

Course-Section: POLI 100 0101
 Title AMER GOVT & POLITICS
 Instructor: KING-MEADOWS, T
 Enrollment: 26
 Questionnaires: 26

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 1334
 FEB 11, 2009
 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	1	7	15	4.50	644/1649	4.50	4.51	4.28	4.11	4.50	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	1	2	4	6	11	4.00	1124/1648	4.25	4.31	4.23	4.16	4.00	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	0	1	1	4	6	12	4.13	901/1375	4.20	4.38	4.27	4.10	4.13	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	1	1	3	3	5	11	3.96	1134/1595	4.18	4.33	4.20	4.03	3.96	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	3	0	1	1	2	6	13	4.26	614/1533	4.38	4.47	4.04	3.87	4.26	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	0	2	1	4	6	11	3.96	952/1512	3.81	4.25	4.10	3.86	3.96	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	2	4	3	5	10	3.71	1299/1623	4.00	4.28	4.16	4.08	3.71	
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	8	16	4.67	1037/1646	4.70	4.64	4.69	4.67	4.67	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	1	0	5	7	8	4.00	914/1621	4.09	4.23	4.06	3.96	4.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	2	2	19	4.74	517/1568	4.77	4.64	4.43	4.39	4.74	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	0	0	0	22	5.00	1/1572	4.89	4.85	4.70	4.64	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	1	4	3	15	4.39	790/1564	4.51	4.48	4.28	4.20	4.39	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	3	5	14	4.50	695/1559	4.52	4.49	4.29	4.20	4.50	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	0	0	1	3	4	15	4.43	370/1352	4.09	3.95	3.98	3.86	4.43	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	1	3	5	11	4.30	644/1384	4.18	4.31	4.08	3.86	4.30	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	2	1	3	1	13	4.10	923/1382	4.14	4.48	4.29	4.03	4.10	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	1	0	4	1	14	4.35	784/1368	4.50	4.60	4.30	4.01	4.35	
4. Were special techniques successful	6	7	3	2	0	2	6	3.46	717/ 948	3.46	4.00	3.95	3.75	3.46	
Laboratory															
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	24	0	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	****/ 243	****	****	4.12	4.08	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	22	2	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 555	****	4.57	4.29	4.14	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	23	1	1	1	0	0	0	1.50	****/ 88	****	5.00	4.54	4.31	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	24	0	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/ 85	****	4.83	4.47	4.30	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	24	0	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	****/ 81	****	4.50	4.43	4.39	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	24	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 92	****	4.33	4.35	4.01	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	19	0	2	2	0	3	0	2.57	252/ 288	3.19	3.67	3.68	3.54	2.57	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	24	0	1	1	0	0	0	1.50	****/ 52	****	****	4.06	3.72	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	24	0	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.09	3.65	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	24	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.47	4.36	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	24	0	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/ 39	****	****	4.38	4.37	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	16	2	0	0	1	7	0	3.88	177/ 312	3.85	3.74	3.68	3.51	3.88	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	24	0	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/ 53	****	****	4.30	4.17	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	24	0	2	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.16	4.06	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	24	1	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 41	****	****	4.43	4.27	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	24	1	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 24	****	****	4.42	4.24	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	21	1	0	1	1	1	1	3.50	****/ 110	****	3.86	3.99	3.83	****	

Course-Section: POLI 100 0101
 Title AMER GOVT & POLITICS
 Instructor: KING-MEADOWS, T
 Enrollment: 26
 Questionnaires: 26

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 1334
 FEB 11, 2009
 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	2	Required for Majors	2	Graduate	0	Major	8
28-55	8	1.00-1.99	0	B	3						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	2	C	8	General	2	Under-grad	26	Non-major	18
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	5	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	0	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	17				
				?	5						

Course-Section: POLI 100 0201
 Title AMER GOVT & POLITICS
 Instructor: KING-MEADOWS, T
 Enrollment: 45
 Questionnaires: 44

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 1335
 FEB 11, 2009
 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	6	0	1	0	5	14	18	4.26	954/1649	4.50	4.51	4.28	4.11	4.26	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	6	0	2	2	7	11	16	3.97	1155/1648	4.25	4.31	4.23	4.16	3.97	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	7	0	1	2	8	16	10	3.86	1055/1375	4.20	4.38	4.27	4.10	3.86	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	6	1	0	1	9	11	16	4.14	970/1595	4.18	4.33	4.20	4.03	4.14	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	7	0	1	1	1	12	22	4.43	443/1533	4.38	4.47	4.04	3.87	4.43	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	7	1	2	2	12	10	10	3.67	1170/1512	3.81	4.25	4.10	3.86	3.67	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	8	0	3	3	12	7	11	3.56	1367/1623	4.00	4.28	4.16	4.08	3.56	
8. How many times was class cancelled	7	0	0	0	0	15	22	4.59	1112/1646	4.70	4.64	4.69	4.67	4.59	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	12	1	1	2	5	15	8	3.87	1087/1621	4.09	4.23	4.06	3.96	3.87	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	6	0	0	0	2	4	32	4.79	424/1568	4.77	4.64	4.43	4.39	4.79	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	6	0	0	0	0	0	38	5.00	1/1572	4.89	4.85	4.70	4.64	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	7	0	1	0	7	8	21	4.30	897/1564	4.51	4.48	4.28	4.20	4.30	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	6	1	3	0	3	13	18	4.16	1031/1559	4.52	4.49	4.29	4.20	4.16	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	6	0	3	1	11	13	10	3.68	960/1352	4.09	3.95	3.98	3.86	3.68	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	15	0	2	1	4	8	14	4.07	774/1384	4.18	4.31	4.08	3.86	4.07	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	15	0	0	0	4	9	16	4.41	706/1382	4.14	4.48	4.29	4.03	4.41	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	15	0	0	2	2	5	20	4.48	673/1368	4.50	4.60	4.30	4.01	4.48	
4. Were special techniques successful	15	19	2	2	3	1	2	2.90	****/ 948	3.46	4.00	3.95	3.75	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	35	8	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 221	****	****	4.16	4.05	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	38	0	0	0	0	3	3	4.50	****/ 243	****	****	4.12	4.08	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	38	5	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 212	****	****	4.40	4.43	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	40	3	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 209	****	****	4.35	4.38	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	31	4	0	0	2	0	7	4.56	****/ 555	****	4.57	4.29	4.14	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	38	3	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	****/ 88	****	5.00	4.54	4.31	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	39	1	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	****/ 85	****	4.83	4.47	4.30	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	38	3	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	****/ 81	****	4.50	4.43	4.39	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	39	1	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	****/ 92	****	4.33	4.35	4.01	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	31	2	0	2	0	7	2	3.82	166/ 288	3.19	3.67	3.68	3.54	3.82	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	37	0	2	0	2	1	2	3.14	****/ 52	****	****	4.06	3.72	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	38	0	1	0	0	2	3	4.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.09	3.65	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	38	2	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	****/ 39	****	****	4.47	4.36	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	38	3	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/ 39	****	****	4.38	4.37	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	28	4	0	1	1	9	1	3.83	181/ 312	3.85	3.74	3.68	3.51	3.83	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	39	0	1	0	2	1	1	3.20	****/ 53	****	****	4.30	4.17	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	39	3	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.16	4.06	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	40	1	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 41	****	****	4.43	4.27	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	39	3	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 24	****	****	4.42	4.24	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	38	3	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	****/ 110	****	3.86	3.99	3.83	****	

Course-Section: POLI 100 0201
 Title AMER GOVT & POLITICS
 Instructor: KING-MEADOWS, T
 Enrollment: 45
 Questionnaires: 44

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 1335
 FEB 11, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	5	0.00-0.99	0	A	8	Required for Majors	12	Graduate	0	Major	8
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	0	B	10						
56-83	5	2.00-2.99	4	C	6	General	5	Under-grad	44	Non-major	36
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	3	D	3						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	7	F	1	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	14				
				?	3						

Course-Section: POLI 100 0301
 Title AMER GOVT & POLITICS
 Instructor: ENGEL, FRANCENE
 Enrollment: 50
 Questionnaires: 46

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 1336
 FEB 11, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor Mean	Instructor Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5							
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	28	0	0	0	1	3	14	4.72	361/1649	4.50	4.51	4.28	4.11	4.72
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	28	0	0	0	1	2	15	4.78	244/1648	4.25	4.31	4.23	4.16	4.78
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	28	0	1	0	1	1	15	4.61	453/1375	4.20	4.38	4.27	4.10	4.61
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	28	5	0	1	1	2	9	4.46	552/1595	4.18	4.33	4.20	4.03	4.46
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	28	0	0	1	1	5	11	4.44	432/1533	4.38	4.47	4.04	3.87	4.44
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	28	8	0	0	2	3	5	4.30	****/1512	3.81	4.25	4.10	3.86	****
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	28	0	0	0	2	1	15	4.72	251/1623	4.00	4.28	4.16	4.08	4.72
8. How many times was class cancelled	28	0	0	0	1	1	16	4.83	782/1646	4.70	4.64	4.69	4.67	4.83
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	28	1	0	1	1	5	10	4.41	497/1621	4.09	4.23	4.06	3.96	4.41
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	28	0	0	0	2	0	16	4.78	442/1568	4.77	4.64	4.43	4.39	4.78
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	28	0	0	1	1	1	15	4.67	1071/1572	4.89	4.85	4.70	4.64	4.67
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	28	0	0	0	1	1	16	4.83	234/1564	4.51	4.48	4.28	4.20	4.83
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	28	0	0	0	1	0	17	4.89	227/1559	4.52	4.49	4.29	4.20	4.89
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	29	3	2	0	1	2	9	4.14	599/1352	4.09	3.95	3.98	3.86	4.14
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	34	0	0	0	4	2	6	4.17	726/1384	4.18	4.31	4.08	3.86	4.17
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	34	0	1	0	4	1	6	3.92	1022/1382	4.14	4.48	4.29	4.03	3.92
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	34	0	0	0	1	2	9	4.67	522/1368	4.50	4.60	4.30	4.01	4.67
4. Were special techniques successful	34	8	0	0	2	2	0	3.50	****/ 948	3.46	4.00	3.95	3.75	****
Laboratory														
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	40	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	****/ 555	****	4.57	4.29	4.14	****
Seminar														
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	38	0	0	1	0	7	0	3.75	****/ 288	3.19	3.67	3.68	3.54	****
Field Work														
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	37	0	1	2	0	6	0	3.22	****/ 312	3.85	3.74	3.68	3.51	****
Self Paced														
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	36	0	1	0	0	9	0	3.70	****/ 110	****	3.86	3.99	3.83	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	1	A	8	Required for Majors	3	Graduate	0	Major	8
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	B	7						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	1	C	0	General	2	Under-grad	46	Non-major	38
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	0	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	2	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	7				
				?	1						

Course-Section: POLI 100Y 0101
 Title AMER GOVT & POLITICS
 Instructor: KING-MEADOWS, T
 Enrollment: 17
 Questionnaires: 17

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 1337
 FEB 11, 2009
 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	6	0	0	1	2	2	6	4.18	1037/1649	4.18	4.51	4.28	4.11	4.18	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	6	0	0	0	3	4	4	4.09	1070/1648	4.09	4.31	4.23	4.16	4.09	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	6	0	0	2	2	2	5	3.91	1034/1375	3.91	4.38	4.27	4.10	3.91	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	6	0	0	1	2	3	5	4.09	1015/1595	4.09	4.33	4.20	4.03	4.09	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	1	2	1	7	4.27	604/1533	4.27	4.47	4.04	3.87	4.27	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	2	3	4	2	3.55	1240/1512	3.55	4.25	4.10	3.86	3.55	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	6	0	0	1	2	4	4	4.00	1029/1623	4.00	4.28	4.16	4.08	4.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	7	0	0	0	0	5	5	4.50	1193/1646	4.50	4.64	4.69	4.67	4.50	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	7	1	0	0	0	5	4	4.44	456/1621	4.44	4.23	4.06	3.96	4.44	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	6	0	0	1	0	2	8	4.55	803/1568	4.55	4.64	4.43	4.39	4.55	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	6	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1572	5.00	4.85	4.70	4.64	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	6	0	0	0	2	5	4	4.18	1010/1564	4.18	4.48	4.28	4.20	4.18	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	1	0	3	7	4.45	763/1559	4.45	4.49	4.29	4.20	4.45	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	6	0	0	0	4	2	5	4.09	638/1352	4.09	3.95	3.98	3.86	4.09	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	1	7	2	4.10	761/1384	4.10	4.31	4.08	3.86	4.10	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	0	0	3	2	5	4.20	869/1382	4.20	4.48	4.29	4.03	4.20	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	0	0	1	3	6	4.50	654/1368	4.50	4.60	4.30	4.01	4.50	
4. Were special techniques successful	7	8	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/ 948	****	4.00	3.95	3.75	****	
Laboratory															
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	8	0	0	0	1	0	8	4.78	246/ 555	4.78	4.57	4.29	4.14	4.78	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	15	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 88	****	5.00	4.54	4.31	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 85	****	4.83	4.47	4.30	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 81	****	4.50	4.43	4.39	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 92	****	4.33	4.35	4.01	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	13	0	0	0	0	3	1	4.25	****/ 288	****	3.67	3.68	3.54	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.06	3.72	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.09	3.65	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.47	4.36	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.38	4.37	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	8	0	0	2	1	6	0	3.44	226/ 312	3.44	3.74	3.68	3.51	3.44	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	4	0.00-0.99	1	A	1	Required for Majors	2	Graduate	0	Major	2
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	5						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	3	General	4	Under-grad	17	Non-major	15
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D	1						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	0	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	4				
				?	0						

Course-Section: POLI 209 0101
 Title SEL TOPICS IN POLI
 Instructor: HOFFMAN, DAVID (Instr. A)
 Enrollment: 25
 Questionnaires: 24

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 1338
 FEB 11, 2009
 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	9	0	1	0	1	4	9	4.33	871/1649	4.33	4.51	4.28	4.29	4.33	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	9	0	0	3	2	5	5	3.80	1313/1648	3.80	4.31	4.23	4.25	3.80	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	9	11	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	****/1375	****	4.38	4.27	4.37	****	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	9	1	0	1	2	5	6	4.14	956/1595	4.14	4.33	4.20	4.22	4.14	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	2	4	9	4.47	410/1533	4.47	4.47	4.04	4.04	4.47	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	1	1	8	5	4.13	808/1512	4.13	4.25	4.10	4.14	4.13	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	9	0	2	2	4	3	4	3.33	1462/1623	3.33	4.28	4.16	4.21	3.33	
8. How many times was class cancelled	9	0	0	0	0	5	10	4.67	1037/1646	4.67	4.64	4.69	4.63	4.67	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	11	0	0	0	2	4	7	4.38	535/1621	4.08	4.23	4.06	4.01	4.08	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	11	0	0	0	2	4	7	4.38	1002/1568	4.35	4.64	4.43	4.39	4.35	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	11	0	0	0	0	2	11	4.85	740/1572	4.85	4.85	4.70	4.73	4.85	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	11	0	0	0	2	4	7	4.38	801/1564	4.35	4.48	4.28	4.27	4.35	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	2	4	7	4.38	851/1559	4.38	4.49	4.29	4.33	4.38	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	11	2	2	0	2	4	3	3.55	1030/1352	3.55	3.95	3.98	4.07	3.55	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	0	3	10	4.77	238/1384	4.77	4.31	4.08	3.99	4.77	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	11	0	0	1	0	1	11	4.69	455/1382	4.69	4.48	4.29	4.19	4.69	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	11	0	0	1	0	2	10	4.62	569/1368	4.62	4.60	4.30	4.21	4.62	
4. Were special techniques successful	11	0	0	0	1	3	9	4.62	167/ 948	4.62	4.00	3.95	3.89	4.62	
Laboratory															
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	19	0	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	****/ 555	****	4.57	4.29	4.33	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	23	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 88	****	5.00	4.54	3.75	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	23	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 85	****	4.83	4.47	3.33	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	23	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 81	****	4.50	4.43	3.67	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	23	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 92	****	4.33	4.35	5.00	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	17	0	0	0	1	6	0	3.86	164/ 288	3.86	3.67	3.68	3.65	3.86	
Field Work															
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	18	0	0	0	0	6	0	4.00	68/ 312	4.00	3.74	3.68	3.59	4.00	
Self Paced															
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	21	0	0	0	0	3	0	4.00	****/ 110	****	3.86	3.99	3.72	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors		
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A 10	Required for Majors 1	Graduate 0	Major 6
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B 3			
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	0	C 2	General 6	Under-grad 24	Non-major 18
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	4	D 0			
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	6	F 0	Electives 2	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	
				P 0			
				I 0	Other 6		
				? 0			

Course-Section: POLI 209 0101
 Title SEL TOPICS IN POLI
 Instructor: GREGG, DELANA S (Instr. B)
 Enrollment: 25
 Questionnaires: 24

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 1339
 FEB 11, 2009
 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	9	0	1	0	1	4	9	4.33	871/1649	4.33	4.51	4.28	4.29	4.33	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	9	0	0	3	2	5	5	3.80	1313/1648	3.80	4.31	4.23	4.25	3.80	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	9	11	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	****/1375	****	4.38	4.27	4.37	****	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	9	1	0	1	2	5	6	4.14	956/1595	4.14	4.33	4.20	4.22	4.14	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	2	4	9	4.47	410/1533	4.47	4.47	4.04	4.04	4.47	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	1	1	8	5	4.13	808/1512	4.13	4.25	4.10	4.14	4.13	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	9	0	2	2	4	3	4	3.33	1462/1623	3.33	4.28	4.16	4.21	3.33	
8. How many times was class cancelled	9	0	0	0	0	5	10	4.67	1037/1646	4.67	4.64	4.69	4.63	4.67	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	11	0	0	0	6	4	3	3.77	1184/1621	4.08	4.23	4.06	4.01	4.08	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	11	0	0	1	1	4	7	4.31	1080/1568	4.35	4.64	4.43	4.39	4.35	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	11	0	0	0	0	2	11	4.85	740/1572	4.85	4.85	4.70	4.73	4.85	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	11	0	0	1	1	4	7	4.31	887/1564	4.35	4.48	4.28	4.27	4.35	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	2	4	7	4.38	851/1559	4.38	4.49	4.29	4.33	4.38	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	11	2	2	0	2	4	3	3.55	1030/1352	3.55	3.95	3.98	4.07	3.55	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	0	3	10	4.77	238/1384	4.77	4.31	4.08	3.99	4.77	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	11	0	0	1	0	1	11	4.69	455/1382	4.69	4.48	4.29	4.19	4.69	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	11	0	0	1	0	2	10	4.62	569/1368	4.62	4.60	4.30	4.21	4.62	
4. Were special techniques successful	11	0	0	0	1	3	9	4.62	167/ 948	4.62	4.00	3.95	3.89	4.62	
Laboratory															
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	19	0	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	****/ 555	****	4.57	4.29	4.33	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	23	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 88	****	5.00	4.54	3.75	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	23	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 85	****	4.83	4.47	3.33	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	23	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 81	****	4.50	4.43	3.67	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	23	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 92	****	4.33	4.35	5.00	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	17	0	0	0	1	6	0	3.86	164/ 288	3.86	3.67	3.68	3.65	3.86	
Field Work															
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	18	0	0	0	0	6	0	4.00	68/ 312	4.00	3.74	3.68	3.59	4.00	
Self Paced															
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	21	0	0	0	0	3	0	4.00	****/ 110	****	3.86	3.99	3.72	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors		
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A 10	Required for Majors 1	Graduate 0	Major 6
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B 3			
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	0	C 2	General 6	Under-grad 24	Non-major 18
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	4	D 0			
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	6	F 0	Electives 2	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	
				P 0			
				I 0	Other 6		
				? 0			

Course-Section: POLI 210 0101
 Title POLITICAL PHILOSOPHY
 Instructor: STAUDINGER, ALI
 Enrollment: 48
 Questionnaires: 47

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 1340
 FEB 11, 2009
 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	15	0	0	0	3	8	21	4.56	563/1649	4.35	4.51	4.28	4.29	4.56	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	16	0	0	0	4	9	18	4.45	629/1648	4.45	4.31	4.23	4.25	4.45	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	15	4	0	0	3	4	21	4.64	422/1375	4.59	4.38	4.27	4.37	4.64	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	15	0	1	0	2	9	20	4.47	552/1595	4.31	4.33	4.20	4.22	4.47	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	2	9	21	4.59	295/1533	4.49	4.47	4.04	4.04	4.59	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	15	1	0	0	5	8	18	4.42	507/1512	4.38	4.25	4.10	4.14	4.42	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	15	0	0	0	4	8	20	4.50	502/1623	4.23	4.28	4.16	4.21	4.50	
8. How many times was class cancelled	16	0	0	0	1	19	11	4.32	1348/1646	4.42	4.64	4.69	4.63	4.32	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	24	0	0	0	1	12	10	4.39	523/1621	4.06	4.23	4.06	4.01	4.39	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	17	0	0	1	4	7	18	4.40	983/1568	4.58	4.64	4.43	4.39	4.40	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	17	0	0	0	2	1	27	4.83	765/1572	4.78	4.85	4.70	4.73	4.83	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	18	0	0	1	3	5	20	4.52	640/1564	4.48	4.48	4.28	4.27	4.52	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	1	2	7	20	4.53	662/1559	4.57	4.49	4.29	4.33	4.53	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	23	13	2	0	4	2	3	3.36	****/1352	4.26	3.95	3.98	4.07	****	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	24	0	0	0	2	2	19	4.74	266/1384	4.56	4.31	4.08	3.99	4.74	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	23	0	0	0	2	2	20	4.75	394/1382	4.57	4.48	4.29	4.19	4.75	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	23	0	0	0	1	2	21	4.83	337/1368	4.74	4.60	4.30	4.21	4.83	
4. Were special techniques successful	23	2	0	0	4	2	16	4.55	189/ 948	4.55	4.00	3.95	3.89	4.55	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	46	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 221	****	****	4.16	4.45	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	46	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 243	****	****	4.12	4.47	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	32	0	0	0	2	0	13	4.73	257/ 555	4.73	4.57	4.29	4.33	4.73	
Seminar															
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	32	0	0	1	0	14	0	3.87	163/ 288	3.87	3.67	3.68	3.65	3.87	
Field Work															
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	38	0	1	0	0	8	0	3.67	****/ 312	****	3.74	3.68	3.59	****	
Self Paced															
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	36	0	0	2	0	9	0	3.64	****/ 110	****	3.86	3.99	3.72	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors		
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A 15	Required for Majors 3	Graduate 0	Major 14
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	0	B 7			
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	2	C 2	General 4	Under-grad 47	Non-major 33
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	2	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 15		
				? 3			

Course-Section: POLI 210 0201
 Title POLITICAL PHILOSOPHY
 Instructor: CARTER, JOHN W.
 Enrollment: 48
 Questionnaires: 47

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 1341
 FEB 11, 2009
 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	18	0	1	0	7	7	14	4.14	1086/1649	4.35	4.51	4.28	4.29	4.14	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	18	0	1	0	1	10	17	4.45	643/1648	4.45	4.31	4.23	4.25	4.45	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	19	0	1	0	1	7	19	4.54	521/1375	4.59	4.38	4.27	4.37	4.54	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	19	0	2	0	3	10	13	4.14	956/1595	4.31	4.33	4.20	4.22	4.14	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	18	0	1	0	4	6	18	4.38	505/1533	4.49	4.47	4.04	4.04	4.38	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	20	0	1	0	2	10	14	4.33	595/1512	4.38	4.25	4.10	4.14	4.33	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	18	0	1	3	6	5	14	3.97	1089/1623	4.23	4.28	4.16	4.21	3.97	
8. How many times was class cancelled	18	0	0	0	0	14	15	4.52	1184/1646	4.42	4.64	4.69	4.63	4.52	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	27	1	0	1	6	9	3	3.74	1209/1621	4.06	4.23	4.06	4.01	3.74	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	18	0	0	0	1	5	23	4.76	480/1568	4.58	4.64	4.43	4.39	4.76	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	18	0	0	0	0	8	21	4.72	985/1572	4.78	4.85	4.70	4.73	4.72	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	18	0	1	0	1	10	17	4.45	728/1564	4.48	4.48	4.28	4.27	4.45	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	18	1	0	1	1	6	20	4.61	586/1559	4.57	4.49	4.29	4.33	4.61	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	18	2	1	1	2	9	14	4.26	515/1352	4.26	3.95	3.98	4.07	4.26	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	23	0	1	0	2	7	14	4.38	571/1384	4.56	4.31	4.08	3.99	4.38	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	24	0	0	1	3	5	14	4.39	724/1382	4.57	4.48	4.29	4.19	4.39	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	24	0	0	0	2	4	17	4.65	531/1368	4.74	4.60	4.30	4.21	4.65	
4. Were special techniques successful	25	11	1	1	0	3	6	4.09	****/ 948	4.55	4.00	3.95	3.89	****	
Laboratory															
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	46	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 243	****	****	4.12	4.47	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	46	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 212	****	****	4.40	4.62	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	43	1	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 555	4.73	4.57	4.29	4.33	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	46	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 88	****	5.00	4.54	3.75	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	46	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 85	****	4.83	4.47	3.33	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	46	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 81	****	4.50	4.43	3.67	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	46	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 92	****	4.33	4.35	5.00	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	43	0	0	2	0	1	1	3.25	****/ 288	3.87	3.67	3.68	3.65	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	46	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.06	3.93	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	46	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.09	4.05	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	46	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.47	4.49	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	46	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.38	3.66	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	41	0	0	3	0	2	1	3.17	****/ 312	****	3.74	3.68	3.59	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	46	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 53	****	****	4.30	4.07	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	46	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.16	1.50	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	46	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 41	****	****	4.43	3.50	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	46	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 24	****	****	4.42	2.00	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	37	0	1	1	0	7	1	3.60	****/ 110	****	3.86	3.99	3.72	****	

Course-Section: POLI 210 0201
 Title POLITICAL PHILOSOPHY
 Instructor: CARTER, JOHN W.
 Enrollment: 48
 Questionnaires: 47

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 1341
 FEB 11, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	A	8	Required for Majors	2	Graduate	0	Major	15
28-55	6	1.00-1.99	0	B	10						
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	4	C	3	General	2	Under-grad	47	Non-major	32
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	7	F	0	Electives	2	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	16				
				?	2						

Course-Section: POLI 233 0101
 Title COMMON LAW&LEGAL ANALY
 Instructor: MILLER, KERWIN
 Enrollment: 35
 Questionnaires: 35

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 1342
 FEB 11, 2009
 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	8	0	0	1	0	4	22	4.74	339/1649	4.74	4.51	4.28	4.29	4.74	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	8	0	0	0	0	2	25	4.93	118/1648	4.93	4.31	4.23	4.25	4.93	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	8	0	0	0	2	4	21	4.70	360/1375	4.70	4.38	4.27	4.37	4.70	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	8	1	0	0	0	6	20	4.77	227/1595	4.77	4.33	4.20	4.22	4.77	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	1	1	25	4.89	115/1533	4.89	4.47	4.04	4.04	4.89	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	1	5	21	4.74	202/1512	4.74	4.25	4.10	4.14	4.74	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	8	0	0	0	1	6	20	4.70	272/1623	4.70	4.28	4.16	4.21	4.70	
8. How many times was class cancelled	9	0	0	0	0	15	11	4.42	1268/1646	4.42	4.64	4.69	4.63	4.42	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	14	1	0	0	1	6	13	4.60	288/1621	4.60	4.23	4.06	4.01	4.60	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	10	0	0	0	1	7	17	4.64	667/1568	4.64	4.64	4.43	4.39	4.64	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	10	0	0	0	0	3	22	4.88	640/1572	4.88	4.85	4.70	4.73	4.88	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	10	0	0	0	0	6	19	4.76	326/1564	4.76	4.48	4.28	4.27	4.76	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	0	5	20	4.80	318/1559	4.80	4.49	4.29	4.33	4.80	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	11	7	1	0	2	5	9	4.24	528/1352	4.24	3.95	3.98	4.07	4.24	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	0	3	16	4.84	180/1384	4.84	4.31	4.08	3.99	4.84	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	16	0	0	0	0	4	15	4.79	362/1382	4.79	4.48	4.29	4.19	4.79	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	16	0	0	0	0	2	17	4.89	274/1368	4.89	4.60	4.30	4.21	4.89	
4. Were special techniques successful	16	2	1	2	1	3	10	4.12	404/ 948	4.12	4.00	3.95	3.89	4.12	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	34	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 221	****	****	4.16	4.45	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	34	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 243	****	****	4.12	4.47	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	34	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 212	****	****	4.40	4.62	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	34	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 209	****	****	4.35	4.64	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	31	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	****/ 555	****	4.57	4.29	4.33	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	34	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 88	****	5.00	4.54	3.75	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	34	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 85	****	4.83	4.47	3.33	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	34	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 81	****	4.50	4.43	3.67	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	34	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 92	****	4.33	4.35	5.00	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	32	0	1	0	0	1	1	3.33	****/ 288	****	3.67	3.68	3.65	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	34	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.06	3.93	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	34	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.09	4.05	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	34	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.47	4.49	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	34	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.38	3.66	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	31	0	0	2	1	1	0	2.75	****/ 312	****	3.74	3.68	3.59	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	34	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 53	****	****	4.30	4.07	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	34	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.16	1.50	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	34	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 41	****	****	4.43	3.50	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	34	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 24	****	****	4.42	2.00	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	29	0	0	1	1	3	1	3.67	****/ 110	****	3.86	3.99	3.72	****	

Course-Section: POLI 233 0101
 Title COMMON LAW&LEGAL ANALY
 Instructor: MILLER, KERWIN
 Enrollment: 35
 Questionnaires: 35

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 1342
 FEB 11, 2009
 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	14	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	11
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	0	B	5						
56-83	5	2.00-2.99	2	C	1	General	5	Under-grad	35	Non-major	24
84-150	6	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	11	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	16				
				?	2						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	6	0	0	0	2	14	16	4.44	736/1649	4.44	4.51	4.28	4.29	4.44	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	6	0	0	0	5	5	22	4.53	521/1648	4.53	4.31	4.23	4.25	4.53	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	6	0	0	1	2	10	19	4.47	593/1375	4.47	4.38	4.27	4.37	4.47	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	7	10	0	0	4	3	14	4.48	538/1595	4.48	4.33	4.20	4.22	4.48	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	6	1	0	0	2	10	19	4.55	334/1533	4.55	4.47	4.04	4.04	4.55	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	7	12	0	0	3	8	8	4.26	675/1512	4.26	4.25	4.10	4.14	4.26	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	8	0	0	0	2	8	20	4.60	395/1623	4.60	4.28	4.16	4.21	4.60	
8. How many times was class cancelled	7	0	0	0	0	6	25	4.81	833/1646	4.81	4.64	4.69	4.63	4.81	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	13	1	1	0	2	17	4	3.96	987/1621	3.96	4.23	4.06	4.01	3.96	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	8	0	1	2	1	11	15	4.23	1137/1568	4.23	4.64	4.43	4.39	4.23	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	8	0	0	0	1	1	28	4.90	591/1572	4.90	4.85	4.70	4.73	4.90	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	8	0	0	0	4	5	21	4.57	590/1564	4.57	4.48	4.28	4.27	4.57	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	8	0	1	0	5	5	19	4.37	871/1559	4.37	4.49	4.29	4.33	4.37	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	8	16	1	1	1	2	9	4.21	541/1352	4.21	3.95	3.98	4.07	4.21	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	2	8	16	4.54	418/1384	4.54	4.31	4.08	3.99	4.54	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	12	0	1	0	4	7	14	4.27	825/1382	4.27	4.48	4.29	4.19	4.27	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	12	0	0	0	2	3	21	4.73	449/1368	4.73	4.60	4.30	4.21	4.73	
4. Were special techniques successful	12	13	1	1	1	2	8	4.15	385/ 948	4.15	4.00	3.95	3.89	4.15	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	36	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 221	****	****	4.16	4.45	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	36	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 243	****	****	4.12	4.47	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	37	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 212	****	****	4.40	4.62	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	36	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 209	****	****	4.35	4.64	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	20	0	0	0	0	1	17	4.94	137/ 555	4.94	4.57	4.29	4.33	4.94	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	37	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 88	****	5.00	4.54	3.75	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	23	0	0	0	0	15	0	4.00	83/ 288	4.00	3.67	3.68	3.65	4.00	
Field Work															
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	20	0	0	1	0	17	0	3.89	176/ 312	3.89	3.74	3.68	3.59	3.89	
Self Paced															
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	31	0	1	0	0	6	0	3.57	****/ 110	****	3.86	3.99	3.72	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99 0	A 16	Required for Majors	7	Graduate 0 Major 17
28-55	7	1.00-1.99 0	B 11	General	0	Under-grad 38 Non-major 21
56-83	4	2.00-2.99 3	C 0			
84-150	6	3.00-3.49 4	D 0	Electives	2	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 11	F 0			
			P 0			
			I 0			
			? 0			

Course-Section: POLI 250 0101
 Title INTRO TO PUBLIC ADMIN
 Instructor: HUSSEY, LAURA
 Enrollment: 22
 Questionnaires: 21

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 1344
 FEB 11, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	11	0	1	0	1	1	7	4.30	912/1649	4.47	4.51	4.28	4.29	4.30
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	11	0	1	0	1	2	6	4.20	966/1648	4.35	4.31	4.23	4.25	4.20
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	11	0	1	0	1	1	7	4.30	763/1375	4.35	4.38	4.27	4.37	4.30
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	11	0	1	0	1	3	5	4.10	1010/1595	4.22	4.33	4.20	4.22	4.10
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	12	0	1	1	1	1	5	3.89	935/1533	4.14	4.47	4.04	4.04	3.89
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	13	0	1	1	0	3	3	3.75	1119/1512	3.97	4.25	4.10	4.14	3.75
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	12	0	1	1	0	2	5	4.00	1029/1623	4.36	4.28	4.16	4.21	4.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	12	1	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	714/1646	4.71	4.64	4.69	4.63	4.88
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	13	0	0	0	1	5	2	4.13	835/1621	4.18	4.23	4.06	4.01	4.13
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	12	0	1	0	0	0	8	4.56	791/1568	4.71	4.64	4.43	4.39	4.56
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	12	0	1	0	0	1	7	4.44	1289/1572	4.67	4.85	4.70	4.73	4.44
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	12	0	1	0	0	0	8	4.56	600/1564	4.60	4.48	4.28	4.27	4.56
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	12	0	1	0	0	0	8	4.56	640/1559	4.69	4.49	4.29	4.33	4.56
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	13	0	1	0	1	2	4	4.00	690/1352	4.15	3.95	3.98	4.07	4.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	14	0	1	0	0	1	5	4.29	655/1384	4.36	4.31	4.08	3.99	4.29
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	14	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	435/1382	4.64	4.48	4.29	4.19	4.71
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	14	0	0	0	1	1	5	4.57	601/1368	4.69	4.60	4.30	4.21	4.57
4. Were special techniques successful	15	1	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	****/ 948	4.50	4.00	3.95	3.89	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 221	****	****	4.16	4.45	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 243	****	****	4.12	4.47	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 212	****	****	4.40	4.62	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 209	****	****	4.35	4.64	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	18	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/ 555	5.00	4.57	4.29	4.33	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 88	****	5.00	4.54	3.75	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 85	****	4.83	4.47	3.33	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 81	****	4.50	4.43	3.67	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 92	****	4.33	4.35	5.00	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	19	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/ 288	4.00	3.67	3.68	3.65	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.06	3.93	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.09	4.05	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.47	4.49	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.38	3.66	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	19	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 312	4.00	3.74	3.68	3.59	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 53	****	****	4.30	4.07	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.16	1.50	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 41	****	****	4.43	3.50	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 24	****	****	4.42	2.00	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	18	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	****/ 110	****	3.86	3.99	3.72	****

Course-Section: POLI 250 0101
 Title INTRO TO PUBLIC ADMIN
 Instructor: HUSSEY, LAURA
 Enrollment: 22
 Questionnaires: 21

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 1344
 FEB 11, 2009
 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	1	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	2
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	2						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	1	C	1	General	1	Under-grad	21	Non-major	19
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	0	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	0	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	1	Other	4				
				?	0						

Course-Section: POLI 250 0201
 Title INTRO TO PUBLIC ADMIN
 Instructor: HUSSEY, LAURA
 Enrollment: 43
 Questionnaires: 36

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 1345
 FEB 11, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	6	0	0	0	0	11	19	4.63	471/1649	4.47	4.51	4.28	4.29	4.63	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	6	0	0	1	2	8	19	4.50	556/1648	4.35	4.31	4.23	4.25	4.50	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	6	0	0	1	3	9	17	4.40	665/1375	4.35	4.38	4.27	4.37	4.40	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	6	3	0	1	4	7	15	4.33	722/1595	4.22	4.33	4.20	4.22	4.33	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	8	0	1	2	1	5	19	4.39	485/1533	4.14	4.47	4.04	4.04	4.39	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	2	4	7	13	4.19	755/1512	3.97	4.25	4.10	4.14	4.19	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	8	0	0	0	3	2	23	4.71	261/1623	4.36	4.28	4.16	4.21	4.71	
8. How many times was class cancelled	8	0	0	0	0	13	15	4.54	1166/1646	4.71	4.64	4.69	4.63	4.54	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	14	1	0	0	3	10	8	4.24	709/1621	4.18	4.23	4.06	4.01	4.24	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	8	0	0	0	0	4	24	4.86	316/1568	4.71	4.64	4.43	4.39	4.86	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	8	0	0	0	1	1	26	4.89	615/1572	4.67	4.85	4.70	4.73	4.89	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	8	0	0	1	2	3	22	4.64	498/1564	4.60	4.48	4.28	4.27	4.64	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	2	1	26	4.83	295/1559	4.69	4.49	4.29	4.33	4.83	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	8	1	1	1	5	2	18	4.30	488/1352	4.15	3.95	3.98	4.07	4.30	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	1	1	1	8	19	4.43	509/1384	4.36	4.31	4.08	3.99	4.43	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	0	5	3	22	4.57	570/1382	4.64	4.48	4.29	4.19	4.57	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	0	1	0	3	26	4.80	369/1368	4.69	4.60	4.30	4.21	4.80	
4. Were special techniques successful	6	0	1	0	1	9	19	4.50	203/ 948	4.50	4.00	3.95	3.89	4.50	
Laboratory															
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	22	0	0	0	0	0	14	5.00	1/ 555	5.00	4.57	4.29	4.33	5.00	
Seminar															
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	27	0	0	0	0	9	0	4.00	83/ 288	4.00	3.67	3.68	3.65	4.00	
Field Work															
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	23	0	0	0	0	13	0	4.00	68/ 312	4.00	3.74	3.68	3.59	4.00	
Self Paced															
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	32	0	0	1	0	3	0	3.50	****/ 110	****	3.86	3.99	3.72	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors					
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	A 11	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	14
28-55	7	1.00-1.99	1	B 12						
56-83	8	2.00-2.99	6	C 5	General	5	Under-grad	36	Non-major	22
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	5	D 0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	8	F 0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P 0						
				I 0	Other	24				
				? 0						

Course-Section: POLI 260 0101
 Title COMPARATIVE POLITICS
 Instructor: FORESTIERE, CAR
 Enrollment: 48
 Questionnaires: 48

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 1346
 FEB 11, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	12	0	0	0	1	5	30	4.81	274/1649	4.78	4.51	4.28	4.29	4.81
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	12	0	0	0	2	7	27	4.69	323/1648	4.67	4.31	4.23	4.25	4.69
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	12	0	0	0	2	8	26	4.67	401/1375	4.68	4.38	4.27	4.37	4.67
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	12	15	1	0	1	3	16	4.57	417/1595	4.56	4.33	4.20	4.22	4.57
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	12	0	1	1	1	5	28	4.61	280/1533	4.60	4.47	4.04	4.04	4.61
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	12	18	0	0	2	0	16	4.78	179/1512	4.64	4.25	4.10	4.14	4.78
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	12	0	0	0	1	2	33	4.89	130/1623	4.84	4.28	4.16	4.21	4.89
8. How many times was class cancelled	12	0	0	0	1	23	12	4.31	1364/1646	4.29	4.64	4.69	4.63	4.31
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	18	1	1	0	1	13	14	4.34	583/1621	4.47	4.23	4.06	4.01	4.34
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	16	0	0	0	0	4	28	4.88	287/1568	4.88	4.64	4.43	4.39	4.88
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	16	0	0	0	0	1	31	4.97	237/1572	4.91	4.85	4.70	4.73	4.97
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	16	0	0	0	1	3	28	4.84	225/1564	4.81	4.48	4.28	4.27	4.84
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	0	3	29	4.91	205/1559	4.88	4.49	4.29	4.33	4.91
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	16	1	1	0	4	5	21	4.45	351/1352	4.49	3.95	3.98	4.07	4.45
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	21	0	2	1	2	5	17	4.26	673/1384	4.32	4.31	4.08	3.99	4.26
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	21	0	1	2	2	3	19	4.37	740/1382	4.58	4.48	4.29	4.19	4.37
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	21	0	0	1	0	3	23	4.78	403/1368	4.78	4.60	4.30	4.21	4.78
4. Were special techniques successful	21	14	1	0	0	3	9	4.46	234/ 948	4.05	4.00	3.95	3.89	4.46
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	46	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 221	****	****	4.16	4.45	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	47	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 243	****	****	4.12	4.47	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	46	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 212	****	****	4.40	4.62	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	46	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 209	****	****	4.35	4.64	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	35	1	1	1	4	0	6	3.75	451/ 555	4.11	4.57	4.29	4.33	3.75
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	46	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 88	****	5.00	4.54	3.75	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	46	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 85	****	4.83	4.47	3.33	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	46	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 81	****	4.50	4.43	3.67	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	46	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 92	****	4.33	4.35	5.00	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	40	0	0	3	0	3	2	3.50	****/ 288	****	3.67	3.68	3.65	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	47	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.06	3.93	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	47	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.09	4.05	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	46	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.47	4.49	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	46	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.38	3.66	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	36	1	1	2	1	6	1	3.36	****/ 312	3.15	3.74	3.68	3.59	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	46	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 53	****	****	4.30	4.07	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	46	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.16	1.50	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	46	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 41	****	****	4.43	3.50	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	46	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 24	****	****	4.42	2.00	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	36	1	0	3	0	7	1	3.55	****/ 110	****	3.86	3.99	3.72	****

Course-Section: POLI 260 0101
 Title COMPARATIVE POLITICS
 Instructor: FORESTIERE, CAR
 Enrollment: 48
 Questionnaires: 48

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 1346
 FEB 11, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	1	A	10	Required for Majors	3	Graduate	0	Major	10
28-55	6	1.00-1.99	0	B	8						
56-83	5	2.00-2.99	4	C	7	General	1	Under-grad	48	Non-major	38
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	6	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	22				
				?	2						

Course-Section: POLI 260 0201
 Title COMPARATIVE POLITICS
 Instructor: FORESTIERE, CAR
 Enrollment: 44
 Questionnaires: 44

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 1347
 FEB 11, 2009
 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	11	0	0	0	2	4	27	4.76	328/1649	4.78	4.51	4.28	4.29	4.76	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	11	0	0	0	2	8	23	4.64	401/1648	4.67	4.31	4.23	4.25	4.64	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	11	0	0	0	2	6	25	4.70	370/1375	4.68	4.38	4.27	4.37	4.70	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	11	15	0	1	0	5	12	4.56	440/1595	4.56	4.33	4.20	4.22	4.56	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	1	0	10	21	4.59	295/1533	4.60	4.47	4.04	4.04	4.59	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	12	18	0	1	0	4	9	4.50	380/1512	4.64	4.25	4.10	4.14	4.50	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	11	0	0	1	0	4	28	4.79	189/1623	4.84	4.28	4.16	4.21	4.79	
8. How many times was class cancelled	11	1	0	0	1	21	10	4.28	1377/1646	4.29	4.64	4.69	4.63	4.28	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	15	0	0	0	1	10	18	4.59	305/1621	4.47	4.23	4.06	4.01	4.59	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	12	0	0	0	1	2	29	4.88	287/1568	4.88	4.64	4.43	4.39	4.88	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	12	0	0	0	2	1	29	4.84	740/1572	4.91	4.85	4.70	4.73	4.84	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	12	0	0	0	1	5	26	4.78	294/1564	4.81	4.48	4.28	4.27	4.78	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	1	0	2	29	4.84	272/1559	4.88	4.49	4.29	4.33	4.84	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	13	4	0	1	3	4	19	4.52	297/1352	4.49	3.95	3.98	4.07	4.52	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	20	0	0	1	2	8	13	4.38	571/1384	4.32	4.31	4.08	3.99	4.38	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	20	0	0	0	1	3	20	4.79	352/1382	4.58	4.48	4.29	4.19	4.79	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	20	0	0	0	1	3	20	4.79	380/1368	4.78	4.60	4.30	4.21	4.79	
4. Were special techniques successful	20	10	2	3	1	0	8	3.64	656/ 948	4.05	4.00	3.95	3.89	3.64	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	42	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 221	****	****	4.16	4.45	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	43	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 243	****	****	4.12	4.47	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	43	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 212	****	****	4.40	4.62	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	43	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 209	****	****	4.35	4.64	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	29	0	0	0	4	0	11	4.47	305/ 555	4.11	4.57	4.29	4.33	4.47	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	42	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 88	****	5.00	4.54	3.75	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	43	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 85	****	4.83	4.47	3.33	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	43	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 81	****	4.50	4.43	3.67	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	43	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 92	****	4.33	4.35	5.00	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	34	1	1	1	0	6	1	3.56	****/ 288	****	3.67	3.68	3.65	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	43	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.06	3.93	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	43	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.09	4.05	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	43	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.47	4.49	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	43	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.38	3.66	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	31	0	0	6	0	6	1	3.15	253/ 312	3.15	3.74	3.68	3.59	3.15	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	43	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 53	****	****	4.30	4.07	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	43	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.16	1.50	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	43	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 41	****	****	4.43	3.50	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	43	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 24	****	****	4.42	2.00	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	38	1	0	1	0	3	1	3.80	****/ 110	****	3.86	3.99	3.72	****	

Course-Section: POLI 260 0201
 Title COMPARATIVE POLITICS
 Instructor: FORESTIERE, CAR
 Enrollment: 44
 Questionnaires: 44

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 1347
 FEB 11, 2009
 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	8	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	14
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	1	B	12						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	3	C	0	General	3	Under-grad	44	Non-major	30
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	4	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	21				
				?	4						

Course-Section: POLI 280 0101
 Title INTERNATIONAL RELATION
 Instructor: HODY, CYNTHIA (Instr. A)
 Enrollment: 49
 Questionnaires: 35

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 1348
 FEB 11, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank						
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	3	0	0	1	8	9	14	4.13	1096/1649	4.29	4.51	4.28	4.29	4.13	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	3	0	3	5	9	12	3	3.22	1569/1648	3.64	4.31	4.23	4.25	3.22	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	3	0	5	4	8	9	6	3.22	1293/1375	3.62	4.38	4.27	4.37	3.22	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	4	4	1	3	10	9	4	3.44	1425/1595	3.76	4.33	4.20	4.22	3.44	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	4	0	2	0	7	7	15	4.06	774/1533	4.27	4.47	4.04	4.04	4.06	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	4	3	3	1	8	9	7	3.57	1221/1512	3.84	4.25	4.10	4.14	3.57	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	4	1	2	3	7	5	13	3.80	1241/1623	3.99	4.28	4.16	4.21	3.80	
8. How many times was class cancelled	5	0	0	0	16	14	14	4.47	1230/1646	4.44	4.64	4.69	4.63	4.47	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	11	0	2	1	6	13	2	3.50	1345/1621	3.47	4.23	4.06	4.01	3.10	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	7	8	7	10	3.63	1435/1568	4.12	4.64	4.43	4.39	3.63	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	1	3	28	4.84	740/1572	4.93	4.85	4.70	4.73	4.92	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	1	4	12	10	5	3.44	1415/1564	3.76	4.48	4.28	4.27	3.44	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	4	5	8	7	7	3.26	1440/1559	3.57	4.49	4.29	4.33	3.13	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	11	4	1	8	5	3	3.10	1208/1352	3.59	3.95	3.98	4.07	3.10	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	9	0	2	6	6	8	4	3.23	1198/1384	3.53	4.31	4.08	3.99	3.23	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	9	0	1	6	4	6	9	3.62	1170/1382	3.78	4.48	4.29	4.19	3.62	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	1	3	5	9	8	3.77	1090/1368	3.99	4.60	4.30	4.21	3.77	
4. Were special techniques successful	9	17	1	3	4	0	1	2.67	901/ 948	2.67	4.00	3.95	3.89	2.67	
Laboratory															
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	29	1	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	****/ 555	****	4.57	4.29	4.33	****	
Seminar															
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	30	1	0	3	0	1	0	2.50	****/ 288	****	3.67	3.68	3.65	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	34	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.06	3.93	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	34	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.09	4.05	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	22	1	0	2	0	10	0	3.67	207/ 312	3.67	3.74	3.68	3.59	3.67	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	34	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 53	****	****	4.30	4.07	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	34	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.16	1.50	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	34	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 41	****	****	4.43	3.50	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	26	1	0	0	0	7	1	4.13	****/ 110	****	3.86	3.99	3.72	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	4	0.00-0.99	0	A	7	Required for Majors	7	Graduate	0	Major	13
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	0	B	8						
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	2	C	9	General	5	Under-grad	35	Non-major	22
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5	F	0	Electives	2	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	1						
				I	0	Other	16				
				?	3						

Course-Section: POLI 280 0101
 Title INTERNATIONAL RELATION
 Instructor: (Instr. B)
 Enrollment: 49
 Questionnaires: 35

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 1349
 FEB 11, 2009
 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	3	0	0	1	8	9	14	4.13	1096/1649	4.29	4.51	4.28	4.29	4.13	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	3	0	3	5	9	12	3	3.22	1569/1648	3.64	4.31	4.23	4.25	3.22	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	3	0	5	4	8	9	6	3.22	1293/1375	3.62	4.38	4.27	4.37	3.22	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	4	4	1	3	10	9	4	3.44	1425/1595	3.76	4.33	4.20	4.22	3.44	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	4	0	2	0	7	7	15	4.06	774/1533	4.27	4.47	4.04	4.04	4.06	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	4	3	3	1	8	9	7	3.57	1221/1512	3.84	4.25	4.10	4.14	3.57	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	4	1	2	3	7	5	13	3.80	1241/1623	3.99	4.28	4.16	4.21	3.80	
8. How many times was class cancelled	5	0	0	0	16	14	14	4.47	1230/1646	4.44	4.64	4.69	4.63	4.47	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	25	0	3	1	3	2	1	2.70	1568/1621	3.47	4.23	4.06	4.01	3.10	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	27	0	1	1	1	0	5	3.88	****/1568	4.12	4.64	4.43	4.39	3.63	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	26	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1572	4.93	4.85	4.70	4.73	4.92	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	26	0	2	0	2	2	3	3.44	1411/1564	3.76	4.48	4.28	4.27	3.44	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	26	0	2	1	2	3	1	3.00	1479/1559	3.57	4.49	4.29	4.33	3.13	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	26	2	1	0	2	3	1	3.43	****/1352	3.59	3.95	3.98	4.07	3.10	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	9	0	2	6	6	8	4	3.23	1198/1384	3.53	4.31	4.08	3.99	3.23	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	9	0	1	6	4	6	9	3.62	1170/1382	3.78	4.48	4.29	4.19	3.62	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	1	3	5	9	8	3.77	1090/1368	3.99	4.60	4.30	4.21	3.77	
4. Were special techniques successful	9	17	1	3	4	0	1	2.67	901/ 948	2.67	4.00	3.95	3.89	2.67	
Laboratory															
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	29	1	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	****/ 555	****	4.57	4.29	4.33	****	
Seminar															
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	30	1	0	3	0	1	0	2.50	****/ 288	****	3.67	3.68	3.65	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	34	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.06	3.93	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	34	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.09	4.05	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	22	1	0	2	0	10	0	3.67	207/ 312	3.67	3.74	3.68	3.59	3.67	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	34	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 53	****	****	4.30	4.07	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	34	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.16	1.50	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	34	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 41	****	****	4.43	3.50	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	26	1	0	0	0	7	1	4.13	****/ 110	****	3.86	3.99	3.72	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	4	0.00-0.99	0	A	7	Required for Majors	7	Graduate	0	Major	13
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	0	B	8						
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	2	C	9	General	5	Under-grad	35	Non-major	22
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5	F	0	Electives	2	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	1						
				I	0	Other	16				
				?	3						

Course-Section: POLI 280 0201
 Title INTERNATIONAL RELATION
 Instructor: HODY, CYNTHIA
 Enrollment: 48
 Questionnaires: 47

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 1350
 FEB 11, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor Mean	Instructor Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5								
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	26	0	0	0	2	4	15	4.62	497/1649	4.29	4.51	4.28	4.29	4.62	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	26	0	0	0	3	5	13	4.48	599/1648	3.64	4.31	4.23	4.25	4.48	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	26	0	0	2	1	4	14	4.43	641/1375	3.62	4.38	4.27	4.37	4.43	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	26	0	0	1	1	8	11	4.38	660/1595	3.76	4.33	4.20	4.22	4.38	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	26	0	0	0	2	3	16	4.67	241/1533	4.27	4.47	4.04	4.04	4.67	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	26	0	1	0	2	5	13	4.38	543/1512	3.84	4.25	4.10	4.14	4.38	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	26	0	0	1	3	4	13	4.38	659/1623	3.99	4.28	4.16	4.21	4.38	
8. How many times was class cancelled	26	0	0	0	1	11	9	4.38	1302/1646	4.44	4.64	4.69	4.63	4.38	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	31	1	0	1	1	7	6	4.20	754/1621	3.47	4.23	4.06	4.01	4.20	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	26	0	1	0	0	4	16	4.62	715/1568	4.12	4.64	4.43	4.39	4.62	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	27	0	0	0	0	1	19	4.95	355/1572	4.93	4.85	4.70	4.73	4.95	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	27	0	1	0	1	6	12	4.40	780/1564	3.76	4.48	4.28	4.27	4.40	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	27	0	0	1	3	2	14	4.45	777/1559	3.57	4.49	4.29	4.33	4.45	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	27	7	0	1	3	3	6	4.08	650/1352	3.59	3.95	3.98	4.07	4.08	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	30	0	0	0	6	3	8	4.12	755/1384	3.53	4.31	4.08	3.99	4.12	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	30	0	1	1	2	4	9	4.12	917/1382	3.78	4.48	4.29	4.19	4.12	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	31	0	0	0	2	5	9	4.44	722/1368	3.99	4.60	4.30	4.21	4.44	
4. Were special techniques successful	31	9	1	2	1	0	3	3.29	****/ 948	2.67	4.00	3.95	3.89	****	
Laboratory															
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	41	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	****/ 555	****	4.57	4.29	4.33	****	
Seminar															
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	42	0	0	2	0	3	0	3.20	****/ 288	****	3.67	3.68	3.65	****	
Field Work															
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	37	0	0	0	1	9	0	3.90	****/ 312	3.67	3.74	3.68	3.59	****	
Self Paced															
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	38	0	0	4	0	4	1	3.22	****/ 110	****	3.86	3.99	3.72	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	5	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	9
28-55	5	1.00-1.99	0	B	10						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	1	C	4	General	1	Under-grad	47	Non-major	38
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	6	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	18				
				?	0						

Course-Section: POLI 300 0101
 Title QUANT POLI SCI
 Instructor: MILLER, NICHOLA
 Enrollment: 52
 Questionnaires: 52

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 1351
 FEB 11, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	25	0	5	2	8	7	5	3.19	1576/1649	3.19	4.51	4.28	4.27	3.19
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	25	0	2	2	8	7	8	3.63	1434/1648	3.63	4.31	4.23	4.18	3.63
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	25	0	0	5	8	6	8	3.63	1162/1375	3.63	4.38	4.27	4.22	3.63
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	25	6	2	1	5	2	11	3.90	1202/1595	3.90	4.33	4.20	4.21	3.90
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	27	0	7	3	7	3	5	2.84	1484/1533	2.84	4.47	4.04	4.05	2.84
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	27	6	0	3	5	4	7	3.79	1101/1512	3.79	4.25	4.10	4.11	3.79
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	26	0	2	1	5	8	10	3.88	1192/1623	3.88	4.28	4.16	4.08	3.88
8. How many times was class cancelled	25	0	0	0	0	6	21	4.78	881/1646	4.78	4.64	4.69	4.67	4.78
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	33	0	2	1	5	9	2	3.42	1393/1621	3.42	4.23	4.06	4.02	3.42
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	26	0	1	1	4	5	15	4.23	1137/1568	4.23	4.64	4.43	4.39	4.23
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	27	0	1	2	5	3	14	4.08	1451/1572	4.08	4.85	4.70	4.64	4.08
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	26	0	3	6	3	8	6	3.31	1448/1564	3.31	4.48	4.28	4.25	3.31
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	26	0	5	3	8	1	9	3.23	1443/1559	3.23	4.49	4.29	4.23	3.23
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	26	2	3	1	4	5	11	3.83	860/1352	3.83	3.95	3.98	3.97	3.83
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	35	0	5	2	5	3	2	2.71	1331/1384	2.71	4.31	4.08	4.11	2.71
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	35	0	2	2	1	6	6	3.71	1128/1382	3.71	4.48	4.29	4.37	3.71
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	35	0	0	0	6	2	9	4.18	886/1368	4.18	4.60	4.30	4.39	4.18
4. Were special techniques successful	35	12	2	1	0	1	1	2.60	****/ 948	****	4.00	3.95	4.00	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	50	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/ 221	****	****	4.16	4.07	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	50	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 243	****	****	4.12	3.89	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	51	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 212	****	****	4.40	4.21	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	42	1	0	0	2	0	7	4.56	****/ 555	****	4.57	4.29	4.22	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	51	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 88	****	5.00	4.54	4.63	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	45	1	0	0	0	6	0	4.00	****/ 288	****	3.67	3.68	3.58	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	51	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.06	3.59	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	51	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.09	4.21	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	51	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.47	4.43	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	51	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.38	4.32	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	41	0	0	2	0	9	0	3.64	****/ 312	****	3.74	3.68	3.60	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	51	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 53	****	****	4.30	4.32	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	51	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.16	4.44	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	51	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 41	****	****	4.43	5.00	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	39	1	0	0	1	10	1	4.00	****/ 110	****	3.86	3.99	4.05	****

Course-Section: POLI 300 0101
 Title QUANT POLI SCI
 Instructor: MILLER, NICHOLA
 Enrollment: 52
 Questionnaires: 52

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 1351
 FEB 11, 2009
 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	9	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	17
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B	6						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	3	C	7	General	1	Under-grad	52	Non-major	35
84-150	11	3.00-3.49	5	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	21				
				?	0						

Course-Section: POLI 323 0101
 Title THE PRESIDENCY
 Instructor: SCHALLER, THOMA
 Enrollment: 33
 Questionnaires: 32

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 1352
 FEB 11, 2009
 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	7	0	0	0	0	5	20	4.80	274/1649	4.80	4.51	4.28	4.27	4.80	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	7	0	1	1	6	4	13	4.08	1076/1648	4.08	4.31	4.23	4.18	4.08	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	8	4	2	1	0	7	10	4.10	915/1375	4.10	4.38	4.27	4.22	4.10	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	7	0	0	0	2	9	14	4.48	524/1595	4.48	4.33	4.20	4.21	4.48	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	7	0	1	0	1	7	16	4.48	388/1533	4.48	4.47	4.04	4.05	4.48	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	7	1	1	0	5	10	8	4.00	883/1512	4.00	4.25	4.10	4.11	4.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	7	0	0	0	3	6	16	4.52	480/1623	4.52	4.28	4.16	4.08	4.52	
8. How many times was class cancelled	7	0	0	0	0	11	14	4.56	1139/1646	4.56	4.64	4.69	4.67	4.56	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	13	0	1	0	0	5	13	4.53	356/1621	4.53	4.23	4.06	4.02	4.53	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	10	0	0	0	0	2	20	4.91	245/1568	4.91	4.64	4.43	4.39	4.91	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	10	0	0	0	0	0	22	5.00	1/1572	5.00	4.85	4.70	4.64	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	10	0	0	0	1	4	17	4.73	390/1564	4.73	4.48	4.28	4.25	4.73	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	0	2	20	4.91	205/1559	4.91	4.49	4.29	4.23	4.91	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	13	0	0	0	1	3	15	4.74	167/1352	4.74	3.95	3.98	3.97	4.74	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	0	5	13	4.72	275/1384	4.72	4.31	4.08	4.11	4.72	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	14	0	0	0	0	2	16	4.89	262/1382	4.89	4.48	4.29	4.37	4.89	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	14	0	0	0	0	2	16	4.89	285/1368	4.89	4.60	4.30	4.39	4.89	
4. Were special techniques successful	15	12	0	1	0	0	4	4.40	****/ 948	****	4.00	3.95	4.00	****	
Laboratory															
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	28	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	****/ 555	****	4.57	4.29	4.22	****	
Seminar															
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	24	2	0	2	0	4	0	3.33	****/ 288	****	3.67	3.68	3.58	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	31	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.06	3.59	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	31	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.09	4.21	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	31	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.47	4.43	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	27	0	0	2	0	3	0	3.20	****/ 312	****	3.74	3.68	3.60	****	
Self Paced															
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	26	0	0	0	0	5	1	4.17	****/ 110	****	3.86	3.99	4.05	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	8	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	13
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	B	9						
56-83	8	2.00-2.99	2	C	1	General	10	Under-grad	32	Non-major	19
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	4	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	12	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	12				
				?	3						

Course-Section: POLI 323 8620
 Title The Presidency
 Instructor: Croatti, Mark
 Enrollment: 0
 Questionnaires: 20

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 11
 FEB 11, 2009
 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	0	1	4	13	4.30	912/1649	****	4.52	4.28	4.11	4.30	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	3	4	2	10	3.85	1271/1648	****	4.35	4.23	4.16	3.85	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	0	8	0	11	4.00	950/1375	****	4.38	4.27	4.10	4.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	2	1	2	5	10	4.00	1067/1595	****	4.38	4.20	4.03	4.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	3	0	2	7	8	3.85	966/1533	****	4.01	4.04	3.87	3.85	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	3	0	3	6	8	3.80	1089/1512	****	4.35	4.10	3.86	3.80	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	2	4	13	4.45	581/1623	****	4.22	4.16	4.08	4.45	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	2	18	4.90	664/1646	****	4.85	4.69	4.67	4.90	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	8	0	2	0	2	3	5	3.75	1192/1621	****	4.07	4.06	3.96	3.75	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	1	0	3	3	12	4.32	1070/1568	****	4.50	4.43	4.39	4.32	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	2	17	4.80	840/1572	****	4.82	4.70	4.64	4.80	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	2	1	4	2	10	3.89	1224/1564	****	4.29	4.28	4.20	3.89	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	3	0	4	3	10	3.85	1221/1559	****	4.34	4.29	4.20	3.85	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	7	1	0	4	3	4	3.75	914/1352	****	3.91	3.98	3.86	3.75	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	2	1	4	2	9	3.83	921/1384	****	4.39	4.08	3.86	3.83	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	4	2	2	5	5	3.28	1268/1382	****	4.49	4.29	4.03	3.28	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	2	1	4	3	8	3.78	1085/1368	****	4.43	4.30	4.01	3.78	
4. Were special techniques successful	2	11	2	0	0	0	5	3.86	555/ 948	****	4.24	3.95	3.75	3.86	
Laboratory															
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	16	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	****/ 555	****	4.01	4.29	4.14	****	
Seminar															
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	14	0	0	0	0	4	2	4.33	58/ 288	****	3.36	3.68	3.54	4.33	
Field Work															
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	13	0	0	0	0	5	2	4.29	46/ 312	****	3.81	3.68	3.51	4.29	
Self Paced															
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	15	0	0	0	0	4	1	4.20	26/ 110	****	4.00	3.99	3.83	4.20	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors		
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	A 6	Required for Majors 1	Graduate 0	Major 0
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B 7			
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	0	C 3	General 2	Under-grad 20	Non-major 2
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	5	D 0			
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F 0	Electives 0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	
				P 0			
				I 0	Other 13		
				? 0			

Course-Section: POLI 327 0101
 Title INTEREST GROUPS & LOBB
 Instructor: SCOTT, JAMES L
 Enrollment: 31
 Questionnaires: 30

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 1353
 FEB 11, 2009
 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	7	0	0	0	0	3	20	4.87	221/1649	4.87	4.51	4.28	4.27	4.87	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	7	0	0	0	0	5	18	4.78	234/1648	4.78	4.31	4.23	4.18	4.78	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	7	0	0	0	0	3	20	4.87	192/1375	4.87	4.38	4.27	4.22	4.87	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	7	0	0	0	2	4	17	4.65	332/1595	4.65	4.33	4.20	4.21	4.65	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	7	0	1	0	0	1	21	4.78	162/1533	4.78	4.47	4.04	4.05	4.78	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	0	2	21	4.91	99/1512	4.91	4.25	4.10	4.11	4.91	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	7	0	0	0	0	5	18	4.78	189/1623	4.78	4.28	4.16	4.08	4.78	
8. How many times was class cancelled	7	0	0	0	0	1	22	4.96	332/1646	4.96	4.64	4.69	4.67	4.96	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	9	1	0	0	0	7	13	4.65	243/1621	4.65	4.23	4.06	4.02	4.65	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	7	0	0	0	0	1	22	4.96	123/1568	4.96	4.64	4.43	4.39	4.96	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	7	0	0	0	0	0	23	5.00	1/1572	5.00	4.85	4.70	4.64	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	7	0	0	0	0	4	19	4.83	244/1564	4.83	4.48	4.28	4.25	4.83	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	0	2	21	4.91	184/1559	4.91	4.49	4.29	4.23	4.91	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	8	17	1	0	0	1	3	4.00	****/1352	****	3.95	3.98	3.97	****	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	0	1	18	4.95	90/1384	4.95	4.31	4.08	4.11	4.95	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	11	0	0	0	0	0	19	5.00	1/1382	5.00	4.48	4.29	4.37	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	11	0	0	1	0	0	18	4.84	327/1368	4.84	4.60	4.30	4.39	4.84	
4. Were special techniques successful	11	0	0	0	1	5	13	4.63	161/ 948	4.63	4.00	3.95	4.00	4.63	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	29	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 221	****	****	4.16	4.07	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	29	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 243	****	****	4.12	3.89	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	29	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 212	****	****	4.40	4.21	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	29	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 209	****	****	4.35	4.12	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	22	0	0	1	4	0	3	3.63	462/ 555	3.63	4.57	4.29	4.22	3.63	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	28	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 88	****	5.00	4.54	4.63	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	28	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 85	****	4.83	4.47	4.55	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	28	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 81	****	4.50	4.43	4.30	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	28	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 92	****	4.33	4.35	4.46	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	27	0	0	1	0	1	1	3.67	****/ 288	****	3.67	3.68	3.58	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	29	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.06	3.59	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	29	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.09	4.21	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	29	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.47	4.43	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	29	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.38	4.32	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	26	0	0	1	0	2	1	3.75	****/ 312	****	3.74	3.68	3.60	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	29	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 53	****	****	4.30	4.32	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	29	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.16	4.44	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	29	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 41	****	****	4.43	5.00	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	29	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 24	****	****	4.42	5.00	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	19	0	0	2	0	7	2	3.82	85/ 110	3.82	3.86	3.99	4.05	3.82	

Course-Section: POLI 327 0101
 Title INTEREST GROUPS & LOBB
 Instructor: SCOTT, JAMES L
 Enrollment: 31
 Questionnaires: 30

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 1353
 FEB 11, 2009
 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	14	Required for Majors	2	Graduate	0	Major	6
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	7						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	6	C	0	General	1	Under-grad	30	Non-major	24
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	8	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	1						
				I	0	Other	19				
				?	0						

Course-Section: POLI 328 0101
 Title WOMEN AND POLITICS
 Instructor: GUISEGERRITY, N
 Enrollment: 30
 Questionnaires: 30

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 1354
 FEB 11, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

Laboratory														
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	25	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	****/ 555	****	4.57	4.29	4.22	****
Seminar														
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	21	0	1	1	0	7	0	3.44	197/ 288	3.44	3.67	3.68	3.58	3.44
Field Work														
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	21	0	0	0	0	9	0	4.00	68/ 312	4.00	3.74	3.68	3.60	4.00
Self Paced														
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	15	0	0	2	0	13	0	3.73	89/ 110	3.73	3.86	3.99	4.05	3.73

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: POLI 334 0101
 Title JUDICIAL PROCESS
 Instructor: SCOTT, KEVIN
 Enrollment: 25
 Questionnaires: 25

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 1355
 FEB 11, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	7	0	1	0	1	7	9	4.28	943/1649	4.28	4.51	4.28	4.27	4.28	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	8	0	1	0	5	3	8	4.00	1124/1648	4.00	4.31	4.23	4.18	4.00	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	7	0	1	1	2	3	11	4.22	831/1375	4.22	4.38	4.27	4.22	4.22	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	7	0	1	2	3	1	11	4.06	1038/1595	4.06	4.33	4.20	4.21	4.06	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	7	0	1	1	1	4	11	4.28	604/1533	4.28	4.47	4.04	4.05	4.28	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	7	2	1	1	2	2	10	4.19	764/1512	4.19	4.25	4.10	4.11	4.19	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	7	0	1	3	1	2	11	4.06	1004/1623	4.06	4.28	4.16	4.08	4.06	
8. How many times was class cancelled	7	0	0	0	1	14	3	4.11	1498/1646	4.11	4.64	4.69	4.67	4.11	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	11	0	1	0	4	4	5	3.86	1105/1621	3.86	4.23	4.06	4.02	3.86	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	7	0	1	0	0	4	13	4.56	791/1568	4.56	4.64	4.43	4.39	4.56	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	7	0	1	0	1	1	15	4.61	1133/1572	4.61	4.85	4.70	4.64	4.61	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	7	0	1	0	2	4	11	4.33	854/1564	4.33	4.48	4.28	4.25	4.33	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	7	0	1	0	2	4	11	4.33	901/1559	4.33	4.49	4.29	4.23	4.33	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	8	2	0	2	1	5	7	4.13	607/1352	4.13	3.95	3.98	3.97	4.13	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	14	0	1	0	4	2	4	3.73	981/1384	3.73	4.31	4.08	4.11	3.73	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	13	0	2	0	2	5	3	3.58	1183/1382	3.58	4.48	4.29	4.37	3.58	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	16	0	0	0	2	4	3	4.11	915/1368	4.11	4.60	4.30	4.39	4.11	
4. Were special techniques successful	14	8	1	1	1	0	0	2.00	****/ 948	****	4.00	3.95	4.00	****	
Laboratory															
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	20	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	****/ 555	****	4.57	4.29	4.22	****	
Seminar															
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	14	1	0	2	0	8	0	3.60	184/ 288	3.60	3.67	3.68	3.58	3.60	
Field Work															
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	18	0	0	2	0	5	0	3.43	229/ 312	3.43	3.74	3.68	3.60	3.43	
Self Paced															
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	23	0	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	****/ 110	****	3.86	3.99	4.05	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	6	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	14
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	5						
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	2	C	0	General	3	Under-grad	25	Non-major	11
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	2	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	11				
				?	2						

Course-Section: POLI 337 0101
 Title COMPARATIVE JUSTICE
 Instructor: DAVIS, JEFFREY
 Enrollment: 28
 Questionnaires: 28

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 1356
 FEB 11, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	8	0	0	1	1	2	16	4.65	446/1649	4.65	4.51	4.28	4.27	4.65	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	8	0	0	0	1	5	14	4.65	375/1648	4.65	4.31	4.23	4.18	4.65	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	8	0	0	0	0	3	17	4.85	199/1375	4.85	4.38	4.27	4.22	4.85	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	8	1	0	0	1	2	16	4.79	209/1595	4.79	4.33	4.20	4.21	4.79	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	0	1	19	4.95	64/1533	4.95	4.47	4.04	4.05	4.95	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	1	3	16	4.75	194/1512	4.75	4.25	4.10	4.11	4.75	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	8	0	0	0	1	2	17	4.80	169/1623	4.80	4.28	4.16	4.08	4.80	
8. How many times was class cancelled	9	1	0	0	0	3	15	4.83	782/1646	4.83	4.64	4.69	4.67	4.83	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	12	0	0	0	0	5	11	4.69	216/1621	4.69	4.23	4.06	4.02	4.69	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	9	0	0	0	0	0	19	5.00	1/1568	5.00	4.64	4.43	4.39	5.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	9	0	0	0	0	0	19	5.00	1/1572	5.00	4.85	4.70	4.64	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	9	0	0	0	2	0	17	4.79	294/1564	4.79	4.48	4.28	4.25	4.79	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	0	1	18	4.95	123/1559	4.95	4.49	4.29	4.23	4.95	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	9	0	0	0	2	4	13	4.58	263/1352	4.58	3.95	3.98	3.97	4.58	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	0	3	10	4.77	238/1384	4.77	4.31	4.08	4.11	4.77	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	15	0	0	0	0	1	12	4.92	194/1382	4.92	4.48	4.29	4.37	4.92	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	15	0	0	0	1	3	9	4.62	569/1368	4.62	4.60	4.30	4.39	4.62	
4. Were special techniques successful	15	8	0	1	0	0	4	4.40	****/ 948	****	4.00	3.95	4.00	****	
Laboratory															
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	23	0	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	****/ 555	****	4.57	4.29	4.22	****	
Seminar															
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	21	0	0	2	0	5	0	3.43	199/ 288	3.43	3.67	3.68	3.58	3.43	
Field Work															
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	20	0	0	1	0	7	0	3.75	193/ 312	3.75	3.74	3.68	3.60	3.75	
Self Paced															
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	19	0	1	1	0	7	0	3.44	97/ 110	3.44	3.86	3.99	4.05	3.44	

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 8		Graduate 0
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	C 1	General	4
84-150	6	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad 28
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	12
			? 1		

Course-Section: POLI 353 0101
 Title GOVERNMENTAL BUDGETING
 Instructor: MEYERS, ROY T.
 Enrollment: 28
 Questionnaires: 28

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 1357
 FEB 11, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	9	0	0	0	1	4	14	4.68	408/1649	4.68	4.51	4.28	4.27	4.68	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	9	0	0	0	3	4	12	4.47	599/1648	4.47	4.31	4.23	4.18	4.47	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	10	14	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	****/1375	****	4.38	4.27	4.22	****	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	9	0	0	0	1	5	13	4.63	352/1595	4.63	4.33	4.20	4.21	4.63	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	1	4	3	10	4.22	653/1533	4.22	4.47	4.04	4.05	4.22	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	4	4	11	4.37	564/1512	4.37	4.25	4.10	4.11	4.37	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	10	0	0	1	4	3	10	4.22	849/1623	4.22	4.28	4.16	4.08	4.22	
8. How many times was class cancelled	9	0	0	1	0	9	9	4.37	1317/1646	4.37	4.64	4.69	4.67	4.37	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	13	0	0	0	2	4	9	4.47	428/1621	4.47	4.23	4.06	4.02	4.47	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	10	0	0	0	0	3	15	4.83	344/1568	4.83	4.64	4.43	4.39	4.83	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	10	0	0	0	0	0	18	5.00	1/1572	5.00	4.85	4.70	4.64	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	10	0	0	0	1	4	13	4.67	473/1564	4.67	4.48	4.28	4.25	4.67	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	2	1	15	4.72	434/1559	4.72	4.49	4.29	4.23	4.72	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	11	2	2	0	4	3	6	3.73	928/1352	3.73	3.95	3.98	3.97	3.73	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	1	4	6	4.45	489/1384	4.45	4.31	4.08	4.11	4.45	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	17	0	0	0	2	1	8	4.55	585/1382	4.55	4.48	4.29	4.37	4.55	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	17	0	0	0	1	2	8	4.64	550/1368	4.64	4.60	4.30	4.39	4.64	
4. Were special techniques successful	17	1	0	1	2	4	3	3.90	533/ 948	3.90	4.00	3.95	4.00	3.90	
Laboratory															
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	14	0	0	1	0	0	13	4.79	243/ 555	4.79	4.57	4.29	4.22	4.79	
Seminar															
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	23	0	0	0	0	5	0	4.00	****/ 288	****	3.67	3.68	3.58	****	
Field Work															
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	21	0	0	0	0	7	0	4.00	68/ 312	4.00	3.74	3.68	3.60	4.00	
Self Paced															
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	26	0	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	****/ 110	****	3.86	3.99	4.05	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors		
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A 12	Required for Majors 1	Graduate 0	Major 4
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B 5			
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	4	C 0	General 3	Under-grad 28	Non-major 24
84-150	8	3.00-3.49	3	D 0			
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	6	F 0	Electives 0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	
				P 0			
				I 0	Other 10		
				? 0			

Course-Section: POLI 354 0101
 Title PUBL MGMNT/PERSONNEL S
 Instructor: ADLER, JOSEPH
 Enrollment: 29
 Questionnaires: 29

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 1358
 FEB 11, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	14	0	0	0	3	6	6	4.20	1027/1649	4.20	4.51	4.28	4.27	4.20
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	14	0	0	0	4	3	8	4.27	885/1648	4.27	4.31	4.23	4.18	4.27
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	14	0	0	0	4	2	9	4.33	733/1375	4.33	4.38	4.27	4.22	4.33
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	14	1	0	1	3	3	7	4.14	956/1595	4.14	4.33	4.20	4.21	4.14
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	2	3	2	8	4.07	774/1533	4.07	4.47	4.04	4.05	4.07
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	14	1	0	1	3	2	8	4.21	735/1512	4.21	4.25	4.10	4.11	4.21
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	14	0	0	1	1	1	12	4.60	395/1623	4.60	4.28	4.16	4.08	4.60
8. How many times was class cancelled	14	0	0	0	0	3	12	4.80	833/1646	4.80	4.64	4.69	4.67	4.80
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	14	0	0	1	7	5	2	3.53	1332/1621	3.53	4.23	4.06	4.02	3.53
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	14	0	0	0	5	1	9	4.27	1112/1568	4.27	4.64	4.43	4.39	4.27
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	14	0	0	1	2	1	11	4.47	1273/1572	4.47	4.85	4.70	4.64	4.47
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	14	0	0	0	4	4	7	4.20	1001/1564	4.20	4.48	4.28	4.25	4.20
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	14	0	1	2	4	0	8	3.80	1246/1559	3.80	4.49	4.29	4.23	3.80
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	14	0	0	3	3	1	8	3.93	779/1352	3.93	3.95	3.98	3.97	3.93
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	17	0	1	0	4	0	7	4.00	795/1384	4.00	4.31	4.08	4.11	4.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	17	0	1	0	4	0	7	4.00	946/1382	4.00	4.48	4.29	4.37	4.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	18	0	0	0	3	4	4	4.09	922/1368	4.09	4.60	4.30	4.39	4.09
4. Were special techniques successful	17	2	0	1	4	2	3	3.70	624/ 948	3.70	4.00	3.95	4.00	3.70
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	28	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 221	****	****	4.16	4.07	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	28	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 243	****	****	4.12	3.89	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	28	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 212	****	****	4.40	4.21	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	28	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 209	****	****	4.35	4.12	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	23	0	0	1	1	0	4	4.17	****/ 555	****	4.57	4.29	4.22	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	28	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 88	****	5.00	4.54	4.63	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	28	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 85	****	4.83	4.47	4.55	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	28	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 81	****	4.50	4.43	4.30	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	28	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 92	****	4.33	4.35	4.46	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	27	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 288	****	3.67	3.68	3.58	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	28	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.06	3.59	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	28	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.09	4.21	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	28	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.47	4.43	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	28	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.38	4.32	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	22	1	0	2	0	3	1	3.50	****/ 312	****	3.74	3.68	3.60	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	28	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 53	****	****	4.30	4.32	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	28	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.16	4.44	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	28	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 41	****	****	4.43	5.00	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	28	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 24	****	****	4.42	5.00	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	23	0	0	3	0	2	1	3.17	****/ 110	****	3.86	3.99	4.05	****

Course-Section: POLI 354 0101
 Title PUBL MGMNT/PERSONNEL S
 Instructor: ADLER, JOSEPH
 Enrollment: 29
 Questionnaires: 29

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 1358
 FEB 11, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	A	7	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	2
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	7						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	4	C	0	General	2	Under-grad	29	Non-major	27
84-150	7	3.00-3.49	3	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	12				
				?	0						

Course-Section: POLI 373 0101
 Title COMP MID-EAST/N AFR PO
 Instructor: LEBSON, MICAH
 Enrollment: 23
 Questionnaires: 23

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 1359
 FEB 11, 2009
 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	3	0	1	0	2	5	12	4.35	844/1649	4.35	4.51	4.28	4.27	4.35	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	3	0	1	1	5	5	8	3.90	1229/1648	3.90	4.31	4.23	4.18	3.90	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	4	9	0	0	0	3	7	4.70	370/1375	4.70	4.38	4.27	4.22	4.70	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	3	0	1	0	3	7	9	4.15	943/1595	4.15	4.33	4.20	4.21	4.15	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	1	6	13	4.60	288/1533	4.60	4.47	4.04	4.05	4.60	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	3	0	2	0	3	5	10	4.05	859/1512	4.05	4.25	4.10	4.11	4.05	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	4	0	1	1	3	5	9	4.05	1004/1623	4.05	4.28	4.16	4.08	4.05	
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	0	0	0	0	7	13	4.65	1048/1646	4.65	4.64	4.69	4.67	4.65	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	0	1	2	3	7	4	3.65	1274/1621	3.65	4.23	4.06	4.02	3.65	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	2	1	3	5	8	3.84	1369/1568	3.84	4.64	4.43	4.39	3.84	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	1	0	2	3	13	4.42	1305/1572	4.42	4.85	4.70	4.64	4.42	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	2	1	5	4	7	3.68	1328/1564	3.68	4.48	4.28	4.25	3.68	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	3	0	4	4	8	3.74	1289/1559	3.74	4.49	4.29	4.23	3.74	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	6	1	1	4	4	3	3.54	1034/1352	3.54	3.95	3.98	3.97	3.54	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	2	3	12	4.59	388/1384	4.59	4.31	4.08	4.11	4.59	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	0	0	3	14	4.82	322/1382	4.82	4.48	4.29	4.37	4.82	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	0	0	0	4	13	4.76	415/1368	4.76	4.60	4.30	4.39	4.76	
4. Were special techniques successful	6	1	0	0	2	4	10	4.50	203/ 948	4.50	4.00	3.95	4.00	4.50	
Laboratory															
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	19	0	0	0	3	0	1	3.50	****/ 555	****	4.57	4.29	4.22	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 88	****	5.00	4.54	4.63	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 85	****	4.83	4.47	4.55	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 81	****	4.50	4.43	4.30	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 92	****	4.33	4.35	4.46	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	20	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	****/ 288	****	3.67	3.68	3.58	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 4	Required for Majors 1 Graduate 0 Major 14
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B 9	
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	2	C 2	General 4 Under-grad 23 Non-major 9
84-150	9	3.00-3.49	2	D 0	
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5	F 0	Electives 2
				P 0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
				I 0	Other 9
				? 2	

Course-Section: POLI 380 0101
 Title INTERNATIONAL RELATION
 Instructor: HODY, CYNTHIA
 Enrollment: 28
 Questionnaires: 27

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 1360
 FEB 11, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	14	0	0	0	1	6	6	4.38	803/1649	4.38	4.51	4.28	4.27	4.38	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	14	0	0	0	2	3	8	4.46	614/1648	4.46	4.31	4.23	4.18	4.46	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	14	2	0	0	1	3	7	4.55	513/1375	4.55	4.38	4.27	4.22	4.55	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	14	1	0	0	2	3	7	4.42	622/1595	4.42	4.33	4.20	4.21	4.42	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	0	3	10	4.77	174/1533	4.77	4.47	4.04	4.05	4.77	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	1	3	9	4.62	302/1512	4.62	4.25	4.10	4.11	4.62	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	14	0	1	0	0	3	9	4.46	555/1623	4.46	4.28	4.16	4.08	4.46	
8. How many times was class cancelled	14	0	0	0	0	7	6	4.46	1230/1646	4.46	4.64	4.69	4.67	4.46	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	17	0	0	0	1	4	5	4.40	511/1621	4.40	4.23	4.06	4.02	4.40	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	14	0	0	1	0	3	9	4.54	815/1568	4.54	4.64	4.43	4.39	4.54	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	14	0	0	0	0	2	11	4.85	740/1572	4.85	4.85	4.70	4.64	4.85	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	14	0	0	0	2	5	6	4.31	887/1564	4.31	4.48	4.28	4.25	4.31	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	2	3	8	4.46	749/1559	4.46	4.49	4.29	4.23	4.46	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	15	7	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	****/1352	****	3.95	3.98	3.97	****	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	2	4	4	4.20	708/1384	4.20	4.31	4.08	4.11	4.20	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	17	0	0	0	2	2	6	4.40	716/1382	4.40	4.48	4.29	4.37	4.40	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	17	0	0	0	1	2	7	4.60	579/1368	4.60	4.60	4.30	4.39	4.60	
4. Were special techniques successful	17	7	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	****/ 948	****	4.00	3.95	4.00	****	
Laboratory															
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	26	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 555	****	4.57	4.29	4.22	****	
Seminar															
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	21	0	1	0	1	4	0	3.33	****/ 288	****	3.67	3.68	3.58	****	
Field Work															
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	21	0	0	1	0	5	0	3.67	****/ 312	****	3.74	3.68	3.60	****	
Self Paced															
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	23	0	0	1	0	3	0	3.50	****/ 110	****	3.86	3.99	4.05	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	5	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	6
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	4						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	1	C	1	General	2	Under-grad	27	Non-major	21
84-150	2	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	7				
				?	0						

Course-Section: POLI 395 0101
 Title U.S. NAT'L SECURITY PO
 Instructor: STARKEY, BRIGID
 Enrollment: 32
 Questionnaires: 31

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 1361
 FEB 11, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor Mean	Instructor Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5								
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	6	0	0	1	2	4	18	4.56	563/1649	4.56	4.51	4.28	4.27	4.56	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	6	0	0	0	3	3	19	4.64	388/1648	4.64	4.31	4.23	4.18	4.64	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	6	0	0	0	1	6	18	4.68	391/1375	4.68	4.38	4.27	4.22	4.68	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	6	0	0	0	2	5	18	4.64	342/1595	4.64	4.33	4.20	4.21	4.64	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	3	22	4.88	115/1533	4.88	4.47	4.04	4.05	4.88	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	3	9	13	4.40	522/1512	4.40	4.25	4.10	4.11	4.40	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	7	1	0	1	2	6	14	4.43	595/1623	4.43	4.28	4.16	4.08	4.43	
8. How many times was class cancelled	6	0	0	0	0	2	23	4.92	531/1646	4.92	4.64	4.69	4.67	4.92	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	12	0	0	0	2	8	9	4.37	559/1621	4.37	4.23	4.06	4.02	4.37	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	7	0	0	0	2	3	19	4.71	573/1568	4.71	4.64	4.43	4.39	4.71	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	8	0	0	0	1	0	22	4.91	532/1572	4.91	4.85	4.70	4.64	4.91	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	9	0	0	0	1	4	17	4.73	390/1564	4.73	4.48	4.28	4.25	4.73	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	2	4	18	4.67	512/1559	4.67	4.49	4.29	4.23	4.67	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	8	5	1	1	4	3	9	4.00	690/1352	4.00	3.95	3.98	3.97	4.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	14	0	1	0	1	4	11	4.41	530/1384	4.41	4.31	4.08	4.11	4.41	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	14	0	0	1	0	2	14	4.71	446/1382	4.71	4.48	4.29	4.37	4.71	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	14	0	0	0	0	3	14	4.82	348/1368	4.82	4.60	4.30	4.39	4.82	
4. Were special techniques successful	15	5	1	0	0	4	6	4.27	334/ 948	4.27	4.00	3.95	4.00	4.27	
Laboratory															
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	23	0	0	0	2	0	6	4.50	293/ 555	4.50	4.57	4.29	4.22	4.50	
Seminar															
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	27	0	1	0	0	3	0	3.25	****/ 288	****	3.67	3.68	3.58	****	
Field Work															
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	25	0	0	1	0	5	0	3.67	****/ 312	****	3.74	3.68	3.60	****	
Self Paced															
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	25	0	1	1	0	4	0	3.17	****/ 110	****	3.86	3.99	4.05	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors		
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 11	Required for Majors 1	Graduate 0	Major 10
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B 11			
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	4	C 0	General 6	Under-grad 31	Non-major 21
84-150	10	3.00-3.49	6	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 15		
				? 1			

Course-Section: POLI 401 1501
 Title INDIVIDUAL STUDY IN PO
 Instructor: KING-MEADOWS, T
 Enrollment: 2
 Questionnaires: 2

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 1362
 FEB 11, 2009
 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	0	2	5.00	1/1649	5.00	4.51	4.28	4.50	5.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1648	5.00	4.31	4.23	4.36	5.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1595	5.00	4.33	4.20	4.36	5.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1533	5.00	4.47	4.04	4.14	5.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1512	5.00	4.25	4.10	4.26	5.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1623	5.00	4.28	4.16	4.27	5.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1646	5.00	4.64	4.69	4.71	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1621	5.00	4.23	4.06	4.24	5.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1568	5.00	4.64	4.43	4.54	5.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1572	5.00	4.85	4.70	4.79	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1564	5.00	4.48	4.28	4.40	5.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1559	5.00	4.49	4.29	4.41	5.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	303/1352	4.50	3.95	3.98	4.07	4.50	
Laboratory															
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 555	5.00	4.57	4.29	4.41	5.00	
Seminar															
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	83/ 288	4.00	3.67	3.68	3.71	4.00	
Self Paced															
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	40/ 110	4.00	3.86	3.99	4.22	4.00	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: POLI 405 0101
 Title SEMINAR IN POLITICAL S
 Instructor: KING-MEADOWS, T
 Enrollment: 14
 Questionnaires: 14

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 1363
 FEB 11, 2009
 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	5	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1649	5.00	4.51	4.28	4.50	5.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	5	0	0	1	1	5	2	3.89	1245/1648	3.89	4.31	4.23	4.36	3.89	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	5	2	0	0	2	1	4	4.29	780/1375	4.29	4.38	4.27	4.48	4.29	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	5	0	1	0	1	3	4	4.00	1067/1595	4.00	4.33	4.20	4.36	4.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	168/1533	4.78	4.47	4.04	4.14	4.78	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	5	4	4.44	465/1512	4.44	4.25	4.10	4.26	4.44	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	5	0	1	1	1	3	3	3.67	1318/1623	3.67	4.28	4.16	4.27	3.67	
8. How many times was class cancelled	5	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1646	5.00	4.64	4.69	4.71	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	7	1	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	121/1621	4.83	4.23	4.06	4.24	4.83	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	5	0	0	0	0	3	6	4.67	636/1568	4.67	4.64	4.43	4.54	4.67	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	5	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1572	5.00	4.85	4.70	4.79	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	5	0	0	1	0	5	3	4.11	1073/1564	4.11	4.48	4.28	4.40	4.11	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	1	0	1	7	4.56	640/1559	4.56	4.49	4.29	4.41	4.56	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	6	2	0	0	6	0	0	3.00	1219/1352	3.00	3.95	3.98	4.07	3.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	1	0	7	4.75	247/1384	4.75	4.31	4.08	4.35	4.75	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	272/1382	4.88	4.48	4.29	4.56	4.88	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1368	5.00	4.60	4.30	4.58	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	6	0	0	1	3	0	4	3.88	546/ 948	3.88	4.00	3.95	4.31	3.88	
Laboratory															
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	11	0	1	0	0	0	2	3.67	****/ 555	****	4.57	4.29	4.41	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	8	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/ 88	5.00	5.00	4.54	4.66	5.00	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	8	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	27/ 85	4.83	4.83	4.47	4.54	4.83	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	41/ 81	4.50	4.50	4.43	4.57	4.50	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	1	2	3	4.33	58/ 92	4.33	4.33	4.35	4.44	4.33	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	8	0	0	0	2	1	3	4.17	75/ 288	4.17	3.67	3.68	3.71	4.17	
Field Work															
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	12	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 312	****	3.74	3.68	3.95	****	
Self Paced															
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	9	0	0	0	0	5	0	4.00	40/ 110	4.00	3.86	3.99	4.22	4.00	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	1	A	3	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B	3						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	1	C	1	General	2	Under-grad	14	Non-major	13
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	0	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	7				
				?	2						

Course-Section: POLI 423 0101
 Title PRESIDENTIAL ELECTIONS
 Instructor: MILLER, NICHOLA
 Enrollment: 24
 Questionnaires: 24

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 1364
 FEB 11, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	12	0	0	2	2	4	4	3.83	1327/1649	3.83	4.51	4.28	4.50	3.83
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	12	0	0	2	2	4	4	3.83	1287/1648	3.83	4.31	4.23	4.36	3.83
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	13	0	0	1	1	4	5	4.18	862/1375	4.18	4.38	4.27	4.48	4.18
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	12	2	0	1	1	4	4	4.10	1010/1595	4.10	4.33	4.20	4.36	4.10
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	2	4	1	5	3.75	1065/1533	3.75	4.47	4.04	4.14	3.75
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	12	1	1	0	4	3	3	3.64	1186/1512	3.64	4.25	4.10	4.26	3.64
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	12	0	0	2	1	4	5	4.00	1029/1623	4.00	4.28	4.16	4.27	4.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	12	0	0	0	0	3	9	4.75	913/1646	4.75	4.64	4.69	4.71	4.75
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	13	0	1	0	5	3	2	3.45	1375/1621	3.45	4.23	4.06	4.24	3.45
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	12	0	0	1	1	1	9	4.50	852/1568	4.50	4.64	4.43	4.54	4.50
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	12	0	0	0	1	1	10	4.75	931/1572	4.75	4.85	4.70	4.79	4.75
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	12	0	0	1	1	5	5	4.17	1028/1564	4.17	4.48	4.28	4.40	4.17
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	12	0	1	1	0	4	6	4.08	1084/1559	4.08	4.49	4.29	4.41	4.08
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	13	1	1	0	2	3	4	3.90	818/1352	3.90	3.95	3.98	4.07	3.90
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	16	0	1	2	3	0	2	3.00	1254/1384	3.00	4.31	4.08	4.35	3.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	16	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	394/1382	4.75	4.48	4.29	4.56	4.75
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	16	0	0	0	2	4	2	4.00	948/1368	4.00	4.60	4.30	4.58	4.00
4. Were special techniques successful	16	6	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 948	****	4.00	3.95	4.31	****
Laboratory														
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	18	0	0	0	2	0	4	4.33	338/ 555	4.33	4.57	4.29	4.41	4.33
Seminar														
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	22	0	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/ 288	****	3.67	3.68	3.71	****
Field Work														
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	20	0	0	2	0	2	0	3.00	****/ 312	****	3.74	3.68	3.95	****
Self Paced														
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	21	0	0	0	0	3	0	4.00	****/ 110	****	3.86	3.99	4.22	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 1	Required for Majors	1
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	B 8		Graduate 0
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	C 0	General	3
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad 24
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		
			I 0		
			? 1	Other	5

- Means there are not enough responses to be significant

Course-Section: POLI 425 8620
 Title US Campaigns & Elections
 Instructor: Goldberg, Marni
 Enrollment: 0
 Questionnaires: 21

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 13
 FEB 11, 2009
 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	0	3	16	4.70	395/1649	****	4.52	4.28	4.11	4.70	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	1	0	6	13	4.55	498/1648	****	4.35	4.23	4.16	4.55	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	3	3	0	0	1	4	10	4.60	464/1375	****	4.38	4.27	4.10	4.60	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	0	1	0	0	4	14	4.58	417/1595	****	4.38	4.20	4.03	4.58	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	3	16	4.75	180/1533	****	4.01	4.04	3.87	4.75	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	3	16	4.75	194/1512	****	4.35	4.10	3.86	4.75	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	0	2	2	15	4.68	296/1623	****	4.22	4.16	4.08	4.68	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	2	18	4.90	664/1646	****	4.85	4.69	4.67	4.90	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	7	0	0	0	2	4	8	4.43	483/1621	****	4.07	4.06	3.96	4.43	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	1	19	4.95	147/1568	****	4.50	4.43	4.39	4.95	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	1	19	4.95	355/1572	****	4.82	4.70	4.64	4.95	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	4	16	4.80	263/1564	****	4.29	4.28	4.20	4.80	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	1	18	4.85	261/1559	****	4.34	4.29	4.20	4.85	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	1	0	1	1	3	14	4.58	263/1352	****	3.91	3.98	3.86	4.58	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	1	1	2	15	4.63	351/1384	****	4.39	4.08	3.86	4.63	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	0	2	17	4.89	252/1382	****	4.49	4.29	4.03	4.89	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	0	1	18	4.95	158/1368	****	4.43	4.30	4.01	4.95	
4. Were special techniques successful	2	6	1	1	1	0	10	4.31	323/ 948	****	4.24	3.95	3.75	4.31	
Laboratory															
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	13	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/ 555	****	4.01	4.29	4.14	5.00	
Seminar															
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	15	0	0	0	0	4	2	4.33	58/ 288	****	3.36	3.68	3.54	4.33	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 52	****	4.18	4.06	3.72	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 48	****	4.50	4.09	3.65	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 39	****	4.40	4.47	4.36	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 39	****	4.62	4.38	4.37	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	12	0	0	0	0	3	6	4.67	21/ 312	****	3.81	3.68	3.51	4.67	
Self Paced															
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	11	0	0	0	0	8	2	4.20	26/ 110	****	4.00	3.99	3.83	4.20	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors		
00-27	4	0.00-0.99	0	A 5	Required for Majors 0	Graduate 0	Major 0
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B 7			
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	2	C 5	General 0	Under-grad 21	Non-major 3
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	3	D 0			
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F 0	Electives 1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	
				P 0			
				I 0	Other 17		
				? 1			

Course-Section: POLI 433 0101
 Title FIRST AMENDMENT FREEDO
 Instructor: LANOUE, GEORGE
 Enrollment: 36
 Questionnaires: 35

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 1365
 FEB 11, 2009
 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	5	0	0	0	2	6	22	4.67	433/1649	4.67	4.51	4.28	4.50	4.67	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	5	0	0	1	3	7	19	4.47	614/1648	4.47	4.31	4.23	4.36	4.47	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	5	1	0	2	6	6	15	4.17	868/1375	4.17	4.38	4.27	4.48	4.17	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	5	2	0	1	2	11	14	4.36	697/1595	4.36	4.33	4.20	4.36	4.36	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	1	9	19	4.62	272/1533	4.62	4.47	4.04	4.14	4.62	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	6	3	1	1	3	9	12	4.15	791/1512	4.15	4.25	4.10	4.26	4.15	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	6	0	0	3	3	4	19	4.34	708/1623	4.34	4.28	4.16	4.27	4.34	
8. How many times was class cancelled	6	0	0	0	0	1	28	4.97	266/1646	4.97	4.64	4.69	4.71	4.97	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	14	0	1	0	1	7	12	4.38	535/1621	4.38	4.23	4.06	4.24	4.38	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	8	0	0	0	0	4	23	4.85	316/1568	4.85	4.64	4.43	4.54	4.85	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	8	0	0	0	0	3	24	4.89	640/1572	4.89	4.85	4.70	4.79	4.89	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	9	0	0	0	1	8	17	4.62	537/1564	4.62	4.48	4.28	4.40	4.62	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	1	2	2	21	4.65	524/1559	4.65	4.49	4.29	4.41	4.65	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	10	11	2	1	6	2	3	3.21	1173/1352	3.21	3.95	3.98	4.07	3.21	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	2	0	7	13	4.41	541/1384	4.41	4.31	4.08	4.35	4.41	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	13	0	0	1	2	4	15	4.50	616/1382	4.50	4.48	4.29	4.56	4.50	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	13	0	0	1	3	2	16	4.50	654/1368	4.50	4.60	4.30	4.58	4.50	
4. Were special techniques successful	13	1	1	1	4	4	11	4.10	411/ 948	4.10	4.00	3.95	4.31	4.10	
Laboratory															
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	34	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 243	****	****	4.12	4.61	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	32	1	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 555	****	4.57	4.29	4.41	****	
Seminar															
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	34	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 92	****	4.33	4.35	4.44	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	31	0	0	1	1	2	0	3.25	****/ 288	****	3.67	3.68	3.71	****	
Field Work															
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	28	0	0	2	0	5	0	3.43	****/ 312	****	3.74	3.68	3.95	****	
Self Paced															
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	28	0	0	0	0	6	1	4.14	****/ 110	****	3.86	3.99	4.22	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	9	Required for Majors	4	Graduate	0	Major	12
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	9						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	3	C	6	General	4	Under-grad	35	Non-major	23
84-150	11	3.00-3.49	8	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5	F	1	Electives	2	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	1						
				I	0	Other	17				
				?	1						

Course-Section: POLI 433 8620
 Title First Amendment Freedoms
 Instructor: Melcavage, E. Peter
 Enrollment: 0
 Questionnaires: 22

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 12
 FEB 11, 2009
 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	0	2	6	13	4.36	830/1649	****	4.52	4.28	4.11	4.36	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	0	1	7	13	4.41	702/1648	****	4.35	4.23	4.16	4.41	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	0	3	3	15	4.41	665/1375	****	4.38	4.27	4.10	4.41	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	1	1	0	2	7	10	4.25	818/1595	****	4.38	4.20	4.03	4.25	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	1	1	5	13	4.18	688/1533	****	4.01	4.04	3.87	4.18	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	1	1	7	12	4.27	663/1512	****	4.35	4.10	3.86	4.27	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	1	5	4	11	4.05	1009/1623	****	4.22	4.16	4.08	4.05	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	22	5.00	1/1646	****	4.85	4.69	4.67	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	8	1	1	0	1	9	2	3.85	1114/1621	****	4.07	4.06	3.96	3.85	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	3	18	4.77	442/1568	****	4.50	4.43	4.39	4.77	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	3	19	4.86	690/1572	****	4.82	4.70	4.64	4.86	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	1	1	1	5	13	4.33	854/1564	****	4.29	4.28	4.20	4.33	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	0	1	4	15	4.52	673/1559	****	4.34	4.29	4.20	4.52	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	14	1	0	1	0	4	4.00	690/1352	****	3.91	3.98	3.86	4.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	4	17	4.81	201/1384	****	4.39	4.08	3.86	4.81	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	0	0	20	5.00	1/1382	****	4.49	4.29	4.03	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	0	21	5.00	1/1368	****	4.43	4.30	4.01	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	1	10	0	2	1	0	8	4.27	334/ 948	****	4.24	3.95	3.75	4.27	
Laboratory															
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	14	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/ 555	****	4.01	4.29	4.14	5.00	
Seminar															
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	16	0	0	0	0	3	3	4.50	37/ 288	****	3.36	3.68	3.54	4.50	
Field Work															
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	12	0	0	0	0	7	3	4.30	44/ 312	****	3.81	3.68	3.51	4.30	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	21	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 53	****	3.67	4.30	4.17	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	18	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	****/ 110	****	4.00	3.99	3.83	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	A 4	Required for Majors	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	B 7		0
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	C 5	General	0
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	D 0		22
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	1
			P 0		
			I 0	Other	16
			? 3		

- Means there are not enough responses to be significant

Course-Section: POLI 445 0101
 Title LAW/POLITICS/AMER EDUC
 Instructor: L'ANOUE, GEORGE
 Enrollment: 12
 Questionnaires: 11

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 1366
 FEB 11, 2009
 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	1	9	4.90	186/1649	4.90	4.51	4.28	4.50	4.90	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	3	7	4.70	323/1648	4.70	4.31	4.23	4.36	4.70	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	6	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1375	5.00	4.38	4.27	4.48	5.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	3	6	4.50	497/1595	4.50	4.33	4.20	4.36	4.50	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	106/1533	4.90	4.47	4.04	4.14	4.90	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	1	8	4.70	240/1512	4.70	4.25	4.10	4.26	4.70	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	1	0	2	7	4.50	502/1623	4.50	4.28	4.16	4.27	4.50	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	3	7	4.70	1004/1646	4.70	4.64	4.69	4.71	4.70	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	1	0	0	0	4	3	4.43	483/1621	4.43	4.23	4.06	4.24	4.43	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1568	5.00	4.64	4.43	4.54	5.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1572	5.00	4.85	4.70	4.79	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1564	5.00	4.48	4.28	4.40	5.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	318/1559	4.80	4.49	4.29	4.41	4.80	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	1	0	2	3	3	1	3.33	1130/1352	3.33	3.95	3.98	4.07	3.33	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	165/1384	4.88	4.31	4.08	4.35	4.88	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1382	5.00	4.48	4.29	4.56	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	295/1368	4.88	4.60	4.30	4.58	4.88	
4. Were special techniques successful	4	0	0	0	1	2	4	4.43	265/ 948	4.43	4.00	3.95	4.31	4.43	
Laboratory															
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	6	0	0	1	0	0	4	4.40	323/ 555	4.40	4.57	4.29	4.41	4.40	
Field Work															
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	8	0	0	0	0	3	0	4.00	68/ 312	4.00	3.74	3.68	3.95	4.00	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	6	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	2	Major	3
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	2						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	0	C	1	General	3	Under-grad	9	Non-major	8
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	3	D	1						
Grad.	2	3.50-4.00	5	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	7				
				?	0						

Course-Section: POLI 460 0101
 Title COMP INST DEVELOPMENT
 Instructor: FORESTIERE, CAR
 Enrollment: 18
 Questionnaires: 17

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 1367
 FEB 11, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	2	0	0	0	0	1	14	4.93	130/1649	4.93	4.51	4.28	4.50	4.93	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	0	0	0	1	14	4.93	103/1648	4.93	4.31	4.23	4.36	4.93	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	3	2	0	0	1	2	9	4.67	401/1375	4.67	4.38	4.27	4.48	4.67	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	0	0	0	2	2	11	4.60	383/1595	4.60	4.33	4.20	4.36	4.60	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	2	13	4.87	124/1533	4.87	4.47	4.04	4.14	4.87	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	1	1	13	4.80	156/1512	4.80	4.25	4.10	4.26	4.80	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	1	0	2	3	9	4.27	803/1623	4.27	4.28	4.16	4.27	4.27	
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	6	9	4.60	1103/1646	4.60	4.64	4.69	4.71	4.60	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	7	1	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1621	5.00	4.23	4.06	4.24	5.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	0	2	12	4.86	316/1568	4.86	4.64	4.43	4.54	4.86	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	1	1	12	4.79	876/1572	4.79	4.85	4.70	4.79	4.79	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	0	2	12	4.86	216/1564	4.86	4.48	4.28	4.40	4.86	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	1	2	11	4.71	448/1559	4.71	4.49	4.29	4.41	4.71	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	0	0	0	2	3	9	4.50	303/1352	4.50	3.95	3.98	4.07	4.50	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	1	1	7	4.67	326/1384	4.67	4.31	4.08	4.35	4.67	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	0	0	0	3	6	4.67	483/1382	4.67	4.48	4.29	4.56	4.67	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	0	0	0	3	6	4.67	522/1368	4.67	4.60	4.30	4.58	4.67	
4. Were special techniques successful	8	2	0	0	1	4	2	4.14	389/ 948	4.14	4.00	3.95	4.31	4.14	
Laboratory															
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	15	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 555	****	4.57	4.29	4.41	****	
Seminar															
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	12	0	0	2	0	3	0	3.20	219/ 288	3.20	3.67	3.68	3.71	3.20	
Field Work															
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	9	0	0	0	0	8	0	4.00	68/ 312	4.00	3.74	3.68	3.95	4.00	
Self Paced															
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	16	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 110	****	3.86	3.99	4.22	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 7	Required for Majors	1
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	B 4		Graduate 0
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	C 0	General	17
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	D 0		Non-major 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	9
			? 0		

Course-Section: POLI 482 8020
 Title INTERNATIONAL LAW
 Instructor: DAVIS, JEFFREY
 Enrollment: 20
 Questionnaires: 20

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 1368
 FEB 11, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	6	0	0	0	0	2	12	4.86	230/1649	4.69	4.51	4.28	4.50	4.86	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	6	0	0	0	0	7	7	4.50	556/1648	4.25	4.31	4.23	4.36	4.50	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	6	0	0	0	0	5	9	4.64	422/1375	4.47	4.38	4.27	4.48	4.64	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	6	4	0	0	2	2	6	4.40	636/1595	4.32	4.33	4.20	4.36	4.40	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	0	2	11	4.85	133/1533	4.60	4.47	4.04	4.14	4.85	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	1	3	3	6	4.08	849/1512	4.07	4.25	4.10	4.26	4.08	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	7	0	0	0	1	1	11	4.77	210/1623	4.33	4.28	4.16	4.27	4.77	
8. How many times was class cancelled	7	0	0	0	0	4	9	4.69	1004/1646	4.85	4.64	4.69	4.71	4.69	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	7	0	0	0	0	3	10	4.77	159/1621	4.38	4.23	4.06	4.24	4.77	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	6	0	0	0	0	0	14	5.00	1/1568	4.94	4.64	4.43	4.54	5.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	6	0	0	0	0	0	14	5.00	1/1572	4.97	4.85	4.70	4.79	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	6	0	0	0	0	3	11	4.79	294/1564	4.82	4.48	4.28	4.40	4.79	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	2	12	4.86	261/1559	4.77	4.49	4.29	4.41	4.86	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	6	4	1	1	1	3	4	3.80	879/1352	3.50	3.95	3.98	4.07	3.80	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	1	0	1	8	4.60	376/1384	4.56	4.31	4.08	4.35	4.60	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	10	0	0	1	0	1	8	4.60	540/1382	4.56	4.48	4.29	4.56	4.60	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	10	0	0	0	1	2	7	4.60	579/1368	4.71	4.60	4.30	4.58	4.60	
4. Were special techniques successful	10	8	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/ 948	3.36	4.00	3.95	4.31	****	
Laboratory															
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	17	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/ 555	5.00	4.57	4.29	4.41	****	
Seminar															
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	16	0	0	0	0	4	0	4.00	****/ 288	****	3.67	3.68	3.71	****	
Field Work															
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	14	0	1	0	1	4	0	3.33	239/ 312	3.33	3.74	3.68	3.95	3.33	
Self Paced															
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	17	0	1	0	0	2	0	3.00	****/ 110	****	3.86	3.99	4.22	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	5	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	10
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	7						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	1	C	0	General	3	Under-grad	20	Non-major	10
84-150	6	3.00-3.49	4	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	8				
				?	1						

Course-Section: POLI 482 8620
 Title INTERNATIONAL LAW
 Instructor: MELCAVAGE, EUGE
 Enrollment: 17
 Questionnaires: 17

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 1369
 FEB 11, 2009
 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	0	1	2	13	4.53	617/1649	4.69	4.51	4.28	4.50	4.53	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	1	2	6	7	4.00	1124/1648	4.25	4.31	4.23	4.36	4.00	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	5	9	4.29	771/1375	4.47	4.38	4.27	4.48	4.29	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	1	1	7	7	4.25	818/1595	4.32	4.33	4.20	4.36	4.25	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	2	4	10	4.35	525/1533	4.60	4.47	4.04	4.14	4.35	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	5	6	6	4.06	859/1512	4.07	4.25	4.10	4.26	4.06	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	1	5	2	8	3.88	1192/1623	4.33	4.28	4.16	4.27	3.88	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	17	5.00	1/1646	4.85	4.64	4.69	4.71	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	1	1	0	8	5	4.00	914/1621	4.38	4.23	4.06	4.24	4.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	2	15	4.88	273/1568	4.94	4.64	4.43	4.54	4.88	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	16	4.94	355/1572	4.97	4.85	4.70	4.79	4.94	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	0	0	0	2	11	4.85	225/1564	4.82	4.48	4.28	4.40	4.85	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	0	0	1	14	4.69	487/1559	4.77	4.49	4.29	4.41	4.69	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	10	1	1	1	0	2	3.20	1177/1352	3.50	3.95	3.98	4.07	3.20	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	4	11	4.53	424/1384	4.56	4.31	4.08	4.35	4.53	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	1	0	1	2	13	4.53	600/1382	4.56	4.48	4.29	4.56	4.53	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	1	0	0	16	4.82	348/1368	4.71	4.60	4.30	4.58	4.82	
4. Were special techniques successful	0	6	2	1	3	1	4	3.36	763/ 948	3.36	4.00	3.95	4.31	3.36	
Laboratory															
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	15	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/ 243	****	****	4.12	4.61	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	15	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 209	****	****	4.35	4.63	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	4	1	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/ 555	5.00	4.57	4.29	4.41	5.00	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	15	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 88	****	5.00	4.54	4.66	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	15	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 85	****	4.83	4.47	4.54	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 81	****	4.50	4.43	4.57	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 92	****	4.33	4.35	4.44	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	13	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	****/ 288	****	3.67	3.68	3.71	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.06	4.86	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.09	4.42	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.47	4.52	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.38	4.59	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	13	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	****/ 312	3.33	3.74	3.68	3.95	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 53	****	****	4.30	4.64	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	14	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.16	4.24	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	14	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 41	****	****	4.43	4.84	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	14	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 24	****	****	4.42	4.85	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	14	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 110	****	3.86	3.99	4.22	****	

Course-Section: POLI 482 8620
 Title INTERNATIONAL LAW
 Instructor: MELCAVAGE, EUGE
 Enrollment: 17
 Questionnaires: 17

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 1369
 FEB 11, 2009
 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	3	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	1	Major	12
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	8						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	1	C	1	General	1	Under-grad	16	Non-major	5
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00	1	F	0	Electives	2	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	13				
				?	1						

Course-Section: POLI 488 0101
 Title POLITICS/IR SOUTH ASIA
 Instructor: HAGERTY, DEVIN
 Enrollment: 26
 Questionnaires: 26

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 1370
 FEB 11, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	8	0	0	0	0	4	14	4.78	306/1649	4.78	4.51	4.28	4.50	4.78	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	8	0	0	0	2	2	14	4.67	362/1648	4.67	4.31	4.23	4.36	4.67	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	8	0	0	1	0	4	13	4.61	453/1375	4.61	4.38	4.27	4.48	4.61	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	8	0	0	0	3	4	11	4.44	580/1595	4.44	4.33	4.20	4.36	4.44	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	2	0	5	11	4.39	495/1533	4.39	4.47	4.04	4.14	4.39	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	4	4	10	4.33	595/1512	4.33	4.25	4.10	4.26	4.33	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	8	0	0	1	0	4	13	4.61	382/1623	4.61	4.28	4.16	4.27	4.61	
8. How many times was class cancelled	8	0	0	0	2	11	5	4.17	1462/1646	4.17	4.64	4.69	4.71	4.17	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	10	0	0	0	1	4	11	4.63	270/1621	4.63	4.23	4.06	4.24	4.63	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	8	0	0	0	0	3	15	4.83	344/1568	4.83	4.64	4.43	4.54	4.83	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	8	0	0	0	0	2	16	4.89	640/1572	4.89	4.85	4.70	4.79	4.89	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	8	0	0	0	1	3	14	4.72	390/1564	4.72	4.48	4.28	4.40	4.72	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	0	3	15	4.83	284/1559	4.83	4.49	4.29	4.41	4.83	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	8	3	0	2	2	6	5	3.93	779/1352	3.93	3.95	3.98	4.07	3.93	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	1	6	10	4.53	424/1384	4.53	4.31	4.08	4.35	4.53	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	9	0	0	0	2	0	15	4.76	383/1382	4.76	4.48	4.29	4.56	4.76	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	0	0	0	2	15	4.88	285/1368	4.88	4.60	4.30	4.58	4.88	
4. Were special techniques successful	9	13	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	****/ 948	****	4.00	3.95	4.31	****	
Laboratory															
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	18	0	0	0	1	1	6	4.63	278/ 555	4.63	4.57	4.29	4.41	4.63	
Seminar															
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	18	0	0	2	0	6	0	3.50	190/ 288	3.50	3.67	3.68	3.71	3.50	
Field Work															
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	18	1	0	2	1	4	0	3.29	244/ 312	3.29	3.74	3.68	3.95	3.29	
Self Paced															
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	19	0	0	0	0	7	0	4.00	40/ 110	4.00	3.86	3.99	4.22	4.00	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	5	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	14
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	7						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	1	C	3	General	1	Under-grad	26	Non-major	12
84-150	8	3.00-3.49	6	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	12				
				?	0						

Course-Section: POLI 489A 0101
 Title COMP FOREIGN POLICIES
 Instructor: STARKEY, BRIGID
 Enrollment: 20
 Questionnaires: 19

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 1371
 FEB 11, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	8	0	0	0	0	2	9	4.82	265/1649	4.82	4.51	4.28	4.50	4.82	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	8	0	0	0	0	3	8	4.73	291/1648	4.73	4.31	4.23	4.36	4.73	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	8	0	0	0	1	2	8	4.64	432/1375	4.64	4.38	4.27	4.48	4.64	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	9	1	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	218/1595	4.78	4.33	4.20	4.36	4.78	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	0	2	9	4.82	146/1533	4.82	4.47	4.04	4.14	4.82	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	8	1	0	0	1	5	4	4.30	627/1512	4.30	4.25	4.10	4.26	4.30	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	8	0	0	0	1	3	7	4.55	459/1623	4.55	4.28	4.16	4.27	4.55	
8. How many times was class cancelled	8	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1646	5.00	4.64	4.69	4.71	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	10	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	101/1621	4.89	4.23	4.06	4.24	4.89	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	8	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	245/1568	4.91	4.64	4.43	4.54	4.91	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	8	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1572	5.00	4.85	4.70	4.79	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	8	0	0	0	0	2	9	4.82	253/1564	4.82	4.48	4.28	4.40	4.82	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	0	2	9	4.82	306/1559	4.82	4.49	4.29	4.41	4.82	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	9	7	0	1	0	1	1	3.67	****/1352	****	3.95	3.98	4.07	****	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	0	4	4	4.50	437/1384	4.50	4.31	4.08	4.35	4.50	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	11	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	272/1382	4.88	4.48	4.29	4.56	4.88	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	11	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1368	5.00	4.60	4.30	4.58	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	11	2	0	0	1	3	2	4.17	380/ 948	4.17	4.00	3.95	4.31	4.17	
Laboratory															
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	17	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 555	****	4.57	4.29	4.41	****	
Seminar															
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	15	0	0	3	1	0	0	2.25	****/ 288	****	3.67	3.68	3.71	****	
Field Work															
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	16	1	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	****/ 312	****	3.74	3.68	3.95	****	
Self Paced															
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	11	0	0	0	0	8	0	4.00	40/ 110	4.00	3.86	3.99	4.22	4.00	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 4	Required for Majors	2
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	B 4		Graduate 0
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	C 1	General	1
84-150	7	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad 19
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: POLI 623 0101
 Title GOVERNMENTAL BUDGETING
 Instructor: MEYERS, ROY T.
 Enrollment: 20
 Questionnaires: 20

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 1372
 FEB 11, 2009
 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	3	0	0	0	0	9	8	4.47	683/1649	4.47	4.51	4.28	4.46	4.47	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	3	0	0	0	4	6	7	4.18	988/1648	4.18	4.31	4.23	4.34	4.18	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	3	15	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/1375	****	4.38	4.27	4.44	****	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	3	0	0	0	3	9	5	4.12	996/1595	4.12	4.33	4.20	4.35	4.12	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	3	0	1	1	4	4	7	3.88	935/1533	3.88	4.47	4.04	4.28	3.88	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	2	1	7	7	4.12	826/1512	4.12	4.25	4.10	4.35	4.12	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	4	0	0	3	1	5	7	4.00	1029/1623	4.00	4.28	4.16	4.29	4.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	0	0	0	0	0	17	5.00	1/1646	5.00	4.64	4.69	4.81	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	7	0	0	0	2	9	2	4.00	914/1621	4.00	4.23	4.06	4.20	4.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	3	5	9	4.35	1031/1568	4.35	4.64	4.43	4.52	4.35	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	0	1	16	4.94	355/1572	4.94	4.85	4.70	4.83	4.94	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	1	3	6	7	4.12	1073/1564	4.12	4.48	4.28	4.41	4.12	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	4	3	10	4.35	881/1559	4.35	4.49	4.29	4.41	4.35	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	1	0	0	5	3	7	4.13	607/1352	4.13	3.95	3.98	4.10	4.13	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	3	8	4	4.07	774/1384	4.07	4.31	4.08	4.30	4.07	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	1	0	2	1	11	4.40	716/1382	4.40	4.48	4.29	4.52	4.40	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	1	1	1	12	4.60	579/1368	4.60	4.60	4.30	4.56	4.60	
4. Were special techniques successful	5	4	0	2	2	4	3	3.73	614/ 948	3.73	4.00	3.95	4.03	3.73	
Laboratory															
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	18	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/ 555	****	4.57	4.29	4.66	****	
Seminar															
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	17	0	1	1	0	1	0	2.33	****/ 288	****	3.67	3.68	3.87	****	
Self Paced															
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	18	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 110	****	3.86	3.99	3.92	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	4	0.00-0.99	1	A	11	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	10	Major	0
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B	4						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	1	C	1	General	0	Under-grad	10	Non-major	20
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	5	D	0						
Grad.	10	3.50-4.00	7	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	17				
				?	1						

Course-Section: POLI 625 0101
 Title THEORIES OF PUBLIC ADM
 Instructor: FLETCHER, PATRI
 Enrollment: 5
 Questionnaires: 5

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 1373
 FEB 11, 2009
 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		
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	274/1649	4.80	4.51	4.28	4.46	4.80
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	2	4.40	702/1648	4.40	4.31	4.23	4.34	4.40
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	383/1595	4.60	4.33	4.20	4.35	4.60
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	151/1533	4.80	4.47	4.04	4.28	4.80
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	0	3	4.20	755/1512	4.20	4.25	4.10	4.35	4.20
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	3	2	4.40	635/1623	4.40	4.28	4.16	4.29	4.40
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	4	1	4.20	1440/1646	4.20	4.64	4.69	4.81	4.20
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	374/1621	4.50	4.23	4.06	4.20	4.50
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	731/1568	4.60	4.64	4.43	4.52	4.60
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1572	5.00	4.85	4.70	4.83	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	263/1564	4.80	4.48	4.28	4.41	4.80
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	586/1559	4.60	4.49	4.29	4.41	4.60
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1384	5.00	4.31	4.08	4.30	5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1382	5.00	4.48	4.29	4.52	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	369/1368	4.80	4.60	4.30	4.56	4.80
4. Were special techniques successful	0	3	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	431/ 948	4.00	4.00	3.95	4.03	4.00
Laboratory														
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	4	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 555	****	4.57	4.29	4.66	****
Seminar														
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	4	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 288	****	3.67	3.68	3.87	****

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: POLI 652 0101
 Title POLITICS OF HEALTH
 Instructor: MILLER, NANCY A
 Enrollment: 13
 Questionnaires: 9

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 1374
 FEB 11, 2009
 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	5	4.22	996/1649	4.22	4.51	4.28	4.46	4.22	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	2	6	4.56	498/1648	4.56	4.31	4.23	4.34	4.56	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	5	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	401/1375	4.67	4.38	4.27	4.44	4.67	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	6	4.67	321/1595	4.67	4.33	4.20	4.35	4.67	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	168/1533	4.78	4.47	4.04	4.28	4.78	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	0	7	4.56	345/1512	4.56	4.25	4.10	4.35	4.56	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	199/1623	4.78	4.28	4.16	4.29	4.78	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	881/1646	4.78	4.64	4.69	4.81	4.78	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	1	2	4	4.43	483/1621	4.43	4.23	4.06	4.20	4.43	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	442/1568	4.78	4.64	4.43	4.52	4.78	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1572	5.00	4.85	4.70	4.83	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	187/1564	4.89	4.48	4.28	4.41	4.89	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	227/1559	4.89	4.49	4.29	4.41	4.89	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	4	0	0	3	0	2	3.80	879/1352	3.80	3.95	3.98	4.10	3.80	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	4	1	4	4.00	795/1384	4.00	4.31	4.08	4.30	4.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	3	1	5	4.22	851/1382	4.22	4.48	4.29	4.52	4.22	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	403/1368	4.78	4.60	4.30	4.56	4.78	
4. Were special techniques successful	0	5	0	0	2	1	1	3.75	601/ 948	3.75	4.00	3.95	4.03	3.75	
Laboratory															
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	7	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/ 555	****	4.57	4.29	4.66	****	
Seminar															
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	8	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 288	****	3.67	3.68	3.87	****	
Field Work															
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	8	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 312	****	3.74	3.68	3.83	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	1	A	5	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	4	Major	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	3						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	1	C	0	General	6	Under-grad	5	Non-major	9
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	4	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	3				
				?	0						