

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	4	5	9	3.90	1220/1522	4.23	3.97	4.30	4.34	3.90	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	2	1	5	13	4.38	726/1522	4.51	4.08	4.26	4.29	4.38	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	7	11	4.33	706/1285	4.63	4.09	4.30	4.36	4.33	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	5	9	6	3.95	1068/1476	4.32	4.01	4.22	4.20	3.95	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	5	8	7	4.00	760/1412	4.48	3.86	4.06	4.00	4.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	3	4	5	9	3.95	872/1381	4.15	3.94	4.08	3.97	3.95	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	2	1	6	10	4.26	770/1500	4.41	4.24	4.18	4.20	4.26	
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	0	19	5.00	1/1517	4.92	4.92	4.65	4.63	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	1	0	0	4	6	6	4.13	807/1497	4.37	3.74	4.11	4.11	4.13	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	5	16	4.76	432/1440	4.67	4.24	4.45	4.42	4.76	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	4	17	4.81	765/1448	4.88	4.37	4.71	4.78	4.81	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	8	13	4.62	467/1436	4.68	4.08	4.29	4.29	4.62	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	3	5	13	4.48	669/1432	4.65	4.25	4.29	4.31	4.48	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	1	0	0	1	4	14	4.68	162/1221	4.47	4.14	3.93	4.02	4.68	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	1	2	6	8	4.24	598/1280	4.21	4.10	4.10	4.08	4.24	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	0	0	6	11	4.65	489/1277	4.66	4.19	4.34	4.33	4.65	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	0	2	5	10	4.47	611/1269	4.61	4.27	4.31	4.33	4.47	
4. Were special techniques successful	4	3	0	0	1	7	6	4.36	277/ 854	4.36	3.94	4.02	4.00	4.36	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	18	1	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 215	****	****	4.36	4.62	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	18	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	****/ 228	****	****	4.35	4.56	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	18	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 217	****	****	4.51	4.57	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	18	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 216	****	****	4.42	4.72	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	19	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 205	****	****	4.23	4.37	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	20	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 79	****	****	4.58	4.58	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 77	****	****	4.52	5.00	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	20	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 65	****	****	4.49	5.00	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	20	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 78	****	****	4.45	5.00	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 80	****	****	4.11	4.00	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	20	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 47	****	****	4.41	4.83	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors		
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A 7	Required for Majors 3	Graduate 0	Major 0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B 5			
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	4	C 2	General 7	Under-grad 21	Non-major 21
84-150	6	3.00-3.49	5	D 0			
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F 0	Electives 1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	
				P 1			
				I 0	Other 3		
				? 1			

Course-Section: AGNG 200 0201
 Title THE AGING EXPERIENCE
 Instructor: FREIBERG, KAREN
 Enrollment: 36
 Questionnaires: 25

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 26
 JUN 26, 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	0	0	0	0	1	9	15	4.56	537/1522	4.23	3.97	4.30	4.34	4.56	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	3	19	4.64	383/1522	4.51	4.08	4.26	4.29	4.64	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	23	4.92	120/1285	4.63	4.09	4.30	4.36	4.92	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	6	0	0	1	4	14	4.68	295/1476	4.32	4.01	4.22	4.20	4.68	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	24	4.96	41/1412	4.48	3.86	4.06	4.00	4.96	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	11	0	2	1	1	10	4.36	495/1381	4.15	3.94	4.08	3.97	4.36	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	1	6	17	4.56	425/1500	4.41	4.24	4.18	4.20	4.56	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	4	21	4.84	623/1517	4.92	4.92	4.65	4.63	4.84	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	1	0	0	1	6	14	4.62	304/1497	4.37	3.74	4.11	4.11	4.62	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	3	4	17	4.58	705/1440	4.67	4.24	4.45	4.42	4.58	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	1	23	4.96	247/1448	4.88	4.37	4.71	4.78	4.96	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	1	1	1	20	4.74	326/1436	4.68	4.08	4.29	4.29	4.74	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	2	0	20	4.82	280/1432	4.65	4.25	4.29	4.31	4.82	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	1	2	3	2	16	4.25	461/1221	4.47	4.14	3.93	4.02	4.25	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	9	0	2	0	1	3	10	4.19	631/1280	4.21	4.10	4.10	4.08	4.19	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	10	0	0	0	1	3	11	4.67	470/1277	4.66	4.19	4.34	4.33	4.67	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	0	0	1	2	13	4.75	381/1269	4.61	4.27	4.31	4.33	4.75	
4. Were special techniques successful	10	10	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	****/ 854	4.36	3.94	4.02	4.00	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	23	0	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/ 47	****	****	4.41	4.83	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	23	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 45	****	****	4.30	4.58	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	23	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 39	****	****	4.40	4.75	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	22	1	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 35	****	****	4.31	4.75	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	22	1	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 34	****	****	4.30	4.17	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	24	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 37	****	****	4.63	****	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	23	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 23	****	****	4.41	****	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	23	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 33	****	****	4.69	****	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	23	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 22	****	****	4.54	****	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	23	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 18	****	****	4.49	****	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors		
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	0	A 14	Required for Majors 4	Graduate 0	Major 0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B 9			
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	3	C 0	General 17	Under-grad 25	Non-major 25
84-150	6	3.00-3.49	7	D 0			
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F 0	Electives 1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	
				P 0			
				I 0	Other 2		
				? 0			

Course-Section: AGNG 300 0101
 Title OVERVIEW: AGING SERVIC
 Instructor: GRIBBIN, JOSEPH (Instr. A)
 Enrollment: 24
 Questionnaires: 17

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 27
 JUN 26, 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	0	0	1	1	1	5	9	4.18	980/1522	4.18	3.97	4.30	4.34	4.18	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	2	4	5	5	3.65	1309/1522	3.65	4.08	4.26	4.25	3.65	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	1	1	3	5	2	5	3.44	1189/1285	3.44	4.09	4.30	4.30	3.44	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	3	0	2	3	5	3	3.69	1227/1476	3.69	4.01	4.22	4.26	3.69	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	1	3	1	3	3	5	3.40	1225/1412	3.40	3.86	4.06	4.03	3.40	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	2	2	2	2	3	5	3.50	1152/1381	3.50	3.94	4.08	4.13	3.50	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	1	1	4	0	2	8	3.80	1147/1500	3.80	4.24	4.18	4.13	3.80	
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	1	0	0	0	3	11	4.79	749/1517	4.79	4.92	4.65	4.62	4.79	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	2	1	0	3	3	7	4.07	852/1497	3.39	3.74	4.11	4.13	3.39	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	1	0	2	0	13	4.50	798/1440	4.13	4.24	4.45	4.46	4.13	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	1	0	1	1	13	4.56	1106/1448	4.22	4.37	4.71	4.71	4.22	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	1	1	1	2	11	4.31	814/1436	3.72	4.08	4.29	4.30	3.72	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	1	0	2	0	2	11	4.47	682/1432	3.90	4.25	4.29	4.29	3.90	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	1	1	2	2	3	7	3.87	720/1221	3.77	4.14	3.93	3.94	3.77	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	1	3	3	7	4.14	657/1280	4.14	4.10	4.10	4.14	4.14	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	1	4	3	6	4.00	930/1277	4.00	4.19	4.34	4.38	4.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	4	5	5	4.07	859/1269	4.07	4.27	4.31	4.39	4.07	
4. Were special techniques successful	3	9	1	0	1	2	1	3.40	705/ 854	3.40	3.94	4.02	4.00	3.40	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	2	0.00-0.99 0	A 3	Required for Majors	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99 0	B 5		Graduate 0
56-83	7	2.00-2.99 5	C 5	General	17
84-150	2	3.00-3.49 4	D 0		Major 5
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 2	F 0	Electives	
			P 0		
			I 0		
			? 0	Other	10

- Means there are not enough responses to be significant

Course-Section: AGNG 300 0101
 Title OVERVIEW: AGING SERVIC
 Instructor: (Instr. B)
 Enrollment: 24
 Questionnaires: 17

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 28
 JUN 26, 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	0	0	1	1	1	5	9	4.18	980/1522	4.18	3.97	4.30	4.34	4.18	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	2	4	5	5	3.65	1309/1522	3.65	4.08	4.26	4.25	3.65	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	1	1	3	5	2	5	3.44	1189/1285	3.44	4.09	4.30	4.30	3.44	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	3	0	2	3	5	3	3.69	1227/1476	3.69	4.01	4.22	4.26	3.69	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	1	3	1	3	3	5	3.40	1225/1412	3.40	3.86	4.06	4.03	3.40	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	2	2	2	2	3	5	3.50	1152/1381	3.50	3.94	4.08	4.13	3.50	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	1	1	4	0	2	8	3.80	1147/1500	3.80	4.24	4.18	4.13	3.80	
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	1	0	0	0	3	11	4.79	749/1517	4.79	4.92	4.65	4.62	4.79	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	2	3	1	7	3	0	2.71	1464/1497	3.39	3.74	4.11	4.13	3.39	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	1	3	3	1	8	3.75	1304/1440	4.13	4.24	4.45	4.46	4.13	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	1	1	4	3	7	3.88	1388/1448	4.22	4.37	4.71	4.71	4.22	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	3	4	2	2	5	3.13	1370/1436	3.72	4.08	4.29	4.30	3.72	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	1	4	1	1	4	5	3.33	1320/1432	3.90	4.25	4.29	4.29	3.90	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	4	1	2	2	2	5	3.67	832/1221	3.77	4.14	3.93	3.94	3.77	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	1	3	3	7	4.14	657/1280	4.14	4.10	4.10	4.14	4.14	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	1	4	3	6	4.00	930/1277	4.00	4.19	4.34	4.38	4.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	4	5	5	4.07	859/1269	4.07	4.27	4.31	4.39	4.07	
4. Were special techniques successful	3	9	1	0	1	2	1	3.40	705/ 854	3.40	3.94	4.02	4.00	3.40	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	2	0.00-0.99 0	A 3	Required for Majors 0	Graduate 0 Major 12
28-55	1	1.00-1.99 0	B 5		
56-83	7	2.00-2.99 5	C 5	General 2	Under-grad 17 Non-major 5
84-150	2	3.00-3.49 4	D 0		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 2	F 0	Electives 0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 10	
			? 0		

Course-Section: AGNG 422 0101
 Title RESEARCH APPLICATIONS
 Instructor: MAJESKI, ROBIN (Instr. A)
 Enrollment: 5
 Questionnaires: 4

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 29
 JUN 26, 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	0	0	0	0	3	1	0	3.25	1464/1522	3.25	3.97	4.30	4.42	3.25	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	1	1	3.75	1267/1522	3.75	4.08	4.26	4.34	3.75	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	938/1285	4.00	4.09	4.30	4.42	4.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	2	0	3.67	1245/1476	3.67	4.01	4.22	4.31	3.67	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	3	1	0	3.25	1287/1412	3.25	3.86	4.06	4.11	3.25	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	1	1	3.75	1046/1381	3.75	3.94	4.08	4.21	3.75	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	780/1500	4.25	4.24	4.18	4.25	4.25	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1517	5.00	4.92	4.65	4.71	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	2	2	0	3.50	1277/1497	3.08	3.74	4.11	4.21	3.08	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	1186/1440	3.67	4.24	4.45	4.52	3.67	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	3	0	3.75	1402/1448	3.71	4.37	4.71	4.75	3.71	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	4	0	4.00	1056/1436	3.50	4.08	4.29	4.32	3.50	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	884/1432	3.96	4.25	4.29	4.34	3.96	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	606/1221	4.00	4.14	3.93	4.04	4.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	0	3	0	3.50	1031/1280	3.50	4.10	4.10	4.28	3.50	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	1	0	0	2	1	3.50	1136/1277	3.50	4.19	4.34	4.50	3.50	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	1	3	0	3.75	1030/1269	3.75	4.27	4.31	4.49	3.75	
4. Were special techniques successful	0	0	0	0	1	3	0	3.75	588/ 854	3.75	3.94	4.02	4.31	3.75	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 1	Required for Majors	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	B 2		Graduate 0
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	C 0	General	1
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad 4
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: AGNG 422 0101
 Title RESEARCH APPLICATIONS
 Instructor: (Instr. B)
 Enrollment: 5
 Questionnaires: 4

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 30
 JUN 26, 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	0	0	0	0	3	1	0	3.25	1464/1522	3.25	3.97	4.30	4.42	3.25	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	1	1	3.75	1267/1522	3.75	4.08	4.26	4.34	3.75	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	938/1285	4.00	4.09	4.30	4.42	4.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	2	0	3.67	1245/1476	3.67	4.01	4.22	4.31	3.67	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	3	1	0	3.25	1287/1412	3.25	3.86	4.06	4.11	3.25	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	1	1	3.75	1046/1381	3.75	3.94	4.08	4.21	3.75	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	780/1500	4.25	4.24	4.18	4.25	4.25	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1517	5.00	4.92	4.65	4.71	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	1	0	1	1	0	2.67	1469/1497	3.08	3.74	4.11	4.21	3.08	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	1	0	2	0	3.33	1385/1440	3.67	4.24	4.45	4.52	3.67	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	1	2	0	3.67	1411/1448	3.71	4.37	4.71	4.75	3.71	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	1	0	0	2	0	3.00	1378/1436	3.50	4.08	4.29	4.32	3.50	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	0	0	0	2	3.67	1224/1432	3.96	4.25	4.29	4.34	3.96	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	606/1221	4.00	4.14	3.93	4.04	4.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	0	3	0	3.50	1031/1280	3.50	4.10	4.10	4.28	3.50	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	1	0	0	2	1	3.50	1136/1277	3.50	4.19	4.34	4.50	3.50	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	1	3	0	3.75	1030/1269	3.75	4.27	4.31	4.49	3.75	
4. Were special techniques successful	0	0	0	0	1	3	0	3.75	588/ 854	3.75	3.94	4.02	4.31	3.75	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 1	Required for Majors	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	B 2		Graduate 0
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	C 0	General	4
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	D 0		Major 2
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: AGNG 440 0101
 Title: DIVERSITY - AGING SVCS
 Instructor: FRANKOWSKI, ANN
 Enrollment: 5
 Questionnaires: 4

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 31
 JUN 26, 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	0	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	605/1522	4.50	3.97	4.30	4.42	4.50	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	255/1522	4.75	4.08	4.26	4.34	4.75	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	531/1285	4.50	4.09	4.30	4.42	4.50	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	226/1476	4.75	4.01	4.22	4.31	4.75	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	167/1412	4.75	3.86	4.06	4.11	4.75	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	149/1381	4.75	3.94	4.08	4.21	4.75	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	211/1500	4.75	4.24	4.18	4.25	4.75	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1517	5.00	4.92	4.65	4.71	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	385/1497	4.50	3.74	4.11	4.21	4.50	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	452/1440	4.75	4.24	4.45	4.52	4.75	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1448	5.00	4.37	4.71	4.75	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	295/1436	4.75	4.08	4.29	4.32	4.75	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	350/1432	4.75	4.25	4.29	4.34	4.75	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	279/1221	4.50	4.14	3.93	4.04	4.50	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1280	5.00	4.10	4.10	4.28	5.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1277	5.00	4.19	4.34	4.50	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1269	5.00	4.27	4.31	4.49	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	0	2	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 854	5.00	3.94	4.02	4.31	5.00	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 2	Required for Majors	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	B 2		Graduate
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	C 0	General	0
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	D 0		4
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		
			I 0	Other	3
			? 0		

- Means there are not enough responses to be significant