

Course-Section: GERO 703 0101  
 Title POLI ANA AGING  
 Instructor: MILLER, NANCY A  
 Enrollment: 8  
 Questionnaires: 6

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2005

Page 943  
 JAN 21, 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	3	4.33	854/1674	4.33	4.23	4.27	4.44	4.33	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	3	4.50	578/1674	4.50	4.26	4.23	4.34	4.50	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	1	0	0	2	2	3.80	1285/1609	3.80	4.23	4.22	4.34	3.80	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	224/1585	4.67	4.04	3.96	4.23	4.67	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	283/1535	4.60	4.08	4.08	4.27	4.60	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	330/1651	4.67	4.20	4.18	4.32	4.67	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1673	5.00	4.65	4.69	4.78	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	4	2	4.33	615/1656	4.33	4.06	4.07	4.15	4.33	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	663/1586	4.67	4.43	4.43	4.50	4.67	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1585	5.00	4.72	4.69	4.79	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	3	2	4.17	1025/1582	4.17	4.30	4.26	4.33	4.17	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	3	3	4.50	692/1575	4.50	4.32	4.27	4.30	4.50	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	3	1	1	1	0	0	2.00	1359/1380	2.00	3.94	3.94	3.85	2.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	173/1520	4.83	4.14	4.01	4.19	4.83	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1515	5.00	4.37	4.24	4.47	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	323/1511	4.83	4.37	4.27	4.49	4.83	
4. Were special techniques successful	0	4	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	881/ 994	3.00	3.97	3.94	4.07	3.00	

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 3		Graduate 2
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	C 0	General	0
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad 4
Grad.	2	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	5
			? 0		

Course-Section: GERO 750 0101  
 Title THEORY/METHODS I  
 Instructor: MORGAN, LESLIE (Instr. A)  
 Enrollment: 5  
 Questionnaires: 5

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2005

Page 944  
 JAN 21, 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	2	1	3.80	1385/1674	3.80	4.23	4.27	4.44	3.80	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	3	1	4.00	1146/1674	4.00	4.26	4.23	4.34	4.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	374/1609	4.60	4.23	4.22	4.34	4.60	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	265/1585	4.60	4.04	3.96	4.23	4.60	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	283/1535	4.60	4.08	4.08	4.27	4.60	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	1	1	2	3.80	1289/1651	3.80	4.20	4.18	4.32	3.80	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	1	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	958/1673	4.75	4.65	4.69	4.78	4.75	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	3	1	4.25	719/1656	4.29	4.06	4.07	4.15	4.29	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	389/1586	4.53	4.43	4.43	4.50	4.53	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1585	5.00	4.72	4.69	4.79	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	525/1582	4.55	4.30	4.26	4.33	4.55	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	579/1575	4.55	4.32	4.27	4.30	4.55	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	2	1	0	0	0	2	3.67	962/1380	3.50	3.94	3.94	3.85	3.50	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	338/1520	4.60	4.14	4.01	4.19	4.60	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1515	5.00	4.37	4.24	4.47	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1511	5.00	4.37	4.27	4.49	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	0	4	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 994	****	3.97	3.94	4.07	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	0	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	53/ 103	4.60	4.39	4.41	4.56	4.60	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	0	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	65/ 101	4.40	4.33	4.48	4.62	4.40	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	50/ 95	4.40	4.15	4.31	4.43	4.40	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	63/ 99	4.20	4.36	4.39	4.54	4.20	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	0	0	1	1	0	1	2	3.40	83/ 97	3.40	3.76	4.14	4.26	3.40	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: GERO 750 0101  
 Title THEORY/METHODS I  
 Instructor: (Instr. B)  
 Enrollment: 5  
 Questionnaires: 5

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2005

Page 945  
 JAN 21, 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	2	1	3.80	1385/1674	3.80	4.23	4.27	4.44	3.80	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	3	1	4.00	1146/1674	4.00	4.26	4.23	4.34	4.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	374/1609	4.60	4.23	4.22	4.34	4.60	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	265/1585	4.60	4.04	3.96	4.23	4.60	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	283/1535	4.60	4.08	4.08	4.27	4.60	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	1	1	2	3.80	1289/1651	3.80	4.20	4.18	4.32	3.80	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	1	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	958/1673	4.75	4.65	4.69	4.78	4.75	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	615/1656	4.29	4.06	4.07	4.15	4.29	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	3	1	4.25	1144/1586	4.53	4.43	4.43	4.50	4.53	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1585	5.00	4.72	4.69	4.79	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	632/1582	4.55	4.30	4.26	4.33	4.55	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	692/1575	4.55	4.32	4.27	4.30	4.55	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	1	1	0	0	1	1	3.33	1127/1380	3.50	3.94	3.94	3.85	3.50	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	338/1520	4.60	4.14	4.01	4.19	4.60	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1515	5.00	4.37	4.24	4.47	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1511	5.00	4.37	4.27	4.49	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	0	4	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 994	****	3.97	3.94	4.07	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	0	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	53/ 103	4.60	4.39	4.41	4.56	4.60	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	0	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	65/ 101	4.40	4.33	4.48	4.62	4.40	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	50/ 95	4.40	4.15	4.31	4.43	4.40	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	63/ 99	4.20	4.36	4.39	4.54	4.20	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	0	0	1	1	0	1	2	3.40	83/ 97	3.40	3.76	4.14	4.26	3.40	

Frequency Distribution

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