

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

| | |
|------------------------|-------------------------------|
| Course-Section: | SOCY 101 01 |
| Title: | Basic Concepts In Socy |
| Instructor: | Cousin-Gossett, |

Term - Spring 2012

| | |
|------------------------|------------|
| Enrollment: | 111 |
| Questionnaires: | 49 |

| Questions | NR | NA | Frequencies | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Org | UMBC | Level | Sect |
|---|----|----|-------------|---|----|----|----|------------|-----------|--------|------|------|-------|------|
| | | | 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 | 3 | 2 | 5 | 11 | 27 | 4.19 | 1034/1542 | 4.00 | 4.31 | 4.33 | 4.18 | 4.19 |
| 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 5 | 15 | 27 | 4.40 | 765/1542 | 4.09 | 4.31 | 4.29 | 4.23 | 4.40 |
| 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 7 | 8 | 32 | 4.46 | 638/1339 | 4.25 | 4.41 | 4.32 | 4.14 | 4.46 |
| 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals | 2 | 12 | 1 | 2 | 4 | 10 | 18 | 4.20 | 906/1498 | 3.98 | 4.26 | 4.26 | 4.08 | 4.20 |
| 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned | 1 | 0 | 6 | 8 | 6 | 11 | 17 | 3.52 | 1223/1428 | 3.91 | 4.29 | 4.12 | 3.98 | 3.52 |
| 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned | 2 | 13 | 3 | 2 | 10 | 6 | 13 | 3.71 | 1108/1407 | 3.86 | 4.25 | 4.15 | 3.92 | 3.71 |
| 7. Was the grading system clearly explained | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 9 | 35 | 4.65 | 356/1521 | 4.36 | 4.32 | 4.20 | 4.09 | 4.65 |
| 8. How many times was class cancelled | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 31 | 16 | 4.34 | 1260/1541 | 4.48 | 4.57 | 4.70 | 4.66 | 4.34 |
| 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness | 8 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 7 | 18 | 13 | 4.10 | 842/1518 | 3.98 | 4.11 | 4.11 | 4.00 | 4.10 |
| Lecture | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 10 | 30 | 4.52 | 791/1472 | 4.19 | 4.41 | 4.46 | 4.38 | 4.52 |
| 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject | 3 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 8 | 36 | 4.70 | 1000/1475 | 4.59 | 4.75 | 4.72 | 4.63 | 4.70 |
| 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly | 3 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 5 | 11 | 28 | 4.41 | 770/1471 | 4.23 | 4.37 | 4.32 | 4.23 | 4.41 |
| 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned | 3 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 4 | 9 | 31 | 4.48 | 728/1470 | 4.23 | 4.44 | 4.33 | 4.21 | 4.48 |
| 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding | 3 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 14 | 27 | 4.44 | 384/1310 | 4.09 | 4.08 | 4.06 | 3.93 | 4.44 |
| Discussion | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned | 26 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 17 | 4.74 | 266/1210 | 4.30 | 4.32 | 4.18 | 3.91 | 4.74 |
| 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate | 26 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 3 | 18 | 4.70 | 424/1211 | 4.38 | 4.51 | 4.37 | 4.15 | 4.70 |
| 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion | 26 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 22 | 4.96 | 117/1207 | 4.63 | 4.55 | 4.41 | 4.12 | 4.96 |
| 4. Were special techniques successful | 26 | 9 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 6 | 4 | 4.00 | 478/859 | 3.97 | 4.06 | 4.08 | 3.95 | 4.00 |

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

| | |
|------------------------|-------------------------------|
| Course-Section: | SOCY 101 01 |
| Title: | Basic Concepts In Socy |
| Instructor: | Cousin-Gossett, |

Term - Spring 2012

| | |
|------------------------|------------|
| Enrollment: | 111 |
| Questionnaires: | 49 |

| Questions | NR | NA | Frequencies | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Org | UMBC | Level | Sect |
|---|----|----|-------------|---|---|---|---|------------|----------|--------|------|------|-------|------|
| | | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Mean | Rank | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean |
| Laboratory | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material | 46 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/207 | **** | **** | 4.12 | 3.92 | **** |
| 2. Were you provided with adequate background information | 46 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 3.33 | ****/210 | **** | **** | 4.17 | 4.14 | **** |
| Seminar | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme | 44 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 3 | 4.50 | ****/69 | **** | **** | 4.56 | 4.27 | **** |
| 2. Was the instructor available for individual attention | 46 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 4.00 | ****/69 | **** | **** | 4.60 | 4.28 | **** |
| 3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned | 46 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 4.00 | ****/68 | **** | **** | 4.50 | 4.15 | **** |
| 4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned | 46 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 4.00 | ****/73 | **** | **** | 4.54 | 4.22 | **** |
| 5. Were criteria for grading made clear | 46 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 3.33 | ****/67 | **** | **** | 4.17 | 3.14 | **** |
| Field Work | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned | 47 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 3.00 | ****/32 | **** | **** | 4.20 | 5.00 | **** |
| 2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria | 47 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 3.50 | ****/35 | **** | **** | 4.36 | 5.00 | **** |
| 3. Was the instructor available for consultation | 47 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 4.00 | ****/25 | **** | **** | 4.59 | 5.00 | **** |
| 4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations | 47 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 3.50 | ****/23 | **** | **** | 4.41 | 5.00 | **** |
| 5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities | 47 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 3.00 | ****/17 | **** | **** | 4.62 | 5.00 | **** |
| Self Paced | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned | 47 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 4.00 | ****/30 | **** | **** | 4.27 | 4.84 | **** |
| 2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal | 47 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 3.50 | ****/19 | **** | **** | 4.57 | 4.84 | **** |
| 3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful | 47 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 3.00 | ****/29 | **** | **** | 4.29 | 4.82 | **** |
| 4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful | 47 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1.00 | ****/18 | **** | **** | 4.25 | 4.80 | **** |

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

| | |
|------------------------|-------------------------------|
| Course-Section: | SOCY 101 01 |
| Title: | Basic Concepts In Socy |
| Instructor: | Cousin-Gossett, |

Term - Spring 2012

| | |
|------------------------|------------|
| Enrollment: | 111 |
| Questionnaires: | 49 |

| Questions | NR | NA | Frequencies | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Org | UMBC | Level | Sect |
|--|----|----|-------------|---|---|---|---|------------|---------|--------|------|------|-------|------|
| | | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Mean | Rank | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean |
| Self Paced | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 5. Were there enough proctors for all the students | 47 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1.00 | ****/13 | **** | **** | 4.14 | 4.77 | **** |

Frequency Distribution

| Credits Earned | Cum. GPA | Expected Grades | Reasons | Type | Majors |
|----------------|----------|-----------------|---------|-----------------------|---|
| 00-27 | 5 | 0.00-0.99 2 | A 18 | Required for Majors 9 | Graduate 0 |
| 28-55 | 6 | 1.00-1.99 0 | B 21 | | Major 0 |
| 56-83 | 8 | 2.00-2.99 5 | C 3 | General 20 | Under-grad 49 |
| 84-150 | 2 | 3.00-3.49 4 | D 0 | | Non-major 49 |
| Grad. | 0 | 3.50-4.00 8 | F 0 | Electives 7 | |
| | | | P 0 | | **** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant |
| | | | I 0 | Other 3 | |
| | | | ? 5 | | |

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

| | |
|------------------------|-------------------------------|
| Course-Section: | SOCY 101 02 |
| Title: | Basic Concepts In Socy |
| Instructor: | Damasiewicz,Mer |

Term - Spring 2012

| | |
|------------------------|------------|
| Enrollment: | 114 |
| Questionnaires: | 57 |

| Questions | NR | NA | Frequencies | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Org | UMBC | Level | Sect |
|---|----|----|-------------|---|---|----|----|------------|-----------|--------|------|------|-------|------|
| | | | 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 | 8 | 2 | 6 | 6 | 35 | 4.02 | 1166/1542 | 4.00 | 4.31 | 4.33 | 4.18 | 4.02 |
| 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals | 0 | 0 | 8 | 2 | 9 | 8 | 30 | 3.88 | 1229/1542 | 4.09 | 4.31 | 4.29 | 4.23 | 3.88 |
| 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals | 0 | 1 | 6 | 2 | 9 | 8 | 31 | 4.00 | 982/1339 | 4.25 | 4.41 | 4.32 | 4.14 | 4.00 |
| 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals | 1 | 4 | 5 | 4 | 7 | 6 | 30 | 4.00 | 1058/1498 | 3.98 | 4.26 | 4.26 | 4.08 | 4.00 |
| 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned | 3 | 1 | 5 | 4 | 9 | 6 | 29 | 3.94 | 931/1428 | 3.91 | 4.29 | 4.12 | 3.98 | 3.94 |
| 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned | 4 | 1 | 7 | 4 | 7 | 9 | 25 | 3.79 | 1064/1407 | 3.86 | 4.25 | 4.15 | 3.92 | 3.79 |
| 7. Was the grading system clearly explained | 3 | 1 | 6 | 4 | 7 | 9 | 27 | 3.89 | 1151/1521 | 4.36 | 4.32 | 4.20 | 4.09 | 3.89 |
| 8. How many times was class cancelled | 2 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 51 | 4.98 | 138/1541 | 4.48 | 4.57 | 4.70 | 4.66 | 4.98 |
| 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness | 10 | 1 | 5 | 1 | 8 | 15 | 17 | 3.83 | 1114/1518 | 3.98 | 4.11 | 4.11 | 4.00 | 3.83 |
| Lecture | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared | 5 | 0 | 7 | 3 | 9 | 7 | 26 | 3.81 | 1327/1472 | 4.19 | 4.41 | 4.46 | 4.38 | 3.81 |
| 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject | 5 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 4 | 2 | 43 | 4.58 | 1142/1475 | 4.59 | 4.75 | 4.72 | 4.63 | 4.58 |
| 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly | 4 | 0 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 9 | 29 | 3.98 | 1118/1471 | 4.23 | 4.37 | 4.32 | 4.23 | 3.98 |
| 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned | 4 | 1 | 7 | 3 | 5 | 1 | 36 | 4.08 | 1082/1470 | 4.23 | 4.44 | 4.33 | 4.21 | 4.08 |
| 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding | 5 | 18 | 5 | 2 | 7 | 5 | 15 | 3.68 | 987/1310 | 4.09 | 4.08 | 4.06 | 3.93 | 3.68 |
| Discussion | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned | 17 | 0 | 5 | 1 | 4 | 6 | 24 | 4.08 | 750/1210 | 4.30 | 4.32 | 4.18 | 3.91 | 4.08 |
| 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate | 17 | 0 | 3 | 2 | 4 | 5 | 26 | 4.23 | 816/1211 | 4.38 | 4.51 | 4.37 | 4.15 | 4.23 |
| 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion | 17 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 3 | 4 | 29 | 4.35 | 756/1207 | 4.63 | 4.55 | 4.41 | 4.12 | 4.35 |
| 4. Were special techniques successful | 17 | 20 | 2 | 0 | 3 | 3 | 12 | 4.15 | 420/859 | 3.97 | 4.06 | 4.08 | 3.95 | 4.15 |

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

| | |
|------------------------|-------------------------------|
| Course-Section: | SOCY 101 02 |
| Title: | Basic Concepts In Socy |
| Instructor: | Damasiewicz,Mer |

Term - Spring 2012

| | |
|------------------------|------------|
| Enrollment: | 114 |
| Questionnaires: | 57 |

| Questions | NR | NA | Frequencies | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Org | UMBC | Level | Sect |
|---|----|----|-------------|---|---|---|---|------------|----------|--------|------|------|-------|------|
| | | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Mean | Rank | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean |
| Laboratory | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material | 56 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 4.00 | ****/207 | **** | **** | 4.12 | 3.92 | **** |
| 2. Were you provided with adequate background information | 56 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/210 | **** | **** | 4.17 | 4.14 | **** |
| Seminar | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme | 56 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 4.00 | ****/69 | **** | **** | 4.56 | 4.27 | **** |
| 2. Was the instructor available for individual attention | 56 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/69 | **** | **** | 4.60 | 4.28 | **** |
| Self Paced | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned | 56 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 4.00 | ****/30 | **** | **** | 4.27 | 4.84 | **** |
| 2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal | 56 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 4.00 | ****/19 | **** | **** | 4.57 | 4.84 | **** |

Frequency Distribution

| Credits Earned | Cum. GPA | Expected Grades | Reasons | Type | Majors | | | | | | |
|----------------|----------|-----------------|---------|------|--------|---------------------|----|---|----|-----------|----|
| 00-27 | 9 | 0.00-0.99 | 0 | A | 21 | Required for Majors | 9 | Graduate | 0 | Major | 0 |
| 28-55 | 6 | 1.00-1.99 | 1 | B | 18 | | | | | | |
| 56-83 | 3 | 2.00-2.99 | 5 | C | 5 | General | 20 | Under-grad | 57 | Non-major | 57 |
| 84-150 | 6 | 3.00-3.49 | 4 | D | 0 | | | | | | |
| Grad. | 0 | 3.50-4.00 | 8 | F | 0 | Electives | 11 | **** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant | | | |
| | | | | P | 0 | | | | | | |
| | | | | I | 0 | Other | 2 | | | | |
| | | | | ? | 12 | | | | | | |

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

| | |
|------------------------|-------------------------------|
| Course-Section: | SOCY 101 03 |
| Title: | Basic Concepts In Socy |
| Instructor: | Mood,Mary A |

Term - Spring 2012

| | |
|------------------------|-----------|
| Enrollment: | 82 |
| Questionnaires: | 33 |

| Questions | NR | NA | Frequencies | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Org | UMBC | Level | Sect |
|---|----|----|-------------|---|---|----|----|------------|-----------|--------|------|------|-------|------|
| | | | 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 | 4 | 4 | 9 | 14 | 3.88 | 1280/1542 | 4.00 | 4.31 | 4.33 | 4.18 | 3.88 |
| 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals | 0 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 17 | 4.03 | 1108/1542 | 4.09 | 4.31 | 4.29 | 4.23 | 4.03 |
| 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 5 | 13 | 13 | 4.19 | 880/1339 | 4.25 | 4.41 | 4.32 | 4.14 | 4.19 |
| 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals | 0 | 16 | 1 | 0 | 7 | 4 | 5 | 3.71 | 1263/1498 | 3.98 | 4.26 | 4.26 | 4.08 | 3.71 |
| 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned | 1 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 3 | 12 | 13 | 4.06 | 815/1428 | 3.91 | 4.29 | 4.12 | 3.98 | 4.06 |
| 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned | 1 | 22 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 4 | 4.00 | 874/1407 | 3.86 | 4.25 | 4.15 | 3.92 | 4.00 |
| 7. Was the grading system clearly explained | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 6 | 22 | 4.53 | 485/1521 | 4.36 | 4.32 | 4.20 | 4.09 | 4.53 |
| 8. How many times was class cancelled | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 30 | 4.97 | 276/1541 | 4.48 | 4.57 | 4.70 | 4.66 | 4.97 |
| 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness | 9 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 5 | 10 | 7 | 4.00 | 920/1518 | 3.98 | 4.11 | 4.11 | 4.00 | 4.00 |
| Lecture | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared | 2 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 3 | 8 | 18 | 4.35 | 1003/1472 | 4.19 | 4.41 | 4.46 | 4.38 | 4.35 |
| 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 7 | 20 | 4.52 | 1189/1475 | 4.59 | 4.75 | 4.72 | 4.63 | 4.52 |
| 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly | 2 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 4 | 7 | 18 | 4.29 | 914/1471 | 4.23 | 4.37 | 4.32 | 4.23 | 4.29 |
| 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned | 3 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 4 | 7 | 17 | 4.27 | 951/1470 | 4.23 | 4.44 | 4.33 | 4.21 | 4.27 |
| 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding | 4 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 10 | 15 | 4.28 | 556/1310 | 4.09 | 4.08 | 4.06 | 3.93 | 4.28 |
| Discussion | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned | 14 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 12 | 4.21 | 660/1210 | 4.30 | 4.32 | 4.18 | 3.91 | 4.21 |
| 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate | 14 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 13 | 4.26 | 790/1211 | 4.38 | 4.51 | 4.37 | 4.15 | 4.26 |
| 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion | 14 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 2 | 15 | 4.58 | 578/1207 | 4.63 | 4.55 | 4.41 | 4.12 | 4.58 |
| 4. Were special techniques successful | 14 | 12 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 4.00 | ****/859 | 3.97 | 4.06 | 4.08 | 3.95 | **** |

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

| | |
|------------------------|-------------------------------|
| Course-Section: | SOCY 101 03 |
| Title: | Basic Concepts In Socy |
| Instructor: | Mood,Mary A |

Term - Spring 2012

| | |
|------------------------|-----------|
| Enrollment: | 82 |
| Questionnaires: | 33 |

| Questions | NR | NA | Frequencies | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Org | UMBC | Level | Sect |
|---|----|----|-------------|---|---|---|---|------------|---------|--------|------|------|-------|------|
| | | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Mean | Rank | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean |
| Seminar | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned | 32 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/73 | **** | **** | 4.54 | 4.22 | **** |
| 5. Were criteria for grading made clear | 32 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 4.00 | ****/67 | **** | **** | 4.17 | 3.14 | **** |

Frequency Distribution

| Credits Earned | Cum. GPA | Expected Grades | Reasons | Type | Majors | | | | | | |
|----------------|----------|-----------------|---------|------|--------|---------------------|----|---|----|-----------|----|
| 00-27 | 7 | 0.00-0.99 | 1 | A | 12 | Required for Majors | 6 | Graduate | 1 | Major | 0 |
| 28-55 | 5 | 1.00-1.99 | 0 | B | 13 | | | | | | |
| 56-83 | 1 | 2.00-2.99 | 4 | C | 6 | General | 19 | Under-grad | 32 | Non-major | 33 |
| 84-150 | 2 | 3.00-3.49 | 4 | D | 0 | | | | | | |
| Grad. | 1 | 3.50-4.00 | 6 | F | 0 | Electives | 2 | **** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant | | | |
| | | | | P | 0 | | | | | | |
| | | | | I | 0 | Other | 2 | | | | |
| | | | | ? | 2 | | | | | | |

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

| | |
|------------------------|-------------------------------|
| Course-Section: | SOCY 101 04 |
| Title: | Basic Concepts In Socy |
| Instructor: | Seckin,Gul |

Term - Spring 2012

| | |
|------------------------|------------|
| Enrollment: | 130 |
| Questionnaires: | 69 |

| Questions | NR | NA | Frequencies | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Org | UMBC | Level | Sect |
|---|----|----|-------------|---|----|----|----|------------|-----------|--------|------|------|-------|------|
| | | | 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 | 4 | 6 | 12 | 15 | 31 | 3.93 | 1246/1542 | 4.00 | 4.31 | 4.33 | 4.18 | 3.93 |
| 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals | 1 | 0 | 2 | 5 | 13 | 15 | 33 | 4.06 | 1100/1542 | 4.09 | 4.31 | 4.29 | 4.23 | 4.06 |
| 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals | 2 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 12 | 9 | 43 | 4.36 | 739/1339 | 4.25 | 4.41 | 4.32 | 4.14 | 4.36 |
| 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals | 2 | 4 | 3 | 4 | 13 | 12 | 31 | 4.02 | 1052/1498 | 3.98 | 4.26 | 4.26 | 4.08 | 4.02 |
| 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned | 1 | 0 | 3 | 9 | 4 | 13 | 39 | 4.12 | 780/1428 | 3.91 | 4.29 | 4.12 | 3.98 | 4.12 |
| 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned | 1 | 0 | 6 | 6 | 9 | 12 | 35 | 3.94 | 933/1407 | 3.86 | 4.25 | 4.15 | 3.92 | 3.94 |
| 7. Was the grading system clearly explained | 1 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 12 | 13 | 41 | 4.37 | 708/1521 | 4.36 | 4.32 | 4.20 | 4.09 | 4.37 |
| 8. How many times was class cancelled | 1 | 1 | 1 | 5 | 18 | 36 | 7 | 3.64 | 1524/1541 | 4.48 | 4.57 | 4.70 | 4.66 | 3.64 |
| 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness | 15 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 15 | 12 | 22 | 4.00 | 920/1518 | 3.98 | 4.11 | 4.11 | 4.00 | 4.00 |
| Lecture | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared | 6 | 0 | 1 | 5 | 12 | 16 | 29 | 4.06 | 1202/1472 | 4.19 | 4.41 | 4.46 | 4.38 | 4.06 |
| 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject | 3 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 6 | 11 | 47 | 4.56 | 1150/1475 | 4.59 | 4.75 | 4.72 | 4.63 | 4.56 |
| 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly | 3 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 9 | 17 | 35 | 4.23 | 969/1471 | 4.23 | 4.37 | 4.32 | 4.23 | 4.23 |
| 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned | 3 | 0 | 5 | 5 | 7 | 11 | 38 | 4.09 | 1075/1470 | 4.23 | 4.44 | 4.33 | 4.21 | 4.09 |
| 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding | 3 | 7 | 3 | 3 | 13 | 13 | 27 | 3.98 | 781/1310 | 4.09 | 4.08 | 4.06 | 3.93 | 3.98 |
| Discussion | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned | 28 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 7 | 13 | 19 | 4.17 | 689/1210 | 4.30 | 4.32 | 4.18 | 3.91 | 4.17 |
| 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate | 28 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 14 | 22 | 4.34 | 731/1211 | 4.38 | 4.51 | 4.37 | 4.15 | 4.34 |
| 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion | 27 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 8 | 31 | 4.62 | 546/1207 | 4.63 | 4.55 | 4.41 | 4.12 | 4.62 |
| 4. Were special techniques successful | 28 | 20 | 4 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 11 | 3.76 | 603/859 | 3.97 | 4.06 | 4.08 | 3.95 | 3.76 |

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

| | |
|------------------------|-------------------------------|
| Course-Section: | SOCY 101 04 |
| Title: | Basic Concepts In Socy |
| Instructor: | Seckin,Gul |

Term - Spring 2012

| | |
|------------------------|------------|
| Enrollment: | 130 |
| Questionnaires: | 69 |

| Questions | NR | NA | Frequencies | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Org | UMBC | Level | Sect |
|---|----|----|-------------|---|---|---|---|------------|----------|--------|------|------|-------|------|
| | | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Mean | Rank | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean |
| Laboratory | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material | 65 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 4.00 | ****/207 | **** | **** | 4.12 | 3.92 | **** |
| 2. Were you provided with adequate background information | 68 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 4.00 | ****/210 | **** | **** | 4.17 | 4.14 | **** |
| 3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities | 68 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 4.00 | ****/202 | **** | **** | 4.50 | 4.49 | **** |
| 4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance | 68 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 4.00 | ****/202 | **** | **** | 4.32 | 4.22 | **** |
| 5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified | 68 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 4.00 | ****/199 | **** | **** | 4.15 | 4.14 | **** |
| Seminar | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme | 66 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 4.50 | ****/69 | **** | **** | 4.56 | 4.27 | **** |
| 2. Was the instructor available for individual attention | 67 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 5.00 | ****/69 | **** | **** | 4.60 | 4.28 | **** |
| 3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned | 67 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 4.00 | ****/68 | **** | **** | 4.50 | 4.15 | **** |
| 4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned | 67 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 4.00 | ****/73 | **** | **** | 4.54 | 4.22 | **** |
| 5. Were criteria for grading made clear | 67 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 4.00 | ****/67 | **** | **** | 4.17 | 3.14 | **** |
| Field Work | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned | 68 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 4.00 | ****/32 | **** | **** | 4.20 | 5.00 | **** |
| 2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria | 68 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 4.00 | ****/35 | **** | **** | 4.36 | 5.00 | **** |
| 3. Was the instructor available for consultation | 68 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 4.00 | ****/25 | **** | **** | 4.59 | 5.00 | **** |
| 4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations | 68 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 4.00 | ****/23 | **** | **** | 4.41 | 5.00 | **** |
| 5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities | 68 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 4.00 | ****/17 | **** | **** | 4.62 | 5.00 | **** |
| Self Paced | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned | 66 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 4.33 | ****/30 | **** | **** | 4.27 | 4.84 | **** |
| 2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal | 66 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 5.00 | ****/19 | **** | **** | 4.57 | 4.84 | **** |
| 3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful | 66 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 4.33 | ****/29 | **** | **** | 4.29 | 4.82 | **** |

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

| | |
|------------------------|-------------------------------|
| Course-Section: | SOCY 101 04 |
| Title: | Basic Concepts In Socy |
| Instructor: | Seckin,Gul |

Term - Spring 2012

| | |
|------------------------|------------|
| Enrollment: | 130 |
| Questionnaires: | 69 |

| Questions | NR | NA | Frequencies | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Org | UMBC | Level | Sect |
|--|----|----|-------------|---|---|---|---|------------|---------|--------|------|------|-------|------|
| | | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Mean | Rank | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean |
| Self Paced | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful | 66 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 4.67 | ****/18 | **** | **** | 4.25 | 4.80 | **** |
| 5. Were there enough proctors for all the students | 66 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 5.00 | ****/13 | **** | **** | 4.14 | 4.77 | **** |

Frequency Distribution

| Credits Earned | Cum. GPA | Expected Grades | Reasons | Type | Majors | | | | | | |
|----------------|----------|-----------------|---------|------|--------|---------------------|----|------------|----|-----------|----|
| 00-27 | 11 | 0.00-0.99 | 2 | A | 42 | Required for Majors | 10 | Graduate | 0 | Major | 2 |
| 28-55 | 9 | 1.00-1.99 | 1 | B | 9 | | | | | | |
| 56-83 | 4 | 2.00-2.99 | 7 | C | 0 | General | 31 | Under-grad | 69 | Non-major | 67 |
| 84-150 | 0 | 3.00-3.49 | 8 | D | 1 | | | | | | |
| Grad. | 0 | 3.50-4.00 | 5 | F | 0 | Electives | 10 | | | | |
| | | | | P | 0 | | | | | | |
| | | | | I | 0 | Other | 1 | | | | |
| | | | | ? | 15 | | | | | | |

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

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

| | |
|------------------------|---------------------------------|
| Course-Section: | SOCY 201 01 |
| Title: | Social Prob:Amer Society |
| Instructor: | Mood,Mary A |

Term - Spring 2012

| | |
|------------------------|-----------|
| Enrollment: | 50 |
| Questionnaires: | 28 |

| Questions | NR | NA | Frequencies | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Org | UMBC | Level | Sect |
|---|----|----|-------------|---|---|----|----|------------|----------|--------|------|------|-------|------|
| | | | 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 | 3 | 5 | 16 | 4.44 | 720/1542 | 4.44 | 4.31 | 4.33 | 4.35 | 4.44 |
| 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals | 3 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 7 | 15 | 4.44 | 698/1542 | 4.44 | 4.31 | 4.29 | 4.29 | 4.44 |
| 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 6 | 17 | 4.60 | 476/1339 | 4.60 | 4.41 | 4.32 | 4.40 | 4.60 |
| 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals | 3 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 11 | 11 | 4.38 | 722/1498 | 4.38 | 4.26 | 4.26 | 4.31 | 4.38 |
| 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned | 4 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 20 | 4.87 | 112/1428 | 4.87 | 4.29 | 4.12 | 4.17 | 4.87 |
| 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned | 3 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 7 | 6 | 11 | 4.04 | 855/1407 | 4.04 | 4.25 | 4.15 | 4.14 | 4.04 |
| 7. Was the grading system clearly explained | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 5 | 17 | 4.63 | 382/1521 | 4.63 | 4.32 | 4.20 | 4.22 | 4.63 |
| 8. How many times was class cancelled | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 19 | 4.76 | 895/1541 | 4.76 | 4.57 | 4.70 | 4.68 | 4.76 |
| 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness | 7 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 14 | 6 | 4.19 | 753/1518 | 4.19 | 4.11 | 4.11 | 4.12 | 4.19 |
| Lecture | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 18 | 4.82 | 351/1472 | 4.82 | 4.41 | 4.46 | 4.53 | 4.82 |
| 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 19 | 4.86 | 646/1475 | 4.86 | 4.75 | 4.72 | 4.79 | 4.86 |
| 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 17 | 4.73 | 386/1471 | 4.73 | 4.37 | 4.32 | 4.37 | 4.73 |
| 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 18 | 4.82 | 297/1470 | 4.82 | 4.44 | 4.33 | 4.40 | 4.82 |
| 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding | 7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 8 | 13 | 4.62 | 239/1310 | 4.62 | 4.08 | 4.06 | 4.19 | 4.62 |
| Discussion | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned | 12 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 6 | 9 | 4.50 | 430/1210 | 4.50 | 4.32 | 4.18 | 4.18 | 4.50 |
| 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate | 12 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 5 | 9 | 4.38 | 706/1211 | 4.38 | 4.51 | 4.37 | 4.34 | 4.38 |
| 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion | 12 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 14 | 4.81 | 333/1207 | 4.81 | 4.55 | 4.41 | 4.40 | 4.81 |

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

| | |
|------------------------|---------------------------------|
| Course-Section: | SOCY 201 01 |
| Title: | Social Prob:Amer Society |
| Instructor: | Mood,Mary A |

Term - Spring 2012

| | |
|------------------------|-----------|
| Enrollment: | 50 |
| Questionnaires: | 28 |

| Questions | NR | NA | Frequencies | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Org | UMBC | Level | Sect |
|---------------------------------------|----|----|-------------|---|---|---|---|------------|---------|--------|------|------|-------|------|
| | | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Mean | Rank | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean |
| Discussion | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 4. Were special techniques successful | 12 | 5 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3.55 | 699/859 | 3.55 | 4.06 | 4.08 | 4.07 | 3.55 |

Frequency Distribution

| Credits Earned | | Cum. GPA | | Expected Grades | | Reasons | | Type | | Majors | |
|----------------|---|-----------|---|-----------------|----|---------------------|----|---|----|-----------|----|
| 00-27 | 5 | 0.00-0.99 | 0 | A | 13 | Required for Majors | 10 | Graduate | 0 | Major | 5 |
| 28-55 | 1 | 1.00-1.99 | 0 | B | 8 | | | | | | |
| 56-83 | 2 | 2.00-2.99 | 4 | C | 3 | General | 7 | Under-grad | 28 | Non-major | 23 |
| 84-150 | 5 | 3.00-3.49 | 7 | D | 0 | | | | | | |
| Grad. | 0 | 3.50-4.00 | 6 | F | 0 | Electives | 4 | **** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant | | | |
| | | | | P | 0 | | | | | | |
| | | | | I | 0 | Other | 2 | | | | |
| | | | | ? | 4 | | | | | | |

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

| | |
|------------------------|----------------------------------|
| Course-Section: | SOCY 204 01 |
| Title: | Diversity & Pluralism |
| Instructor: | Pincus,Fred L |

Term - Spring 2012

| | |
|------------------------|-----------|
| Enrollment: | 46 |
| Questionnaires: | 29 |

| Questions | NR | NA | Frequencies | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Org | UMBC | Level | Sect |
|---|----|----|-------------|---|----|----|----|------------|-----------|--------|------|------|-------|------|
| | | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Mean | Rank | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean |
| General | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course | 0 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 5 | 10 | 11 | 3.93 | 1237/1542 | 3.93 | 4.31 | 4.33 | 4.35 | 3.93 |
| 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 7 | 10 | 10 | 3.93 | 1182/1542 | 3.93 | 4.31 | 4.29 | 4.29 | 3.93 |
| 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 9 | 7 | 9 | 3.69 | 1152/1339 | 3.69 | 4.41 | 4.32 | 4.40 | 3.69 |
| 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals | 0 | 3 | 0 | 4 | 3 | 11 | 8 | 3.88 | 1171/1498 | 3.88 | 4.26 | 4.26 | 4.31 | 3.88 |
| 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 7 | 17 | 4.38 | 519/1428 | 4.38 | 4.29 | 4.12 | 4.17 | 4.38 |
| 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 7 | 12 | 8 | 3.96 | 913/1407 | 3.96 | 4.25 | 4.15 | 4.14 | 3.96 |
| 7. Was the grading system clearly explained | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 5 | 6 | 14 | 4.00 | 1046/1521 | 4.00 | 4.32 | 4.20 | 4.22 | 4.00 |
| 8. How many times was class cancelled | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 26 | 4.83 | 820/1541 | 4.83 | 4.57 | 4.70 | 4.68 | 4.83 |
| 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness | 5 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 11 | 11 | 1 | 3.46 | 1310/1518 | 3.46 | 4.11 | 4.11 | 4.12 | 3.46 |
| Lecture | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared | 1 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 3 | 8 | 15 | 4.29 | 1065/1472 | 4.29 | 4.41 | 4.46 | 4.53 | 4.29 |
| 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 8 | 18 | 4.57 | 1142/1475 | 4.57 | 4.75 | 4.72 | 4.79 | 4.57 |
| 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 8 | 16 | 4.32 | 882/1471 | 4.32 | 4.37 | 4.32 | 4.37 | 4.32 |
| 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned | 1 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 8 | 15 | 4.14 | 1044/1470 | 4.14 | 4.44 | 4.33 | 4.40 | 4.14 |
| 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding | 1 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 2 | 10 | 12 | 4.04 | 744/1310 | 4.04 | 4.08 | 4.06 | 4.19 | 4.04 |
| Discussion | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned | 5 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 7 | 15 | 4.50 | 430/1210 | 4.50 | 4.32 | 4.18 | 4.18 | 4.50 |
| 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 20 | 4.79 | 302/1211 | 4.79 | 4.51 | 4.37 | 4.34 | 4.79 |
| 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion | 5 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 18 | 4.63 | 537/1207 | 4.63 | 4.55 | 4.41 | 4.40 | 4.63 |

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

| | |
|------------------------|----------------------------------|
| Course-Section: | SOCY 204 01 |
| Title: | Diversity & Pluralism |
| Instructor: | Pincus,Fred L |

Term - Spring 2012

| | |
|------------------------|-----------|
| Enrollment: | 46 |
| Questionnaires: | 29 |

| Questions | NR | NA | Frequencies | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Org | UMBC | Level | Sect |
|---------------------------------------|----|----|-------------|---|---|---|---|------------|---------|--------|------|------|-------|------|
| | | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Mean | Rank | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean |
| Discussion | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 4. Were special techniques successful | 5 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 6 | 6 | 9 | 3.96 | 512/859 | 3.96 | 4.06 | 4.08 | 4.07 | 3.96 |

Frequency Distribution

| Credits Earned | Cum. GPA | Expected Grades | Reasons | Type | Majors |
|----------------|----------|-----------------|---------|-----------------------|---|
| 00-27 | 3 | 0.00-0.99 0 | A 11 | Required for Majors 6 | Graduate 0 |
| 28-55 | 2 | 1.00-1.99 0 | B 13 | | |
| 56-83 | 4 | 2.00-2.99 1 | C 1 | General 12 | Under-grad 29 |
| 84-150 | 5 | 3.00-3.49 3 | D 0 | | |
| Grad. | 0 | 3.50-4.00 13 | F 0 | Electives 6 | **** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant |
| | | | P 0 | | |
| | | | I 0 | Other 1 | |
| | | | ? 4 | | |

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

| | |
|------------------------|---------------------------------|
| Course-Section: | SOCY 300 01 |
| Title: | Methodology:Social Rsrch |
| Instructor: | Wallace,Brandy |

Term - Spring 2012

| | |
|------------------------|-----------|
| Enrollment: | 50 |
| Questionnaires: | 39 |

| Questions | NR | NA | Frequencies | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Org | UMBC | Level | Sect |
|---|----|----|-------------|---|----|----|----|------------|-----------|--------|------|------|-------|------|
| | | | 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 | 3 | 12 | 13 | 9 | 3.62 | 1407/1542 | 4.02 | 4.31 | 4.33 | 4.37 | 3.62 |
| 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals | 0 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 14 | 16 | 4 | 3.46 | 1415/1542 | 4.04 | 4.31 | 4.29 | 4.31 | 3.46 |
| 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals | 0 | 0 | 2 | 3 | 8 | 19 | 7 | 3.67 | 1160/1339 | 4.10 | 4.41 | 4.32 | 4.36 | 3.67 |
| 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals | 0 | 0 | 3 | 3 | 10 | 11 | 12 | 3.67 | 1281/1498 | 4.13 | 4.26 | 4.26 | 4.32 | 3.67 |
| 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 12 | 13 | 12 | 3.90 | 992/1428 | 4.18 | 4.29 | 4.12 | 4.15 | 3.90 |
| 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 6 | 16 | 13 | 3.97 | 903/1407 | 4.28 | 4.25 | 4.15 | 4.20 | 3.97 |
| 7. Was the grading system clearly explained | 0 | 0 | 2 | 7 | 6 | 14 | 10 | 3.59 | 1295/1521 | 4.17 | 4.32 | 4.20 | 4.23 | 3.59 |
| 8. How many times was class cancelled | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 29 | 6 | 4.05 | 1442/1541 | 4.53 | 4.57 | 4.70 | 4.71 | 4.05 |
| 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness | 9 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 15 | 11 | 1 | 3.33 | 1354/1518 | 3.87 | 4.11 | 4.11 | 4.13 | 3.33 |
| Lecture | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5 | 13 | 11 | 9 | 3.56 | 1390/1472 | 4.16 | 4.41 | 4.46 | 4.46 | 3.56 |
| 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject | 2 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 7 | 13 | 16 | 4.19 | 1358/1475 | 4.57 | 4.75 | 4.72 | 4.74 | 4.19 |
| 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly | 2 | 0 | 2 | 4 | 12 | 13 | 6 | 3.46 | 1345/1471 | 4.01 | 4.37 | 4.32 | 4.33 | 3.46 |
| 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned | 1 | 0 | 2 | 8 | 3 | 13 | 12 | 3.66 | 1271/1470 | 4.20 | 4.44 | 4.33 | 4.35 | 3.66 |
| 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding | 3 | 3 | 2 | 8 | 6 | 8 | 9 | 3.42 | 1103/1310 | 3.89 | 4.08 | 4.06 | 4.11 | 3.42 |
| Discussion | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned | 15 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 4 | 5 | 12 | 4.04 | 760/1210 | 4.20 | 4.32 | 4.18 | 4.27 | 4.04 |
| 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate | 15 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 6 | 4 | 13 | 4.21 | 829/1211 | 4.30 | 4.51 | 4.37 | 4.45 | 4.21 |
| 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion | 16 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 4 | 5 | 13 | 4.26 | 810/1207 | 4.48 | 4.55 | 4.41 | 4.51 | 4.26 |

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

| | |
|------------------------|---------------------------------|
| Course-Section: | SOCY 300 01 |
| Title: | Methodology:Social Rsrch |
| Instructor: | Wallace,Brandy |

Term - Spring 2012

| | |
|------------------------|-----------|
| Enrollment: | 50 |
| Questionnaires: | 39 |

| Questions | NR | NA | Frequencies | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Org | UMBC | Level | Sect |
|---------------------------------------|----|----|-------------|---|---|---|---|------------|---------|--------|------|------|-------|------|
| | | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Mean | Rank | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean |
| Discussion | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 4. Were special techniques successful | 17 | 4 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 9 | 6 | 4.06 | 465/859 | 4.08 | 4.06 | 4.08 | 4.13 | 4.06 |

Frequency Distribution

| Credits Earned | Cum. GPA | Expected Grades | Reasons | Type | Majors | | | | |
|----------------|----------|-----------------|---------|---------------------|--------|---|----|-----------|----|
| 00-27 | 3 | 0.00-0.99 | 1 A 12 | Required for Majors | 34 | Graduate | 0 | Major | 12 |
| 28-55 | 2 | 1.00-1.99 | 0 B 15 | | | | | | |
| 56-83 | 4 | 2.00-2.99 | 3 C 6 | General | 0 | Under-grad | 39 | Non-major | 27 |
| 84-150 | 7 | 3.00-3.49 | 6 D 0 | | | | | | |
| Grad. | 0 | 3.50-4.00 | 7 F 0 | Electives | 0 | **** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant | | | |
| | | | P 0 | | | | | | |
| | | | I 0 | Other | 0 | | | | |
| | | | ? 6 | | | | | | |

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

| | |
|------------------------|---------------------------------|
| Course-Section: | SOCY 300 02 |
| Title: | Methodology:Social Rsrch |
| Instructor: | Schumacher,John |

Term - Spring 2012

| | |
|------------------------|-----------|
| Enrollment: | 45 |
| Questionnaires: | 25 |

| Questions | NR | NA | Frequencies | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Org | UMBC | Level | Sect |
|---|----|----|-------------|---|---|----|----|------------|----------|--------|------|------|-------|------|
| | | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Mean | Rank | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean |
| General | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 10 | 12 | 4.42 | 765/1542 | 4.02 | 4.31 | 4.33 | 4.37 | 4.42 |
| 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 7 | 16 | 4.63 | 466/1542 | 4.04 | 4.31 | 4.29 | 4.31 | 4.63 |
| 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 7 | 15 | 4.54 | 539/1339 | 4.10 | 4.41 | 4.32 | 4.36 | 4.54 |
| 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 8 | 15 | 4.58 | 452/1498 | 4.13 | 4.26 | 4.26 | 4.32 | 4.58 |
| 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 9 | 13 | 4.46 | 442/1428 | 4.18 | 4.29 | 4.12 | 4.15 | 4.46 |
| 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 10 | 14 | 4.58 | 325/1407 | 4.28 | 4.25 | 4.15 | 4.20 | 4.58 |
| 7. Was the grading system clearly explained | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 18 | 4.75 | 231/1521 | 4.17 | 4.32 | 4.20 | 4.23 | 4.75 |
| 8. How many times was class cancelled | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 24 | 5.00 | 1/1541 | 4.53 | 4.57 | 4.70 | 4.71 | 5.00 |
| 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 10 | 9 | 4.40 | 494/1518 | 3.87 | 4.11 | 4.11 | 4.13 | 4.40 |
| Lecture | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 19 | 4.75 | 452/1472 | 4.16 | 4.41 | 4.46 | 4.46 | 4.75 |
| 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 22 | 4.96 | 269/1475 | 4.57 | 4.75 | 4.72 | 4.74 | 4.96 |
| 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 6 | 15 | 4.57 | 577/1471 | 4.01 | 4.37 | 4.32 | 4.33 | 4.57 |
| 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 18 | 4.74 | 399/1470 | 4.20 | 4.44 | 4.33 | 4.35 | 4.74 |
| 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding | 2 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 9 | 12 | 4.35 | 485/1310 | 3.89 | 4.08 | 4.06 | 4.11 | 4.35 |
| Discussion | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 3 | 12 | 4.35 | 562/1210 | 4.20 | 4.32 | 4.18 | 4.27 | 4.35 |
| 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate | 5 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 5 | 12 | 4.40 | 682/1211 | 4.30 | 4.51 | 4.37 | 4.45 | 4.40 |
| 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 14 | 4.70 | 461/1207 | 4.48 | 4.55 | 4.41 | 4.51 | 4.70 |
| 4. Were special techniques successful | 5 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 4 | 3 | 11 | 4.10 | 453/859 | 4.08 | 4.06 | 4.08 | 4.13 | 4.10 |

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

| Course-Section: SOCY 300 02 | | Term - Spring 2012 | | | | | | | | Enrollment: 45 | | | | |
|---|----|--------------------|---|---|---|---|------------|------|----------|---------------------------|------|-------|------|------|
| Title: Methodology:Social Rsrch | | | | | | | | | | Questionnaires: 25 | | | | |
| Instructor: Schumacher,John | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | Frequencies | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Org | UMBC | Level | Sect | |
| Questions | NR | NA | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Mean | Rank | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean |
| Laboratory | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material | 22 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 5.00 | ****/207 | **** | **** | 4.12 | 4.17 | **** |
| 2. Were you provided with adequate background information | 23 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 5.00 | ****/210 | **** | **** | 4.17 | 4.21 | **** |
| 3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities | 23 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 5.00 | ****/202 | **** | **** | 4.50 | 4.54 | **** |
| 4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance | 23 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 5.00 | ****/202 | **** | **** | 4.32 | 4.44 | **** |
| 5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified | 23 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 5.00 | ****/199 | **** | **** | 4.15 | 4.18 | **** |
| Seminar | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme | 23 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/69 | **** | **** | 4.56 | 4.70 | **** |
| 2. Was the instructor available for individual attention | 24 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/69 | **** | **** | 4.60 | 4.68 | **** |
| 3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned | 24 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/68 | **** | **** | 4.50 | 4.51 | **** |
| 4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned | 24 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/73 | **** | **** | 4.54 | 4.55 | **** |
| 5. Were criteria for grading made clear | 24 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/67 | **** | **** | 4.17 | 4.46 | **** |
| Field Work | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned | 24 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1.00 | ****/32 | **** | **** | 4.20 | 3.88 | **** |
| 3. Was the instructor available for consultation | 24 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/25 | **** | **** | 4.59 | 4.24 | **** |
| 4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations | 24 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/23 | **** | **** | 4.41 | 3.84 | **** |
| Self Paced | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned | 24 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/30 | **** | **** | 4.27 | 3.17 | **** |
| 2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal | 24 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/19 | **** | **** | 4.57 | 4.33 | **** |
| 3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful | 24 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/29 | **** | **** | 4.29 | 2.17 | **** |
| 4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful | 24 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/18 | **** | **** | 4.25 | 1.00 | **** |

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

| | |
|------------------------|---------------------------------|
| Course-Section: | SOCY 300 02 |
| Title: | Methodology:Social Rsrch |
| Instructor: | Schumacher,John |

Term - Spring 2012

| | |
|------------------------|-----------|
| Enrollment: | 45 |
| Questionnaires: | 25 |

| Questions | NR | NA | Frequencies | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Org | UMBC | Level | Sect |
|--|----|----|-------------|---|---|---|---|------------|---------|--------|------|------|-------|------|
| | | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Mean | Rank | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean |
| Self Paced | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 5. Were there enough proctors for all the students | 24 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/13 | **** | **** | 4.14 | 1.00 | **** |

Frequency Distribution

| Credits Earned | Cum. GPA | Expected Grades | Reasons | Type | Majors | | | | | | |
|----------------|----------|-----------------|---------|------|--------|---------------------|----|---|----|-----------|----|
| 00-27 | 2 | 0.00-0.99 | 2 | A | 7 | Required for Majors | 16 | Graduate | 0 | Major | 8 |
| 28-55 | 0 | 1.00-1.99 | 0 | B | 9 | | | | | | |
| 56-83 | 5 | 2.00-2.99 | 0 | C | 3 | General | 2 | Under-grad | 25 | Non-major | 17 |
| 84-150 | 2 | 3.00-3.49 | 3 | D | 0 | | | | | | |
| Grad. | 0 | 3.50-4.00 | 8 | F | 0 | Electives | 0 | **** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant | | | |
| | | | | P | 0 | | | | | | |
| | | | | I | 0 | Other | 0 | | | | |
| | | | | ? | 5 | | | | | | |

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

| | |
|------------------------|--------------------------------|
| Course-Section: | SOCY 301 01 |
| Title: | Analy:Sociological Data |
| Instructor: | Grieves,Margare |

Term - Spring 2012

| | |
|------------------------|-----------|
| Enrollment: | 53 |
| Questionnaires: | 35 |

| Questions | NR | NA | Frequencies | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Org | UMBC | Level | Sect |
|---|----|----|-------------|---|----|----|----|------------|-----------|--------|------|------|-------|------|
| | | | 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 | 4 | 3 | 5 | 9 | 11 | 3.63 | 1403/1542 | 3.63 | 4.31 | 4.33 | 4.37 | 3.63 |
| 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals | 2 | 0 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 10 | 11 | 3.61 | 1376/1542 | 3.61 | 4.31 | 4.29 | 4.31 | 3.61 |
| 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals | 3 | 0 | 4 | 2 | 4 | 7 | 15 | 3.84 | 1088/1339 | 3.84 | 4.41 | 4.32 | 4.36 | 3.84 |
| 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals | 3 | 5 | 4 | 5 | 2 | 6 | 10 | 3.48 | 1352/1498 | 3.48 | 4.26 | 4.26 | 4.32 | 3.48 |
| 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned | 5 | 1 | 3 | 3 | 1 | 9 | 13 | 3.90 | 992/1428 | 3.90 | 4.29 | 4.12 | 4.15 | 3.90 |
| 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned | 4 | 6 | 2 | 5 | 2 | 7 | 9 | 3.64 | 1135/1407 | 3.64 | 4.25 | 4.15 | 4.20 | 3.64 |
| 7. Was the grading system clearly explained | 5 | 0 | 4 | 4 | 6 | 5 | 11 | 3.50 | 1331/1521 | 3.50 | 4.32 | 4.20 | 4.23 | 3.50 |
| 8. How many times was class cancelled | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 8 | 24 | 4.75 | 906/1541 | 4.75 | 4.57 | 4.70 | 4.71 | 4.75 |
| 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness | 11 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 10 | 9 | 2 | 3.33 | 1354/1518 | 3.33 | 4.11 | 4.11 | 4.13 | 3.33 |
| Lecture | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared | 4 | 0 | 4 | 3 | 3 | 10 | 11 | 3.68 | 1367/1472 | 3.68 | 4.41 | 4.46 | 4.46 | 3.68 |
| 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject | 5 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 3 | 8 | 15 | 4.10 | 1386/1475 | 4.10 | 4.75 | 4.72 | 4.74 | 4.10 |
| 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly | 5 | 0 | 5 | 3 | 5 | 8 | 9 | 3.43 | 1350/1471 | 3.43 | 4.37 | 4.32 | 4.33 | 3.43 |
| 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned | 6 | 0 | 3 | 3 | 5 | 4 | 14 | 3.79 | 1223/1470 | 3.79 | 4.44 | 4.33 | 4.35 | 3.79 |
| 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding | 6 | 2 | 7 | 2 | 2 | 8 | 8 | 3.30 | 1156/1310 | 3.30 | 4.08 | 4.06 | 4.11 | 3.30 |
| Discussion | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned | 16 | 0 | 6 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 5 | 2.95 | 1142/1210 | 2.95 | 4.32 | 4.18 | 4.27 | 2.95 |
| 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate | 17 | 0 | 2 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 9 | 3.72 | 1050/1211 | 3.72 | 4.51 | 4.37 | 4.45 | 3.72 |
| 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion | 16 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 3 | 2 | 10 | 3.74 | 1044/1207 | 3.74 | 4.55 | 4.41 | 4.51 | 3.74 |
| 4. Were special techniques successful | 16 | 7 | 4 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 2.83 | 829/859 | 2.83 | 4.06 | 4.08 | 4.13 | 2.83 |

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

| | |
|------------------------|--------------------------------|
| Course-Section: | SOCY 301 01 |
| Title: | Analy:Sociological Data |
| Instructor: | Grieves,Margare |

Term - Spring 2012

| | |
|------------------------|-----------|
| Enrollment: | 53 |
| Questionnaires: | 35 |

| Questions | NR | NA | Frequencies | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Org | UMBC | Level | Sect |
|---|----|----|-------------|---|---|---|---|------------|----------|--------|------|------|-------|------|
| | | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Mean | Rank | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean |
| Laboratory | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material | 34 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1.00 | ****/207 | **** | **** | 4.12 | 4.17 | **** |
| 2. Were you provided with adequate background information | 34 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1.00 | ****/210 | **** | **** | 4.17 | 4.21 | **** |
| 3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities | 34 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1.00 | ****/202 | **** | **** | 4.50 | 4.54 | **** |
| 4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance | 34 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1.00 | ****/202 | **** | **** | 4.32 | 4.44 | **** |
| 5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified | 34 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1.00 | ****/199 | **** | **** | 4.15 | 4.18 | **** |

Frequency Distribution

| Credits Earned | Cum. GPA | Expected Grades | Reasons | Type | Majors | | | | | | |
|----------------|----------|-----------------|---------|------|--------|---------------------|----|------------|----|-----------|----|
| 00-27 | 2 | 0.00-0.99 | 2 | A | 14 | Required for Majors | 25 | Graduate | 0 | Major | 15 |
| 28-55 | 1 | 1.00-1.99 | 0 | B | 9 | | | | | | |
| 56-83 | 2 | 2.00-2.99 | 4 | C | 4 | General | 2 | Under-grad | 35 | Non-major | 20 |
| 84-150 | 11 | 3.00-3.49 | 3 | D | 0 | | | | | | |
| Grad. | 0 | 3.50-4.00 | 8 | F | 0 | Electives | 0 | | | | |
| | | | | P | 0 | | | | | | |
| | | | | I | 0 | Other | 0 | | | | |
| | | | | ? | 7 | | | | | | |

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

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

| | |
|------------------------|------------------------------------|
| Course-Section: | SOCY 321 01 |
| Title: | Race & Ethnic Relations |
| Instructor: | Cousin-Gossett, |

Term - Spring 2012

| | |
|------------------------|-----------|
| Enrollment: | 40 |
| Questionnaires: | 25 |

| Questions | NR | NA | Frequencies | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Org | UMBC | Level | Sect |
|---|----|----|-------------|---|---|----|----|------------|----------|--------|------|------|-------|------|
| | | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Mean | Rank | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean |
| General | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 9 | 13 | 4.40 | 780/1542 | 4.40 | 4.31 | 4.33 | 4.37 | 4.40 |
| 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 10 | 13 | 4.40 | 754/1542 | 4.40 | 4.31 | 4.29 | 4.31 | 4.40 |
| 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 7 | 15 | 4.32 | 766/1339 | 4.32 | 4.41 | 4.32 | 4.36 | 4.32 |
| 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 7 | 14 | 4.28 | 822/1498 | 4.28 | 4.26 | 4.26 | 4.32 | 4.28 |
| 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 7 | 16 | 4.52 | 372/1428 | 4.52 | 4.29 | 4.12 | 4.15 | 4.52 |
| 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5 | 5 | 14 | 4.28 | 651/1407 | 4.28 | 4.25 | 4.15 | 4.20 | 4.28 |
| 7. Was the grading system clearly explained | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 6 | 17 | 4.52 | 496/1521 | 4.52 | 4.32 | 4.20 | 4.23 | 4.52 |
| 8. How many times was class cancelled | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 21 | 4.88 | 738/1541 | 4.88 | 4.57 | 4.70 | 4.71 | 4.88 |
| 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness | 3 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 10 | 9 | 4.18 | 763/1518 | 4.18 | 4.11 | 4.11 | 4.13 | 4.18 |
| Lecture | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5 | 3 | 16 | 4.36 | 993/1472 | 4.36 | 4.41 | 4.46 | 4.46 | 4.36 |
| 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 22 | 4.84 | 700/1475 | 4.84 | 4.75 | 4.72 | 4.74 | 4.84 |
| 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 5 | 15 | 4.36 | 833/1471 | 4.36 | 4.37 | 4.32 | 4.33 | 4.36 |
| 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 4 | 19 | 4.64 | 528/1470 | 4.64 | 4.44 | 4.33 | 4.35 | 4.64 |
| 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding | 0 | 5 | 2 | 0 | 4 | 7 | 7 | 3.85 | 893/1310 | 3.85 | 4.08 | 4.06 | 4.11 | 3.85 |
| Discussion | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 14 | 4.74 | 266/1210 | 4.74 | 4.32 | 4.18 | 4.27 | 4.74 |
| 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 5 | 12 | 4.53 | 565/1211 | 4.53 | 4.51 | 4.37 | 4.45 | 4.53 |
| 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 15 | 4.79 | 367/1207 | 4.79 | 4.55 | 4.41 | 4.51 | 4.79 |

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

| | |
|------------------------|------------------------------------|
| Course-Section: | SOCY 321 01 |
| Title: | Race & Ethnic Relations |
| Instructor: | Cousin-Gossett, |

Term - Spring 2012

| | |
|------------------------|-----------|
| Enrollment: | 40 |
| Questionnaires: | 25 |

| Questions | NR | NA | Frequencies | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Org | UMBC | Level | Sect |
|---------------------------------------|----|----|-------------|---|---|---|---|------------|---------|--------|------|------|-------|------|
| | | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Mean | Rank | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean |
| Discussion | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 4. Were special techniques successful | 6 | 9 | 4 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 2 | 2.90 | 825/859 | 2.90 | 4.06 | 4.08 | 4.13 | 2.90 |

Frequency Distribution

| Credits Earned | | Cum. GPA | | Expected Grades | | Reasons | | Type | | Majors | |
|----------------|---|-----------|---|-----------------|---|---------------------|----|---|----|-----------|----|
| 00-27 | 0 | 0.00-0.99 | 0 | A | 8 | Required for Majors | 8 | Graduate | 0 | Major | 2 |
| 28-55 | 0 | 1.00-1.99 | 0 | B | 8 | | | | | | |
| 56-83 | 3 | 2.00-2.99 | 5 | C | 4 | General | 1 | Under-grad | 25 | Non-major | 23 |
| 84-150 | 9 | 3.00-3.49 | 2 | D | 0 | | | | | | |
| Grad. | 0 | 3.50-4.00 | 5 | F | 0 | Electives | 10 | **** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant | | | |
| | | | | P | 0 | | | | | | |
| | | | | I | 0 | Other | 1 | | | | |
| | | | | ? | 3 | | | | | | |

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

| | |
|------------------------|---------------------------------|
| Course-Section: | SOCY 332 01 |
| Title: | Hum Sexuality/Socio Pers |
| Instructor: | Hylton, Kevin |

Term - Spring 2012

| | |
|------------------------|-----------|
| Enrollment: | 23 |
| Questionnaires: | 23 |

| Questions | NR | NA | Frequencies | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Org | UMBC | Level | Sect |
|---|----|----|-------------|---|---|----|----|------------|-----------|--------|------|------|-------|------|
| | | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Mean | Rank | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean |
| General | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course | 4 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 5 | 11 | 4.26 | 951/1542 | 4.39 | 4.31 | 4.33 | 4.37 | 4.26 |
| 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals | 4 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 6 | 10 | 4.26 | 917/1542 | 4.32 | 4.31 | 4.29 | 4.31 | 4.26 |
| 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 4 | 13 | 4.58 | 507/1339 | 4.46 | 4.41 | 4.32 | 4.36 | 4.58 |
| 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals | 4 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 13 | 4.37 | 733/1498 | 4.30 | 4.26 | 4.26 | 4.32 | 4.37 |
| 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned | 4 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 4 | 12 | 4.42 | 473/1428 | 4.34 | 4.29 | 4.12 | 4.15 | 4.42 |
| 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned | 5 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 13 | 4.50 | 405/1407 | 4.35 | 4.25 | 4.15 | 4.20 | 4.50 |
| 7. Was the grading system clearly explained | 4 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 4 | 11 | 4.21 | 881/1521 | 4.21 | 4.32 | 4.20 | 4.23 | 4.21 |
| 8. How many times was class cancelled | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 16 | 3 | 4.16 | 1394/1541 | 3.53 | 4.57 | 4.70 | 4.71 | 4.16 |
| 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness | 10 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 3 | 6 | 4.15 | 793/1518 | 4.05 | 4.11 | 4.11 | 4.13 | 4.15 |
| Lecture | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 13 | 4.67 | 598/1472 | 4.42 | 4.41 | 4.46 | 4.46 | 4.67 |
| 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 16 | 4.89 | 592/1475 | 4.75 | 4.75 | 4.72 | 4.74 | 4.89 |
| 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 7 | 10 | 4.50 | 637/1471 | 4.39 | 4.37 | 4.32 | 4.33 | 4.50 |
| 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 4 | 11 | 4.53 | 671/1470 | 4.44 | 4.44 | 4.33 | 4.35 | 4.53 |
| 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding | 6 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 12 | 4.47 | 354/1310 | 4.28 | 4.08 | 4.06 | 4.11 | 4.47 |
| Discussion | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 5 | 12 | 4.53 | 418/1210 | 4.47 | 4.32 | 4.18 | 4.27 | 4.53 |
| 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate | 5 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 16 | 4.72 | 390/1211 | 4.75 | 4.51 | 4.37 | 4.45 | 4.72 |
| 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion | 4 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 13 | 4.47 | 657/1207 | 4.64 | 4.55 | 4.41 | 4.51 | 4.47 |
| 4. Were special techniques successful | 4 | 4 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 7 | 6 | 4.13 | 433/859 | 4.24 | 4.06 | 4.08 | 4.13 | 4.13 |

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

| Course-Section: SOCY 332 01 | | Term - Spring 2012 | | | | | | | | Enrollment: 23 | | | | |
|---|----|--------------------|---|---|---|---|------------|------|----------|---------------------------|------|-------|------|------|
| Title: Hum Sexuality/Socio Pers | | | | | | | | | | Questionnaires: 23 | | | | |
| Instructor: Hylton, Kevin | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | Frequencies | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Org | UMBC | Level | Sect | |
| Questions | NR | NA | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Mean | Rank | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean |
| Laboratory | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material | 18 | 4 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2.00 | ****/207 | **** | **** | 4.12 | 4.17 | **** |
| 2. Were you provided with adequate background information | 20 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1.67 | ****/210 | **** | **** | 4.17 | 4.21 | **** |
| 3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities | 20 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1.00 | ****/202 | **** | **** | 4.50 | 4.54 | **** |
| Seminar | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme | 20 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 3.00 | ****/69 | **** | **** | 4.56 | 4.70 | **** |
| 2. Was the instructor available for individual attention | 21 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 3.00 | ****/69 | **** | **** | 4.60 | 4.68 | **** |
| 3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned | 21 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 2.50 | ****/68 | **** | **** | 4.50 | 4.51 | **** |
| 4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned | 21 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 3.00 | ****/73 | **** | **** | 4.54 | 4.55 | **** |
| 5. Were criteria for grading made clear | 21 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2.00 | ****/67 | **** | **** | 4.17 | 4.46 | **** |
| Field Work | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned | 20 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1.67 | ****/32 | **** | **** | 4.20 | 3.88 | **** |
| 2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria | 21 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 2.00 | ****/35 | **** | **** | 4.36 | 4.08 | **** |
| 3. Was the instructor available for consultation | 21 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 3.00 | ****/25 | **** | **** | 4.59 | 4.24 | **** |
| 4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations | 21 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 3.00 | ****/23 | **** | **** | 4.41 | 3.84 | **** |
| 5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities | 21 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1.00 | ****/17 | **** | **** | 4.62 | 4.17 | **** |
| Self Paced | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned | 20 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 4.33 | ****/30 | **** | **** | 4.27 | 3.17 | **** |
| 2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal | 21 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 3.50 | ****/19 | **** | **** | 4.57 | 4.33 | **** |
| 3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful | 21 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 2.50 | ****/29 | **** | **** | 4.29 | 2.17 | **** |

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

| | |
|------------------------|---------------------------------|
| Course-Section: | SOCY 332 01 |
| Title: | Hum Sexuality/Socio Pers |
| Instructor: | Hylton, Kevin |

Term - Spring 2012

| | |
|------------------------|-----------|
| Enrollment: | 23 |
| Questionnaires: | 23 |

| Questions | NR | NA | Frequencies | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Org | UMBC | Level | Sect |
|--|----|----|-------------|---|---|---|---|------------|---------|--------|------|------|-------|------|
| | | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Mean | Rank | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean |
| Self Paced | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful | 21 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 3.00 | ****/18 | **** | **** | 4.25 | 1.00 | **** |

Frequency Distribution

| Credits Earned | | Cum. GPA | | Expected Grades | | Reasons | | Type | | Majors | |
|----------------|---|-----------|---|-----------------|---|---------------------|----|---|----|-----------|----|
| 00-27 | 0 | 0.00-0.99 | 0 | A | 7 | Required for Majors | 2 | Graduate | 0 | Major | 0 |
| 28-55 | 0 | 1.00-1.99 | 0 | B | 7 | | | | | | |
| 56-83 | 0 | 2.00-2.99 | 0 | C | 2 | General | 1 | Under-grad | 23 | Non-major | 23 |
| 84-150 | 3 | 3.00-3.49 | 4 | D | 0 | | | | | | |
| Grad. | 0 | 3.50-4.00 | 3 | F | 0 | Electives | 12 | **** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant | | | |
| | | | | P | 0 | | | | | | |
| | | | | I | 0 | Other | 1 | | | | |
| | | | | ? | 6 | | | | | | |

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

| | |
|------------------------|---------------------------------|
| Course-Section: | SOCY 332 02 |
| Title: | Hum Sexuality/Socio Pers |
| Instructor: | Krieger,Annie M |

Term - Spring 2012

| | |
|------------------------|-----------|
| Enrollment: | 80 |
| Questionnaires: | 48 |

| Questions | NR | NA | Frequencies | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Org | UMBC | Level | Sect |
|---|----|----|-------------|---|----|----|----|------------|-----------|--------|------|------|-------|------|
| | | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Mean | Rank | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean |
| General | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course | 4 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 10 | 29 | 4.52 | 608/1542 | 4.39 | 4.31 | 4.33 | 4.37 | 4.52 |
| 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals | 4 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 4 | 12 | 26 | 4.39 | 776/1542 | 4.32 | 4.31 | 4.29 | 4.31 | 4.39 |
| 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals | 4 | 0 | 3 | 1 | 3 | 8 | 29 | 4.34 | 748/1339 | 4.46 | 4.41 | 4.32 | 4.36 | 4.34 |
| 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals | 4 | 1 | 1 | 4 | 4 | 9 | 25 | 4.23 | 874/1498 | 4.30 | 4.26 | 4.26 | 4.32 | 4.23 |
| 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned | 4 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 6 | 7 | 27 | 4.25 | 629/1428 | 4.34 | 4.29 | 4.12 | 4.15 | 4.25 |
| 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned | 6 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 8 | 7 | 24 | 4.19 | 748/1407 | 4.35 | 4.25 | 4.15 | 4.20 | 4.19 |
| 7. Was the grading system clearly explained | 4 | 1 | 4 | 2 | 3 | 6 | 28 | 4.21 | 892/1521 | 4.21 | 4.32 | 4.20 | 4.23 | 4.21 |
| 8. How many times was class cancelled | 4 | 0 | 5 | 4 | 25 | 10 | 0 | 2.91 | 1538/1541 | 3.53 | 4.57 | 4.70 | 4.71 | 2.91 |
| 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness | 11 | 4 | 2 | 1 | 7 | 10 | 13 | 3.94 | 1015/1518 | 4.05 | 4.11 | 4.11 | 4.13 | 3.94 |
| Lecture | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared | 7 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 14 | 20 | 4.17 | 1141/1472 | 4.42 | 4.41 | 4.46 | 4.46 | 4.17 |
| 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject | 6 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 4 | 4 | 33 | 4.62 | 1105/1475 | 4.75 | 4.75 | 4.72 | 4.74 | 4.62 |
| 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly | 8 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 4 | 10 | 23 | 4.28 | 930/1471 | 4.39 | 4.37 | 4.32 | 4.33 | 4.28 |
| 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned | 6 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 3 | 9 | 27 | 4.36 | 865/1470 | 4.44 | 4.44 | 4.33 | 4.35 | 4.36 |
| 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding | 7 | 5 | 1 | 0 | 10 | 9 | 16 | 4.08 | 717/1310 | 4.28 | 4.08 | 4.06 | 4.11 | 4.08 |
| Discussion | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned | 21 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 7 | 16 | 4.41 | 523/1210 | 4.47 | 4.32 | 4.18 | 4.27 | 4.41 |
| 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate | 21 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 23 | 4.78 | 327/1211 | 4.75 | 4.51 | 4.37 | 4.45 | 4.78 |
| 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion | 21 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 23 | 4.81 | 333/1207 | 4.64 | 4.55 | 4.41 | 4.51 | 4.81 |
| 4. Were special techniques successful | 21 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 6 | 15 | 4.35 | 309/859 | 4.24 | 4.06 | 4.08 | 4.13 | 4.35 |

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

| | |
|------------------------|---------------------------------|
| Course-Section: | SOCY 332 02 |
| Title: | Hum Sexuality/Socio Pers |
| Instructor: | Krieger,Annie M |

Term - Spring 2012

| | |
|------------------------|-----------|
| Enrollment: | 80 |
| Questionnaires: | 48 |

| Questions | NR | NA | Frequencies | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Org | UMBC | Level | Sect |
|---|----|----|-------------|---|---|---|---|------------|----------|--------|------|------|-------|------|
| | | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Mean | Rank | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean |
| Laboratory | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material | 46 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/207 | **** | **** | 4.12 | 4.17 | **** |
| 2. Were you provided with adequate background information | 46 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3.50 | ****/210 | **** | **** | 4.17 | 4.21 | **** |
| 3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities | 46 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3.00 | ****/202 | **** | **** | 4.50 | 4.54 | **** |
| 4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance | 46 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/202 | **** | **** | 4.32 | 4.44 | **** |
| 5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified | 46 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/199 | **** | **** | 4.15 | 4.18 | **** |
| Seminar | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme | 46 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/69 | **** | **** | 4.56 | 4.70 | **** |
| 2. Was the instructor available for individual attention | 46 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3.00 | ****/69 | **** | **** | 4.60 | 4.68 | **** |
| 3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned | 46 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3.00 | ****/68 | **** | **** | 4.50 | 4.51 | **** |
| 4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned | 46 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3.00 | ****/73 | **** | **** | 4.54 | 4.55 | **** |
| 5. Were criteria for grading made clear | 46 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3.00 | ****/67 | **** | **** | 4.17 | 4.46 | **** |
| Field Work | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned | 46 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3.00 | ****/32 | **** | **** | 4.20 | 3.88 | **** |
| 2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria | 46 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3.00 | ****/35 | **** | **** | 4.36 | 4.08 | **** |
| 3. Was the instructor available for consultation | 46 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3.00 | ****/25 | **** | **** | 4.59 | 4.24 | **** |
| 4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations | 46 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3.00 | ****/23 | **** | **** | 4.41 | 3.84 | **** |
| 5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities | 46 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/17 | **** | **** | 4.62 | 4.17 | **** |
| Self Paced | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned | 46 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3.00 | ****/30 | **** | **** | 4.27 | 3.17 | **** |
| 2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal | 46 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3.00 | ****/19 | **** | **** | 4.57 | 4.33 | **** |
| 3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful | 47 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/29 | **** | **** | 4.29 | 2.17 | **** |

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

| | |
|------------------------|---------------------------------|
| Course-Section: | SOCY 332 02 |
| Title: | Hum Sexuality/Socio Pers |
| Instructor: | Krieger,Annie M |

Term - Spring 2012

| | |
|------------------------|-----------|
| Enrollment: | 80 |
| Questionnaires: | 48 |

| Questions | NR | NA | Frequencies | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Org | UMBC | Level | Sect |
|--|----|----|-------------|---|---|---|---|------------|---------|--------|------|------|-------|------|
| | | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Mean | Rank | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean |
| Self Paced | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful | 47 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/18 | **** | **** | 4.25 | 1.00 | **** |
| 5. Were there enough proctors for all the students | 46 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/13 | **** | **** | 4.14 | 1.00 | **** |

Frequency Distribution

| Credits Earned | Cum. GPA | Expected Grades | Reasons | Type | Majors |
|----------------|----------|-----------------|---------|------------------------|---|
| 00-27 | 1 | 0.00-0.99 0 | A 21 | Required for Majors 14 | Graduate 0 Major 7 |
| 28-55 | 0 | 1.00-1.99 0 | B 11 | | |
| 56-83 | 6 | 2.00-2.99 4 | C 1 | General 5 | Under-grad 48 Non-major 41 |
| 84-150 | 7 | 3.00-3.49 9 | D 0 | | |
| Grad. | 0 | 3.50-4.00 10 | F 0 | Electives 13 | **** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant |
| | | | P 0 | | |
| | | | I 0 | Other 2 | |
| | | | ? 14 | | |

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

| | |
|------------------------|--------------------------|
| Course-Section: | SOCY 351 01 |
| Title: | Medical Sociology |
| Instructor: | Sufian,Meryl |

Term - Spring 2012

| | |
|------------------------|----------|
| Enrollment: | 5 |
| Questionnaires: | 5 |

| Questions | NR | NA | Frequencies | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Org | UMBC | Level | Sect |
|---|----|----|-------------|---|---|---|---|------------|-----------|--------|------|------|-------|------|
| | | | 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 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 4.50 | 632/1542 | 4.67 | 4.31 | 4.33 | 4.37 | 4.50 |
| 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 5.00 | 1/1542 | 4.98 | 4.31 | 4.29 | 4.31 | 5.00 |
| 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 5.00 | 1/1339 | 4.96 | 4.41 | 4.32 | 4.36 | 5.00 |
| 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 5.00 | 1/1498 | 4.88 | 4.26 | 4.26 | 4.32 | 5.00 |
| 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 4.50 | 390/1428 | 4.47 | 4.29 | 4.12 | 4.15 | 4.50 |
| 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 5.00 | 1/1407 | 4.84 | 4.25 | 4.15 | 4.20 | 5.00 |
| 7. Was the grading system clearly explained | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 5.00 | 1/1521 | 4.96 | 4.32 | 4.20 | 4.23 | 5.00 |
| 8. How many times was class cancelled | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 4.50 | 1124/1541 | 4.49 | 4.57 | 4.70 | 4.71 | 4.50 |
| 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 4.00 | 920/1518 | 4.41 | 4.11 | 4.11 | 4.13 | 4.00 |
| Lecture | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 4.50 | 817/1472 | 4.72 | 4.41 | 4.46 | 4.46 | 4.50 |
| 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 5.00 | 1/1475 | 5.00 | 4.75 | 4.72 | 4.74 | 5.00 |
| 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 4.50 | 637/1471 | 4.74 | 4.37 | 4.32 | 4.33 | 4.50 |
| 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 4.50 | 692/1470 | 4.73 | 4.44 | 4.33 | 4.35 | 4.50 |
| 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 4.50 | 324/1310 | 4.69 | 4.08 | 4.06 | 4.11 | 4.50 |
| Discussion | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 4.50 | 430/1210 | 4.70 | 4.32 | 4.18 | 4.27 | 4.50 |
| 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate | 3 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3.50 | 1100/1211 | 4.25 | 4.51 | 4.37 | 4.45 | 3.50 |
| 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 4.50 | 630/1207 | 4.75 | 4.55 | 4.41 | 4.51 | 4.50 |

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

| | |
|------------------------|--------------------------|
| Course-Section: | SOCY 351 01 |
| Title: | Medical Sociology |
| Instructor: | Sufian,Meryl |

Term - Spring 2012

| | |
|------------------------|----------|
| Enrollment: | 5 |
| Questionnaires: | 5 |

| Questions | NR | NA | Frequencies | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Org | UMBC | Level | Sect |
|---------------------------------------|----|----|-------------|---|---|---|---|------------|---------|--------|------|------|-------|------|
| | | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Mean | Rank | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean |
| Discussion | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 4. Were special techniques successful | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 4.00 | 478/859 | 4.17 | 4.06 | 4.08 | 4.13 | 4.00 |

Frequency Distribution

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

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

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

| | |
|------------------------|--------------------------|
| Course-Section: | SOCY 351 02 |
| Title: | Medical Sociology |
| Instructor: | Hosler, Colleen |

Term - Spring 2012

| | |
|------------------------|-----------|
| Enrollment: | 63 |
| Questionnaires: | 50 |

| Questions | NR | NA | Frequencies | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Org | UMBC | Level | Sect |
|---|----|----|-------------|---|---|----|----|------------|-----------|--------|------|------|-------|------|
| | | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Mean | Rank | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean |
| General | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 39 | 4.85 | 223/1542 | 4.67 | 4.31 | 4.33 | 4.37 | 4.85 |
| 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 44 | 4.96 | 72/1542 | 4.98 | 4.31 | 4.29 | 4.31 | 4.96 |
| 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 42 | 4.91 | 141/1339 | 4.96 | 4.41 | 4.32 | 4.36 | 4.91 |
| 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals | 4 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 6 | 38 | 4.76 | 240/1498 | 4.88 | 4.26 | 4.26 | 4.32 | 4.76 |
| 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned | 4 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 5 | 7 | 31 | 4.43 | 462/1428 | 4.47 | 4.29 | 4.12 | 4.15 | 4.43 |
| 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned | 4 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 10 | 33 | 4.69 | 234/1407 | 4.84 | 4.25 | 4.15 | 4.20 | 4.69 |
| 7. Was the grading system clearly explained | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 42 | 4.91 | 89/1521 | 4.96 | 4.32 | 4.20 | 4.23 | 4.91 |
| 8. How many times was class cancelled | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 24 | 22 | 4.48 | 1149/1541 | 4.49 | 4.57 | 4.70 | 4.71 | 4.48 |
| 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness | 10 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5 | 33 | 4.82 | 142/1518 | 4.41 | 4.11 | 4.11 | 4.13 | 4.82 |
| Lecture | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 42 | 4.93 | 146/1472 | 4.72 | 4.41 | 4.46 | 4.46 | 4.93 |
| 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 45 | 5.00 | 1/1475 | 5.00 | 4.75 | 4.72 | 4.74 | 5.00 |
| 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 44 | 4.98 | 49/1471 | 4.74 | 4.37 | 4.32 | 4.33 | 4.98 |
| 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 43 | 4.96 | 89/1470 | 4.73 | 4.44 | 4.33 | 4.35 | 4.96 |
| 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding | 7 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 37 | 4.88 | 82/1310 | 4.69 | 4.08 | 4.06 | 4.11 | 4.88 |
| Discussion | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned | 21 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 27 | 4.90 | 137/1210 | 4.70 | 4.32 | 4.18 | 4.27 | 4.90 |
| 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate | 21 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 29 | 5.00 | 1/1211 | 4.25 | 4.51 | 4.37 | 4.45 | 5.00 |
| 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion | 21 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 29 | 5.00 | 1/1207 | 4.75 | 4.55 | 4.41 | 4.51 | 5.00 |
| 4. Were special techniques successful | 21 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 4 | 3 | 20 | 4.34 | 309/859 | 4.17 | 4.06 | 4.08 | 4.13 | 4.34 |

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

| | |
|------------------------|--------------------------|
| Course-Section: | SOCY 351 02 |
| Title: | Medical Sociology |
| Instructor: | Hosler, Colleen |

Term - Spring 2012

| | |
|------------------------|-----------|
| Enrollment: | 63 |
| Questionnaires: | 50 |

| Questions | NR | NA | Frequencies | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Org | UMBC | Level | Sect |
|---|----|----|-------------|---|---|---|---|------------|----------|--------|------|------|-------|------|
| | | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Mean | Rank | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean |
| Laboratory | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material | 49 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/207 | **** | **** | 4.12 | 4.17 | **** |
| 2. Were you provided with adequate background information | 49 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/210 | **** | **** | 4.17 | 4.21 | **** |
| 3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities | 49 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/202 | **** | **** | 4.50 | 4.54 | **** |
| 4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance | 48 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/202 | **** | **** | 4.32 | 4.44 | **** |
| 5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified | 48 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/199 | **** | **** | 4.15 | 4.18 | **** |
| Seminar | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme | 48 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 4.50 | ****/69 | **** | **** | 4.56 | 4.70 | **** |
| 2. Was the instructor available for individual attention | 48 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 4.50 | ****/69 | **** | **** | 4.60 | 4.68 | **** |
| 3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned | 48 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 5.00 | ****/68 | **** | **** | 4.50 | 4.51 | **** |
| 4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned | 48 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 5.00 | ****/73 | **** | **** | 4.54 | 4.55 | **** |
| 5. Were criteria for grading made clear | 48 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 5.00 | ****/67 | **** | **** | 4.17 | 4.46 | **** |
| Field Work | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned | 48 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 5.00 | ****/32 | **** | **** | 4.20 | 3.88 | **** |
| 2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria | 48 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 5.00 | ****/35 | **** | **** | 4.36 | 4.08 | **** |
| 3. Was the instructor available for consultation | 48 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 5.00 | ****/25 | **** | **** | 4.59 | 4.24 | **** |
| 4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations | 48 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/23 | **** | **** | 4.41 | 3.84 | **** |
| 5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities | 48 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/17 | **** | **** | 4.62 | 4.17 | **** |
| Self Paced | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned | 48 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 5.00 | ****/30 | **** | **** | 4.27 | 3.17 | **** |
| 2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal | 48 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 5.00 | ****/19 | **** | **** | 4.57 | 4.33 | **** |
| 3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful | 48 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/29 | **** | **** | 4.29 | 2.17 | **** |

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

| | |
|------------------------|--------------------------|
| Course-Section: | SOCY 351 02 |
| Title: | Medical Sociology |
| Instructor: | Hosler, Colleen |

Term - Spring 2012

| | |
|------------------------|-----------|
| Enrollment: | 63 |
| Questionnaires: | 50 |

| Questions | NR | NA | Frequencies | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Org | UMBC | Level | Sect |
|--|----|----|-------------|---|---|---|---|------------|---------|--------|------|------|-------|------|
| | | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Mean | Rank | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean |
| Self Paced | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful | 48 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/18 | **** | **** | 4.25 | 1.00 | **** |
| 5. Were there enough proctors for all the students | 48 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 4.00 | ****/13 | **** | **** | 4.14 | 1.00 | **** |

Frequency Distribution

| Credits Earned | Cum. GPA | Expected Grades | Reasons | Type | Majors | | | | | | |
|----------------|----------|-----------------|---------|------|--------|---------------------|----|---|----|-----------|----|
| 00-27 | 1 | 0.00-0.99 | 1 | A | 29 | Required for Majors | 17 | Graduate | 0 | Major | 2 |
| 28-55 | 0 | 1.00-1.99 | 0 | B | 12 | | | | | | |
| 56-83 | 3 | 2.00-2.99 | 5 | C | 1 | General | 9 | Under-grad | 50 | Non-major | 48 |
| 84-150 | 14 | 3.00-3.49 | 16 | D | 0 | | | | | | |
| Grad. | 0 | 3.50-4.00 | 3 | F | 0 | Electives | 17 | **** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant | | | |
| | | | | P | 0 | | | | | | |
| | | | | I | 0 | Other | 0 | | | | |
| | | | | ? | 6 | | | | | | |

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

| | |
|------------------------|------------------------------|
| Course-Section: | SOCY 352 01 |
| Title: | Issues In Health Care |
| Instructor: | Nolin,Michael A |

Term - Spring 2012

| | |
|------------------------|-----------|
| Enrollment: | 79 |
| Questionnaires: | 55 |

| Questions | NR | NA | Frequencies | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Org | UMBC | Level | Sect |
|---|----|----|-------------|---|----|----|----|------------|-----------|--------|------|------|-------|------|
| | | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Mean | Rank | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean |
| General | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course | 4 | 0 | 2 | 6 | 7 | 17 | 19 | 3.88 | 1275/1542 | 3.88 | 4.31 | 4.33 | 4.37 | 3.88 |
| 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals | 5 | 0 | 1 | 6 | 8 | 18 | 17 | 3.88 | 1222/1542 | 3.88 | 4.31 | 4.29 | 4.31 | 3.88 |
| 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals | 5 | 1 | 0 | 5 | 8 | 20 | 16 | 3.96 | 1018/1339 | 3.96 | 4.41 | 4.32 | 4.36 | 3.96 |
| 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals | 6 | 6 | 1 | 2 | 13 | 13 | 14 | 3.86 | 1182/1498 | 3.86 | 4.26 | 4.26 | 4.32 | 3.86 |
| 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned | 4 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 8 | 23 | 17 | 4.06 | 821/1428 | 4.06 | 4.29 | 4.12 | 4.15 | 4.06 |
| 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned | 4 | 25 | 1 | 4 | 6 | 8 | 7 | 3.62 | 1148/1407 | 3.62 | 4.25 | 4.15 | 4.20 | 3.62 |
| 7. Was the grading system clearly explained | 4 | 0 | 0 | 8 | 5 | 9 | 29 | 4.16 | 944/1521 | 4.16 | 4.32 | 4.20 | 4.23 | 4.16 |
| 8. How many times was class cancelled | 5 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 31 | 16 | 4.24 | 1334/1541 | 4.24 | 4.57 | 4.70 | 4.71 | 4.24 |
| 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness | 17 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 14 | 17 | 6 | 3.74 | 1172/1518 | 3.74 | 4.11 | 4.11 | 4.13 | 3.74 |
| Lecture | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared | 9 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 14 | 12 | 18 | 3.98 | 1244/1472 | 3.98 | 4.41 | 4.46 | 4.46 | 3.98 |
| 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject | 8 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 8 | 36 | 4.68 | 1013/1475 | 4.68 | 4.75 | 4.72 | 4.74 | 4.68 |
| 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly | 11 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 10 | 12 | 18 | 4.00 | 1104/1471 | 4.00 | 4.37 | 4.32 | 4.33 | 4.00 |
| 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned | 10 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 9 | 11 | 21 | 4.07 | 1086/1470 | 4.07 | 4.44 | 4.33 | 4.35 | 4.07 |
| 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding | 11 | 3 | 6 | 7 | 9 | 7 | 12 | 3.29 | 1156/1310 | 3.29 | 4.08 | 4.06 | 4.11 | 3.29 |
| Discussion | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned | 27 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 4 | 10 | 11 | 3.96 | 806/1210 | 3.96 | 4.32 | 4.18 | 4.27 | 3.96 |
| 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate | 27 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 9 | 16 | 4.36 | 723/1211 | 4.36 | 4.51 | 4.37 | 4.45 | 4.36 |
| 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion | 27 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 11 | 17 | 4.61 | 556/1207 | 4.61 | 4.55 | 4.41 | 4.51 | 4.61 |
| 4. Were special techniques successful | 27 | 15 | 0 | 3 | 4 | 2 | 4 | 3.54 | ****/859 | **** | 4.06 | 4.08 | 4.13 | **** |

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

| | |
|------------------------|------------------------------|
| Course-Section: | SOCY 352 01 |
| Title: | Issues In Health Care |
| Instructor: | Nolin,Michael A |

Term - Spring 2012

| | |
|------------------------|-----------|
| Enrollment: | 79 |
| Questionnaires: | 55 |

| Questions | NR | NA | Frequencies | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Org | UMBC | Level | Sect |
|---|----|----|-------------|---|---|---|---|------------|----------|--------|------|------|-------|------|
| | | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Mean | Rank | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean |
| Laboratory | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material | 54 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 4.00 | ****/207 | **** | **** | 4.12 | 4.17 | **** |
| 2. Were you provided with adequate background information | 54 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 4.00 | ****/210 | **** | **** | 4.17 | 4.21 | **** |
| 3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities | 54 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 3.00 | ****/202 | **** | **** | 4.50 | 4.54 | **** |
| 4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance | 54 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 3.00 | ****/202 | **** | **** | 4.32 | 4.44 | **** |
| 5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified | 54 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2.00 | ****/199 | **** | **** | 4.15 | 4.18 | **** |
| Seminar | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme | 54 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 4.00 | ****/69 | **** | **** | 4.56 | 4.70 | **** |
| 2. Was the instructor available for individual attention | 53 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 3.50 | ****/69 | **** | **** | 4.60 | 4.68 | **** |
| 3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned | 53 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 3.00 | ****/68 | **** | **** | 4.50 | 4.51 | **** |
| 4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned | 54 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 3.00 | ****/73 | **** | **** | 4.54 | 4.55 | **** |
| 5. Were criteria for grading made clear | 54 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 4.00 | ****/67 | **** | **** | 4.17 | 4.46 | **** |
| Field Work | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned | 54 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 4.00 | ****/32 | **** | **** | 4.20 | 3.88 | **** |
| 2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria | 54 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 4.00 | ****/35 | **** | **** | 4.36 | 4.08 | **** |
| 3. Was the instructor available for consultation | 54 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 4.00 | ****/25 | **** | **** | 4.59 | 4.24 | **** |
| 4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations | 54 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 3.00 | ****/23 | **** | **** | 4.41 | 3.84 | **** |
| 5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities | 54 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 4.00 | ****/17 | **** | **** | 4.62 | 4.17 | **** |
| Self Paced | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned | 54 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 4.00 | ****/30 | **** | **** | 4.27 | 3.17 | **** |
| 2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal | 54 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 4.00 | ****/19 | **** | **** | 4.57 | 4.33 | **** |
| 3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful | 54 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 4.00 | ****/29 | **** | **** | 4.29 | 2.17 | **** |

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

| | |
|------------------------|------------------------------|
| Course-Section: | SOCY 352 01 |
| Title: | Issues In Health Care |
| Instructor: | Nolin,Michael A |

Term - Spring 2012

| | |
|------------------------|-----------|
| Enrollment: | 79 |
| Questionnaires: | 55 |

| Questions | NR | NA | Frequencies | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Org | UMBC | Level | Sect |
|--|----|----|-------------|---|---|---|---|------------|---------|--------|------|------|-------|------|
| | | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Mean | Rank | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean |
| Self Paced | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful | 54 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 3.00 | ****/18 | **** | **** | 4.25 | 1.00 | **** |
| 5. Were there enough proctors for all the students | 54 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 3.00 | ****/13 | **** | **** | 4.14 | 1.00 | **** |

Frequency Distribution

| Credits Earned | Cum. GPA | Expected Grades | Reasons | Type | Majors |
|----------------|----------|-----------------|---------|------------------------|---|
| 00-27 | 0 | 0.00-0.99 0 | A 22 | Required for Majors 16 | Graduate 0 Major 1 |
| 28-55 | 0 | 1.00-1.99 0 | B 12 | | |
| 56-83 | 3 | 2.00-2.99 4 | C 2 | General 4 | Under-grad 55 Non-major 54 |
| 84-150 | 12 | 3.00-3.49 10 | D 0 | | |
| Grad. | 0 | 3.50-4.00 7 | F 0 | Electives 18 | **** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant |
| | | | P 0 | | |
| | | | I 0 | Other 2 | |
| | | | ? 19 | | |

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

| | |
|------------------------|--------------------------------|
| Course-Section: | SOCY 353 01 |
| Title: | Marriage And The Family |
| Instructor: | Damasiewicz,Mer |

Term - Spring 2012

| | |
|------------------------|-----------|
| Enrollment: | 80 |
| Questionnaires: | 25 |

| Questions | NR | NA | Frequencies | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Org | UMBC | Level | Sect |
|---|----|----|-------------|---|---|---|----|------------|-----------|--------|------|------|-------|------|
| | | | 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 | 3 | 5 | 16 | 4.54 | 584/1542 | 4.54 | 4.31 | 4.33 | 4.37 | 4.54 |
| 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 7 | 13 | 4.38 | 787/1542 | 4.38 | 4.31 | 4.29 | 4.31 | 4.38 |
| 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 9 | 10 | 4.17 | 896/1339 | 4.17 | 4.41 | 4.32 | 4.36 | 4.17 |
| 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 8 | 14 | 4.52 | 524/1498 | 4.52 | 4.26 | 4.26 | 4.32 | 4.52 |
| 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 6 | 16 | 4.50 | 390/1428 | 4.50 | 4.29 | 4.12 | 4.15 | 4.50 |
| 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned | 2 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 6 | 12 | 4.36 | 569/1407 | 4.36 | 4.25 | 4.15 | 4.20 | 4.36 |
| 7. Was the grading system clearly explained | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5 | 18 | 4.71 | 278/1521 | 4.71 | 4.32 | 4.20 | 4.23 | 4.71 |
| 8. How many times was class cancelled | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 22 | 4.96 | 345/1541 | 4.96 | 4.57 | 4.70 | 4.71 | 4.96 |
| 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 6 | 8 | 4.16 | 793/1518 | 4.16 | 4.11 | 4.11 | 4.13 | 4.16 |
| Lecture | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 4 | 15 | 4.38 | 983/1472 | 4.38 | 4.41 | 4.46 | 4.46 | 4.38 |
| 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 23 | 4.96 | 269/1475 | 4.96 | 4.75 | 4.72 | 4.74 | 4.96 |
| 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 6 | 14 | 4.48 | 681/1471 | 4.48 | 4.37 | 4.32 | 4.33 | 4.48 |
| 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 4 | 18 | 4.67 | 498/1470 | 4.67 | 4.44 | 4.33 | 4.35 | 4.67 |
| 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding | 3 | 14 | 1 | 0 | 3 | 1 | 3 | 3.63 | 1010/1310 | 3.63 | 4.08 | 4.06 | 4.11 | 3.63 |
| Discussion | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned | 5 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 4 | 3 | 11 | 4.15 | 704/1210 | 4.15 | 4.32 | 4.18 | 4.27 | 4.15 |
| 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 19 | 4.95 | 97/1211 | 4.95 | 4.51 | 4.37 | 4.45 | 4.95 |
| 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 19 | 4.95 | 117/1207 | 4.95 | 4.55 | 4.41 | 4.51 | 4.95 |
| 4. Were special techniques successful | 6 | 10 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 6 | 4.22 | 377/859 | 4.22 | 4.06 | 4.08 | 4.13 | 4.22 |

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

| | |
|------------------------|--------------------------------|
| Course-Section: | SOCY 353 01 |
| Title: | Marriage And The Family |
| Instructor: | Damasiewicz,Mer |

Term - Spring 2012

| | |
|------------------------|-----------|
| Enrollment: | 80 |
| Questionnaires: | 25 |

| Questions | NR | NA | Frequencies | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Org | UMBC | Level | Sect |
|---|----|----|-------------|---|---|---|---|------------|----------|--------|------|------|-------|------|
| | | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Mean | Rank | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean |
| Laboratory | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 2. Were you provided with adequate background information | 24 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 4.00 | ****/210 | **** | **** | 4.17 | 4.21 | **** |
| Seminar | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme | 23 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/69 | **** | **** | 4.56 | 4.70 | **** |
| 2. Was the instructor available for individual attention | 23 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/69 | **** | **** | 4.60 | 4.68 | **** |
| 3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned | 23 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/68 | **** | **** | 4.50 | 4.51 | **** |
| 4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned | 23 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/73 | **** | **** | 4.54 | 4.55 | **** |
| 5. Were criteria for grading made clear | 23 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/67 | **** | **** | 4.17 | 4.46 | **** |
| Field Work | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned | 24 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 3.00 | ****/32 | **** | **** | 4.20 | 3.88 | **** |
| 2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria | 24 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/35 | **** | **** | 4.36 | 4.08 | **** |
| 3. Was the instructor available for consultation | 24 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/25 | **** | **** | 4.59 | 4.24 | **** |
| 4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations | 24 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/23 | **** | **** | 4.41 | 3.84 | **** |
| 5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities | 24 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/17 | **** | **** | 4.62 | 4.17 | **** |
| Self Paced | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned | 23 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 5.00 | ****/30 | **** | **** | 4.27 | 3.17 | **** |
| 2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal | 23 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 5.00 | ****/19 | **** | **** | 4.57 | 4.33 | **** |
| 3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful | 23 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 5.00 | ****/29 | **** | **** | 4.29 | 2.17 | **** |
| 4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful | 23 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 5.00 | ****/18 | **** | **** | 4.25 | 1.00 | **** |

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

| | |
|------------------------|--------------------------------|
| Course-Section: | SOCY 353 01 |
| Title: | Marriage And The Family |
| Instructor: | Damasiewicz,Mer |

Term - Spring 2012

| | |
|------------------------|-----------|
| Enrollment: | 80 |
| Questionnaires: | 25 |

| Questions | NR | NA | Frequencies | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Org | UMBC | Level | Sect |
|--|----|----|-------------|---|---|---|---|------------|---------|--------|------|------|-------|------|
| | | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Mean | Rank | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean |
| Self Paced | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 5. Were there enough proctors for all the students | 23 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/13 | **** | **** | 4.14 | 1.00 | **** |

Frequency Distribution

| Credits Earned | Cum. GPA | Expected Grades | Reasons | Type | Majors |
|----------------|----------|-----------------|---------|-----------------------|---------------|
| 00-27 | 1 | 0.00-0.99 0 | A 9 | Required for Majors 6 | Graduate 0 |
| 28-55 | 1 | 1.00-1.99 0 | B 10 | | |
| 56-83 | 2 | 2.00-2.99 1 | C 3 | General 7 | Under-grad 25 |
| 84-150 | 2 | 3.00-3.49 4 | D 0 | | Non-major 22 |
| Grad. | 0 | 3.50-4.00 6 | F 0 | Electives 8 | |
| | | | P 0 | | |
| | | | I 0 | Other 2 | |
| | | | ? 3 | | |

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

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

| | |
|------------------------|--------------------------------|
| Course-Section: | SOCY 358 01 |
| Title: | Cont. Problems Of Aging |
| Instructor: | Doyle,Patrick |

Term - Spring 2012

| | |
|------------------------|-----------|
| Enrollment: | 44 |
| Questionnaires: | 34 |

| Questions | NR | NA | Frequencies | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Org | UMBC | Level | Sect |
|---|----|----|-------------|---|---|----|----|------------|----------|--------|------|------|-------|------|
| | | | 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 | 11 | 21 | 4.56 | 572/1542 | 4.56 | 4.31 | 4.33 | 4.37 | 4.56 |
| 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 6 | 25 | 4.65 | 441/1542 | 4.65 | 4.31 | 4.29 | 4.31 | 4.65 |
| 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 8 | 22 | 4.50 | 582/1339 | 4.50 | 4.41 | 4.32 | 4.36 | 4.50 |
| 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals | 0 | 5 | 0 | 3 | 3 | 7 | 16 | 4.24 | 864/1498 | 4.24 | 4.26 | 4.26 | 4.32 | 4.24 |
| 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 6 | 25 | 4.62 | 292/1428 | 4.62 | 4.29 | 4.12 | 4.15 | 4.62 |
| 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned | 0 | 3 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 6 | 23 | 4.65 | 270/1407 | 4.65 | 4.25 | 4.15 | 4.20 | 4.65 |
| 7. Was the grading system clearly explained | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 8 | 25 | 4.71 | 278/1521 | 4.71 | 4.32 | 4.20 | 4.23 | 4.71 |
| 8. How many times was class cancelled | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 32 | 4.94 | 413/1541 | 4.94 | 4.57 | 4.70 | 4.71 | 4.94 |
| 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness | 4 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 17 | 10 | 4.24 | 698/1518 | 4.24 | 4.11 | 4.11 | 4.13 | 4.24 |
| Lecture | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 25 | 4.78 | 401/1472 | 4.78 | 4.41 | 4.46 | 4.46 | 4.78 |
| 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 31 | 4.94 | 376/1475 | 4.94 | 4.75 | 4.72 | 4.74 | 4.94 |
| 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5 | 27 | 4.79 | 306/1471 | 4.79 | 4.37 | 4.32 | 4.33 | 4.79 |
| 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 9 | 24 | 4.73 | 412/1470 | 4.73 | 4.44 | 4.33 | 4.35 | 4.73 |
| 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding | 2 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 5 | 3 | 23 | 4.47 | 364/1310 | 4.47 | 4.08 | 4.06 | 4.11 | 4.47 |
| Discussion | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned | 6 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 4 | 22 | 4.68 | 314/1210 | 4.68 | 4.32 | 4.18 | 4.27 | 4.68 |
| 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate | 5 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 6 | 22 | 4.69 | 433/1211 | 4.69 | 4.51 | 4.37 | 4.45 | 4.69 |
| 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 23 | 4.82 | 322/1207 | 4.82 | 4.55 | 4.41 | 4.51 | 4.82 |
| 4. Were special techniques successful | 6 | 1 | 3 | 1 | 4 | 5 | 14 | 3.96 | 505/859 | 3.96 | 4.06 | 4.08 | 4.13 | 3.96 |

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

| | |
|------------------------|--------------------------------|
| Course-Section: | SOCY 358 01 |
| Title: | Cont. Problems Of Aging |
| Instructor: | Doyle,Patrick |

Term - Spring 2012

| | |
|------------------------|-----------|
| Enrollment: | 44 |
| Questionnaires: | 34 |

| Questions | NR | NA | Frequencies | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Org | UMBC | Level | Sect |
|---|----|----|-------------|---|---|---|---|------------|----------|--------|------|------|-------|------|
| | | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Mean | Rank | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean |
| Laboratory | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material | 31 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 5.00 | ****/207 | **** | **** | 4.12 | 4.17 | **** |
| 2. Were you provided with adequate background information | 31 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 5.00 | ****/210 | **** | **** | 4.17 | 4.21 | **** |
| 3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities | 31 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 5.00 | ****/202 | **** | **** | 4.50 | 4.54 | **** |
| 4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance | 31 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 5.00 | ****/202 | **** | **** | 4.32 | 4.44 | **** |
| 5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified | 31 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 5.00 | ****/199 | **** | **** | 4.15 | 4.18 | **** |
| Seminar | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme | 31 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 5.00 | ****/69 | **** | **** | 4.56 | 4.70 | **** |
| 2. Was the instructor available for individual attention | 31 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 5.00 | ****/69 | **** | **** | 4.60 | 4.68 | **** |
| 3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned | 31 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 5.00 | ****/68 | **** | **** | 4.50 | 4.51 | **** |
| 4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned | 31 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 5.00 | ****/73 | **** | **** | 4.54 | 4.55 | **** |
| 5. Were criteria for grading made clear | 31 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 5.00 | ****/67 | **** | **** | 4.17 | 4.46 | **** |
| Field Work | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned | 31 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 5.00 | ****/32 | **** | **** | 4.20 | 3.88 | **** |
| 2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria | 31 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 5.00 | ****/35 | **** | **** | 4.36 | 4.08 | **** |
| 3. Was the instructor available for consultation | 31 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 5.00 | ****/25 | **** | **** | 4.59 | 4.24 | **** |
| 4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations | 31 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 5.00 | ****/23 | **** | **** | 4.41 | 3.84 | **** |
| 5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities | 31 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 5.00 | ****/17 | **** | **** | 4.62 | 4.17 | **** |
| Self Paced | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned | 31 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 5.00 | ****/30 | **** | **** | 4.27 | 3.17 | **** |
| 2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal | 31 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 5.00 | ****/19 | **** | **** | 4.57 | 4.33 | **** |
| 3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful | 31 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 5.00 | ****/29 | **** | **** | 4.29 | 2.17 | **** |

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

| | |
|------------------------|--------------------------------|
| Course-Section: | SOCY 358 01 |
| Title: | Cont. Problems Of Aging |
| Instructor: | Doyle,Patrick |

Term - Spring 2012

| | |
|------------------------|-----------|
| Enrollment: | 44 |
| Questionnaires: | 34 |

| Questions | NR | NA | Frequencies | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Org | UMBC | Level | Sect |
|--|----|----|-------------|---|---|---|---|------------|---------|--------|------|------|-------|------|
| | | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Mean | Rank | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean |
| Self Paced | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful | 31 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 5.00 | ****/18 | **** | **** | 4.25 | 1.00 | **** |
| 5. Were there enough proctors for all the students | 31 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 5.00 | ****/13 | **** | **** | 4.14 | 1.00 | **** |

Frequency Distribution

| Credits Earned | Cum. GPA | Expected Grades | Reasons | Type | Majors | | | | | | |
|----------------|----------|-----------------|---------|------|--------|---------------------|----|---|----|-----------|----|
| 00-27 | 1 | 0.00-0.99 | 1 | A | 13 | Required for Majors | 11 | Graduate | 0 | Major | 11 |
| 28-55 | 0 | 1.00-1.99 | 0 | B | 10 | | | | | | |
| 56-83 | 6 | 2.00-2.99 | 2 | C | 8 | General | 7 | Under-grad | 34 | Non-major | 23 |
| 84-150 | 7 | 3.00-3.49 | 4 | D | 0 | | | | | | |
| Grad. | 0 | 3.50-4.00 | 4 | F | 0 | Electives | 13 | **** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant | | | |
| | | | | P | 0 | | | | | | |
| | | | | I | 0 | Other | 1 | | | | |
| | | | | ? | 3 | | | | | | |

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

| | |
|------------------------|-----------------------------|
| Course-Section: | SOCY 372 01 |
| Title: | Juvenile Delinquency |
| Instructor: | Tuer, Jeffrey E |

Term - Spring 2012

| | |
|------------------------|-----------|
| Enrollment: | 71 |
| Questionnaires: | 37 |

| Questions | NR | NA | Frequencies | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Org | UMBC | Level | Sect |
|---|----|----|-------------|---|---|----|----|------------|-----------|--------|------|------|-------|------|
| | | | 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 | 2 | 3 | 12 | 19 | 4.33 | 869/1542 | 4.33 | 4.31 | 4.33 | 4.37 | 4.33 |
| 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 11 | 20 | 4.39 | 776/1542 | 4.39 | 4.31 | 4.29 | 4.31 | 4.39 |
| 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals | 2 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 12 | 21 | 4.51 | 571/1339 | 4.51 | 4.41 | 4.32 | 4.36 | 4.51 |
| 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 5 | 10 | 18 | 4.23 | 885/1498 | 4.23 | 4.26 | 4.26 | 4.32 | 4.23 |
| 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 10 | 23 | 4.56 | 345/1428 | 4.56 | 4.29 | 4.12 | 4.15 | 4.56 |
| 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned | 1 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 4 | 12 | 15 | 4.06 | 851/1407 | 4.06 | 4.25 | 4.15 | 4.20 | 4.06 |
| 7. Was the grading system clearly explained | 2 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 4 | 27 | 4.63 | 382/1521 | 4.63 | 4.32 | 4.20 | 4.23 | 4.63 |
| 8. How many times was class cancelled | 2 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 28 | 5 | 4.15 | 1394/1541 | 4.15 | 4.57 | 4.70 | 4.71 | 4.15 |
| 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness | 8 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 10 | 16 | 4.38 | 534/1518 | 4.38 | 4.11 | 4.11 | 4.13 | 4.38 |
| Lecture | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 3 | 6 | 26 | 4.56 | 753/1472 | 4.56 | 4.41 | 4.46 | 4.46 | 4.56 |
| 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 8 | 28 | 4.78 | 861/1475 | 4.78 | 4.75 | 4.72 | 4.74 | 4.78 |
| 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 6 | 25 | 4.60 | 538/1471 | 4.60 | 4.37 | 4.32 | 4.33 | 4.60 |
| 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 7 | 27 | 4.69 | 453/1470 | 4.69 | 4.44 | 4.33 | 4.35 | 4.69 |
| 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding | 1 | 3 | 1 | 3 | 5 | 9 | 15 | 4.03 | 744/1310 | 4.03 | 4.08 | 4.06 | 4.11 | 4.03 |
| Discussion | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned | 13 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 4 | 5 | 13 | 4.13 | 726/1210 | 4.13 | 4.32 | 4.18 | 4.27 | 4.13 |
| 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate | 13 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 6 | 15 | 4.42 | 671/1211 | 4.42 | 4.51 | 4.37 | 4.45 | 4.42 |
| 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion | 13 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 4 | 15 | 4.38 | 742/1207 | 4.38 | 4.55 | 4.41 | 4.51 | 4.38 |
| 4. Were special techniques successful | 13 | 11 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 2 | 7 | 4.23 | 371/859 | 4.23 | 4.06 | 4.08 | 4.13 | 4.23 |

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

| | |
|------------------------|-----------------------------|
| Course-Section: | SOCY 372 01 |
| Title: | Juvenile Delinquency |
| Instructor: | Tuer,Jeffrey E |

Term - Spring 2012

| | |
|------------------------|-----------|
| Enrollment: | 71 |
| Questionnaires: | 37 |

| Questions | NR | NA | Frequencies | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Org | UMBC | Level | Sect |
|---|----|----|-------------|---|---|---|---|------------|---------|--------|------|------|-------|------|
| | | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Mean | Rank | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean |
| Self Paced | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned | 36 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 4.00 | ****/30 | **** | **** | 4.27 | 3.17 | **** |
| 2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal | 36 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/19 | **** | **** | 4.57 | 4.33 | **** |

Frequency Distribution

| Credits Earned | Cum. GPA | Expected Grades | Reasons | Type | Majors |
|----------------|----------|-----------------|---------|-----------------------|---|
| 00-27 | 0 | 0.00-0.99 0 | A 18 | Required for Majors 9 | Graduate 0 Major 6 |
| 28-55 | 0 | 1.00-1.99 0 | B 12 | | |
| 56-83 | 3 | 2.00-2.99 2 | C 1 | General 2 | Under-grad 37 Non-major 31 |
| 84-150 | 8 | 3.00-3.49 8 | D 0 | | |
| Grad. | 0 | 3.50-4.00 7 | F 0 | Electives 17 | **** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant |
| | | | P 0 | | |
| | | | I 0 | Other 2 | |
| | | | ? 6 | | |

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

| | |
|------------------------|--------------------------|
| Course-Section: | SOCY 374 01 |
| Title: | Drugs And Alcohol |
| Instructor: | Hosler,Colleen |

Term - Spring 2012

| | |
|------------------------|-----------|
| Enrollment: | 70 |
| Questionnaires: | 44 |

| Questions | NR | NA | Frequencies | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Org | UMBC | Level | Sect |
|---|----|----|-------------|---|---|----|----|------------|-----------|--------|------|------|-------|------|
| | | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Mean | Rank | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean |
| General | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 42 | 4.95 | 85/1542 | 4.48 | 4.31 | 4.33 | 4.37 | 4.95 |
| 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 41 | 4.93 | 101/1542 | 4.51 | 4.31 | 4.29 | 4.31 | 4.93 |
| 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 41 | 4.93 | 110/1339 | 4.66 | 4.41 | 4.32 | 4.36 | 4.93 |
| 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 6 | 36 | 4.77 | 228/1498 | 4.58 | 4.26 | 4.26 | 4.32 | 4.77 |
| 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned | 0 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 3 | 6 | 32 | 4.53 | 363/1428 | 4.34 | 4.29 | 4.12 | 4.15 | 4.53 |
| 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 5 | 35 | 4.70 | 216/1407 | 4.62 | 4.25 | 4.15 | 4.20 | 4.70 |
| 7. Was the grading system clearly explained | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 43 | 4.98 | 30/1521 | 4.57 | 4.32 | 4.20 | 4.23 | 4.98 |
| 8. How many times was class cancelled | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 29 | 15 | 4.34 | 1260/1541 | 4.25 | 4.57 | 4.70 | 4.71 | 4.34 |
| 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness | 9 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 29 | 4.88 | 122/1518 | 4.50 | 4.11 | 4.11 | 4.13 | 4.88 |
| Lecture | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 43 | 4.91 | 209/1472 | 4.66 | 4.41 | 4.46 | 4.46 | 4.91 |
| 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 44 | 5.00 | 1/1475 | 4.88 | 4.75 | 4.72 | 4.74 | 5.00 |
| 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 44 | 5.00 | 1/1471 | 4.75 | 4.37 | 4.32 | 4.33 | 5.00 |
| 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 44 | 5.00 | 1/1470 | 4.75 | 4.44 | 4.33 | 4.35 | 5.00 |
| 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 3 | 40 | 4.86 | 89/1310 | 4.84 | 4.08 | 4.06 | 4.11 | 4.86 |
| Discussion | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned | 12 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 29 | 4.88 | 153/1210 | 4.63 | 4.32 | 4.18 | 4.27 | 4.88 |
| 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate | 12 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 32 | 5.00 | 1/1211 | 4.73 | 4.51 | 4.37 | 4.45 | 5.00 |
| 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion | 12 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 32 | 5.00 | 1/1207 | 4.71 | 4.55 | 4.41 | 4.51 | 5.00 |
| 4. Were special techniques successful | 12 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 3 | 25 | 4.71 | 144/859 | 4.48 | 4.06 | 4.08 | 4.13 | 4.71 |

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

| | |
|------------------------|--------------------------|
| Course-Section: | SOCY 374 01 |
| Title: | Drugs And Alcohol |
| Instructor: | Hosler,Colleen |

Term - Spring 2012

| | |
|------------------------|-----------|
| Enrollment: | 70 |
| Questionnaires: | 44 |

| Questions | NR | NA | Frequencies | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Org | UMBC | Level | Sect |
|---|----|----|-------------|---|---|---|---|------------|----------|--------|------|------|-------|------|
| | | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Mean | Rank | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean |
| Laboratory | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material | 43 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/207 | **** | **** | 4.12 | 4.17 | **** |
| 2. Were you provided with adequate background information | 43 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/210 | **** | **** | 4.17 | 4.21 | **** |
| 3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities | 43 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/202 | **** | **** | 4.50 | 4.54 | **** |
| 4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance | 43 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/202 | **** | **** | 4.32 | 4.44 | **** |
| 5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified | 43 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/199 | **** | **** | 4.15 | 4.18 | **** |
| Seminar | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme | 42 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 5.00 | ****/69 | **** | **** | 4.56 | 4.70 | **** |
| 2. Was the instructor available for individual attention | 42 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 5.00 | ****/69 | **** | **** | 4.60 | 4.68 | **** |
| 3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned | 42 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 5.00 | ****/68 | **** | **** | 4.50 | 4.51 | **** |
| 4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned | 42 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 5.00 | ****/73 | **** | **** | 4.54 | 4.55 | **** |
| 5. Were criteria for grading made clear | 42 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 5.00 | ****/67 | **** | **** | 4.17 | 4.46 | **** |
| Field Work | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned | 43 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/32 | **** | **** | 4.20 | 3.88 | **** |
| 2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria | 43 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/35 | **** | **** | 4.36 | 4.08 | **** |
| 3. Was the instructor available for consultation | 43 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/25 | **** | **** | 4.59 | 4.24 | **** |
| 5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities | 43 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/17 | **** | **** | 4.62 | 4.17 | **** |
| Self Paced | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned | 43 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/30 | **** | **** | 4.27 | 3.17 | **** |
| 2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal | 43 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/19 | **** | **** | 4.57 | 4.33 | **** |
| 3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful | 43 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/29 | **** | **** | 4.29 | 2.17 | **** |
| 4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful | 43 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/18 | **** | **** | 4.25 | 1.00 | **** |

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

| | |
|------------------------|--------------------------|
| Course-Section: | SOCY 374 01 |
| Title: | Drugs And Alcohol |
| Instructor: | Hosler,Colleen |

Term - Spring 2012

| | |
|------------------------|-----------|
| Enrollment: | 70 |
| Questionnaires: | 44 |

| Questions | NR | NA | Frequencies | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Org | UMBC | Level | Sect |
|--|----|----|-------------|---|---|---|---|------------|---------|--------|------|------|-------|------|
| | | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Mean | Rank | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean |
| Self Paced | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 5. Were there enough proctors for all the students | 43 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/13 | **** | **** | 4.14 | 1.00 | **** |

Frequency Distribution

| Credits Earned | Cum. GPA | Expected Grades | Reasons | Type | Majors | | | | | | |
|----------------|----------|-----------------|---------|------|--------|---------------------|----|---|----|-----------|----|
| 00-27 | 1 | 0.00-0.99 | 0 | A | 36 | Required for Majors | 9 | Graduate | 0 | Major | 5 |
| 28-55 | 0 | 1.00-1.99 | 0 | B | 7 | | | | | | |
| 56-83 | 2 | 2.00-2.99 | 7 | C | 0 | General | 12 | Under-grad | 44 | Non-major | 39 |
| 84-150 | 23 | 3.00-3.49 | 13 | D | 0 | | | | | | |
| Grad. | 0 | 3.50-4.00 | 11 | F | 0 | Electives | 18 | **** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant | | | |
| | | | | P | 0 | | | | | | |
| | | | | I | 0 | Other | 4 | | | | |
| | | | | ? | 0 | | | | | | |

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

| | |
|------------------------|--------------------------|
| Course-Section: | SOCY 374 02 |
| Title: | Drugs And Alcohol |
| Instructor: | Hylton, Kevin |

Term - Spring 2012

| | |
|------------------------|-----------|
| Enrollment: | 28 |
| Questionnaires: | 28 |

| Questions | NR | NA | Frequencies | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Org | UMBC | Level | Sect |
|---|----|----|-------------|---|---|---|----|------------|-----------|--------|------|------|-------|------|
| | | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Mean | Rank | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean |
| General | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course | 15 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 7 | 4.00 | 1173/1542 | 4.48 | 4.31 | 4.33 | 4.37 | 4.00 |
| 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals | 16 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 3 | 6 | 4.08 | 1086/1542 | 4.51 | 4.31 | 4.29 | 4.31 | 4.08 |
| 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals | 15 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 8 | 4.38 | 712/1339 | 4.66 | 4.41 | 4.32 | 4.36 | 4.38 |
| 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals | 15 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 8 | 4.38 | 710/1498 | 4.58 | 4.26 | 4.26 | 4.32 | 4.38 |
| 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned | 15 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 5 | 6 | 4.15 | 736/1428 | 4.34 | 4.29 | 4.12 | 4.15 | 4.15 |
| 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned | 15 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 8 | 4.54 | 375/1407 | 4.62 | 4.25 | 4.15 | 4.20 | 4.54 |
| 7. Was the grading system clearly explained | 15 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 6 | 5 | 4.15 | 944/1521 | 4.57 | 4.32 | 4.20 | 4.23 | 4.15 |
| 8. How many times was class cancelled | 15 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 5 | 4.15 | 1394/1541 | 4.25 | 4.57 | 4.70 | 4.71 | 4.15 |
| 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness | 18 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 4.13 | 822/1518 | 4.50 | 4.11 | 4.11 | 4.13 | 4.13 |
| Lecture | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared | 16 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 3 | 7 | 4.42 | 940/1472 | 4.66 | 4.41 | 4.46 | 4.46 | 4.42 |
| 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject | 16 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 10 | 4.75 | 897/1475 | 4.88 | 4.75 | 4.72 | 4.74 | 4.75 |
| 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly | 16 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 7 | 4.50 | 637/1471 | 4.75 | 4.37 | 4.32 | 4.33 | 4.50 |
| 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned | 16 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 7 | 4.50 | 692/1470 | 4.75 | 4.44 | 4.33 | 4.35 | 4.50 |
| 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding | 17 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 9 | 4.82 | 105/1310 | 4.84 | 4.08 | 4.06 | 4.11 | 4.82 |
| Discussion | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned | 15 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 9 | 4.38 | 538/1210 | 4.63 | 4.32 | 4.18 | 4.27 | 4.38 |
| 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate | 15 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 10 | 4.46 | 620/1211 | 4.73 | 4.51 | 4.37 | 4.45 | 4.46 |
| 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion | 16 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 9 | 4.42 | 712/1207 | 4.71 | 4.55 | 4.41 | 4.51 | 4.42 |

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

| | |
|------------------------|--------------------------|
| Course-Section: | SOCY 374 02 |
| Title: | Drugs And Alcohol |
| Instructor: | Hylton, Kevin |

Term - Spring 2012

| | |
|------------------------|-----------|
| Enrollment: | 28 |
| Questionnaires: | 28 |

| Questions | NR | NA | Frequencies | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Org | UMBC | Level | Sect |
|---------------------------------------|----|----|-------------|---|---|---|---|------------|---------|--------|------|------|-------|------|
| | | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Mean | Rank | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean |
| Discussion | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 4. Were special techniques successful | 15 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 3 | 6 | 4.25 | 361/859 | 4.48 | 4.06 | 4.08 | 4.13 | 4.25 |

Frequency Distribution

| Credits Earned | Cum. GPA | Expected Grades | Reasons | Type | Majors |
|----------------|----------|-----------------|---------|-----------------------|---------------|
| 00-27 | 0 | 0.00-0.99 1 | A 9 | Required for Majors 1 | Graduate 0 |
| 28-55 | 0 | 1.00-1.99 0 | B 1 | | |
| 56-83 | 0 | 2.00-2.99 0 | C 0 | General 0 | Under-grad 28 |
| 84-150 | 3 | 3.00-3.49 1 | D 0 | | Non-major 28 |
| Grad. | 0 | 3.50-4.00 3 | F 0 | Electives 7 | |
| | | | P 0 | | |
| | | | I 0 | Other 2 | |
| | | | ? 18 | | |

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

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

| | |
|------------------------|----------------------------|
| Course-Section: | SOCY 380 01 |
| Title: | Political Sociology |
| Instructor: | Seckin,Gul |

Term - Spring 2012

| | |
|------------------------|-----------|
| Enrollment: | 48 |
| Questionnaires: | 38 |

| Questions | NR | NA | Frequencies | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Org | UMBC | Level | Sect |
|---|----|----|-------------|---|----|----|----|------------|-----------|--------|------|------|-------|------|
| | | | 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 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 11 | 20 | 4.33 | 869/1542 | 4.33 | 4.31 | 4.33 | 4.37 | 4.33 |
| 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals | 2 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 4 | 12 | 18 | 4.28 | 904/1542 | 4.28 | 4.31 | 4.29 | 4.31 | 4.28 |
| 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals | 3 | 4 | 0 | 2 | 3 | 5 | 21 | 4.45 | 638/1339 | 4.45 | 4.41 | 4.32 | 4.36 | 4.45 |
| 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals | 2 | 10 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 5 | 18 | 4.58 | 464/1498 | 4.58 | 4.26 | 4.26 | 4.32 | 4.58 |
| 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned | 2 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 8 | 25 | 4.58 | 318/1428 | 4.58 | 4.29 | 4.12 | 4.15 | 4.58 |
| 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned | 3 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 8 | 17 | 4.45 | 480/1407 | 4.45 | 4.25 | 4.15 | 4.20 | 4.45 |
| 7. Was the grading system clearly explained | 5 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 3 | 8 | 20 | 4.39 | 670/1521 | 4.39 | 4.32 | 4.20 | 4.23 | 4.39 |
| 8. How many times was class cancelled | 3 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 10 | 22 | 2 | 3.71 | 1520/1541 | 3.71 | 4.57 | 4.70 | 4.71 | 3.71 |
| 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness | 4 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 17 | 11 | 4.19 | 763/1518 | 4.19 | 4.11 | 4.11 | 4.13 | 4.19 |
| Lecture | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared | 6 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5 | 8 | 18 | 4.34 | 1012/1472 | 4.34 | 4.41 | 4.46 | 4.46 | 4.34 |
| 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 28 | 4.88 | 619/1475 | 4.88 | 4.75 | 4.72 | 4.74 | 4.88 |
| 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly | 5 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 10 | 20 | 4.48 | 666/1471 | 4.48 | 4.37 | 4.32 | 4.33 | 4.48 |
| 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned | 5 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 9 | 20 | 4.45 | 752/1470 | 4.45 | 4.44 | 4.33 | 4.35 | 4.45 |
| 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding | 8 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 3 | 24 | 4.76 | 140/1310 | 4.76 | 4.08 | 4.06 | 4.11 | 4.76 |
| Discussion | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned | 11 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 6 | 19 | 4.56 | 401/1210 | 4.56 | 4.32 | 4.18 | 4.27 | 4.56 |
| 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate | 11 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 22 | 4.78 | 327/1211 | 4.78 | 4.51 | 4.37 | 4.45 | 4.78 |
| 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion | 12 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 22 | 4.81 | 344/1207 | 4.81 | 4.55 | 4.41 | 4.51 | 4.81 |
| 4. Were special techniques successful | 11 | 4 | 0 | 2 | 5 | 6 | 10 | 4.04 | 468/859 | 4.04 | 4.06 | 4.08 | 4.13 | 4.04 |

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

| | |
|------------------------|----------------------------|
| Course-Section: | SOCY 380 01 |
| Title: | Political Sociology |
| Instructor: | Seckin,Gul |

Term - Spring 2012

| | |
|------------------------|-----------|
| Enrollment: | 48 |
| Questionnaires: | 38 |

| Questions | NR | NA | Frequencies | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Org | UMBC | Level | Sect |
|---|----|----|-------------|---|---|---|---|------------|----------|--------|------|------|-------|------|
| | | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Mean | Rank | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean |
| Laboratory | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material | 37 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/207 | **** | **** | 4.12 | 4.17 | **** |
| 2. Were you provided with adequate background information | 37 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2.00 | ****/210 | **** | **** | 4.17 | 4.21 | **** |
| 4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance | 37 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2.00 | ****/202 | **** | **** | 4.32 | 4.44 | **** |
| 5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified | 37 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 3.00 | ****/199 | **** | **** | 4.15 | 4.18 | **** |
| Seminar | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme | 37 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2.00 | ****/69 | **** | **** | 4.56 | 4.70 | **** |
| 2. Was the instructor available for individual attention | 37 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2.00 | ****/69 | **** | **** | 4.60 | 4.68 | **** |
| 3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned | 37 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2.00 | ****/68 | **** | **** | 4.50 | 4.51 | **** |
| 5. Were criteria for grading made clear | 37 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1.00 | ****/67 | **** | **** | 4.17 | 4.46 | **** |
| Field Work | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned | 37 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/32 | **** | **** | 4.20 | 3.88 | **** |
| 2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria | 37 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 3.00 | ****/35 | **** | **** | 4.36 | 4.08 | **** |
| 3. Was the instructor available for consultation | 37 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 4.00 | ****/25 | **** | **** | 4.59 | 4.24 | **** |
| 4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations | 37 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 3.00 | ****/23 | **** | **** | 4.41 | 3.84 | **** |
| 5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities | 37 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2.00 | ****/17 | **** | **** | 4.62 | 4.17 | **** |
| Self Paced | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned | 37 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2.00 | ****/30 | **** | **** | 4.27 | 3.17 | **** |
| 2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal | 37 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1.00 | ****/19 | **** | **** | 4.57 | 4.33 | **** |
| 4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful | 37 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1.00 | ****/18 | **** | **** | 4.25 | 1.00 | **** |

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

| | |
|------------------------|----------------------------|
| Course-Section: | SOCY 380 01 |
| Title: | Political Sociology |
| Instructor: | Seckin,Gul |

Term - Spring 2012

| | |
|------------------------|-----------|
| Enrollment: | 48 |
| Questionnaires: | 38 |

| Questions | NR | NA | Frequencies | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Org | UMBC | Level | Sect |
|--|----|----|-------------|---|---|---|---|------------|---------|--------|------|------|-------|------|
| | | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Mean | Rank | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean |
| Self Paced | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 5. Were there enough proctors for all the students | 37 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1.00 | ****/13 | **** | **** | 4.14 | 1.00 | **** |

Frequency Distribution

| Credits Earned | Cum. GPA | Expected Grades | Reasons | Type | Majors |
|----------------|----------|-----------------|---------|------------------------|---|
| 00-27 | 2 | 0.00-0.99 0 | A 28 | Required for Majors 13 | Graduate 0 |
| 28-55 | 0 | 1.00-1.99 0 | B 3 | | |
| 56-83 | 6 | 2.00-2.99 4 | C 1 | General 6 | Under-grad 38 |
| 84-150 | 9 | 3.00-3.49 5 | D 0 | | |
| Grad. | 0 | 3.50-4.00 11 | F 0 | Electives 11 | **** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant |
| | | | P 0 | | |
| | | | I 0 | Other 0 | |
| | | | ? 5 | | |

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

| | |
|------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| Course-Section: | SOCY 396 01 |
| Title: | Comm Serv & Learn Intern |
| Instructor: | Wolff,Michele K |

Term - Spring 2012

| | |
|------------------------|-----------|
| Enrollment: | 19 |
| Questionnaires: | 13 |

| Questions | NR | NA | Frequencies | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Org | UMBC | Level | Sect |
|---|----|----|-------------|---|---|---|----|------------|----------|--------|------|------|-------|------|
| | | | 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 | 1 | 10 | 4.62 | 499/1542 | 4.62 | 4.31 | 4.33 | 4.37 | 4.62 |
| 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 11 | 4.69 | 378/1542 | 4.69 | 4.31 | 4.29 | 4.31 | 4.69 |
| 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals | 0 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 5 | 4.71 | 361/1339 | 4.71 | 4.41 | 4.32 | 4.36 | 4.71 |
| 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 9 | 4.82 | 187/1498 | 4.82 | 4.26 | 4.26 | 4.32 | 4.82 |
| 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 10 | 4.62 | 292/1428 | 4.62 | 4.29 | 4.12 | 4.15 | 4.62 |
| 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 9 | 4.75 | 178/1407 | 4.75 | 4.25 | 4.15 | 4.20 | 4.75 |
| 7. Was the grading system clearly explained | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 10 | 4.91 | 99/1521 | 4.91 | 4.32 | 4.20 | 4.23 | 4.91 |
| 8. How many times was class cancelled | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 9 | 4.69 | 967/1541 | 4.69 | 4.57 | 4.70 | 4.71 | 4.69 |
| 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 6 | 4.56 | 334/1518 | 4.56 | 4.11 | 4.11 | 4.13 | 4.56 |
| Lecture | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 10 | 4.83 | 319/1472 | 4.83 | 4.41 | 4.46 | 4.46 | 4.83 |
| 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 11 | 4.92 | 484/1475 | 4.92 | 4.75 | 4.72 | 4.74 | 4.92 |
| 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 10 | 4.75 | 346/1471 | 4.75 | 4.37 | 4.32 | 4.33 | 4.75 |
| 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 9 | 4.50 | 692/1470 | 4.50 | 4.44 | 4.33 | 4.35 | 4.50 |
| 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding | 2 | 7 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 4.00 | 761/1310 | 4.00 | 4.08 | 4.06 | 4.11 | 4.00 |
| Discussion | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 8 | 5.00 | 1/1210 | 5.00 | 4.32 | 4.18 | 4.27 | 5.00 |
| 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 8 | 5.00 | 1/1211 | 5.00 | 4.51 | 4.37 | 4.45 | 5.00 |
| 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 8 | 5.00 | 1/1207 | 5.00 | 4.55 | 4.41 | 4.51 | 5.00 |

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

| | |
|------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| Course-Section: | SOCY 396 01 |
| Title: | Comm Serv & Learn Intern |
| Instructor: | Wolff,Michele K |

Term - Spring 2012

| | |
|------------------------|-----------|
| Enrollment: | 19 |
| Questionnaires: | 13 |

| Questions | NR | NA | Frequencies | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Org | UMBC | Level | Sect |
|---------------------------------------|----|----|-------------|---|---|---|---|------------|--------|--------|------|------|-------|------|
| | | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Mean | Rank | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean |
| Discussion | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 4. Were special techniques successful | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 7 | 4.88 | 84/859 | 4.88 | 4.06 | 4.08 | 4.13 | 4.88 |

Frequency Distribution

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

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

| | |
|------------------------|--------------------------------|
| Course-Section: | SOCY 397 01 |
| Title: | Selected Topics In Socy |
| Instructor: | Cousin-Gossett, |

Term - Spring 2012

| | |
|------------------------|-----------|
| Enrollment: | 44 |
| Questionnaires: | 31 |

| Questions | NR | NA | Frequencies | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Org | UMBC | Level | Sect |
|---|----|----|-------------|---|---|----|----|------------|-----------|--------|------|------|-------|------|
| | | | 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 | 4 | 4 | 21 | 4.59 | 536/1542 | 4.43 | 4.31 | 4.33 | 4.37 | 4.59 |
| 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 6 | 21 | 4.71 | 352/1542 | 4.48 | 4.31 | 4.29 | 4.31 | 4.71 |
| 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 24 | 4.79 | 265/1339 | 4.53 | 4.41 | 4.32 | 4.36 | 4.79 |
| 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals | 2 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 4 | 23 | 4.69 | 333/1498 | 4.40 | 4.26 | 4.26 | 4.32 | 4.69 |
| 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned | 3 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 3 | 22 | 4.61 | 301/1428 | 4.44 | 4.29 | 4.12 | 4.15 | 4.61 |
| 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 4 | 22 | 4.66 | 261/1407 | 4.45 | 4.25 | 4.15 | 4.20 | 4.66 |
| 7. Was the grading system clearly explained | 3 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 23 | 4.71 | 268/1521 | 4.55 | 4.32 | 4.20 | 4.23 | 4.71 |
| 8. How many times was class cancelled | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 11 | 16 | 4.59 | 1054/1541 | 4.30 | 4.57 | 4.70 | 4.71 | 4.59 |
| 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 11 | 12 | 4.40 | 494/1518 | 4.22 | 4.11 | 4.11 | 4.13 | 4.40 |
| Lecture | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared | 3 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 25 | 4.79 | 401/1472 | 4.62 | 4.41 | 4.46 | 4.46 | 4.79 |
| 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject | 3 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 25 | 4.79 | 843/1475 | 4.68 | 4.75 | 4.72 | 4.74 | 4.79 |
| 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly | 3 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 24 | 4.75 | 346/1471 | 4.54 | 4.37 | 4.32 | 4.33 | 4.75 |
| 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned | 3 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 25 | 4.79 | 336/1470 | 4.57 | 4.44 | 4.33 | 4.35 | 4.79 |
| 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding | 3 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 3 | 2 | 22 | 4.57 | 270/1310 | 4.26 | 4.08 | 4.06 | 4.11 | 4.57 |
| Discussion | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned | 5 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 21 | 4.69 | 298/1210 | 4.46 | 4.32 | 4.18 | 4.27 | 4.69 |
| 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate | 5 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 3 | 21 | 4.62 | 497/1211 | 4.57 | 4.51 | 4.37 | 4.45 | 4.62 |
| 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion | 5 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 21 | 4.65 | 508/1207 | 4.40 | 4.55 | 4.41 | 4.51 | 4.65 |
| 4. Were special techniques successful | 6 | 8 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 4 | 10 | 4.29 | 339/859 | 4.21 | 4.06 | 4.08 | 4.13 | 4.29 |

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

| | |
|------------------------|--------------------------------|
| Course-Section: | SOCY 397 01 |
| Title: | Selected Topics In Socy |
| Instructor: | Cousin-Gossett, |

Term - Spring 2012

| | |
|------------------------|-----------|
| Enrollment: | 44 |
| Questionnaires: | 31 |

| Questions | NR | NA | Frequencies | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Org | UMBC | Level | Sect |
|---|----|----|-------------|---|---|---|---|------------|----------|--------|------|------|-------|------|
| | | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Mean | Rank | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean |
| Laboratory | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material | 30 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/207 | **** | **** | 4.12 | 4.17 | **** |
| 2. Were you provided with adequate background information | 30 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/210 | **** | **** | 4.17 | 4.21 | **** |
| 3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities | 30 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/202 | **** | **** | 4.50 | 4.54 | **** |
| 4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance | 30 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/202 | **** | **** | 4.32 | 4.44 | **** |
| 5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified | 30 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/199 | **** | **** | 4.15 | 4.18 | **** |
| Seminar | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme | 30 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/69 | **** | **** | 4.56 | 4.70 | **** |
| 2. Was the instructor available for individual attention | 30 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/69 | **** | **** | 4.60 | 4.68 | **** |
| 3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned | 30 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/68 | **** | **** | 4.50 | 4.51 | **** |
| 4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned | 30 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/73 | **** | **** | 4.54 | 4.55 | **** |
| 5. Were criteria for grading made clear | 30 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/67 | **** | **** | 4.17 | 4.46 | **** |
| Field Work | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned | 30 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1.00 | ****/32 | **** | **** | 4.20 | 3.88 | **** |
| 2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria | 30 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/35 | **** | **** | 4.36 | 4.08 | **** |
| 3. Was the instructor available for consultation | 30 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/25 | **** | **** | 4.59 | 4.24 | **** |
| 4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations | 30 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/23 | **** | **** | 4.41 | 3.84 | **** |
| 5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities | 30 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/17 | **** | **** | 4.62 | 4.17 | **** |
| Self Paced | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned | 30 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/30 | **** | **** | 4.27 | 3.17 | **** |
| 2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal | 30 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/19 | **** | **** | 4.57 | 4.33 | **** |
| 3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful | 30 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/29 | **** | **** | 4.29 | 2.17 | **** |

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

| | |
|------------------------|--------------------------------|
| Course-Section: | SOCY 397 01 |
| Title: | Selected Topics In Socy |
| Instructor: | Cousin-Gossett, |

Term - Spring 2012

| | |
|------------------------|-----------|
| Enrollment: | 44 |
| Questionnaires: | 31 |

| Questions | NR | NA | Frequencies | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Org | UMBC | Level | Sect |
|--|----|----|-------------|---|---|---|---|------------|---------|--------|------|------|-------|------|
| | | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Mean | Rank | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean |
| Self Paced | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful | 30 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/18 | **** | **** | 4.25 | 1.00 | **** |
| 5. Were there enough proctors for all the students | 30 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/13 | **** | **** | 4.14 | 1.00 | **** |

Frequency Distribution

| Credits Earned | Cum. GPA | Expected Grades | Reasons | Type | Majors | | | | | | |
|----------------|----------|-----------------|---------|------|--------|---------------------|----|---|----|-----------|----|
| 00-27 | 3 | 0.00-0.99 | 1 | A | 11 | Required for Majors | 7 | Graduate | 0 | Major | 4 |
| 28-55 | 1 | 1.00-1.99 | 0 | B | 12 | | | | | | |
| 56-83 | 5 | 2.00-2.99 | 3 | C | 1 | General | 6 | Under-grad | 31 | Non-major | 27 |
| 84-150 | 7 | 3.00-3.49 | 5 | D | 0 | | | | | | |
| Grad. | 0 | 3.50-4.00 | 6 | F | 0 | Electives | 10 | **** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant | | | |
| | | | | P | 0 | | | | | | |
| | | | | I | 0 | Other | 0 | | | | |
| | | | | ? | 7 | | | | | | |

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

| | |
|------------------------|--------------------------------|
| Course-Section: | SOCY 397 02 |
| Title: | Selected Topics In Socy |
| Instructor: | Tuer,Jeffrey E |

Term - Spring 2012

| | |
|------------------------|-----------|
| Enrollment: | 46 |
| Questionnaires: | 37 |

| Questions | NR | NA | Frequencies | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Org | UMBC | Level | Sect |
|---|----|----|-------------|---|---|----|----|------------|-----------|--------|------|------|-------|------|
| | | | 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 | 5 | 10 | 20 | 4.27 | 940/1542 | 4.43 | 4.31 | 4.33 | 4.37 | 4.27 |
| 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 4 | 16 | 16 | 4.24 | 942/1542 | 4.48 | 4.31 | 4.29 | 4.31 | 4.24 |
| 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 4 | 7 | 22 | 4.27 | 809/1339 | 4.53 | 4.41 | 4.32 | 4.36 | 4.27 |
| 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals | 0 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 4 | 9 | 19 | 4.11 | 1007/1498 | 4.40 | 4.26 | 4.26 | 4.32 | 4.11 |
| 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 6 | 9 | 20 | 4.27 | 608/1428 | 4.44 | 4.29 | 4.12 | 4.15 | 4.27 |
| 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 8 | 9 | 19 | 4.24 | 695/1407 | 4.45 | 4.25 | 4.15 | 4.20 | 4.24 |
| 7. Was the grading system clearly explained | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 7 | 24 | 4.38 | 696/1521 | 4.55 | 4.32 | 4.20 | 4.23 | 4.38 |
| 8. How many times was class cancelled | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 26 | 6 | 4.00 | 1455/1541 | 4.30 | 4.57 | 4.70 | 4.71 | 4.00 |
| 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness | 7 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 6 | 13 | 10 | 4.03 | 896/1518 | 4.22 | 4.11 | 4.11 | 4.13 | 4.03 |
| Lecture | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 9 | 23 | 4.44 | 899/1472 | 4.62 | 4.41 | 4.46 | 4.46 | 4.44 |
| 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject | 2 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 27 | 4.57 | 1142/1475 | 4.68 | 4.75 | 4.72 | 4.74 | 4.57 |
| 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 4 | 9 | 21 | 4.33 | 870/1471 | 4.54 | 4.37 | 4.32 | 4.33 | 4.33 |
| 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 5 | 6 | 23 | 4.36 | 855/1470 | 4.57 | 4.44 | 4.33 | 4.35 | 4.36 |
| 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding | 1 | 3 | 3 | 0 | 5 | 13 | 12 | 3.94 | 832/1310 | 4.26 | 4.08 | 4.06 | 4.11 | 3.94 |
| Discussion | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned | 10 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 5 | 7 | 14 | 4.22 | 654/1210 | 4.46 | 4.32 | 4.18 | 4.27 | 4.22 |
| 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate | 10 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 4 | 20 | 4.52 | 572/1211 | 4.57 | 4.51 | 4.37 | 4.45 | 4.52 |
| 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion | 10 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 7 | 14 | 4.15 | 871/1207 | 4.40 | 4.55 | 4.41 | 4.51 | 4.15 |
| 4. Were special techniques successful | 10 | 10 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 5 | 9 | 4.12 | 446/859 | 4.21 | 4.06 | 4.08 | 4.13 | 4.12 |

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

| | |
|------------------------|--------------------------------|
| Course-Section: | SOCY 397 02 |
| Title: | Selected Topics In Socy |
| Instructor: | Tuer,Jeffrey E |

Term - Spring 2012

| | |
|------------------------|-----------|
| Enrollment: | 46 |
| Questionnaires: | 37 |

| Questions | Frequencies | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Org | UMBC | Level | Sect | | |
|---|-------------|----|---|---|---|------------|---|--------|---------|------|-------|------|------|------|
| | NR | NA | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Mean | Rank | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean | |
| Seminar | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 5. Were criteria for grading made clear | 36 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 3.00 | ****/67 | **** | **** | 4.17 | 4.46 | **** |
| Field Work | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations | 36 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 3.00 | ****/23 | **** | **** | 4.41 | 3.84 | **** |
| 5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities | 36 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 3.00 | ****/17 | **** | **** | 4.62 | 4.17 | **** |
| Self Paced | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned | 36 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 4.00 | ****/30 | **** | **** | 4.27 | 3.17 | **** |
| 2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal | 36 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 4.00 | ****/19 | **** | **** | 4.57 | 4.33 | **** |
| 3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful | 36 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 3.00 | ****/29 | **** | **** | 4.29 | 2.17 | **** |
| 4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful | 36 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 3.00 | ****/18 | **** | **** | 4.25 | 1.00 | **** |
| 5. Were there enough proctors for all the students | 36 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 3.00 | ****/13 | **** | **** | 4.14 | 1.00 | **** |

Frequency Distribution

| Credits Earned | Cum. GPA | Expected Grades | Reasons | Type | Majors |
|----------------|----------|-----------------|---------|-----------------------|---|
| 00-27 | 2 | 0.00-0.99 0 | A 26 | Required for Majors 9 | Graduate 0 Major 7 |
| 28-55 | 2 | 1.00-1.99 0 | B 8 | | |
| 56-83 | 7 | 2.00-2.99 4 | C 2 | General 9 | Under-grad 37 Non-major 30 |
| 84-150 | 13 | 3.00-3.49 14 | D 0 | | |
| Grad. | 0 | 3.50-4.00 8 | F 0 | Electives 16 | **** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant |
| | | | P 0 | | |
| | | | I 0 | Other 1 | |
| | | | ? 1 | | |

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

| | |
|------------------------|----------------------------|
| Course-Section: | SOCY 409 01 |
| Title: | Sociological Theory |
| Instructor: | Mair,Christine |

Term - Spring 2012

| | |
|------------------------|-----------|
| Enrollment: | 45 |
| Questionnaires: | 27 |

| Questions | NR | NA | Frequencies | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Org | UMBC | Level | Sect |
|---|----|----|-------------|---|---|----|----|------------|----------|--------|------|------|-------|------|
| | | | 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 | 5 | 20 | 4.67 | 435/1542 | 4.67 | 4.31 | 4.33 | 4.42 | 4.67 |
| 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 4 | 20 | 4.63 | 466/1542 | 4.63 | 4.31 | 4.29 | 4.33 | 4.63 |
| 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 23 | 4.81 | 244/1339 | 4.81 | 4.41 | 4.32 | 4.44 | 4.81 |
| 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 9 | 16 | 4.52 | 536/1498 | 4.52 | 4.26 | 4.26 | 4.35 | 4.52 |
| 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 5 | 18 | 4.58 | 327/1428 | 4.58 | 4.29 | 4.12 | 4.22 | 4.58 |
| 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 6 | 17 | 4.54 | 375/1407 | 4.54 | 4.25 | 4.15 | 4.30 | 4.54 |
| 7. Was the grading system clearly explained | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 5 | 19 | 4.65 | 343/1521 | 4.65 | 4.32 | 4.20 | 4.24 | 4.65 |
| 8. How many times was class cancelled | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 25 | 4.96 | 276/1541 | 4.96 | 4.57 | 4.70 | 4.72 | 4.96 |
| 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 12 | 11 | 4.42 | 481/1518 | 4.42 | 4.11 | 4.11 | 4.18 | 4.42 |
| Lecture | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 24 | 4.92 | 167/1472 | 4.92 | 4.41 | 4.46 | 4.50 | 4.92 |
| 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 24 | 4.92 | 430/1475 | 4.92 | 4.75 | 4.72 | 4.74 | 4.92 |
| 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 23 | 4.85 | 233/1471 | 4.85 | 4.37 | 4.32 | 4.36 | 4.85 |
| 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 22 | 4.85 | 257/1470 | 4.85 | 4.44 | 4.33 | 4.38 | 4.85 |
| 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding | 2 | 3 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 5 | 12 | 4.18 | 642/1310 | 4.18 | 4.08 | 4.06 | 4.09 | 4.18 |
| Discussion | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned | 7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 17 | 4.85 | 170/1210 | 4.85 | 4.32 | 4.18 | 4.34 | 4.85 |
| 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate | 7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 17 | 4.80 | 290/1211 | 4.80 | 4.51 | 4.37 | 4.47 | 4.80 |
| 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion | 7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 15 | 4.75 | 402/1207 | 4.75 | 4.55 | 4.41 | 4.53 | 4.75 |
| 4. Were special techniques successful | 7 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 6 | 9 | 4.28 | 350/859 | 4.28 | 4.06 | 4.08 | 4.19 | 4.28 |

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

| | |
|------------------------|----------------------------|
| Course-Section: | SOCY 409 01 |
| Title: | Sociological Theory |
| Instructor: | Mair,Christine |

Term - Spring 2012

| | |
|------------------------|-----------|
| Enrollment: | 45 |
| Questionnaires: | 27 |

| Questions | NR | NA | Frequencies | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Org | UMBC | Level | Sect |
|---|----|----|-------------|---|---|---|---|------------|---------|--------|------|------|-------|------|
| | | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Mean | Rank | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean |
| Seminar | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme | 26 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/69 | **** | **** | 4.56 | 4.62 | **** |
| 4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned | 26 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/73 | **** | **** | 4.54 | 4.72 | **** |

Frequency Distribution

| Credits Earned | Cum. GPA | Expected Grades | Reasons | Type | Majors |
|----------------|----------|-----------------|---------|------------------------|---|
| 00-27 | 0 | 0.00-0.99 0 | A 8 | Required for Majors 24 | Graduate 1 Major 20 |
| 28-55 | 0 | 1.00-1.99 0 | B 14 | | |
| 56-83 | 1 | 2.00-2.99 6 | C 3 | General 1 | Under-grad 26 Non-major 7 |
| 84-150 | 9 | 3.00-3.49 5 | D 0 | | |
| Grad. | 1 | 3.50-4.00 5 | F 0 | Electives 0 | **** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant |
| | | | P 0 | | |
| | | | I 0 | Other 0 | |
| | | | ? 2 | | |

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

| | |
|------------------------|--------------------------------|
| Course-Section: | SOCY 419 01 |
| Title: | Qual Meth Social Resrch |
| Instructor: | Eckert,J K |

Term - Spring 2012

| | |
|------------------------|-----------|
| Enrollment: | 17 |
| Questionnaires: | 14 |

| Questions | NR | NA | Frequencies | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Org | UMBC | Level | Sect |
|---|----|----|-------------|---|---|---|----|------------|-----------|--------|------|------|-------|------|
| | | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Mean | Rank | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean |
| General | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 1 | 9 | 4.36 | 844/1542 | 4.36 | 4.31 | 4.33 | 4.42 | 4.36 |
| 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 11 | 4.57 | 528/1542 | 4.57 | 4.31 | 4.29 | 4.33 | 4.57 |
| 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals | 0 | 9 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 5.00 | 1/1339 | 5.00 | 4.41 | 4.32 | 4.44 | 5.00 |
| 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 10 | 4.38 | 710/1498 | 4.38 | 4.26 | 4.26 | 4.35 | 4.38 |
| 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 9 | 4.29 | 598/1428 | 4.29 | 4.29 | 4.12 | 4.22 | 4.29 |
| 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 10 | 4.57 | 335/1407 | 4.57 | 4.25 | 4.15 | 4.30 | 4.57 |
| 7. Was the grading system clearly explained | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 4 | 7 | 4.14 | 955/1521 | 4.14 | 4.32 | 4.20 | 4.24 | 4.14 |
| 8. How many times was class cancelled | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 12 | 4.92 | 551/1541 | 4.92 | 4.57 | 4.70 | 4.72 | 4.92 |
| 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness | 3 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 6 | 4.27 | 663/1518 | 4.27 | 4.11 | 4.11 | 4.18 | 4.27 |
| Lecture | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 3 | 1 | 9 | 4.21 | 1113/1472 | 4.21 | 4.41 | 4.46 | 4.50 | 4.21 |
| 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 13 | 4.93 | 430/1475 | 4.93 | 4.75 | 4.72 | 4.74 | 4.93 |
| 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 3 | 9 | 4.50 | 637/1471 | 4.50 | 4.37 | 4.32 | 4.36 | 4.50 |
| 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 9 | 4.36 | 865/1470 | 4.36 | 4.44 | 4.33 | 4.38 | 4.36 |
| 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding | 0 | 6 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 2 | 3.50 | 1064/1310 | 3.50 | 4.08 | 4.06 | 4.09 | 3.50 |
| Discussion | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 9 | 4.43 | 504/1210 | 4.43 | 4.32 | 4.18 | 4.34 | 4.43 |
| 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 13 | 4.86 | 242/1211 | 4.86 | 4.51 | 4.37 | 4.47 | 4.86 |
| 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 12 | 4.71 | 449/1207 | 4.71 | 4.55 | 4.41 | 4.53 | 4.71 |
| 4. Were special techniques successful | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 8 | 4.50 | 216/859 | 4.50 | 4.06 | 4.08 | 4.19 | 4.50 |

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

| | |
|------------------------|--------------------------------|
| Course-Section: | SOCY 419 01 |
| Title: | Qual Meth Social Resrch |
| Instructor: | Eckert,J K |

Term - Spring 2012

| | |
|------------------------|-----------|
| Enrollment: | 17 |
| Questionnaires: | 14 |

| Questions | NR | NA | Frequencies | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Org | UMBC | Level | Sect |
|--|----|----|-------------|---|---|---|---|------------|---------|--------|------|------|-------|------|
| | | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Mean | Rank | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean |
| Seminar | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme | 11 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 4.67 | ****/69 | **** | **** | 4.56 | 4.62 | **** |
| 2. Was the instructor available for individual attention | 11 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 5.00 | ****/69 | **** | **** | 4.60 | 4.67 | **** |
| 3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned | 11 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 4.67 | ****/68 | **** | **** | 4.50 | 4.65 | **** |
| 4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned | 11 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 4.33 | ****/73 | **** | **** | 4.54 | 4.72 | **** |
| 5. Were criteria for grading made clear | 11 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 3.67 | ****/67 | **** | **** | 4.17 | 4.37 | **** |
| Field Work | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned | 12 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 5.00 | ****/32 | **** | **** | 4.20 | 4.39 | **** |
| 2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria | 12 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 5.00 | ****/35 | **** | **** | 4.36 | 4.25 | **** |
| 3. Was the instructor available for consultation | 12 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 5.00 | ****/25 | **** | **** | 4.59 | 4.56 | **** |
| 4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations | 12 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 5.00 | ****/23 | **** | **** | 4.41 | 4.33 | **** |
| 5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities | 12 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 5.00 | ****/17 | **** | **** | 4.62 | 4.70 | **** |

Frequency Distribution

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

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

| | |
|------------------------|----------------------------|
| Course-Section: | SOCY 420 01 |
| Title: | Social Epidemiology |
| Instructor: | Damasiewicz,Mer |

Term - Spring 2012

| | |
|------------------------|-----------|
| Enrollment: | 30 |
| Questionnaires: | 11 |

| Questions | NR | NA | Frequencies | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Org | UMBC | Level | Sect |
|---|----|----|-------------|---|---|---|---|------------|-----------|--------|------|------|-------|------|
| | | | 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 | 4 | 6 | 4.45 | 706/1542 | 4.45 | 4.31 | 4.33 | 4.42 | 4.45 |
| 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 2 | 6 | 4.27 | 904/1542 | 4.27 | 4.31 | 4.29 | 4.33 | 4.27 |
| 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 4 | 4 | 4.09 | 946/1339 | 4.09 | 4.41 | 4.32 | 4.44 | 4.09 |
| 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 1 | 5 | 4.22 | 885/1498 | 4.22 | 4.26 | 4.26 | 4.35 | 4.22 |
| 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 9 | 4.73 | 204/1428 | 4.73 | 4.29 | 4.12 | 4.22 | 4.73 |
| 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5 | 5 | 4.36 | 569/1407 | 4.36 | 4.25 | 4.15 | 4.30 | 4.36 |
| 7. Was the grading system clearly explained | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 4 | 1 | 4 | 3.55 | 1313/1521 | 3.55 | 4.32 | 4.20 | 4.24 | 3.55 |
| 8. How many times was class cancelled | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 8 | 4.80 | 853/1541 | 4.80 | 4.57 | 4.70 | 4.72 | 4.80 |
| 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 4 | 2 | 3.80 | 1129/1518 | 3.80 | 4.11 | 4.11 | 4.18 | 3.80 |
| Lecture | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5 | 5 | 4.36 | 993/1472 | 4.36 | 4.41 | 4.46 | 4.50 | 4.36 |
| 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 7 | 4.45 | 1234/1475 | 4.45 | 4.75 | 4.72 | 4.74 | 4.45 |
| 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 5 | 4.10 | 1062/1471 | 4.10 | 4.37 | 4.32 | 4.36 | 4.10 |
| 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 8 | 4.64 | 543/1470 | 4.64 | 4.44 | 4.33 | 4.38 | 4.64 |
| 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding | 1 | 6 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 3.50 | 1064/1310 | 3.50 | 4.08 | 4.06 | 4.09 | 3.50 |
| Discussion | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned | 2 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 1 | 4 | 3.89 | 862/1210 | 3.89 | 4.32 | 4.18 | 4.34 | 3.89 |
| 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 5 | 4.11 | 880/1211 | 4.11 | 4.51 | 4.37 | 4.47 | 4.11 |
| 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 1 | 5 | 4.22 | 830/1207 | 4.22 | 4.55 | 4.41 | 4.53 | 4.22 |
| 4. Were special techniques successful | 2 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 4.33 | 315/859 | 4.33 | 4.06 | 4.08 | 4.19 | 4.33 |

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

| | |
|------------------------|----------------------------|
| Course-Section: | SOCY 420 01 |
| Title: | Social Epidemiology |
| Instructor: | Damasiewicz,Mer |

Term - Spring 2012

| | |
|------------------------|-----------|
| Enrollment: | 30 |
| Questionnaires: | 11 |

| Questions | NR | NA | Frequencies | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Org | UMBC | Level | Sect |
|---|----|----|-------------|---|---|---|---|------------|----------|--------|------|------|-------|------|
| | | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Mean | Rank | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean |
| Laboratory | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material | 10 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 3.00 | ****/207 | **** | **** | 4.12 | 4.41 | **** |
| 2. Were you provided with adequate background information | 10 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 3.00 | ****/210 | **** | **** | 4.17 | 4.02 | **** |
| 3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities | 10 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 3.00 | ****/202 | **** | **** | 4.50 | 4.42 | **** |
| 4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance | 10 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 3.00 | ****/202 | **** | **** | 4.32 | 4.23 | **** |
| 5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified | 10 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 3.00 | ****/199 | **** | **** | 4.15 | 3.77 | **** |
| Seminar | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme | 10 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 3.00 | ****/69 | **** | **** | 4.56 | 4.62 | **** |
| 2. Was the instructor available for individual attention | 10 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 3.00 | ****/69 | **** | **** | 4.60 | 4.67 | **** |
| 3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned | 10 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 3.00 | ****/68 | **** | **** | 4.50 | 4.65 | **** |
| 4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned | 10 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 3.00 | ****/73 | **** | **** | 4.54 | 4.72 | **** |
| 5. Were criteria for grading made clear | 10 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2.00 | ****/67 | **** | **** | 4.17 | 4.37 | **** |
| Field Work | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned | 10 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 3.00 | ****/32 | **** | **** | 4.20 | 4.39 | **** |
| 2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria | 10 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 3.00 | ****/35 | **** | **** | 4.36 | 4.25 | **** |
| 3. Was the instructor available for consultation | 10 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 3.00 | ****/25 | **** | **** | 4.59 | 4.56 | **** |
| 4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations | 10 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 3.00 | ****/23 | **** | **** | 4.41 | 4.33 | **** |
| 5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities | 10 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 3.00 | ****/17 | **** | **** | 4.62 | 4.70 | **** |
| Self Paced | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned | 10 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 3.00 | ****/30 | **** | **** | 4.27 | 3.00 | **** |
| 2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal | 10 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 3.00 | ****/19 | **** | **** | 4.57 | 4.00 | **** |
| 3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful | 10 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 3.00 | ****/29 | **** | **** | 4.29 | 4.00 | **** |

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

| | |
|------------------------|----------------------------|
| Course-Section: | SOCY 420 01 |
| Title: | Social Epidemiology |
| Instructor: | Damasiewicz,Mer |

Term - Spring 2012

| | |
|------------------------|-----------|
| Enrollment: | 30 |
| Questionnaires: | 11 |

| Questions | NR | NA | Frequencies | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Org | UMBC | Level | Sect |
|--|----|----|-------------|---|---|---|---|------------|---------|--------|------|------|-------|------|
| | | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Mean | Rank | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean |
| Self Paced | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful | 10 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 3.00 | ****/18 | **** | **** | 4.25 | 2.67 | **** |
| 5. Were there enough proctors for all the students | 10 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 3.00 | ****/13 | **** | **** | 4.14 | 3.33 | **** |

Frequency Distribution

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

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

| | |
|------------------------|--------------------------------|
| Course-Section: | SOCY 497 01 |
| Title: | Selected Topics In Socy |
| Instructor: | Schumacher,John |

Term - Spring 2012

| | |
|------------------------|-----------|
| Enrollment: | 21 |
| Questionnaires: | 13 |

| Questions | NR | NA | Frequencies | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Org | UMBC | Level | Sect |
|---|----|----|-------------|---|---|---|----|------------|----------|--------|------|------|-------|------|
| | | | 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 | 5 | 6 | 4.31 | 908/1542 | 4.31 | 4.31 | 4.33 | 4.42 | 4.31 |
| 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5 | 7 | 4.46 | 670/1542 | 4.46 | 4.31 | 4.29 | 4.33 | 4.46 |
| 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 9 | 4.62 | 465/1339 | 4.62 | 4.41 | 4.32 | 4.44 | 4.62 |
| 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 6 | 5 | 4.23 | 874/1498 | 4.23 | 4.26 | 4.26 | 4.35 | 4.23 |
| 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 7 | 4.58 | 318/1428 | 4.58 | 4.29 | 4.12 | 4.22 | 4.58 |
| 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 5 | 5 | 4.08 | 837/1407 | 4.08 | 4.25 | 4.15 | 4.30 | 4.08 |
| 7. Was the grading system clearly explained | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 8 | 4.50 | 518/1521 | 4.50 | 4.32 | 4.20 | 4.24 | 4.50 |
| 8. How many times was class cancelled | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 12 | 5.00 | 1/1541 | 5.00 | 4.57 | 4.70 | 4.72 | 5.00 |
| 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 2 | 5 | 4.20 | 744/1518 | 4.20 | 4.11 | 4.11 | 4.18 | 4.20 |
| Lecture | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 7 | 4.50 | 817/1472 | 4.50 | 4.41 | 4.46 | 4.50 | 4.50 |
| 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 9 | 4.75 | 897/1475 | 4.75 | 4.75 | 4.72 | 4.74 | 4.75 |
| 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 7 | 4.58 | 557/1471 | 4.58 | 4.37 | 4.32 | 4.36 | 4.58 |
| 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5 | 6 | 4.42 | 800/1470 | 4.42 | 4.44 | 4.33 | 4.38 | 4.42 |
| 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5 | 5 | 4.36 | 465/1310 | 4.36 | 4.08 | 4.06 | 4.09 | 4.36 |
| Discussion | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 7 | 4.50 | 430/1210 | 4.50 | 4.32 | 4.18 | 4.34 | 4.50 |
| 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 7 | 4.60 | 507/1211 | 4.60 | 4.51 | 4.37 | 4.47 | 4.60 |
| 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 7 | 4.60 | 556/1207 | 4.60 | 4.55 | 4.41 | 4.53 | 4.60 |
| 4. Were special techniques successful | 3 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 5 | 4.44 | 250/859 | 4.44 | 4.06 | 4.08 | 4.19 | 4.44 |

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

| | |
|------------------------|--------------------------------|
| Course-Section: | SOCY 497 01 |
| Title: | Selected Topics In Socy |
| Instructor: | Schumacher,John |

Term - Spring 2012

| | |
|------------------------|-----------|
| Enrollment: | 21 |
| Questionnaires: | 13 |

| Questions | NR | NA | Frequencies | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Org | UMBC | Level | Sect |
|--|----|----|-------------|---|---|---|---|------------|---------|--------|------|------|-------|------|
| | | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Mean | Rank | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean |
| Seminar | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme | 10 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 4.00 | ****/69 | **** | **** | 4.56 | 4.62 | **** |
| 2. Was the instructor available for individual attention | 10 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 3.33 | ****/69 | **** | **** | 4.60 | 4.67 | **** |
| 3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned | 10 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 4.33 | ****/68 | **** | **** | 4.50 | 4.65 | **** |
| 4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned | 10 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 4.33 | ****/73 | **** | **** | 4.54 | 4.72 | **** |
| 5. Were criteria for grading made clear | 10 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 4.00 | ****/67 | **** | **** | 4.17 | 4.37 | **** |

Frequency Distribution

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

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

| | |
|------------------------|-----------------------------|
| Course-Section: | SOCY 604 01 |
| Title: | Statistical Analysis |
| Instructor: | Adler, Marina A |

Term - Spring 2012

| | |
|------------------------|----------|
| Enrollment: | 9 |
| Questionnaires: | 9 |

| Questions | NR | NA | Frequencies | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Org | UMBC | Level | Sect |
|---|----|----|-------------|---|---|---|---|------------|-----------|--------|------|------|-------|------|
| | | | 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 | 1 | 0 | 7 | 4.75 | 322/1542 | 4.29 | 4.31 | 4.33 | 4.39 | 4.75 |
| 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 7 | 4.75 | 297/1542 | 4.29 | 4.31 | 4.29 | 4.31 | 4.75 |
| 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 7 | 4.88 | 186/1339 | 4.23 | 4.41 | 4.32 | 4.31 | 4.88 |
| 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 6 | 4.86 | 161/1498 | 4.11 | 4.26 | 4.26 | 4.25 | 4.86 |
| 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 5 | 4.25 | 629/1428 | 3.67 | 4.29 | 4.12 | 4.13 | 4.25 |
| 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 5 | 4.57 | 335/1407 | 3.85 | 4.25 | 4.15 | 4.20 | 4.57 |
| 7. Was the grading system clearly explained | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 7 | 4.75 | 231/1521 | 4.51 | 4.32 | 4.20 | 4.24 | 4.75 |
| 8. How many times was class cancelled | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 8 | 5.00 | 1/1541 | 5.00 | 4.57 | 4.70 | 4.75 | 5.00 |
| 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 5 | 4.57 | 318/1518 | 4.10 | 4.11 | 4.11 | 4.15 | 4.57 |
| Lecture | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 8 | 5.00 | 1/1472 | 4.33 | 4.41 | 4.46 | 4.48 | 5.00 |
| 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 5 | 4.50 | 1197/1475 | 4.58 | 4.75 | 4.72 | 4.76 | 4.50 |
| 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 6 | 4.63 | 513/1471 | 3.77 | 4.37 | 4.32 | 4.36 | 4.63 |
| 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 7 | 4.88 | 217/1470 | 4.10 | 4.44 | 4.33 | 4.34 | 4.88 |
| 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding | 2 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 4.40 | 425/1310 | 3.95 | 4.08 | 4.06 | 3.99 | 4.40 |
| Discussion | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 4.80 | 212/1210 | 4.07 | 4.32 | 4.18 | 4.28 | 4.80 |
| 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 5.00 | 1/1211 | 4.33 | 4.51 | 4.37 | 4.51 | 5.00 |
| 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 5.00 | 1/1207 | 4.40 | 4.55 | 4.41 | 4.53 | 5.00 |

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

| | |
|------------------------|-----------------------------|
| Course-Section: | SOCY 604 01 |
| Title: | Statistical Analysis |
| Instructor: | Adler, Marina A |

Term - Spring 2012

| | |
|------------------------|----------|
| Enrollment: | 9 |
| Questionnaires: | 9 |

| Questions | NR | NA | Frequencies | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Org | UMBC | Level | Sect |
|---------------------------------------|----|----|-------------|---|---|---|---|------------|-------|--------|------|------|-------|------|
| | | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Mean | Rank | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean |
| Discussion | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 4. Were special techniques successful | 4 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 5.00 | 1/859 | 5.00 | 4.06 | 4.08 | 4.08 | 5.00 |

Frequency Distribution

| Credits Earned | Cum. GPA | Expected Grades | Reasons | Type | Majors |
|----------------|----------|-----------------|---------|-----------------------|---|
| 00-27 | 1 | 0.00-0.99 0 | A 3 | Required for Majors 7 | Graduate 4 Major 7 |
| 28-55 | 0 | 1.00-1.99 0 | B 2 | | |
| 56-83 | 0 | 2.00-2.99 0 | C 1 | General 0 | Under-grad 5 Non-major 2 |
| 84-150 | 0 | 3.00-3.49 0 | 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 0 | |
| | | | ? 3 | | |

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

| | |
|------------------------|-----------------------------|
| Course-Section: | SOCY 604 02 |
| Title: | Statistical Analysis |
| Instructor: | Flow-Delwiche,E |

Term - Spring 2012

| | |
|------------------------|-----------|
| Enrollment: | 19 |
| Questionnaires: | 12 |

| Questions | NR | NA | Frequencies | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Org | UMBC | Level | Sect |
|---|----|----|-------------|---|---|---|----|------------|-----------|--------|------|------|-------|------|
| | | | 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 | 1 | 3 | 5 | 3.83 | 1300/1542 | 4.29 | 4.31 | 4.33 | 4.39 | 3.83 |
| 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 4 | 3 | 3.83 | 1257/1542 | 4.29 | 4.31 | 4.29 | 4.31 | 3.83 |
| 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 3.58 | 1190/1339 | 4.23 | 4.41 | 4.32 | 4.31 | 3.58 |
| 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 5 | 1 | 3 | 3.36 | 1390/1498 | 4.11 | 4.26 | 4.26 | 4.25 | 3.36 |
| 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned | 1 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 5 | 1 | 2 | 3.09 | 1351/1428 | 3.67 | 4.29 | 4.12 | 4.13 | 3.09 |
| 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned | 2 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 3.13 | 1332/1407 | 3.85 | 4.25 | 4.15 | 4.20 | 3.13 |
| 7. Was the grading system clearly explained | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 6 | 4.27 | 817/1521 | 4.51 | 4.32 | 4.20 | 4.24 | 4.27 |
| 8. How many times was class cancelled | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 11 | 5.00 | 1/1541 | 5.00 | 4.57 | 4.70 | 4.75 | 5.00 |
| 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 6 | 1 | 3.64 | 1230/1518 | 4.10 | 4.11 | 4.11 | 4.15 | 3.64 |
| Lecture | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 3 | 1 | 5 | 3.67 | 1370/1472 | 4.33 | 4.41 | 4.46 | 4.48 | 3.67 |
| 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 10 | 4.67 | 1039/1475 | 4.58 | 4.75 | 4.72 | 4.76 | 4.67 |
| 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 4 | 3 | 1 | 2.92 | 1429/1471 | 3.77 | 4.37 | 4.32 | 4.36 | 2.92 |
| 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 4 | 3.33 | 1361/1470 | 4.10 | 4.44 | 4.33 | 4.34 | 3.33 |
| 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding | 0 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 4 | 3.50 | 1064/1310 | 3.95 | 4.08 | 4.06 | 3.99 | 3.50 |
| Discussion | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned | 6 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 3 | 3.33 | 1073/1210 | 4.07 | 4.32 | 4.18 | 4.28 | 3.33 |
| 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate | 6 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 3.67 | 1066/1211 | 4.33 | 4.51 | 4.37 | 4.51 | 3.67 |
| 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion | 7 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 3.80 | 1021/1207 | 4.40 | 4.55 | 4.41 | 4.53 | 3.80 |
| 4. Were special techniques successful | 7 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 3.00 | ****/859 | 5.00 | 4.06 | 4.08 | 4.08 | **** |

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

| | |
|------------------------|-----------------------------|
| Course-Section: | SOCY 604 02 |
| Title: | Statistical Analysis |
| Instructor: | Flow-Delwiche,E |

Term - Spring 2012

| | |
|------------------------|-----------|
| Enrollment: | 19 |
| Questionnaires: | 12 |

| Questions | NR | NA | Frequencies | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Org | UMBC | Level | Sect |
|---|----|----|-------------|---|---|---|---|------------|----------|--------|------|------|-------|------|
| | | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Mean | Rank | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean |
| Laboratory | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material | 10 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2.00 | ****/207 | **** | **** | 4.12 | 4.20 | **** |
| 2. Were you provided with adequate background information | 11 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2.00 | ****/210 | **** | **** | 4.17 | 4.12 | **** |
| 3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities | 10 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1.00 | ****/202 | **** | **** | 4.50 | 4.23 | **** |
| 4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance | 11 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1.00 | ****/202 | **** | **** | 4.32 | 4.24 | **** |
| 5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified | 11 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1.00 | ****/199 | **** | **** | 4.15 | 4.30 | **** |

Frequency Distribution

| Credits Earned | Cum. GPA | Expected Grades | Reasons | Type | Majors |
|----------------|----------|-----------------|---------|------------------------|--------------|
| 00-27 | 4 | 0.00-0.99 0 | A 6 | Required for Majors 11 | Graduate 5 |
| 28-55 | 0 | 1.00-1.99 0 | B 3 | | Major 7 |
| 56-83 | 0 | 2.00-2.99 0 | C 2 | General 0 | Under-grad 7 |
| 84-150 | 0 | 3.00-3.49 1 | D 0 | | Non-major 5 |
| Grad. | 5 | 3.50-4.00 5 | F 0 | Electives 0 | |
| | | | P 0 | | |
| | | | I 0 | | |
| | | | ? 1 | | |

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

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

| | |
|------------------------|---------------------------------|
| Course-Section: | SOCY 606 01 |
| Title: | Soc Inequality/Soc Polcy |
| Instructor: | Adler,Marina A |

Term - Spring 2012

| | |
|------------------------|-----------|
| Enrollment: | 23 |
| Questionnaires: | 17 |

| Questions | NR | NA | Frequencies | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Org | UMBC | Level | Sect |
|---|----|----|-------------|---|---|---|----|------------|-----------|--------|------|------|-------|------|
| | | | 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 | 1 | 7 | 6 | 3.94 | 1228/1542 | 3.94 | 4.31 | 4.33 | 4.39 | 3.94 |
| 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 6 | 3 | 6 | 3.76 | 1295/1542 | 3.76 | 4.31 | 4.29 | 4.31 | 3.76 |
| 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals | 0 | 5 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 4 | 5 | 4.00 | 982/1339 | 4.00 | 4.41 | 4.32 | 4.31 | 4.00 |
| 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 3.82 | 1204/1498 | 3.82 | 4.26 | 4.26 | 4.25 | 3.82 |
| 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 5 | 8 | 4.18 | 714/1428 | 4.18 | 4.29 | 4.12 | 4.13 | 4.18 |
| 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 0 | 7 | 6 | 3.82 | 1037/1407 | 3.82 | 4.25 | 4.15 | 4.20 | 3.82 |
| 7. Was the grading system clearly explained | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 5 | 3.71 | 1238/1521 | 3.71 | 4.32 | 4.20 | 4.24 | 3.71 |
| 8. How many times was class cancelled | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 17 | 5.00 | 1/1541 | 5.00 | 4.57 | 4.70 | 4.75 | 5.00 |
| 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness | 4 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 7 | 1 | 3.75 | 1160/1518 | 3.75 | 4.11 | 4.11 | 4.15 | 3.75 |
| Lecture | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5 | 6 | 5 | 3.88 | 1302/1472 | 3.88 | 4.41 | 4.46 | 4.48 | 3.88 |
| 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 14 | 4.82 | 754/1475 | 4.82 | 4.75 | 4.72 | 4.76 | 4.82 |
| 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 8 | 4 | 3.71 | 1267/1471 | 3.71 | 4.37 | 4.32 | 4.36 | 3.71 |
| 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 6 | 5 | 3.94 | 1152/1470 | 3.94 | 4.44 | 4.33 | 4.34 | 3.94 |
| 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding | 0 | 10 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 3.14 | 1200/1310 | 3.14 | 4.08 | 4.06 | 3.99 | 3.14 |
| Discussion | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 7 | 7 | 4.40 | 523/1210 | 4.40 | 4.32 | 4.18 | 4.28 | 4.40 |
| 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 4 | 8 | 4.33 | 739/1211 | 4.33 | 4.51 | 4.37 | 4.51 | 4.33 |
| 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion | 2 | 0 | 2 | 4 | 1 | 3 | 5 | 3.33 | 1142/1207 | 3.33 | 4.55 | 4.41 | 4.53 | 3.33 |
| 4. Were special techniques successful | 2 | 6 | 2 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 4 | 3.56 | 695/859 | 3.56 | 4.06 | 4.08 | 4.08 | 3.56 |

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

| | |
|------------------------|---------------------------------|
| Course-Section: | SOCY 606 01 |
| Title: | Soc Inequality/Soc Polcy |
| Instructor: | Adler,Marina A |

Term - Spring 2012

| | |
|------------------------|-----------|
| Enrollment: | 23 |
| Questionnaires: | 17 |

| Questions | NR | NA | Frequencies | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Org | UMBC | Level | Sect |
|--|----|----|-------------|---|---|---|---|------------|---------|--------|------|------|-------|------|
| | | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Mean | Rank | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean |
| Seminar | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme | 16 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/69 | **** | **** | 4.56 | 4.62 | **** |
| 2. Was the instructor available for individual attention | 16 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/69 | **** | **** | 4.60 | 4.71 | **** |
| 4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned | 16 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/73 | **** | **** | 4.54 | 4.54 | **** |
| 5. Were criteria for grading made clear | 16 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/67 | **** | **** | 4.17 | 4.35 | **** |
| Field Work | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria | 16 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/35 | **** | **** | 4.36 | 4.40 | **** |

Frequency Distribution

| Credits Earned | Cum. GPA | Expected Grades | Reasons | Type | Majors |
|----------------|----------|-----------------|---------|-----------------------|---------------|
| 00-27 | 2 | 0.00-0.99 0 | A 11 | Required for Majors 9 | Graduate 6 |
| 28-55 | 0 | 1.00-1.99 0 | B 2 | | |
| 56-83 | 0 | 2.00-2.99 0 | C 0 | General 2 | Under-grad 11 |
| 84-150 | 0 | 3.00-3.49 2 | D 0 | | |
| Grad. | 6 | 3.50-4.00 4 | F 0 | Electives 2 | |
| | | | P 0 | | |
| | | | I 0 | Other 0 | |
| | | | ? 3 | | |

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

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

| | |
|------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| Course-Section: | SOCY 611 01 |
| Title: | Constr Race Class & Gend |
| Instructor: | Pincus,Fred L |

Term - Spring 2012

| | |
|------------------------|-----------|
| Enrollment: | 21 |
| Questionnaires: | 16 |

| Questions | NR | NA | Frequencies | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Org | UMBC | Level | Sect |
|---|----|----|-------------|---|---|---|----|------------|-----------|--------|------|------|-------|------|
| | | | 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 | 3 | 13 | 4.81 | 250/1542 | 4.81 | 4.31 | 4.33 | 4.39 | 4.81 |
| 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 5 | 10 | 4.50 | 615/1542 | 4.50 | 4.31 | 4.29 | 4.31 | 4.50 |
| 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals | 0 | 10 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 5 | 4.67 | 414/1339 | 4.67 | 4.41 | 4.32 | 4.31 | 4.67 |
| 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 5 | 9 | 4.44 | 646/1498 | 4.44 | 4.26 | 4.26 | 4.25 | 4.44 |
| 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 13 | 4.73 | 196/1428 | 4.73 | 4.29 | 4.12 | 4.13 | 4.73 |
| 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 12 | 4.56 | 345/1407 | 4.56 | 4.25 | 4.15 | 4.20 | 4.56 |
| 7. Was the grading system clearly explained | 1 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 4 | 7 | 3.87 | 1163/1521 | 3.87 | 4.32 | 4.20 | 4.24 | 3.87 |
| 8. How many times was class cancelled | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 10 | 4.67 | 994/1541 | 4.67 | 4.57 | 4.70 | 4.75 | 4.67 |
| 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness | 5 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 5 | 4.50 | 373/1518 | 4.50 | 4.11 | 4.11 | 4.15 | 4.50 |
| Lecture | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5 | 7 | 4.46 | 871/1472 | 4.46 | 4.41 | 4.46 | 4.48 | 4.46 |
| 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 13 | 4.93 | 430/1475 | 4.93 | 4.75 | 4.72 | 4.76 | 4.93 |
| 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly | 3 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 10 | 4.62 | 525/1471 | 4.62 | 4.37 | 4.32 | 4.36 | 4.62 |
| 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 9 | 4.62 | 573/1470 | 4.62 | 4.44 | 4.33 | 4.34 | 4.62 |
| 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding | 4 | 8 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 3 | 4.50 | 324/1310 | 4.50 | 4.08 | 4.06 | 3.99 | 4.50 |
| Discussion | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 14 | 4.88 | 153/1210 | 4.88 | 4.32 | 4.18 | 4.28 | 4.88 |
| 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 15 | 4.94 | 136/1211 | 4.94 | 4.51 | 4.37 | 4.51 | 4.94 |
| 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 15 | 4.81 | 333/1207 | 4.81 | 4.55 | 4.41 | 4.53 | 4.81 |
| 4. Were special techniques successful | 0 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 8 | 4.80 | 97/859 | 4.80 | 4.06 | 4.08 | 4.08 | 4.80 |

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

| | |
|------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| Course-Section: | SOCY 611 01 |
| Title: | Constr Race Class & Gend |
| Instructor: | Pincus,Fred L |

Term - Spring 2012

| | |
|------------------------|-----------|
| Enrollment: | 21 |
| Questionnaires: | 16 |

| Questions | NR | NA | Frequencies | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Org | UMBC | Level | Sect |
|--|----|----|-------------|---|---|---|---|------------|---------|--------|------|------|-------|------|
| | | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Mean | Rank | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean |
| Seminar | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme | 14 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 5.00 | ****/69 | **** | **** | 4.56 | 4.62 | **** |
| 2. Was the instructor available for individual attention | 14 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 5.00 | ****/69 | **** | **** | 4.60 | 4.71 | **** |
| 3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned | 14 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 5.00 | ****/68 | **** | **** | 4.50 | 4.55 | **** |
| 4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned | 14 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 4.50 | ****/73 | **** | **** | 4.54 | 4.54 | **** |
| 5. Were criteria for grading made clear | 14 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 4.50 | ****/67 | **** | **** | 4.17 | 4.35 | **** |

Frequency Distribution

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

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

| | |
|------------------------|-------------------------------|
| Course-Section: | SOCY 618 01 |
| Title: | SAS For Soc Scientists |
| Instructor: | Miller,Jayne M |

Term - Spring 2012

| | |
|------------------------|-----------|
| Enrollment: | 19 |
| Questionnaires: | 15 |

| Questions | NR | NA | Frequencies | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Org | UMBC | Level | Sect |
|---|----|----|-------------|---|---|---|----|------------|-----------|--------|------|------|-------|------|
| | | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Mean | Rank | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean |
| General | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 2 | 9 | 4.33 | 869/1542 | 4.33 | 4.31 | 4.33 | 4.39 | 4.33 |
| 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 3 | 10 | 4.53 | 578/1542 | 4.53 | 4.31 | 4.29 | 4.31 | 4.53 |
| 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 12 | 4.73 | 337/1339 | 4.73 | 4.41 | 4.32 | 4.31 | 4.73 |
| 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 2 | 10 | 4.47 | 604/1498 | 4.47 | 4.26 | 4.26 | 4.25 | 4.47 |
| 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 7 | 2 | 4 | 3.64 | 1168/1428 | 3.64 | 4.29 | 4.12 | 4.13 | 3.64 |
| 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 2 | 10 | 4.47 | 455/1407 | 4.47 | 4.25 | 4.15 | 4.20 | 4.47 |
| 7. Was the grading system clearly explained | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 12 | 4.67 | 330/1521 | 4.67 | 4.32 | 4.20 | 4.24 | 4.67 |
| 8. How many times was class cancelled | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 15 | 5.00 | 1/1541 | 5.00 | 4.57 | 4.70 | 4.75 | 5.00 |
| 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 6 | 4.45 | 433/1518 | 4.45 | 4.11 | 4.11 | 4.15 | 4.45 |
| Lecture | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 11 | 4.79 | 401/1472 | 4.79 | 4.41 | 4.46 | 4.48 | 4.79 |
| 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 14 | 5.00 | 1/1475 | 5.00 | 4.75 | 4.72 | 4.76 | 5.00 |
| 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 11 | 4.64 | 488/1471 | 4.64 | 4.37 | 4.32 | 4.36 | 4.64 |
| 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 3 | 10 | 4.57 | 619/1470 | 4.57 | 4.44 | 4.33 | 4.34 | 4.57 |
| 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding | 1 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 10 | 4.83 | 99/1310 | 4.83 | 4.08 | 4.06 | 3.99 | 4.83 |
| Discussion | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned | 5 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 3.50 | 1007/1210 | 3.50 | 4.32 | 4.18 | 4.28 | 3.50 |
| 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate | 5 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 6 | 4.10 | 886/1211 | 4.10 | 4.51 | 4.37 | 4.51 | 4.10 |
| 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion | 5 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 7 | 4.40 | 722/1207 | 4.40 | 4.55 | 4.41 | 4.53 | 4.40 |
| 4. Were special techniques successful | 5 | 6 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 2.75 | 833/859 | 2.75 | 4.06 | 4.08 | 4.08 | 2.75 |

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

| | |
|------------------------|-------------------------------|
| Course-Section: | SOCY 618 01 |
| Title: | SAS For Soc Scientists |
| Instructor: | Miller,Jayne M |

Term - Spring 2012

| | |
|------------------------|-----------|
| Enrollment: | 19 |
| Questionnaires: | 15 |

| Questions | NR | NA | Frequencies | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Org | UMBC | Level | Sect |
|---|----|----|-------------|---|---|---|---|------------|----------|--------|------|------|-------|------|
| | | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Mean | Rank | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean |
| Laboratory | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material | 14 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/207 | **** | **** | 4.12 | 4.20 | **** |
| 2. Were you provided with adequate background information | 14 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/210 | **** | **** | 4.17 | 4.12 | **** |
| 3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities | 14 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/202 | **** | **** | 4.50 | 4.23 | **** |
| 4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance | 14 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/202 | **** | **** | 4.32 | 4.24 | **** |
| 5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified | 14 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/199 | **** | **** | 4.15 | 4.30 | **** |
| Seminar | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme | 14 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/69 | **** | **** | 4.56 | 4.62 | **** |
| 4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned | 14 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 3.00 | ****/73 | **** | **** | 4.54 | 4.54 | **** |
| Field Work | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned | 14 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/32 | **** | **** | 4.20 | 4.06 | **** |
| 2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria | 14 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/35 | **** | **** | 4.36 | 4.40 | **** |
| 4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations | 14 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 3.00 | ****/23 | **** | **** | 4.41 | 4.39 | **** |

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

| | |
|------------------------|-------------------------------|
| Course-Section: | SOCY 618 01 |
| Title: | SAS For Soc Scientists |
| Instructor: | Miller,Jayne M |

Term - Spring 2012

| | |
|------------------------|-----------|
| Enrollment: | 19 |
| Questionnaires: | 15 |

| Questions | NR | NA | Frequencies | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Org | UMBC | Level | Sect |
|--|----|----|-------------|---|---|---|---|------------|---------|--------|------|------|-------|------|
| | | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Mean | Rank | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean |
| Field Work | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities | 14 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 3.00 | ****/17 | **** | **** | 4.62 | 4.43 | **** |

Frequency Distribution

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

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

| | |
|------------------------|----------------------------|
| Course-Section: | SOCY 620 01 |
| Title: | Social Epidemiology |
| Instructor: | Andersen,Daniel |

Term - Spring 2012

| | |
|------------------------|-----------|
| Enrollment: | 16 |
| Questionnaires: | 15 |

| Questions | NR | NA | Frequencies | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Org | UMBC | Level | Sect |
|---|----|----|-------------|---|---|----|----|------------|-----------|--------|------|------|-------|------|
| | | | 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 | 7 | 2 | 4 | 3.47 | 1443/1542 | 3.47 | 4.31 | 4.33 | 4.39 | 3.47 |
| 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals | 0 | 0 | 4 | 1 | 6 | 2 | 2 | 2.80 | 1517/1542 | 2.80 | 4.31 | 4.29 | 4.31 | 2.80 |
| 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals | 0 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 3 | 4 | 4 | 3.50 | 1212/1339 | 3.50 | 4.41 | 4.32 | 4.31 | 3.50 |
| 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals | 0 | 0 | 3 | 3 | 1 | 6 | 2 | 3.07 | 1450/1498 | 3.07 | 4.26 | 4.26 | 4.25 | 3.07 |
| 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned | 0 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 3.47 | 1243/1428 | 3.47 | 4.29 | 4.12 | 4.13 | 3.47 |
| 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned | 0 | 0 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 6 | 2 | 3.13 | 1329/1407 | 3.13 | 4.25 | 4.15 | 4.20 | 3.13 |
| 7. Was the grading system clearly explained | 0 | 0 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 2 | 1 | 2.60 | 1491/1521 | 2.60 | 4.32 | 4.20 | 4.24 | 2.60 |
| 8. How many times was class cancelled | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 14 | 1 | 4.07 | 1439/1541 | 4.07 | 4.57 | 4.70 | 4.75 | 4.07 |
| 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness | 1 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 5 | 5 | 0 | 3.00 | 1425/1518 | 3.00 | 4.11 | 4.11 | 4.15 | 3.00 |
| Lecture | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared | 0 | 0 | 3 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 4 | 3.20 | 1425/1472 | 3.20 | 4.41 | 4.46 | 4.48 | 3.20 |
| 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 11 | 4.67 | 1039/1475 | 4.67 | 4.75 | 4.72 | 4.76 | 4.67 |
| 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 3.53 | 1324/1471 | 3.53 | 4.37 | 4.32 | 4.36 | 3.53 |
| 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned | 0 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 3 | 5 | 4 | 3.53 | 1309/1470 | 3.53 | 4.44 | 4.33 | 4.34 | 3.53 |
| 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding | 0 | 0 | 3 | 1 | 6 | 3 | 2 | 3.00 | 1218/1310 | 3.00 | 4.08 | 4.06 | 3.99 | 3.00 |
| Discussion | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned | 1 | 0 | 3 | 1 | 3 | 4 | 3 | 3.21 | 1103/1210 | 3.21 | 4.32 | 4.18 | 4.28 | 3.21 |
| 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 4 | 8 | 4.43 | 661/1211 | 4.43 | 4.51 | 4.37 | 4.51 | 4.43 |
| 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 1 | 9 | 4.29 | 800/1207 | 4.29 | 4.55 | 4.41 | 4.53 | 4.29 |
| 4. Were special techniques successful | 2 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 4 | 2 | 3 | 3.45 | 729/859 | 3.45 | 4.06 | 4.08 | 4.08 | 3.45 |

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

| | |
|------------------------|----------------------------|
| Course-Section: | SOCY 620 01 |
| Title: | Social Epidemiology |
| Instructor: | Andersen,Daniel |

Term - Spring 2012

| | |
|------------------------|-----------|
| Enrollment: | 16 |
| Questionnaires: | 15 |

| Questions | NR | NA | Frequencies | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Org | UMBC | Level | Sect |
|---|----|----|-------------|---|---|---|---|------------|----------|--------|------|------|-------|------|
| | | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Mean | Rank | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean |
| Laboratory | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 2. Were you provided with adequate background information | 14 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/210 | **** | **** | 4.17 | 4.12 | **** |
| Seminar | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme | 14 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 3.00 | ****/69 | **** | **** | 4.56 | 4.62 | **** |
| 2. Was the instructor available for individual attention | 14 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 4.00 | ****/69 | **** | **** | 4.60 | 4.71 | **** |
| 3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned | 14 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 4.00 | ****/68 | **** | **** | 4.50 | 4.55 | **** |
| 4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned | 14 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/73 | **** | **** | 4.54 | 4.54 | **** |
| 5. Were criteria for grading made clear | 14 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 3.00 | ****/67 | **** | **** | 4.17 | 4.35 | **** |
| Field Work | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned | 14 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 3.00 | ****/32 | **** | **** | 4.20 | 4.06 | **** |
| 2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria | 14 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 3.00 | ****/35 | **** | **** | 4.36 | 4.40 | **** |
| 3. Was the instructor available for consultation | 14 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 3.00 | ****/25 | **** | **** | 4.59 | 4.53 | **** |
| 4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations | 14 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 4.00 | ****/23 | **** | **** | 4.41 | 4.39 | **** |
| Self Paced | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned | 14 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 4.00 | ****/30 | **** | **** | 4.27 | 4.36 | **** |
| 2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal | 14 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 4.00 | ****/19 | **** | **** | 4.57 | 4.45 | **** |
| 3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful | 14 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 4.00 | ****/29 | **** | **** | 4.29 | 4.42 | **** |
| 4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful | 14 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 3.00 | ****/18 | **** | **** | 4.25 | 4.35 | **** |

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

| | |
|------------------------|----------------------------|
| Course-Section: | SOCY 620 01 |
| Title: | Social Epidemiology |
| Instructor: | Andersen,Daniel |

Term - Spring 2012

| | |
|------------------------|-----------|
| Enrollment: | 16 |
| Questionnaires: | 15 |

| Questions | NR | NA | Frequencies | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Org | UMBC | Level | Sect |
|--|----|----|-------------|---|---|---|---|------------|---------|--------|------|------|-------|------|
| | | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Mean | Rank | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean |
| Self Paced | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 5. Were there enough proctors for all the students | 14 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/13 | **** | **** | 4.14 | 4.23 | **** |

Frequency Distribution

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

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

| | |
|------------------------|------------------------------------|
| Course-Section: | SOCY 645 01 |
| Title: | Hlth&Illness 21 Century |
| Instructor: | Rothstein,Willi |

Term - Spring 2012

| | |
|------------------------|-----------|
| Enrollment: | 20 |
| Questionnaires: | 19 |

| Questions | NR | NA | Frequencies | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Org | UMBC | Level | Sect |
|---|----|----|-------------|---|---|---|----|------------|-----------|--------|------|------|-------|------|
| | | | 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 | 3 | 15 | 4.74 | 347/1542 | 4.74 | 4.31 | 4.33 | 4.39 | 4.74 |
| 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 2 | 14 | 4.58 | 528/1542 | 4.58 | 4.31 | 4.29 | 4.31 | 4.58 |
| 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 18 | 4.89 | 166/1339 | 4.89 | 4.41 | 4.32 | 4.31 | 4.89 |
| 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 15 | 4.78 | 228/1498 | 4.78 | 4.26 | 4.26 | 4.25 | 4.78 |
| 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 17 | 4.84 | 122/1428 | 4.84 | 4.29 | 4.12 | 4.13 | 4.84 |
| 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 5 | 12 | 4.53 | 385/1407 | 4.53 | 4.25 | 4.15 | 4.20 | 4.53 |
| 7. Was the grading system clearly explained | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 16 | 4.74 | 250/1521 | 4.74 | 4.32 | 4.20 | 4.24 | 4.74 |
| 8. How many times was class cancelled | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 19 | 5.00 | 1/1541 | 5.00 | 4.57 | 4.70 | 4.75 | 5.00 |
| 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 12 | 4.65 | 261/1518 | 4.65 | 4.11 | 4.11 | 4.15 | 4.65 |
| Lecture | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 18 | 4.95 | 125/1472 | 4.95 | 4.41 | 4.46 | 4.48 | 4.95 |
| 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 18 | 4.95 | 323/1475 | 4.95 | 4.75 | 4.72 | 4.76 | 4.95 |
| 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 16 | 4.84 | 233/1471 | 4.84 | 4.37 | 4.32 | 4.36 | 4.84 |
| 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 19 | 5.00 | 1/1470 | 5.00 | 4.44 | 4.33 | 4.34 | 5.00 |
| 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding | 0 | 15 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 3.00 | ****/1310 | **** | 4.08 | 4.06 | 3.99 | **** |
| Discussion | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned | 3 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 10 | 4.13 | 726/1210 | 4.13 | 4.32 | 4.18 | 4.28 | 4.13 |
| 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate | 3 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 11 | 4.44 | 651/1211 | 4.44 | 4.51 | 4.37 | 4.51 | 4.44 |
| 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion | 3 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 12 | 4.50 | 630/1207 | 4.50 | 4.55 | 4.41 | 4.53 | 4.50 |
| 4. Were special techniques successful | 3 | 11 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 3.80 | 589/859 | 3.80 | 4.06 | 4.08 | 4.08 | 3.80 |

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

| | |
|------------------------|------------------------------------|
| Course-Section: | SOCY 645 01 |
| Title: | Hlth&Illness 21 Century |
| Instructor: | Rothstein,Willi |

Term - Spring 2012

| | |
|------------------------|-----------|
| Enrollment: | 20 |
| Questionnaires: | 19 |

| Questions | NR | NA | Frequencies | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Org | UMBC | Level | Sect |
|---|----|----|-------------|---|---|---|---|------------|----------|--------|------|------|-------|------|
| | | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Mean | Rank | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean |
| Laboratory | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 2. Were you provided with adequate background information | 18 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/210 | **** | **** | 4.17 | 4.12 | **** |
| 3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities | 18 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/202 | **** | **** | 4.50 | 4.23 | **** |
| 5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified | 18 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/199 | **** | **** | 4.15 | 4.30 | **** |
| Seminar | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme | 17 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 5.00 | ****/69 | **** | **** | 4.56 | 4.62 | **** |
| 2. Was the instructor available for individual attention | 17 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 5.00 | ****/69 | **** | **** | 4.60 | 4.71 | **** |
| 3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned | 17 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 5.00 | ****/68 | **** | **** | 4.50 | 4.55 | **** |
| 4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned | 17 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 5.00 | ****/73 | **** | **** | 4.54 | 4.54 | **** |
| 5. Were criteria for grading made clear | 17 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 5.00 | ****/67 | **** | **** | 4.17 | 4.35 | **** |
| Field Work | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned | 18 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/32 | **** | **** | 4.20 | 4.06 | **** |
| 2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria | 18 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/35 | **** | **** | 4.36 | 4.40 | **** |
| 3. Was the instructor available for consultation | 18 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/25 | **** | **** | 4.59 | 4.53 | **** |
| 4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations | 18 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/23 | **** | **** | 4.41 | 4.39 | **** |
| 5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities | 18 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/17 | **** | **** | 4.62 | 4.43 | **** |
| Self Paced | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned | 18 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/30 | **** | **** | 4.27 | 4.36 | **** |
| 2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal | 18 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/19 | **** | **** | 4.57 | 4.45 | **** |
| 3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful | 18 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/29 | **** | **** | 4.29 | 4.42 | **** |
| 4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful | 18 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/18 | **** | **** | 4.25 | 4.35 | **** |

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

| | |
|------------------------|------------------------------------|
| Course-Section: | SOCY 645 01 |
| Title: | Hlth&Illness 21 Century |
| Instructor: | Rothstein,Willi |

Term - Spring 2012

| | |
|------------------------|-----------|
| Enrollment: | 20 |
| Questionnaires: | 19 |

| Questions | NR | NA | Frequencies | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Org | UMBC | Level | Sect |
|--|----|----|-------------|---|---|---|---|------------|---------|--------|------|------|-------|------|
| | | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Mean | Rank | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean |
| Self Paced | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 5. Were there enough proctors for all the students | 18 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/13 | **** | **** | 4.14 | 4.23 | **** |

Frequency Distribution

| Credits Earned | Cum. GPA | Expected Grades | Reasons | Type | Majors |
|----------------|----------|-----------------|---------|-----------------------|---|
| 00-27 | 4 | 0.00-0.99 0 | A 12 | Required for Majors 3 | Graduate 10 |
| 28-55 | 0 | 1.00-1.99 0 | B 6 | | |
| 56-83 | 0 | 2.00-2.99 0 | C 0 | General 4 | Under-grad 9 |
| 84-150 | 0 | 3.00-3.49 2 | D 0 | | |
| Grad. | 10 | 3.50-4.00 8 | F 0 | Electives 8 | **** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant |
| | | | P 0 | | |
| | | | I 0 | Other 0 | |
| | | | ? 1 | | |

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

| | |
|------------------------|----------------------------|
| Course-Section: | SOCY 685 01 |
| Title: | Nonprofit Structure |
| Instructor: | Hall,Nancy F |

Term - Spring 2012

| | |
|------------------------|-----------|
| Enrollment: | 19 |
| Questionnaires: | 13 |

| Questions | NR | NA | Frequencies | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Org | UMBC | Level | Sect |
|---|----|----|-------------|---|---|---|----|------------|-----------|--------|------|------|-------|------|
| | | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Mean | Rank | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean |
| General | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 10 | 4.83 | 232/1542 | 4.83 | 4.31 | 4.33 | 4.39 | 4.83 |
| 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 9 | 4.67 | 416/1542 | 4.67 | 4.31 | 4.29 | 4.31 | 4.67 |
| 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals | 1 | 8 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 4.75 | 313/1339 | 4.75 | 4.41 | 4.32 | 4.31 | 4.75 |
| 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 8 | 4.50 | 549/1498 | 4.50 | 4.26 | 4.26 | 4.25 | 4.50 |
| 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned | 1 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 5 | 4.44 | 452/1428 | 4.44 | 4.29 | 4.12 | 4.13 | 4.44 |
| 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 10 | 4.75 | 178/1407 | 4.75 | 4.25 | 4.15 | 4.20 | 4.75 |
| 7. Was the grading system clearly explained | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 4 | 2 | 3 | 3.45 | 1347/1521 | 3.45 | 4.32 | 4.20 | 4.24 | 3.45 |
| 8. How many times was class cancelled | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 11 | 4.92 | 620/1541 | 4.92 | 4.57 | 4.70 | 4.75 | 4.92 |
| 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 7 | 2 | 4.10 | 842/1518 | 4.10 | 4.11 | 4.11 | 4.15 | 4.10 |
| Lecture | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 11 | 4.92 | 188/1472 | 4.92 | 4.41 | 4.46 | 4.48 | 4.92 |
| 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 11 | 4.92 | 484/1475 | 4.92 | 4.75 | 4.72 | 4.76 | 4.92 |
| 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 9 | 4.75 | 346/1471 | 4.75 | 4.37 | 4.32 | 4.36 | 4.75 |
| 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 11 | 4.92 | 159/1470 | 4.92 | 4.44 | 4.33 | 4.34 | 4.92 |
| 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding | 2 | 4 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 3 | 3.71 | 968/1310 | 3.71 | 4.08 | 4.06 | 3.99 | 3.71 |
| Discussion | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 8 | 4.50 | 430/1210 | 4.50 | 4.32 | 4.18 | 4.28 | 4.50 |
| 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 9 | 4.58 | 521/1211 | 4.58 | 4.51 | 4.37 | 4.51 | 4.58 |
| 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 4 | 6 | 4.33 | 769/1207 | 4.33 | 4.55 | 4.41 | 4.53 | 4.33 |
| 4. Were special techniques successful | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 6 | 4 | 4.27 | 350/859 | 4.27 | 4.06 | 4.08 | 4.08 | 4.27 |

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

| | |
|------------------------|----------------------------|
| Course-Section: | SOCY 685 01 |
| Title: | Nonprofit Structure |
| Instructor: | Hall,Nancy F |

Term - Spring 2012

| | |
|------------------------|-----------|
| Enrollment: | 19 |
| Questionnaires: | 13 |

| Questions | NR | NA | Frequencies | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Org | UMBC | Level | Sect |
|---|----|----|-------------|---|---|---|---|------------|----------|--------|------|------|-------|------|
| | | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Mean | Rank | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean |
| Laboratory | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material | 11 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 4.00 | ****/207 | **** | **** | 4.12 | 4.20 | **** |
| 2. Were you provided with adequate background information | 12 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 4.00 | ****/210 | **** | **** | 4.17 | 4.12 | **** |
| 4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance | 12 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 4.00 | ****/202 | **** | **** | 4.32 | 4.24 | **** |
| Seminar | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme | 10 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 5.00 | ****/69 | **** | **** | 4.56 | 4.62 | **** |
| 2. Was the instructor available for individual attention | 11 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 5.00 | ****/69 | **** | **** | 4.60 | 4.71 | **** |
| 3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned | 11 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 4.50 | ****/68 | **** | **** | 4.50 | 4.55 | **** |
| 4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned | 11 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 4.50 | ****/73 | **** | **** | 4.54 | 4.54 | **** |
| 5. Were criteria for grading made clear | 11 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 3.50 | ****/67 | **** | **** | 4.17 | 4.35 | **** |
| Field Work | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned | 12 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/32 | **** | **** | 4.20 | 4.06 | **** |
| 2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria | 12 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/35 | **** | **** | 4.36 | 4.40 | **** |
| 3. Was the instructor available for consultation | 12 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 3.00 | ****/25 | **** | **** | 4.59 | 4.53 | **** |
| 4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations | 12 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 4.00 | ****/23 | **** | **** | 4.41 | 4.39 | **** |
| Self Paced | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned | 12 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/30 | **** | **** | 4.27 | 4.36 | **** |
| 2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal | 12 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/19 | **** | **** | 4.57 | 4.45 | **** |
| 3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful | 12 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 4.00 | ****/29 | **** | **** | 4.29 | 4.42 | **** |

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

| | |
|------------------------|----------------------------|
| Course-Section: | SOCY 685 01 |
| Title: | Nonprofit Structure |
| Instructor: | Hall,Nancy F |

Term - Spring 2012

| | |
|------------------------|-----------|
| Enrollment: | 19 |
| Questionnaires: | 13 |

| Questions | NR | NA | Frequencies | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Org | UMBC | Level | Sect |
|--|----|----|-------------|---|---|---|---|------------|---------|--------|------|------|-------|------|
| | | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Mean | Rank | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean |
| Self Paced | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful | 12 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 4.00 | ****/18 | **** | **** | 4.25 | 4.35 | **** |

Frequency Distribution

| Credits Earned | Cum. GPA | Expected Grades | Reasons | Type | Majors |
|----------------|----------|-----------------|---------|---------------------|----------------------------|
| 00-27 | 0 | 0.00-0.99 | 1 A 7 | Required for Majors | 6 Graduate 8 Major 6 |
| 28-55 | 0 | 1.00-1.99 | 0 B 3 | | |
| 56-83 | 0 | 2.00-2.99 | 0 C 0 | General | 0 Under-grad 5 Non-major 7 |
| 84-150 | 1 | 3.00-3.49 | 0 D 0 | | |
| Grad. | 8 | 3.50-4.00 | 6 F 0 | Electives | 5 |
| | | | P 0 | | |
| | | | I 0 | Other | 0 |
| | | | ? 3 | | |

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