4.21	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	5	13	4.63	708/1488	4.63	4.52	4.47	4.55	4.63	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	18	4.95	334/1493	4.95	4.80	4.73	4.80	4.95	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	4	7	8	4.21	988/1486	4.21	4.38	4.32	4.41	4.21	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	1	6	11	4.37	856/1489	4.37	4.43	4.32	4.38	4.37	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	1	0	3	15	4.68	201/1277	4.68	4.20	4.03	4.04	4.68	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	1	1	4	5	4	3.67	1000/1279	3.67	4.26	4.17	4.31	3.67	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	1	4	1	9	4.20	855/1270	4.20	4.44	4.35	4.53	4.20	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	0	3	4	8	4.33	773/1269	4.33	4.50	4.35	4.55	4.33	
4. Were special techniques successful	4	12	1	0	0	0	2	3.67	****/ 878	****	3.89	4.05	4.33	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 234	****	****	4.23	4.28	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 240	****	****	4.35	4.45	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 229	****	****	4.51	4.70	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 232	****	****	4.29	4.56	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 379	****	4.33	4.20	4.19	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 85	****	4.67	4.72	4.77	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 79	****	4.67	4.69	4.69	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 72	****	4.67	4.64	4.64	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 80	****	4.67	4.61	4.52	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 375	****	4.21	4.01	3.90	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	1	A	15
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	B	0
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	0	C	1
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	3	D	0
Grad.	7	3.50-4.00	12	F	0
				P	1
				I	0
				?	0
			Required for Majors	2	Graduate
			General	14	Under-grad
			Electives	0	Major
			Other	2	Non-major
					8
					#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	2	0	1	4	9	4.13	1073/1576	4.13	4.33	4.30	4.46	4.13	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	2	1	3	3	7	3.75	1311/1576	3.75	4.29	4.27	4.35	3.75	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	3	2	4	6	3.69	1160/1342	3.69	4.31	4.32	4.46	3.69	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	3	2	1	3	7	3.56	1342/1520	3.56	4.22	4.25	4.38	3.56	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	3	0	4	2	7	3.63	1194/1465	3.63	4.21	4.12	4.22	3.63	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	4	1	1	2	8	3.56	1184/1434	3.56	4.16	4.14	4.30	3.56	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	2	1	3	2	7	3.73	1247/1547	3.73	4.37	4.19	4.24	3.73	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	1	0	0	15	4.81	645/1574	4.81	4.59	4.64	4.69	4.81	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	3	0	2	2	5	3.50	1303/1554	3.50	4.07	4.10	4.24	3.50	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	1	2	1	3	9	4.06	1215/1488	4.06	4.52	4.47	4.55	4.06	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	1	1	2	12	4.56	1159/1493	4.56	4.80	4.73	4.80	4.56	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	2	1	1	4	8	3.94	1168/1486	3.94	4.38	4.32	4.41	3.94	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	0	1	4	9	4.13	1050/1489	4.13	4.43	4.32	4.38	4.13	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	8	2	0	2	0	4	3.50	1020/1277	3.50	4.20	4.03	4.04	3.50	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	1	1	0	4	6	4.08	777/1279	4.08	4.26	4.17	4.31	4.08	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	1	1	2	8	4.42	726/1270	4.42	4.44	4.35	4.53	4.42	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	1	1	1	9	4.50	644/1269	4.50	4.50	4.35	4.55	4.50	
4. Were special techniques successful	4	7	1	0	1	0	3	3.80	603/ 878	3.80	3.89	4.05	4.33	3.80	
Laboratory															
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	15	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 240	****	****	4.35	4.45	****	
Seminar															
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	15	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 79	****	4.67	4.69	4.69	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 72	****	4.67	4.64	4.64	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	15	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 80	****	4.67	4.61	4.52	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	15	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 375	****	4.21	4.01	3.90	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	15	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.48	4.70	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	15	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.40	4.30	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	14	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 45	****	****	4.57	4.34	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 40	****	****	4.60	5.00	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	14	0	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/ 24	****	****	4.83	5.00	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	14	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 35	****	****	4.67	5.00	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	A 7	Required for Majors	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	B 7		Graduate 0
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	C 1	General	16
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	D 0		Major
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	11



Course-Section: SOCY 431 0101  
 Title FAMILY/AGING IN SOCIET  
 Instructor: SCHUMACHER, JOH  
 Enrollment: 2  
 Questionnaires: 2

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2009

Page 1452  
 JUL 2, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1576	5.00	4.33	4.30	4.46	5.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	608/1576	4.50	4.29	4.27	4.35	4.50	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	583/1342	4.50	4.31	4.32	4.46	4.50	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	511/1520	4.50	4.22	4.25	4.38	4.50	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	366/1465	4.50	4.21	4.12	4.22	4.50	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1434	5.00	4.16	4.14	4.30	5.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1547	5.00	4.37	4.19	4.24	5.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1574	5.00	4.59	4.64	4.69	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	395/1554	4.50	4.07	4.10	4.24	4.50	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1488	5.00	4.52	4.47	4.55	5.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1493	5.00	4.80	4.73	4.80	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	678/1486	4.50	4.38	4.32	4.41	4.50	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	696/1489	4.50	4.43	4.32	4.38	4.50	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	692/1277	4.00	4.20	4.03	4.04	4.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1279	5.00	4.26	4.17	4.31	5.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1270	5.00	4.44	4.35	4.53	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1269	5.00	4.50	4.35	4.55	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	221/ 878	4.50	3.89	4.05	4.33	4.50	

Frequency Distribution

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



Course-Section: SOCY 434 0101  
 Title GENDER & THE LIFE COUR  
 Instructor: WALLACE, BRANDY  
 Enrollment: 17  
 Questionnaires: 13

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2009

Page 1453  
 JUL 2, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor Mean	Instructor Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5								
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	4	9	4.69	373/1576	4.69	4.33	4.30	4.46	4.69	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	4	7	4.38	785/1576	4.38	4.29	4.27	4.35	4.38	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	1	1	4	6	4.25	835/1342	4.25	4.31	4.32	4.46	4.25	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	2	9	4.67	339/1520	4.67	4.22	4.25	4.38	4.67	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	2	10	4.69	244/1465	4.69	4.21	4.12	4.22	4.69	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	2	1	9	4.31	625/1434	4.31	4.16	4.14	4.30	4.31	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	2	1	10	4.62	399/1547	4.62	4.37	4.19	4.24	4.62	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	9	4	4.31	1288/1574	4.31	4.59	4.64	4.69	4.31	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	1	7	4	4.25	712/1554	4.25	4.07	4.10	4.24	4.25	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	2	2	0	7	4.09	1206/1488	4.09	4.52	4.47	4.55	4.09	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	2	9	4.82	784/1493	4.82	4.80	4.73	4.80	4.82	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	1	2	3	5	4.09	1072/1486	4.09	4.38	4.32	4.41	4.09	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	1	1	2	6	4.00	1118/1489	4.00	4.43	4.32	4.38	4.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	5	0	1	1	2	1	3.60	974/1277	3.60	4.20	4.03	4.04	3.60	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	219/1279	4.80	4.26	4.17	4.31	4.80	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1270	5.00	4.44	4.35	4.53	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1269	5.00	4.50	4.35	4.55	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	3	2	0	0	0	5	3	4.38	299/ 878	4.38	3.89	4.05	4.33	4.38	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	12	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 85	****	4.67	4.72	4.77	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 79	****	4.67	4.69	4.69	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 72	****	4.67	4.64	4.64	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 80	****	4.67	4.61	4.52	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	12	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 375	****	4.21	4.01	3.90	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors		
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	A 11	Required for Majors 2	Graduate 4	Major 3
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B 2			
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	1	C 0	General 7	Under-grad 9	Non-major 10
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	6	D 0			
Grad.	4	3.50-4.00	5	F 0	Electives 0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	
				P 0			
				I 0	Other 5		
				? 0			

Course-Section: SOCY 452 0101  
 Title HEALTH CARE ORG/DEL  
 Instructor: BREWER, MARY A  
 Enrollment: 39  
 Questionnaires: 16

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2009

Page 1454  
 JUL 2, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	1	2	8	5	4.06	1112/1576	4.06	4.33	4.30	4.46	4.06	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	4	5	7	4.19	1005/1576	4.19	4.29	4.27	4.35	4.19	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	5	9	4.38	735/1342	4.38	4.31	4.32	4.46	4.38	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	9	0	0	1	2	4	4.43	648/1520	4.43	4.22	4.25	4.38	4.43	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	2	5	8	4.19	718/1465	4.19	4.21	4.12	4.22	4.19	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	10	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	270/1434	4.67	4.16	4.14	4.30	4.67	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	2	6	8	4.38	718/1547	4.38	4.37	4.19	4.24	4.38	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	2	14	4.88	527/1574	4.88	4.59	4.64	4.69	4.88	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	1	0	0	7	4	1	3.50	1303/1554	3.50	4.07	4.10	4.24	3.50	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	1	4	10	4.60	750/1488	4.60	4.52	4.47	4.55	4.60	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	3	13	4.81	784/1493	4.81	4.80	4.73	4.80	4.81	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	3	5	8	4.31	911/1486	4.31	4.38	4.32	4.41	4.31	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	8	7	4.38	845/1489	4.38	4.43	4.32	4.38	4.38	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	2	0	0	2	4	8	4.43	385/1277	4.43	4.20	4.03	4.04	4.43	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	3	2	6	4.27	649/1279	4.27	4.26	4.17	4.31	4.27	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	1	3	0	7	4.18	860/1270	4.18	4.44	4.35	4.53	4.18	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	0	3	1	7	4.36	754/1269	4.36	4.50	4.35	4.55	4.36	
4. Were special techniques successful	5	6	0	1	2	0	2	3.60	688/ 878	3.60	3.89	4.05	4.33	3.60	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 234	****	****	4.23	4.28	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 240	****	****	4.35	4.45	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 232	****	****	4.29	4.56	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 379	****	4.33	4.20	4.19	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 85	****	4.67	4.72	4.77	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 79	****	4.67	4.69	4.69	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 72	****	4.67	4.64	4.64	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 80	****	4.67	4.61	4.52	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 375	****	4.21	4.01	3.90	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.48	4.70	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.40	4.30	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 44	****	****	4.73	4.60	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 45	****	****	4.57	4.34	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 326	****	****	4.03	3.97	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 40	****	****	4.60	5.00	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 24	****	****	4.83	5.00	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 35	****	****	4.67	5.00	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 28	****	****	4.78	5.00	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 382	****	****	4.08	3.88	****	

Course-Section: SOCY 452 0101  
 Title HEALTH CARE ORG/DEL  
 Instructor: BREWER, MARY A  
 Enrollment: 39  
 Questionnaires: 16

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2009

Page 1454  
 JUL 2, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: SOCY 604 0101  
 Title STATISTICAL ANALYSIS  
 Instructor: ADLER, MARINA  
 Enrollment: 16  
 Questionnaires: 11

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2009

Page 1455  
 JUL 2, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor Mean	Instructor Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5								
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1576	4.65	4.33	4.30	4.43	5.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1576	4.65	4.29	4.27	4.32	5.00	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	9	4.73	333/1342	4.36	4.31	4.32	4.38	4.73		
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	1	2	6	4.56	453/1520	4.39	4.22	4.25	4.36	4.56	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	1	6	2	3.90	989/1465	3.64	4.21	4.12	4.25	3.90	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	1	1	0	1	7	4.20	748/1434	4.25	4.16	4.14	4.35	4.20	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	123/1547	4.34	4.37	4.19	4.24	4.91	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1574	4.94	4.59	4.64	4.75	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	222/1554	4.25	4.07	4.10	4.18	4.71	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1488	4.59	4.52	4.47	4.52	5.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1493	4.88	4.80	4.73	4.80	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	2	9	4.82	261/1486	4.29	4.38	4.32	4.37	4.82	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1489	4.62	4.43	4.32	4.38	5.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	1	0	0	1	9	4.55	288/1277	4.24	4.20	4.03	4.08	4.55	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	1	2	1	5	4.11	764/1279	4.02	4.26	4.17	4.34	4.11	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	2	1	6	4.44	696/1270	4.22	4.44	4.35	4.53	4.44	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	1	0	1	1	6	4.22	835/1269	4.11	4.50	4.35	4.55	4.22	
4. Were special techniques successful	1	6	0	1	1	1	1	3.50	709/ 878	3.25	3.89	4.05	4.11	3.50	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 85	****	4.67	4.72	4.79	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 79	****	4.67	4.69	4.77	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 72	****	4.67	4.64	4.70	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 80	****	4.67	4.61	4.70	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	7	0	0	0	2	1	1	3.75	199/ 375	3.75	4.21	4.01	4.10	3.75	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: SOCY 604 0201  
 Title STATISTICAL ANALYSIS  
 Instructor: FLOW-DELWICHE,  
 Enrollment: 18  
 Questionnaires: 17

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2009

Page 1456  
 JUL 2, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	1	1	1	3	11	4.29	904/1576	4.65	4.33	4.30	4.43	4.29
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	1	1	3	11	4.29	900/1576	4.65	4.29	4.27	4.32	4.29
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	1	4	2	9	4.00	972/1342	4.36	4.31	4.32	4.38	4.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	4	1	0	1	4	7	4.23	880/1520	4.39	4.22	4.25	4.36	4.23
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	4	0	4	2	6	3.38	1302/1465	3.64	4.21	4.12	4.25	3.38
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	4	1	0	1	3	8	4.31	625/1434	4.25	4.16	4.14	4.35	4.31
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	2	2	2	3	8	3.76	1235/1547	4.34	4.37	4.19	4.24	3.76
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	2	15	4.88	508/1574	4.94	4.59	4.64	4.75	4.88
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	1	1	1	2	6	4	3.79	1145/1554	4.25	4.07	4.10	4.18	3.79
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	2	1	6	8	4.18	1165/1488	4.59	4.52	4.47	4.52	4.18
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	2	0	15	4.76	888/1493	4.88	4.80	4.73	4.80	4.76
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	1	2	4	3	7	3.76	1249/1486	4.29	4.38	4.32	4.37	3.76
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	1	2	2	11	4.24	969/1489	4.62	4.43	4.32	4.38	4.24
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	1	1	2	7	6	3.94	758/1277	4.24	4.20	4.03	4.08	3.94
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	1	2	2	1	8	3.93	879/1279	4.02	4.26	4.17	4.34	3.93
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	1	2	1	2	8	4.00	928/1270	4.22	4.44	4.35	4.53	4.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	1	1	2	3	7	4.00	928/1269	4.11	4.50	4.35	4.55	4.00
4. Were special techniques successful	5	7	2	0	1	0	2	3.00	799/ 878	3.25	3.89	4.05	4.11	3.00
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	15	0	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/ 234	****	****	4.23	4.36	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	15	0	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/ 240	****	****	4.35	4.37	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	15	0	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/ 229	****	****	4.51	4.51	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	15	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 232	****	****	4.29	4.47	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	15	1	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 379	****	4.33	4.20	4.37	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	14	1	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 85	****	4.67	4.72	4.79	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	15	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 79	****	4.67	4.69	4.77	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	15	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 80	****	4.67	4.61	4.70	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	15	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 375	3.75	4.21	4.01	4.10	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	5	0.00-0.99 0	A 4	Required for Majors	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99 0	B 8		
56-83	0	2.00-2.99 0	C 1	General	0
84-150	1	3.00-3.49 2	D 0	Under-grad	10
Grad.	7	3.50-4.00 9	F 0		
			P 0		
			I 0		
			? 1	Other	16
				#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	

Course-Section: SOCY 606 0101  
 Title SOC INEQUALITY/SOC POL  
 Instructor: ADLER, MARINA  
 Enrollment: 23  
 Questionnaires: 15

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2009

Page 1457  
 JUL 2, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	2	0	0	0	1	4	8	4.54	595/1576	4.54	4.33	4.30	4.43	4.54	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	0	1	4	2	6	4.00	1138/1576	4.00	4.29	4.27	4.32	4.00	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	10	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/1342	****	4.31	4.32	4.38	****	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	3	0	0	1	2	4	5	4.08	1003/1520	4.08	4.22	4.25	4.36	4.08	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	0	1	4	7	4.23	668/1465	4.23	4.21	4.12	4.25	4.23	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	1	2	4	6	4.15	787/1434	4.15	4.16	4.14	4.35	4.15	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	1	3	3	6	4.08	992/1547	4.08	4.37	4.19	4.24	4.08	
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	0	0	0	0	2	10	4.83	606/1574	4.83	4.59	4.64	4.75	4.83	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	0	0	0	0	5	4	4.44	477/1554	4.44	4.07	4.10	4.18	4.44	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	1	1	11	4.77	484/1488	4.77	4.52	4.47	4.52	4.77	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	1	12	4.92	445/1493	4.92	4.80	4.73	4.80	4.92	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	1	0	4	8	4.46	735/1486	4.46	4.38	4.32	4.37	4.46	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	2	2	9	4.54	660/1489	4.54	4.43	4.32	4.38	4.54	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	0	0	1	3	2	7	4.15	615/1277	4.15	4.20	4.03	4.08	4.15	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	1	5	6	4.42	543/1279	4.42	4.26	4.17	4.34	4.42	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	0	3	0	8	4.45	686/1270	4.45	4.44	4.35	4.53	4.45	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	1	1	3	1	6	3.83	1010/1269	3.83	4.50	4.35	4.55	3.83	
4. Were special techniques successful	3	3	2	0	3	2	2	3.22	776/ 878	3.22	3.89	4.05	4.11	3.22	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	13	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 85	****	4.67	4.72	4.79	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	13	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 79	****	4.67	4.69	4.77	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 72	****	4.67	4.64	4.70	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 80	****	4.67	4.61	4.70	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	13	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 375	****	4.21	4.01	4.10	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	4	0.00-0.99	1	A	3	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	6	Major	1
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	6						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	4	Under-grad	9	Non-major	14
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	6	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	7				
				?	1						

Course-Section: SOCY 620 0101  
 Title SOCIAL EPIDEMIOLOGY  
 Instructor: SERPI, TRACEY L  
 Enrollment: 11  
 Questionnaires: 9

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2009

Page 1458  
 JUL 2, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	1	7	4.67	415/1576	4.67	4.33	4.30	4.43	4.67	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	256/1576	4.78	4.29	4.27	4.32	4.78	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	191/1342	4.89	4.31	4.32	4.38	4.89	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	2	6	4.56	453/1520	4.56	4.22	4.25	4.36	4.56	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	132/1465	4.89	4.21	4.12	4.25	4.89	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	2	6	4.56	360/1434	4.56	4.16	4.14	4.35	4.56	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	0	8	4.78	217/1547	4.78	4.37	4.19	4.24	4.78	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	4	5	4.56	1041/1574	4.56	4.59	4.64	4.75	4.56	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	2	3	1	3.83	1110/1554	3.83	4.07	4.10	4.18	3.83	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	463/1488	4.78	4.52	4.47	4.52	4.78	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	0	8	4.78	868/1493	4.78	4.80	4.73	4.80	4.78	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	311/1486	4.78	4.38	4.32	4.37	4.78	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	217/1489	4.89	4.43	4.32	4.38	4.89	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	1	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	273/1277	4.57	4.20	4.03	4.08	4.57	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	244/1279	4.78	4.26	4.17	4.34	4.78	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	279/1270	4.89	4.44	4.35	4.53	4.89	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	299/1269	4.89	4.50	4.35	4.55	4.89	
4. Were special techniques successful	0	1	0	0	1	3	4	4.38	299/ 878	4.38	3.89	4.05	4.11	4.38	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: SOCY 631 0101  
 Title FAMILY/AGING IN SOCIET  
 Instructor: SCHUMACHER, JOH  
 Enrollment: 12  
 Questionnaires: 8

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2009

Page 1459  
 JUL 2, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	2	5	4.50	637/1576	4.50	4.33	4.30	4.43	4.50	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	2	5	4.50	608/1576	4.50	4.29	4.27	4.32	4.50	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	0	2	5	4.38	735/1342	4.38	4.31	4.32	4.38	4.38	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	0	1	6	4.50	511/1520	4.50	4.22	4.25	4.36	4.50	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	0	6	4.50	366/1465	4.50	4.21	4.12	4.25	4.50	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	1	1	5	4.25	682/1434	4.25	4.16	4.14	4.35	4.25	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	0	0	7	4.63	387/1547	4.63	4.37	4.19	4.24	4.63	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	567/1574	4.86	4.59	4.64	4.75	4.86	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	1	3	1	4.00	924/1554	4.00	4.07	4.10	4.18	4.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	1	0	0	2	5	4.25	1111/1488	4.25	4.52	4.47	4.52	4.25	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	908/1493	4.75	4.80	4.73	4.80	4.75	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	1	0	2	5	4.38	851/1486	4.38	4.38	4.32	4.37	4.38	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	0	1	5	4.43	789/1489	4.43	4.43	4.32	4.38	4.43	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	181/1277	4.71	4.20	4.03	4.08	4.71	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	0	0	1	5	4.29	641/1279	4.29	4.26	4.17	4.34	4.29	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	458/1270	4.71	4.44	4.35	4.53	4.71	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	332/1269	4.86	4.50	4.35	4.55	4.86	
4. Were special techniques successful	1	1	1	1	0	2	2	3.50	709/ 878	3.50	3.89	4.05	4.11	3.50	

Frequency Distribution

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



Course-Section: SOCY 645 0101  
 Title HLTH&ILLNESS 21 CENTUR  
 Instructor: ROTHSTEIN, WILL  
 Enrollment: 17  
 Questionnaires: 12

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2009

Page 1460  
 JUL 2, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	1	2	1	3	5	3.75	1345/1576	3.75	4.33	4.30	4.43	3.75	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	1	3	4	3	3.58	1372/1576	3.58	4.29	4.27	4.32	3.58	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	6	1	5	3	3.92	1058/1342	3.92	4.31	4.32	4.38	3.92	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	3	2	3	3	3.33	1418/1520	3.33	4.22	4.25	4.36	3.33	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	1	2	8	4.33	571/1465	4.33	4.21	4.12	4.25	4.33	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	1	3	4	2	3.45	1233/1434	3.45	4.16	4.14	4.35	3.45	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	2	1	1	4	4	3.58	1311/1547	3.58	4.37	4.19	4.24	3.58	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/1574	5.00	4.59	4.64	4.75	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	2	4	3	4.11	860/1554	4.11	4.07	4.10	4.18	4.11	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	2	0	1	2	7	4.00	1233/1488	4.00	4.52	4.47	4.52	4.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	2	10	4.83	734/1493	4.83	4.80	4.73	4.80	4.83	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	1	2	1	2	6	3.83	1222/1486	3.83	4.38	4.32	4.37	3.83	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	1	2	8	4.33	888/1489	4.33	4.43	4.32	4.38	4.33	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	10	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/1277	****	4.20	4.03	4.08	****	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	2	2	0	7	4.09	774/1279	4.09	4.26	4.17	4.34	4.09	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	3	4	4	4.09	905/1270	4.09	4.44	4.35	4.53	4.09	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	1	3	3	1	3	3.18	1191/1269	3.18	4.50	4.35	4.55	3.18	
4. Were special techniques successful	1	10	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 878	****	3.89	4.05	4.11	****	
Laboratory															
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	10	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 379	****	4.33	4.20	4.37	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	9	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 85	****	4.67	4.72	4.79	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	10	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 79	****	4.67	4.69	4.77	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/ 72	****	4.67	4.64	4.70	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 80	****	4.67	4.61	4.70	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	10	0	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	****/ 375	****	4.21	4.01	4.10	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	11	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.48	4.40	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 40	****	****	4.60	4.50	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	6	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	5	Major	2
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	4						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	7	Under-grad	7	Non-major	10
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D	0						
Grad.	5	3.50-4.00	8	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	2				
				?	0						