

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>GERO 750 1</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Theory/Methods I</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Morgan,Leslie A</b>

**Term - Fall 2011**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>4</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	1118/1520	4.00	4.10	4.31	4.39	4.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	1	1	3.75	1274/1520	3.75	3.86	4.27	4.28	3.75
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	1	0	3.25	1411/1483	3.25	3.50	4.23	4.25	3.25
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	803/1417	4.00	4.13	4.08	4.13	4.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	0	2	4.00	843/1405	4.00	4.11	4.12	4.24	4.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	3	1	0	0	2.25	1489/1504	2.25	2.88	4.16	4.21	2.25
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1519	5.00	4.87	4.70	4.77	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	3	0	4.00	891/1495	4.00	3.97	4.11	4.20	4.00
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	1	0	1	1	3.67	1361/1459	3.67	3.91	4.47	4.48	3.67
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	1195/1460	4.50	4.59	4.74	4.77	4.50
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	2	0	1	3.67	1274/1455	3.67	3.91	4.32	4.31	3.67
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	2	0	0	2.67	1440/1456	2.58	3.13	4.34	4.32	2.58
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	2	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	1281/1316	2.50	2.97	4.03	3.86	2.50
<b>Discussion</b>														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	1	1	3.75	934/1243	3.75	3.78	4.17	4.23	3.75
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	324/1241	4.75	4.55	4.33	4.39	4.75
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	649/1236	4.50	4.56	4.40	4.47	4.50
4. Were special techniques successful	0	1	1	0	1	1	0	2.67	872/889	2.67	3.44	4.02	4.06	2.67
<b>Laboratory</b>														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	3	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	151/164	3.00	3.00	4.15	3.66	3.00

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>GERO 750 1</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Theory/Methods I</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Morgan,Leslie A</b>

**Term - Fall 2011**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>4</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Laboratory</b>														
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	3	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	157/165	3.00	3.00	4.19	3.75	3.00
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	3	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	156/160	3.00	3.00	4.45	3.91	3.00
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	3	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	156/158	2.00	2.00	4.36	3.59	2.00
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	3	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	149/150	2.00	2.00	4.05	3.71	2.00
<b>Seminar</b>														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	1	0	0	0	2	1	0	3.33	64/67	3.33	3.63	4.60	4.62	3.33
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	1	0	0	1	0	1	1	3.67	60/66	3.67	3.67	4.55	4.62	3.67
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	47/62	4.33	4.26	4.54	4.59	4.33
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	58/68	4.00	4.15	4.59	4.62	4.00
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	1	0	0	2	0	1	0	2.67	63/66	2.67	3.07	4.20	4.26	2.67

### Frequency Distribution

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

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>GERO 750 1</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Theory/Methods I</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Picot,Sandra Je</b>

**Term - Fall 2011**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>4</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	1118/1520	4.00	4.10	4.31	4.39	4.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	1	1	3.75	1274/1520	3.75	3.86	4.27	4.28	3.75
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	1	0	3.25	1411/1483	3.25	3.50	4.23	4.25	3.25
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	803/1417	4.00	4.13	4.08	4.13	4.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	0	2	4.00	843/1405	4.00	4.11	4.12	4.24	4.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	3	1	0	0	2.25	1489/1504	2.25	2.88	4.16	4.21	2.25
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1519	5.00	4.87	4.70	4.77	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	3	0	4.00	891/1495	4.00	3.97	4.11	4.20	4.00
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	1	0	1	1	3.67	1361/1459	3.67	3.91	4.47	4.48	3.67
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	1195/1460	4.50	4.59	4.74	4.77	4.50
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	2	0	1	3.67	1274/1455	3.67	3.91	4.32	4.31	3.67
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	1445/1456	2.58	3.13	4.34	4.32	2.58
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	2	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	1281/1316	2.50	2.97	4.03	3.86	2.50
<b>Discussion</b>														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	1	1	3.75	934/1243	3.75	3.78	4.17	4.23	3.75
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	324/1241	4.75	4.55	4.33	4.39	4.75
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	649/1236	4.50	4.56	4.40	4.47	4.50
4. Were special techniques successful	0	1	1	0	1	1	0	2.67	872/889	2.67	3.44	4.02	4.06	2.67
<b>Laboratory</b>														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	3	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	151/164	3.00	3.00	4.15	3.66	3.00

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>GERO 750 1</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Theory/Methods I</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Picot,Sandra Je</b>

**Term - Fall 2011**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>4</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Laboratory</b>														
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	3	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	157/165	3.00	3.00	4.19	3.75	3.00
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	3	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	156/160	3.00	3.00	4.45	3.91	3.00
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	3	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	156/158	2.00	2.00	4.36	3.59	2.00
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	3	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	149/150	2.00	2.00	4.05	3.71	2.00
<b>Seminar</b>														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	1	0	0	0	2	1	0	3.33	64/67	3.33	3.63	4.60	4.62	3.33
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	1	0	0	1	0	1	1	3.67	60/66	3.67	3.67	4.55	4.62	3.67
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	47/62	4.33	4.26	4.54	4.59	4.33
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	58/68	4.00	4.15	4.59	4.62	4.00
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	1	0	0	2	0	1	0	2.67	63/66	2.67	3.07	4.20	4.26	2.67

### Frequency Distribution

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

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>GERO 786 1</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Psyc Aspects Of Aging</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Gruber-Baldini,</b>

**Term - Fall 2011**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>14</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>14</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	0	0	3	3	7	4.31	874/1520	4.31	4.10	4.31	4.39	4.31
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	5	2	6	4.08	1041/1520	4.08	3.86	4.27	4.28	4.08
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	9	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	290/1291	4.75	4.75	4.33	4.38	4.75
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	2	2	3	6	4.00	1010/1483	4.00	3.50	4.23	4.25	4.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	2	4	7	4.38	492/1417	4.38	4.13	4.08	4.13	4.38
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	1	6	5	4.33	575/1405	4.33	4.11	4.12	4.24	4.33
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	1	3	2	7	4.15	859/1504	4.15	2.88	4.16	4.21	4.15
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	5	8	4.62	1012/1519	4.62	4.87	4.70	4.77	4.62
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	2	8	1	3.91	1022/1495	3.91	3.97	4.11	4.20	3.91
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	1	0	5	7	4.38	984/1459	4.38	3.91	4.47	4.48	4.38
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	3	10	4.77	884/1460	4.77	4.59	4.74	4.77	4.77
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	2	4	7	4.38	784/1455	4.38	3.91	4.32	4.31	4.38
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	2	0	4	7	4.23	963/1456	4.23	3.13	4.34	4.32	4.23
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	1	1	0	2	5	4	3.92	819/1316	3.92	2.97	4.03	3.86	3.92
<b>Discussion</b>														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	2	2	5	4	3.85	881/1243	3.85	3.78	4.17	4.23	3.85
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	2	2	1	8	4.15	844/1241	4.15	4.55	4.33	4.39	4.15
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	1	2	10	4.69	476/1236	4.69	4.56	4.40	4.47	4.69
4. Were special techniques successful	1	9	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/889	5.00	3.44	4.02	4.06	5.00

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>GERO 786 1</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Psyc Aspects Of Aging</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Gruber-Baldini,</b>

**Term - Fall 2011**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>14</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>14</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Laboratory</b>														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	12	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/164	****	3.00	4.15	3.66	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/165	****	3.00	4.19	3.75	****
<b>Seminar</b>														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	5	0	0	1	2	0	6	4.22	55/67	4.22	3.63	4.60	4.62	4.22
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	5	0	1	0	3	2	3	3.67	60/66	3.67	3.67	4.55	4.62	3.67
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	2	4	3	4.11	49/62	4.11	4.26	4.54	4.59	4.11
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	1	0	2	6	4.44	49/68	4.44	4.15	4.59	4.62	4.44
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	5	0	0	2	1	2	4	3.89	49/66	3.89	3.07	4.20	4.26	3.89

### Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	1	A	11	Required for Majors	9	Graduate	10	Major	11
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	2						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	4	Non-major	3
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D	0						
Grad.	10	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	4	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	1						