

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sept
	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	3	20	24	40	4.13	986/1481	4.21	4.16	4.29	4.14	4.13	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	4	19	21	43	4.18	892/1481	4.32	4.14	4.23	4.18	4.18	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	3	8	19	23	35	3.90	984/1249	4.19	4.23	4.27	4.14	3.90	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	10	2	4	17	21	32	4.01	953/1424	4.30	4.19	4.21	4.06	4.01	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	1	4	3	12	21	46	4.19	564/1396	4.12	4.13	3.98	3.89	4.19	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	3	5	6	27	17	30	3.72	1011/1342	3.93	4.04	4.07	3.88	3.72	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	4	13	14	57	4.41	611/1459	4.55	4.33	4.16	4.17	4.41	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	1	0	6	81	4.90	715/1480	4.58	4.74	4.68	4.64	4.90	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	19	2	1	1	7	36	22	4.15	741/1450	4.23	4.03	4.09	3.97	4.15	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	6	0	0	1	6	18	57	4.60	659/1409	4.67	4.43	4.42	4.36	4.60	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	5	0	0	0	3	10	70	4.81	728/1407	4.85	4.79	4.69	4.57	4.81	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	6	0	0	3	9	21	49	4.41	671/1399	4.56	4.29	4.26	4.23	4.41	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	5	1	1	5	6	25	45	4.32	816/1400	4.50	4.27	4.27	4.19	4.32	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	0	1	2	14	25	43	4.26	442/1179	4.38	3.93	3.96	3.85	4.26	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	30	0	1	2	13	11	31	4.19	617/1262	4.03	3.98	4.05	3.77	4.19	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	30	0	1	3	9	11	34	4.28	770/1259	4.15	4.40	4.29	4.06	4.28	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	30	0	0	1	4	11	42	4.62	496/1256	4.51	4.46	4.30	4.08	4.62	
4. Were special techniques successful	30	16	5	4	8	8	17	3.67	564/ 788	3.70	4.03	4.00	3.80	3.67	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	79	4	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	****/ 246	****	****	4.20	3.93	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	81	0	0	0	1	1	5	4.57	****/ 249	****	****	4.11	3.95	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	81	1	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	****/ 242	****	****	4.40	4.33	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	81	1	0	0	1	0	5	4.67	****/ 240	****	****	4.20	4.20	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	82	1	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	****/ 217	****	****	4.04	4.02	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	82	1	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	****/ 68	****	5.00	4.49	4.54	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	82	1	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	****/ 69	****	4.80	4.53	4.18	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	82	1	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	****/ 63	****	4.80	4.44	4.17	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	82	1	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	****/ 69	****	5.00	4.35	4.14	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	83	1	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	****/ 68	****	4.80	3.92	3.80	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	83	0	1	0	1	1	2	3.60	****/ 59	****	****	4.30	4.00	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	83	0	1	0	0	0	4	4.20	****/ 51	****	****	4.00	3.44	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	83	1	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	****/ 36	****	****	4.60	5.00	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	83	1	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	****/ 41	****	****	4.26	****	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	83	1	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	****/ 31	****	****	4.42	****	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	83	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	****/ 55	****	****	4.55	4.48	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	83	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	****/ 31	****	****	4.75	4.42	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	83	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	****/ 51	****	****	4.65	4.63	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	83	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	****/ 34	****	****	4.83	4.67	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	83	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	****/ 24	****	****	4.82	4.58	****	

Course-Section: SOCY 101 0101
 Title BASIC CONCEPTS IN SOCY
 Instructor: Tufekcioglu, Ze
 Enrollment: 164
 Questionnaires: 88

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2006

Page 1320
 JUN 13, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	16	0.00-0.99	0	A	27	Required for Majors	33	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	6	1.00-1.99	1	B	29						
56-83	8	2.00-2.99	8	C	8	General	10	Under-grad	88	Non-major	88
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	12	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	8	F	0	Electives	8	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	11				
				?	2						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sept
	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	2	6	27	76	4.56	496/1481	4.21	4.16	4.29	4.14	4.56	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	1	4	32	74	4.58	422/1481	4.32	4.14	4.23	4.18	4.58	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	3	4	30	75	4.58	423/1249	4.19	4.23	4.27	4.14	4.58	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	1	1	2	10	33	64	4.43	533/1424	4.30	4.19	4.21	4.06	4.43	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	1	2	3	12	35	58	4.31	459/1396	4.12	4.13	3.98	3.89	4.31	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	4	4	16	37	50	4.13	672/1342	3.93	4.04	4.07	3.88	4.13	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	1	1	7	30	71	4.54	425/1459	4.55	4.33	4.16	4.17	4.54	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	1	0	0	58	52	4.44	1086/1480	4.58	4.74	4.68	4.64	4.44	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	19	1	1	0	1	29	61	4.62	252/1450	4.23	4.03	4.09	3.97	4.62	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	1	0	2	8	98	4.85	261/1409	4.67	4.43	4.42	4.36	4.85	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	1	1	3	104	4.93	400/1407	4.85	4.79	4.69	4.57	4.93	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	5	0	1	0	2	8	96	4.85	170/1399	4.56	4.29	4.26	4.23	4.85	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	1	1	1	10	95	4.82	229/1400	4.50	4.27	4.27	4.19	4.82	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	8	7	0	4	2	22	69	4.61	208/1179	4.38	3.93	3.96	3.85	4.61	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	45	0	3	1	9	13	41	4.31	527/1262	4.03	3.98	4.05	3.77	4.31	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	45	0	1	0	7	14	45	4.52	572/1259	4.15	4.40	4.29	4.06	4.52	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	45	0	0	1	2	12	52	4.72	406/1256	4.51	4.46	4.30	4.08	4.72	
4. Were special techniques successful	45	28	4	4	4	6	21	3.92	468/ 788	3.70	4.03	4.00	3.80	3.92	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	104	4	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	****/ 246	****	****	4.20	3.93	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	106	0	1	0	0	2	3	4.00	****/ 249	****	****	4.11	3.95	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	106	1	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	****/ 242	****	****	4.40	4.33	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	107	0	0	1	0	1	3	4.20	****/ 240	****	****	4.20	4.20	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	107	1	0	1	0	0	3	4.25	****/ 217	****	****	4.04	4.02	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	107	1	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	****/ 68	****	5.00	4.49	4.54	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	108	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	****/ 69	****	4.80	4.53	4.18	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	108	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	****/ 63	****	4.80	4.44	4.17	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	108	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	****/ 69	****	5.00	4.35	4.14	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	108	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	****/ 68	****	4.80	3.92	3.80	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	109	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 59	****	****	4.30	4.00	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	109	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 51	****	****	4.00	3.44	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	109	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 36	****	****	4.60	5.00	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	109	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 41	****	****	4.26	****	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	109	1	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 31	****	****	4.42	****	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	109	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 55	****	****	4.55	4.48	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	109	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 31	****	****	4.75	4.42	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	109	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 51	****	****	4.65	4.63	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	109	1	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 34	****	****	4.83	4.67	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	109	1	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 24	****	****	4.82	4.58	****	

Course-Section: SOCY 101 0201
 Title BASIC CONCEPTS IN SOCY
 Instructor: KELLEY-MOORE, J
 Enrollment: 163
 Questionnaires: 112

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2006

Page 1321
 JUN 13, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	23	0.00-0.99	2	A	47	Required for Majors	51	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	13	1.00-1.99	0	B	44						
56-83	6	2.00-2.99	15	C	7	General	16	Under-grad	112	Non-major	111
84-150	16	3.00-3.49	22	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	17	F	0	Electives	6	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	21				
				?	0						

Course-Section: SOCY 101 0301
 Title BASIC CONCEPTS IN SOCY
 Instructor: TRELA, JAMES E
 Enrollment: 137
 Questionnaires: 50

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2006

Page 1322
 JUN 13, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	0	2	9	21	17	4.08	1018/1481	4.21	4.16	4.29	4.14	4.08	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	2	6	17	24	4.29	790/1481	4.32	4.14	4.23	4.18	4.29	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	1	0	7	14	27	4.35	671/1249	4.19	4.23	4.27	4.14	4.35	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	36	0	1	0	1	11	4.69	263/1424	4.30	4.19	4.21	4.06	4.69	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	1	2	4	10	13	19	3.90	808/1396	4.12	4.13	3.98	3.89	3.90	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	40	0	0	1	1	7	4.67	****/1342	3.93	4.04	4.07	3.88	****	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	0	6	9	33	4.56	390/1459	4.55	4.33	4.16	4.17	4.56	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	45	4	4.08	1329/1480	4.58	4.74	4.68	4.64	4.08	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	9	0	0	2	8	21	10	3.95	904/1450	4.23	4.03	4.09	3.97	3.95	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	2	13	33	4.65	588/1409	4.67	4.43	4.42	4.36	4.65	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	1	5	42	4.85	614/1407	4.85	4.79	4.69	4.57	4.85	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	4	17	27	4.48	601/1399	4.56	4.29	4.26	4.23	4.48	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	1	2	5	9	30	4.38	729/1400	4.50	4.27	4.27	4.19	4.38	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	0	0	1	9	15	23	4.25	442/1179	4.38	3.93	3.96	3.85	4.25	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	21	0	8	1	4	4	12	3.38	1044/1262	4.03	3.98	4.05	3.77	3.38	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	20	0	6	2	5	6	11	3.47	1107/1259	4.15	4.40	4.29	4.06	3.47	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	19	0	2	1	5	5	18	4.16	826/1256	4.51	4.46	4.30	4.08	4.16	
4. Were special techniques successful	19	24	0	0	5	0	2	3.57	****/ 788	3.70	4.03	4.00	3.80	****	
Laboratory															
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	45	0	1	1	2	1	0	2.60	****/ 249	****	****	4.11	3.95	****	
Seminar															
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	48	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 69	****	4.80	4.53	4.18	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	48	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 69	****	5.00	4.35	4.14	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	48	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 68	****	4.80	3.92	3.80	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	48	0	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/ 59	****	****	4.30	4.00	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	48	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 51	****	****	4.00	3.44	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	48	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 36	****	****	4.60	5.00	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	48	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.42	****	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	47	0	0	0	2	0	1	3.67	****/ 55	****	****	4.55	4.48	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	46	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	****/ 31	****	****	4.75	4.42	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	46	1	0	0	3	0	0	3.00	****/ 51	****	****	4.65	4.63	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	47	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 34	****	****	4.83	4.67	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	47	2	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 24	****	****	4.82	4.58	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors		
00-27	10	0.00-0.99	0	A 15	Required for Majors 19	Graduate 0	Major 0
28-55	6	1.00-1.99	1	B 20			
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	4	C 8	General 11	Under-grad 50	Non-major 50
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	6	D 0			
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	8	F 0	Electives 3	#### - Means there are not enough	

P	0			responses to be significant
I	0	Other	8	
?	1			

Course-Section: SOCY 101 0401
 Title BASIC CONCEPTS IN SOCY
 Instructor: Tufekcioglu, Ze
 Enrollment: 99
 Questionnaires: 41

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2006

Page 1323
 JUN 13, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sept
	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	8	16	15	4.07	1024/1481	4.21	4.16	4.29	4.14	4.07	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	5	18	17	4.24	833/1481	4.32	4.14	4.23	4.18	4.24	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	2	1	8	17	13	3.93	962/1249	4.19	4.23	4.27	4.14	3.93	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	4	0	2	7	14	14	4.08	918/1424	4.30	4.19	4.21	4.06	4.08	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	2	1	6	13	18	4.10	643/1396	4.12	4.13	3.98	3.89	4.10	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	2	1	1	11	11	14	3.95	832/1342	3.93	4.04	4.07	3.88	3.95	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	2	8	31	4.71	231/1459	4.55	4.33	4.16	4.17	4.71	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	2	0	38	4.90	702/1480	4.58	4.74	4.68	4.64	4.90	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	9	0	0	0	4	17	11	4.22	672/1450	4.23	4.03	4.09	3.97	4.22	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	1	2	10	28	4.59	670/1409	4.67	4.43	4.42	4.36	4.59	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	2	3	35	4.82	682/1407	4.85	4.79	4.69	4.57	4.82	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	1	0	3	9	26	4.51	556/1399	4.56	4.29	4.26	4.23	4.51	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	2	1	8	27	4.49	613/1400	4.50	4.27	4.27	4.19	4.49	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	0	1	1	5	7	25	4.38	352/1179	4.38	3.93	3.96	3.85	4.38	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	10	0	1	1	6	5	18	4.23	589/1262	4.03	3.98	4.05	3.77	4.23	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	10	0	0	1	5	8	17	4.32	736/1259	4.15	4.40	4.29	4.06	4.32	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	10	0	0	0	5	4	22	4.55	549/1256	4.51	4.46	4.30	4.08	4.55	
4. Were special techniques successful	9	7	1	5	7	4	8	3.52	600/ 788	3.70	4.03	4.00	3.80	3.52	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	38	2	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 246	****	****	4.20	3.93	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	38	0	0	0	2	0	1	3.67	****/ 249	****	****	4.11	3.95	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	38	2	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 242	****	****	4.40	4.33	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	38	2	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 240	****	****	4.20	4.20	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	38	2	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 217	****	****	4.04	4.02	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	37	0	0	0	2	1	1	3.75	****/ 68	****	5.00	4.49	4.54	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	37	2	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/ 69	****	4.80	4.53	4.18	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	37	3	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 63	****	4.80	4.44	4.17	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	37	2	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/ 69	****	5.00	4.35	4.14	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	37	1	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/ 68	****	4.80	3.92	3.80	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	38	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/ 59	****	****	4.30	4.00	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	39	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 51	****	****	4.00	3.44	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	39	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 36	****	****	4.60	5.00	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	39	1	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 41	****	****	4.26	****	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	39	1	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.42	****	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	38	0	0	0	1	2	0	3.67	****/ 55	****	****	4.55	4.48	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	38	0	0	1	1	1	0	3.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.75	4.42	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	38	1	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 51	****	****	4.65	4.63	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	38	0	0	2	0	1	0	2.67	****/ 34	****	****	4.83	4.67	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	38	0	0	0	3	0	0	3.00	****/ 24	****	****	4.82	4.58	****	

Course-Section: SOCY 101 0401
 Title BASIC CONCEPTS IN SOCY
 Instructor: Tufekcioglu, Ze
 Enrollment: 99
 Questionnaires: 41

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2006

Page 1323
 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 1	A 12	Required for Majors 21	Graduate 0 Major 0
28-55	4	1.00-1.99 0	B 19		
56-83	1	2.00-2.99 7	C 1	General 5	Under-grad 41 Non-major 41
84-150	2	3.00-3.49 8	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 7	
			? 1		

Course-Section: SOCY 204 0101
 Title: DIVERSITY & PLURALISM
 Instructor: PINCUS, FRED L
 Enrollment: 35
 Questionnaires: 23

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2006

Page 1324
 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	6	3	1	5	8	3.26	1420/1481	3.26	4.16	4.29	4.40	3.26	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	6	8	9	4.13	934/1481	4.13	4.14	4.23	4.29	4.13	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	6	9	7	3.96	936/1249	3.96	4.23	4.27	4.36	3.96	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	5	11	7	4.09	918/1424	4.09	4.19	4.21	4.28	4.09	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	1	2	4	14	4.32	451/1396	4.32	4.13	3.98	3.94	4.32	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	0	3	3	2	4	9	3.62	1065/1342	3.62	4.04	4.07	4.05	3.62	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	0	2	6	13	4.52	436/1459	4.52	4.33	4.16	4.17	4.52	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	22	5.00	1/1480	5.00	4.74	4.68	4.68	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	1	0	3	10	7	4.05	814/1450	4.05	4.03	4.09	4.15	4.05	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	3	4	14	4.52	739/1409	4.52	4.43	4.42	4.47	4.52	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	1	3	17	4.76	804/1407	4.76	4.79	4.69	4.78	4.76	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	3	5	13	4.48	601/1399	4.48	4.29	4.26	4.29	4.48	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	4	2	1	2	12	3.76	1140/1400	3.76	4.27	4.27	4.34	3.76	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	1	0	2	1	4	13	4.40	340/1179	4.40	3.93	3.96	4.05	4.40	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	3	1	1	4	11	3.95	752/1262	3.95	3.98	4.05	4.11	3.95	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	1	2	1	16	4.60	509/1259	4.60	4.40	4.29	4.34	4.60	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	1	3	2	14	4.45	636/1256	4.45	4.46	4.30	4.28	4.45	
4. Were special techniques successful	3	2	1	0	2	4	11	4.33	254/ 788	4.33	4.03	4.00	3.98	4.33	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 68	****	5.00	4.49	5.00	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 69	****	4.80	4.53	4.83	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 63	****	4.80	4.44	4.00	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 69	****	5.00	4.35	4.72	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 68	****	4.80	3.92	3.55	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 13	Required for Majors	10
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	B 4		Graduate 0
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	C 3	General	4
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad 23
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	7
			? 0		

Course-Section: SOCY 204H 0101
 Title
 Instructor: PINCUS, FRED L (Instr. A)
 Enrollment: 11
 Questionnaires: 11

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2006

Page 1325
 JUN 13, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	0	0	0	7	3	4.30	780/1481	4.30	4.16	4.29	4.40	4.30	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	6	3	4.20	884/1481	4.20	4.14	4.23	4.29	4.20	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	1	0	0	1	1	7	4.67	334/1249	4.67	4.23	4.27	4.36	4.67	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	1	0	0	1	4	4	4.33	645/1424	4.33	4.19	4.21	4.28	4.33	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	3	7	4.70	169/1396	4.70	4.13	3.98	3.94	4.70	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	1	0	0	0	5	4	4.44	364/1342	4.44	4.04	4.07	4.05	4.44	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	1	2	7	4.60	344/1459	4.60	4.33	4.16	4.17	4.60	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1480	5.00	4.74	4.68	4.68	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	5	5	4.50	334/1450	4.45	4.03	4.09	4.15	4.45	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	5	5	4.50	762/1409	4.47	4.43	4.42	4.47	4.47	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	500/1407	4.95	4.79	4.69	4.78	4.95	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	1	1	7	4.67	376/1399	4.58	4.29	4.26	4.29	4.58	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	4	5	4.40	704/1400	4.31	4.27	4.27	4.34	4.31	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	1	0	0	2	4	3	4.11	549/1179	4.18	3.93	3.96	4.05	4.18	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	4	6	4.60	295/1262	4.60	3.98	4.05	4.11	4.60	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1259	5.00	4.40	4.29	4.34	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	2	1	7	4.50	571/1256	4.50	4.46	4.30	4.28	4.50	
4. Were special techniques successful	1	3	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	159/ 788	4.57	4.03	4.00	3.98	4.57	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: SOCY 204H 0101
 Title
 Instructor: PINCUS, FRED L (Instr. B)
 Enrollment: 11
 Questionnaires: 11

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2006

Page 1326
 JUN 13, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	0	0	0	7	3	4.30	780/1481	4.30	4.16	4.29	4.40	4.30	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	6	3	4.20	884/1481	4.20	4.14	4.23	4.29	4.20	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	1	0	0	1	1	7	4.67	334/1249	4.67	4.23	4.27	4.36	4.67	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	1	0	0	1	4	4	4.33	645/1424	4.33	4.19	4.21	4.28	4.33	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	3	7	4.70	169/1396	4.70	4.13	3.98	3.94	4.70	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	1	0	0	0	5	4	4.44	364/1342	4.44	4.04	4.07	4.05	4.44	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	1	2	7	4.60	344/1459	4.60	4.33	4.16	4.17	4.60	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1480	5.00	4.74	4.68	4.68	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	1	4	5	4.40	473/1450	4.45	4.03	4.09	4.15	4.45	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	1	3	5	4.44	839/1409	4.47	4.43	4.42	4.47	4.47	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1407	4.95	4.79	4.69	4.78	4.95	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	2	0	6	4.50	567/1399	4.58	4.29	4.26	4.29	4.58	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	2	3	4	4.22	890/1400	4.31	4.27	4.27	4.34	4.31	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	0	0	0	1	4	3	4.25	442/1179	4.18	3.93	3.96	4.05	4.18	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	4	6	4.60	295/1262	4.60	3.98	4.05	4.11	4.60	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1259	5.00	4.40	4.29	4.34	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	2	1	7	4.50	571/1256	4.50	4.46	4.30	4.28	4.50	
4. Were special techniques successful	1	3	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	159/ 788	4.57	4.03	4.00	3.98	4.57	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: SOCY 300 0101
 Title METHODOLOGY:SOCIAL RSR
 Instructor: MACLENNAN, JAMI
 Enrollment: 44
 Questionnaires: 30

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2006

Page 1327
 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	2	11	3	13	3.83	1206/1481	3.93	4.16	4.29	4.29	3.83	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	7	8	3	12	3.67	1253/1481	3.82	4.14	4.23	4.23	3.67	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	2	4	5	9	10	3.70	1071/1249	3.85	4.23	4.27	4.28	3.70	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	2	1	8	5	14	3.93	1048/1424	4.02	4.19	4.21	4.27	3.93	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	3	3	7	15	4.10	643/1396	4.14	4.13	3.98	4.00	4.10	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	3	3	6	6	11	3.66	1044/1342	3.75	4.04	4.07	4.12	3.66	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	0	4	6	18	4.38	647/1459	4.39	4.33	4.16	4.17	4.38	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	1	28	4.97	281/1480	4.91	4.74	4.68	4.65	4.97	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	2	2	10	8	4	3.38	1272/1450	3.69	4.03	4.09	4.10	3.38	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	3	5	8	5	8	3.34	1323/1409	3.64	4.43	4.42	4.43	3.34	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	4	6	20	4.53	1084/1407	4.47	4.79	4.69	4.67	4.53	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	3	6	5	9	7	3.37	1270/1399	3.72	4.29	4.26	4.27	3.37	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	1	6	4	3	8	8	3.28	1279/1400	3.58	4.27	4.27	4.28	3.28	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	4	2	3	4	7	10	3.77	786/1179	3.48	3.93	3.96	4.02	3.77	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	2	2	5	4	10	3.78	872/1262	3.75	3.98	4.05	4.14	3.78	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	0	1	6	1	15	4.30	751/1259	4.46	4.40	4.29	4.34	4.30	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	0	1	1	4	17	4.61	516/1256	4.58	4.46	4.30	4.34	4.61	
4. Were special techniques successful	7	7	1	4	5	2	4	3.25	690/ 788	3.55	4.03	4.00	4.07	3.25	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	28	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 246	****	****	4.20	4.20	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	28	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 249	****	****	4.11	4.23	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	28	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/ 242	****	****	4.40	4.36	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	28	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 240	****	****	4.20	3.96	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	28	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/ 217	****	****	4.04	4.11	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	28	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 68	****	5.00	4.49	4.70	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	28	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 69	****	4.80	4.53	4.66	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	28	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 63	****	4.80	4.44	4.56	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	28	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 69	****	5.00	4.35	4.48	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	28	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 68	****	4.80	3.92	4.43	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	28	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 59	****	****	4.30	4.48	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	28	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 51	****	****	4.00	4.13	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	28	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/ 36	****	****	4.60	4.33	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	28	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 41	****	****	4.26	3.90	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	28	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.42	4.00	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	28	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 55	****	****	4.55	4.88	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	28	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.75	4.67	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	28	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/ 51	****	****	4.65	4.88	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	28	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/ 34	****	****	4.83	4.67	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	28	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 24	****	****	4.82	4.67	****	

Course-Section: SOCY 300 0101
 Title METHODOLOGY:SOCIAL RSR
 Instructor: MACLENNAN, JAMI
 Enrollment: 44
 Questionnaires: 30

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2006

Page 1327
 JUN 13, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	1	A	8	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	6
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	1	B	15						
56-83	6	2.00-2.99	2	C	5	General	0	Under-grad	30	Non-major	24
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	7	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	3	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	24				
				?	0						

Course-Section: SOCY 300 0201
 Title: METHODOLOGY:SOCIAL RSR
 Instructor: MACLENNAN, JAMI
 Enrollment: 42
 Questionnaires: 28

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2006

Page 1328
 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	1	5	10	11	4.04	1050/1481	3.93	4.16	4.29	4.29	4.04	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	4	3	7	13	3.96	1047/1481	3.82	4.14	4.23	4.23	3.96	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	4	4	8	12	4.00	893/1249	3.85	4.23	4.27	4.28	4.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	1	4	10	12	4.11	908/1424	4.02	4.19	4.21	4.27	4.11	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	1	4	8	14	4.18	574/1396	4.14	4.13	3.98	4.00	4.18	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	1	3	5	8	10	3.85	920/1342	3.75	4.04	4.07	4.12	3.85	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	2	10	15	4.39	623/1459	4.39	4.33	4.16	4.17	4.39	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	1	0	0	0	4	23	4.85	770/1480	4.91	4.74	4.68	4.65	4.85	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	1	1	3	10	8	4.00	836/1450	3.69	4.03	4.09	4.10	4.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	1	3	3	10	10	3.93	1204/1409	3.64	4.43	4.42	4.43	3.93	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	2	1	1	3	20	4.41	1184/1407	4.47	4.79	4.69	4.67	4.41	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	1	1	3	11	10	4.08	976/1399	3.72	4.29	4.26	4.27	4.08	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	3	4	9	10	3.89	1095/1400	3.58	4.27	4.27	4.28	3.89	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	4	4	3	6	3	6	3.18	1016/1179	3.48	3.93	3.96	4.02	3.18	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	10	0	1	0	7	5	5	3.72	902/1262	3.75	3.98	4.05	4.14	3.72	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	10	0	1	0	0	3	14	4.61	499/1259	4.46	4.40	4.29	4.34	4.61	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	10	0	1	0	0	4	13	4.56	543/1256	4.58	4.46	4.30	4.34	4.56	
4. Were special techniques successful	10	5	1	2	1	3	6	3.85	503/ 788	3.55	4.03	4.00	4.07	3.85	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	1	0.00-0.99 0	A 8	Required for Majors	0
28-55	2	1.00-1.99 1	B 12		Graduate 0
56-83	10	2.00-2.99 0	C 6	General	0
84-150	6	3.00-3.49 9	D 0		Under-grad 28
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 10	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	25
			? 0		

Course-Section: SOCY 301 0101
 Title ANALY:SOCIOLOGICAL DAT
 Instructor: MACLENNAN, JAMI
 Enrollment: 43
 Questionnaires: 36

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2006

Page 1329
 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	7	29	4.81	233/1481	4.81	4.16	4.29	4.29	4.81	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	1	34	4.92	103/1481	4.92	4.14	4.23	4.23	4.92	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	35	4.97	43/1249	4.97	4.23	4.27	4.28	4.28	4.97	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	7	0	1	2	3	23	4.66	295/1424	4.66	4.19	4.21	4.27	4.66	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	6	1	5	8	14	3.68	978/1396	3.68	4.13	3.98	4.00	3.68	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	10	0	2	2	5	17	4.42	384/1342	4.42	4.04	4.07	4.12	4.42	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	0	1	6	28	4.67	276/1459	4.67	4.33	4.16	4.17	4.67	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	22	14	4.39	1126/1480	4.39	4.74	4.68	4.65	4.39	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	7	0	0	0	0	8	21	4.72	179/1450	4.72	4.03	4.09	4.10	4.72	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	0	4	29	4.88	231/1409	4.88	4.43	4.42	4.43	4.88	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	0	0	33	5.00	1/1407	5.00	4.79	4.69	4.67	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	5	0	0	0	0	2	29	4.94	90/1399	4.94	4.29	4.26	4.27	4.94	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	2	30	4.94	102/1400	4.94	4.27	4.27	4.28	4.94	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	5	1	1	0	2	4	23	4.60	208/1179	4.60	3.93	3.96	4.02	4.60	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	11	0	3	0	4	4	14	4.04	694/1262	4.04	3.98	4.05	4.14	4.04	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	11	0	1	0	3	1	20	4.56	540/1259	4.56	4.40	4.29	4.34	4.56	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	12	0	0	1	1	4	18	4.63	496/1256	4.63	4.46	4.30	4.34	4.63	
4. Were special techniques successful	11	11	1	1	2	1	9	4.14	347/ 788	4.14	4.03	4.00	4.07	4.14	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	32	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	****/ 246	****	****	4.20	4.20	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	32	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	****/ 249	****	****	4.11	4.23	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	32	1	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 242	****	****	4.40	4.36	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	32	2	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 240	****	****	4.20	3.96	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	32	3	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 217	****	****	4.04	4.11	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 21	Required for Majors	0
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	B 12		Graduate 0
56-83	7	2.00-2.99	C 2	General	0
84-150	14	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad 36
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	34
			? 0		

Course-Section: SOCY 315 0101
 Title POPULATION & SOCIETY
 Instructor: ROTHSTEIN, WILL
 Enrollment: 42
 Questionnaires: 29

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2006

Page 1330
 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	2	11	15	4.38	708/1481	4.38	4.16	4.29	4.29	4.38	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	4	9	16	4.41	646/1481	4.41	4.14	4.23	4.23	4.41	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	4	6	18	4.41	611/1249	4.41	4.23	4.27	4.28	4.41	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	7	0	0	6	6	10	4.18	818/1424	4.18	4.19	4.21	4.27	4.18	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	4	1	4	5	9	6	3.60	1025/1396	3.60	4.13	3.98	4.00	3.60	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	5	2	0	6	7	9	3.88	905/1342	3.88	4.04	4.07	4.12	3.88	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	0	0	4	6	18	4.50	460/1459	4.50	4.33	4.16	4.17	4.50	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	29	5.00	1/1480	5.00	4.74	4.68	4.65	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	2	0	0	7	10	5	3.91	973/1450	3.91	4.03	4.09	4.10	3.91	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	2	5	22	4.69	529/1409	4.69	4.43	4.42	4.43	4.69	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	6	23	4.79	747/1407	4.79	4.79	4.69	4.67	4.79	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	5	6	17	4.43	659/1399	4.43	4.29	4.26	4.27	4.43	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	7	20	4.62	468/1400	4.62	4.27	4.27	4.28	4.62	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	3	0	2	8	9	7	3.81	760/1179	3.81	3.93	3.96	4.02	3.81	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	1	4	2	5	10	3.86	823/1262	3.86	3.98	4.05	4.14	3.86	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	0	1	4	9	8	4.09	869/1259	4.09	4.40	4.29	4.34	4.09	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	0	5	2	8	7	3.77	1035/1256	3.77	4.46	4.30	4.34	3.77	
4. Were special techniques successful	7	20	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 788	****	4.03	4.00	4.07	****	
Laboratory															
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	28	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 249	****	****	4.11	4.23	****	
Seminar															
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	28	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 69	****	4.80	4.53	4.66	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	28	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 63	****	4.80	4.44	4.56	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	28	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 69	****	5.00	4.35	4.48	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	28	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 59	****	****	4.30	4.48	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	28	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 51	****	****	4.00	4.13	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	28	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 36	****	****	4.60	4.33	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	28	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 41	****	****	4.26	3.90	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	28	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.42	4.00	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	27	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 55	****	****	4.55	4.88	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	27	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.75	4.67	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	27	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 51	****	****	4.65	4.88	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	27	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 34	****	****	4.83	4.67	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	27	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 24	****	****	4.82	4.67	****	

Course-Section: SOCY 315 0101
 Title POPULATION & SOCIETY
 Instructor: ROTHSTEIN, WILL
 Enrollment: 42
 Questionnaires: 29

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2006

Page 1330
 JUN 13, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	12	Required for Majors	6	Graduate	0	Major	2
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	1	B	9						
56-83	6	2.00-2.99	4	C	4	General	11	Under-grad	29	Non-major	27
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	3	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	12				
				?	1						

Course-Section: SOCY 321 8020
 Title RACE & ETHNIC RELATION
 Instructor: SUFIAN, MERYL
 Enrollment: 13
 Questionnaires: 13

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2006

Page 1331
 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	3	6	3	3.85	1199/1481	3.85	4.16	4.29	4.29	3.85	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	4	3	6	4.15	917/1481	4.15	4.14	4.23	4.23	4.15	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	3	8	4.46	548/1249	4.46	4.23	4.27	4.28	4.46	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	0	1	4	7	4.23	762/1424	4.23	4.19	4.21	4.27	4.23	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	3	2	7	4.15	594/1396	4.15	4.13	3.98	4.00	4.15	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	4	7	4.38	424/1342	4.38	4.04	4.07	4.12	4.38	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	0	7	5	4.23	792/1459	4.23	4.33	4.16	4.17	4.23	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	8	5	4.38	1126/1480	4.38	4.74	4.68	4.65	4.38	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	3	9	1	3.85	1022/1450	3.85	4.03	4.09	4.10	3.85	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	4	8	4.54	727/1409	4.54	4.43	4.42	4.43	4.54	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	2	11	4.85	636/1407	4.85	4.79	4.69	4.67	4.85	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	2	3	8	4.46	613/1399	4.46	4.29	4.26	4.27	4.46	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	4	7	4.38	729/1400	4.38	4.27	4.27	4.28	4.38	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	3	2	1	3	0	4	3.30	984/1179	3.30	3.93	3.96	4.02	3.30	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	1	4	7	4.23	583/1262	4.23	3.98	4.05	4.14	4.23	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	2	11	4.85	266/1259	4.85	4.40	4.29	4.34	4.85	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	1	0	0	5	7	4.31	742/1256	4.31	4.46	4.30	4.34	4.31	
4. Were special techniques successful	0	1	0	0	1	3	8	4.58	156/ 788	4.58	4.03	4.00	4.07	4.58	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 4	Required for Majors	1
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	B 7		Graduate 0
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	C 2	General	10
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad 13
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	2
			? 0		

Course-Section: SOCY 333 0101
 Title HUM SEXUALITY/CROSS-CU
 Instructor: SPURGAS, ALYSON
 Enrollment: 101
 Questionnaires: 42

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2006

Page 1332
 JUN 13, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	2	3	4	12	20	4.10	1012/1481	4.10	4.16	4.29	4.29	4.10	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	3	3	8	9	18	3.88	1136/1481	3.88	4.14	4.23	4.23	3.88	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	5	4	3	13	16	3.76	1046/1249	3.76	4.23	4.27	4.28	3.76	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	5	6	2	6	5	16	3.66	1227/1424	3.66	4.19	4.21	4.27	3.66	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	2	2	4	12	21	4.17	574/1396	4.17	4.13	3.98	4.00	4.17	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	1	6	5	4	10	15	3.58	1084/1342	3.58	4.04	4.07	4.12	3.58	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	2	1	7	8	23	4.20	827/1459	4.20	4.33	4.16	4.17	4.20	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	2	31	8	4.15	1295/1480	4.15	4.74	4.68	4.65	4.15	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	9	0	2	1	8	15	7	3.73	1124/1450	3.73	4.03	4.09	4.10	3.73	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	1	0	1	7	31	4.68	544/1409	4.68	4.43	4.42	4.43	4.68	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	3	5	32	4.72	880/1407	4.73	4.79	4.69	4.67	4.72	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	5	0	1	1	9	2	24	4.27	810/1399	4.27	4.29	4.26	4.27	4.27	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	2	0	6	9	22	4.26	867/1400	4.26	4.27	4.27	4.28	4.26	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	3	3	1	9	7	15	3.86	726/1179	3.86	3.93	3.96	4.02	3.86	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	11	0	4	0	2	11	14	4.00	708/1262	4.00	3.98	4.05	4.14	4.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	11	0	0	0	4	9	18	4.45	634/1259	4.45	4.40	4.29	4.34	4.45	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	11	0	0	1	2	7	21	4.55	549/1256	4.55	4.46	4.30	4.34	4.55	
4. Were special techniques successful	11	25	0	0	1	2	3	4.33	****/ 788	****	4.03	4.00	4.07	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	6	0.00-0.99 1	A 16	Required for Majors 9	Graduate 0 Major 6
28-55	4	1.00-1.99 0	B 15		
56-83	4	2.00-2.99 6	C 3	General 15	Under-grad 42 Non-major 36
84-150	13	3.00-3.49 11	D 0		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 8	F 0	Electives 1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 1		
			I 0	Other 13	
			? 3		

Course-Section: SOCY 335 0101
 Title TERRORISM & SOCIAL VIO
 Instructor: HEWITT, CHRIS J
 Enrollment: 49
 Questionnaires: 29

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2006

Page 1333
 JUN 13, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	0	1	1	4	22	4.68	384/1481	4.68	4.16	4.29	4.29	4.68	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	0	1	4	4	18	4.44	603/1481	4.44	4.14	4.23	4.23	4.44	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	0	0	2	2	7	16	4.37	647/1249	4.37	4.23	4.27	4.28	4.37	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	1	0	1	4	7	14	4.31	684/1424	4.31	4.19	4.21	4.27	4.31	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	4	4	1	10	3	6	3.25	1199/1396	3.25	4.13	3.98	4.00	3.25	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	7	1	3	2	4	11	4.00	755/1342	4.00	4.04	4.07	4.12	4.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	3	0	3	10	12	4.00	961/1459	4.00	4.33	4.16	4.17	4.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	19	8	4.30	1185/1480	4.30	4.74	4.68	4.65	4.30	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	1	0	3	5	15	4.38	504/1450	4.38	4.03	4.09	4.10	4.38	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	1	0	1	3	21	4.65	574/1409	4.65	4.43	4.42	4.43	4.65	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	0	0	0	25	5.00	1/1407	5.00	4.79	4.69	4.67	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	0	0	4	4	17	4.52	545/1399	4.52	4.29	4.26	4.27	4.52	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	1	2	22	4.84	208/1400	4.84	4.27	4.27	4.28	4.84	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	2	2	1	8	5	7	3.61	860/1179	3.61	3.93	3.96	4.02	3.61	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	20	0	3	1	2	0	3	2.89	1179/1262	2.89	3.98	4.05	4.14	2.89	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	19	0	1	0	4	0	5	3.80	1027/1259	3.80	4.40	4.29	4.34	3.80	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	19	0	1	0	1	1	7	4.30	742/1256	4.30	4.46	4.30	4.34	4.30	
4. Were special techniques successful	19	9	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 788	****	4.03	4.00	4.07	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99 0	A 14	Required for Majors 4	Graduate 0 Major 4
28-55	2	1.00-1.99 0	B 9		
56-83	3	2.00-2.99 2	C 2	General 9	Under-grad 29 Non-major 25
84-150	9	3.00-3.49 6	D 0		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 5	F 0	Electives 2	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 10	
			? 0		

Course-Section: SOCY 352 0101
 Title ISSUES IN HEALTH CARE
 Instructor: CHARD, SARAH
 Enrollment: 56
 Questionnaires: 41

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2006

Page 1334
 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	2	7	31	4.66	406/1481	4.66	4.16	4.29	4.29	4.66	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	13	26	4.59	422/1481	4.59	4.14	4.23	4.23	4.59	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	0	1	13	26	4.54	470/1249	4.54	4.23	4.27	4.28	4.54	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	6	4	30	4.54	406/1424	4.54	4.19	4.21	4.27	4.54	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	1	4	11	24	4.37	411/1396	4.37	4.13	3.98	4.00	4.37	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	2	4	12	22	4.27	534/1342	4.27	4.04	4.07	4.12	4.27	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	2	2	8	29	4.56	390/1459	4.56	4.33	4.16	4.17	4.56	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	5	36	4.88	743/1480	4.88	4.74	4.68	4.65	4.88	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	8	1	0	0	3	11	18	4.47	389/1450	4.47	4.03	4.09	4.10	4.47	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	1	4	34	4.85	275/1409	4.85	4.43	4.42	4.43	4.85	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	1	3	35	4.87	568/1407	4.87	4.79	4.69	4.67	4.87	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	2	6	30	4.74	289/1399	4.74	4.29	4.26	4.27	4.74	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	1	6	31	4.79	274/1400	4.79	4.27	4.27	4.28	4.79	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	1	1	0	0	14	22	4.51	253/1179	4.51	3.93	3.96	4.02	4.51	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	6	11	15	4.28	550/1262	4.28	3.98	4.05	4.14	4.28	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	9	0	0	0	2	3	27	4.78	325/1259	4.78	4.40	4.29	4.34	4.78	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	0	0	0	4	28	4.88	240/1256	4.88	4.46	4.30	4.34	4.88	
4. Were special techniques successful	9	10	1	2	3	8	8	3.91	487/ 788	3.91	4.03	4.00	4.07	3.91	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	40	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 246	****	****	4.20	4.20	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	40	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 249	****	****	4.11	4.23	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	40	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 242	****	****	4.40	4.36	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	40	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 240	****	****	4.20	3.96	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	40	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 217	****	****	4.04	4.11	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	40	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 68	****	5.00	4.49	4.70	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	40	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 69	****	4.80	4.53	4.66	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	40	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 63	****	4.80	4.44	4.56	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	40	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 69	****	5.00	4.35	4.48	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	40	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 68	****	4.80	3.92	4.43	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	40	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 59	****	****	4.30	4.48	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	40	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 51	****	****	4.00	4.13	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	40	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 36	****	****	4.60	4.33	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	40	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 41	****	****	4.26	3.90	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	40	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.42	4.00	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	40	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 55	****	****	4.55	4.88	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	40	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.75	4.67	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	40	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 51	****	****	4.65	4.88	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	40	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 34	****	****	4.83	4.67	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	40	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 24	****	****	4.82	4.67	****	

Course-Section: SOCY 352 0101
 Title ISSUES IN HEALTH CARE
 Instructor: CHARD, SARAH
 Enrollment: 56
 Questionnaires: 41

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2006

Page 1334
 JUN 13, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	21	Required for Majors	7	Graduate	0	Major	9
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	14						
56-83	5	2.00-2.99	10	C	0	General	10	Under-grad	41	Non-major	32
84-150	21	3.00-3.49	8	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	8	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	1						
				I	0	Other	19				
				?	1						

Course-Section: SOCY 353 0101
 Title MARRIAGE AND THE FAMIL
 Instructor: SERVATIUS, NANC
 Enrollment: 101
 Questionnaires: 22

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2006

Page 1335
 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	2	5	6	1	8	3.36	1398/1481	3.36	4.16	4.29	4.29	3.36	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	4	6	1	3	8	3.23	1390/1481	3.23	4.14	4.23	4.23	3.23	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	0	2	3	5	4	6	3.45	1127/1249	3.45	4.23	4.27	4.28	3.45	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	1	2	4	2	5	7	3.55	1258/1424	3.55	4.19	4.21	4.27	3.55	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	3	3	4	4	2	6	3.21	1214/1396	3.21	4.13	3.98	4.00	3.21	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	9	1	3	3	1	5	3.46	1135/1342	3.46	4.04	4.07	4.12	3.46	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	4	2	4	4	7	3.38	1303/1459	3.38	4.33	4.16	4.17	3.38	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	1	0	0	1	5	14	4.65	959/1480	4.65	4.74	4.68	4.65	4.65	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	4	5	1	4	2	3	2.80	1398/1450	2.80	4.03	4.09	4.10	2.80	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	8	0	4	3	6	2.95	1366/1409	2.95	4.43	4.42	4.43	2.95	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	2	4	3	13	4.23	1268/1407	4.23	4.79	4.69	4.67	4.23	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	5	3	5	1	8	3.18	1305/1399	3.18	4.29	4.26	4.27	3.18	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	8	2	3	2	7	2.91	1335/1400	2.91	4.27	4.27	4.28	2.91	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	6	3	4	2	2	3	2.86	1093/1179	2.86	3.93	3.96	4.02	2.86	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	2	2	3	3	4	3.36	1052/1262	3.36	3.98	4.05	4.14	3.36	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	2	1	3	2	6	3.64	1071/1259	3.64	4.40	4.29	4.34	3.64	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	3	0	3	2	6	3.57	1090/1256	3.57	4.46	4.30	4.34	3.57	
4. Were special techniques successful	8	3	2	2	2	1	4	3.27	686/ 788	3.27	4.03	4.00	4.07	3.27	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	3	0.00-0.99 0	A 11	Required for Majors	8
28-55	0	1.00-1.99 0	B 9		Graduate 0
56-83	2	2.00-2.99 6	C 0	General	7
84-150	8	3.00-3.49 4	D 0		Under-grad 22
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 4	F 0	Electives	1
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	4
			? 0		

Course-Section: SOCY 354 0101
 Title SOC BASES:PUBL/COMM HL
 Instructor: BREWER, MARY
 Enrollment: 45
 Questionnaires: 16

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2006

Page 1336
 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	3	3	3	3	4	3.13	1438/1481	3.13	4.16	4.29	4.29	3.13	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	4	1	7	1	3	2.88	1446/1481	2.88	4.14	4.23	4.23	2.88	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	3	2	6	2	3	3.00	1193/1249	3.00	4.23	4.27	4.28	3.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	3	2	5	3	2	2.93	1377/1424	2.93	4.19	4.21	4.27	2.93	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	3	0	5	3	5	3.44	1120/1396	3.44	4.13	3.98	4.00	3.44	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	2	2	1	5	3	3	3.29	1200/1342	3.29	4.04	4.07	4.12	3.29	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	3	2	1	4	6	3.50	1256/1459	3.50	4.33	4.16	4.17	3.50	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	16	5.00	1/1480	5.00	4.74	4.68	4.65	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	4	2	4	2	1	2.54	1426/1450	2.54	4.03	4.09	4.10	2.54	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	2	1	8	1	4	3.25	1338/1409	3.25	4.43	4.42	4.43	3.25	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	1	0	1	6	8	4.25	1257/1407	4.25	4.79	4.69	4.67	4.25	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	5	2	5	2	2	2.63	1373/1399	2.63	4.29	4.26	4.27	2.63	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	4	2	4	2	4	3.00	1312/1400	3.00	4.27	4.27	4.28	3.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	3	4	3	1	1	2	2.45	1134/1179	2.45	3.93	3.96	4.02	2.45	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	9	0	3	1	2	0	1	2.29	1238/1262	2.29	3.98	4.05	4.14	2.29	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	9	0	3	0	1	1	2	2.86	1193/1259	2.86	4.40	4.29	4.34	2.86	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	2	0	1	2	2	3.29	1141/1256	3.29	4.46	4.30	4.34	3.29	
4. Were special techniques successful	9	4	0	1	1	0	1	3.33	****/ 788	****	4.03	4.00	4.07	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 7	Required for Majors	2
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	B 4		Graduate 0
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	C 2	General	4
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad 16
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	1
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	8
			? 2		

Course-Section: SOCY 372 0101
 Title JUVENILE DELINQUENCY
 Instructor: Knapp, Roland
 Enrollment: 60
 Questionnaires: 39

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2006

Page 1337
 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	3	2	4	9	21	4.10	1006/1481	4.10	4.16	4.29	4.29	4.10	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	4	7	7	21	4.15	917/1481	4.15	4.14	4.23	4.23	4.15	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	7	8	23	4.36	663/1249	4.36	4.23	4.27	4.28	4.36	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	1	2	4	8	22	4.30	695/1424	4.30	4.19	4.21	4.27	4.30	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	1	5	4	8	20	4.08	662/1396	4.08	4.13	3.98	4.00	4.08	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	4	4	5	2	8	16	3.77	974/1342	3.77	4.04	4.07	4.12	3.77	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	4	5	29	4.59	367/1459	4.59	4.33	4.16	4.17	4.59	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	1	0	0	0	20	17	4.46	1079/1480	4.46	4.74	4.68	4.65	4.46	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	2	2	0	8	16	6	3.75	1098/1450	3.75	4.03	4.09	4.10	3.75	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	2	0	4	8	22	4.33	968/1409	4.33	4.43	4.42	4.43	4.33	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	4	6	27	4.62	1008/1407	4.62	4.79	4.69	4.67	4.62	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	2	1	5	11	17	4.11	956/1399	4.11	4.29	4.26	4.27	4.11	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	1	4	5	7	19	4.08	991/1400	4.08	4.27	4.27	4.28	4.08	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	7	1	1	5	7	15	4.17	503/1179	4.17	3.93	3.96	4.02	4.17	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	12	0	5	1	4	1	16	3.81	855/1262	3.81	3.98	4.05	4.14	3.81	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	12	0	3	3	5	3	13	3.74	1046/1259	3.74	4.40	4.29	4.34	3.74	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	12	0	3	0	5	4	15	4.04	888/1256	4.04	4.46	4.30	4.34	4.04	
4. Were special techniques successful	12	11	2	1	1	0	12	4.19	324/ 788	4.19	4.03	4.00	4.07	4.19	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99 0	A 23	Required for Majors 0	Graduate 0 Major 9
28-55	4	1.00-1.99 0	B 8		
56-83	3	2.00-2.99 6	C 2	General 15	Under-grad 39 Non-major 30
84-150	13	3.00-3.49 7	D 0		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 11	F 0	Electives 1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 17	
			? 0		

Course-Section: SOCY 396 0101
 Title COMM SERV & LEARN INTE
 Instructor: WOLFF, MICHELE
 Enrollment: 16
 Questionnaires: 10

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2006

Page 1338
 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	3	4	3	4.00	1069/1481	4.00	4.16	4.29	4.29	4.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	6	3	4.20	884/1481	4.20	4.14	4.23	4.23	4.20	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	6	0	0	0	3	1	4.25	742/1249	4.25	4.23	4.27	4.28	4.25	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	4	0	0	0	3	3	4.50	437/1424	4.50	4.19	4.21	4.27	4.50	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	3	6	4.50	297/1396	4.50	4.13	3.98	4.00	4.50	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	1	0	5	2	4.00	755/1342	4.00	4.04	4.07	4.12	4.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	7	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1459	5.00	4.33	4.16	4.17	5.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	4	6	4.60	997/1480	4.60	4.74	4.68	4.65	4.60	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	1	5	3	4.22	662/1450	4.22	4.03	4.09	4.10	4.22	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	0	4	4	4.50	762/1409	4.50	4.43	4.42	4.43	4.50	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	568/1407	4.88	4.79	4.69	4.67	4.88	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	0	4	4	4.50	567/1399	4.50	4.29	4.26	4.27	4.50	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	1	0	2	5	4.38	741/1400	4.38	4.27	4.27	4.28	4.38	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	6	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/1179	****	3.93	3.96	4.02	****	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	2	6	4.56	320/1262	4.56	3.98	4.05	4.14	4.56	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	229/1259	4.89	4.40	4.29	4.34	4.89	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1256	5.00	4.46	4.30	4.34	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	1	2	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	117/ 788	4.71	4.03	4.00	4.07	4.71	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	1	0.00-0.99 0	A 0	Required for Majors 0	Graduate 0 Major 1
28-55	1	1.00-1.99 0	B 0		
56-83	3	2.00-2.99 3	C 0	General 3	Under-grad 10 Non-major 9
84-150	3	3.00-3.49 2	D 0		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 3	F 0	Electives 6	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 9		
			I 0	Other 1	
			? 0		

Course-Section: SOCY 397 0101
 Title SELECTED TOPICS IN SOC
 Instructor: Tufekcioglu, Ze
 Enrollment: 41
 Questionnaires: 28

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2006

Page 1339
 JUN 13, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	2	0	0	1	5	8	12	4.19	918/1481	4.19	4.16	4.29	4.29	4.19	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	0	2	5	12	7	3.92	1094/1481	3.92	4.14	4.23	4.23	3.92	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	0	1	2	6	7	10	3.88	988/1249	3.88	4.23	4.27	4.28	3.88	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	4	2	0	3	11	6	3.86	1116/1424	3.86	4.19	4.21	4.27	3.86	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	0	3	13	9	4.12	633/1396	4.12	4.13	3.98	4.00	4.12	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	1	1	2	4	11	7	3.84	927/1342	3.84	4.04	4.07	4.12	3.84	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	1	1	0	3	4	17	4.44	550/1459	4.44	4.33	4.16	4.17	4.44	
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	1	1	0	0	1	23	4.80	839/1480	4.80	4.74	4.68	4.65	4.80	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	8	0	0	0	3	10	7	4.20	692/1450	4.20	4.03	4.09	4.10	4.20	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	5	0	0	0	0	8	15	4.65	574/1409	4.65	4.43	4.42	4.43	4.65	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	0	0	3	21	4.88	568/1407	4.88	4.79	4.69	4.67	4.88	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	5	0	0	1	4	6	12	4.26	819/1399	4.26	4.29	4.26	4.27	4.26	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	1	1	4	17	4.61	492/1400	4.61	4.27	4.27	4.28	4.61	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	0	0	1	3	7	13	4.33	384/1179	4.33	3.93	3.96	4.02	4.33	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	1	2	10	8	4.19	610/1262	4.19	3.98	4.05	4.14	4.19	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	0	0	0	5	16	4.76	347/1259	4.76	4.40	4.29	4.34	4.76	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	0	0	0	4	17	4.81	296/1256	4.81	4.46	4.30	4.34	4.81	
4. Were special techniques successful	7	3	1	3	4	4	6	3.61	580/ 788	3.61	4.03	4.00	4.07	3.61	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	23	2	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/ 246	****	****	4.20	4.20	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	24	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	****/ 249	****	****	4.11	4.23	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	25	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 242	****	****	4.40	4.36	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	25	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 240	****	****	4.20	3.96	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	26	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 217	****	****	4.04	4.11	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	22	1	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	****/ 68	****	5.00	4.49	4.70	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	23	0	0	0	2	0	3	4.20	****/ 69	****	4.80	4.53	4.66	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	23	1	0	0	2	0	2	4.00	****/ 63	****	4.80	4.44	4.56	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	23	0	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	****/ 69	****	5.00	4.35	4.48	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	23	1	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	****/ 68	****	4.80	3.92	4.43	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	24	0	1	0	0	1	2	3.75	****/ 59	****	****	4.30	4.48	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	25	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 51	****	****	4.00	4.13	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	25	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/ 36	****	****	4.60	4.33	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	25	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/ 41	****	****	4.26	3.90	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	25	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/ 31	****	****	4.42	4.00	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	24	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	****/ 55	****	****	4.55	4.88	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	24	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	****/ 31	****	****	4.75	4.67	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	24	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	****/ 51	****	****	4.65	4.88	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	24	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	****/ 34	****	****	4.83	4.67	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	24	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	****/ 24	****	****	4.82	4.67	****	

Course-Section: SOCY 397 0101
 Title SELECTED TOPICS IN SOC
 Instructor: Tufekcioglu, Ze
 Enrollment: 41
 Questionnaires: 28

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2006

Page 1339
 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	9	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	3
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	1	B	12						
56-83	9	2.00-2.99	4	C	1	General	7	Under-grad	28	Non-major	25
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	6	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	15				
				?	1						

Course-Section: SOCY 409 0101
 Title SOCIOLOGICAL THEORY
 Instructor: COHEN, JERE M
 Enrollment: 39
 Questionnaires: 21

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2006

Page 1340
 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	7	12	4.48	587/1481	4.48	4.16	4.29	4.45	4.48	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	5	13	4.48	560/1481	4.48	4.14	4.23	4.32	4.48	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	6	15	4.71	278/1249	4.71	4.23	4.27	4.44	4.71	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	11	0	0	2	3	5	4.30	684/1424	4.30	4.19	4.21	4.35	4.30	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	4	7	10	4.29	476/1396	4.29	4.13	3.98	4.09	4.29	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	8	0	0	1	2	10	4.69	166/1342	4.69	4.04	4.07	4.21	4.69	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	3	6	12	4.43	580/1459	4.43	4.33	4.16	4.25	4.43	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	21	5.00	1/1480	5.00	4.74	4.68	4.74	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	0	15	4	4.21	672/1450	4.21	4.03	4.09	4.28	4.21	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	0	2	16	4.89	217/1409	4.89	4.43	4.42	4.51	4.89	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	0	0	18	5.00	1/1407	5.00	4.79	4.69	4.79	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	1	6	11	4.56	513/1399	4.56	4.29	4.26	4.36	4.56	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	4	14	4.78	287/1400	4.78	4.27	4.27	4.38	4.78	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	13	3	0	1	0	1	2.20	****/1179	****	3.93	3.96	4.07	****	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	4	1	2	7	3.86	829/1262	3.86	3.98	4.05	4.33	3.86	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	0	2	0	3	9	4.36	715/1259	4.36	4.40	4.29	4.57	4.36	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	0	0	1	3	10	4.64	477/1256	4.64	4.46	4.30	4.60	4.64	
4. Were special techniques successful	8	10	1	0	0	0	2	3.67	****/ 788	****	4.03	4.00	4.26	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 11	Required for Majors	0
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	B 6		Graduate 0
56-83	5	2.00-2.99	C 1	General	3
84-150	7	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad 21
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	15
			? 1		

Course-Section: SOCY 415 0101
 Title HIGHER ED AND SOC INEQ
 Instructor: PINCUS, FRED L
 Enrollment: 15
 Questionnaires: 12

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2006

Page 1341
 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	9	4.75	292/1481	4.75	4.16	4.29	4.45	4.75	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	5	5	4.25	822/1481	4.25	4.14	4.23	4.32	4.25	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	10	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/1249	****	4.23	4.27	4.44	****	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	1	0	4	6	4.36	607/1424	4.36	4.19	4.21	4.35	4.36	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	3	9	4.75	136/1396	4.75	4.13	3.98	4.09	4.75	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	2	9	4.67	190/1342	4.67	4.04	4.07	4.21	4.67	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	2	5	5	4.25	775/1459	4.25	4.33	4.16	4.25	4.25	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/1480	5.00	4.74	4.68	4.74	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	0	4	5	4.56	296/1450	4.56	4.03	4.09	4.28	4.56	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	3	9	4.75	417/1409	4.75	4.43	4.42	4.51	4.75	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	450/1407	4.92	4.79	4.69	4.79	4.92	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	1	2	8	4.64	417/1399	4.64	4.29	4.26	4.36	4.64	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	1	9	4.58	511/1400	4.58	4.27	4.27	4.38	4.58	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	10	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1179	****	3.93	3.96	4.07	****	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	10	4.83	154/1262	4.83	3.98	4.05	4.33	4.83	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	190/1259	4.92	4.40	4.29	4.57	4.92	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	1	2	9	4.67	457/1256	4.67	4.46	4.30	4.60	4.67	
4. Were special techniques successful	0	7	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	218/ 788	4.40	4.03	4.00	4.26	4.40	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 68	****	5.00	4.49	4.68	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	11	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 69	****	4.80	4.53	4.64	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 63	****	4.80	4.44	4.49	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 69	****	5.00	4.35	4.53	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	11	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 68	****	4.80	3.92	4.10	****	
Self Paced															
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	11	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 24	****	****	4.82	5.00	****	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: SOCY 419 0101
 Title QUAL METH SOCIAL RESRC
 Instructor: SAN ANTONIO, PA
 Enrollment: 21
 Questionnaires: 14

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2006

Page 1342
 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	3	10	4.64	417/1481	4.64	4.16	4.29	4.45	4.64	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	0	1	3	9	4.36	715/1481	4.36	4.14	4.23	4.32	4.36	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	8	0	0	1	2	3	4.33	679/1249	4.33	4.23	4.27	4.44	4.33	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	3	0	0	0	4	6	4.60	334/1424	4.60	4.19	4.21	4.35	4.60	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	2	3	7	4.23	519/1396	4.23	4.13	3.98	4.09	4.23	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	2	10	4.69	166/1342	4.69	4.04	4.07	4.21	4.69	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	1	2	0	0	4	6	4.00	961/1459	4.00	4.33	4.16	4.25	4.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	1	12	4.92	561/1480	4.92	4.74	4.68	4.74	4.92	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	0	0	4	5	4.56	296/1450	4.56	4.03	4.09	4.28	4.56	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	1	4	8	4.54	727/1409	4.54	4.43	4.42	4.51	4.54	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	2	12	4.86	614/1407	4.86	4.79	4.69	4.79	4.86	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	7	7	4.50	567/1399	4.50	4.29	4.26	4.36	4.50	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	5	8	4.50	591/1400	4.50	4.27	4.27	4.38	4.50	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	5	2	1	1	3	1	3.00	1041/1179	3.00	3.93	3.96	4.07	3.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	3	1	6	4.30	537/1262	4.30	3.98	4.05	4.33	4.30	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	0	1	3	6	4.50	588/1259	4.50	4.40	4.29	4.57	4.50	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	0	0	3	7	4.70	428/1256	4.70	4.46	4.30	4.60	4.70	
4. Were special techniques successful	4	3	0	0	1	5	1	4.00	394/ 788	4.00	4.03	4.00	4.26	4.00	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	13	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 68	****	5.00	4.49	4.68	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	13	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 69	****	4.80	4.53	4.64	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 63	****	4.80	4.44	4.49	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 69	****	5.00	4.35	4.53	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	13	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 68	****	4.80	3.92	4.10	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 59	****	****	4.30	4.93	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	11	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	****/ 51	****	****	4.00	4.56	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	11	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 36	****	****	4.60	4.91	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	11	1	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 41	****	****	4.26	4.72	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	11	1	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 31	****	****	4.42	4.83	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors		
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	1	A 6	Required for Majors 0	Graduate 8	Major 2
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B 6			
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C 0	General 5	Under-grad 6	Non-major 12
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	0	D 0			
Grad.	8	3.50-4.00	7	F 0	Electives 2	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	
				P 0			
				I 0	Other 5		
				? 2			

Course-Section: SOCY 451 0101
 Title SOCY OF HEALTH & ILLNE
 Instructor: SCHUMACHER, JOH
 Enrollment: 32
 Questionnaires: 28

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2006

Page 1343
 JUN 13, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	0	1	1	5	20	4.63	439/1481	4.63	4.16	4.29	4.45	4.63	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	6	20	4.70	274/1481	4.70	4.14	4.23	4.32	4.70	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	3	4	20	4.63	381/1249	4.63	4.23	4.27	4.44	4.63	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	1	0	0	0	9	17	4.65	295/1424	4.65	4.19	4.21	4.35	4.65	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	4	22	4.78	126/1396	4.78	4.13	3.98	4.09	4.78	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	1	5	7	12	4.08	713/1342	4.08	4.04	4.07	4.21	4.08	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	1	4	3	19	4.48	490/1459	4.48	4.33	4.16	4.25	4.48	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	1	26	4.96	281/1480	4.96	4.74	4.68	4.74	4.96	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	2	0	1	11	10	4.13	761/1450	4.13	4.03	4.09	4.28	4.13	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	0	1	25	4.96	75/1409	4.96	4.43	4.42	4.51	4.96	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	0	1	24	4.96	200/1407	4.96	4.79	4.69	4.79	4.96	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	0	5	21	4.81	212/1399	4.81	4.29	4.26	4.36	4.81	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	1	0	3	22	4.77	299/1400	4.77	4.27	4.27	4.38	4.77	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	0	0	1	1	1	23	4.77	129/1179	4.77	3.93	3.96	4.07	4.77	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	1	2	7	12	4.36	477/1262	4.36	3.98	4.05	4.33	4.36	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	0	1	0	21	4.91	211/1259	4.91	4.40	4.29	4.57	4.91	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	0	0	1	2	19	4.82	288/1256	4.82	4.46	4.30	4.60	4.82	
4. Were special techniques successful	6	7	0	1	3	1	10	4.33	254/ 788	4.33	4.03	4.00	4.26	4.33	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	26	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 68	****	5.00	4.49	4.68	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	27	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 69	****	4.80	4.53	4.64	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	27	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 63	****	4.80	4.44	4.49	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	27	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 69	****	5.00	4.35	4.53	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	27	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 68	****	4.80	3.92	4.10	****	
Field Work															
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	27	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 36	****	****	4.60	4.91	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	27	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 41	****	****	4.26	4.72	****	
Self Paced															
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	27	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.75	5.00	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	27	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 51	****	****	4.65	4.71	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	A 14	Required for Majors	3
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	B 9		Graduate 6
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	C 1	General	11
84-150	8	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad 22
Grad.	6	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	13
			? 1		

Course-Section: SOCY 604 0101
 Title STATISTICAL ANALYSIS
 Instructor: COHEN, JERE M
 Enrollment: 20
 Questionnaires: 18

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2006

Page 1345
 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	3	4	4	6	3.61	1319/1481	3.61	4.16	4.29	4.28	3.61	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	3	5	4	6	3.72	1221/1481	3.72	4.14	4.23	4.11	3.72	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	9	6	4.11	846/1249	4.11	4.23	4.27	4.24	4.11	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	1	3	5	7	4.13	885/1424	4.13	4.19	4.21	4.16	4.13	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	1	7	4	5	3.61	1018/1396	3.61	4.13	3.98	4.00	3.61	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	9	0	0	2	2	5	4.33	474/1342	4.33	4.04	4.07	4.18	4.33	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	2	1	5	10	4.28	757/1459	4.28	4.33	4.16	4.01	4.28	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	18	5.00	1/1480	5.00	4.74	4.68	4.74	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	1	3	5	4	3	3.31	1291/1450	3.31	4.03	4.09	3.96	3.31	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	2	3	6	7	4.00	1152/1409	4.00	4.43	4.42	4.36	4.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	3	14	4.72	880/1407	4.72	4.79	4.69	4.73	4.72	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	3	2	5	6	2	3.11	1314/1399	3.11	4.29	4.26	4.16	3.11	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	1	7	2	7	3.72	1160/1400	3.72	4.27	4.27	4.17	3.72	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	15	2	0	0	0	1	2.33	****/1179	****	3.93	3.96	3.81	****	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	3	3	1	3	2	2.83	1186/1262	2.83	3.98	4.05	4.07	2.83	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	1	1	0	4	6	4.08	872/1259	4.08	4.40	4.29	4.30	4.08	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	0	1	1	5	5	4.17	826/1256	4.17	4.46	4.30	4.33	4.17	
4. Were special techniques successful	6	10	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 788	****	4.03	4.00	3.97	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	5	0.00-0.99 0	A 5	Required for Majors 0	Graduate 9 Major 14
28-55	0	1.00-1.99 0	B 6		
56-83	0	2.00-2.99 0	C 4	General 0	Under-grad 9 Non-major 4
84-150	1	3.00-3.49 2	D 1		
Grad.	9	3.50-4.00 13	F 1	Electives 0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 16	
			? 0		

Course-Section: SOCY 606 0101
 Title SOC INEQUALITY/SOC POL
 Instructor: HEWITT, CHRIS J
 Enrollment: 22
 Questionnaires: 17

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2006

Page 1346
 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	2	5	3	6	3.65	1307/1481	3.65	4.16	4.29	4.28	3.65	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	2	5	4	2	4	3.06	1416/1481	3.06	4.14	4.23	4.11	3.06	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	4	0	0	5	2	4	3.91	980/1249	3.91	4.23	4.27	4.24	3.91	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	3	1	2	2	6	3	3.57	1251/1424	3.57	4.19	4.21	4.16	3.57	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	1	4	5	6	3.82	861/1396	3.82	4.13	3.98	4.00	3.82	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	7	3	0	2	2	3	3.20	1220/1342	3.20	4.04	4.07	4.18	3.20	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	5	1	5	2	3	2.81	1411/1459	2.81	4.33	4.16	4.01	2.81	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	13	4	4.24	1230/1480	4.24	4.74	4.68	4.74	4.24	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	1	1	3	6	3	3.64	1170/1450	3.64	4.03	4.09	3.96	3.64	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	1	2	7	5	4.07	1134/1409	4.07	4.43	4.42	4.36	4.07	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	3	12	4.80	728/1407	4.80	4.79	4.69	4.73	4.80	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	1	3	7	4	3.93	1067/1399	3.93	4.29	4.26	4.16	3.93	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	4	5	1	5	3.47	1240/1400	3.47	4.27	4.27	4.17	3.47	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	12	2	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/1179	****	3.93	3.96	3.81	****	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	1	2	2	10	4.40	437/1262	4.40	3.98	4.05	4.07	4.40	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	1	0	3	11	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	3	1	11	4.53	554/1256	4.53	4.46	4.30	4.33	4.53	
4. Were special techniques successful	2	13	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 788	****	4.03	4.00	3.97	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	13	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	****/ 68	****	5.00	4.49	4.23	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	13	0	1	0	1	0	2	3.50	****/ 69	****	4.80	4.53	4.46	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	13	0	1	0	0	0	3	4.00	****/ 63	****	4.80	4.44	4.44	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	****/ 69	****	5.00	4.35	4.16	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	13	0	1	0	1	0	2	3.50	****/ 68	****	4.80	3.92	3.71	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors		
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	0	A 11	Required for Majors 1	Graduate 9	Major 1
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B 4			
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C 0	General 3	Under-grad 8	Non-major 16
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	5	D 0			
Grad.	9	3.50-4.00	7	F 0	Electives 0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	
				P 0			
				I 0	Other 13		
				? 2			