

Course-Section: PUB 150 01
 Title Public Affairs Schol S
 Instructor: Meyers,Roy T
 Enrollment: 17
 Questionnaires: 16

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 1260
 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	2	0	1	1	5	2	5	3.64	1296/1447	3.64	3.81	4.31	4.18	3.64
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	1	3	3	3	5	3.53	1311/1447	3.53	3.04	4.27	4.30	3.53
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	7	1	0	2	0	5	4.00	923/1241	4.00	4.00	4.33	4.25	4.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	1	3	5	6	4.07	936/1402	4.07	3.36	4.24	4.15	4.07
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	2	2	7	2	2	3.00	1291/1358	3.00	3.93	4.11	4.03	3.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	0	2	1	3	6	2	3.36	1192/1316	3.36	3.79	4.14	3.99	3.36
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	2	1	5	2	4	3.36	1306/1427	3.36	2.62	4.19	4.24	3.36
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	2	13	4.87	592/1447	4.87	4.82	4.69	4.68	4.87
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	1	0	0	5	5	1	3.64	1169/1434	3.64	4.04	4.10	4.10	3.64
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	1	5	8	4.50	798/1387	4.50	3.98	4.46	4.46	4.50
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	1	2	11	4.71	919/1387	4.71	4.86	4.73	4.71	4.71
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	4	3	7	4.21	911/1386	4.21	3.93	4.32	4.32	4.21
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	1	3	1	8	4.00	1030/1380	4.00	4.04	4.32	4.31	4.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	9	0	0	3	0	2	3.80	813/1193	3.80	3.57	4.02	3.99	3.80
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	1	0	2	1	6	4.10	672/1172	4.10	4.26	4.15	3.95	4.10
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	1	0	0	0	9	4.60	490/1182	4.60	4.20	4.35	4.18	4.60
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	327/1170	4.80	4.49	4.38	4.17	4.80
4. Were special techniques successful	6	2	0	2	2	1	3	3.63	624/ 800	3.63	3.48	4.06	3.95	3.63

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	

00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	A	12	Required for Majors	13	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	9	1.00-1.99	0	B	1						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	16	Non-major	16
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	12	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	2						

Course-Section: PUB 304 1
 Title Community Research
 Instructor: Hanlon, Bernadet (Instr. A)
 Enrollment: 14
 Questionnaires: 10

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 1261
 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	1	3	2	4	3.90	1159/1447	3.90	3.81	4.31	4.32	3.90
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	2	5	2	0	2.80	1417/1447	2.80	3.04	4.27	4.23	2.80
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	9	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/1241	****	4.00	4.33	4.33	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	6	1	0	2	0	1	3.00	1359/1402	3.00	3.36	4.24	4.24	3.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	0	2	7	4.40	452/1358	4.40	3.93	4.11	4.10	4.40
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	1	2	2	4	4.00	812/1316	4.00	3.79	4.14	4.13	4.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	6	1	1	2	0	0	2.25	1412/1427	2.25	2.62	4.19	4.15	2.25
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	754/1447	4.80	4.82	4.69	4.65	4.80
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	1	6	3	4.20	701/1434	4.24	4.04	4.10	4.09	4.24
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	2	2	1	2	3.43	1314/1387	3.71	3.98	4.46	4.44	3.71
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	656/1387	4.93	4.86	4.73	4.71	4.93
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	1	3	1	2	3.57	1243/1386	3.79	3.93	4.32	4.30	3.79
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	1	2	1	3	3.86	1128/1380	4.05	4.04	4.32	4.32	4.05
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	4	0	1	1	0	1	3.33	1022/1193	3.33	3.57	4.02	4.05	3.33
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	2	0	4	4.33	521/1172	4.33	4.26	4.15	4.24	4.33
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	0	3	0	3	4.00	856/1182	4.00	4.20	4.35	4.42	4.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	0	2	0	4	4.33	710/1170	4.33	4.49	4.38	4.49	4.33
4. Were special techniques successful	4	1	1	0	2	0	2	3.40	683/ 800	3.40	3.48	4.06	4.12	3.40
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 38	****	****	4.49	4.73	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	9	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 36	****	****	4.25	3.81	****

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: PUB 304 1
 Title Community Research
 Instructor: Meyers, Roy T (Instr. B)
 Enrollment: 14
 Questionnaires: 10

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 1262
 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	1	3	2	4	3.90	1159/1447	3.90	3.81	4.31	4.32	3.90
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	2	5	2	0	2.80	1417/1447	2.80	3.04	4.27	4.23	2.80
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	9	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/1241	****	4.00	4.33	4.33	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	6	1	0	2	0	1	3.00	1359/1402	3.00	3.36	4.24	4.24	3.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	0	2	7	4.40	452/1358	4.40	3.93	4.11	4.10	4.40
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	1	2	2	4	4.00	812/1316	4.00	3.79	4.14	4.13	4.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	6	1	1	2	0	0	2.25	1412/1427	2.25	2.62	4.19	4.15	2.25
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	754/1447	4.80	4.82	4.69	4.65	4.80
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	0	5	2	4.29	600/1434	4.24	4.04	4.10	4.09	4.24
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	5	0	0	0	2	1	2	4.00	1176/1387	3.71	3.98	4.46	4.44	3.71
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	5	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1387	4.93	4.86	4.73	4.71	4.93
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	5	0	0	0	2	1	2	4.00	1047/1386	3.79	3.93	4.32	4.30	3.79
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	887/1380	4.05	4.04	4.32	4.32	4.05
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	6	2	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/1193	3.33	3.57	4.02	4.05	3.33
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	2	0	4	4.33	521/1172	4.33	4.26	4.15	4.24	4.33
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	0	3	0	3	4.00	856/1182	4.00	4.20	4.35	4.42	4.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	0	2	0	4	4.33	710/1170	4.33	4.49	4.38	4.49	4.33
4. Were special techniques successful	4	1	1	0	2	0	2	3.40	683/ 800	3.40	3.48	4.06	4.12	3.40
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 38	****	****	4.49	4.73	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	9	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 36	****	****	4.25	3.81	****

Frequency Distribution

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