

Course-Section: POLI 100 0301  
 Title AMER GOVT & POLITICS  
 Instructor: MELCAVAGE, EUGE  
 Enrollment: 53  
 Questionnaires: 42

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2006

Page 1174  
 JUN 13, 2006  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	0	3	5	13	20	4.22	896/1481	4.27	4.51	4.29	4.14	4.22	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	1	6	18	16	4.20	884/1481	4.05	4.34	4.23	4.18	4.20	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	2	8	13	18	4.15	824/1249	4.06	4.39	4.27	4.14	4.15	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	12	2	1	7	6	13	3.93	1048/1424	3.91	4.37	4.21	4.06	3.93	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	4	0	3	6	7	7	15	3.66	992/1396	3.69	4.39	3.98	3.89	3.66	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	4	22	1	1	4	5	5	3.75	987/1342	3.84	4.33	4.07	3.88	3.75	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	0	8	9	23	4.38	647/1459	4.35	4.31	4.16	4.17	4.38	
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	6	34	4.85	770/1480	4.40	4.57	4.68	4.64	4.85	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	14	1	0	0	6	12	9	4.11	771/1450	4.03	4.32	4.09	3.97	4.11	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	5	7	29	4.59	670/1409	4.64	4.59	4.42	4.36	4.59	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	2	7	32	4.73	861/1407	4.85	4.89	4.69	4.57	4.73	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	0	1	5	9	23	4.42	659/1399	4.22	4.41	4.26	4.23	4.42	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	3	6	31	4.70	385/1400	4.50	4.58	4.27	4.19	4.70	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	22	3	0	6	4	3	3.25	997/1179	3.05	3.68	3.96	3.85	3.25	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	1	4	12	16	4.30	537/1262	4.19	4.44	4.05	3.77	4.30	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	1	0	1	8	24	4.59	524/1259	4.45	4.65	4.29	4.06	4.59	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	0	1	2	5	26	4.65	477/1256	4.56	4.66	4.30	4.08	4.65	
4. Were special techniques successful	9	25	1	0	2	2	3	3.75	****/ 788	****	4.14	4.00	3.80	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	38	2	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 246	****	****	4.20	3.93	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	40	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 249	****	****	4.11	3.95	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	40	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 68	****	5.00	4.49	4.54	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	40	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 59	****	****	4.30	4.00	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	41	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 51	****	****	4.00	3.44	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	41	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 55	****	****	4.55	4.48	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	10	0.00-0.99	3	A	10
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	1	B	18
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	8	C	9
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	9	D	1
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5	F	0
				P	0
				I	0
				?	0
				Required for Majors	8
				General	10
				Electives	2
				Other	17
				Graduate	0
				Under-grad	42
				Major	9
				Non-major	33
				#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	

Course-Section: POLI 100 0401  
 Title AMER GOVT & POLITICS  
 Instructor: KING-MEADOWS, T  
 Enrollment: 44  
 Questionnaires: 36

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2006

Page 1175  
 JUN 13, 2006  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	10	0	0	0	5	5	16	4.42	652/1481	4.27	4.51	4.29	4.14	4.42	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	10	0	0	3	5	10	8	3.88	1130/1481	4.05	4.34	4.23	4.18	3.88	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	10	0	0	1	9	8	8	3.88	988/1249	4.06	4.39	4.27	4.14	3.88	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	10	0	2	2	7	4	11	3.77	1181/1424	3.91	4.37	4.21	4.06	3.77	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	10	0	1	1	0	7	17	4.46	330/1396	3.69	4.39	3.98	3.89	4.46	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	10	0	2	1	5	7	11	3.92	858/1342	3.84	4.33	4.07	3.88	3.92	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	10	0	1	1	4	4	16	4.27	766/1459	4.35	4.31	4.16	4.17	4.27	
8. How many times was class cancelled	10	0	0	0	0	23	3	4.12	1316/1480	4.40	4.57	4.68	4.64	4.12	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	13	1	1	1	1	11	8	4.09	786/1450	4.03	4.32	4.09	3.97	4.09	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	10	0	0	0	1	5	20	4.73	450/1409	4.64	4.59	4.42	4.36	4.73	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	10	0	0	0	0	0	26	5.00	1/1407	4.85	4.89	4.69	4.57	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	10	0	0	2	6	8	10	4.00	1002/1399	4.22	4.41	4.26	4.23	4.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	5	6	15	4.38	729/1400	4.50	4.58	4.27	4.19	4.38	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	10	20	1	2	2	1	0	2.50	****/1179	3.05	3.68	3.96	3.85	****	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	2	3	9	9	4.09	680/1262	4.19	4.44	4.05	3.77	4.09	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	13	0	1	0	1	11	10	4.26	777/1259	4.45	4.65	4.29	4.06	4.26	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	13	0	0	0	1	8	14	4.57	538/1256	4.56	4.66	4.30	4.08	4.57	
4. Were special techniques successful	13	21	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 788	****	4.14	4.00	3.80	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	35	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 246	****	****	4.20	3.93	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	35	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 249	****	****	4.11	3.95	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	35	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 242	****	****	4.40	4.33	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	35	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 217	****	****	4.04	4.02	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	35	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 68	****	5.00	4.49	4.54	****	
Self Paced															
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	35	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 51	****	****	4.65	4.63	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	10	0.00-0.99	0	A	4	Required for Majors	6	Graduate	0	Major	5
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	0	B	11						
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	8	C	9	General	4	Under-grad	36	Non-major	31
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	6	D	1						
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	11				
				?	1						

Course-Section: POLI 100 0501  
 Title AMER GOVT & POLITICS  
 Instructor: MELCAVAGE, EUGE  
 Enrollment: 49  
 Questionnaires: 42

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2006

Page 1176  
 JUN 13, 2006  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	1	2	7	10	21	4.17	938/1481	4.27	4.51	4.29	4.14	4.17	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	3	7	12	19	4.07	971/1481	4.05	4.34	4.23	4.18	4.07	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	2	3	8	3	26	4.14	824/1249	4.06	4.39	4.27	4.14	4.14	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	18	2	0	5	5	12	4.04	938/1424	3.91	4.37	4.21	4.06	4.04	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	1	10	8	7	2	12	2.95	1313/1396	3.69	4.39	3.98	3.89	2.95	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	32	1	1	0	0	7	4.22	****/1342	3.84	4.33	4.07	3.88	****	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	1	0	4	4	4	28	4.40	611/1459	4.35	4.31	4.16	4.17	4.40	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	31	10	4.24	1223/1480	4.40	4.57	4.68	4.64	4.24	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	15	1	3	1	3	8	11	3.88	989/1450	4.03	4.32	4.09	3.97	3.88	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	1	3	7	30	4.61	648/1409	4.64	4.59	4.42	4.36	4.61	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	1	1	3	36	4.80	728/1407	4.85	4.89	4.69	4.57	4.80	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	2	3	2	10	24	4.24	837/1399	4.22	4.41	4.26	4.23	4.24	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	1	4	6	29	4.40	704/1400	4.50	4.58	4.27	4.19	4.40	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	29	6	1	0	1	5	2.85	1094/1179	3.05	3.68	3.96	3.85	2.85	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	2	2	4	7	21	4.19	610/1262	4.19	4.44	4.05	3.77	4.19	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	3	2	5	26	4.50	588/1259	4.45	4.65	4.29	4.06	4.50	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	0	1	6	4	24	4.46	625/1256	4.56	4.66	4.30	4.08	4.46	
4. Were special techniques successful	6	27	0	1	3	0	5	4.00	****/ 788	****	4.14	4.00	3.80	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	39	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 246	****	****	4.20	3.93	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	40	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 249	****	****	4.11	3.95	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	40	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 242	****	****	4.40	4.33	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	41	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 240	****	****	4.20	4.20	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	40	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 217	****	****	4.04	4.02	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	39	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 68	****	5.00	4.49	4.54	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	41	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 69	****	5.00	4.53	4.18	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	41	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 63	****	5.00	4.44	4.17	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	41	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 69	****	5.00	4.35	4.14	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	41	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 68	****	5.00	3.92	3.80	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	40	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 59	****	****	4.30	4.00	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	41	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 51	****	****	4.00	3.44	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	41	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 36	****	****	4.60	5.00	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	41	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 41	****	****	4.26	****	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	41	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.42	****	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	41	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 55	****	****	4.55	4.48	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	41	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.75	4.42	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	41	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 51	****	****	4.65	4.63	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	41	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 34	****	****	4.83	4.67	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	41	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 24	****	****	4.82	4.58	****	

Course-Section: POLI 100 0501  
 Title AMER GOVT & POLITICS  
 Instructor: MELCAVAGE, EUGE  
 Enrollment: 49  
 Questionnaires: 42

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2006

Page 1176  
 JUN 13, 2006  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	7	0.00-0.99	0	A	11	Required for Majors	10	Graduate	0	Major	12
28-55	8	1.00-1.99	0	B	21						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	11	C	4	General	9	Under-grad	42	Non-major	30
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	5	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	2	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	1						
				I	0	Other	19				
				?	2						

Course-Section: POLI 210 0101  
 Title POLITICAL PHILOSOPHY  
 Instructor: Furlow, Shanays  
 Enrollment: 48  
 Questionnaires: 23

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2006

Page 1177  
 JUN 13, 2006  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	4	4	15	4.48	587/1481	4.44	4.51	4.29	4.40	4.48	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	5	15	4.52	493/1481	4.33	4.34	4.23	4.29	4.52	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	1	3	8	10	4.23	765/1249	4.19	4.39	4.27	4.36	4.23	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	9	0	0	3	4	5	4.17	840/1424	4.18	4.37	4.21	4.28	4.17	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	0	8	14	4.52	285/1396	4.47	4.39	3.98	3.94	4.52	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	16	0	1	1	2	2	3.83	934/1342	4.27	4.33	4.07	4.05	3.83	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	1	5	2	14	4.17	845/1459	4.20	4.31	4.16	4.17	4.17	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	1	0	0	6	14	1	3.76	1438/1480	3.88	4.57	4.68	4.68	3.76	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	1	0	0	5	11	2	3.83	1030/1450	3.89	4.32	4.09	4.15	3.83	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	0	2	0	5	12	4.42	865/1409	4.35	4.59	4.42	4.47	4.42	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	0	0	2	17	4.89	522/1407	4.91	4.89	4.69	4.78	4.89	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	0	0	1	10	8	4.37	723/1399	4.28	4.41	4.26	4.29	4.37	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	7	12	4.63	456/1400	4.66	4.58	4.27	4.34	4.63	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	5	12	0	1	3	1	1	3.33	972/1179	3.33	3.68	3.96	4.05	3.33	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	1	0	4	5	5	3.87	823/1262	4.00	4.44	4.05	4.11	3.87	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	1	0	1	2	11	4.47	624/1259	4.40	4.65	4.29	4.34	4.47	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	0	1	1	2	11	4.53	554/1256	4.55	4.66	4.30	4.28	4.53	
4. Were special techniques successful	8	5	0	4	1	2	3	3.40	650/ 788	3.40	4.14	4.00	3.98	3.40	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	7	0.00-0.99 1	A 10	Required for Majors	1
28-55	7	1.00-1.99 0	B 8		Graduate 0
56-83	0	2.00-2.99 3	C 1	General	2
84-150	1	3.00-3.49 6	D 0		Under-grad 23
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 4	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 1	Other	15
			? 1		

Course-Section: POLI 210 0201  
 Title POLITICAL PHILOSOPHY  
 Instructor: Furlow, Shanays  
 Enrollment: 45  
 Questionnaires: 29

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2006

Page 1178  
 JUN 13, 2006  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	2	0	0	1	4	5	17	4.41	678/1481	4.44	4.51	4.29	4.40	4.41	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	1	1	3	10	12	4.15	925/1481	4.33	4.34	4.23	4.29	4.15	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	0	1	0	5	9	12	4.15	824/1249	4.19	4.39	4.27	4.36	4.15	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	3	16	1	0	0	4	5	4.20	807/1424	4.18	4.37	4.21	4.28	4.20	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	3	0	2	0	1	5	18	4.42	363/1396	4.47	4.39	3.98	3.94	4.42	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	3	16	0	0	0	3	7	4.70	166/1342	4.27	4.33	4.07	4.05	4.70	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	3	0	1	2	3	4	16	4.23	792/1459	4.20	4.31	4.16	4.17	4.23	
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	0	0	0	3	20	3	4.00	1349/1480	3.88	4.57	4.68	4.68	4.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	9	0	0	0	6	9	5	3.95	904/1450	3.89	4.32	4.09	4.15	3.95	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	4	11	11	4.27	1025/1409	4.35	4.59	4.42	4.47	4.27	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	0	0	2	23	4.92	400/1407	4.91	4.89	4.69	4.78	4.92	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	0	1	5	7	12	4.20	883/1399	4.28	4.41	4.26	4.29	4.20	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	2	4	19	4.68	409/1400	4.66	4.58	4.27	4.34	4.68	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	18	2	0	1	1	3	3.43	****/1179	3.33	3.68	3.96	4.05	****	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	2	0	4	2	13	4.14	645/1262	4.00	4.44	4.05	4.11	4.14	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	1	1	3	1	15	4.33	729/1259	4.40	4.65	4.29	4.34	4.33	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	0	1	2	2	16	4.57	532/1256	4.55	4.66	4.30	4.28	4.57	
4. Were special techniques successful	8	15	1	0	2	0	3	3.67	****/ 788	3.40	4.14	4.00	3.98	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	4	0.00-0.99 0	A 14	Required for Majors	6
28-55	6	1.00-1.99 0	B 7		Graduate 0
56-83	5	2.00-2.99 4	C 4	General	2
84-150	1	3.00-3.49 3	D 0		Under-grad 29
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 6	F 0	Electives	1
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	17
			? 1		

Course-Section: POLI 230 0101  
 Title INTRO CONSTITUTIONAL L  
 Instructor: DAVIS, JEFFREY  
 Enrollment: 54  
 Questionnaires: 33

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2006

Page 1179  
 JUN 13, 2006  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	0	2	2	3	25	4.59	469/1481	4.67	4.51	4.29	4.40	4.59	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	4	6	22	4.48	545/1481	4.60	4.34	4.23	4.29	4.48	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	3	1	5	23	4.50	498/1249	4.58	4.39	4.27	4.36	4.50	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	5	0	2	3	5	18	4.39	569/1424	4.50	4.37	4.21	4.28	4.39	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	1	6	25	4.67	193/1396	4.69	4.39	3.98	3.94	4.67	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	3	6	6	17	4.16	638/1342	4.30	4.33	4.07	4.05	4.16	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	2	3	27	4.70	242/1459	4.62	4.31	4.16	4.17	4.70	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	33	5.00	1/1480	5.00	4.57	4.68	4.68	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	8	0	0	1	2	7	15	4.44	417/1450	4.50	4.32	4.09	4.15	4.44	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	1	5	26	4.78	367/1409	4.80	4.59	4.42	4.47	4.78	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	1	1	30	4.91	500/1407	4.90	4.89	4.69	4.78	4.91	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	3	3	26	4.72	311/1399	4.75	4.41	4.26	4.29	4.72	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	2	1	28	4.75	312/1400	4.78	4.58	4.27	4.34	4.75	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	2	0	1	5	7	16	4.31	397/1179	4.28	3.68	3.96	4.05	4.31	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	9	0	1	2	1	1	19	4.46	391/1262	4.56	4.44	4.05	4.11	4.46	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	9	0	0	0	3	2	19	4.67	451/1259	4.76	4.65	4.29	4.34	4.67	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	0	0	2	2	20	4.75	357/1256	4.73	4.66	4.30	4.28	4.75	
4. Were special techniques successful	9	11	2	2	2	0	7	3.62	580/ 788	3.62	4.14	4.00	3.98	3.62	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	32	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 68	****	5.00	4.49	5.00	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	32	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 69	****	5.00	4.53	4.83	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	32	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 63	****	5.00	4.44	4.00	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	32	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 69	****	5.00	4.35	4.72	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	32	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 68	****	5.00	3.92	3.55	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	32	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 55	****	****	4.55	4.44	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	32	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.75	4.50	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	32	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 51	****	****	4.65	4.66	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	32	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 34	****	****	4.83	4.43	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	32	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 24	****	****	4.82	5.00	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors		
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	1	A 15	Required for Majors 2	Graduate 0	Major 24
28-55	8	1.00-1.99	0	B 10			
56-83	5	2.00-2.99	2	C 5	General 3	Under-grad 33	Non-major 9
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	7	D 0			
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	13	F 0	Electives 2	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	
				P 0			
				I 0	Other 22		
				? 0			

Course-Section: POLI 230 0201  
 Title INTRO CONSTITUTIONAL L  
 Instructor: DAVIS, JEFFREY  
 Enrollment: 51  
 Questionnaires: 28

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2006

Page 1180  
 JUN 13, 2006  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	1	1	2	24	4.75	292/1481	4.67	4.51	4.29	4.40	4.75	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	4	22	4.71	264/1481	4.60	4.34	4.23	4.29	4.71	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	2	5	20	4.67	334/1249	4.58	4.39	4.27	4.36	4.67	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	7	0	1	1	3	15	4.60	334/1424	4.50	4.37	4.21	4.28	4.60	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	3	2	23	4.71	156/1396	4.69	4.39	3.98	3.94	4.71	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	4	7	16	4.44	364/1342	4.30	4.33	4.07	4.05	4.44	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	1	1	4	21	4.54	425/1459	4.62	4.31	4.16	4.17	4.54	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	1	0	0	0	0	27	5.00	1/1480	5.00	4.57	4.68	4.68	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	0	0	10	13	4.57	289/1450	4.50	4.32	4.09	4.15	4.57	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	2	1	24	4.81	319/1409	4.80	4.59	4.42	4.47	4.81	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	1	1	25	4.89	545/1407	4.90	4.89	4.69	4.78	4.89	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	2	2	23	4.78	245/1399	4.75	4.41	4.26	4.29	4.78	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	2	1	24	4.81	239/1400	4.78	4.58	4.27	4.34	4.81	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	1	0	1	5	6	13	4.24	457/1179	4.28	3.68	3.96	4.05	4.24	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	2	3	16	4.67	264/1262	4.56	4.44	4.05	4.11	4.67	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	0	0	1	1	19	4.86	257/1259	4.76	4.65	4.29	4.34	4.86	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	0	0	2	2	17	4.71	406/1256	4.73	4.66	4.30	4.28	4.71	
4. Were special techniques successful	7	16	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	****/ 788	3.62	4.14	4.00	3.98	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	27	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 246	****	****	4.20	4.51	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	27	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 249	****	****	4.11	4.32	****	

Frequency Distribution

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



Course-Section: POLI 250 0101  
 Title INTRO TO PUBLIC ADMIN  
 Instructor: CROATTI, MARK  
 Enrollment: 59  
 Questionnaires: 38

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2006

Page 1181  
 JUN 13, 2006  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	2	0	1	2	7	11	15	4.03	1056/1481	4.03	4.51	4.29	4.40	4.03	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	3	7	8	6	12	3.47	1333/1481	3.47	4.34	4.23	4.29	3.47	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	0	4	9	8	2	13	3.31	1153/1249	3.31	4.39	4.27	4.36	3.31	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	0	4	3	10	5	14	3.61	1239/1424	3.61	4.37	4.21	4.28	3.61	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	1	2	5	4	10	14	3.83	861/1396	3.83	4.39	3.98	3.94	3.83	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	3	2	6	7	7	11	3.58	1084/1342	3.58	4.33	4.07	4.05	3.58	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	1	2	3	9	21	4.31	732/1459	4.31	4.31	4.16	4.17	4.31	
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	0	0	0	0	3	32	4.91	631/1480	4.91	4.57	4.68	4.68	4.91	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	9	1	3	2	4	10	9	3.71	1133/1450	3.71	4.32	4.09	4.15	3.71	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	0	2	5	9	18	4.26	1025/1409	4.26	4.59	4.42	4.47	4.26	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	1	2	2	29	4.74	861/1407	4.74	4.89	4.69	4.78	4.74	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	1	2	6	7	18	4.15	929/1399	4.15	4.41	4.26	4.29	4.15	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	3	2	6	5	18	3.97	1038/1400	3.97	4.58	4.27	4.34	3.97	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	6	2	1	2	6	5	16	4.10	557/1179	4.10	3.68	3.96	4.05	4.10	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	12	0	3	2	2	3	16	4.04	697/1262	4.04	4.44	4.05	4.11	4.04	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	12	0	0	3	5	5	13	4.08	875/1259	4.08	4.65	4.29	4.34	4.08	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	12	0	3	2	3	4	14	3.92	967/1256	3.92	4.66	4.30	4.28	3.92	
4. Were special techniques successful	14	11	2	1	0	4	6	3.85	503/ 788	3.85	4.14	4.00	3.98	3.85	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	37	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 246	****	****	4.20	4.51	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	37	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 249	****	****	4.11	4.32	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	2	0.00-0.99 1	A 15	Required for Majors	5
28-55	2	1.00-1.99 0	B 10		Graduate 0
56-83	9	2.00-2.99 4	C 5	General	0
84-150	5	3.00-3.49 12	D 0		Under-grad 38
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 7	F 0	Electives	1
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	23
			? 0		

Course-Section: POLI 260 0101  
 Title COMPARATIVE POLITICS  
 Instructor: CROATTI, MARK  
 Enrollment: 56  
 Questionnaires: 37

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2006

Page 1182  
 JUN 13, 2006  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	1	1	9	26	4.62	439/1481	4.62	4.51	4.29	4.40	4.62	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	13	12	11	3.89	1124/1481	3.89	4.34	4.23	4.29	3.89	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	1	6	8	11	10	3.64	1088/1249	3.64	4.39	4.27	4.36	3.64	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	2	9	10	14	4.03	948/1424	4.03	4.37	4.21	4.28	4.03	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	5	8	8	15	3.84	854/1396	3.84	4.39	3.98	3.94	3.84	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	4	0	5	9	8	11	3.76	987/1342	3.76	4.33	4.07	4.05	3.76	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	2	9	7	19	4.16	854/1459	4.16	4.31	4.16	4.17	4.16	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	4	33	4.89	715/1480	4.89	4.57	4.68	4.68	4.89	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	0	0	1	5	11	14	4.23	662/1450	4.23	4.32	4.09	4.15	4.23	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	3	9	8	15	4.00	1152/1409	4.00	4.59	4.42	4.47	4.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	1	1	34	4.92	450/1407	4.92	4.89	4.69	4.78	4.92	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	1	3	7	9	15	3.97	1030/1399	3.97	4.41	4.26	4.29	3.97	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	3	6	7	18	4.09	991/1400	4.09	4.58	4.27	4.34	4.09	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	1	0	2	7	11	15	4.11	549/1179	4.11	3.68	3.96	4.05	4.11	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	9	6	10	4.04	694/1262	4.04	4.44	4.05	4.11	4.04	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	12	0	1	2	6	7	9	3.84	1007/1259	3.84	4.65	4.29	4.34	3.84	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	12	0	2	2	6	5	10	3.76	1038/1256	3.76	4.66	4.30	4.28	3.76	
4. Were special techniques successful	12	16	0	2	3	3	1	3.33	****/ 788	****	4.14	4.00	3.98	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	4	0.00-0.99 2	A 14	Required for Majors 1	Graduate 0 Major 19
28-55	11	1.00-1.99 0	B 16		
56-83	3	2.00-2.99 3	C 3	General 3	Under-grad 37 Non-major 18
84-150	7	3.00-3.49 8	D 0		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 11	F 0	Electives 3	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 23	
			? 0		

Course-Section: POLI 315 0101  
 Title POLITICAL PHIL FROM 16  
 Instructor: Stacey, Simon  
 Enrollment: 34  
 Questionnaires: 21

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2006

Page 1183  
 JUN 13, 2006  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	5	15	4.67	395/1481	4.67	4.51	4.29	4.29	4.67	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	5	15	4.67	324/1481	4.67	4.34	4.23	4.23	4.67	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	3	9	0	0	1	2	6	4.56	451/1249	4.56	4.39	4.27	4.28	4.56	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	1	18	4.76	209/1424	4.76	4.37	4.21	4.27	4.76	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	1	19	4.86	96/1396	4.86	4.39	3.98	4.00	4.86	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	2	0	0	1	5	12	4.61	230/1342	4.61	4.33	4.07	4.12	4.61	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	0	1	7	11	4.53	436/1459	4.53	4.31	4.16	4.17	4.53	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	1	16	4	4.14	1295/1480	4.14	4.57	4.68	4.65	4.14	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	0	6	11	4.65	231/1450	4.65	4.32	4.09	4.10	4.65	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	0	2	17	4.89	202/1409	4.89	4.59	4.42	4.43	4.89	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	1	18	4.95	300/1407	4.95	4.89	4.69	4.67	4.95	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	0	4	15	4.79	234/1399	4.79	4.41	4.26	4.27	4.79	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	2	17	4.89	156/1400	4.89	4.58	4.27	4.28	4.89	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	12	2	0	0	1	2	3.20	****/1179	****	3.68	3.96	4.02	****	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	1	2	13	4.75	205/1262	4.75	4.44	4.05	4.14	4.75	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	0	0	2	14	4.88	238/1259	4.88	4.65	4.29	4.34	4.88	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	0	0	0	16	5.00	1/1256	5.00	4.66	4.30	4.34	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	5	13	1	0	1	0	1	3.00	****/ 788	****	4.14	4.00	4.07	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 8	Required for Majors	17
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	B 8		
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	C 1	General	2
84-150	6	3.00-3.49	D 0		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	1
			P 0		
			I 0	Other	14
			? 2		

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

Course-Section: POLI 324 0101  
 Title THE CONGRESS  
 Instructor: KING-MEADOWS, T  
 Enrollment: 20  
 Questionnaires: 10

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2006

Page 1184  
 JUN 13, 2006  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	5	4	4.30	780/1481	4.30	4.51	4.29	4.29	4.30	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	5	2	3.90	1118/1481	3.90	4.34	4.23	4.23	3.90	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	4	5	1	3.70	1071/1249	3.70	4.39	4.27	4.28	3.70	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	8	1	4.11	896/1424	4.11	4.37	4.21	4.27	4.11	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	1	3	5	4.20	554/1396	4.20	4.39	3.98	4.00	4.20	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	3	2	5	4.20	592/1342	4.20	4.33	4.07	4.12	4.20	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	6	3	4.20	827/1459	4.20	4.31	4.16	4.17	4.20	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	8	2	4.20	1260/1480	4.20	4.57	4.68	4.65	4.20	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	1	2	5	2	3.80	1055/1450	3.80	4.32	4.09	4.10	3.80	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	1	0	0	1	7	4.44	839/1409	4.44	4.59	4.42	4.43	4.44	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1407	5.00	4.89	4.69	4.67	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	1	0	1	3	4	4.00	1002/1399	4.00	4.41	4.26	4.27	4.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	3	2	4	4.11	977/1400	4.11	4.58	4.27	4.28	4.11	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	6	1	1	1	0	0	2.00	1156/1179	2.00	3.68	3.96	4.02	2.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	0	1	4	3	3.89	810/1262	3.89	4.44	4.05	4.14	3.89	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	0	3	6	4.67	451/1259	4.67	4.65	4.29	4.34	4.67	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	332/1256	4.78	4.66	4.30	4.34	4.78	
4. Were special techniques successful	1	8	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 788	****	4.14	4.00	4.07	****	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: POLI 350 0101  
 Title POLICY-MAKING PROCESS  
 Instructor: MILLER, CHERYL  
 Enrollment: 30  
 Questionnaires: 19

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2006

Page 1185  
 JUN 13, 2006  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	2	0	0	0	2	7	8	4.35	729/1481	4.35	4.51	4.29	4.29	4.35	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	0	1	2	8	6	4.12	950/1481	4.12	4.34	4.23	4.23	4.12	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	0	0	1	3	3	10	4.29	710/1249	4.29	4.39	4.27	4.28	4.29	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	1	1	0	4	6	5	3.88	1108/1424	3.88	4.37	4.21	4.27	3.88	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	3	2	12	4.53	285/1396	4.53	4.39	3.98	4.00	4.53	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	3	0	0	2	8	4	4.14	649/1342	4.14	4.33	4.07	4.12	4.14	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	1	2	8	7	4.17	854/1459	4.17	4.31	4.16	4.17	4.17	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	18	5.00	1/1480	5.00	4.57	4.68	4.65	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	1	0	0	4	6	3	3.92	945/1450	3.92	4.32	4.09	4.10	3.92	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	1	5	11	4.59	670/1409	4.59	4.59	4.42	4.43	4.59	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	1	2	14	4.76	804/1407	4.76	4.89	4.69	4.67	4.76	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	3	4	10	4.41	671/1399	4.41	4.41	4.26	4.27	4.41	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	4	3	10	4.35	766/1400	4.35	4.58	4.27	4.28	4.35	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	1	3	0	9	4.31	537/1262	4.31	4.44	4.05	4.14	4.31	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	0	1	5	7	4.46	624/1259	4.46	4.65	4.29	4.34	4.46	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	0	0	2	2	9	4.54	554/1256	4.54	4.66	4.30	4.34	4.54	
4. Were special techniques successful	6	5	0	2	2	4	0	3.25	690/ 788	3.25	4.14	4.00	4.07	3.25	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 5	Required for Majors	1
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	B 10		Graduate 0
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	C 2	General	0
84-150	6	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad 19
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	1
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	15
			? 0		

Course-Section: POLI 352 0101  
 Title ADMINISTRATIVE LAW  
 Instructor: BARNER-BARRY, C  
 Enrollment: 29  
 Questionnaires: 19

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2006

Page 1186  
 JUN 13, 2006  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	0	0	3	5	10	4.39	698/1481	4.39	4.51	4.29	4.29	4.39	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	1	5	6	6	3.94	1070/1481	3.94	4.34	4.23	4.23	3.94	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	5	5	8	4.17	810/1249	4.17	4.39	4.27	4.28	4.17	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	13	0	0	2	0	3	4.20	807/1424	4.20	4.37	4.21	4.27	4.20	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	6	2	10	4.22	527/1396	4.22	4.39	3.98	4.00	4.22	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	10	0	0	1	1	6	4.63	222/1342	4.63	4.33	4.07	4.12	4.63	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	1	2	5	9	4.11	899/1459	4.11	4.31	4.16	4.17	4.11	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	3	15	4.83	797/1480	4.83	4.57	4.68	4.65	4.83	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	1	0	1	4	5	5	3.93	931/1450	3.93	4.32	4.09	4.10	3.93	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	0	3	14	4.82	304/1409	4.82	4.59	4.42	4.43	4.82	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	4	13	4.76	804/1407	4.76	4.89	4.69	4.67	4.76	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	1	0	1	8	7	4.18	901/1399	4.18	4.41	4.26	4.27	4.18	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	1	1	6	9	4.35	766/1400	4.35	4.58	4.27	4.28	4.35	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	14	1	1	0	0	1	2.67	****/1179	****	3.68	3.96	4.02	****	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	1	1	4	9	4.40	437/1262	4.40	4.44	4.05	4.14	4.40	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	1	0	0	5	9	4.40	680/1259	4.40	4.65	4.29	4.34	4.40	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	1	0	2	6	6	4.07	876/1256	4.07	4.66	4.30	4.34	4.07	
4. Were special techniques successful	5	13	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 788	****	4.14	4.00	4.07	****	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: POLI 400 0101  
 Title: QUAL RESEARCH METHODS  
 Instructor: FORESTIERE, CAR  
 Enrollment: 36  
 Questionnaires: 30

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2006

Page 1187  
 JUN 13, 2006  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	1	0	2	8	18	4.45	626/1481	4.44	4.51	4.29	4.45	4.45	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	4	7	18	4.48	545/1481	4.46	4.34	4.23	4.32	4.48	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	15	0	0	1	3	10	4.64	357/1249	4.65	4.39	4.27	4.44	4.64	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	3	0	0	0	1	4	22	4.78	201/1424	4.70	4.37	4.21	4.35	4.78	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	2	1	2	8	16	4.21	545/1396	3.98	4.39	3.98	4.09	4.21	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	1	1	1	25	4.79	121/1342	4.66	4.33	4.07	4.21	4.79	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	3	0	0	0	4	7	16	4.44	550/1459	4.45	4.31	4.16	4.25	4.44	
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	0	0	0	2	17	8	4.22	1238/1480	4.09	4.57	4.68	4.74	4.22	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	1	1	0	2	5	15	4.43	431/1450	4.39	4.32	4.09	4.28	4.43	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	2	4	22	4.71	483/1409	4.62	4.59	4.42	4.51	4.71	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	0	28	5.00	1/1407	4.96	4.89	4.69	4.79	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	3	3	21	4.67	376/1399	4.58	4.41	4.26	4.36	4.67	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	3	24	4.89	166/1400	4.69	4.58	4.27	4.38	4.89	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	9	1	1	2	3	10	4.18	503/1179	3.85	3.68	3.96	4.07	4.18	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	2	2	20	4.75	205/1262	4.51	4.44	4.05	4.33	4.75	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	0	0	0	0	23	5.00	1/1259	4.84	4.65	4.29	4.57	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	0	0	0	2	21	4.91	194/1256	4.77	4.66	4.30	4.60	4.91	
4. Were special techniques successful	8	6	0	0	0	2	14	4.88	81/ 788	4.44	4.14	4.00	4.26	4.88	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	29	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 246	****	****	4.20	4.45	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	29	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 249	****	****	4.11	3.87	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	29	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 242	****	****	4.40	4.45	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	29	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 240	****	****	4.20	4.43	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	29	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 217	****	****	4.04	3.86	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	29	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 68	****	5.00	4.49	4.68	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	29	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 69	****	5.00	4.53	4.64	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	29	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 63	****	5.00	4.44	4.49	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	29	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 69	****	5.00	4.35	4.53	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	29	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 68	****	5.00	3.92	4.10	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	29	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 59	****	****	4.30	4.93	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	29	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 51	****	****	4.00	4.56	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	29	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 36	****	****	4.60	4.91	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	29	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 41	****	****	4.26	4.72	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	29	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.42	4.83	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	29	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 55	****	****	4.55	4.86	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	29	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.75	5.00	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	29	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 51	****	****	4.65	4.71	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	29	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 34	****	****	4.83	5.00	****	

Course-Section: POLI 400 0101  
 Title: QUAL RESEARCH METHODS  
 Instructor: FORESTIERE, CAR  
 Enrollment: 36  
 Questionnaires: 30

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2006

Page 1187  
 JUN 13, 2006  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	16	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	27
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	9						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	2	C	2	General	0	Under-grad	30	Non-major	3
84-150	18	3.00-3.49	11	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	25				
				?	1						



Course-Section: POLI 400 0201  
 Title: QUAL RESEARCH METHODS  
 Instructor: FORESTIERE, CAR  
 Enrollment: 34  
 Questionnaires: 29

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2006

Page 1188  
 JUN 13, 2006  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	1	0	2	8	17	4.43	652/1481	4.44	4.51	4.29	4.45	4.43	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	1	4	5	18	4.43	632/1481	4.46	4.34	4.23	4.32	4.43	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	16	0	0	1	2	9	4.67	334/1249	4.65	4.39	4.27	4.44	4.67	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	1	0	0	3	4	20	4.63	318/1424	4.70	4.37	4.21	4.35	4.63	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	3	2	6	5	12	3.75	918/1396	3.98	4.39	3.98	4.09	3.75	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	3	7	18	4.54	283/1342	4.66	4.33	4.07	4.21	4.54	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	2	1	7	18	4.46	520/1459	4.45	4.31	4.16	4.25	4.46	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	1	4	18	5	3.96	1377/1480	4.09	4.57	4.68	4.74	3.96	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	12	0	1	0	1	5	10	4.35	525/1450	4.39	4.32	4.09	4.28	4.35	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	1	0	1	6	17	4.52	739/1409	4.62	4.59	4.42	4.51	4.52	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	0	2	24	4.92	400/1407	4.96	4.89	4.69	4.79	4.92	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	1	0	1	7	17	4.50	567/1399	4.58	4.41	4.26	4.36	4.50	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	4	5	17	4.50	591/1400	4.69	4.58	4.27	4.38	4.50	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	10	3	2	1	2	7	3.53	883/1179	3.85	3.68	3.96	4.07	3.53	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	5	6	11	4.27	556/1262	4.51	4.44	4.05	4.33	4.27	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	0	0	2	3	17	4.68	432/1259	4.84	4.65	4.29	4.57	4.68	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	0	0	3	2	17	4.64	486/1256	4.77	4.66	4.30	4.60	4.64	
4. Were special techniques successful	7	4	0	3	3	3	9	4.00	394/ 788	4.44	4.14	4.00	4.26	4.00	
Laboratory															
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	27	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 249	****	****	4.11	3.87	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	27	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 242	****	****	4.40	4.45	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	27	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 240	****	****	4.20	4.43	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	27	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 217	****	****	4.04	3.86	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	27	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 68	****	5.00	4.49	4.68	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	27	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 69	****	5.00	4.53	4.64	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	27	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 63	****	5.00	4.44	4.49	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	27	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 69	****	5.00	4.35	4.53	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	27	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 68	****	5.00	3.92	4.10	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	27	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 59	****	****	4.30	4.93	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	27	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 51	****	****	4.00	4.56	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	27	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 36	****	****	4.60	4.91	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	27	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 41	****	****	4.26	4.72	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	27	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.42	4.83	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	27	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 55	****	****	4.55	4.86	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	27	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.75	5.00	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	27	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 51	****	****	4.65	4.71	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	27	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 34	****	****	4.83	5.00	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	27	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 24	****	****	4.82	5.00	****	

Course-Section: POLI 400 0201  
 Title: QUAL RESEARCH METHODS  
 Instructor: FORESTIERE, CAR  
 Enrollment: 34  
 Questionnaires: 29

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2006

Page 1188  
 JUN 13, 2006  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	15	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	24
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	8						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	3	C	1	General	0	Under-grad	29	Non-major	5
84-150	14	3.00-3.49	9	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	21				
				?	0						

Course-Section: POLI 405 0101  
 Title SEMINAR IN POLITICAL S  
 Instructor: BARNER-BARRY, C  
 Enrollment: 15  
 Questionnaires: 14

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2006

Page 1189  
 JUN 13, 2006  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	1	0	0	3	10	4.50	549/1481	4.50	4.51	4.29	4.45	4.50	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	2	9	4.36	715/1481	4.36	4.34	4.23	4.32	4.36	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	0	1	2	8	4.64	369/1249	4.64	4.39	4.27	4.44	4.64	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	0	1	2	8	4.64	310/1424	4.64	4.37	4.21	4.35	4.64	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	3	11	4.79	121/1396	4.79	4.39	3.98	4.09	4.79	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	3	0	0	1	2	8	4.64	214/1342	4.64	4.33	4.07	4.21	4.64	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	0	1	5	7	4.21	809/1459	4.21	4.31	4.16	4.25	4.21	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	14	5.00	1/1480	5.00	4.57	4.68	4.74	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	1	0	0	0	3	6	4.67	217/1450	4.67	4.32	4.09	4.28	4.67	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	5	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	383/1409	4.78	4.59	4.42	4.51	4.78	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	500/1407	4.91	4.89	4.69	4.79	4.91	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	0	0	1	2	7	4.60	459/1399	4.60	4.41	4.26	4.36	4.60	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	1	0	1	8	4.60	492/1400	4.60	4.58	4.27	4.38	4.60	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	6	6	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1179	****	3.68	3.96	4.07	****	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/1262	5.00	4.44	4.05	4.33	5.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/1259	5.00	4.65	4.29	4.57	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/1256	5.00	4.66	4.30	4.60	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	2	3	1	0	0	0	8	4.56	164/ 788	4.56	4.14	4.00	4.26	4.56	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: POLI 419B 0101  
 Title .  
 Instructor: VAUGHAN, GEOFFR  
 Enrollment: 21  
 Questionnaires: 16

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2006

Page 1190  
 JUN 13, 2006  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	2	13	4.75	292/1481	4.75	4.51	4.29	4.45	4.75	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	5	10	4.56	446/1481	4.56	4.34	4.23	4.32	4.56	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	12	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	245/1249	4.75	4.39	4.27	4.44	4.75	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	4	10	4.50	437/1424	4.50	4.37	4.21	4.35	4.50	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	14	4.88	90/1396	4.88	4.39	3.98	4.09	4.88	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	1	6	7	4.43	384/1342	4.43	4.33	4.07	4.21	4.43	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	1	0	2	2	10	4.33	695/1459	4.33	4.31	4.16	4.25	4.33	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	15	4.94	491/1480	4.94	4.57	4.68	4.74	4.94	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	1	0	0	4	8	4.38	494/1450	4.38	4.32	4.09	4.28	4.38	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	3	12	4.80	334/1409	4.80	4.59	4.42	4.51	4.80	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	1	14	4.93	350/1407	4.93	4.89	4.69	4.79	4.93	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	0	5	9	4.64	404/1399	4.64	4.41	4.26	4.36	4.64	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	2	13	4.87	187/1400	4.87	4.58	4.27	4.38	4.87	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	9	1	0	0	1	2	3.75	793/1179	3.75	3.68	3.96	4.07	3.75	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	1	1	2	10	4.50	345/1262	4.50	4.44	4.05	4.33	4.50	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	2	2	10	4.57	532/1259	4.57	4.65	4.29	4.57	4.57	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	0	2	12	4.86	256/1256	4.86	4.66	4.30	4.60	4.86	
4. Were special techniques successful	3	10	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/ 788	****	4.14	4.00	4.26	****	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: POLI 428 0101  
 Title POLITICS INTERNSHIP  
 Instructor: SCHALLER, THOMA  
 Enrollment: 10  
 Questionnaires: 1

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2006

Page 1191  
 JUN 13, 2006  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1481	5.00	4.51	4.29	4.45	5.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1481	5.00	4.34	4.23	4.32	5.00	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1249	5.00	4.39	4.27	4.44	5.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1424	5.00	4.37	4.21	4.35	5.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	707/1396	4.00	4.39	3.98	4.09	4.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	755/1342	4.00	4.33	4.07	4.21	4.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	961/1459	4.00	4.31	4.16	4.25	4.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1480	5.00	4.57	4.68	4.74	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1450	5.00	4.32	4.09	4.28	5.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1409	5.00	4.59	4.42	4.51	5.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1407	5.00	4.89	4.69	4.79	5.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1400	5.00	4.58	4.27	4.38	5.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1179	5.00	3.68	3.96	4.07	5.00	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: POLI 432 0101  
 Title CIVIL RIGHTS  
 Instructor: L'ANOUE, GEORGE  
 Enrollment: 35  
 Questionnaires: 27

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2006

Page 1192  
 JUN 13, 2006  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	2	6	19	4.63	439/1481	4.63	4.51	4.29	4.45	4.63	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	2	1	4	20	4.56	458/1481	4.56	4.34	4.23	4.32	4.56	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	3	22	4.70	287/1249	4.70	4.39	4.27	4.44	4.70	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	4	0	0	3	2	18	4.65	295/1424	4.65	4.37	4.21	4.35	4.65	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	5	21	4.74	141/1396	4.74	4.39	3.98	4.09	4.74	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	3	1	0	0	6	17	4.58	251/1342	4.58	4.33	4.07	4.21	4.58	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	3	5	19	4.59	355/1459	4.59	4.31	4.16	4.25	4.59	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	1	0	0	0	0	26	5.00	1/1480	5.00	4.57	4.68	4.74	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	2	6	15	4.57	289/1450	4.57	4.32	4.09	4.28	4.57	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	3	24	4.89	217/1409	4.89	4.59	4.42	4.51	4.89	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	3	24	4.89	545/1407	4.89	4.89	4.69	4.79	4.89	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	1	1	0	7	18	4.48	590/1399	4.48	4.41	4.26	4.36	4.48	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	1	4	21	4.77	299/1400	4.77	4.58	4.27	4.38	4.77	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	7	0	0	6	4	8	4.11	549/1179	4.11	3.68	3.96	4.07	4.11	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	1	4	3	14	4.36	477/1262	4.36	4.44	4.05	4.33	4.36	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	0	0	3	19	4.86	248/1259	4.86	4.65	4.29	4.57	4.86	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	0	1	2	19	4.82	288/1256	4.82	4.66	4.30	4.60	4.82	
4. Were special techniques successful	5	2	0	0	0	4	16	4.80	89/ 788	4.80	4.14	4.00	4.26	4.80	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 5	Required for Majors	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	B 14	Graduate	1
56-83	5	2.00-2.99	C 5	General	1
84-150	12	3.00-3.49	D 0	Under-grad	26
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	1
			P 0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	
			I 0	Other	22
			? 1		

Course-Section: POLI 438 0101  
 Title LEGAL INTERNSHIP  
 Instructor: DAVIS, JEFFREY  
 Enrollment: 11  
 Questionnaires: 9

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2006

Page 1193  
 JUN 13, 2006  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	1	0	0	2	6	4.33	749/1481	4.33	4.51	4.29	4.45	4.33	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	2	5	4.22	854/1481	4.22	4.34	4.23	4.32	4.22	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	5	0	1	0	0	3	4.25	742/1249	4.25	4.39	4.27	4.44	4.25	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	0	6	4.22	773/1424	4.22	4.37	4.21	4.35	4.22	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	0	7	4.56	269/1396	4.56	4.39	3.98	4.09	4.56	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	2	5	4.33	474/1342	4.33	4.33	4.07	4.21	4.33	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	1	2	5	4.22	800/1459	4.22	4.31	4.16	4.25	4.22	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	1	0	0	1	7	4.44	1086/1480	4.44	4.57	4.68	4.74	4.44	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	164/1450	4.75	4.32	4.09	4.28	4.75	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	0	8	4.78	383/1409	4.78	4.59	4.42	4.51	4.78	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	0	8	4.78	785/1407	4.78	4.89	4.69	4.79	4.78	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	0	8	4.78	245/1399	4.78	4.41	4.26	4.36	4.78	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	0	0	8	4.67	421/1400	4.67	4.58	4.27	4.38	4.67	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	1	1	0	1	5	4.00	590/1179	4.00	3.68	3.96	4.07	4.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	295/1262	4.60	4.44	4.05	4.33	4.60	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	509/1259	4.60	4.65	4.29	4.57	4.60	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	516/1256	4.60	4.66	4.30	4.60	4.60	
4. Were special techniques successful	4	2	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	254/ 788	4.33	4.14	4.00	4.26	4.33	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 59	****	****	4.30	4.93	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 51	****	****	4.00	4.56	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 36	****	****	4.60	4.91	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 41	****	****	4.26	4.72	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.42	4.83	****	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: POLI 439 0101  
 Title SEL TOPICS PUBLIC LAW  
 Instructor: Stacey, Simon  
 Enrollment: 22  
 Questionnaires: 13

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2006

Page 1194  
 JUN 13, 2006  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	3	10	4.77	280/1481	4.77	4.51	4.29	4.45	4.77	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	4	6	4.23	843/1481	4.23	4.34	4.23	4.32	4.23	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	7	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	184/1249	4.83	4.39	4.27	4.44	4.83	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	3	9	4.75	217/1424	4.75	4.37	4.21	4.35	4.75	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	11	4.85	99/1396	4.85	4.39	3.98	4.09	4.85	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	2	1	9	4.58	251/1342	4.58	4.33	4.07	4.21	4.58	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	2	2	3	6	4.00	961/1459	4.00	4.31	4.16	4.25	4.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	9	4	4.31	1178/1480	4.31	4.57	4.68	4.74	4.31	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	0	4	6	4.60	259/1450	4.60	4.32	4.09	4.28	4.60	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	1	3	8	4.58	670/1409	4.58	4.59	4.42	4.51	4.58	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	0	12	4.85	636/1407	4.85	4.89	4.69	4.79	4.85	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	1	11	4.77	256/1399	4.77	4.41	4.26	4.36	4.77	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	11	4.85	208/1400	4.85	4.58	4.27	4.38	4.85	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	8	0	2	0	0	2	3.50	894/1179	3.50	3.68	3.96	4.07	3.50	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	126/1262	4.90	4.44	4.05	4.33	4.90	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	211/1259	4.90	4.65	4.29	4.57	4.90	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1256	5.00	4.66	4.30	4.60	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	3	5	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	218/ 788	4.40	4.14	4.00	4.26	4.40	

Frequency Distribution

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



Course-Section: POLI 450 8020  
 Title SEM PUB ADMIN AND POLI  
 Instructor: MUNRO, JOHN  
 Enrollment: 7  
 Questionnaires: 2

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2006

Page 1195  
 JUN 13, 2006  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	1358/1481	3.50	4.51	4.29	4.45	3.50	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	1320/1481	3.50	4.34	4.23	4.32	3.50	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	893/1249	4.00	4.39	4.27	4.44	4.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	1275/1424	3.50	4.37	4.21	4.35	3.50	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	297/1396	4.50	4.39	3.98	4.09	4.50	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	755/1342	4.00	4.33	4.07	4.21	4.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	1256/1459	3.50	4.31	4.16	4.25	3.50	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	1044/1480	4.50	4.57	4.68	4.74	4.50	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	1223/1450	3.50	4.32	4.09	4.28	3.50	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	1356/1409	3.00	4.59	4.42	4.51	3.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1407	5.00	4.89	4.69	4.79	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	1325/1399	3.00	4.41	4.26	4.36	3.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	1230/1400	3.50	4.58	4.27	4.38	3.50	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	1156/1179	2.00	3.68	3.96	4.07	2.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	345/1262	4.50	4.44	4.05	4.33	4.50	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1259	5.00	4.65	4.29	4.57	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1256	5.00	4.66	4.30	4.60	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	394/ 788	4.00	4.14	4.00	4.26	4.00	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 68	5.00	5.00	4.49	4.68	5.00	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 69	5.00	5.00	4.53	4.64	5.00	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 63	5.00	5.00	4.44	4.49	5.00	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 69	5.00	5.00	4.35	4.53	5.00	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 68	5.00	5.00	3.92	4.10	5.00	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: POLI 458 0101  
 Title ADMIN INTERNSHIP  
 Instructor: JOHNSON, ARTHUR  
 Enrollment: 6  
 Questionnaires: 6

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2006

Page 1196  
 JUN 13, 2006  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	395/1481	4.67	4.51	4.29	4.45	4.67	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	324/1481	4.67	4.34	4.23	4.32	4.67	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	4	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	498/1249	4.50	4.39	4.27	4.44	4.50	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	2	3	4.33	645/1424	4.33	4.37	4.21	4.35	4.33	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	193/1396	4.67	4.39	3.98	4.09	4.67	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	238/1342	4.60	4.33	4.07	4.21	4.60	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	0	1	4	4.33	695/1459	4.33	4.31	4.16	4.25	4.33	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	951/1480	4.67	4.57	4.68	4.74	4.67	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1450	5.00	4.32	4.09	4.28	5.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	3	3	4.50	762/1409	4.50	4.59	4.42	4.51	4.50	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	963/1407	4.67	4.89	4.69	4.79	4.67	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	3	2	4.17	910/1399	4.17	4.41	4.26	4.36	4.17	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	421/1400	4.67	4.58	4.27	4.38	4.67	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	3	1	0	0	2	0	3.00	1041/1179	3.00	3.68	3.96	4.07	3.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1262	5.00	4.44	4.05	4.33	5.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1259	5.00	4.65	4.29	4.57	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1256	5.00	4.66	4.30	4.60	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	1	2	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	394/ 788	4.00	4.14	4.00	4.26	4.00	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: POLI 480 0101  
 Title INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZA  
 Instructor: HODY, CYNTHIA  
 Enrollment: 22  
 Questionnaires: 3

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2006

Page 1197  
 JUN 13, 2006  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1481	5.00	4.51	4.29	4.45	5.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	324/1481	4.67	4.34	4.23	4.32	4.67	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	893/1249	4.00	4.39	4.27	4.44	4.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1424	5.00	4.37	4.21	4.35	5.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	193/1396	4.67	4.39	3.98	4.09	4.67	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	474/1342	4.33	4.33	4.07	4.21	4.33	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	695/1459	4.33	4.31	4.16	4.25	4.33	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	1158/1480	4.33	4.57	4.68	4.74	4.33	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	546/1450	4.33	4.32	4.09	4.28	4.33	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	559/1409	4.67	4.59	4.42	4.51	4.67	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1407	5.00	4.89	4.69	4.79	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	753/1399	4.33	4.41	4.26	4.36	4.33	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	421/1400	4.67	4.58	4.27	4.38	4.67	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	345/1262	4.50	4.44	4.05	4.33	4.50	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1259	5.00	4.65	4.29	4.57	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1256	5.00	4.66	4.30	4.60	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	176/ 788	4.50	4.14	4.00	4.26	4.50	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 68	5.00	5.00	4.49	4.68	5.00	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 69	5.00	5.00	4.53	4.64	5.00	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 63	5.00	5.00	4.44	4.49	5.00	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 69	5.00	5.00	4.35	4.53	5.00	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 68	5.00	5.00	3.92	4.10	5.00	

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

Course-Section: POLI 485 0101  
 Title DYN OF THE ARAB-ISRAEL  
 Instructor: FREEDMAN, ROBER  
 Enrollment: 20  
 Questionnaires: 20

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2006

Page 1198  
 JUN 13, 2006  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	0	0	2	1	16	4.74	316/1481	4.74	4.51	4.29	4.45	4.74	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	5	13	4.63	361/1481	4.63	4.34	4.23	4.32	4.63	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	4	14	4.68	310/1249	4.68	4.39	4.27	4.44	4.68	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	10	0	0	1	4	4	4.33	645/1424	4.33	4.37	4.21	4.35	4.33	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	0	4	1	12	4.28	484/1396	4.28	4.39	3.98	4.09	4.28	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	11	0	1	1	2	3	4.00	755/1342	4.00	4.33	4.07	4.21	4.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	3	0	0	0	4	4	9	4.29	740/1459	4.29	4.31	4.16	4.25	4.29	
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	0	0	0	0	5	12	4.71	921/1480	4.71	4.57	4.68	4.74	4.71	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	2	6	10	4.44	417/1450	4.44	4.32	4.09	4.28	4.44	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	1	2	16	4.79	367/1409	4.79	4.59	4.42	4.51	4.79	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	1	0	18	4.89	522/1407	4.89	4.89	4.69	4.79	4.89	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	2	3	14	4.63	417/1399	4.63	4.41	4.26	4.36	4.63	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	2	16	4.79	274/1400	4.79	4.58	4.27	4.38	4.79	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	14	1	1	0	1	2	3.40	945/1179	3.40	3.68	3.96	4.07	3.40	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	2	0	2	4	5	3.77	882/1262	3.77	4.44	4.05	4.33	3.77	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	0	0	1	5	7	4.46	624/1259	4.46	4.65	4.29	4.57	4.46	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	0	1	1	1	10	4.54	554/1256	4.54	4.66	4.30	4.60	4.54	
4. Were special techniques successful	7	11	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/ 788	****	4.14	4.00	4.26	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	1	0.00-0.99 0	A 11	Required for Majors	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99 0	B 6		Graduate 1
56-83	2	2.00-2.99 1	C 1	General	4
84-150	6	3.00-3.49 3	D 0		Under-grad 19
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00 8	F 0	Electives	2
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	12
			? 1		

Course-Section: POLI 486 0101  
 Title MIDDLE EAST INTL RELAT  
 Instructor: MIKHAIL, NABIL  
 Enrollment: 55  
 Questionnaires: 43

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2006

Page 1199  
 JUN 13, 2006  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	0	0	3	7	32	4.69	362/1481	4.69	4.51	4.29	4.45	4.69	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	2	0	9	31	4.64	349/1481	4.64	4.34	4.23	4.32	4.64	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	2	9	31	4.69	298/1249	4.69	4.39	4.27	4.44	4.69	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	2	2	0	1	5	32	4.63	318/1424	4.63	4.37	4.21	4.35	4.63	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	0	1	8	31	4.66	201/1396	4.66	4.39	3.98	4.09	4.66	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	7	1	0	1	8	25	4.60	238/1342	4.60	4.33	4.07	4.21	4.60	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	1	1	8	31	4.60	355/1459	4.60	4.31	4.16	4.25	4.60	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	6	36	4.86	770/1480	4.86	4.57	4.68	4.74	4.86	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	10	0	1	0	3	11	18	4.36	515/1450	4.36	4.32	4.09	4.28	4.36	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	1	0	2	7	32	4.64	588/1409	4.64	4.59	4.42	4.51	4.64	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	42	5.00	1/1407	5.00	4.89	4.69	4.79	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	1	1	7	32	4.71	322/1399	4.71	4.41	4.26	4.36	4.71	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	3	38	4.88	166/1400	4.88	4.58	4.27	4.38	4.88	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	15	0	1	2	2	20	4.64	187/1179	4.64	3.68	3.96	4.07	4.64	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	14	0	1	1	1	5	21	4.52	340/1262	4.52	4.44	4.05	4.33	4.52	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	14	0	0	0	0	4	25	4.86	248/1259	4.86	4.65	4.29	4.57	4.86	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	14	0	0	0	1	5	23	4.76	357/1256	4.76	4.66	4.30	4.60	4.76	
4. Were special techniques successful	14	11	2	0	2	3	11	4.17	335/ 788	4.17	4.14	4.00	4.26	4.17	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	42	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 246	****	****	4.20	4.45	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	42	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 249	****	****	4.11	3.87	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	42	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 242	****	****	4.40	4.45	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	42	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 240	****	****	4.20	4.43	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	42	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 217	****	****	4.04	3.86	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	42	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 68	****	5.00	4.49	4.68	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	42	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 69	****	5.00	4.53	4.64	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	42	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 63	****	5.00	4.44	4.49	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	42	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 69	****	5.00	4.35	4.53	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	42	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 68	****	5.00	3.92	4.10	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	42	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 59	****	****	4.30	4.93	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	42	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 51	****	****	4.00	4.56	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	42	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 36	****	****	4.60	4.91	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	42	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 41	****	****	4.26	4.72	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	42	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.42	4.83	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	42	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 55	****	****	4.55	4.86	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	42	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.75	5.00	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	42	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 51	****	****	4.65	4.71	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	42	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 34	****	****	4.83	5.00	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	42	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 24	****	****	4.82	5.00	****	

Course-Section: POLI 486 0101  
 Title MIDDLE EAST INTL RELAT  
 Instructor: MIKHAIL, NABIL  
 Enrollment: 55  
 Questionnaires: 43

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2006

Page 1199  
 JUN 13, 2006  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	1	A	25	Required for Majors	2	Graduate	0	Major	29
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	12						
56-83	7	2.00-2.99	6	C	1	General	5	Under-grad	43	Non-major	14
84-150	16	3.00-3.49	13	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	10	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	29				
				?	1						

Course-Section: POLI 487 0101  
 Title INTERNATIONAL POLI ECO  
 Instructor: HODY, CYNTHIA  
 Enrollment: 22  
 Questionnaires: 18

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2006

Page 1200  
 JUN 13, 2006  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	1	17	4.94	95/1481	4.94	4.51	4.29	4.45	4.94	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	15	4.83	162/1481	4.83	4.34	4.23	4.32	4.83	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	11	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	172/1249	4.86	4.39	4.27	4.44	4.86	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	2	15	4.78	201/1424	4.78	4.37	4.21	4.35	4.78	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	1	16	4.83	102/1396	4.83	4.39	3.98	4.09	4.83	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	17	4.94	52/1342	4.94	4.33	4.07	4.21	4.94	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	2	15	4.78	182/1459	4.78	4.31	4.16	4.25	4.78	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	2	5	11	4.50	1044/1480	4.50	4.57	4.68	4.74	4.50	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	1	0	0	0	3	10	4.77	159/1450	4.77	4.32	4.09	4.28	4.77	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	2	2	14	4.67	559/1409	4.67	4.59	4.42	4.51	4.67	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	17	4.94	300/1407	4.94	4.89	4.69	4.79	4.94	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	2	2	14	4.67	376/1399	4.67	4.41	4.26	4.36	4.67	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	1	16	4.83	218/1400	4.83	4.58	4.27	4.38	4.83	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	14	1	0	2	0	1	3.00	****/1179	****	3.68	3.96	4.07	****	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	1	2	12	4.73	220/1262	4.73	4.44	4.05	4.33	4.73	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	1	0	0	14	4.80	304/1259	4.80	4.65	4.29	4.57	4.80	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	1	0	14	4.87	248/1256	4.87	4.66	4.30	4.60	4.87	
4. Were special techniques successful	3	8	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	117/ 788	4.71	4.14	4.00	4.26	4.71	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 68	****	5.00	4.49	4.68	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 69	****	5.00	4.53	4.64	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 63	****	5.00	4.44	4.49	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 69	****	5.00	4.35	4.53	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 68	****	5.00	3.92	4.10	****	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: POLI 646 0101  
 Title THE POLITICS OF POVERT  
 Instructor: MILLER, CHERYL  
 Enrollment: 11  
 Questionnaires: 11

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2006

Page 1201  
 JUN 13, 2006  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	3	8	4.73	328/1481	4.73	4.51	4.29	4.28	4.73	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	2	7	4.45	589/1481	4.45	4.34	4.23	4.11	4.45	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	6	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	203/1249	4.80	4.39	4.27	4.24	4.80	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	1	1	0	8	4.50	437/1424	4.50	4.37	4.21	4.16	4.50	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	9	4.82	108/1396	4.82	4.39	3.98	4.00	4.82	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	2	8	4.64	214/1342	4.64	4.33	4.07	4.18	4.64	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	1	0	5	4	4.20	827/1459	4.20	4.31	4.16	4.01	4.20	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1480	5.00	4.57	4.68	4.74	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	4	7	4.64	238/1450	4.64	4.32	4.09	3.96	4.64	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	1	9	4.73	466/1409	4.73	4.59	4.42	4.36	4.73	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1407	5.00	4.89	4.69	4.73	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	2	8	4.64	417/1399	4.64	4.41	4.26	4.16	4.64	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	9	4.82	239/1400	4.82	4.58	4.27	4.17	4.82	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	4	0	0	3	1	3	4.00	590/1179	4.00	3.68	3.96	3.81	4.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1262	5.00	4.44	4.05	4.07	5.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	336/1259	4.78	4.65	4.29	4.30	4.78	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	1	0	2	6	4.44	636/1256	4.44	4.66	4.30	4.33	4.44	
4. Were special techniques successful	2	0	0	1	3	1	4	3.89	492/ 788	3.89	4.14	4.00	3.97	3.89	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 68	****	5.00	4.49	4.23	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 69	****	5.00	4.53	4.46	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 63	****	5.00	4.44	4.44	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 69	****	5.00	4.35	4.16	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 68	****	5.00	3.92	3.71	****	

Frequency Distribution

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



Course-Section: POLI 652 0101  
 Title POLITICS OF HEALTH  
 Instructor: MILLER, NANCY A  
 Enrollment: 10  
 Questionnaires: 9

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2006

Page 1202  
 JUN 13, 2006  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	0	1	0	2	5	4.38	708/1481	4.38	4.51	4.29	4.28	4.38	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	2	5	4.50	517/1481	4.50	4.34	4.23	4.11	4.50	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	1	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	172/1249	4.86	4.39	4.27	4.24	4.86	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	148/1424	4.88	4.37	4.21	4.16	4.88	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	3	4	4.38	403/1396	4.38	4.39	3.98	4.00	4.38	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	3	5	4.63	222/1342	4.63	4.33	4.07	4.18	4.63	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	1	1	6	4.63	321/1459	4.63	4.31	4.16	4.01	4.63	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	6	2	4.25	1215/1480	4.25	4.57	4.68	4.74	4.25	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	4	4	4.50	334/1450	4.50	4.32	4.09	3.96	4.50	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	1	0	7	4.75	417/1409	4.75	4.59	4.42	4.36	4.75	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	568/1407	4.88	4.89	4.69	4.73	4.88	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	267/1399	4.75	4.41	4.26	4.16	4.75	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	0	1	6	4.50	591/1400	4.50	4.58	4.27	4.17	4.50	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	2	0	0	2	2	2	4.00	590/1179	4.00	3.68	3.96	3.81	4.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	154/1262	4.83	4.44	4.05	4.07	4.83	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	451/1259	4.67	4.65	4.29	4.30	4.67	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	457/1256	4.67	4.66	4.30	4.33	4.67	
4. Were special techniques successful	3	2	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	394/ 788	4.00	4.14	4.00	3.97	4.00	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 68	****	5.00	4.49	4.23	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 69	****	5.00	4.53	4.46	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 63	****	5.00	4.44	4.44	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 69	****	5.00	4.35	4.16	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 68	****	5.00	3.92	3.71	****	

Frequency Distribution

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