

Course-Section: PUBL 601 0101
 Title POLITICAL/SOCIAL CONTE
 Instructor: CHRIQUI, JAMIE
 Enrollment: 19
 Questionnaires: 16

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2006

Page 1285
 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	4	10	4.50	549/1481	4.50	4.26	4.29	4.28	4.50	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	7	7	4.31	758/1481	4.31	4.26	4.23	4.11	4.31	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	4	10	4.50	498/1249	4.50	4.37	4.27	4.24	4.50	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	4	3	8	4.13	885/1424	4.13	4.27	4.21	4.16	4.13	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	2	4	9	4.31	451/1396	4.31	4.07	3.98	4.00	4.31	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	2	2	5	7	4.06	719/1342	4.06	4.12	4.07	4.18	4.06	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	2	4	9	4.31	719/1459	4.31	4.19	4.16	4.01	4.31	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	1	0	1	14	4.75	880/1480	4.75	4.64	4.68	4.74	4.75	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	1	0	0	0	9	0	4.00	836/1450	4.00	4.10	4.09	3.96	4.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	6	9	4.50	762/1409	4.50	4.46	4.42	4.36	4.50	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	3	12	4.69	941/1407	4.69	4.77	4.69	4.73	4.69	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	1	2	6	7	4.19	892/1399	4.19	4.30	4.26	4.16	4.19	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	3	3	10	4.44	670/1400	4.44	4.35	4.27	4.17	4.44	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	9	2	1	3	1	0	2.43	1137/1179	2.43	3.94	3.96	3.81	2.43	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	3	4	7	4.13	652/1262	4.13	4.18	4.05	4.07	4.13	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	1	2	3	9	4.33	729/1259	4.33	4.40	4.29	4.30	4.33	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	2	3	10	4.53	554/1256	4.53	4.34	4.30	4.33	4.53	
4. Were special techniques successful	1	8	1	1	2	2	1	3.14	705/ 788	3.14	4.03	4.00	3.97	3.14	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	14	1	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 246	****	4.26	4.20	4.27	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	14	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 249	****	4.08	4.11	3.93	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	14	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 242	****	4.45	4.40	4.27	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	14	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 240	****	4.37	4.20	4.15	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	14	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 217	****	4.42	4.04	3.73	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	10	0	0	1	0	2	3	4.17	51/ 68	4.17	4.66	4.49	4.23	4.17	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	10	0	0	1	0	1	4	4.33	52/ 69	4.33	4.26	4.53	4.46	4.33	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	1	0	3	2	4.00	45/ 63	4.00	4.24	4.44	4.44	4.00	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	1	1	3	1	3.67	55/ 69	3.67	4.19	4.35	4.16	3.67	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	10	0	0	0	2	2	2	4.00	36/ 68	4.00	3.98	3.92	3.71	4.00	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 59	****	3.92	4.30	4.01	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	15	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 51	****	4.04	4.00	3.81	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	15	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 36	****	5.00	4.60	4.65	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	15	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 41	****	3.68	4.26	4.27	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	15	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 31	****	3.50	4.42	4.58	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 55	****	3.90	4.55	4.38	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	15	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 31	****	4.28	4.75	4.95	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	15	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 51	****	4.42	4.65	4.54	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	15	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 34	****	4.50	4.83	5.00	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	15	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 24	****	4.50	4.82	5.00	****	

Course-Section: PUBL 601 0101
 Title POLITICAL/SOCIAL CONTE
 Instructor: CHRIQUI, JAMIE
 Enrollment: 19
 Questionnaires: 16

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2006

Page 1285
 JUN 13, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: PUBL 603 0101
 Title POLICY ANALYSIS
 Instructor: MANDELL, MARVIN
 Enrollment: 25
 Questionnaires: 22

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2006

Page 1286
 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	2	2	9	9	4.14	976/1481	4.14	4.26	4.29	4.28	4.14	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	3	8	6	5	3.59	1289/1481	3.59	4.26	4.23	4.11	3.59	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	6	0	2	2	5	5	3.93	962/1249	3.93	4.37	4.27	4.24	3.93	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	1	0	7	0	5	8	3.70	1213/1424	3.70	4.27	4.21	4.16	3.70	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	5	5	5	5	3.38	1145/1396	3.38	4.07	3.98	4.00	3.38	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	4	2	6	8	3.76	980/1342	3.76	4.12	4.07	4.18	3.76	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	2	4	3	7	6	3.50	1256/1459	3.50	4.19	4.16	4.01	3.50	
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	8	12	4.60	997/1480	4.60	4.64	4.68	4.74	4.60	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	3	6	13	4.45	403/1450	4.45	4.10	4.09	3.96	4.45	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	6	4	12	4.27	1019/1409	4.27	4.46	4.42	4.36	4.27	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	2	4	16	4.64	997/1407	4.64	4.77	4.69	4.73	4.64	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	2	3	7	10	4.14	938/1399	4.14	4.30	4.26	4.16	4.14	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	2	3	6	11	4.18	921/1400	4.18	4.35	4.27	4.17	4.18	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	4	0	1	6	4	5	3.81	753/1179	3.81	3.94	3.96	3.81	3.81	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	1	5	5	8	3.90	797/1262	3.90	4.18	4.05	4.07	3.90	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	1	0	0	4	15	4.60	509/1259	4.60	4.40	4.29	4.30	4.60	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	2	2	16	4.70	428/1256	4.70	4.34	4.30	4.33	4.70	
4. Were special techniques successful	3	8	2	1	2	1	5	3.55	596/ 788	3.55	4.03	4.00	3.97	3.55	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 68	****	4.66	4.49	4.23	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 69	****	4.26	4.53	4.46	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 63	****	4.24	4.44	4.44	****	

Frequency Distribution

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

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	8	8	4.50	549/1481	4.50	4.26	4.29	4.28	4.50	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	7	8	4.44	617/1481	4.44	4.26	4.23	4.11	4.44	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	5	11	4.69	310/1249	4.69	4.37	4.27	4.24	4.69	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	1	1	6	6	4.21	784/1424	4.21	4.27	4.21	4.16	4.21	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	2	3	5	4	1	2.93	1317/1396	2.93	4.07	3.98	4.00	2.93	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	3	0	0	0	6	7	4.54	283/1342	4.54	4.12	4.07	4.18	4.54	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	2	5	8	4.25	775/1459	4.25	4.19	4.16	4.01	4.25	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	5	11	4.69	936/1480	4.69	4.64	4.68	4.74	4.69	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	2	7	3	4.08	792/1450	4.08	4.10	4.09	3.96	4.08	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	1	1	13	4.80	334/1409	4.80	4.46	4.42	4.36	4.80	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	1	1	13	4.80	728/1407	4.80	4.77	4.69	4.73	4.80	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	2	3	5	5	3.87	1115/1399	3.87	4.30	4.26	4.16	3.87	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	2	3	10	4.53	561/1400	4.53	4.35	4.27	4.17	4.53	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	2	0	1	4	3	5	3.92	671/1179	3.92	3.94	3.96	3.81	3.92	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	1	0	1	6	4	4.00	708/1262	4.00	4.18	4.05	4.07	4.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	1	1	5	5	4.17	836/1259	4.17	4.40	4.29	4.30	4.17	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	1	1	4	6	4.25	773/1256	4.25	4.34	4.30	4.33	4.25	
4. Were special techniques successful	4	8	0	0	2	1	1	3.75	533/ 788	3.75	4.03	4.00	3.97	3.75	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	9	0	1	0	3	3	0	3.14	237/ 246	3.14	4.26	4.20	4.27	3.14	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	9	0	0	0	2	3	2	4.00	145/ 249	4.00	4.08	4.11	3.93	4.00	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	9	0	0	0	1	2	4	4.43	137/ 242	4.43	4.45	4.40	4.27	4.43	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	10	0	0	0	1	3	2	4.17	154/ 240	4.17	4.37	4.20	4.15	4.17	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	9	2	0	1	2	2	0	3.20	189/ 217	3.20	4.42	4.04	3.73	3.20	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	13	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 68	****	4.66	4.49	4.23	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	13	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 69	****	4.26	4.53	4.46	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	13	1	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 69	****	4.19	4.35	4.16	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	14	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 68	****	3.98	3.92	3.71	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 59	****	3.92	4.30	4.01	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	15	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 51	****	4.04	4.00	3.81	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	15	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 36	****	5.00	4.60	4.65	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	15	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 41	****	3.68	4.26	4.27	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	15	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 31	****	3.50	4.42	4.58	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 55	****	3.90	4.55	4.38	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	15	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 31	****	4.28	4.75	4.95	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	15	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 51	****	4.42	4.65	4.54	****	

Course-Section: PUBL 604 0101
 Title STATISTICAL ANALYSIS
 Instructor: MARCOTTE, DAVID
 Enrollment: 23
 Questionnaires: 16

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2006

Page 1287
 JUN 13, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	6	0.00-0.99	0	A	6	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	4	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	6						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	1	General	0	Under-grad	12	Non-major	3
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	4	3.50-4.00	5	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	14				
				?	1						

Course-Section: PUBL 610C 0101
 Title ETHICS & PUBLIC POLICY
 Instructor: Stacey, Simon
 Enrollment: 35
 Questionnaires: 21

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2006

Page 1288
 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	8	12	4.52	531/1481	4.52	4.26	4.29	4.28	4.52	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	8	11	4.43	632/1481	4.43	4.26	4.23	4.11	4.43	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	15	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	****/1249	****	4.37	4.27	4.24	****	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	0	2	8	8	4.33	645/1424	4.33	4.27	4.21	4.16	4.33	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	2	17	4.89	84/1396	4.89	4.07	3.98	4.00	4.89	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	2	0	0	2	6	10	4.44	364/1342	4.44	4.12	4.07	4.18	4.44	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	1	0	0	3	4	11	4.44	550/1459	4.44	4.19	4.16	4.01	4.44	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	13	8	4.38	1126/1480	4.38	4.64	4.68	4.74	4.38	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	1	0	0	2	7	6	4.27	620/1450	4.27	4.10	4.09	3.96	4.27	

Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	0	2	17	4.89	202/1409	4.89	4.46	4.42	4.36	4.89	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	0	19	5.00	1/1407	5.00	4.77	4.69	4.73	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	1	4	14	4.68	349/1399	4.68	4.30	4.26	4.16	4.68	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	1	4	14	4.68	397/1400	4.68	4.35	4.27	4.17	4.68	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	14	1	0	2	0	2	3.40	****/1179	****	3.94	3.96	3.81	****	

Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	1	2	14	4.76	197/1262	4.76	4.18	4.05	4.07	4.76	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	0	1	3	13	4.71	413/1259	4.71	4.40	4.29	4.30	4.71	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	0	0	2	15	4.88	232/1256	4.88	4.34	4.30	4.33	4.88	
4. Were special techniques successful	4	12	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	****/ 788	****	4.03	4.00	3.97	****	

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	2	1.00-1.99	B 7		Graduate 1
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	C 0	General	4
84-150	7	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad 20
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	1
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	10
			? 1		

Course-Section: PUBL 610D 0101
 Title HURRICANE KATRINA
 Instructor: SHORT, JOHN R
 Enrollment: 5
 Questionnaires: 5

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2006

Page 1289
 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	2	4.40	678/1481	4.40	4.26	4.29	4.28	4.40	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	0	2	3.60	1286/1481	3.60	4.26	4.23	4.11	3.60	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	557/1424	4.40	4.27	4.21	4.16	4.40	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	4	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1396	****	4.07	3.98	4.00	****	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	0	0	4	4.40	405/1342	4.40	4.12	4.07	4.18	4.40	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	611/1459	4.40	4.19	4.16	4.01	4.40	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	5	0	4.00	1349/1480	4.00	4.64	4.68	4.74	4.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	692/1450	4.20	4.10	4.09	3.96	4.20	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	891/1409	4.40	4.46	4.42	4.36	4.40	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	728/1407	4.80	4.77	4.69	4.73	4.80	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	883/1399	4.20	4.30	4.26	4.16	4.20	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	492/1400	4.60	4.35	4.27	4.17	4.60	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	4	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/1179	****	3.94	3.96	3.81	****	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	2	1	3.80	862/1262	3.80	4.18	4.05	4.07	3.80	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	1	0	1	3	4.20	821/1259	4.20	4.40	4.29	4.30	4.20	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	680/1256	4.40	4.34	4.30	4.33	4.40	
4. Were special techniques successful	0	4	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 788	****	4.03	4.00	3.97	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	3	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 68	****	4.66	4.49	4.23	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	4	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 69	****	4.26	4.53	4.46	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 63	****	4.24	4.44	4.44	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 69	****	4.19	4.35	4.16	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	4	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 68	****	3.98	3.92	3.71	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 59	****	3.92	4.30	4.01	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 55	****	3.90	4.55	4.38	****	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: PUBL 610F 0101
 Title HEALTH POLICIES & PROG
 Instructor: SALKEVER, DAVID
 Enrollment: 3
 Questionnaires: 3

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2006

Page 1290
 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	2	4.67	395/1481	4.67	4.26	4.29	4.28	4.67	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	0	4.00	1000/1481	4.00	4.26	4.23	4.11	4.00	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1249	5.00	4.37	4.27	4.24	5.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	287/1424	4.67	4.27	4.21	4.16	4.67	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1396	5.00	4.07	3.98	4.00	5.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	474/1342	4.33	4.12	4.07	4.18	4.33	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	961/1459	4.00	4.19	4.16	4.01	4.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	951/1480	4.67	4.64	4.68	4.74	4.67	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1450	5.00	4.10	4.09	3.96	5.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	968/1409	4.33	4.46	4.42	4.36	4.33	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1407	5.00	4.77	4.69	4.73	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	753/1399	4.33	4.30	4.26	4.16	4.33	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1400	5.00	4.35	4.27	4.17	5.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	2	1	0	3.33	972/1179	3.33	3.94	3.96	3.81	3.33	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1262	5.00	4.18	4.05	4.07	5.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1259	5.00	4.40	4.29	4.30	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1256	5.00	4.34	4.30	4.33	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	0	2	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	394/ 788	4.00	4.03	4.00	3.97	4.00	

Frequency Distribution

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

- Means there are not enough responses to be significant

Course-Section: PUBL 610G 0101
 Title CAUSAL INFERENCE IN PR
 Instructor: MARCOTTE, DAVID
 Enrollment: 6
 Questionnaires: 5

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2006

Page 1291
 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	4	4.80	233/1481	4.80	4.26	4.29	4.28	4.80	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	2	4.40	661/1481	4.40	4.26	4.23	4.11	4.40	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	405/1249	4.60	4.37	4.27	4.24	4.60	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	178/1424	4.80	4.27	4.21	4.16	4.80	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	111/1396	4.80	4.07	3.98	4.00	4.80	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1342	5.00	4.12	4.07	4.18	5.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1459	5.00	4.19	4.16	4.01	5.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	997/1480	4.60	4.64	4.68	4.74	4.60	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	1	0	0	1	2	3.75	1098/1450	3.75	4.10	4.09	3.96	3.75	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	334/1409	4.80	4.46	4.42	4.36	4.80	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1407	5.00	4.77	4.69	4.73	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	883/1399	4.20	4.30	4.26	4.16	4.20	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	704/1400	4.40	4.35	4.27	4.17	4.40	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	1	1	0	1	1	1	3.25	997/1179	3.25	3.94	3.96	3.81	3.25	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	167/1262	4.80	4.18	4.05	4.07	4.80	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1259	5.00	4.40	4.29	4.30	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1256	5.00	4.34	4.30	4.33	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	0	4	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 788	****	4.03	4.00	3.97	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	1	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/ 68	5.00	4.66	4.49	4.23	5.00	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	1	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/ 69	5.00	4.26	4.53	4.46	5.00	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/ 63	5.00	4.24	4.44	4.44	5.00	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	29/ 69	4.75	4.19	4.35	4.16	4.75	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	1	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/ 68	5.00	3.98	3.92	3.71	5.00	

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

Course-Section: PUBL 610H 0101
 Title ISS IN U.S. METRO AREA
 Instructor: SHORT, JOHN R
 Enrollment: 3
 Questionnaires: 3

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2006

Page 1292
 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	0	3.00	1451/1481	3.00	4.26	4.29	4.28	3.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	736/1481	4.33	4.26	4.23	4.11	4.33	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1249	5.00	4.37	4.27	4.24	5.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	437/1424	4.50	4.27	4.21	4.16	4.50	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	297/1396	4.50	4.07	3.98	4.00	4.50	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	190/1342	4.67	4.12	4.07	4.18	4.67	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	1	0	0	1	2.67	1419/1459	2.67	4.19	4.16	4.01	2.67	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1480	5.00	4.64	4.68	4.74	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1450	5.00	4.10	4.09	3.96	5.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	559/1409	4.67	4.46	4.42	4.36	4.67	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1407	5.00	4.77	4.69	4.73	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	376/1399	4.67	4.30	4.26	4.16	4.67	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	791/1400	4.33	4.35	4.27	4.17	4.33	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	177/1179	4.67	3.94	3.96	3.81	4.67	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	264/1262	4.67	4.18	4.05	4.07	4.67	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	451/1259	4.67	4.40	4.29	4.30	4.67	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1256	5.00	4.34	4.30	4.33	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	0	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 788	5.00	4.03	4.00	3.97	5.00	

Frequency Distribution

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

- Means there are not enough responses to be significant

Course-Section: PUBL 613 0101
 Title MANAGING PUBLIC ORG
 Instructor: NORRIS, DONALD
 Enrollment: 18
 Questionnaires: 16

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2006

Page 1293
 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	8	6	4.19	928/1481	4.19	4.26	4.29	4.28	4.19	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	2	3	5	5	3.69	1242/1481	3.69	4.26	4.23	4.11	3.69	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	4	1	1	5	0	4	3.45	1127/1249	3.45	4.37	4.27	4.24	3.45	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	4	2	6	2	2	2.75	1401/1424	2.75	4.27	4.21	4.16	2.75	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	1	9	5	4.06	668/1396	4.06	4.07	3.98	4.00	4.06	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	4	3	3	5	3.44	1150/1342	3.44	4.12	4.07	4.18	3.44	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	3	3	3	6	3.63	1219/1459	3.63	4.19	4.16	4.01	3.63	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	4	12	4.75	880/1480	4.75	4.64	4.68	4.74	4.75	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	1	0	2	9	2	3.79	1072/1450	3.79	4.10	4.09	3.96	3.79	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	2	5	9	4.44	852/1409	4.44	4.46	4.42	4.36	4.44	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	1	0	1	14	4.75	823/1407	4.75	4.77	4.69	4.73	4.75	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	1	1	6	8	4.31	773/1399	4.31	4.30	4.26	4.16	4.31	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	3	2	10	4.25	867/1400	4.25	4.35	4.27	4.17	4.25	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	7	3	0	3	2	1	2.78	1102/1179	2.78	3.94	3.96	3.81	2.78	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	2	0	8	6	4.13	659/1262	4.13	4.18	4.05	4.07	4.13	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	1	0	2	4	9	4.25	783/1259	4.25	4.40	4.29	4.30	4.25	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	2	1	5	8	4.19	815/1256	4.19	4.34	4.30	4.33	4.19	
4. Were special techniques successful	0	12	1	0	0	1	2	3.75	533/ 788	3.75	4.03	4.00	3.97	3.75	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 68	****	4.66	4.49	4.23	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 69	****	4.26	4.53	4.46	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 69	****	4.19	4.35	4.16	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 68	****	3.98	3.92	3.71	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	4	0.00-0.99	0	A	4	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	9	Major	0
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B	8						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	7	Non-major	2
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	5	D	0						
Grad.	9	3.50-4.00	8	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	14				
				?	1						

Course-Section: PUBL 618 0101
 Title HLTH CARE FIN & SERV D
 Instructor: DAVIDOFF, AMY J
 Enrollment: 5
 Questionnaires: 5

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2006

Page 1294
 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	3	4.60	461/1481	4.60	4.26	4.29	4.28	4.60	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	0	2	1	1	3.20	1394/1481	3.20	4.26	4.23	4.11	3.20	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	0	0	3	1	3.60	1242/1424	3.60	4.27	4.21	4.16	3.60	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	1	2	1	3.60	1025/1396	3.60	4.07	3.98	4.00	3.60	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	0	2	2	3.80	956/1342	3.80	4.12	4.07	4.18	3.80	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	1	1	1	1	3.00	1380/1459	3.00	4.19	4.16	4.01	3.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	839/1480	4.80	4.64	4.68	4.74	4.80	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	1443/1450	2.00	4.10	4.09	3.96	2.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	1068/1409	4.20	4.46	4.42	4.36	4.20	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	1184/1407	4.40	4.77	4.69	4.73	4.40	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	2	0	3	0	3.20	1303/1399	3.20	4.30	4.26	4.16	3.20	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	0	3	1	3.80	1120/1400	3.80	4.35	4.27	4.17	3.80	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	4	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/1179	****	3.94	3.96	3.81	****	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	0	0	1	2	3.75	887/1262	3.75	4.18	4.05	4.07	3.75	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	1	0	1	1	1	3.25	1144/1259	3.25	4.40	4.29	4.30	3.25	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	1	0	1	0	2	3.50	1106/1256	3.50	4.34	4.30	4.33	3.50	
4. Were special techniques successful	1	2	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	604/ 788	3.50	4.03	4.00	3.97	3.50	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: PUBL 643 0101
 Title ELECTRONIC GOVERNMENT
 Instructor: FLETCHER, PATRI
 Enrollment: 8
 Questionnaires: 7

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2006

Page 1295
 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	2	3	4.14	967/1481	4.14	4.26	4.29	4.28	4.14	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	3	3	4.29	790/1481	4.29	4.26	4.23	4.11	4.29	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	6	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1249	****	4.37	4.27	4.24	****	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	3	3	4.29	706/1424	4.29	4.27	4.21	4.16	4.29	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	3	1	2	3.57	1042/1396	3.57	4.07	3.98	4.00	3.57	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	3	2	4.17	626/1342	4.17	4.12	4.07	4.18	4.17	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	0	3	3	4.50	460/1459	4.50	4.19	4.16	4.01	4.50	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	770/1480	4.86	4.64	4.68	4.74	4.86	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	2	3	0	3.60	1189/1450	3.60	4.10	4.09	3.96	3.60	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	559/1409	4.67	4.46	4.42	4.36	4.67	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1407	5.00	4.77	4.69	4.73	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	1	3	2	4.17	910/1399	4.17	4.30	4.26	4.16	4.17	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	3	2	4.17	937/1400	4.17	4.35	4.27	4.17	4.17	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	4	1	0	1	0	1	3.00	1041/1179	3.00	3.94	3.96	3.81	3.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	0	5	4.67	264/1262	4.67	4.18	4.05	4.07	4.67	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	276/1259	4.83	4.40	4.29	4.30	4.83	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	571/1256	4.50	4.34	4.30	4.33	4.50	
4. Were special techniques successful	1	1	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	218/ 788	4.40	4.03	4.00	3.97	4.40	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: PUBL 700 0101
 Title DOCTORAL RESEARCH SEM
 Instructor: LANOUE, GEORGE
 Enrollment: 8
 Questionnaires: 8

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2006

Page 1296
 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	5	4.63	439/1481	4.63	4.26	4.29	4.28	4.63	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	5	4.63	374/1481	4.63	4.26	4.23	4.11	4.63	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	7	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1249	****	4.37	4.27	4.24	****	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	157/1424	4.86	4.27	4.21	4.16	4.86	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	104/1342	4.83	4.12	4.07	4.18	4.83	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	3	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	961/1459	4.00	4.19	4.16	4.01	4.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	951/1480	4.67	4.64	4.68	4.74	4.67	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	0	3	2	4.40	473/1450	4.40	4.10	4.09	3.96	4.40	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	417/1409	4.75	4.46	4.42	4.36	4.75	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	728/1407	4.80	4.77	4.69	4.73	4.80	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	567/1399	4.50	4.30	4.26	4.16	4.50	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	312/1400	4.75	4.35	4.27	4.17	4.75	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	3	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	1156/1179	2.00	3.94	3.96	3.81	2.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	1	0	5	4.67	264/1262	4.67	4.18	4.05	4.07	4.67	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1259	5.00	4.40	4.29	4.30	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1256	5.00	4.34	4.30	4.33	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	2	5	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 788	****	4.03	4.00	3.97	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 68	****	4.66	4.49	4.23	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 69	****	4.26	4.53	4.46	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 63	****	4.24	4.44	4.44	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 69	****	4.19	4.35	4.16	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	7	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 68	****	3.98	3.92	3.71	****	
Field Work															
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	7	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 41	****	3.68	4.26	4.27	****	

Frequency Distribution

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