

Course-Section: AGNG 100 1
 Title Revolutionizing Aging
 Instructor: Ronch, Judah L.
 Enrollment: 25
 Questionnaires: 24

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 22
 JUN 28, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	0	0	1	4	18	4.74	331/1447	4.74	4.51	4.31	4.18	4.74
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	2	3	18	4.70	315/1447	4.70	4.53	4.27	4.30	4.70
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	3	0	0	0	5	14	4.74	303/1241	4.74	4.55	4.33	4.25	4.74
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	8	14	4.57	425/1402	4.57	4.32	4.24	4.15	4.57
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	0	1	5	16	4.52	332/1358	4.52	4.44	4.11	4.03	4.52
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	2	5	16	4.61	292/1316	4.61	4.41	4.14	3.99	4.61
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	0	7	16	4.70	256/1427	4.70	4.34	4.19	4.24	4.70
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	2	21	4.91	436/1447	4.91	4.80	4.69	4.68	4.91
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	7	0	1	0	0	5	11	4.47	374/1434	4.47	4.23	4.10	4.10	4.47
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	0	4	17	4.81	353/1387	4.81	4.66	4.46	4.46	4.81
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	0	0	21	5.00	1/1387	5.00	4.85	4.73	4.71	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	0	0	0	2	18	4.90	136/1386	4.90	4.60	4.32	4.32	4.90
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	3	18	4.86	216/1380	4.86	4.53	4.32	4.31	4.86
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	0	0	0	0	4	17	4.81	100/1193	4.81	4.43	4.02	3.99	4.81
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	0	3	13	4.81	175/1172	4.81	4.53	4.15	3.95	4.81
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	0	0	1	7	8	4.44	612/1182	4.44	4.59	4.35	4.18	4.44
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	0	0	0	4	12	4.75	390/1170	4.75	4.56	4.38	4.17	4.75
4. Were special techniques successful	8	1	0	1	3	3	8	4.20	366/ 800	4.20	4.23	4.06	3.95	4.20
Laboratory														
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	23	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 192	****	5.00	4.34	4.31	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	23	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 186	****	5.00	4.48	4.46	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	1	A	11	Required for Majors	4	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	6						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	1	C	0	General	6	Under-grad	24	Non-major	23
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F	0	Electives	7	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	1				
				?	1						

Course-Section: AGNG 200 1
 Title Agng People, Pol & Mng
 Instructor: Majeski, Robin A
 Enrollment: 28
 Questionnaires: 21

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 23
 JUN 28, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	2	3	4	12	4.24	889/1447	4.07	4.51	4.31	4.31	4.24
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	3	5	12	4.33	766/1447	4.18	4.53	4.27	4.23	4.33
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	3	7	10	4.24	798/1241	4.19	4.55	4.33	4.35	4.24
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	2	2	2	4	11	3.95	1026/1402	3.83	4.32	4.24	4.24	3.95
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	4	4	12	4.29	581/1358	4.04	4.44	4.11	4.12	4.29
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	3	3	4	11	4.10	763/1316	3.94	4.41	4.14	4.08	4.10
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	3	5	3	10	3.95	1024/1427	3.75	4.34	4.19	4.14	3.95
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	2	19	4.90	485/1447	4.62	4.80	4.69	4.70	4.90
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	7	1	1	0	2	8	2	3.77	1081/1434	3.54	4.23	4.10	3.97	3.77
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	0	2	1	2	12	4.41	891/1387	4.29	4.66	4.46	4.42	4.41
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	5	0	0	0	0	1	15	4.94	369/1387	4.69	4.85	4.73	4.71	4.94
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	1	1	1	4	10	4.24	895/1386	4.20	4.60	4.32	4.24	4.24
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	1	1	1	3	11	4.29	849/1380	4.22	4.53	4.32	4.30	4.29
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	5	0	1	1	2	1	11	4.25	478/1193	4.09	4.43	4.02	4.04	4.25
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	1	2	2	7	4.25	580/1172	3.96	4.53	4.15	4.12	4.25
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	9	0	0	1	2	1	8	4.33	691/1182	4.28	4.59	4.35	4.30	4.33
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	0	1	2	1	8	4.33	710/1170	4.31	4.56	4.38	4.32	4.33
4. Were special techniques successful	9	1	1	0	3	1	6	4.00	423/ 800	3.80	4.23	4.06	4.01	4.00
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	17	3	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 189	****	5.00	4.34	4.47	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	18	0	0	0	1	2	0	3.67	****/ 192	****	5.00	4.34	4.38	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	18	2	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 186	****	5.00	4.48	4.57	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	18	2	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 187	****	5.00	4.33	4.46	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	20	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 168	****	5.00	4.20	4.15	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	19	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 66	****	5.00	4.58	4.43	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	19	0	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/ 62	****	5.00	4.56	4.28	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	19	0	1	1	0	0	0	1.50	****/ 58	****	5.00	4.41	3.79	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	2	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 65	****	5.00	4.42	4.36	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	19	0	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/ 64	****	5.00	4.09	3.70	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	19	0	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/ 38	****	5.00	4.49	2.25	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	19	0	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/ 36	****	5.00	4.25	3.25	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	19	0	0	2	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 28	****	5.00	4.52	****	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	19	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 30	****	5.00	4.30	****	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	19	0	0	2	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 27	****	5.00	4.43	****	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 31	****	5.00	4.72	****	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	19	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/ 21	****	5.00	4.57	****	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	19	0	0	2	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 31	****	5.00	4.64	****	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	19	0	0	2	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 20	****	5.00	4.60	****	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	19	0	2	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 15	****	5.00	4.61	****	****

Course-Section: AGNG 200 1
 Title Agng People, Pol & Mng
 Instructor: Majeski,Robin A
 Enrollment: 28
 Questionnaires: 21

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 23
 JUN 28, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: AGNG 200 2
 Title Agng People, Pol & Mng
 Instructor: Majeski, Robin A
 Enrollment: 50
 Questionnaires: 33

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 24
 JUN 28, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	3	0	1	2	6	11	10	3.90	1159/1447	4.07	4.51	4.31	4.31	3.90
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	3	0	1	1	6	10	12	4.03	1035/1447	4.18	4.53	4.27	4.23	4.03
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	4	0	1	2	3	9	14	4.14	861/1241	4.19	4.55	4.33	4.35	4.14
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	3	2	3	0	9	6	10	3.71	1183/1402	3.83	4.32	4.24	4.24	3.71
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	3	1	4	0	6	7	12	3.79	994/1358	4.04	4.44	4.11	4.12	3.79
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	3	1	2	3	4	10	10	3.79	973/1316	3.94	4.41	4.14	4.08	3.79
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	3	1	3	2	8	8	8	3.55	1243/1427	3.75	4.34	4.19	4.14	3.55
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	1	0	0	2	15	12	4.34	1195/1447	4.62	4.80	4.69	4.70	4.34
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	14	0	1	1	8	9	0	3.32	1297/1434	3.54	4.23	4.10	3.97	3.32
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	1	0	4	12	12	4.17	1098/1387	4.29	4.66	4.46	4.42	4.17
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	2	2	6	19	4.45	1179/1387	4.69	4.85	4.73	4.71	4.45
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	1	1	4	9	14	4.17	945/1386	4.20	4.60	4.32	4.24	4.17
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	5	1	1	1	4	8	13	4.15	971/1380	4.22	4.53	4.32	4.30	4.15
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	5	1	1	0	9	7	10	3.93	737/1193	4.09	4.43	4.02	4.04	3.93
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	15	0	2	1	5	3	7	3.67	925/1172	3.96	4.53	4.15	4.12	3.67
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	15	0	1	0	3	4	10	4.22	750/1182	4.28	4.59	4.35	4.30	4.22
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	15	0	1	0	2	5	10	4.28	751/1170	4.31	4.56	4.38	4.32	4.28
4. Were special techniques successful	15	3	1	2	2	7	3	3.60	630/ 800	3.80	4.23	4.06	4.01	3.60
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	31	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 189	****	5.00	4.34	4.47	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	31	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 192	****	5.00	4.34	4.38	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	31	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 186	****	5.00	4.48	4.57	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	31	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 187	****	5.00	4.33	4.46	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	31	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 168	****	5.00	4.20	4.15	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	32	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 66	****	5.00	4.58	4.43	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	32	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 62	****	5.00	4.56	4.28	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	32	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 58	****	5.00	4.41	3.79	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	32	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 65	****	5.00	4.42	4.36	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	32	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 64	****	5.00	4.09	3.70	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	32	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 38	****	5.00	4.49	2.25	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	32	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 36	****	5.00	4.25	3.25	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	32	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 28	****	5.00	4.52	****	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	32	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 30	****	5.00	4.30	****	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	32	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 27	****	5.00	4.43	****	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	32	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 31	****	5.00	4.72	****	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	32	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 21	****	5.00	4.57	****	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	32	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 31	****	5.00	4.64	****	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	32	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 20	****	5.00	4.60	****	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	32	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 15	****	5.00	4.61	****	****

Course-Section: AGNG 200 2
 Title Agng People, Pol & Mng
 Instructor: Majeski, Robin A
 Enrollment: 50
 Questionnaires: 33

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 24
 JUN 28, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	3	0.00-0.99 1	A 6	Required for Majors 4	Graduate 0 Major 1
28-55	1	1.00-1.99 0	B 14		
56-83	4	2.00-2.99 1	C 0	General 12	Under-grad 33 Non-major 32
84-150	1	3.00-3.49 4	D 0		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 2	F 0	Electives 3	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 0	
			? 0		

Course-Section: AGNG 298 1
 Title Special Topics/Aging
 Instructor: Johnson,Dorothea
 Enrollment: 16
 Questionnaires: 14

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 25
 JUN 28, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	0	13	4.86	201/1447	4.86	4.51	4.31	4.31	4.86
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	14	5.00	1/1447	5.00	4.53	4.27	4.23	5.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/1241	5.00	4.55	4.33	4.35	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	0	13	4.86	129/1402	4.86	4.32	4.24	4.24	4.86
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	4	9	4.57	299/1358	4.57	4.44	4.11	4.12	4.57
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	12	4.86	102/1316	4.86	4.41	4.14	4.08	4.86
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	0	2	11	4.85	126/1427	4.85	4.34	4.19	4.14	4.85
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	3	11	4.79	786/1447	4.79	4.80	4.69	4.70	4.79
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	93/1434	4.89	4.23	4.10	3.97	4.89
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	14	5.00	1/1387	5.00	4.66	4.46	4.42	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	14	5.00	1/1387	5.00	4.85	4.73	4.71	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	1	13	4.93	109/1386	4.93	4.60	4.32	4.24	4.93
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	1	0	12	4.57	582/1380	4.57	4.53	4.32	4.30	4.57
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	1	2	2	9	4.36	408/1193	4.36	4.43	4.02	4.04	4.36
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	3	8	4.73	240/1172	4.73	4.53	4.15	4.12	4.73
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	0	2	9	4.82	292/1182	4.82	4.59	4.35	4.30	4.82
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	1	0	0	1	9	4.55	554/1170	4.55	4.56	4.38	4.32	4.55
4. Were special techniques successful	3	5	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	133/ 800	4.67	4.23	4.06	4.01	4.67
Laboratory														
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	13	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 192	****	5.00	4.34	4.38	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	12	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 66	****	5.00	4.58	4.43	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	12	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 62	****	5.00	4.56	4.28	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	12	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 58	****	5.00	4.41	3.79	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 65	****	5.00	4.42	4.36	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	12	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 64	****	5.00	4.09	3.70	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	12	0	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/ 38	****	5.00	4.49	2.25	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	13	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 36	****	5.00	4.25	3.25	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	13	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 30	****	5.00	4.30	****	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 31	****	5.00	4.72	****	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	12	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 21	****	5.00	4.57	****	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	12	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 31	****	5.00	4.64	****	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	12	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/ 20	****	5.00	4.60	****	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	12	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 15	****	5.00	4.61	****	****

Course-Section: AGNG 298 1
 Title Special Topics/Aging
 Instructor: Johnson, Dorothea
 Enrollment: 16
 Questionnaires: 14

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 25
 JUN 28, 2010
 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	9	Required for Majors	8	Graduate	0	Major	7
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	1						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	3	C	0	General	1	Under-grad	14	Non-major	7
84-150	6	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	0						

Course-Section: AGNG 300 1
 Title Intr. Policy Aging Svc
 Instructor: Fox,Nicholas M
 Enrollment: 7
 Questionnaires: 7

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 26
 JUN 28, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1447	5.00	4.51	4.31	4.32	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1447	5.00	4.53	4.27	4.23	5.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1241	5.00	4.55	4.33	4.33	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1402	5.00	4.32	4.24	4.24	5.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	201/1358	4.71	4.44	4.11	4.10	4.71
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	102/1316	4.86	4.41	4.14	4.13	4.86
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	120/1427	4.86	4.34	4.19	4.15	4.86
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	1079/1447	4.50	4.80	4.69	4.65	4.50
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	278/1434	4.60	4.23	4.10	4.09	4.60
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	276/1387	4.86	4.66	4.46	4.44	4.86
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1387	5.00	4.85	4.73	4.71	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1386	5.00	4.60	4.32	4.30	5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	216/1380	4.86	4.53	4.32	4.32	4.86
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1193	5.00	4.43	4.02	4.05	5.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1172	5.00	4.53	4.15	4.24	5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1182	5.00	4.59	4.35	4.42	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1170	5.00	4.56	4.38	4.49	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	1	0	0	0	1	0	5	4.67	133/ 800	4.67	4.23	4.06	4.12	4.67
Laboratory														
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 192	****	5.00	4.34	4.20	****
Seminar														
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 62	****	5.00	4.56	4.21	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 65	****	5.00	4.42	4.01	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 64	****	5.00	4.09	3.38	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 38	****	5.00	4.49	4.73	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 36	****	5.00	4.25	3.81	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 28	****	5.00	4.52	4.46	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 30	****	5.00	4.30	4.42	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 31	****	5.00	4.72	5.00	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 21	****	5.00	4.57	5.00	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 31	****	5.00	4.64	5.00	****

Frequency Distribution

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

I	0	Other	0
?	0		

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	1	2	6	3	5	3.53	1333/1447	3.53	4.51	4.31	4.32	3.53
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	3	1	3	3	6	3.50	1323/1447	3.50	4.53	4.27	4.23	3.50
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	9	0	2	1	0	4	3.86	1021/1241	3.86	4.55	4.33	4.33	3.86
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	0	3	1	5	2	5	3.31	1313/1402	3.31	4.32	4.24	4.24	3.31
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	2	7	1	6	3.69	1070/1358	3.69	4.44	4.11	4.10	3.69
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	0	3	1	6	1	5	3.25	1223/1316	3.25	4.41	4.14	4.13	3.25
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	3	3	4	1	5	3.13	1354/1427	3.13	4.34	4.19	4.15	3.13
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	1	15	4.94	339/1447	4.94	4.80	4.69	4.65	4.94
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	8	0	2	1	4	3	0	2.80	1385/1434	2.80	4.23	4.10	4.09	2.80
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	1	4	3	7	4.07	1156/1387	4.07	4.66	4.46	4.44	4.07
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	1	4	10	4.60	1055/1387	4.60	4.85	4.73	4.71	4.60
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	5	0	0	0	7	2	4	3.77	1188/1386	3.77	4.60	4.32	4.30	3.77
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	2	1	5	2	5	3.47	1255/1380	3.47	4.53	4.32	4.32	3.47
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	5	1	3	0	0	2	7	3.83	796/1193	3.83	4.43	4.02	4.05	3.83
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	3	0	2	3	3	3.27	1055/1172	3.27	4.53	4.15	4.24	3.27
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	1	2	1	2	5	3.73	1020/1182	3.73	4.59	4.35	4.42	3.73
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	2	0	3	2	4	3.55	1054/1170	3.55	4.56	4.38	4.49	3.55
4. Were special techniques successful	7	4	2	0	2	2	1	3.00	742/ 800	3.00	4.23	4.06	4.12	3.00
Laboratory														
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	17	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 192	****	5.00	4.34	4.20	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	17	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 187	****	5.00	4.33	4.11	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	17	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 66	****	5.00	4.58	4.17	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	17	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 62	****	5.00	4.56	4.21	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 38	****	5.00	4.49	4.73	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	17	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 36	****	5.00	4.25	3.81	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 31	****	5.00	4.72	5.00	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	17	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 21	****	5.00	4.57	5.00	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	5	Required for Majors	10	Graduate	0	Major	12
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	5						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	1	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	18	Non-major	6
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	6	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	2				
				?	1						

Course-Section: AGNG 401 1
 Title Foundations of Aging
 Instructor: Stewart, Margare
 Enrollment: 9
 Questionnaires: 9

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 28
 JUN 28, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	2	6	4.56	529/1447	4.56	4.51	4.31	4.43	4.56
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	6	4.67	352/1447	4.67	4.53	4.27	4.31	4.67
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	4	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	451/1241	4.60	4.55	4.33	4.41	4.60
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	4	5	4.56	437/1402	4.56	4.32	4.24	4.34	4.56
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	1	2	5	4.22	635/1358	4.22	4.44	4.11	4.15	4.22
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	2	6	4.56	342/1316	4.56	4.41	4.14	4.27	4.56
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	4	4	4.33	680/1427	4.33	4.34	4.19	4.20	4.33
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1447	5.00	4.80	4.69	4.72	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	0	4	2	4.33	540/1434	4.33	4.23	4.10	4.17	4.33
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1387	5.00	4.66	4.46	4.48	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1387	5.00	4.85	4.73	4.76	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	290/1386	4.78	4.60	4.32	4.34	4.78
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1380	5.00	4.53	4.32	4.34	5.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	72/1193	4.89	4.43	4.02	4.00	4.89
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	152/1172	4.86	4.53	4.15	4.25	4.86
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	250/1182	4.86	4.59	4.35	4.49	4.86
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	275/1170	4.86	4.56	4.38	4.51	4.86
4. Were special techniques successful	2	1	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	133/ 800	4.67	4.23	4.06	4.19	4.67
Laboratory														
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	7	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 192	****	5.00	4.34	4.61	****
Seminar														
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	7	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 62	****	5.00	4.56	4.80	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	7	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 58	****	5.00	4.41	4.59	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	7	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 65	****	5.00	4.42	4.55	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	7	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 64	****	5.00	4.09	4.43	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 38	****	5.00	4.49	4.68	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	7	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 36	****	5.00	4.25	4.42	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	7	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 28	****	5.00	4.52	4.72	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	7	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 30	****	5.00	4.30	4.38	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	7	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 27	****	5.00	4.43	4.62	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 31	****	5.00	4.72	4.80	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	7	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 21	****	5.00	4.57	5.00	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	7	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 31	****	5.00	4.64	4.60	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 7	Required for Majors 8	Graduate 0	Major	5
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B 1				
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	3	C 0	General 0	Under-grad 9	Non-major	4
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	4	D 0				

Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	0	F	0	Electives	0	### - Means there are not enough
				P	0			responses to be significant
				I	0	Other	0	
				?	0			

Course-Section: AGNG 460 1
 Title Internship - Aging Ser
 Instructor: Jarman-Reisch,L
 Enrollment: 7
 Questionnaires: 7

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 29
 JUN 28, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	201/1447	4.86	4.51	4.31	4.43	4.86	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1447	5.00	4.53	4.27	4.31	5.00	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	231/1241	4.80	4.55	4.33	4.41	4.80	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	1	5	4.57	414/1402	4.57	4.32	4.24	4.34	4.57	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	137/1358	4.80	4.44	4.11	4.15	4.80	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	1	5	4.57	322/1316	4.57	4.41	4.14	4.27	4.57	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	133/1427	4.83	4.34	4.19	4.20	4.83	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1447	5.00	4.80	4.69	4.72	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	108/1434	4.83	4.23	4.10	4.17	4.83	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1387	5.00	4.66	4.46	4.48	5.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1387	5.00	4.85	4.73	4.76	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	217/1386	4.83	4.60	4.32	4.34	4.83	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1380	5.00	4.53	4.32	4.34	5.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	5	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1193	****	4.43	4.02	4.00	****	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1172	5.00	4.53	4.15	4.25	5.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1182	5.00	4.59	4.35	4.49	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1170	5.00	4.56	4.38	4.51	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	1	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	86/ 800	4.83	4.23	4.06	4.19	4.83	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 189	****	5.00	4.34	4.74	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 192	****	5.00	4.34	4.61	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 186	****	5.00	4.48	4.72	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 187	****	5.00	4.33	4.59	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 168	****	5.00	4.20	4.53	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	5	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 66	5.00	5.00	4.58	4.87	5.00	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	5	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 62	5.00	5.00	4.56	4.80	5.00	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 58	5.00	5.00	4.41	4.59	5.00	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 65	5.00	5.00	4.42	4.55	5.00	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	5	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 64	5.00	5.00	4.09	4.43	5.00	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 38	****	5.00	4.49	4.68	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 36	****	5.00	4.25	4.42	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 28	****	5.00	4.52	4.72	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 30	****	5.00	4.30	4.38	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 27	****	5.00	4.43	4.62	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 31	****	5.00	4.72	4.80	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 21	****	5.00	4.57	5.00	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 31	****	5.00	4.64	4.60	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 20	****	5.00	4.60	5.00	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 15	****	5.00	4.61	5.00	****	

Course-Section: AGNG 460 1
 Title Internship - Aging Ser
 Instructor: Jarman-Reisch,L
 Enrollment: 7
 Questionnaires: 7

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 29
 JUN 28, 2010
 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	2	Required for Majors	6	Graduate	0	Major	5
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	0						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	1	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	7	Non-major	2
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	5						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	0						

Course-Section: AGNG 470 1
 Title Capstone Seminar
 Instructor: Compton, Richard
 Enrollment: 4
 Questionnaires: 4

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 30
 JUN 28, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	585/1447	4.50	4.51	4.31	4.43	4.50
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	249/1447	4.75	4.53	4.27	4.31	4.75
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1241	5.00	4.55	4.33	4.41	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	494/1402	4.50	4.32	4.24	4.34	4.50
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	173/1358	4.75	4.44	4.11	4.15	4.75
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	617/1316	4.25	4.41	4.14	4.27	4.25
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	459/1427	4.50	4.34	4.19	4.20	4.50
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1447	5.00	4.80	4.69	4.72	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	230/1434	4.67	4.23	4.10	4.17	4.67
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	429/1387	4.75	4.66	4.46	4.48	4.75
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1387	5.00	4.85	4.73	4.76	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1386	5.00	4.60	4.32	4.34	5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	339/1380	4.75	4.53	4.32	4.34	4.75
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	131/1193	4.75	4.43	4.02	4.00	4.75
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	218/1172	4.75	4.53	4.15	4.25	4.75
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1182	5.00	4.59	4.35	4.49	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	390/1170	4.75	4.56	4.38	4.51	4.75
4. Were special techniques successful	0	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	195/ 800	4.50	4.23	4.06	4.19	4.50
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 189	5.00	5.00	4.34	4.74	5.00
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 192	5.00	5.00	4.34	4.61	5.00
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 186	5.00	5.00	4.48	4.72	5.00
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 187	5.00	5.00	4.33	4.59	5.00
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 168	5.00	5.00	4.20	4.53	5.00
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	2	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 66	5.00	5.00	4.58	4.87	5.00
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	2	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 62	5.00	5.00	4.56	4.80	5.00
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 58	5.00	5.00	4.41	4.59	5.00
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 65	5.00	5.00	4.42	4.55	5.00
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	2	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 64	5.00	5.00	4.09	4.43	5.00
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 38	5.00	5.00	4.49	4.68	5.00
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 36	5.00	5.00	4.25	4.42	5.00
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 28	5.00	5.00	4.52	4.72	5.00
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 30	5.00	5.00	4.30	4.38	5.00
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 27	5.00	5.00	4.43	4.62	5.00
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 31	5.00	5.00	4.72	4.80	5.00
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 21	5.00	5.00	4.57	5.00	5.00
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 31	5.00	5.00	4.64	4.60	5.00
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 20	5.00	5.00	4.60	5.00	5.00
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 15	5.00	5.00	4.61	5.00	5.00

Course-Section: AGNG 470 1
 Title Capstone Seminar
 Instructor: Compton, Richard
 Enrollment: 4
 Questionnaires: 4

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 30
 JUN 28, 2010
 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	4	Required for Majors	4	Graduate	0	Major	3
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	0						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	4	Non-major	1
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	3	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: AGNG 497 1
 Title Supplemental Practicum
 Instructor: Ronch, Judah L.
 Enrollment: 2
 Questionnaires: 1

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 31
 JUN 28, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1447	5.00	4.51	4.31	4.43	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1447	5.00	4.53	4.27	4.31	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1402	5.00	4.32	4.24	4.34	5.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1316	5.00	4.41	4.14	4.27	5.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1427	5.00	4.34	4.19	4.20	5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1447	5.00	4.80	4.69	4.72	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1434	5.00	4.23	4.10	4.17	5.00
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 38	5.00	5.00	4.49	4.68	5.00
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 36	5.00	5.00	4.25	4.42	5.00
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 28	5.00	5.00	4.52	4.72	5.00
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 30	5.00	5.00	4.30	4.38	5.00
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 27	5.00	5.00	4.43	4.62	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	1
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B 0						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C 0	General	0	Under-grad	1	Non-major	0
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	1	D 0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	0	F 0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P 0						
				I 0	Other	1				
				? 0						

Course-Section: AGNG 600 1
 Title Social & Econ Contexts
 Instructor: Ronch, Judah L.
 Enrollment: 33
 Questionnaires: 31

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 32
 JUN 28, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	4	27	4.87	179/1447	4.87	4.51	4.31	4.46	4.87
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	9	21	4.65	376/1447	4.65	4.53	4.27	4.30	4.65
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	13	1	0	0	3	14	4.61	439/1241	4.61	4.55	4.33	4.38	4.61
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	1	0	3	8	18	4.40	616/1402	4.40	4.32	4.24	4.29	4.40
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	3	28	4.90	87/1358	4.90	4.44	4.11	4.26	4.90
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	1	5	24	4.65	256/1316	4.65	4.41	4.14	4.34	4.65
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	4	3	24	4.65	301/1427	4.65	4.34	4.19	4.25	4.65
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	10	21	4.68	948/1447	4.68	4.80	4.69	4.74	4.68
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	1	0	0	0	13	12	4.48	363/1434	4.48	4.23	4.10	4.21	4.48
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	6	25	4.81	353/1387	4.81	4.66	4.46	4.51	4.81
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	30	4.97	211/1387	4.97	4.85	4.73	4.81	4.97
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	4	26	4.81	253/1386	4.81	4.60	4.32	4.43	4.81
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	3	26	4.77	312/1380	4.77	4.53	4.32	4.38	4.77
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	3	0	1	3	10	12	4.27	470/1193	4.27	4.43	4.02	4.02	4.27
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	6	25	4.81	181/1172	4.81	4.53	4.15	4.32	4.81
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	2	4	25	4.74	355/1182	4.74	4.59	4.35	4.46	4.74
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	2	2	27	4.81	327/1170	4.81	4.56	4.38	4.52	4.81
4. Were special techniques successful	0	6	0	2	4	4	15	4.28	318/ 800	4.28	4.23	4.06	4.10	4.28

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	2	0.00-0.99 22	A 15	Required for Majors	26
28-55	0	1.00-1.99 0	B 8		
56-83	0	2.00-2.99 0	C 0	General	0
84-150	0	3.00-3.49 0	D 0	Under-grad	11
Grad.	20	3.50-4.00 0	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		
			I 0		
			? 1	Other	0
				#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	0	30	4.94	103/1447	4.94	4.51	4.31	4.46	4.94
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	7	23	4.71	303/1447	4.71	4.53	4.27	4.30	4.71
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	5	1	0	0	7	18	4.58	478/1241	4.58	4.55	4.33	4.38	4.58
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	1	0	5	12	12	4.13	882/1402	4.13	4.32	4.24	4.29	4.13
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	0	1	29	4.87	102/1358	4.87	4.44	4.11	4.26	4.87
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	1	4	25	4.71	204/1316	4.71	4.41	4.14	4.34	4.71
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	2	8	9	12	4.00	971/1427	4.00	4.34	4.19	4.25	4.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	8	23	4.74	852/1447	4.74	4.80	4.69	4.74	4.74
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	11	1	0	0	1	9	9	4.42	431/1434	4.42	4.23	4.10	4.21	4.42
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	1	0	1	29	4.87	245/1387	4.87	4.66	4.46	4.51	4.87
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	1	0	0	30	4.90	528/1387	4.90	4.85	4.73	4.81	4.90
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	1	0	5	25	4.74	328/1386	4.74	4.60	4.32	4.43	4.74
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	0	0	30	4.90	159/1380	4.90	4.53	4.32	4.38	4.90
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	1	0	1	0	4	25	4.77	124/1193	4.77	4.43	4.02	4.02	4.77
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	5	25	4.77	203/1172	4.77	4.53	4.15	4.32	4.77
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	1	2	8	20	4.52	546/1182	4.52	4.59	4.35	4.46	4.52
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	2	0	12	17	4.42	648/1170	4.42	4.56	4.38	4.52	4.42
4. Were special techniques successful	0	10	1	0	4	8	8	4.05	416/ 800	4.05	4.23	4.06	4.10	4.05

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99 22	A 6	Required for Majors 27	Graduate 30 Major 24
28-55	0	1.00-1.99 0	B 15		
56-83	0	2.00-2.99 0	C 0	General 0	Under-grad 1 Non-major 7
84-150	0	3.00-3.49 0	D 0		
Grad.	30	3.50-4.00 0	F 0	Electives 0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 0	
			? 2		

Course-Section: AGNG 610 1
 Title Leadership & Org Chg I
 Instructor: Stewart, Margare
 Enrollment: 33
 Questionnaires: 31

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 34
 JUN 28, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	1	3	8	14	5	3.61	1306/1447	3.61	4.51	4.31	4.46	3.61
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	4	10	12	5	3.58	1293/1447	3.58	4.53	4.27	4.30	3.58
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	16	1	2	0	3	8	4.07	891/1241	4.07	4.55	4.33	4.38	4.07
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	4	2	5	10	9	3.60	1227/1402	3.60	4.32	4.24	4.29	3.60
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	2	3	11	13	4.10	746/1358	4.10	4.44	4.11	4.26	4.10
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	2	1	3	9	15	4.13	729/1316	4.13	4.41	4.14	4.34	4.13
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	3	5	10	12	4.03	953/1427	4.03	4.34	4.19	4.25	4.03
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	12	18	4.60	1018/1447	4.60	4.80	4.69	4.74	4.60
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	1	2	12	10	3	3.43	1269/1434	3.43	4.23	4.10	4.21	3.43
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	2	6	7	16	4.19	1085/1387	4.19	4.66	4.46	4.51	4.19
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	3	4	4	20	4.32	1233/1387	4.32	4.85	4.73	4.81	4.32
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	4	6	5	16	4.06	1022/1386	4.06	4.60	4.32	4.43	4.06
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	4	3	4	5	15	3.77	1162/1380	3.77	4.53	4.32	4.38	3.77
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	2	2	1	8	7	11	3.83	802/1193	3.83	4.43	4.02	4.02	3.83
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	0	3	5	21	4.50	377/1172	4.50	4.53	4.15	4.32	4.50
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	1	4	7	18	4.40	638/1182	4.40	4.59	4.35	4.46	4.40
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	5	6	19	4.47	608/1170	4.47	4.56	4.38	4.52	4.47
4. Were special techniques successful	1	2	0	1	5	8	14	4.25	335/ 800	4.25	4.23	4.06	4.10	4.25

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	2	0.00-0.99 21	A 14	Required for Majors 22	Graduate 23 Major 26
28-55	0	1.00-1.99 0	B 11		
56-83	0	2.00-2.99 0	C 0	General 0	Under-grad 8 Non-major 5
84-150	0	3.00-3.49 0	D 0		
Grad.	23	3.50-4.00 0	F 0	Electives 0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 0	
			? 1		