

Course Section: AGNG 200 0101
 Title THE AGING EXPERIENCE
 Instructor: MAJESKI, ROBIN
 Enrollment: 28
 Questionnaires: 18

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2006

Page 23
 JAN 18, 2007
 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	1	7	9	4.47	633/1669	3.86	3.86	4.23	4.34	4.47	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	1	4	4	8	4.12	1028/1666	3.59	3.59	4.19	4.29	4.12	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	3	0	7	7	4.06	950/1421	3.65	3.65	4.24	4.35	4.06	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	1	0	0	3	6	7	4.25	801/1617	3.61	3.61	4.15	4.24	4.25	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	3	4	1	8	3.88	963/1555	3.52	3.52	4.00	3.96	3.88	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	1	0	1	1	6	7	4.27	649/1543	3.70	3.70	4.06	4.10	4.27	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	2	2	4	1	7	3.56	1369/1647	3.55	3.55	4.12	4.19	3.56	
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	0	16	5.00	1/1668	4.93	4.93	4.67	4.59	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	6	7	1	3.64	1286/1605	3.27	3.27	4.07	4.15	3.64	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	4	6	7	4.18	1130/1514	3.68	3.68	4.39	4.39	4.18	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	3	14	4.82	732/1551	4.56	4.56	4.66	4.72	4.82	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	6	4	7	4.06	1040/1503	3.43	3.43	4.24	4.29	4.06	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	3	7	7	4.24	926/1506	3.63	3.63	4.26	4.33	4.24	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	1	2	4	10	4.35	373/1311	3.66	3.66	3.85	3.96	4.35	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	3	4	9	4.38	585/1490	3.67	3.67	4.05	4.11	4.38	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	0	4	12	4.75	393/1502	4.15	4.15	4.26	4.31	4.75	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	0	3	13	4.81	368/1489	4.23	4.23	4.29	4.36	4.81	
4. Were special techniques successful	2	0	0	3	2	4	7	3.94	568/1006	3.47	3.47	4.00	3.99	3.94	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	14	3	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 226	****	****	4.20	4.42	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	16	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 233	****	****	4.19	4.36	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	15	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 225	****	****	4.50	4.74	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	16	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 223	****	****	4.35	4.71	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	16	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 112	****	****	4.38	4.59	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	16	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 97	****	****	4.36	4.60	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	16	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 92	****	****	4.22	4.50	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 105	****	****	4.20	4.63	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	16	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 98	****	****	3.95	4.20	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 58	****	****	4.22	4.20	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	16	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.06	5.00	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	16	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 39	****	****	4.39	5.00	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	16	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 40	****	****	3.97	5.00	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	17	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.33	5.00	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 55	****	****	4.34	4.67	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	17	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 42	****	****	4.31	5.00	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 46	****	****	4.45	5.00	****	

Course Section: AGNG 200 0101
 Title THE AGING EXPERIENCE
 Instructor: MAJESKI, ROBIN
 Enrollment: 28
 Questionnaires: 18

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2006

Page 23
 JAN 18, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	2	A	7	Required for Majors	2	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	9						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	5	Under-grad	18	Non-major	17
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	0	D	1						
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	11				
				?	1						

Course Section: AGNG 200 0201
 Title THE AGING EXPERIENCE
 Instructor: MAJESKI, ROBIN
 Enrollment: 55
 Questionnaires: 36

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2006

Page 24
 JAN 18, 2007
 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	3	5	14	8	6	3.25	1563/1669	3.86	3.86	4.23	4.34	3.25	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	11	12	9	3	3.06	1574/1666	3.59	3.59	4.19	4.29	3.06	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	3	2	7	9	11	4	3.24	1310/1421	3.65	3.65	4.24	4.35	3.24	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	5	6	11	9	3	2.97	1526/1617	3.61	3.61	4.15	4.24	2.97	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	5	6	6	14	4	3.17	1392/1555	3.52	3.52	4.00	3.96	3.17	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	4	8	9	9	6	3.14	1382/1543	3.70	3.70	4.06	4.10	3.14	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	3	6	5	11	10	3.54	1377/1647	3.55	3.55	4.12	4.19	3.54	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	1	0	2	33	4.86	788/1668	4.93	4.93	4.67	4.59	4.86	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	8	0	3	7	10	6	2	2.89	1527/1605	3.27	3.27	4.07	4.15	2.89	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	3	6	10	12	3	3.18	1441/1514	3.68	3.68	4.39	4.39	3.18	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	8	8	18	4.29	1322/1551	4.56	4.56	4.66	4.72	4.29	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	5	7	14	6	2	2.79	1448/1503	3.43	3.43	4.24	4.29	2.79	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	5	8	6	11	4	3.03	1402/1506	3.63	3.63	4.26	4.33	3.03	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	2	3	11	8	4	6	2.97	1133/1311	3.66	3.66	3.85	3.96	2.97	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	4	9	4	8	4	2.97	1350/1490	3.67	3.67	4.05	4.11	2.97	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	1	6	8	4	10	3.55	1290/1502	4.15	4.15	4.26	4.31	3.55	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	2	2	8	9	8	3.66	1225/1489	4.23	4.23	4.29	4.36	3.66	
4. Were special techniques successful	7	2	7	2	7	6	5	3.00	923/1006	3.47	3.47	4.00	3.99	3.00	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	32	1	0	1	1	1	0	3.00	****/ 226	****	****	4.20	4.42	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	33	0	0	0	2	1	0	3.33	****/ 233	****	****	4.19	4.36	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	31	2	0	0	1	2	0	3.67	****/ 225	****	****	4.50	4.74	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	33	0	0	1	0	2	0	3.33	****/ 223	****	****	4.35	4.71	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	33	0	1	0	0	2	0	3.00	****/ 206	****	****	4.15	4.59	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	32	1	0	0	0	3	0	4.00	****/ 112	****	****	4.38	4.59	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	32	0	0	1	1	1	1	3.50	****/ 97	****	****	4.36	4.60	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	32	1	0	1	0	2	0	3.33	****/ 92	****	****	4.22	4.50	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	32	0	0	1	1	2	0	3.25	****/ 105	****	****	4.20	4.63	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	32	0	0	1	0	2	1	3.75	****/ 98	****	****	3.95	4.20	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	33	0	1	0	1	1	0	2.67	****/ 58	****	****	4.22	4.20	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	33	0	0	1	1	1	0	3.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.06	5.00	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	34	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 39	****	****	4.39	5.00	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	33	0	0	0	1	2	0	3.67	****/ 40	****	****	3.97	5.00	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	33	0	0	1	1	1	0	3.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.33	5.00	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	34	0	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/ 55	****	****	4.34	4.67	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	33	0	0	1	1	1	0	3.00	****/ 42	****	****	4.31	5.00	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	33	0	0	1	1	1	0	3.00	****/ 46	****	****	4.45	5.00	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	33	0	0	1	1	1	0	3.00	****/ 33	****	****	4.25	5.00	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	33	0	0	1	0	2	0	3.33	****/ 29	****	****	4.34	5.00	****	

Course Section: AGNG 200 0201
 Title THE AGING EXPERIENCE
 Instructor: MAJESKI, ROBIN
 Enrollment: 55
 Questionnaires: 36

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2006

Page 24
 JAN 18, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	3	A	21	Required for Majors	4	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	B	8						
56-83	6	2.00-2.99	0	C	2	General	6	Under-grad	36	Non-major	35
84-150	6	3.00-3.49	4	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	6	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	15				
				?	0						